

# **The Organization Executive Course**

by  
**L. Ron Hubbard**

**EXECUTIVE  
DIVISION**

**VOLUME  
7**

*Published in the USA by*  
**Bridge Publications, Inc.**  
4751 Fountain Avenue  
Los Angeles, California 90029

ISBN 0-88404-598-6

*Published in all other countries by*  
**NEW ERA Publications International ApS**  
Store Kongensgade 55  
1264 Copenhagen K, Denmark

ISBN 87-7336-757-5

© 1991  
L. Ron Hubbard Library  
All Rights Reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced  
without the permission of the copyright owner.

DIANETICS, SCIENTOLOGY, HUBBARD, E-METER, FLAG, HCO, LRH, KEY TO LIFE,  
LIFE ORIENTATION, FEBC, MARK V, ARC STRAIGHTWIRE, FALSE PURPOSE RUNDOWN,  
METHOD ONE, NED, NEW ERA DIANETICS, PURIFICATION RUNDOWN, PURIF, STUDENT HAT,  
CLEAR CERTAINTY RUNDOWN, OEC, OT, SHSBC, THE BRIDGE, *Ability* magazine, *The Auditor*  
magazine, BOOK ONE, HQS, INCOMM, L. RON HUBBARD, the SCIENTOLOGY Symbol, the  
DIANETICS Symbol in Circle and the Standard Admin Symbol are trademarks and service  
marks owned by Religious Technology Center and used with its permission.  
SCIENTOLOGIST is a collective membership mark designating members of the  
churches and missions of Scientology.

*Printed in the United States of America*

Editor's Note: In 1982, LRH gave the trademarks of the Scientology Religion to RTC. The purpose of RTC is to protect the trademarks of the Scientology religion and to ensure that the Dianetics and Scientology technology remains in good hands and is properly used. Since 1986, the copyrighted works of LRH have been owned by the L. Ron Hubbard Library.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 FEBRUARY 1965

Remimeo  
Sthil Students  
Assoc/Org Sec  
Hat  
HCO Sec Hat  
Case Sup Hat  
Ds of P Hat  
Ds of T Hat  
Staff Member  
Hat  
Missions

***Keeping Scientology Working Series 1***

*Note:* Neglect of this PL has caused great hardship on staffs, has cost countless millions and made it necessary in 1970 to engage in an all-out, international effort to restore basic Scientology over the world. Within 5 years after the issue of this PL, with me off the lines, violation had almost destroyed orgs. "Quickie grades" entered in and denied gain to tens of thousands of cases. Therefore actions which neglect or violate this policy letter are HIGH CRIMES resulting in Comm Evs on ADMINISTRATORS and EXECUTIVES. It is not "entirely a tech matter," as its neglect destroys orgs and caused a 2-year slump. IT IS THE BUSINESS OF EVERY STAFF MEMBER to enforce it.

**SPECIAL MESSAGE**

THE FOLLOWING POLICY LETTER MEANS WHAT IT SAYS.

IT WAS TRUE IN 1965 WHEN I WROTE IT. IT WAS TRUE IN 1970 WHEN I HAD IT REISSUED. I AM REISSUING IT NOW, IN 1980, TO AVOID AGAIN SLIPPING BACK INTO A PERIOD OF OMITTED AND QUICKIED FUNDAMENTAL GRADE CHART ACTIONS ON CASES, THEREBY DENYING GAINS AND THREATENING THE VIABILITY OF SCIENTOLOGY AND OF ORGS. SCIENTOLOGY WILL KEEP WORKING ONLY AS LONG AS *YOU* DO YOUR PART TO KEEP IT WORKING BY APPLYING THIS POLICY LETTER.

WHAT I SAY IN THESE PAGES HAS ALWAYS BEEN TRUE, IT HOLDS TRUE TODAY, IT WILL STILL HOLD TRUE IN THE YEAR 2000 AND IT WILL CONTINUE TO HOLD TRUE FROM THERE ON OUT.

NO MATTER WHERE YOU ARE IN SCIENTOLOGY, ON STAFF OR NOT, THIS POLICY LETTER HAS SOMETHING TO DO WITH YOU.

***ALL LEVELS***

**KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING**

HCO Sec or Communicator hat check  
on all personnel and all new personnel  
as taken on.

We have some time since passed the point of achieving uniformly workable technology.

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

If you can't get the technology applied, then you can't deliver what's promised. It's as simple as that. If you can get the technology applied, you *can* deliver what's promised.

The only thing you can be upbraided for by students or pcs is "no results." Trouble spots occur only where there are "no results." Attacks from governments or monopolies occur only where there are "no results" or "bad results."

Therefore the road before Scientology is clear and its ultimate success is assured *if* the technology is applied.

So it is the task of the Assoc or Org Sec, the HCO Sec, the Case Supervisor, the D of P, the D of T and all staff members to get the correct technology applied.

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

**One: Having the correct technology.**

**Two: Knowing the technology.**

**Three: Knowing it is correct.**

**Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.**

**Five: Applying the technology.**

**Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.**

**Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.**

**Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.**

**Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.**

**Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.**

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

Three is achieved by the individual applying the correct technology in a proper manner and observing that it works that way.

Four is being done daily successfully in most parts of the world.

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by Instructors and Supervisors consistently.

Seven is done by a few but is a weak point.

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

Nine is impeded by the “reasonable” attitude of the not-quite-bright.

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are the only places Scientology can bog down in any area.

The reasons for this are not hard to find. (a) A weak certainty that it works in Three above can lead to weakness in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. (b) Further, the not-too-bright have a bad point on the button Self-Importance. (c) The lower the IQ, the more the individual is shut off from the fruits of observation. (d) The service faces of people make them defend themselves against anything they confront, good or bad, and seek to make it wrong. (e) The bank seeks to knock out the good and perpetuate the bad.

Thus, we as Scientologists and as an organization must be very alert to Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

In all the years I have been engaged in research I have kept my comm lines wide open for research data. I once had the idea that a group could evolve truth. A third of a century has thoroughly disabused me of that idea. Willing as I was to accept suggestions and data, only a handful of suggestions (less than twenty) had long-run value and *none* were major or basic; and when I did accept major or basic suggestions and used them, we went astray and I repented and eventually had to “eat crow.”

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which, if accepted and acted upon, would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of pcs. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable “technology.” By actual record the percentages are about twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology. As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had better steel ourselves to continue to do so now that we have made it. This point will, of course, be attacked as “unpopular,” “egotistical” and “undemocratic.” It very well may be. But it is also a survival point. And I don’t see that popular measures, self-abnegation and democracy have done anything for man but push him further into the mud. Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels, self-abnegation has filled the Southeast Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

Our technology has not been discovered by a group. True, if the group had not supported me in many ways, I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that if in its formative stages it was not discovered by a group, then group efforts, one can safely assume, will not add to it or successfully alter it in the future. I can only say this now that it is done. There remains, of course, group tabulation or coordination of what has been done, which will be valuable—only so long as it does not seek to alter basic principles and successful applications.

The contributions that were worthwhile in this period of forming the technology were help in the form of friendship, of defense, of organization, of dissemination, of application, of advices on results and of finance. These were great contributions

and were, and are, appreciated. Many thousands contributed in this way and made us what we are. Discovery contribution was not however part of the broad picture.

We will not speculate here on why this was so or how I came to rise above the bank. We are dealing only in facts and the above is a fact—the group left to its own devices would not have evolved Scientology but with wild dramatizations of the bank called “new ideas” would have wiped it out. Supporting this is the fact that man has never before evolved workable mental technology and emphasizing it is the vicious technology he *did* evolve—psychiatry, psychology, surgery, shock treatment, whips, duress, punishment, etc., ad infinitum.

So realize that we have climbed out of the mud by whatever good luck and good sense, and *refuse* to sink back into it again. See that Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten above are ruthlessly followed and we will never be stopped. Relax them, get reasonable about it and we will perish.

So far, while keeping myself in complete communication with all suggestions, I have not failed on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten in areas I could supervise closely. But it's not good enough for just myself and a few others to work at this.

Whenever this control as per Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten has been relaxed, the whole organizational area has failed. Witness Elizabeth, NJ; Wichita; the early organizations and groups. They crashed only because I no longer did Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. Then, when they were all messed up, you saw the obvious “reasons” for failure. But ahead of that they ceased to deliver and *that* involved them in other reasons.

The common denominator of a group is the reactive bank. Thetans without banks have different responses. They only have their banks in common. They agree then only on bank principles. Person to person the bank is identical. So constructive ideas are *individual* and seldom get broad agreement in a human group. An individual must rise *above* an avid craving for agreement from a humanoid group to get anything decent done. The bank-agreement has been what has made Earth a hell—and if you were looking for hell and found Earth, it would certainly serve. War, famine, agony and disease has been the lot of man. Right now the great governments of Earth have developed the means of frying every man, woman and child on the planet. That is bank. That is the result of Collective-Thought Agreement. The decent, pleasant things on this planet come from *individual* actions and ideas that have somehow gotten by the Group Idea. For that matter, look how we ourselves are attacked by “public opinion” media. Yet there is no more ethical group on this planet than ourselves.

Thus each one of us can rise above the domination of the bank and then, as a group of freed beings, achieve freedom and reason. It is only the aberrated group, the mob, that is destructive.

When you don't do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten actively, you are working for the bank-dominated mob. For it will surely, surely (a) introduce incorrect technology and swear by it, (b) apply technology as incorrectly as possible, (c) open the door to any destructive idea, and (d) encourage incorrect application.

It's the bank that says the group is all and the individual nothing. It's the bank that says we must fail.

So just don't play that game. Do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten and you will knock out of your road all the future thorns.

Here's an actual example in which a senior executive had to interfere because of a pc spin: A Case Supervisor told Instructor A to have Auditor B run Process X on Preclear C. Auditor B afterwards told Instructor A that "It didn't work." Instructor A was weak on Three above and didn't really believe in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. So Instructor A told the Case Supervisor, "Process X didn't work on Preclear C." Now *this* strikes directly at each of One to Six above in Preclear C, Auditor B, Instructor A *and* the Case Supervisor. It opens the door to the introduction of "new technology" and to failure.

What happened here? Instructor A didn't jump down Auditor B's throat, that's all that happened. This is what he *should* have done: Grabbed the auditor's report and looked it over. When a higher executive on this case did so, she found what the Case Supervisor and the rest missed: that Process X *increased* Preclear C's TA to 25 TA divisions for the session but that near session end Auditor B Q-and-Aed with a cognition and abandoned Process X while it still gave high TA and went off running one of Auditor B's own manufacture, which nearly spun Preclear C. Auditor B's IQ on examination turned out to be about 75. Instructor A was found to have huge ideas of how you must never invalidate anyone, even a lunatic. The Case Supervisor was found to be "too busy with admin to have any time for actual cases."

All right, there's an all-too-typical example. The *Instructor* should have done Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. This would have begun this way. Auditor B: "That Process X didn't work." Instructor A: "What exactly did *you* do wrong?" Instant attack. "Where's your auditor's report for the session? Good. Look here, you were getting a lot of TA when you stopped Process X. What did you do?" Then the pc wouldn't have come close to a spin and all four of these would have retained their certainty.

In a year, I had four instances in *one* small group where the correct process recommended was reported not to have worked. But on review found that each one had (a) increased the TA, (b) had been abandoned, and (c) had been falsely reported as unworkable. Also, despite this abuse, in each of these four cases the recommended, correct process cracked the case. Yet they were reported as *not having worked!*

Similar examples exist in instruction and these are all the more deadly as every time instruction in correct technology is flubbed, then the resulting error, uncorrected in the auditor, is perpetuated on every pc that auditor audits thereafter. So Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are even more important in a course than in supervision of cases.

Here's an example: A rave recommendation is given a graduating student "because he gets more TA on pcs than any other student on the course!" Figures of 435 TA divisions a session are reported. "Of course his Model Session is poor but it's just a knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertaken because *nobody* at Levels 0 to IV is going to get that much TA on pcs. It is found that this student was never taught to read an E-Meter TA dial! And no Instructor observed his handling of a meter and it was not discovered that he "overcompensated" nervously, swinging the TA 2 or 3 divisions beyond

where it needed to go to place the needle at “set.” So everyone was about to throw away standard processes and Model Session because this one student “got such remarkable TA.” They only read the reports and listened to the brags and never *looked* at this student. The pcs in actual fact were making slightly less than average gain, impeded by a rough Model Session and misworded processes. Thus, what was making the pcs win (actual Scientology) was hidden under a lot of departures and errors.

I recall one student who was squirreling on an Academy course and running a lot of offbeat whole track on other students after course hours. The Academy students were in a state of electrification on all these new experiences and weren’t quickly brought under control, and the student himself never was given the works on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten so they stuck. Subsequently, this student prevented another squirrel from being straightened out and his wife died of cancer resulting from physical abuse. A hard, tough instructor at that moment could have salvaged two squirrels and saved the life of a girl. But no, students had a right to do whatever they pleased.

Squirreling (going off into weird practices or altering Scientology) only comes about from noncomprehension. Usually the noncomprehension is not of Scientology but some earlier contact with an offbeat humanoid practice which in its turn was not understood.

When people can’t get results from *what they think* is standard practice, they can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree. The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each *could not* assimilate straight Scientology. Under instruction in Scientology, they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles. And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two places, directly traced to failures of instruction earlier. So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his Instructors and all Scientology Instructors must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten into effective action. That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone, may yet someday be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make *sure* Scientology got home to him.

With what we know now, there is no student we enroll who cannot be properly trained. As an Instructor, one should be very alert to slow progress and should turn the sluggards inside out personally. No *system* will do it, only you or me with our sleeves rolled up can crack the back of bad studenting and we can only do it on an individual student, never on a whole class only. He’s slow = something is awful wrong. Take *fast* action to correct it. Don’t wait until next week. By then he’s got other messes stuck to him. If you can’t graduate them with their good sense appealed to and wisdom shining, graduate them in such a state of shock they’ll have nightmares if they contemplate squirreling. Then experience will gradually bring about Three in them and they’ll *know* better than to chase butterflies when they should be auditing.

When somebody enrolls, consider he or she has joined up for the duration of the universe—never permit an “open-minded” approach. If they’re going to quit let them quit fast. If they enrolled, they’re aboard; and if they’re aboard, they’re here on the same terms as the rest of us—win or die in the attempt. Never let



them be half-minded about being Scientologists. The finest organizations in history have been tough, dedicated organizations. Not one namby-pamby bunch of pantywaist dilettantes have ever made anything. It's a tough universe. The social veneer makes it seem mild. But only the tigers survive—and even *they* have a hard time. We'll survive because we are tough and are dedicated. When we *do* instruct somebody properly, he becomes more and more tiger. When we instruct half-mindedly and are afraid to offend, scared to enforce, we don't make students into good Scientologists and that lets everybody down. When Mrs. Pattycake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in her eye into a fixed, dedicated glare and she'll win and we'll all win. Humor her and we all die a little. The proper instruction attitude is, "You're here so you're a Scientologist. Now we're going to make you into an expert auditor no matter what happens. We'd rather have you dead than incapable."

Fit that into the economics of the situation and lack of adequate time and you see the cross we have to bear.

But we won't have to bear it forever. The bigger we get, the more economics and time we will have to do our job. And the only things which can prevent us from getting that big fast are areas in from One to Ten. Keep those in mind and we'll be able to grow. Fast. And as we grow, our shackles will be less and less. Failing to keep One to Ten will make *us* grow less.

So the ogre which might eat us up is not the government or the High Priests. It's our possible failure to retain and practice our technology.

An Instructor or Supervisor or Executive *must* challenge with ferocity instances of "unworkability." They must uncover what *did* happen, what *was* run and what *was* done or not done.

If you have One and Two, you can only acquire Three for all by making sure of all the rest.

We're not playing some minor game in Scientology. It isn't cute or something to do for lack of something better.

The whole agonized future of this planet, every man, woman and child on it, and your own destiny for the next endless trillions of years depend on what you do here and now with and in Scientology.

This is a deadly serious activity. And if we miss getting out of the trap now, we may never again have another chance.

Remember, this is our first chance to do so in all the endless trillions of years of the past. Don't muff it now because it seems unpleasant or unsocial to do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD  
Founder