

ORGANIZATION

A lecture given on
23 August 1966

Thank you. I'm a bulletin board today! What's the date?

Audience: twenty—third of August, AD 16.

Twenty—third of August, AD 16. This is a notable day. I hope you—I hope you get something out of this lecture because I had to knock off my afternoon research session to give it to you, putting the OTs that far behind, you see. Make you all guilty now. But the truth of the matter is that I'm making very good progress indeed and all is well in that quarter.

People who are picking on Scientology at this time—you know, they're perfectly right, they're perfectly correct. From their personal point of view, why, what they're doing is very dangerous. Yes, those fellows who're picking on Scientology know just what they're doing in their insane way—they're in danger. Matter of fact, HCO shouldn't issue Suppressive Orders on them, but Danger conditions. That sounds like a threat. It isn't; it's a promise.

Well, today I'm a bulletin board! I've got more people and more things.

I'm told that there are now 130 students total on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and Solo Audit Course. Highest number of students ever and plenty more coming.

Yes, we already have OT projects going. You can expect to see these people start disappearing any day now. Of course, not Craig; he's Case Supervisor, you know. You know that the hierarchy of the Tech Division now are all of them Clear, you know.

Well now, today—today I'm going to talk to you about organization. I've never talked to you about organization before. I never have!

During the entirety of 1965 and something into 1966 I spent literally thousands of hours on the subject of organization, and out of that area of study came a great deal of data.

And one of the first things I found out is the reason that a business organization pattern would not fit a Scientology organization was because a business organization never had isolated the principles of organization.

Now, in a Scientology organization you are handling a commodity known as life and that is the commodity it handles. And, of course, it is handling it with a vessel made out of life. And this is something on the order of trying to pour water into a pitcher made out of water. So it will find out at once every frailty in an organization. It'll find out every missing law. It'll find out every misplaced datum at once and quickly and it will show up very huge.

So that in an ordinary organization, they get a board of directors together and the board of directors appoint a general manager. And the general manager starts organizing things and he gets a production engineer of some sort or another, and he goes down and builds a plant. And they start putting the Coca - Cola bottles through the plant and it comes out of the other end filled up full of Coca - Cola. They have a sales organization; they go out and sell the Coca - Cola; and then they have an Accounting Division to fend off income tax and that's it, no strain, no pain—all very smooth.

Of course, we notice strange things in an organization like this. I wouldn't go so far as to say the thing was completely perfect. For instance, the way they—they get a new head of the company is to marry the boss's daughter. The way they regulate matters is usually by somebody's prejudice. And all of their selection of personnel is done by a system just hiring

and firing. They keep hiring and firing until they find somebody that—who can hold the post down somewhat and they're away.

But wog organization was based on a complete ignorance—and I mean a total ignorance—of all the basic laws of organization. It's the most clean sweep that you ever had much to do with.

There was one law that they did not violate—one law—and that was that “any organization is better than no organization.” And that's true. The individualistic efforts which have gone forward along the time track are very great and they're very stellar and they have absolutely no endurance.

Now you get a bunch of individuals operating together doing something, they will always fall apart when they collide with an organized group of individuals. I'll give you a very gory example of this: Spanish Civil War The government of Spain was, after all, the government of Spain. It was duly elected and so forth, but it had been slow, slower than the rest of Europe in throwing off the various suppressive shackles of a—of an aristocracy that no longer knew its job.

It isn't that aristocracy is bad or even a bad system of government; it is just that the aristocracy got machine—gunned often enough and long enough and became so no—good they could no longer do their job and they themselves were totally disorganized. So that when the society itself began to organize, or when groups of—of politically minded radicals became organized then the aristocracy fell apart. It was not itself sufficiently organized.

For instance, the last days of the court of whichever Louis it was that lost his head in the French Revolution—I didn't know him personally—they all just sort of stood around the court and wept while France was going up in flames. What they should have done, the king should have said, “Hey, you guys, go back to your—take over your baronies and fiefs and hang a few people and get some law and order in the land and let's straighten this out.” No, no, they just all hung around and finally the king got hanged, you see. They were a completely disorganized mess.

They had a terrific organization of etiquette—who could sit on a stool and who couldn't sit on a stool in the court, you know, this was a case of,, well, a fellow could practically be excommunicated for that.

Now the French Revolution was simply a badly organized rabble against a completely disorganized aristocracy, and the resultant product was a mess.

Hah! You ought to read the history of France sometime before you take any recommendation for rabble organizing things. France itself has never had a government as far as I can figure out. It right now has Charles de Gaulle, but it doesn't have a government.

You want to—if you want to go into just hysterics sometime, pick up some short condensed history of France and try to find a stable regime since 1400. It's fantastic! But, therefore, in that scene any slightly organized group could blow the head off the rest of the disorganized scene. Do you see? Badly organized group, but it nevertheless was organized to some slight degree and so could take down the products of the Sun King, and vast history and France, the court language of the world and so forth, all went by the boards. I'm not teaching you how to be a revolutionary, I'm just showing what's happened. I don't have to teach you how to be a revolutionary.

Now, in the Spanish Civil War, the organization of the state did exist and it was duly elected as a government, and it tended to fall apart within itself. And one of the reasons it fell apart within itself—the dominant philosophy of it was anarchy.

Now, according to the capitalist, an anarchist is somebody who walks around with a bomb in his hands with the fuse lit. That is not true. The anarchist is, in actual fact, simply a subscriber to the theory that government is unnecessary. And he works out a terrific organization to organize an organization that makes the organization unnecessary.

Now, the predominant military force which fought against the rebellious generals who came in and said, "This sort of thing can't exist and therefore we are revolting." And the revolution was actually by their military. When the military came in they, of course, were far better organized than the anarchists, and they started to persevere. And the anarchists were running around, they couldn't even agree on who was going to be executed so they were just executing everybody. And there were small groups of anarchists that every night had a goal of executing so many aristocrats. And they would take them out in the suburbs and line them up in a ditch and shoot them and so forth. There was no organization even as to who was going to be shot, which must have been very complex indeed.

So the communist, being a relatively suppressive character, gave Spain too little too late and gave communism one of the biggest setbacks by just being totally ineffectual. They just used Spain as a proving ground for their pilots and aircraft, and they didn't even throw in any infantry. But outfits like the Loyalist Brigades and so on were the hardest fighting of the organizations, but these were not Russian communist type communists; they were international type communists, and there were very few Russians in the Loyalist Brigade.

But these boys had the idea of organization and although they weren't as tightly organized as, let us say, a fascist military, they nevertheless were very, very tightly organized indeed. And when communism started walking in against the anarchist, the next thing you know there were nothing there but communists. And this wasn't that the anarchists were better or worse, or those who were subscribing to communism were better or worse; it was the fact the communists were better organized than the anarchists. And so they absorbed the revolutionary force unto themselves and then with no support at all from Russia, of course, fell on their heads. And the very superior and gallant organization of the Spanish military was able then to crush them rather effectively, financed and helped by Mussolini and others.

Now, this—this is simply—within living memory a historical example of better organization taking over, not against somebody, but taking over in its own ranks. The communist, as sloppy and stupid as his organization was, was not quite as bad as the anarchist and so it became a communist dominated revolutionary force, do you see?

Now, there are many examples of this particular character and if you want to look up—look for the ultimate victor in any situation, you want to look for the best organized.

Now, brilliant leadership can only go so far. It can only go so far. Brilliant leadership needs execution of a sort, and where it doesn't get execution it gets failure.

Now, in communism you had a progressive statistic which even carried on long after his death, so long as Stalin was masterminding the situation and as long as people were being shot all over the place carrying it out. Now, there's a perfectly horrible regime; they could never have made it for two minutes if England and the United States had not been pouring in more war equipment than the Russians could break up before they got to the front. I think they were using butter to grease their tanks—real, real serf' man, that was pretty horrible. And yet they were able to hold the German military machine by weight of numbers and by tremendous support and by internal organization.

Now, the Russian lost Stalin but remained organized. And as—for a little while after Stalin kicked the bucket or was shot by his own political pals—they didn't announce his death for a dog's age—as long as that was going forward, communism continued to have a climbing statistic. Its statistic right now is planed off and has now dived. The communist statistic has dived. Now, that doesn't say it won't resurge. But it has dived. It has lost Indonesia. It is

losing in Vietnam, whether anybody ever finds there's going to be anything left of those poor people in South Vietnam or not, they are still losing.

The complete disorganized state of the Viet Cong cannot be made up for by a superior esprit and elan on the part of the Viet Cong and so they are being smashed down by a superiorly organized military force. Do you see?

Now, this is not in favor of the Viet Cong or the communist or anything; it's just commentaries on various organizational patterns. But the communist—communist now departed from communism to quite a marked degree. Russia isn't quite sure that it shouldn't be in a coexistent state with the West. It isn't quite sure that communism works. They have had now a long period of time here—they've had something on the order of I don't know, 1917 forward; they've had time enough for all the old - time Bolsheviks to die out—to find out that communism does not work. And it doesn't. It is not workable.

The reason it is not workable is because there are two specialties of the two philosophies of capitalism and communism. Capitalism has the philosophy of reward. All it—all its philosophy consists of is reward, reward, reward, reward, see. They don't like to punish anybody and they're pretty soft-headed. They like a buck. They seem to have no value in dead bodies, and capitalism goes along at a high level of production. And communism does nothing but punish, punish, punish, punish, punish, and they never dreamed of a reward.

Cuba, right at this moment, could probably solve its whole situation—production and everything else—by just doing some rewards. But it isn't solving anything. It's going downhill like it's on a toboggan because all it's doing is punish, punish, punish.

The Russian idea of getting a factory operating is to take all the workers out of the factory, shoot them and put some new workers in. You know, they deify the worker; that's why they make him into a spirit so often. But there, there we have an organization which has ceased to be organized the way it was organized. It has departed.

Now, China is frothing. It says that Russia shouldn't do this and China is trying to exercise pure communism and go ahead with the proper communist organization, and for a poor country like China, with which I have a lot of acquaintance, I think it's absolutely fantastic they're making any progress at all. I know very well I could go fifty miles outside of the city into a village and ask the head man or anybody else in the village, "What is communism?" and the fellow would look at me very blankly and say, "Oh, aren't the Tartars still in charge?" They make a lot of splash in the newspapers but I don't think they're making much splash in their back country.

China has successfully absorbed every political philosophy and conqueror for the last several thousand years. And never even noticed when he went down for the third time. And that's because China has a basic organization the communist now is trying to smash. And China has an organization that consists of families, and there are a certain number of families and they are organized with a head of the family, the heads of those families are organized then in a sort of a council and then there's several of these groups in a city, and this goes up to a higher council and then the military conqueror of China does business with the top of this. He even exerts law and orders through this particular top, and that's the basic organization of China which probably still exists at this moment.

Communists organize on the basis of cells, but nevertheless they are organizations. And when you have an organization and it's not confronted with a superior organization that organization will normally win—when it's not confronted with a superior organization.

Now, therefore, we ask the question, 'All right, what is a superior organization?' Well, it is one that is better organized. Well, how would you better organize something? Well, you'd have to find out something about the laws of organization.

Now, man doesn't happen to know anything about the laws of organization. And if I ever have had a picnic it was trying to go through the mass and morass of material that made up the bulk of organizational technology that is used on this planet. I tell you the American Management Association itself, oddly enough, for many, many years has slavishly copied everything we put out organizationally. If you don't believe it, look at their congress program sheets and their seminars and so forth; they even copy it to the number of lectures and all that sort of thing. It's really fantastic. But we haven't fed them any real data on the subject of organization because beyond a book or two very early on we didn't actually release any of our organizational data.

Now today, after a year's sprint on this subject and a great deal of practical work, and that all followed many, many, many years experience in this line, we have a stack of policy letters—I wouldn't adventure to say how many feet high it is, but it is feet high and it actually contains a write-up of the whole subject of organization. And it's pretty good to be able to get it into a set of policy letters just a few feet high, let me assure you, because this is an interesting subject.

An organization is a complex mechanism. It's made up of associated individuals who have an agreed upon goal or intention. They're going along in some direction which they do not too violently disagree with. And it will make progress to the degree that it stays in agreement and holds its form and to the degree that it refines its form to meet new threats to its existence and so it will survive.

Now, regardless of the historical lines, organization is as good as it functions. And I can tell you this right now, if I haven't already, that there is no such thing as really a perfect organization, and there's not even actually such a thing as a good organization. And even with all of our policy and all of our materials and so forth, there will never be an organization, no matter how carefully we run it, which approaches a perfect organization. That is because it is dealing with individuals in its organizational pattern who are to a greater or lesser degree informed of the laws or rules of the organization and who have a greater or lesser degree of agreement with what the organization is doing and who to a greater or lesser degree are skilled.

Now, I was very struck with a set of statistics not too long ago—less than a year, about half a year ago I think it was—I started to look over these statistics, and I found out that the statistic of each division was in direct ratio to the state of case of the divisional secretary. They were being successful or unsuccessful just exactly to the degree of whether they were low level releases or if they were moving up on the VI Course and so forth. Their statistics, their overall statistics, were dependent upon their state of case.

Now, this was not an absolute observation but is an indicator. And it tells you, then, that a democracy amongst a bunch of completely uneducated hill tribes would be a complete bust. It tells you that an organization must to some degree consist of sentient and educatable beings, and when you have them very much at each other's throats you can't have an organization.

So the basic unit of the organization is still the individual. And when you look at some country and say, "Well, we're going to give it democratic independence with a new constitution," and... Look around and find out how many headhunters they've still got in their hill country. That will tell you pretty well the state of the thing. What level of literacy does this have?

Well, we know at once the Spanish Revolution could never have succeeded, it could never have depended upon its people in an organized group because its level of literacy is terrible. The level of literacy of Spain is awful. Mr. Franco right now has been trying desperately to pick this up; he finally got the word. They'll never be self-governed until they're at least literate enough to be able to read the proclamations pasted on the walls, you know.

And so this basic unit, this basic unit of the organization is the individual. You take now a democracy such as England and its high level of education and so on. That level of democracy is, of course, a very high and advanced democratic level and is, all due respects to this or that, pretty good.

Now, unfortunately for England she went mad twice since the beginning of this century and she got involved in two fantastic, catastrophic wars, and then got involved in the reconstruction of countries which could be her trade competitors, and then let all of her machinery wear out so that she couldn't compete. And that's about where she is right this minute.

Now, in this particular case the management has been fantastically knuckleheaded. So an organization can go downhill with knuckleheadedness at the management level. And never lose sight of that fact.

So here we have two facts—here we have two facts. We have that an organization is composed of individuals, and it can be no better than the mean average of its individuals. And it can get ahead very rapidly led by a high—caliber leader and can also deteriorate—but not as rapidly as other things—by a low—caliber leader. And some of the leaders which they elected into power since the beginning of the century, and so forth, have been not quite as good as they needed.

You take Chamberlain and chaps like this and so forth. Eli sits there—he had the intelligence reports on his desk. They were actually stacked on his desk as the exact intentions of Nazi Germany and yet he went to Munich. He never read the intelligence reports, and he gave Hitler just that breather Hitler needed. This is just bum leadership, see?

Now, we're getting a sort of panic leadership at this particular time. And frankly, it's my real belief that conditions in England have never been better than they are at this minute. Business potential, production potential, finance potential, what the country could do for itself, how it could clean itself up, the way it is going forward; it's simply somebody is falsifying the statistics.

I look around me and compare this England to an England I knew in 1952. Ah! It's a much better country than it was. Its production figures are up. Do you see? We have a management that is—right now, that is crying wolf. Well, they're not being too vicious to us at the moment so I shouldn't be critical of them. But they have a far, far better organization here than they realize, and they're suffering a little bit at the upper story right at the present time.

I don't know what would happen if the Queen suddenly took over. She's quite an able administrator. But it's a cinch that what you read in screaming headlines in the newspaper about economic crisis in England do not compare in actual fact with the true state of England at this moment. And one of the reasons for that is, is the average level of the individuals of England is high.

Now, the United States, which has put more pressure on education even than England has—and it has—and which has more natural resources and which has a heterogeneous population whose prejudices were so many and so varied that hardly anything could get into a stampede.

You see, by the time you've taken a lot of Czechs and Germans and Poles and all kinds of chaps from various countries and you've pushed them all together, each one with their own mores and customs and each one with their own screaming prejudices, you'll find that very few of them can—practically no group—very few of them could get anywhere with its prejudices. They can go and preach these prejudices and scream them from the housetops and so on, and nobody's paying any attention because they're trying to push forward their own prejudices. After a while, why, nobody listens to anybody with prejudices.

And America has sort of worn the rough edges of all this off and because very highly skilled people have been pushed in there and because of its verve and so on, it is the richest country on the planet just now. See, not the least reason was, however, it's the fact that nobody's prejudice really counted. They still have some Christian prejudices which were interesting enough to make them burn all the Beatles records the other day. This they could agree on.

But America is one of the tightest organized areas there is. An American business is much more tightly organized even than an English business. Boy, if you want to see organization roughshod in its roughest form and so forth, you ought to take a look at American business organization. They shoot them quick. You take big companies like Standard Oil and so on. They put out fabulous sums in the education of their employees, and they expend fabulous numbers of rounds of ammunition shooting them down when they fall slightly short. Management in America is tough; it puts up with nothing.

Now, they are developing a great strata of incompetence on the political front which may sometime cause them a great deal of trouble, because they have now developed a philosophy of election which: "He who can spill the most money into the taxpayer's pocket gets elected." Well, who's got to pay it?

The taxpayer has, of course. And they've gone out on a program of being the little brother to all the world, and pouring everybody's pockets full of money and thereby inflating all their currency. They've got a political hierarchy going which is probably going to be the death of them one fine day.

But in spite of that, last year—in spite of everything else—America is supposed to have had the greatest year in its history, and I think if somebody had looked at the statistics straight in England they would find England did too.

Now, this is organization. Now, what are you—what's going to happen—what's going to happen in Boojiewoojiekoojiekabloojie - land, huh? It has a tradition of an entirely different type of organization—entirely different type of organization. And suddenly you're going to throw a new organizational pattern down its throat that it has no familiarity with and no agreement with; its education and literacy level is zero, and you're just going to set them adrift. Maybe they'll make it, maybe they won't make it; maybe this desperate action is the thing they need, maybe it isn't. But the main point is, is here we are going dead against and dead into the teeth of the former political system. In other words, we've changed the mores and customs of the people. You can only go so far with that.

Actually no law which is passed which is in the teeth of the mores and customs of the individual will be eventually enforceable. It can be enforced a little bit but it can't be enforced very much.

So we get one of these countries suddenly going into tribal organization—it's not in democratic organization, it's in tribal organization. Although it is a democracy in its organization, the only people who can stand for office, be elected or hold office or be a civil servant are the members of the president's tribe. Well, that isn't a democracy, and I don't think anybody's pointed it out to them. And they quickly and almost instantly revert to a military dictatorship.

But they have simply reverted to the type of organization that they are accustomed to. They feel safer in this. They don't like this idea of the changing head of state all the time because they know what happens when a new head of state comes in: he kills everybody who was an enemy of the old head of state. So now you don't know who to be the friend of because if the state head changes, why, he's going to shoot everybody and therefore you can't be his friend because he's going to be out one of these days and you'll be shot for having been his friend.

And you should just see how some poor people I've seen out in the world sit with their chin cupped in their palms looking very gloomy, and you say, "What's the matter? What's the

matter? Don't you like all this new freedom?" "Yeah, it's all right, but we don't know who's going to be in charge next." Well, you'll think immediately they're talking about revolution. No, they're talking about election. Election looks like revolution. So they're having to get used to this kind of thing.

The basic building block is the individual. Now, if those individuals were self-supportive and did not need to be supported, if they were actually working in a culture with which they were familiar—you know, they've got a Western culture being shoved down their throats and so on. I'm talking about India, Africa, even South America. You get a situation where they not only have a new culture, but they have a new political organization. And then as individuals they don't—aren't able to fit into this new political organization, and then the head of state's a fool.

Now, what you're going to get out of something like this, man? You're going to get a mess. But oddly enough, even an organization as bad as that is superior to a disorganized group of the same types of individuals.

And that's the only excuse an organization has, is in the long run it is better for individuals and better for their survival and better for the culture and better for its survival to have things organized.

Organization has tremendous drawbacks. The drawbacks most of the time do not offset the things it has in its favor. But never lose sight of the fact that any organization has drawbacks. It limits the power of choice of the individual. It very often swallows up the talents and potential contribution of the individual. It very often plays hob with the very principles it's trying to forward. Wrongly led, it becomes a machine that goes straight over the cliff to destruction. But at the same time organizations endure better than disorganized activities.

Now, I don't like to talk much about the whole track, but it is true that the only great societies of outer space are those which have continued under organized OTs. Now, they're merely released OTs, which is quite remarkable, but they have tremendous duration, and that's the only place where OTs survive—organized OTs.

But you'd say these fellows are completely unorganizable because they have total differences of opinions and so forth. Yes, yes, yes, they have total differences of opinion, but they also recognize it's better to be organized than to be disorganized. They also recognize the liabilities of organization.

It's very interesting on an OT organization to see the shift about of posts in the upper hierarchy of them. Those posts shift. And they shift up and they shift down and back and forth and they shuffle around amongst themselves, this sort of thing. But they're a great minority. They're a minority group in charge of fantastic majorities.

Now, if you took on, all by yourself as a released OT—we don't know anything about cleared OTs but as a released OT; we can merely guess—if you were to take on any part of this civilization, and I would say even the worst wogdom that had just been organized as a new democracy, I think you would eventually come a cropper because it's the individual up against the organization. I don't care how powerful the individual was.

That's interesting. That's interesting as a fact and is the only thing, in actual fact, which excuses organization. It has endurance. It has survival. The average fates of the individuals in it are preferable to disorganized activities. There's nothing more can be said for one.

But imagine an organization organized by people who knew no—knew no slightest part of the laws of organization. Now, that would be a ruddy old mess. You know no laws of organization and yet you organize an organization—I think you'd get a radio set that wouldn't play very well. If you didn't know any—thing about how to put together radios and you put together a radio I think it'd be a mess. And that's true about organizations.

Now, unfortunately, I have not had time, due to the breakneck pace of research and so on, to isolate out of all of this mass of material the basic laws which monitor it. Those basic laws are strewn through the material occurring where they are pertinent. But there are a whole set of basic laws and those occur where they occur in the policy letters. Now, they aren't even phrased to be high—sounding laws sometimes. But when you're studying this material, you look through it and you will find out that some law has been stressed more than others. Sometimes a law has been placed in solid caps, the whole paragraph, and you will find one.

Now, here is a law which is of interest: A large organization is composed of groups and a small organization is composed of individuals.

Now, I've just got through telling you that the basic building block of any organization is, of course, its individual members—that's perfectly true. But when you get just so many of these individual members, you lose touch between the head of the organization and the individual member, so that he then depersonalizes the individual member and tends to treat him as a cog in the machine and goes the way the communist is going. The fellow is nothing but a number, he has no feelings, he can be stamped on at will and so on.

Well that's because the hugeness of the communist state is so much—well, is incomparable magnitude to the individual communist or even a communist cell. So you get the magnitude of the state versus, really, the cell which—which may only be composed of five or six members, you see. That's too great. The comparable magnitude there is all out and it makes the individual feel oppressed, and that is what is wrong with the socialist state and that is really all that is wrong with the socialist state. It is the state governing the individual.

You know this old law whereby when you stamp on the earth then the earth moves to that tiny degree—yes—and so on and then moves back against your heel. Did you ever have the physics professor that let you in on that bunk? Well, you know, I've stamped on planets and stamped on them and I've never had them move. I've stood outside of a few a few lives ago and had them move, but—. Incomparable magnitude!

It's like a grasshopper. You say, "Well, if a grasshopper hit a ball often enough and long enough and so forth, the ball would eventually move." No, the funny part of it is the ball does not move. And you get this state as a huge bowling ball running down across the little ant or the individual citizen and he is smashed and he is smashed right now.

Now, they got this going in the Roman Empire to a point where there was no place to hide. And they can talk all they want to about the drop and decay of the empire and why it pulled all of its troops out of every place and no place could defend itself any more. And it was dependent upon the imperial troops to defend the community, and when they disappeared, why, of course, that colony fell in. They can theorize like this, but how come the community couldn't organize to defend itself with the imperial troops gone? How come eventually were they only able to employ barbarians as imperial troops? Perfectly true. Praetorian Guard eventually got to be nothing but solid barbarians. And that was because the state had leaned on the individual so long that they had smashed him flat. He no longer had spirit enough to defend himself or anything else. Because the individual citizen could be leaned on by the state. They thought nothing of issuing an imperial decree against a sergeant of the guard—as I once experienced to my sorrow.

Incomparable magnitude. What is all of this huge organization called "the people" bringing a charge against John Jones for stealing a bottle of milk? Aw, John Jones just goes flat. He looks at all the—wow!! See it's a mechanism which sort of tries to make a paranoid out of him, you see; everybody's against him. You get crime, you get a dispirited citizenry, you get people going around saying, "Why should I vote? My vote doesn't have any count on anything anyhow. No point in voting any more," and so on. These are the signs of decay which you see when you have merely individuals and the state. And it's the primary reason why communism will fail. Socialism will inevitably fail.

Now, where you have permitted companies to exist—I know the Russians have collectives—they're kind of a joke. Where you have companies, the state has to deal with the companies and the roughness with which the United States deals with companies like Standard Oil right today is horrifying. Boy, they're in there with hobnailed boots stamping all over the place, you know. Those companies, by the way, maintain whole accounting departments that you'd have to see the end of—you could only see the end of with a spyglass; you know, just mobs of people doing nothing but taking care of the government claims and pressures on the company.

Now, if a government can stamp all over a company to this degree—and sometimes they put them out of business with this stamping—why, what can they do to an individual? Well, in the Roman Empire nobody had any place to go. The only civilized area of the world was already owned by Rome. There was nothing but barbarians who ate sour milk outside the borders of it in all directions. You had no place to go and you were crushed.

So, the ideal organization is not an organization which is composed of individuals only. It's composed of individuals formed into subgroups, and you must compose the individuals into subgroups. So we get this law: "A large organization is composed of groups and a small organization is composed of individuals."

Now, that law is so much a law that if you try to expand an organization which is only composed of individuals—you know, everybody's wearing everybody else's hat and they're all very skilled and all very fine individuals and they try to expand up—just, you know, bring their—their volume up 20 percent—they all go appetite over tin cup. They go all to pieces, they can't make it, you see, because a large organization is composed of groups and a small organization is composed only of individuals.

So the small organization being composed only of individuals will remain a small organization as long as it's only composed of individuals. You see, the law works in reverse. It limits the size of the organization. And so, whenever you have a socialism or a communism where you have this huge thing called "the state" governing this little tiny fellow called "the individual," it eventually starts shrinking, do you see? You get shrinkage, and the state will actually get less and less powerful and more and more confused.

Now, income tax is the total violation today of the government ruling the individual. Every individual has to report to the government every year. And that is a direct violation of it, so income tax willy - nilly will make a country grow smaller. It will bring down—. It hasn't anything to do with economics. See, it's the fact that every individual in it can be jumped on by this huge thing called "the government." Every individual's got his chest bared to the government. He hasn't got any senior he can go to for any buffer or protection. Well, therefore, the state inevitably will suffer for it and will become a smaller and smaller activity. That's volume, will have begin [begun] to suffer.

Now, it hasn't set in, in the United States, as fast as it has set in in England, but England has had income tax active longer than the United States. It'll catch up with the United States too, because it violates that law. A small—you see what I mean about these laws, you know. It is a law. It isn't an observation. And it operates any way that you apply it. A small organization is composed of individuals; a large organization is composed of groups.

Well, how would you make a large organization be composed of groups? Well, you would try to cut off the organization versus the individual and get the organization versus the group, do you see? You would have the individual as part of a small group, and that small group is what is leaned on by a larger group which is what is leaned on by a slightly larger group, what is what is leaned on by a slightly larger group. And so we say larger group, smaller group, what are we talking about?

Well, a group does have an optimum size. If a manager wants to work himself mad he has about seven or eight things under him. Now, if he is very good he could have seven or eight things under him, so that he came into contact with seven or eight separate individuals or seven or eight groups who are represented each one by one individual, do you see? He'd work like mad. Well, if he only had two under him he'd loaf like mad and so it's someplace between two and eight.

Now, this depends to a large degree upon the individual capability of the manager in handling the—what number. Is the manager so bad he can only handle two, or is he so good he can handle eight? So we take a rough average of this that more or less holds good, and we say it's five. You can have a manager and five, or a head of a group and five. And so we get down—"how big is a big group," then, would be ten. You know, too big, see. But big. And a small group would be two, three. Two, three what? Well, either two or three subunits or two or three individuals down at the lowest unit.

So we get the optimum size of a group of individuals which would be five. Now, by the time you get five and then you expand and you add number six and number seven and number eight, by that time you'd better split the thing into a couple of groups. So we're really studying how do you split things up into groups and hold them that way.

And that, in actual fact, is the hardest task I have in Scientology organizations, is making a secretary take responsibility for a division, and divisional members only look to the secretary, and that broken down even further, that members of a section look to their section leader and the director only looks to section leaders, and the secretary only looks to directors.

And yet, because things are rat—a—tat and tippy and emergencies come up and Danger conditions occur, then they make Danger conditions. And a real Danger condition would be a secretary giving direct orders to one of the people of a section officer, bypassing the chain of command, because immediately you're going to make the organization smaller. The organization's going to get smaller. The more you do of that the less size your organization's going to have because it violates that basic law.

Now if you follow this basic law you actually can move it on out to where your group could contain the popula—I mean your organization could contain the population of the planet. Size doesn't mean anything as long as you know that one law.

Therefore, you need an expansional system which is expansionable and contractible—the thing has got to be made bigger or smaller; it's got to fit little organizations or big organizations; you've got to have some kind of a pattern which is expansionable. One time I hoped to get this pattern down to as few as two staff members, but I find out that that is not possible. It can be gotten down to the basic size of a group which is an optimum group, and could be gotten down to five or six people and you can fit this organizational pattern on it, but you can't get them down to two because two isn't a group really, it's a pair.

Now when you get a state which is breaking down the family, even breaking down the family as a group, if there's nothing substituted for it—. You see, every time you get—the state is death on business, the state is death on the family, the state is death on any of these group formations—you get this type of vendetta, you see. The state is death on social groups or death on the church. And by the way, communist states are death on a lot of these things and you'll see them shrink. They become unmanageable. They become very unhappy. They are very miserable to be around. They are awful to try to work with and they will eventually come appetite over tin cup. They will come unstuck.

So chain of command may be looked upon as one means, and only one means of just making people miserable and giving people status and making somebody better than somebody else; but in actual fact without it you do not have an expansionable group—the group will never grow in size.

Now, what contracts a group in size is its managers become overworked. When a manager becomes just too overworked he ceases to expand, he sees to it that he doesn't expand, he becomes too overworked. So one of your—your greatest liability then, is an overwork of a manager. If you want your group to expand then you had better fix it up so your managers aren't overworked.

So that if you were to set together a group that was going appetite over tin cup, you prob—would be very foolish as an efficiency expert, and if you knew this and if you'd worked in a Scientology organization and knew these policy letters, you'd go out and, frankly, general managers and heads of departments and so forth would look at you with round eyes. They would say, "Good heavens! Where's this come from because this is true, you know, this is true. I've worked with it, yes!" You know, and they'd be agreeing with you all over the place, diving in your front door.

Actually, one of the heaviest drives I got in Scientology in Rhodesia was trying to teach people organization, Scientology organization. They wanted to know all about this; this was interesting—very applicable to what they were doing.

So that an individual going into a group would be very foolish and the efficiency expert can cut his own throat by going down and doing time—motion and stopwatch studies and telling workers what to do without consulting their foremen and violating things in other ways. Any GM that thinks he can hire some—some efficiency expert and not pay any attention to what's being made efficient is crazy, you see, because he'll eventually get unhappy with him.

The only person I would work with would be the GM, and preferably the chairman of the board. And one of the first things I would do would be to hire him more stenographers and more clerks and set him up a communication center. Well, just by doing that all by itself you would improve the business. It would follow automatically. And then you could start breaking the organization down into its proper groups.

Well, we get down to what is a proper group? Well, oddly enough, our seven divisional system which we have here today, this seven division system that you see posted on your big org boards and that sort of thing, that's a very, very interesting pattern, because if itself is very much violated, why, things again won't expand.

There are all kinds of odd little laws about this. You can't have a section that isn't dependent on some other section. A group must be interdependent.

You can't have a division which sets up autonomous activities which then require no further service from the rest of the organization. The second that you set up a unit here, which is going to float free, it'll float free and collapse! It must have service and communication with the remainder of the organization.

It's all very well, somebody says all of a sudden, he's out someplace, he's setting up some hospitals that we've inherited or something like this and he's setting these up. Well, he wants his own purchasing unit and so forth. Well, he could have his own purchasing unit, providing it came from our Treasury Division. Not to him, but for his Treasury Division, see. You get violations of this. And you will get yourself trouble. Interdependency. These must be interdependent.

Now I don't care what you call them. We call them divisions. Now there are seven divisions. And they go One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven because it's a circle. It isn't a two—dimensional plane. It's a sort of a cylinder. And a proper org board would be drawn on a huge cylinder. It meets itself coming or going. So to emphasize that fact we put Division Seven up in front of Division One.

Now the entrance to an organization is in the first department of the first division. Now weirdly enough, this thing is organized so as to impel a particle from the first division right

straight on out the back door. And any particle entered early will shunt late. And that is the way that thing works. And regardless of how you try to stop it, it eventually will. It will enter and eject.

Now as they come around to Seven, Seven doesn't necessarily catch—which is another reason it's there—it doesn't necessarily catch what's ejected over here at Six. So there is a way out. But this is a sort of a—so there is an ejecting flow here. And you start it in here bzzzppp! It'll go out the back.

Now if you violate the position of anything on this chart, you cut your throat, which is fascinating.

Every once in a while somebody will begin to have a great deal of trouble. And he won't know why he's having trouble and he's having trouble because he's got a section or a function wrong on the org board. And they are actually found by trial and error. Once they were put down in this order, then they had to be adjusted and readjusted.

We got enormous trouble—we got into enormous trouble because we tried to put what was essentially Origin—or Construction down here in Department Nine. And every time we tried to put it into Department Nine, it obviously didn't belong in Department Nine, it actually belonged way up at the front here at Origin. The least place it could have been put was Department One. That was as deep as you could have gone into the organization, but it came back here towards Source and you had to get Construction back towards Source, otherwise it just wouldn't work. You see?

So if something is mispositioned on the board it will be nonfunctional and cease to work. So that's the first test of whether or not something is properly organized, is does it function?

Now this—these—these are not named according to a master name chart that I drew up on this thing, but these divisions actually are the various actions which would take place if you were setting up a factory, a government, a service activity or anything. These are the native basic things that must be set up and they must be set up in this sequence.

All you'd have to do is get to be an expert on Scientology organization and you could go run rings round any efficiency expert on the planet right this minute. It's fantastic what suddenly starts showing up. But remember to learn well what you learn.

You start learning our communication systems, you got our communication systems going in some offices and so on. I just put it into a total wog office. And boy, I had trouble getting it in. Oh, man! Did I have trouble getting it in. I finally got it in. And once I got it in, why, it was just all smooth as glass. And they didn't ever know how they had ever worked under anything else. They kept trying to tell me that it hasn't been like that in offices we've worked in. Letters would come in and just lie in the middle of desks undelivered and nothing ever logged and nothing ever filed. And each girl when she typed a letter had a little file of her own on her desk and nobody ever checked anything. I don't know how they lived. That was the organization that they were used to, which was no organization at all.

Now, as we look this over we see that this first division in actual fact is the Communications Division. It's called HCO with us but it's the Communications Division.

Now, this is analogous to getting things communicating as you would have to do in putting together any plant or factory. You'd first have to start something where people could get into communication with somebody about what you were doing, you see, otherwise nothing would happen thereafter. And then, with the communications, you've got to have some kind of a dissemination. Well, in a factory or something, you might have to sell stocks and bonds or something to get finance. That'd be dissemination. You'd have to tell people what you were going to make and all kinds of things of this character. And that would come under the general heading Dissemination.

Your next one is really your Organization Division. We call it Treasury now, but it's actually the division which organizes the actual most of the production activities. It gets together the sand to make the glass for the bottles, and the sugar and saccharin for the candy and so forth. It does the assembly of this type of action and it also has the idea of money, assets; what it makes and so forth all must come in at this point. You must have your money before you can buy the sand for the glass and so on.

And then we get into what—we call it Technical. In actual fact the right name is Production—your Production Division. And that is your Division Four.

And then your next one is not really Qualifications but Correction. Should be called the Correction Division or the Adjustment Division. But Qualifications would also serve.

And then we get the Distribution Division where they get rid of it, you see. But in the process of getting rid of it they've got to have a full sales—personal sales organization and that sort of thing, so when they're busy getting rid of it they are also making new customers who enter in here.

You say, "How about Seven? Doesn't anything go through Seven?" Well, yes! Everything tries to go through Seven. Like on an E - Meter. So, we get a—the organization here that keeps the machine going, that gives the machine sufficient authority in order to travel and resolves the various problems and bugs it runs into—it sits up here at the head of the line. But it can equally sit at the bottom of the line.

Now the departments all have names. And these names have nothing really to do with any name that you have heard as the names of departments.

And these are, the first one would really be the Office of the Executive Director or the General Manager or something of that character. It would be the person who was in charge of it. Now, this could be—if the Chairman of the Board or somebody like this were actually the manager of the company and some such action, then his office would be there.

Now ideally this would be Source. And this would also be the person who had developed the product. And you'll notice that that often happens in companies and so on. But the main thing that man had never solved and the reason you have all different kinds of politics and disorganizational patterns, and so on, is because man never solved the problem of succession.

You know, you get a whole bunch of red - hots and royalists and every—thing else together and you ask them what's the ideal form of the government and they say a benign monarchy. And they all tell you this. And you say what's wrong with a benign monarchy? Well, you can't succeed it so therefore it's no good. That's their only contest with it. You ought to try it out sometime.

You get a bunch of guys, no matter what their political affiliations are, arguing and they will eventually agree that it's a benign monarchy and—but it can't be succeeded.

Well, actually, we've worked out succession in our particular case and so on because what is developed by these other two offices here becomes approved by the LRH Communicator according to policy and he approves anything that is not against policy. If it's not directly against policy, why, he can approve it.

So therefore you get management and you don't have to have succession. Which I consider quite interesting; because the internecine warfare which has occurred amongst man, and the whole destruction of—Rome, and so forth all occurred because of succession.

So, there was normally somebody who started the company, and in the United States that ought to be the Office of George Washington. Got the idea? I don't know who was the first

bloke over here, in this present racial strain in England but it would be somebody. I suppose it would be William. I guess it'd be Bill. "Bill the Bastard." And that ought to be his office. And that ought to be going strong. And they would have saved themselves all kinds of bloodshed and civil war and all kinds of things and so on. But he also would have had to have written up a lot of policy letters. Anyhow...

So this is Source. Now each one of these departments has its proper name. And it's Source, Existence, Conditions, Recognition, Communication, Perception, Orientation, Understanding, Enlightenment, Energy, Adjustment, Body, Prediction, Activity, Production, Result, Review, Ability, Purposes, Clearing, Realization. And that's the lot. And it's because of those successive names that it actually regulates the function of the department. And if you understood this adequately you could understand the department much more easily by noticing its tag, its action.

Now it doesn't fully explain it and so forth, but nevertheless it gives you the code word of the department. For instance, the Department of Routing, Appearances and Personnel is Recognition. And that's essentially what it does. It recognizes. It says "Hello." It lets other people recognize what it is and let them see where the door is and a few minor things of this character, you see.

So, you get Communication, then you get Perception. This is your Department of Inspection and Reports. Department Three.

You can go down here. You pick any of them up. Not to go over them all because you can have patterns of this. You get Department Eleven, the Department of Training and it's Activity. Now why Activity? and why Production? Well, you actually—your production—this a moot point, whether or not we should have training in Department Twelve or training in Department Eleven. You have to decide on what we're actually producing. Well, the ultimate production of Scientology is not auditors but is states of case and so, of course, we get Department Twelve being Production.

Now all of this pattern is put together in that fashion. Now each one of these departments have five sections. And it shouldn't have more than five. If it has more than five it should be written up again. And some of those sections put in. And then those sections are divided into subsections and then really, patternwise, are divided into units. At the moment why, they're dividing sections directly into units. Well one fine day they will have to divide it into subsections, divide it into units, to subunits and so forth in order to make enough space and personnel.

But this, in actual sober fact, is a flow chart. And if things don't flow on it there's something wrong, so we get one of these other primary laws of an organization, which is fascinating, and which I have the hardest possible time teaching anybody, and the one I have the awfulest time teaching anybody—it's terrible trying to get this point across—it's the fast flow system of management. And of course, everybody sits there and says, "Oh great! Fast flow system. Sure, everything's got to go fast! Yeah! We understand it!"

Man! Probably it ought to be called something very complex so they'd think they had to grind away to understand it because the truth of the matter is, is fast flow system of management is don't inspect until it goes wrong. And the trouble with every bleeding, blinking organization since the beginning of time, has been that when it was right they inspected it! And all they did was hold it up and hold it up, and you get blanket arbitrary laws being thrown into the organization continuously!

Something like this: "Well, let's just make sure we don't get any suppressives aboard. Let's make everybody who comes in to take any training or processing immediately take a 'Suppressive Test.' " You see what that does? That instantly stops your flow. So anything that stops your flow is anti—organization. And every time you find something being inspected which hasn't been found wrong, you're going to get some kind of a slowdown.

This is a typical mankind action. One sailor is late coming back for liberty. So the captain of the ship issues an order saying, "All sailors, herein—after, may have no liberty." Typical. Typical suppressive human action.

So we find one Pc has managed to skid by Certs and Awards with the wrong certificate, so we put a certificate checker in to make sure that each pc that goes through Certs and Awards has his certificate checked afterwards.

Well, that isn't the way you run an organization that is going to expand. The way you run an organization that is going to expand requires nerve, something like a World War I fighter pilot. Don't be so damn nervous. When something is found to be wrong, swoop down on it from the executive secretarial, from the secretarial and every other level, inspect it, cross—inspect it, scream, shoot, execute and so forth. AFTER it has been found to be wrong. Do you see? Then act; don't fail to act at that point. But just let it run giddy as hell right up to that moment.

Pcs are tearing past the Examiner at a mad rate, not even checked, not even checked. It goes on day after day after day. It goes on week after week after week. And all of a sudden we turn up with some guy who didn't even go near the auditor getting past the Examiner. At that moment, the Executive Secretaries, the Secretaries involved, the Section Officers involved, the Guardian, everybody else involved, descend on that point. It won't happen again for another year. And your flow will come out. But don't put in permanent preventers on the line and you get a flowing organization.

So an organization, regardless of what it is, must produce something. That's why you don't have a government that is any damn good on the whole planet. Because they produce nothing. Their total production is paper. They must produce something.

And you cannot have an organization that isn't staticized. The wrong people always get shot. Every eager beaver that's making a little more motion than anybody else, being a little more critical, he instantly is going to get shot in any organization that isn't staticized.

What do we mean by statistics? That means every person in the organization has got to have a statistic. As long as the statistic is not in a terrible state of decay, and is going up, why the guy is safe. And if it starts to decay and cave in, he's not safe.

Now, if you don't have that system, you can't have justice in an organization. Because all the guys who are doing their jobs and so on are relatively safe inside the organization. The people who are not doing their jobs become very unsafe, but of course they're making everybody else unsafe too; their fellow staff members and the organization itself is suffering.

So organizations which are not staticized are very, very dangerous to be around. That's why governments are very dangerous to be around today. They're not staticized. There is no way.

I tried to tell the head of a committee in a parliamentary body how to staticize his civil service. He was head of a committee which was going to do something desperate with the civil service. And I said, "Well, why don't you staticize them?" And I spent two or three hours explaining to him what a statistic was and, boy, it was going in one ear and sticking right straight in the meat. He told somebody the next day he couldn't tell what I was all about!

Well, he had some basic law that hadn't even vaguely come up for air I suppose the basic thing that was out on him was he didn't realize that anybo—thing—anybody should expect anything from anybody else. I suppose, you know, that he wasn't up to a point of realizing that an organization should expect something from an individual. Or something of this character, you know. Something wild was out there—BIG, you know.

So anyway, the way the pattern is organized, it's organized to flow and it's organized to expand. For me to give you more than just a few comments at this time is very, very adventurous indeed.

But I do want to tell you that—just these few little things that I've already told you about: Organization is better than no organization; no organization is any good, but it's better than not having any; an efficient and effective organization is a survival organization and it's better for the individual to be a member of an efficient and effective organization than an inefficient, ineffective one—naturally.

That organizations should flow, that they should be expandable, they should be contractible, and that their primary thing that gets violated is people start inspecting things that don't need inspection and therefore interfering with things that don't need to be interfered with. And basically that the Scientology pattern of organization which is in use today, if understood in its basic fundamentals and if studied from that line, is applicable to any business or any activity or any government.

Reg and I had a ball down one time working this over on a basis of a—suddenly dawned on me that we might possibly have a government—or it dawned on him—that this might be a governmental pattern. And sure enough it works out to a governmental pattern. It would be a government that would take into itself every company there.

And I suddenly realized that in this we have something which is far more socialistic than socialism. Far more communistic than communism. And we can say with some sneer to the socialists and communists, 'Au', pif! Bunch of conservative... We could say, "Do you know there are people in Russia today who are not staff members!" They're second—rate staff members. They're called citizens when they do have it, you know. The United States, it only has citizens, no staff members. Leaves a man completely on his own.

So actually, this is much further to the left than anybody has ever gone. What you'd do would be to introduce individual companies into your Production and Activity units as service or production units, you see.

One last thing I'll tell you. This actually is based on something that is in actual fact trillions of years old. And it is an old, old, old, old, old organization that gave me the basic clue on which to go. And it is an organization which lasted itself about 80 trillion years and is still going strong. And the reason you see three—you see, there could easily be eight, there could easily be fifteen departments in a division—but the reason there are three, and the reason it goes into units of three and so on is because you have mind, body, product.

If you want to understand this, the basis—mechanism on which it is organized, you have the Thetan, with a Mind and a Body and a Product. So you have a Secretary, who has a Mind, Body, Product.

And when you put together your little units and that sort of thing and so on, it goes Mind, Body, Product. There's somebody in charge of the Mind, the Body and the Product. And if you want to look at some Secretary and wonder why she isn't doing too well, recognize she doesn't have things laid out on the basis of Mind, Body, Product.

If you want to know why a typist isn't doing well, she really doesn't have these three things. She doesn't have Mind, Body, Product. She doesn't figure out what she's going to do, you see. There is no body of anything with which to perform it, and she doesn't look on anything she's doing as a product. Or one of these things will be missing.

And that, however, is not graphable. And it is good enough to have caused a civilization to have lasted 80 trillion years. But it is—is not graph—able, because you just try and graph it sometime, to put a Thetan with a Mind, Body, Product with a Thetan with a Mind, Body, Product inside a Thetan with a Mind, Body, Product. We used to do it with lenses. Not on a

two—dimensional graph—it was done with multiple lenses—and it actually was a galactic type government that carried planetary systems and planets, and a nation was almost too small to be a flyspeck, you see. Big populations involved. But it was all on Thetan, Mind, Body, Product. And this is a refined version of it which works, at our level, and which gives us a very broad view of what we're trying to do.

You're perfectly at liberty to curse organization; you're perfectly at liberty to find all kinds of faults with organization. And while you're doing so, just remember that there is no such thing as a perfect organization, and that any organization is better than no organization.

Thank you.