

# DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

A lecture given on 15 November 1956

Well, probably for the first time in my career I am saying very honestly that I have nothing to talk to you about tonight at all. Usually I use that as a sort of a gag and so on, but it's absolutely true.

I was going to say a few words about organization and the handling and functions of organizations, finishing off what I was talking about last week. But you possibly wouldn't be much interested in that, so I thought I'd go off onto something else – unless, of course, you wanted to hear something about that.

Audience voices: Yes.

Well, I don't see any great note of enthusiasm there. Organizations are something that get on one's nerves with the greatest of ease, but nevertheless, my talk, I'll have you note, is devoted to getting it off and getting them off our nerves. So you see it is a different kind of a feature.

If organizations get on your nerves, then this talk is to get organizations off your nerves, don't you see? And not only get off of your nerves but get into your bank account. See? Got that? Got that?

A Scientologist should have a great deal to do with organizations in view of the fact that organizations do not know what organizations are or how to run organizations; they just happen. An organization says, "We're going to organize now," and they set up a command line, and then they use that for their communications line, and the next thing you know, why, boom! Either everybody is in confusion – so much in confusion that nobody dares kill the organization (that's usually how they survive), or the organization simply knocks itself off. Because it uses its communication line – as its communication line – its command line. From general down to private is used as their communication line.

Now, this has evidently happened recently to a very large electronic recorder company in America, one of the best, because it is losing all of its good people. Now, when a big organization starts to lose all of its good people, then you can be very sure that there is something wrong with its communication system. It means that those people cannot make the organization and its communications systems function in order to permit them to continue a good, productive level.

An organization is a servomechanism to the doingness of people. Now, I've told you what an organization is. An organization is a group of terminals and communication lines

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

associated with a common purpose. That's what an organization is. All right. Talked to you about that for a whole hour, didn't I? Fact.

Now, here's something very peculiar: An organization never does anything. Never. It can't hurt. It can't bleed. It can't think. It can't act. It's a postulate of a purpose sitting there with communication terminals and communication lines, and that is the totality of the organization. We have to move something alive in on it before it seems to do anything. But the organization never actually does a thing – never. Never accomplishes a second's work.

All an organization can do is to assist and facilitate those people's doingness who wish to do. That's all an organization can do. It can help you with your doingness.

Therefore, what an organization is, very sharply, is a servomechanism to the doingness of people. Now, what do you mean by a servomechanism? It means a mechanism which serves, services or aids something. That is all that that is – servomechanism. If it is not a servomechanism, it becomes a sort of a monster, a peculiar sort of a monster too, because the monster never does anything, except interrupt the willingness and doingness and workingness of human beings. When an organization becomes a monster it has ceased to assist the doingness of the person and has begun to block the doingness of the person, and then that organization is a monster. It is apparently something which exists which kills people.

A bad organization could actually, factually slaughter everybody in its ranks. But what do we see here? We merely see then that ignorance of organization is what slaughters people in their ranks. Since the organization itself can never do anything, then attempted doingnesses go so awry on the organizational lines that they succeed in knocking off all the parts of the organization. You follow me that? It's something that man has never learned, and it's one of the reasons I have been talking to you about organization. Man has never learned this. He has never learned that an organization cannot do. He has never learned that it cannot bleed. It does not suffer. It cannot be punished. There is nothing there to receive or become cognizant of punishment.

And when you look at what an organization is, you find it's a series of communication lines and terminals associated with a common purpose. What about these terminals? No, a terminal is never a body, and that is a fantastic error that is made by 99 percent of the people in organizations. They think of themselves as terminals. They exist as terminals only when they do not have proper communication facilities. I already talked to you about that. I said it snapped in on the body: They use the body as a terminal.

Well, let's look over this whole principle of organization, and let's take one person who is attempting to do something. Now, all he's attempting to do perhaps is to deliver some cartons of nuts and bolts from A to B and get a receipt for them. That's all he has to do. Now, he is a terminal known as shipping department. He has to stay pegged there if there is no real terminal. There's nothing to receive communications in his absence; he is then tied in to this. If there's any way people can write something on a slip of paper and drop it in a basket there, then we do have a terminal. It's a basket or the folder in the basket is the terminal. He can be reached. Therefore, he himself is not glued to this terminal at once. And he has received an order to ship two cartons of nuts and bolts over here to the assembly department. Now, he has

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

to procure these from the people who are storing all of the spare parts and things like that. It's a very simple action. Nothing to this at all.

He calls, phones, writes – in other words, indicates a despatch – to the storehouse and says, "Cartons of nuts and bolts, if you please." He then operates as a communication particle: He picks them up. He walks over to the assembly room. He lays them down. He says, "Give me a receipt." He walks back to where he normally operates to see if there's anything else in his basket. Isn't that a simple arrangement? There's nothing to that.

Let's see how an organization could foul him up.

No communications lines exist whatsoever coming in to Mr. Jones, who is to deliver these nuts and bolts – no communication lines. All of a sudden there's a pink slip appears in front of his face that says "You're fired! Why are you fired? Well, you're fired because you didn't deliver the nuts and bolts." What nuts and bolts? Most elementary situation in the world. He never heard about it. Why did he never hear about it? Because there was no organization there, or the organization that was there was not really a good organization at all. The messages, the calls, the orders, anything to procure the nuts and bolts, went someplace else. They went up to the blueprints factory or something.

See, here's how that'd work. The office boy drops by and he says, "Oh, I'm walking over toward the procurement desk and I'll take this along" – he sees it on somebody's desk. And he walks up to the blueprint place. And he isn't looking, and he just lays down a whole bunch of stuff, and also amongst it is some other stuff that really belonged down in the engineering section. He puts that on the desk up there, too. Some messages went awry.

Well, most organizations specialize only in methods of making messages go astray. That is the only thing they really want to do is to introduce more vias on the line. They try to introduce more vias. If they find a command Jam anywhere along the line, they follow an exact principle.

Now, you think this is just a quip or a joke, but it's not. It's actually a rule that is followed by bad organizations – by the people who run them. It's a rule followed by them just as meticulously and as carefully as Newton followed his three laws, right or wrong. And that is, whenever you have a communication difficulty you add people. If something isn't happening, you add people. If you can't get the job done, you add people. That's all they know. It's a sort of bluh-bluh. Just add some more people.

"What! You mean you can't get these nuts and bolts from this desk over to that desk. Hire three more shipping clerks."

Now, wait a minute. One couldn't receive despatches; do you think three more can?

Oh, no, but they can certainly pass despatches amongst themselves to add to the confusion to such a degree that nobody has any responsibility for ever shipping anything. And the remedy of the organization people in charge of that organization would be, in antediluvian times, to add more people to that desk again. See, one man couldn't do the job, so they added three. The four men now can't do the job, so now we're going to add ten. See, I mean, this is the rule they follow.

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

Now, you want to watch this very carefully as you look around. You will see a bad organization grow in personnel all out of proportion to how they grow in business. Do you see that? Their business doesn't increase, but they keep adding personnel. What's wrong with this organization?

Well, two things could be wrong with it: One is your business, and the other is your business on telling people what organizations are. The people comprising this organization have no doingness about them of any kind whatsoever. It doesn't remedy their no-doinness by adding more people.

The other thing could be wrong is the organization itself doesn't have terminals and communication lines. It cannot communicate inside itself.

I'll give you an example of how bad communication, and so on, works: Here's Jones. He gets fired for not delivering something. It's very seldom explained to the organization at large what happened to the shipping clerk. They think something bad happened. Management never bothers to inform anybody. It says, "That's nobody's business. You know, we're protecting the guy." So people begin to believe that he robbed a bank or he has a criminal record or something real bad, or reversely, that management is merely being arbitrary, you see? It's very upsetting.

Actually, management thought it had a reason to fire Jones, and it never aired this reason. Therefore, the organization never is able to come forward as individuals and say, "What are you talking about – the two cartons of nuts and bolts that weren't delivered? I've been sitting here for three days with that communication on my desk, wondering where it was supposed to go. What do you mean firing Jones for this!" In other words, somebody could talk; somebody could communicate.

Well, there are two things punished in this universe: One is being there, and the other is communicating. Those are the only two punishments there are, let me assure you. Just two, one is being there, and the other is communicating.

Now, they actually are joined together. Being-thereness is advertised by communicatingness. Got it? But these are the two things that are punished. So people hear people communicating, and they say "Shoot them!" Somebody notices somebody is present, they say, "Make him run!" Got the idea?

So in spite of the beauties of the periodic chart, this universe could be said to be against organization, since organization consists entirely of being-thereness and communicatingness.

Well, how could an organization have an entire universe against it? Oh, very easily, very easily. You merely have to fill it up – all those posts in the organization – full of people that have already totally succumbed to the ardures and duress of the universe. That's all you had to do: just get a bunch of people who've already caved in and have closed terminals completely with the physical universe, and let them behave in a chaotic fashion. Then they would take any organizational plan or pattern and scatter it, confuse it and nonexistence it at such a remarkable rate that you would no longer have an organization if you had a perfect one to begin with. Do you see that?

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

So we get to that thing which most intimately concerns the Scientologist. An organization is the easiest thing in the world to lay out. It is the easiest thing in the world to understand, as long as you understand that it is simply a collection of terminals and communication lines associated with a common purpose. Very easy to understand. Nothing to it. You can lay out an organization, scat, just in a moment. Until we run into this other fact: an organization, then, would never exist in any other way than as a collection of individuals. Given a perfect organization and given a collection of individuals – see, a perfect organization and then just a collection of individuals – the doingness of those individuals would confuse or upset the organization to the degree that these people could not straightly do. If they could not do, then the organization itself would be upset. Do you understand?

So every organization under the sun is composed of people – individuals. There isn't a duo or a trio in the whole works. We hear of cliques in organization. We hear of four or five people who kind of run things over there in the machine shop. We hear of the four or five people who sort of run things in the west wing of the jail. We hear of these cliques, and we get the idea that these groups are not individuals but are operating on a group basis. Well, we know already that a group can sort of gather to itself a spirit. We know this. Groups are very hard to knock out. But in the final analysis, you yourself, in your approach to organizations, governments, groups of people in any way, must remember that these numbers of people are composed of individuals, and the general tone of the group is remediable by a change of tone of the individuals in the group.

There is no such thing as the United States government. There is no such thing as the British government. It isn't, if by government you mean something alive, something that acts, something that has volition, something that can receive, something that can send. It isn't. It's a bunch of individuals, and it wouldn't matter how many constitutions, how many Magna Cartas, how many customs you had laid out. It wouldn't matter how many rules and regulations you had on the communication lines if the individual occupying those terminals and using those terminals and lines was himself incapable of keeping lines and terminals straight and separate and was himself incapable of doingness. We get immediately to this fact about organizations. Organizations exist – if they have any general purpose at all – they exist or could exist only to assist the government of themselves or the doingness of people.

You could have an organization which existed solely to exist. You could have that. It could exist only to run itself. You know, everybody taking in everybody else's laundry sort of thing, you know? The total purpose of it was to have an organization. This is possible. Many kids have gangs just to have gangs, not to do anything. It's quite interesting. They have an organization there.

But where the organization itself has a purpose which is exterior to itself, then its only reason for existence, the only excuse it would have to exist, would be to assist the doingness of the individuals within it. And if an organization cannot assist the doingness of individuals within it, then it had better not exist at all, because it will impede the doingness of the individuals within it.

When you have a very large number of people under one of these canopies like government (state, city, federal; I don't care what), you see a weird phenomenon take place,

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

very weird: People look at this thing called a government or an organization or a group or a club – they look at this thing and they say, "The organization did this. The organization did that." In such a way, the organization is simply a shield for cowardly men whose doingness is very poor. Nobody there stands up and dares be there. They say, "The organization. The government did this. The government thought that." The devil it did! At no time did a government ever do a single thing anyplace in the history of the world. A guy did it. A guy co-operating with some more guys did it. That's all that did it. And they used a set of communication lines and terminals that we call government, but they did it.

If you're looking for basic cause in a society – its economic or legal duress or distress – for heaven sakes never be fooled by looking at this huge, nonextant thing called government. Don't ever look at that to be cause for anything, because you are assigning improper cause. That's an improper cause and will wind you up into a concatenation of bad logic, because you didn't start at cause and therefore you won't get distance or effect. You say, "The government did it." The devil it did! It never did any such thing.

Now, this is something you must know if you are ever going to counsel a business or a group and get it into any kind of a shape. If you're ever going to do this, you would have to know this. I'm not just here cursing governments. Actually, there have been good governments on earth, because there have been good men on earth. And when there are bad governments on earth, there are bad men on earth, and that's all it amounts to.

When we address immediately, directly and intimately a business (and by the way, Scientologists these days more and more are addressing businesses), then we must never make the mistake of believing for a moment that the business exists as a living, breathing entity, because there will be something there that we feel called upon to process that we can't reach, and therefore we're up against a hidden menace of some kind or another; we're up against a hidden influence.

We go in and say, "Well, the Salisbury Company" – how easily we say that – "The Salisbury Company wants me to process their employees." You've uttered a common human statement. But because it's a common human error you will never be able to achieve it. Some people in the Salisbury Company want some processing. That is the correct rendition.

Now, the Salisbury Company itself couldn't ever be processed, never. The individual idea of how communication should exist or not exist, however, can be processed. The Salisbury Company will never do or be anything. It assists or impedes the doingness of the individuals within its comm lines and terminal boundaries. That's all it does, if it does anything.

Now, its communication lines and terminals are as good as the people will let them be, and they're as bad as, and as murderous, as the people insist that they are. So you see a bunch of communication lines and you see them all tangled up and so on, don't think that some bright guy in the company can't draw up more communication lines and terminals. They can draw them up by the – oh, I don't know. Sometimes you doubt this when you suddenly shove under the hands of an executive and say, "Here. Draw me a map of your own secretarial service."

And he says, "What do you mean?"

"Draw the communication lines that you use every day."

And he comm lags for two and a half hours. Chews on the pencil, his tongue over here in his cheek. Squints up. "Let me see now. I write a letter... No, I really don't write the letter. Now, let's see. The letter comes in to me. Well, the letter comes in to me. I get a letter. Well, it's easy. I get a letter. I answer it. That's my communication line."

You say, "No. No. No. Come on. Come on. Just where does this thing go?"

"What thing?"

"The letter."

"Thing? You mean a letter. Well, it's a bunch of stuff that says something."

"Oh, it is, is it? Well, what is a letter?"

Wow. Guy will tell you it's anything. He'll say it is a communication. That's dodging the issue nicely. He'll finally find out that a letter is a piece of paper with some words on it. But this will escape him, particularly a business executive, by the hour. What is a letter? He won't be able to tell you. What is this thing? You can hold one up and shake it in front of his face. I've done this. "What is this thing?" I've said.

He says, "It's a communication! What are you talking about? That particular one is a demand for eighteen cans of something or other."

And you say, "Fine. Fine. What is a letter?" You know?

And he finally says – after you plague him and chew on him and beat at him for a long time, he finally up and admits it is a thing; it's a piece of paper with some words on it.

And having cognited then that a communication particle was a particle, that it did have some mass, that it could go across space and distances, we say, "Now, let's get to work on the subject of where your communication lines go, and where they come from." And boy, they sure end always at the door of his private office. They never go out to his secretary. They just never arrive out there. They get taken out there in some fashion, or something of the sort. But when he processes one of these things, he really has no idea that it ever goes anyplace. It sort of magically disappears out of his own brain and appears in somebody else's brain in some fashion, and if it doesn't do that very magically, he gets very upset. He cannot allow any communication lag. He can't allow time for his communication, his letter now, to go through a couple of hands, to be transcribed, to go through a couple of hands and appear on somebody else's desk and to be put into a slot and read in due course. He can't allow for that.

So you find these boys are mostly concerned with jamming their own lines. They write the letter on Thursday – Thursday evening usually, very late. The girl comes in. She has already a jammed line, so she gets this letter typed as soon as she can, sometime around 11:30 or something like that. She gets it into an envelope. Mailboy comes along and picks it up and it goes over to somebody over here. But what do you know, this was Friday and the offices are closed on Saturday. And Monday this other guy reads it in his desk, and so on. This would be optimum, you see. And then he answers it in some fashion, and it goes back onto this

communication line. Monday afternoon our executive is saying, "Let's see. It was clear last Thursday when I wanted to know what happened to Jones. Uh... uh – rr-rrr! I'll have to call him up on the telephone," see? So, he says, "Referring the... Hey, Jones," on the phone, "referring to the letter I wrote you."

"What letter?"

Now, I don't know why, but they always at this moment search for the letter. When he gets all the phone lines all tied up, and he gets Jones' secretary tied up and his own secretary tied up, and he gets everybody all tied up and everything off the groove and off the line, and finally he's satisfied he hasn't got an answer to it yet, Jones told him he'd answer him tomorrow. He's got it all tied up. He's all set, see?

Somebody's trying to crowd, push and crunch, not his job, he's trying to punish the line itself Got this? You'll find most executives are in this condition. The lines themselves don't exist to serve them, they exist to be beaten. Then you wonder why everybody in the plant can't find out anything. It's all sitting on the executive's desk usually. It's someplace unanswered. He has all the data.

I've met some of the most remarkably, wonderfully efficient men. Boy, these guys could tell you at any instant what the production figure was, where it was, how it was, zim-zam. Oh, boy! Straight genius, see? And anybody ten feet away from that desk didn't know a thing, and yet they were expected to do, and they were expected to function.

One notable case – one fantastic case of this – ran a government-surplus sales organization. He bought government surplus and he sold it. He had a staff of fifteen salesmen. He himself would receive all of the lists of the material he now owned. You see, he'd buy those over the phone. He'd take these lists. Then he would call up his own prospects. He would sell them. But in the meantime, routine communication had distributed these lists to his salesmen and they would be out there beating their brains out trying to sell things which had already been sold. And then he'd sit back and say, "You see how much better I am than any other salesman in the place, you know? My sales record is way up, and yours is way down. What's the matter with you people?"

Well, the funny part of it is, every single one of those salesmen knew what was the matter with the people – him. He might have been fooling himself, but he wasn't fooling them; they knew what he was doing. And they knew that – some dim way – that he possibly was not conscious of this fact. He never let anybody have any information anyplace in the place. Nobody ever could find out a thing – secrecy.

In other words, here was an individual who stopped every comm line that he could get his hands on. He'd stop it. He himself would act. He was a case of "I have to do it myself " He couldn't let another soul do a thing anywhere else in the world. And this man's whole organization was in chaos, if you called it an organization.

And one day it up and went broke. And he could never understand why those salesmen hadn't gotten out and sold the stuff for him. They knew that anytime they had an old second-hand ship, or something of the sort, then they knew if they got a sale for it, it would have been sold the day before and they never would have been told. So they didn't dare sell



anything. They just didn't dare sell a thing. In other words, he achieved the cutting out of all of their doingsnesses by cutting the comm lines which would have assisted those doingsnesses. Got it?

So that's how organizations are wrecked. That's how they get into the state they get into. But all an organization is, is a series of comm lines and terminals, so what gets wrecked? The comm lines and the terminals. That's all that are there to get wrecked, so that's all that gets wrecked.

Now you, in handling any group, then, in view of the fact that anybody can dream up an organization, would actually be wasting your time to lay out a beautiful pattern of communication from here to there and so on. You would really be wasting your time. There's no sense in this, beyond this one point: People who are accustomed to this activity can feed you data at both ends, and you, because you hear both ends of the story, can act as mediator. And it sounds like a real bright idea – the idea that Joe gave you and the idea that Bill gave you, see? You put them together into the idea that will agree, and they both say, "You're real bright, Mr. Scientologist. You're all set. You're absolutely right. See, I mean that's a good idea. That's a terrific idea you dreamed up." Who dreamed up? They dreamed up. But they dreamed up an idea that was within their ability to agree with communication. See, that was the idea they dreamed up, and you have to pay attention to that.

You either, then, have to dream up or agree with what they will consider communication – at which time they will communicate in that pattern – or you've got to change their acceptance level of communication, and I'm afraid there are no other answers.

You cannot have a soldier standing alongside of each government desk saying, "Communicate." Somehow or other they'd foul up his supply of bullets.

Here we have, then, this oddity that you could get people to agree on data, agree on organization, agree on patterns of data, patterns of logic. You could get people to agree on these things. But to hammer them with it and say, "You must not think about this now. This is not called to your attention any further. It is for your acceptance and memorization." Wow, they won't communicate with it, and they won't do.

I didn't mean accidentally to describe college education as it exists today. I didn't mean to. I mean, I'm sorry. I keep running into it, though, every once in a while.

You couldn't possibly ask anybody to do anything if you insisted on your evaluation of communication as the thing he must follow. Do you see? You can't then have him do anything. If you take your idea of communication – see, your idea of what is a good communication here – and then insist that he accept it right there, and like that... He'd have to be in terrific shape. If you gave him a Scientology definition of communication – you said that is it – he could look at its component parts but he couldn't put them together. It's not his idea of communication. He knows what communication is, it's "Huh!" That's communication. What do you do when you get a letter, you say, "Huh!" What do you do when you want to ask somebody hello? You know, you greet them on the street, you say, "Huh!" What do you do when you want to sell something? I'm afraid it is also, "Huh!" And we wonder why he isn't a good salesman.

No, I'm afraid we would have to take this subject of communication up with him very directly, and we would have to say "What is a letter?" Until he can finally find some definition in himself that tells you and at the same time tells him what this letter is, he's going no place from there. Do you see that? He's going no place because you've never found an entrance level to the case. There's no entrance level to the case unless you have some communication that is a communication: He understands it's a communication, and understanding it's a communication, he then accepts it as a communication. Don't you see?

Now, if you process people just into an understanding of communication... After all, you have its basic definitions. If you have its basic definitions, if you just went over each one of these definitions – let's take a whole group of business people, see; whole group of business people. We just take the longest, most arduous definition of communication we have. You know, the one that's cause, distance, effect, and attention and intention and all the rest of them – duplication – we take all of these parts and we just rack them all up into an arduous stack over here, see? And we take the first one off the top and we say, "Now, what is this? What is this? What is this thing called attention? What is attention? Oh, you, Jones over there, what is attention?"

Oh well, Jones'll say, "Attention. Attention is something people demand of YOU.

And you'd say to the rest of them, "Now, what do the rest of you think about that? Do you think that's what attention is?"

Finally you'd get them to define, to their own satisfaction, what all these words were. You'd get them to define them as well as you could get them to define them. And I hate to tell you this, but if they're a group of business people that are in an enforced kick on communication all the time, the definitions they give you are not, at the end of hours, going to even approach satisfactoriness. They're going to be still something real wild, something you don't want at all. But they agree that's what it was, and so you say that's fine. You take the next one, and you go through the lot of them.

How many evenings of training do you think a group like this would have to have, huh? All you did was take the most arduous, long formula of communication we have and took every single part of it and asked them what it was. But the funny part of it is, you would wind up with people who, by and large, could then form and carry on an organization which would serve their doingness. Because once they find out they can communicate, they're apt to be willing to appear. As soon as they appear, they're willing to be terminals. As soon as they are willing to be terminals, why, they're perfectly willing to have terminals and confront terminals and work with terminals. And then you would have an organization. You follow me?

In order to reform the United States government – formidable project; one which I advise you never to attempt; don't ever attempt it – don't think it consists of going down to Congress and beating on the drum for a bunch of new laws to be passed. That has nothing to do with it! Has nothing whatsoever to do with it, not for a minute. All those new laws will do is they will enter new arbitraries which will cause additional new confusion. That's all. Because you're feeding into a vast bad organization a lot more ways of stopping, and boy it's on inverted stop now. It can stop everybody.

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

Now, the gay, heroic spirit of the young second lieutenant who goes into the army is a touching sight. I often see somebody with some shoulder bars or something like that – brand-new gold bars. It's wonderful. It's a beautiful sight. I think, "Well, there goes another one, you know? He'll get in there, and he'll want to change this, and he'll want to change that, and he wants to do this, and he wants to do that. And he thinks that this is the thing he ought to do. And he looks and finds his troops are in kind of bad morale and in bad condition, and he wants to get them a little bit better off, and he wants to shape this up, and so forth. And there's no mechanism there to serve his doingness at all. He has no comm lines to serve his doingness.

Just let him try to address something to the major. Uh-ha, well, the major: that's a real close look. Let him try to receive something from the general staff. Comm lines are the command lines, so they're all forbidden. What's a command line do in a large organization? It forbids. See? What is the standard command? It's to forbid. "No, you can't." So if this is then the communication line, what do you get on the comm lines? Forbid. Now, after a while they forbid the comm line.

Did you ever see anybody get mixed up with government who is in a much higher state of action afterwards? Think it over for a moment. Did you ever see anybody get mixed up with a government who came out in a much higher state of ambition and action, hm? Well, they'd have to have had a lot of processing to have made it if they ever did, because the lines are not there to serve the individual. The individual is there to serve the lines. Get the reverse look? And so the doingness of the individual is neglected. And if you neglect the doingness of the individual, you will make everything very gruesome thereafter, because there'll be a lot of bodies around and they won't be moving.

War is not a symptom of the anger of peoples. Governments go on a routine and regular cycle which drops into absolute destruction at relatively regular intervals. Its own organizational lines get down to forbid, and its own laws forbid killing the other fellows in the army, so somebody in the army has to kill somebody, and they go out and find an enemy and knock him off. I don't think that it has a single thing to do with the international situation. I don't think there's even any relation whatsoever between war and politics. I think war is an insanity which is achieved when a bad organization descends to a complete anxiety, and you get a condition of war.

Now, where would you get an organization that would assist the doingness of people? Well, it would have to be amongst people who were doing. And those people, in doing, must be able to tolerate communication. So what would be a good organization to work for? A good organization to work for would be an organization that would tolerate communication. And that wouldn't be too hard to work for. That'd be all right.

Work, of course, you understand is "always" arduous. But how can we get it to not a complete death sentence? And that would be to be in an organization where people were doing, and people were willing to communicate. And if this was the case, then that organization would gradually find that it could have and could construct communication lines to serve the doingness of people.

Somebody has an idea that co-ordinates his action with somebody else's action; there must be some way where he can communicate this. And having communicated it, the other person doesn't go straight up and a mile south and forbid the communication and get all upset about it.

The other person also has the freedom to say "That's nutty. That's crazy. Dopeiest thing I ever heard." Free line, see?

And the other fellow say, "What's dopey about it?"

"Well, I don't like it."

"Well, that's not good enough."

"Well, all right, it'd make me more work."

"Oh, if it'd make you more work... How would it make you more work?"

"Well, I'd have to make everything out in quintuplicate," like they have to do for machine-gun ammunition on the front lines. To get more machinegun ammunition you have to make out the requisitions in quintuplicate, you know? One copy goes to the enemy for okay.

All right. Now, if we look over this we see that we are facing not an unsolvable problem at all. We are facing a problem which is peculiarly solvable, because we can solve the problems on the individual level, therefore it is obvious that we can solve problems on a third-dynamic or organizational level, because they are individual problems.

You can actually give people a test, spot them on the Tone Scale and know exactly how the communication lines will behave in their immediate vicinity – the easiest thing to do a Scientologist ever did. The only thing that happens is the Scientologist, having nothing to do with a science, usually has a good heart, and he is always prone to assign a better value to the individual than the test indicated. This is fabulous. This works everyplace but the HGC.

HGC – we know this so we're always on the safe side, always undercut the actual state of the case by three stages and process there. That's the only place where we do this. Every place else we say, "Well," (charity, sweetness and light) "I mean, they mean all right, even if they are a stupid bunch of jerks," so on – keep giving people the benefit of the doubt. Well, it's a fatal thing to do in taking an assessment of people when you're trying to treat an organizational series of personnel. You better look at it right straight on the button all the way across; be accurate. I know that's not a human characteristic, but be accurate anyhow.

We had it figured out one time that it is impossible to be human and to be right – utterly impossible. You could not possibly be human and be right. To be human it is an absolute necessity to be wrong! Well, that's for sure.

Now, look it over. You sit down at a table. You have a glass of milk while somebody else is finishing dinner, something like that, and you're waiting to go to the movie, see? And so you have a glass of milk to be polite. You didn't want it at all, but you just joined them and you're waiting for them to finish dinner, and they're going to go to the movie with you. That's fine. And they say, "You don't mind waiting, do you?" And you say, "Oh, no. I don't mind

waiting." The feature only goes on in three minutes, you see? And you sit there smiling, you know? What a liar you are. Now, is that being right? No, you're not being right. You're telling lies. You're just lying like mad.

There are many other ways that it is impossible to be right. For instance, somebody says, "Well, you know that the cube root of Newton's second law is one of the more factual facts." And you know it's for the birds, but you don't want to offend him, so you say, "Well, that's right. Yeah." God have mercy on my soul, see?

You are always forced, being human, to tell lies, to be wrong – just as routine, routine activity, see, be wrong. And you look this over carefully, and you discover that it's really not possible to be human and to be right. The penalty of being human is to be wrong.

Somebody wrote a play one time about a fellow who told the truth for twenty-four hours – told nothing but truth, twenty-four hours – and I think in the play he did not get shot, so the play itself was a lie.

But we look this over and we properly evaluate people, and we would be able then to forecast what they would do, what they would be, how they would work and react, and all we're interested in is how they would communicate. If we're interested in how they would communicate, then we can spot the fact that they will be able to do. A person is so accustomed to trying to do something that he cannot then communicate that communicatingness cuts down his doingness. And there's a direct co-ordination between these two things: his communicatingness and his doingness.

So, let's look it over and let's see very plainly that an organization depends upon the tone level of its personnel, and that is really all it depends on, unless of course we grade goals. Some goals of organizations are better and some are worse, some are more pervasive, some are less. But this again was the idea, ordinarily, of a person.

Communism doesn't like this idea. They even swear at the cult of the personality. I know they kept people from going to circuses in droves when they told Popov the Clown that he must play a background role now because he was trying to erect a cult of the personality. The Moscow Circus was being jammed throughout Europe; people were going to it wherever it appeared because of this famous clown, Popov. And the anti-Stalinists said that this must be a bad thing, that he was there and he was communicating, so they were going to cut his throat and they did.

And they get the idea that goals and songs and other things float in the air; they are conditions which exist, never caused. See, a folk song is an uncaused song. Nobody ever wrote it. That's one of the silliest things. You get to looking this over and you'll see that somebody is so stuck in conditions they can't have terminals. So it's rather a fabulous thing that communism operates at all. And we look at it closely and we find out it doesn't operate. What's operating there is a capitalism state-size. Well, we won't go into that any further.

But if we have all things uncaused, why, then we can never treat them. Do you understand that completely? Things which have never been caused can never be erased. Only things which have been caused can be factually erased.

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

A fellow has lumbago: You have to find some basis for his lumbago satisfactory to him before it goes away. He has to understand that he caused it or somebody caused it or something caused it. And all of a sudden he cognites, and he says, "That's when I was going on that sleigh ride. Ah, I remember that pain. Yeah, I was on that sleigh ride and I was kissing the girl, and just at that moment we fell off the back of the sleigh, and I've never been the same since" – something like that; an interrupted kiss or something. Anyway, he says, "That's why I've got this bad leg, here. That's easy." And all of a sudden it goes away.

A condition, to exist, must be uncaused. And so if we say the organization did it, it's uncaused. You see that? If we say the great god Throgmagog caused it (only he doesn't exist: he's everywhere at once; he's in all drinking water), the condition can never be erased. Nobody can ever reach it, and they go frantic. They get very upset with it because they can never penetrate to the causation, and never being able to penetrate to causation, they cannot of course eradicate the condition, so the condition goes on forever.

How do you make something go on forever? You say it was never caused. Nobody, nothing ever caused this. It is a condition which is natural, which exists, which is psychological. Well, all right.

Therefore, the statement that General Electric does this and General Electric does that, and General Motors does this, and the government does that are all uncaused actions which will then float forward till the end of time. And it's no wonder that whereas an organization might have been able to have built a submarine in 1954, to find that they're not able to build a submarine in 1956. They're just hitting the dwindling spiral, aren't they? In other words, this "company" built a submarine. The devil it did! It never did! I didn't see a single company sign down there pounding rivets. There wasn't a single sign, and none of the tape at all came around to polish the windows or the ports or anything. There was nothing. Nothing happened there as far as that's concerned. But there were some men there. And there were some men that did drawings on drawing boards, and there were some girls that copied them off. And there were some riveters and some welders there. And there were some atomic-energy men there, and there were some other people there. But they were all people. And they all lived and breathed. And they are reachable, and they can be contacted, and they can be talked to. And these people exist; they are. And their actions are traceable to them.

I'm afraid what I'm giving you is terribly destructive. If this was uttered tonight in Hungary or in Poland, we would probably all be shot before dawn. Fortunately, our present government has not yet snapped terminals to the degree that it would accomplish this if it found out about it. We are protected by the fact that our government almost never finds out anything. If it finds it out and if it believes it thoroughly, count on it; it's wrong.

Why would this be revolutionary? Because the complete, solid understanding that an organization is composed of individuals and is not itself a thing is primary cause on organization. And if you realize that thoroughly – not just lip service to it – if you really looked it over, if you yourself could find that in your own experience and in your own observation, then the organizations which you have looked at for so long (governments and other things) would be seen by you for what they are: collections of individuals. And those

## 9 DEFINITION OF ORGANIZATION (part 2)

individuals are individual individuals. There is nothing mystic or esoteric about any one of them. They exist, they live, they breathe.

And to realize that about a great government is to realize, almost, the end of that government. Do you see that clearly? Because all you would have to do is to put out this law: You would have to say, "Government officials hereinafter must be human," or "They must be processed," or they must be anything'd. And there would go (up or down) the organization. All you'd have to do is recognize the individual nature of each person in that organization and realize that they were people, and you would never again be afraid of a police force.

Policemen are robots, you know; somebody else always sent them. Definition of a robot: a robot is a machine that somebody else runs. You never contact the operator of robots, you contact the robot. Well, police are peculiarly this. Nevertheless, there was somebody who sent them.

The organization of police is never against one. The organization of government cannot possibly be against one. The organization of an army cannot be against one. But individuals can be nasty on occasion. But remember this: individuals can be handled even when they have rocket pistols in their hands. I know. I speak by experience.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]