

# FUTURE ORG TRENDS

A lecture given on 9 October 1962

Well, what are we here? We've arrived at the what of what?

*Audience: October 9.*

Nine October AD 12. What planet is this?

*Audience: Earth.*

Oh, ho, Earth!

Anyway, the general situation is that I was going to give you an extra week of lecture here, and then skip two, and then give you an extra week on the other side of it so you don't lose out. And take Mary Sue down and show her the Mediterranean for a few days. She needs it. Me, I've been riding around, doing nothing, you know, and so on, but she's entitled to it.

I want to talk to you tonight about a very strange subject – a very, very strange subject: Scientology, its organizations. Now, this is a strange subject, Scientology organizations.

There comes a time in any activity when you have to look forward to the shape of things to come and what they will be. Now, let us envision this as an activity. We do nothing cohesive, everybody just goes his own way, we have no central control of any kind, and people just wander out and process people and so forth; and all of this has into its teeth the combined efforts of people with supervested interests in making slaves. And that supercombined vested interest then pick us up, one by one, and throw us on the nearest dung heap, and we thereafter find Scientology being practiced with electric shock by the governments.

Now, just look at that, not as necessarily an extreme picture, but one which very well might happen. Now, let's look at the other side of this picture. The other side of the picture consisting of a well-unified, a united Scientology with sufficient international esteem, force and wherewithal, that somebody suddenly decides to use Scientology exclusively to electric shock the Chinese to make them work on the farm and collectivize it all, and we sneeze and they fold up.

Now, Scientology would go the way of many other good things unless some thought is put upon its future. Buddhism went its way, collectively, and actually wound up enslaving people. Bum show. The East, the paralysis of the East, the fatalism of the East, and so forth,

are as attributable to Buddhism as to any other single item. I don't know what Gautama Siddhartha said, but I sure know that people have been saying since, "If you just sat and regarded your navel for enough years and did nothing, you would become part of nirvana." And nirvana, as far as I can figure out, is the GPM. Well, just see a picture of it. It looks like a human being surrounded with a lot of little valences. Nirvana. Look at pic – look at a Buddhist picture of nirvana sometime, and you got the GPM – bang.

So, they eventually found out how to put people into the GPM. And all kinds of squirrel, offbeat offshoots like Zen Buddhism. "If you know the answer, I hit you; if you don't know the answer, I hit you; because force is knowingness and never the twain shall be separated." Well, isn't that the way it must be? I don't know if you're acquainted with Zen Buddhism, but after you've done a tremendous amount of study on the subject, you finally can make up your mind that if you're hit, you know. That's the end product.

Now, Lamaism, with ghosts and devils and more GPMs, splintered off from Buddhism, everybody went into apathy, and there it went. Of course, they didn't have the technology. I just say that very advisably. The East has never known how to do it. That I can tell you out of the depths of my own experience.

I can show you an Indian rope trick, the small boy going up the pole. I can do it. Hypnotize the lot of you; you'd see most anything. Never did anybody any good. Anybody wants to dramatize Axiom 10, by all means dramatize Axiom 10. But there's a point where even that catches up with them. Indian rope trick is mass hypnotism.

The last fun I ever got out of mass hypnotism was hypnotizing the staff of Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Washington. I don't know if I ever told you that story. I needn't bother to now. But this, this is all nonsense. They didn't have the technology in the East, they have never had the technology. They knew a few answers. And they all wound up in the soup.

So this is the first time on this planet, certainly – and I think the first time in this universe – when there's ever been a kickback against the ignorance, when man's – or sentient beings were capable of bettering themselves without worsening somebody else. Scientology is peculiar and unique. It is the game in which everybody wins. That's very peculiar. That's very unique. If somebody were to fight Scientology, and win over Scientology, then everybody would lose, including that person.

Now, any time you ascend above the level of games condition and get out of that mire, this other thing takes place. And that's what we're looking at. We're looking at a tremendous amount of force, which is not the kind of force that you put behind bullets and in ballistics. It is the force of reason. It is the force of knowingness. You might say – to use a Scientology phrase – it's theta.

And you're used to seeing a man who was being good all of his life get sat on, hard, and

squashed. You're used to seeing this example in this universe. This fellow was good, and he got clobbered. And this grasshopper was being a good grasshopper and somebody squashed him. And this bird was being a good bird, and somebody throttled him. And it begins to look after a while that goodness is not a force. It begins to look after a while that goodness is weak, and that evil is strong. And of course, that's the lesson which this universe would love to impart.

It doesn't happen to be a true lesson. Evil is not strong, it is weak.

Let me give you an example: Once upon a time there was a Central Organization. I saw that it was failing, financially, and realized suddenly that it was not giving service to the public – not giving service to the public. It was using the technology of Scientology internally on a favored few. And not giving service to the public, of course, it was failing in all directions, because the one thing you daren't do is not audit. It must audit. This organization, if it's there, it must give service. It's its only reason for being. Everybody was about to get very mad at this organization if it had gone very much further. It would have probably gone bankrupt.

So I was apprised of this very suddenly and also apprised of the fact that this organization had failed to file certain papers with the government; there were a great many administrative omissions. And so I sent them a cable. And I put the Association Secretary of that organization into the HGC to find goals on HGC pcs because the HGC was all stacked up with people for their goals to be found, you see. Had long lists of people, but of course they couldn't do anything about it because there was nobody there to find goals. Took the staff clearing auditor, put that person into the HGC to find goals. (They were both Saint Hill graduates; that was all there was there.) Told them to start finding people's goals and turn in the proper reports into the government.

This happens to be the entire length and extent of the perception and the directions given to counteract it. Are those unwise orders? I don't think you would think so. Perfectly reasonable orders. "Just get busy and give some service, and you'll be solvent, and everything will be fine." See? But no, no. No, no. Evil must triumph.

Somebody there sent out a whole string of telegrams to everybody they could lay their hands on to cable me as to how these orders and directions were all bad and couldn't be obeyed, and that they were about to follow anything I told them to do, except what I directed them to do. Something like that. They're perfectly faithful to me and were perfectly willing to follow my orders, while not having followed any of my orders for some time.

Well, I know what I'm doing. That was a perfectly valid direction with a perfectly valid goal in the end in view. And exactly what happened? I'm not setting this up as anything in the way of anything that I personally can do it. Get off that line. I mean, I'm just talking about a theta communication, you see. They're told to start clearing the public – which is a very theta action, I think you would agree – and to straighten it out and turn in the accounts

and things like that they were supposed to turn in. That's all they were told to do, you see?

And then somebody sends out telegrams in all directions, tries to get everybody excited as to how this is the most terrible and awful thing that could possibly happen to them, and drags somebody else into it – who wasn't even part of this picture, by the way, and who was going to stay down clear at the other end of the continent, just because you had to have somebody to wear that hat while this organization straightened itself out.

And honest to Pete, the explosion is something to behold! I every now and then... I got ahold of this in 1950. There was somebody cutting a line in the New Jersey organization. Somebody cutting a line. You can always derive power by taking a theta line and tapping it and holding it up, don't you see. There's always a certain amount of power residual in the line and can be transferred to the person, you see, by tapping this line and blocking it. But at that time, knowing pretty well the mechanics of this situation, I made a remark to some of the auditors around that, by golly, that was just about the most adventurous thing for anybody to do I had ever heard of And I said the end product would be that the guy will explode and spatter all over the landscape.

I actually didn't take any action. Believe me, I took no action of any kind whatsoever. And a few weeks later this guy spattered all over the landscape. It was just a pale pink mist. Nobody did anything to him, you understand.

What I'm talking about is the *mechanics* of the situation. These have intrigued me for more than a dozen years. Somebody tries to stop a theta line, or buck a theta line, and the resultant explosion is something fantastic. Now, so far as anybody knows at this exact moment *of* reporting, all is in order down there, all these orders are being carried out – the exact orders which I gave you – everything is smoothing out like mad. But the jolt is what I'm talking about. Because *of* the slowness of surface and air mail, letters concerning this explosion are beginning to land in other places, and some people are quite shu – were quite shaken up getting reports of what happened, you see. But in actual fact, the explosion occurred. It wasn't that I said this line. You get the idea? I'm not telling you that. But those were just very valid actions. See, they're very valid actions: Clear the public, and file your account statements, see. Very valid orders.

And somebody tried to horse them up and throw red herrings around, and mess it up, and tried to stop those orders from occurring and, honest to Pete, the explosion was fantastic. Wasn't even an experiment on my part; it's something I count on. And it occurs. That if something like that, something very sensible, that somebody is asked to do – if they don't do it, something happens, something weird happens. There's a funny magic concerning this sort of thing.

Now, how would an organization get in that shape in the first place? By individuation. An organization pulls off a few overts, pulls off a few more overts – I don't mean pulls them

off, I mean it commits them – commits a few more overts, and gets into a bit of a games condition with other organizations around, and the next thing you know, starts considering itself something strange and different. And it can't talk well anymore, and it can't communicate well anymore, and it can't function or perform anymore.

Now, this cycle of individuation by overt is a very interesting phenomenon. It is amongst you. You see this, you see this every day. On a casual walk through a town, you will see examples of individuation by overts. Overts, of course, are normally followed by withholds. That is the still after the confusion. All a withhold is, is the still after the confusion. There is the confusion, which is followed by the still. So you've got the stable datum is – very likely to be, much of the time, whatever somebody happened to think after the fighting was over, see. Not necessarily the thing that held it all straight at all. But it is – you get an apparency that it is a stable datum.

Well, let's take this battle has been going on, and all of a sudden, accidentally, why, a cavalry horse rides across the scene and trips over into a machine gun nest and wipes it out. And the other side says, "You know," he says to the fellows around him – all the shooting's over, you see; it's awful qui – awful quiet all of a sudden, and he says, "By golly, you know, that must have been by divine intervention. Some hidden hand must have directed that cavalry horse across the battlefield and dumped him into that machine gun nest, you see, to obliterate it all."

Now, if you look on this, it's a hell of an overt against the cavalry horse to go dropping him in on top of machine gun nests, and all sorts of things. How about the cavalry horse's rider? He must have gotten shot and messed up some place or other. We look around here, we find really nothing but overts, and we don't find any divine intervention involved with it. I don't think God would muddy his hands up with that kind of thing, see, if you subscribe to the Big Thetan theory.

But here's this point. The other fellows around this soldier, as the years go on, they look back at that battle and they're all at this still stuck point: See, "We won the battle by divine intervention." They can invent all kinds of fancy stories as to how divine intervention divined at that particular moment, you know. It materialized in the sky, forty feet tall, you see, and all kinds of odd things occurred right at that exact moment. And all these things happened. And we get stories coming out of wars, time after time after time, which are the most miraculous things you ever listened to.

Well, there's one fellow said that religion had saved him, and he had been saved utterly in the war, and he carried around with him a little YMCA Bible. And a slug had gone into it and torn halfway through it and had stopped just before it entered – or exited from the Bible, you see, and shot him in the heart. And obviously his life had been saved by the Bible, don't you see? You can see it now: This guy – big state of shock, he's in a state of withhold, he's in a state of "what happened?" And he reaches, you know, to feel the blood, and he pulls out the

Bible, and he looks at it, and it – you know, there it is. This is the quiet moment. Well, that one will tend to stick, don't you see? That sticks the incident, right there nicely. Tsk!

Well, the story is perfectly all right except I knew a sailor one time who collected pornographic pictures, and he had a... So you see his still after that!

Ah, well, anyway. That's rather risqué and bawdy and blasphemous and that sort of thing. Anyway, the only point I'm trying to bring in here is you get the overt followed by the withhold. And the withhold becomes an action. That is, it becomes dramatized. It becomes a source of action. That sounds very funny. But it's the withhold that becomes the source of action, not the overt. Very peculiar anatomy.

PR show you how that happens: Bill shoots Joe, and then doesn't tell the police. Now, the way that happened was, is he fired the shot, Bill fell dead, and he thought immediately afterwards (his rage now evaporating, you see), he said, "My God, what have I done? I mustn't tell the police." So this becomes a monitoring datum. See, shooting Bill doesn't really become the monitoring datum, but not telling the police does. He doesn't necessarily dramatize, you see, the killing. What he does dramatize is not telling the police.

So now he's not sure what he mustn't tell the police as time goes on, and he begins to imagine that he's guilty of many things. And in order to get rid of the source of pronouncement of his guilt, he will then commit many more overt. And each time he commits one of these overt – do you see the substance of "I mustn't tell the police" – he might as well have said, "I am different than and distinct from the police." See, he's made a declaration of individuation.

Now, in actual fact, in the field of action, he mustn't be Bill. Bill is full of holes, bleeding and dead, and he is not a thing to be. So we get our individuation there in the field of action. Joe shoots Bill, and then has to realize also that he's different than Bill. So right on the same action we get a differentiation, an individuation of self from the shot person and an individuation of self from the society, all in one fell swoop. So actually here's two withholds, and one of those withholds is a sneaky one.

Now, he can possibly remember and give you the withhold "I mustn't tell the police." But this other is an action, unarticulated, low-level, low-consciousness sort of a withhold. And that is that he mustn't be Bill. See, that's by example he mustn't be Bill. Yet there's a sort of a low-order decision in that too. So, here you get individuation. Do you see that?

By the commission of an overt, we get an individuation. That's the only point I'm trying to make. And the more different and the more separate we are, of course, the less we can communicate, and certainly the less we can understand.

If you want to see somebody really *muy estúpido*, completely incapable of "what's the score?" find something, find anything, on which this person has a bunch of overt. And ask

him to explain it to you. And that is just about the most hilarious activity you ever wanted to engage in.

And some mathematician with a very fancy eye for equations perhaps someday would like to do this. Well, I did it once. I never bothered to keep the notes. But I derived all mathematics from affinity, reality and communication. All mathematics can be derived, of whatever kind, from those three factors. It's really fantastic. Affinity, reality and communication. This – you're working in the field of symbolic logic, you see. You're using – instead of numbers, you're using meanings. You work these things out. But you can derive all mathematics from ARC. You can derive all parts of life from ARC, and therefore you can derive all understanding from ARC, and the complete complement of an understanding is ARC.

In the absence of ARC, there is no understanding. Of course, if you have – the *reductio ad absurdum* – no knowledge whatsoever of affinity, reality or communication; if there's no affinity, no reality, and no communication, there can be no *knowledge*. Do you see that? You get no knowledge as the end result of this. The fellow has never felt anything for it, he has never seen it, and he's never heard about it, that's sure he doesn't know a thing about it. Do you see that as a fact?

There's an iron bolt, let us say, buried twenty-five feet deep out in the field in front of the manor house, and for the last three hundred years nobody's felt anything about it, nobody's felt it, and nobody's seen it, and there isn't even a via on which these is done, such as disguised in old records or something like that – there's no bolt as far as you're concerned. You see? So you have to have A, R and C to know anything.

Now, the lower one's A or the lower one's R, the lower one's C, the less one knows about anything. It's very, very remarkable.

People consider those things dangerous which they're afraid to communicate with. Well, what's their definition of dangerousness? Afraid to *communicate* with.

Now, you can make people... You can always reverse these decisions. This might be interesting to you. You can always make a person feel he has done something if he has a withhold about it. That's an interesting mechanic of the mind.

Now, let's say we tell this person we're going to burn him (which I think is the highest level of ARC achieved by governments), we're going to burn him in the electric chair, see, or something like that, and do you know this fellow will turn around and dream up who he's murdered? I tell you this is a fact. He'll come around on the other side of the thing and he'll dream up a crime to fit the punishment. He'll get delusions about it.

He'll keep protesting his innocence, but he'll go and sit down in quiet and wonder just who he did kill, see. This is quite remarkable. In other words, if the punishment exists,

therefore the crime must have existed. You see that? We can work almost anything backwards this way, and a human being will begin to believe the other thing.

Let me give you an example: I tell all of you carefully, when you come up to the desk or come by the desk or during the daytime when you're in this room, to be very, very, very, very careful not to touch this black wire. *Don't touch that black wire.* I tell you this every lecture. Even though you knew it was a joke, do you know that sooner or later you'd begin to believe that wire was dangerous? You get th – this is the reverse action, don't you see? People's definition of dangerousness is something you don't want to communicate with very much, see. So you just turn it around and you say to them, "Don't communicate with this very much," and they'll believe it's dangerous. You see how you can reverse ends?

The mind is very funny. It normally operates on two-pole conclusions. In other words, there's – one conclusion's dependent on another conclusion. You see the crudest example of this: Somebody walks up to you and says – they say, "You're a Scientologist. What is that? Is it like...?"

Well, of course, you're stuck at this point, to describe Scientology, because of course it isn't "like" anything. There's never before been Scientology. So therefore, there isn't another Scientology extant in the society to compare Scientology to, and therefore the logical pattern and the communication pattern breaks down at that point and leaves you stammering.

You say, "Well, no, it's not like Christian Science, and it's not like religion, it's really not like Buddhism, it's not like..." See, you can define it by negatives. And then they will begin to believe it isn't. And your combat – if you look back on some of the things you've done in the past – of assertions of this character is just to deny the similarity. You find yourself in a big argument of denying the similarity. Of course, all the time you were talking you were actually saying, "Scientology isn't" to the other person. That's the way the other person understood it.

You see, if there's – or they say, "Oh, it's like Christian Science."

And you say, "No, no, no, no, no, it's not like Christian Science. Christian Science believes that..." and we go on and on, and potter around about it and so forth. We all the time are saying that Scientology doesn't exist because it's not like anything. Then we wonder, mysteriously, why the other person isn't interested in what we've been talking about.

You must always dream up something Scientology is just like. You want to talk to people about Scientology, realize that logic is two-pole; there are two sides to an equation; there must be comparison; there's data of comparable magnitude to enter an understanding – all of these, oh, a whole stream of these things I could go into. There must be comparable data. They understand something about something and therefore Scientology must be compared to the something something. And then they understand Scientology because it's compared to, you see?



Well, this is quite an interesting, quite an interesting complication. Because you could get over it every time if you realized that you had to compare Scientology to something. The only thing you have to do is make up your mind of what you're going to compare Scientology to so the other person will understand it.

Well, the more agreement or the more familiarity or the more ARC which he has with the thing you're going to compare Scientology to, the better he is going to understand Scientology. So you always compare Scientology to himself.

This sounds idiotic, but let us say, "Oh," he says, "Scientology. What is that like? What – what is that like?" Well, he really means "What is that like?" He wants a datum of comparable magnitude.

And you would be amazed how often you would get away with this crude – unthinkably crude – rendition of this: "Well, it's like you." You'd just be amazed how often this would intrigue the person. It's almost an idiot's argument from that point thereon. You say, "Well, it's like you."

And he'd say, "Well, how is it like me?"

"Well, you want things better, don't you? Everybody does. I don't care what they're doing in life, man's basically good. And underneath all of this "got to gyp `em all" or something of this sort, why, you're going to find some impulse that..." so on.

The fellow says, "Oh, yes, I'm trying to make things better."

"All right, Scientology's trying to make things better."

You get that? You say, "All right, now, you probably have a lot of basic wisdom about life. Maybe a lot of it is out of sight; maybe it's buried and so forth. But nevertheless you have a lot of wisdom about life. You've been around. You've observed things. You – you know certain things."

Guy says, "That's right."

You say, "Well, Scientology's just like you in that respect. You'd like to be free. You'd like to be out of whatever mess you're in. Well, Scientology wants that." You get this? This sounds like a weird argument, but you would be surprised how much appeal even the argument rendered that blatantly and that nuttily – that crudely! – would appeal to the bank manager or the janitor.

Here – just – guy would say, "Yeah, that's right, I'm trying to make things better; Scientology's trying to make things better."

I had an uncle who was a thirty-third degree Mason and Scottish rite, and other odd things, and Dianetics and Scientology were never quite right with him, but he finally figured out that we were trying to do exactly what they were trying to do in the Scottish rite, and

after that he's figured out it's all right. You couldn't now disabuse him of the fact that we'd do everything that is done in the Scottish rite. We don't. But that is his channel of understanding. And he'd have to be processed before he'd change his mind.

Now, I don't even think he knows what he means by this, but he's satisfied with it. Because he has a familiarity with A, therefore something is shown to him to be like A, then he understands this something that was like A. Except he didn't really understand it. But he has a tendency to understand it. In other words, ARC then monitors understanding to this degree.

Now, in the absence of any ARC you have no observation or no knowledge of. That's the unobtainable absolute, of course. But this is – the something exists but you have no affinity for it and no reality about it, and you've never communicated on the subject, so you don't know that it exists.

All right, let's take the next level of that. Something that you feel something about, and you have a tiny reality on (you have an idea it exists) and you've communicated to its vicinity, slightly – see, you won't have very much understanding of that thing. Understanding of it will be poor but you'll know it exists.

Oh, I'll give you an idea. I'm sure that you realize there is a British constitution, and probably a constitutional society of some kind or another. If there's a constitution, there's usually a constitutional society of some kind or another. That's a supposed existence. You could understand that. You got an idea that you might be capable of understanding that, but you don't know what you should understand about it. See, you don't really know it exists, but you think it probably exists, and therefore if it did exist, you could understand about it. Do you get how this works out?

Well, that's a very thin fringe into the range of understanding. Now, you go up through all of the – all of the misemotional buttons on the subject of understanding, and you get various understandings. There's an understanding goes along with each one of these things. Even if one only understands that it is bad, one understands something about it. And this moves up into a total understanding.

Now, if you have total ARC, you would have total understanding. And if you want to know the road to wisdom – the road to wisdom, of course, presupposes a situation which the Buddhist would interpret as a nirvana. That is part of everything. To understand everything you'd have to be part of everything. It's a marvelous booby trap, man, because that's the reverse of individuation: enforced association. So, just as an individual can back away and become individuated from something, he can also enforcedly move on into it and obsessively become it. So there's two sides to this pattern.

Now, oddly enough this follows a cycle. With an overt, with the first overt, usually quite unintentional, you begin the cycle of individuation from something, and then that individuation cycle winds up with a reverse. And a person obsessively becomes what he is

fighting.

How many of you in auditing your pcs have run into your pc's oppterm?

Well, the PC associates himself with his own oppterm. And you'll find this in varying, degrees. Sometimes the pc believes absolutely he's his own oppterm. Sometimes the PC merely hates his own oppterm, see. There's varying attitudes. From PC to pc you do a Dynamic Assessment and you'll get a different degree of obsessed association or obsessed beingness of the oppterm, and individuation from the oppterm. You get this in varying degrees. It varies from PC to PC.

One PC is more his oppterm than another, and another pc is more individuated from his oppterm than others. Do you see? You'll see this phenomenon throughout existence.

Now, this fellow has been committing overts – you know, that one – the old one about “tend to become what you resist.” Well, let's clarify that and put it with more truth. One certainly will become that eventually which he has overts on, if he obsessively continues overts against a certain target and goes the whole gamut. He's been shooting penguins. That's the only thing he really does well. He shoots penguins, he shoots penguins, and he shoots penguins. And one day you pick him up, and he says, “I'm a penguin.”

Now, he actually hasn't just directly interiorized into the penguin by the overt. Actually he has, through overts, has individuated from (because of the withholds he has from them and so forth) he's individuated from the penguins and become more and more individual. He is himself and penguins are penguins, you see. And more and more, more and more individuated, and then his wheels start to skid. See, he's got this rubber band now stretched as far away from penguins as he can get it stretched, and his efforts now to stretch it actually contract it. And every time he tries harder not to be a penguin, he skids a little bit forward to become slightly more a penguin. You see that whole cycle? That's a very interesting cycle.

That's a cycle of beingness and overts: the relationship to the individual's beingness an overt act has. Yeah, you go out here and you shoot a sparrow; you don't become a sparrow. But let's say you just had a ball, and you got up to a point where you just had to. And all of this logic is backing it up, how you have to shoot sparrows. And you do shoot sparrows, and you go on shooting sparrows, and you go on shooting sparrows.

I almost died one time. I – you can't laugh in people's faces, directly. The most comical incident I think that's happened to me in many months – the most comical thing I have seen – many – long time ago I was up at Lowestoft (a little town up on the North Sea), and a couple of herring merchants were getting rid of some of their ships. So I wanted to buy one of these ships, you know. Their names didn't sound like herring.

But I met these fellows, the pair of them, and of course they have run since time immemorial a fleet of herring boats. And, man, this pair had everything but gills! They – if

herring ever talked, they would talk just like that, you know? Their whole facial structure was that of a herring! Who was it that illustrated Dickens, you know? That boy couldn't have done a better job of portraying a herring. It was interesting that their method of handling things were sort of herring methods. They were sort of resistive to being slaughtered but it was inevitable. I offered a small sum of money for the boat and sailed it away, and they knew they had to sell it. That was enough of a lose so they knew they had to sell it.

This is the result of something like that, you see. I don't know what they'll pick up in their next life, but sooner or later...

Anyway, to make a long story short, this is the cycle of individuation and obsessed beingness. And that cycle is very interesting to you, because you start picking up sight of it with the dynamic and you get a very clear view of it straight in the teeth when you get the item. And that is exactly how the person got there, and is exactly how the meter rock slams.

Now, let's go back and talk about organizations for a moment. Somewhere along the line there was an inadvertent overt by this organization. And that built up, and then they became more and more different, and they became more and more different, and they became more and more different. And if they'd been permitted to go on this, they would have become a sort of a lower-level – which I think they actually had become – a sort of a lower-level beingness. You see, they could go through a whole cycle and come back to becoming an apparency.

Do you know that a thetan will actually run a whole cycle on Clear this way? And you pick him up on the meter, he's sitting exactly at 2. 0, dead thetan? Well, that's how he got there. He's run the whole cycle. Now, he's obsessively being what he started out to be. See, he's obsessively being what he once was part of. He's relatively unprocessable. You'll have more trouble with that character than with any other. I am intrigued by this, you see. He's now a fake thetan!

And so that organization would have become a fake organization. Fantastic. You come to think about it, would have been a lower-level Clear – mockery.

Now, I've looked over very carefully, this, and the organization plan that says that this Scientologist is a field auditor and that Scientologist is a staff member, and therefore of different breeds and areas, and that this Central Organization is Johannesburg's or Melbourne's or something; and I've picked up a very fruitful source of inadvertent withholds. If we're planning anything broad in the way of organizations, the first thing we have to take out of is the incipient individuation. Otherwise we're going to wind up with a fake Scientology which will enslave the multitudes.

The HCO 10 percent is, for instance, a bid for individuation. See, it says, "Well, 90 percent of this is ours and 10 percent of this is yours, so therefore you must be different than me." Doesn't that sort of get understood at this line?

I'm not at this moment wiping out that, and so forth, because we're dealing with the – were dealing with 1970. What's it going to look like in 1970? Well, the first rule that one must apply to it is that all the way around this planet it's got to be just one organization and that is Scientology.

And you look at this, you find that every organization breaks down into individuations and messes up, and so forth; they have no strength, and they don't stand, but when they finally do stand, why, they're sort of a false mockery of what they started out to be. They say that an organization's ethic is never stronger than it is at its inception. That is a comment that is made very sadly by people – philosophers along this line. There's no reason why its ethic shouldn't be much higher than at its inception.

Therefore, I don't see that it's possible, looking out across the years, for organizations to be different than other organizations in Scientology, to be different than the Central Organization, to be different than the International Organization – to be different *than*, don't you see. Because you've set up the incipency of the inadvertent withhold the inadvertent overt may follow, and then you get a cycle there which will follow on through and everybody will wind up under the sword, "Being *the* Scientology organization or get your head cut of" Inevitably that would occur. But nobody would be free, and you really wouldn't have Scientology.

And the way to set it up is set it up as close to the fact as that not happening, and then keep it picked up along the line. And you get an organization that looks something like this. Would you like to take a look at the future on that?

About 1970 – might look very much like this: The basic building block would be the district office. I don't care what that district office is called. Whether or not it's the "Suburban Center" or the this or the that – but the district office. And it covers only a few square miles of houses, if that. It is tiny. Its influence is in terms of, oh, ten thousand people – no greater than that. But that is your basic building block.

And it has a building which is provided for it, which has an assembly hall, and it has some offices, and it has a couple of individual processing rooms, and it has a reception area, and you know. It's a little hall, actually, with some offices attached to it. And that is a district organization.

In charge of it is an administrator, who is an administrative person, and who, although he may be a trained auditor, is – still belongs to the administrative side of the picture. So you have the administrative side of the picture and the technical side of the picture running throughout this. You get occasional swaps across from one to the other. But nevertheless, they are distinct branches of action. There's two distinct actions.

The administrator is to keep things there and keep it paid and keep the place clean, keep the people walking in and out, and handle the money and the mest, and that sort of thing.

And the technical side of it is to keep them processed and keep them happy, and so forth. That's all the technology of Scientology.

So this little center is actually in the charge of an administrator, and he has a couple of receptionists. They relieve each other. And they sort of act as the mail clerk and the switchboard operator and his private secretary, and anything else you can think of. You see, this is all in vignette.

And alongside of this administrator, there's a secretary there and you call her the HCO Secretary. Actually, she's the librarian, and she – she handles all the book stocks, and she issues the publications, and she does checkouts and examinations. She's a very busy person. She wears all factors of an HCO, actually, all in her own vest pocket, you see. And she's there actually to make sure that the material is available and stays straight, and so forth. She's not even there to see that any money is collected or anything like that. She's just there to see that the material's right, and that the material has library materials, and, you know, that's it – you know, that you have adequate supplies of these things, and to be able to get on the telex and communicate with other organizational centers, and that sort of thing. Because these things are all hooked up, one to the other, communicationwise. Well, of course, there's also a janitor and there's a maid.

And there's two technical crews. And these two crews consist of two HCAs or HPAs (depending on where you are), and a Saint Hill graduate. And one of these crews is senior to the other crew, depending on length of time that they've been auditing, and so forth. So, actually have two crews and it – each one is composed of one Saint Hill graduate and two HPA/HCA level people. And the senior technical member is the senior Saint Hill graduate. That is the senior technical member in this particular unit.

And what do they all do for a living? That's very simple. They engage in mass clearing. This is easy. This is the easiest one to do, so that's what they do. And they've got this little specially built building that's exactly tailor-made to their exact requirements to handle this sort of thing.

And what odds and ends of things do they handle? Well, they don't handle many odds and ends of things, because that's all handled for them in the city office which is mainly an administrative center. Doesn't do anything else. It's got a big account system, and it pays all their bills and pays their salary and banks their money, and does everything for them.

You wonder how a little district office like that's going to make any money or get forward or handle anything. Well, there are several ways that this takes place and several ways they go about this. The main way they go about this is they have an afternoon co-audit and an evening co-audit, six nights a week. And one afternoon co-audit goes, of course, Monday-Wednesday-Friday; the other afternoon co-audit goes Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday. One evening co-audit goes on Monday-Wednesday-Friday, and the other evening co-audit goes

Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday. And you have the Monday-Wednesday-Friday crew under one Saint Hill graduate and two HPAs and a receptionist, and you have the other Tuesday-Thursday-Saturday people under the other technical crew. In other words, stagger their week days.

Now, what happens? Well, if you look over the economics of this situation, it becomes rather interesting. Because at fifty people in each one of these co-audits, you have two hundred people in that center a week. This is not going to be very difficult to manage. There are various ways of recruitment. There are various other ways of going about this. But the truth of the matter is that at ten dollars a week this gets to be a rather staggering piece of income. That's a lot of money. Ten dollars per person per week. That's all you're charging them to go Clear. Well, of course, you'd never charge them ten dollars per person per week, the cost would undoubtedly be much higher than that.

But they enroll in the co-audit and they're fed on through. Doesn't cost them anything extra to have their goal found, and so forth. You just have this co-audit and you kick them out the other end Clear. It's just assembly line clearing. They do co-auditing in the meantime, and so forth. Technology's going to get even faster. You'll find goals faster. They found out eight goals, I think, in one week, down in Bulawayo – a couple of Saint Hill graduates working down there right now.

So, anyhow, you see how fast that assembly line could work? But the funny part of it is, it's a staggering amount of income. It makes a Saint Hill graduate capable, in a center, of earning 250 dollars a week, or maybe 100 quid a week. That would be looked on as rather ordinary income. It means this is your Woolworth aspect. This clears everybody. And the funny part of it is the Woolworth aspect is where it makes the money, not taking a lot of money from one or two people.

And as far as I can see, that's the basic building block, and it goes into an administrative center in the middle of that city. And you've got an HCA or HPA Academy set up with the Central Organization. And you've got some hospitals around which give clinical processing. And your big Central Organizations or your Continental Organizations are mainly administrative aside from running this little Academy – this Academy that takes care of that continent. And then you have your International Organization. It runs a university and doesn't do any processing. And it all just feeds through. There aren't 10 percents and exchanges and what's mine and what's yours, and so forth. And somebody...

The biggest crime that has been – ever been pulled off, is an auditor gets an area all stirred up and interested and then he departs.

Well, so somebody in Scientology gets tired of being in lower South Amboy, well, they can always be transferred to Chicago. Oh, say, a guy says, "I'm awful tired of being here, I want to go to Chicago." And you say, "Well, all right, why don't you write Chicago?" And

they write Chicago, and Chicago would say, “Yeah, we’d be happy to have you.” And you go to Chicago.

Now, there’d be money all over the place, as far as I can see. And in the Central Organization – just looking a little bit further ahead than that there’ll be a political officer. You want to know what happens when you clear everybody in that neighborhood, the only thing that center can become used for is a political center. Because by the time you’ve done all this, you are the government and you’ll never be able to refuse it.

Therefore, these things should be provided for, and this thing should be looked over. And everybody in Scientology should be eared for. And the idea of asking for somebody to go out and sweat it through and stumble and fall on his head and collect his funds and that sort of thing – that day should very soon come to an end. It hasn’t come to an end yet.

I’m just giving you a little glimpse of 1970. And it looks to me like a world that someone could walk down the street in. The situation between us now and that then is far closer together than you might think at this present moment. It’s just within an ace of coming true. Any comments you have upon what I’ve said, I would certainly like to hear, because this is your world too.

Thank you.