THE DIANETIC AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
Volume 2, No. 2 August, 1951

Official Publication of
The Hubbard Dianetic Foundation, Inc.
Wichita, Kansas

An Essay on Management

L. Ron Hubbard

A knowledge of Group Dianetics should include a knowledge of management, its problems and optimum performances. In Group Dianetics, the best organization can be seen to be one wherein all individual members of the group are versed in all the problems and skills in the group, specializing in their own contributions but cognizant of the other specialties which go to make up group life.

It is an old and possibly true tenet of business—at least where business has been successful—that management is a specialty. Certainly it is true that ruling, as Group Dianetics concerns itself with government, is a specialized art and craft not less technical than the running of complex machinery, and certainly, until Dianetics, more complex.

With our present technology about groups, it is possible to accomplish with certainty many things which before came out of guesses when they emerged at all. Management in the past has been as uncodified in its techniques as psychiatry, and management, without reservation, has almost always been a complete failure. Men were prone to measure the excellence of management in how many dollars a company accumulated or how much territory a country acquired. These are, at best, crude rules of thumb. Until there was another and better measure, they had to serve. To understand that these are not good measures of the excellence of management one has only to review the history of farms, companies and nations to discover that few have had any long duration and almost all of them have had considerable trouble. Management has failed if only because the "art" of managing as practiced in the past required too much hard labor on the part of the manager.

Until one has considered the definitions of wealth and expanded territory and has taken a proper view on what these things really comprise, one is not likely to be able to appreciate very much about management, its problems or its goals. Hershey, a brilliant manager with a brilliant managing staff, yet failed dismally as a manager because he neglected the primary wealth of his company—his people and their own pride and independence. His reign of a company ceased with his people—well-paid engineers and laborers, well housed, well clothed—shooting at him with remarkably live ammunition. The brilliant management of Germany which came within an inch of restoring to her all her conquests of former years yet laid Germany in ruins.

Before one can judge management one has to consider the goals of an enterprise and discover how nearly a certain management of a certain enterprise was able to attain those goals. And if the goal of the company is said to have been wealth, then one had better have an understanding of wealth itself, and if the goal is said to have been territory, then one had better consider what, exactly, is the ownership of territory.

Goals and their proper definition are important because they are inherent in the definition of management itself. Management could be said to be the planning of means to attain goals and their assignation for execution to staff and the proper coordination of activities within the group to attain maximal efficiency with minimal effort to attain determined goals.

Management itself does not ordinarily include the discovery and delineation of the goals of a group. Management concerns itself with the accomplishment of goals

otherwise determined. In large companies the goals of the group are normally set forth by boards of directors. When this is done, the goals are assigned the nebulous word "policy." In governments goals, when they are assigned at all, generally stem from less formal sources.

Nations are so large that until they embark upon conquests they usually have few national goals which embrace all the group. The government personnel itself has the goal of protecting itself and exerting itself in management, and the remainder of the group bumbles along on small sub-goals. When a goal embracing a whole nation is advanced and defined the nation itself coalesces as a group and flashes forward to the attainment of advances. It is an uncommon occurrence at best that a nation has a goal large enough to embrace the entire group: thus governments are normally very poor, being management with only the purpose of managing. Asia Minor, given a goal by Muhammet, exploded into Europe. Europe, given a goal by certain religious men to the effect that the city of the Cross had better be attained, exploded into Asia Minor. Russia, selling five-year plans and world conquest plans and minority freedom plans, can have a conquest over any other nation without any large group goals. A good goal can be attained by poor management. The best management in the world never attained group support *in toto* in the absence of a goal or in the embracing of a poor one. Thus Russia could be very badly managed and succeed better than an excellently managed but goalless United States (for self-protection is not a goal, it's a defense). Marx is more newly dead than Paine. The goal is less decayed.

Companies obtain, usually, their "policy" from an owner or owners who wish to have personal profit and power. Thus a sort of goal is postulated. Nations obtain their goals from such highly remarkable sources as a jail bird with a dream of a conquered enemy or a messiah with cross in hand and Valhalla in the offing. National goals are not the result of the thinking of presidents or the arguments of assemblies. Goals for companies or governments are usually a dream, dreamed first by one man, then embraced by a few and finally held up as the guidion of the many. Management puts such a goal into effect, provides the ways and means, the coordination and the execution of acts leading toward that goal. Muhammet sat alongside the caravan routes until he had a goal formulated and then his followers managed Muhammetanism into a conquest of a large part of civilization. Jefferson, coding the material of Paine and others, dreamed a goal which became our United States. An inventor dreams of a new toy, and management, on the goal of spreading that toy and making money, manages. Christ gave a goal to men. St. Paul managed that goal into a group goal. In greater or lesser echelons of groups, whether it is a Marine company assigned the goal of taking Hill X428 by the planner of the campaign, or Alexander dreaming of world conquest and a Macedonian Army managing it into actuality, or Standard Oil girdling the world because Rockefeller wanted to get rich, the goal is dreamed by a planning individual or echelon and managed into being by a group. The dreamer, the planner, is seldom an actual member of the group. Usually he is martyred to a cause, overrun and overreached. Often he lives to bask in glory. But he is seldom active management itself. When he becomes management, he ceases to formulate steps to be taken as lesser goals to greater goals and the group loses sight of its goal and falters. It is not a question of whether the dreamer is or is not a good manager. He may be a brilliant manager and he may be an utter flop. But the moment he starts managing, the group loses a figurehead and a guidon and gains a manager. The dreamer of dreams and the user of flogs on lazy backs cannot be encompassed in the same man, for the dream, to be effective, must be revered and the judge and the task master can only be respected. Part of a goal is its glamor and part of any dream is the man who dreamed it. Democracy probably failed when Jefferson took office as president, not because Jefferson was a bad president but because Jefferson, engrossed with management, ceased his appointed task of polishing up the goals.

According to an expert on history, no group ever attains a higher level of ideal or ethic than at the moment it is first organized. This observation should be limited, to be true, to those groups wherein management has been assigned to the dreamer of the dream. For in those cases where the dream was ably supported, the tone of the group

remained high and the group continued to be brilliantly effective as in the case of Alexander whose generals did all the generaling and Alexander, a brilliant individual cavalryman, set examples and pointed out empires.

But whether a group has an Alexander or a wild-eyed poet or an inventor doing its goal setting for it, the group cannot be an actual or even an effective group without such goals for its achievement and without management brilliant enough to achieve those goals.

Having examined the source of such goals, one should also examine the character of goals in general. There are probably as many goals as there are men to dream them, probably more. Goals can be divided into two categories, roughly. The first would be survival goals and the second would be non-survival goals. Actually most goals are a combination of both for goals are occasionally set forth solely for their appeal value, not for their actual value. One sees that the goal of a nation which directs it to conquer all other nations ends up, after occasional spurts of prosperity, in racial disaster. Such a goal is not dissimilar to the money goal of most "successful" industrialists or boards. One might call such goals acquisitive goals entailing, almost exclusively, the ownership of the MEST accumulated through hard work by others. Technically one could call these EnMEST goals, for conquest of nations brings about the ownership of MEST which, by conquest, has been enturbulated into EnMEST and which will make EnMEST of the conqueror's own land eventually. Rapacious money gathering gains EnMEST, not MEST, and makes EnMEST of the rightful money of the acquisitor. Such goals, since they tend toward death, are then non-survival goals. Survival goals are good and successful in ratio to the amount of actual Theta contained in them, which is to say, the ability of the goals to answer up favorably on a maximum number of dynamics. A survival goal then is actually only an optimum solution to existing problems, plus Theta enough in the dreamer to reach well beyond the casual solution. A group best catalyzes on Theta goals, not only to a higher pitch but to a more lasting pitch than a group catalyzed by EnMEST goals as in a war. It can be postulated that Theta goals could bring about a much higher level of enthusiasm and vigor than the most grandly brass-banded war ever adventured upon.

Another postulate is that a goal is as desirable as it contains truth or true advantage along the dynamics.

A group, then, can be seen to have three spheres of interest and action. The first is the postulation of goals. The second is management. The third is the group itself, the executors of the plans, procurers of the means and enjoyers of the victories.

These three factors or divisions must be satisfied to have a successful group or, actually, a true group. The divisions are not particularly sharp. The desires and thoughts of the body of the group influence and catalyze and are actually part of the goal finder. Management has to have the support of the group and the provision of the group to proceed at all and thus must have the agreement of the group for the best and most economical execution of orders. Management must have the confidence of the planning echelon or the planning echelon is liable to include the reform of management as part of the dream. The goal finder must be accepted and trusted by management or management will begin to look around for a new goal finder and, being management, not a goal finder, may take up with some highly specious ideas which management might then seek to make a sub-echelon to itself (the thing which causes most nations to cave in and most companies to collapse).

There are three divisions of action, then, which are interactive and interdependent. ARC amongst these three must be very high. A group which is hated by its management (often the case in the military) often gets wiped out; a whole system may be destroyed (as in American industry) when management and the group decide to become two camps. The death of the goal finder is not destructive to a group but even sometimes aids it, but only so long as the dream itself lives and is kept living. A management, for instance, which would interpose (for the "good" of the group) between the goal finder and the group is leveling death at the group by perverting and interpreting the character of the goal. Management cannot concern itself with the overall goal or plan; it can only execute and expedite the plans of accomplishing the

goal and relegate its own planning to ways and means planning, not goal planning. The traffic between the group and the goal finder should be direct and clean of all "interpretations" unless management wishes to destroy the group (in which case it should, by all means, undertake an interruption of communication between the goal finder and the group). The place of the goal finder is in the market place with the group or off somewhere sitting down thinking up a new idea. The place of management is in the halls and palaces, arsenals and timekeepers' cages, behind the judges' bench and in the dispatcher's tower. Management leads the charge after the goal finder has assigned the cause of the campaign.

Management is subservient to goals but goal finding is not in command of management. So long as a management realizes this it will continue in a healthy state as a management and the group, modified by natural factors such as food, clothing and general abundance, will remain in excellent condition. When management fails to realize this, the goal finder, even when he is merely an individual who enjoys the making of vast fortunes, shifts the management. When the goal finder is actually high Theta and management forgets the quality of ideas (or doesn't ever quite realize their potency) then, again and more so, management will be tumbled around, for a Theta goal finder has behind him a group and in a moment can become much more group than management and easily empties out the halls and palaces. A management that discredits its goal finder or perverts the communication of goals of course dies itself but, in dying, may also kill a group.

Management often takes the goal finder into its confidence and requests the solution to various problems. Management should understand that when it does such a thing it is not taking conference with more management, for the advice it will receive on technical problems, no matter how brilliant, is usually delivered with asperity, for the goal finder has no sight of tenuous lines of supply, quivering bank balances, raging labor leaders, leases and contracts unsigned or perilously inadequate. The goal finder sees goals; management sees obstacles to goals and ways of overcoming them. The first requisite of a goal finder is to see goals which are attainable only by the most violent ardures and which are yet sparkling and alluring enough to lead forward and onward his own interest (in the case of an EnMEST goal finder) or (if he is a Theta goal finder) his entire group. Management pants between the pressure of the group to attain the goal and the clarion call of the goal finder to go forward.

Yet there are specific means by which management can lighten the burdens for itself, recover and retain its own breath and be highly successful as management, which means that the group, by that management, must be highly successful if *its goals are kept bright.*

Let us concern ourselves only with true groups. The true group could be defined as one which has (a) a Theta goal, (b) an active and skilled management working only in the service of the group to accomplish the Theta goal and (c) participant members who fully contribute to the group and its goals and who are contributed to by the group; and which has high ARC between goal and management, management and group, group and goal. Here we have no management problems beyond those natural problems of laying the secondary but more complex plans of accomplishing the goals, pointing out and laying the plans for the avoidance of obstacles en route to that goal or those goals and coordinating the execution of such secondary, but most vitally important, plans. Management, having the agreement of the participants, is immediately relieved, by the participants, of some of the planning and, that plague of management, the tying of loose and overlooked ends. Further, management is not burdened with the actual location or cultivation of food, clothing and shelter for the group as in a welfare state, but is only concerned with coordinating group location or cultivation along secondary plans laid by management for the location and cultivation. Management is enriched by the advice of those most intimately concerned with the problems of participation and is apprised instantly of unworkabilities it may postulate. On the goal side it is relieved of the problem management has never solved, the postulation and theorizing of the primary goals of the group. Further, management does not have the nerve-racking task of smoothing out enturbulations and confusions which are the bane of every semi-group.

Now let us consider what might be meant by a true group as opposed to a pseudo-group. A true group falls away from being a true group in the gradient that ARC breaks exist between goals and management, management and group, and group and goals. In the case of a high Theta goal finder and a group in agreement with those goals, a bond between group and goal finder is so copper bound, cast iron strong, whether the goal finder is alive or dead as a person, that a management out of ARC with either the goal finder or the group will perish and be replaced swiftly. But in the interim while that management still exists, the group is not a true group and is not attaining its objectives as it should. This would be the first grade down from a true group toward a pseudo-group. The condition might obtain for some time if management were not quite a true management and not flagrantly out of ARC. The duration that such a management would last would be inversely proportional to the completeness of the ARC break. A severe perversion or break of ARC would bring about immediate management demise. A continuing slight one might find the management tolerated for a longer time. The break with the group, while the goal finder lives, can be of greater severity than with the goal finder without causing management to collapse or be shifted. Break of ARC with a goal finder finds management under the immediate bombardment of a group catalyzed, as a small sub-goal, into the overthrow of management. For this reason most managements prefer a good, safely dead goal finder whose ideals and rationale are solidly held by the group, and most groups prefer live goal finders because so long as the goal finder lives (in the case of a true group), the group has a solid champion, for a Theta goal finder is mainly interested in the group and its individuals and his goals and has very little thought of management beyond its efficiency in accomplishing goals with minimal turmoil and maximal speed.

The next step down from the true group toward a pseudo-group is that point reached where the goals exist as codes after the death or cessation of activity as a goal finder of the goal finder. Management, always ready to assume emergencies exist, being hard-driven men even in the best group, breaks ARC to some slight degree with the codified goals in the name of expediency. Being interested in current problems and seeing the next hill rather than the next planet, management innocently begins a series of such breaks or perversions and begins to use various means to sell these to the group. The group may resist ordinarily but in a moment of real danger may deliver to management the right to alter or suspend some of the code. If management does not restore the break with or perversion of the code, the true group has slipped well on its road to a pseudo-group.

The next major point on the decline is that point where management is management for the sake of managing for its own good, not according to the demised goal finder's codes of goals, but preserving only some tawdry shadow of these such as "patriotism," "your king," "the American way," "every peasant his own landlord," etc., etc., etc.

The next step down is the complete break and reversal of ARC from group to management, at which moment arrive the revolution, the labor strikes and other matters.

If management succeeds the overthrown management without the simultaneous appearance of a new goal finder, the old regime, despite the blood let, is only replaced by the new one, for management, despite critics, is normally sincere in its effort to manage and strong management, unless a good Theta goal finder springs up and carries through the revolution or strike, is faced with a continuing and continual emergency which demands the most fantastic skill and address on the part of managers and, oddly enough but predictably, the strongest possible control of the group.

We are examining here, if you have not noticed, the tone scale of governments or companies or groups in general from the high Theta of a near cooperative state, down through the Theta of a democratic republic, down through "emergency management," down through totalitarianism, down through tyranny and down, if not resurged by a new goal finder somewhere on the route, into the apathy of a dying organization or nation.

A true group will conquer the most MEST. Not even given proportionate resources with another group, it will conquer other groups which are not quite true groups. Brilliance and skill tend naturally to rally to the standards of a true group as well as resources. As a sort of inevitable consequence, MEST will move under a true group. The amount of MEST a true group will eventually conquer—but not necessarily OWN—is directly in proportion to the amount of Theta that group displays—Theta being many things including solutions along the dynamics toward survival. To display Theta the group must definitely tend toward a true group.

A truly successful management is a management in a true group. It is definitely in the interest of management to have as nearly true a group as it can possibly achieve. Indeed, management can actually go looking, for a group's completion, for a goal finder, or send the group looking for a goal finder and then, the goal finder proving himself by catalyzing the group's thoughts and ambitions, raise the goal finder's sphere of action as high as possible and abide thereby without further attempting to modulate or control the goals made (for management is necessarily a trifle conservative, is always liable to authoritarianism and is apt to be somewhat jealous of its power). Probably the most stupid thing a management can do is refuse to let a group become a true group. The group, if at all alive as individuals, will seek (the third dynamic being what it is) to become a group in the true sense. A group will always have around it a goal finder. Management in Industrial America and in Russia tries to outlaw, fight and condemn goal finders. This places the group in the command, not of management, but of a would-be martyr, a John L. Lewis, a Petrillo, a Townsend,* and management promptly has to go authoritarian and start killing sections of the third dynamic, which course leads to death, not only of the management but to the business or the nation.

Likewise a group should be tremendously aware of the dullness or the real danger of putting a goal finder into management or insisting that the goal finder manage. Hitler had a battle. He probably had a lot of other battles he could have written about if one and all had recognized what goal finder there was in him and supported his goal finding. Instead, current management threw him into jail and sorted itself out as a target for national wrath (for don't think the people weren't behind Hitler, regardless of what the Nazis try to tell our military government). Down went the Republic, up went Hitler as management. Down went Germany in a bath of blood. At best he was a bad goal finder because he dealt with EnMEST, and very little Theta. But he was a hideously bad manager, for by becoming one he could no longer be a good goal finder but, made irascible by the confusions of management, went mad dog.

Being rather low on the tone scale initially, most managements would be very chary of creative imagination level goal finding unless they knew the mechanics of the matter. And these demonstrate that it is unsafe to be without a goal finder, unsafe to suppress goal finders, unsafe not to keep trying for a true group continually and to fight very shy of letting anything drift toward the pseudo-group level. Management should stay in close tune with the group participants and give them as much to say about managing and ways and means as possible, and should avoid assuming the burden of caring for the group, and should assume and keep the role as servants of the group, at the actual command of that group.

Management and enterprises are most highly successful when they attain most energetically toward true group status.

There are certain definite and precise laws by which management can raise the level of its own efficiency and the level of production and activity of a group.

Save when it is necessary to establish a surprise element in an attack or to secure a portion of the group from attack, suppression of OPERATIONAL DATA is permissible to management. Suppression of any other than operational data can disrupt a group and blow management over. Any management which operates as a censorship or a propaganda medium will inevitably destroy itself and injure the group. A management must not pervert affinity, communication or reality and must not interrupt it. A

[*John Llewellyn Lewis, 1880—1959; U.S. labor leader. James Caesar Petrillo, born 1892; U.S. labor leader; president of the American Federation of Musicians 1940—58. Francis E. Townsend, 1867—1960; American reformer who in I 934 proposed pensions for persons over sixty.]

management fails in ratio to the amount of perversion or severance of ARC it engages upon and its plans and the goals of the group are wrong in the exact ratio it finds itself "forced" to engage upon ARC perversion or severance of ARC in terms of propaganda or internal relations.

A management can instantly improve the tone of any organization and thus its efficiency by hooking up and keeping wide open all communication lines between all departments and amongst all persons of the group and communication lines between the goal finder and the group. Fail to establish and keep in open and flowing condition one communication channel and the organization will fail to just that extent.

Communication lines are severed in this fashion: (a) by permitting so much EnTheta to flow on them that the group will close them or avoid them; (b) by perverting the communication and so invalidating the line that afterwards none will pay attention to the line; (c) by glutting the line with too much volume of traffic (too much material, too little meaning); and (d) by chopping the line through carelessness or malice or to gain authority (the principal reason why lines get tampered with).

He who holds the power of an organization is that person who holds its communication lines and who is a crossroad of the communications. Therefore, in a true group, communications and communications lines should be and are sacred. They have been considered so instinctively since the oldest ages of man. Messengers, heralds and riders have been the object of the greatest care even between combatants on EnMEST missions. Priesthoods hold their power through posing or being communication relay points between gods and men. And even most governments consider cults sacred. Communication lines are sacred and who would interrupt or pervert a communication line within a group is entitled to group death—exile. And that usually happens as a natural course of events. Communication lines are sacred and must not be used as channels of viciousness and EnTheta. They must not be twisted or perverted. They must not be glutted with many words and little meaning. They must not be severed. They must be established wherever a communication line seems to want to exist or is needed.

Any management of anything can raise tone and efficiency by establishing and maintaining zealously, as a sacred trust, communication lines through all the group and from outside the group into the group and from in the group outside the group.

The most vital lines of a group are not operational lines, although this may appear so to management. They are the Theta lines between any Theta and the group and the goal finder and the group. Management that tampers with these lines in any way will destroy itself. These actually have tension and explosion in them. It is as inevitable as nightfall that these lines will explode, when tampered with, at the exact point of the tampering. This is a natural law of communication lines.

A line is as dangerous to tamper with as it has truth in its channel. It is safe and even preserving of a line to cut it when it contains EnTheta. For example when a true line is cut, it charges a little power into the cutter and he has authority for a moment thereby. But it is only the authority of the cut line. If the line is thus made to perish, the cutter loses his authority. If there is much truth in that line, it does not give authority to the cutter, it explodes him.

A group has the right to exile anyone it discovers to be guilty of tampering with any communication line.

A management which will pervert an affinity or sever one may gain a momentary power, but the laws here are the same as those relating to communication, and an affinity tampered with will lower the tone of a group.

A management which will pervert or suppress a reality, no matter how "reasonable" the act seems, is acting in the direction of the destruction of a group. It is not what management thinks the group or the goal finder should know, it is what is true. A primary function of management is the discovery and publication, in the briefest form which will admit the whole force of the data, the reality of all existing circumstances, situations and personnel. A management which will hide data, even in the hope of sparing someone's feelings, is operating toward a decline of the group.

A true group must have a management which deals in affinity, reality and communication, and any group is totally within its rights, when a full and reasonable

examination discloses management in fault of perverting or cutting ARC, of slaughtering, exiling or suspending that management. ARC is sacred.

Management should be cognizant of the differences existing in power. Management undeniably must have power but a management which confuses authority with power is acting, no matter its "sincerity" or "earnestness" or even conscious belief that it is doing what is right and well, in the direction of decay of organizational efficiency. Power which is held and used by rationale alone is almost imperishable. That power deteriorates and becomes ineffective in exact ratio to the amount of pain or punishment drive it must use to accomplish its end. The Theta of management becomes EnTheta in a dwindling spiral once this course is entered upon. For example, the punishment of criminals creates more criminals. The use of punishment drive on the insane creates more insane. Punishment drive against inefficiency creates more inefficiency and no management wisdom or power under the sun can reverse or interrupt this working law. Every management of past ages has been an enturbulated group rule seeking to rule an enturbulated group. Management has only succeeded when punishment drive was suspended or when Theta moved in over the scene from a goal finder and by sheer Theta power, disenturbulated the group.

The need of management is for power to advance secondary and vital plans and coordinate their execution by the group. The only power that ever works is derived from reason and the ability to reason. MEST surrenders only to reason when it is to become organized MEST. Punishment drive creates EnMEST where MEST was sought. It is the boasted desire of every management to acquire MEST for the group. By employing punishment drive on the group or on MEST a management can acquire only EnTheta control of EnMEST and that is death. Management, if enough free Theta exists in the group or if the goal is sufficiently Theta, gets away with punishment drive and can confuse the punishment drive it is applying with the existing Theta in the group and can delude itself into thinking that accomplishment occurs because of punishment drive, not because of existing Theta. Thus enthused about punishment drive, management then applies more of it with the result that the existing Theta is enturbulated. Sooner or later the group perishes or (fortunate group) saves itself with a revolt which carries a Theta goal. (Example: British Navy, bad conditions of discipline before first quarter of nineteenth century; mutiny of whole Navy for humanitarian handling of men; result, a more efficient Navy than Britain had ever had before.)

Power, and very real forceful power it is, can be sustained only when it deals with Theta goals and is derived from Theta principles. Authoritarian power, held by breaking or perverting ARC, enforced by punishment drive, brings to management certain destruction and brings to the group reduced efficiency or death. One, in considering these things, is not dealing in airy philosophic impracticalities but in facts so hard and solid they can be worn and eaten and used as roofs. We are dealing here with the basic stuff of management and group survival. It is to be commented upon that management has succeeded despite its use of punishment drive and because of existing Theta goals whether management knew it or not. This sums up not particularly to the discredit of managements of the past but to the highly resistant character of Theta goals. Management, failing to understand the true force of its power and the source of that power, seeing only that if it cut and perverted ARC it had power of a sort, has been the yoke around the neck of Mankind in most instances, not the proud thing management thinks it is or could be, keeping the wheels turning. Where wheels turned in the past it was usually because of highly vital Theta goals and despite management. Management, being a needful cog in the scheme of things, has been kept around by a hopeful Mankind on the off chance that it someday might be of complete use. A punishment drive management is the spoke in the wheel of an action being conducted by a goal finder and a group, not the grease for the wheel which management sincerely believes itself to be. A goal finder-group combination action is only enturbulated because of the lack of a good management or, much worse, the existence of a punishment drive management. Man would run better entirely unmanaged than in the hands of an authoritarian management, for the end of such a management is group death. A group would run better Theta managed with real Theta power than a group entirely unmanaged.

Management derives power most swiftly by acting as interpreter between a goal finder and a group. The power of the management is effective in ratio to the cleanness with which it relays between the goal finder and the group on ARC. Management loses real power in the ratio that it perverts or cuts lines between the goal finder and the group. When the goal finder exists only as a printed code, management can continue to prosper and can continue to serve only in the ratio that it keeps that code cleanly interpreted between archives and group. Management deteriorates and grows unprosperous in the ratio that it perverts or cuts the lines from code to group.

There is an intriguing factor involved, however: ARC lines. When they are slightly interrupted they deliver power to the individual that interrupts them. True, it is authoritarian power—death power. But a very faint tampering with a line gives authority to the tamperer since he is obscuring to some slight degree a section of Theta. His group is trying to see the Theta and reach it and if they can do so only through the tamperer and if they are convinced that the tamperer or tampering is necessary (which it NEVER is), then the group tolerates the tamperer in the hope of seeing more Theta. Mistaking this regard for him as something he is receiving personally, the tamperer cannot resist, if he is a narrow and stupid man, tampering a little more with the ARC line. He can live and is tolerated only so long as the Theta he is partially masking is not entirely obscured. But he, by that first tampering, starts on the dwindling spiral. Eventually he is so "reactive" (and he would have to be pretty much reactive mind to start such an operation) that he obscures the Theta or discredits it. At that moment he dies. He has put so much tension on the line that it explodes. If it is not a very Theta ARC in the first place, he is relatively safe for a longer period. The pomp and glory he assumes are not his. He makes them EnMEST and EnTheta and eventually corrupts them utterly and corrupts himself and all around him dies as management.

There is also a pretense of having a Theta goal without having one which intrigues management. Lacking the actual article the management postulates merely the fact that such an article exists and that management is the sole purveyor of this Theta goal. Usually such a management makes excuses for the goal not being in sight or existing by claiming that "it is too complicated for ignorant minds to grasp" or "it is too sacred to be defiled by the hands of the mob." Management dresses itself in all the trappings of a Theta relay station, but as there is no Theta goal in the first place to give to the group, punishment drive has to be entered upon instantly. Hellfire has to be promised to those who won't believe a Theta goal exists just over management's shoulder. A flog has to be used to convince the group that the cause is just. However, a group is capable of generating some Theta on its own. There are always some minor goal finders around. Unfortunately these serve to buoy up a masking management by actually putting some Theta into circulation. Management can then keep on masking an empty altar. But as the altar is empty such a management is always afraid, instinctively. It starts to speak of rabble, the mob, the horrors of individual say in group actions. It speaks of anarchy and uses wild propaganda to stampede and enturbulate its group. The life goes, to some degree, down in every individual in that group and stays up only because of the minor goal finders in the group. Management, seeing here a rival or a threat of discovery that it exists not for the goal but for itself, starts in punishment driving the minor Theta makers, calling them revolutionaries whenever they advance a goal or idea and having them torn down from any tiny eminence to which their meager supply of Theta has lifted them. When the last of these goal finders is dead, the group is dead, management is dead and desolation reigns. This has been the cycle of management amongst men since first Man became civilized, save in those times and places where a real goal finder existed and where management actually began by being a part of a nearly true group. (See the history of Greece, the history of Egypt, the history of Rome, trace the course of Greek tyrannies. See also the history of various companies, and one readily sorts out those which began because of a goal finder an' those which pretended a goal existed but had no goal finder for the group but only made goals for individuals—management itself. Three life insurance companies began because of real goal finders and they are the leading companies of America despite subsequent perversions of the goal and its subordination to individual profit.)

Now it so happens that a culture which has within it many examples of punishment drive masked management will begin to develop a spurious technology of management based upon mimicry of these masked punishment drive managements. The technology is most ably put forward for that period in Machiavelli's *Prince.* Almost any text on "military science" is a technology of masked management. However, such texts exist and are useful because they furnish a short-term method of assembling a unit to follow a cause whenever one appears. The technology of how a company evolutes or a battery spots is not the technology of management but the technology of a coordinated group. Everywhere one looks in such a text on actual battle skill one finds that cooperation and understanding are the essence and that ARC is stressed amongst the group itself at every period and paragraph. But alas, the technology of the military management itself is so far from useful or factual that wars get won only because most armies have the same management system and that one wins which makes less errors than another and which has a better "cause."

For example, the communist main group in Russia is not a true group. Probably the United States is much closer to (but very far from) a true group. Thus the nation of Russia vs. the nation of the U.S., in a battle of culture would lose miserably. But an army of communists, working for a management which only recently lost its goal finders, Marx and Lenin, can have a "cause" couched in modem terms. All armies are considerably EnTheta and take only EnMEST. But a Russian army has a "cause" superior to a U.S. Army. Neither army has a true group cause, but the U.S. "cause" has not been restated in convincing modem terms. A second-rate and obsolete "cause" is as dangerous to have around an army as an obsolete weapon. The U.S. army "cause" does not include a conquest of MEST clause but contains only protection of status quo clauses. Once the U.S. drove hard on Theta goals. Because her people and culture are not much decayed and her technology is high, a U.S. with a "cause," as before, could easily outreach any Russian culture. And a U.S. army with such a "cause" would crush a vastly superior Russian force. Armies, understand, are short-term groups intimately concerned with the conquest of MEST which, no matter if they made EnMEST of it, is still a MEST goal until conquered. Thus armies can be thrown into action with far less reason than a culture, and, not so closely, ARC within the unit itself can by catalyzed. An army, then, builds its technology on fantastically high ARC on the private-corporal level and is governed by a fantastically low ARC on the management level. Because ARC is high in the bulk of the group and is commanded to be high (management of armies would reverse such a thing if they knew what they were effecting, one fears) by a low ARC management. Optimum in armies is that high ARC on the private-corporal level and management by a government which has high Theta goals and is itself high ARC. When this is attained armies explode out of Asia Minor and overrun Europe.

With such bad examples in a culture, management can develop an entirely false technology. Managers have to be geniuses to work with such technologies and ordinarily work themselves into a swift demise, as witness the presidents of the U.S. who can be seen, if you compare the pictures of the same president after just two years of being president, to deteriorate swiftly. The group one way or another will try to knock apart an authoritarian management or a management even slightly authoritarian. The management thinks this is all because of bad planning, tries to plan better, and thinks all can be righted by just a little more emergency punishment drive. The group revolts more. Management punishment drives more. And finally something has to explode. It is a lucky nation which blows into a Theta goal revolt early in this cycle. The government of the United States is overworked and inefficient as management because all the principles of its original goal finders are not applied and those that are applied are slightly perverted. And the same thing obtains with Russian management. (Example: read the works of Paine and the works of Jefferson in their original form and read also the letters and personal opinions of these men: you will find more Theta in those writings which has been overlooked than the whole U.S. government is using from those same goal finders. Read Marx and Lenin and look at the tremendous quantity of Theta untapped in those works.)

Bad management, then, like any aberration, goes by contagion. Because of a native existence of Theta goals even as to common survival and a country wealthy in brilliant people and natural resources, management can become a sort of priesthood because success reigns and management has never been loath to take credit for a group's production. But statistics will tell you swiftly that the great god "modem business management" is in continual trouble, is expensive, is uneconomical and that, by the duration of large fortunes and businesses, on the average such management as has been purporting to be management is almost a complete failure and is murdering outright the majority of enterprises of this country. The rise of unionism is not an index of the viciousness and willfulness of man but is, as it rises and wars against production, an index of the failure of management as it has been practiced as a technology. Unionism is not wrong. It is simply an unnecessary arbitrary existing because of the existing arbitrary of management operating on an authoritarian level, masking the absence of Theta goal finders and seeking to enforce that lack with punishment drive.

America fought for Independence from absentee management in 1776 and won. With the advent of Alexander Hamilton's banking system (a medal please for Burr*, traitor though he may have been) that part of Independence related to economics did a marked and remarkable slump back into the Dark Ages of fascism—or, Tyranny, as they called it in those days. Senator Bone, USS, once remarked to me, "I have fought since 1905 to place public utilities in the hands of the people. But I believe that, by giving them at last to the government, I have exchanged a fairly unreasonable for a very unreasonable master. It seems to me that when this country got rid of slavery in the Civil War we changed an outright form of slavery for a far more insidious brand—the tyranny of modem management." Fascism exists in America as almost the sole *modus operandi* of big business. And fascism or authoritarianism almost always murders itself swiftly since it is EnTheta and enturbulates the existing Theta. This is best exemplified by the management-labor upsets which have been increasing in volume since the early 1900's.

Economic tyranny alone could make possible the far less than ideal group ideology of communism. Where fascistic business management exists there socialism and communism can grow. State ownership of everything including the human soul and a communal ideology conducted with false propaganda by a rather fascistic group in Moscow are equally undesirable. The world is in tumult today because of three schools of management: fascism reserves the right to fire at will and devil take the men of production; socialism outlaws private property and builds up staggering bureaucracies about as efficient as Rube Goldberg's machinery; communism buffoons around with one-time high ethic tenets, building an empire on deceits. None of the three are worthy of attention should a workable science of management come into being.

Such a science of management should obtain optimum performance potentialities and optimum living conditions for the group and its members. Such a science is postulated in Group Dianetics. It is not an ideology. It is an effort toward rational operation of groups. Its pilot project has worked. Other pilot projects will follow. In Group Dianetics, should its results continue to bear out its tenets, one is looking at the general form of the government of the world. That government will not extend, as administrator, out from the Dianetic Foundation. But the Foundation will probably train the personnel that governments send to it and will probably be the advisor to all governments. No empty dreams—we have in Group Dianetics a much better mousetrap.

However, if the Foundation is ever to accomplish a post as trainer of government personnel, a tutor to the world of all management, the Foundation had better become, of itself, the best example of Group Dianetics in existence.

In accordance with an ambition to put its house in order, it is suggested that any organization so desiring put into practice the following tenets:

1. Consider well its ideal and ethics. This is the province of goal finding.

[*Aaron Burr (1756—1836), American political leader; mortally wounded Alexander Hamilton in a duel in 1804; was charged with treason in 1807, and later acquitted.]