

THE KEY WORDS (BUTTONS) OF SCIENTOLOGY CLEARING - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on 21 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Yeah, Australia. I was there when they were still glad to see Yanks.

Male voice: Wow, that was early.

That was early, wasn't it?

As a matter of fact, I was one of the first officers back from the upper battle areas. And I've had Australian officers meet me at airports and in offices and so forth, and actually stand there with tears in their eyes, they were so glad to see somebody give them a hand. I was the total antiaircraft of Brisbane, once. One submachine gun. They referred to me as the „*ack-ack battery!*“ Yeah.

Boy, when naval observers came in there, by the way, they looked at me in this patched-up office that I was running it from; they couldn't believe that either, you see? There'd been too much dispatch traffic coming from this particular part of the world, too many demands, too much authority. We were ordering about US cruisers and things. You know? We were not above telling people to arrive, and sail, and get out of there, and dump their cargo and so forth.

And I'd sent, on my own authority, four cargo ships loaded to the gunwales with machine gun ammunition, rifle ammunition and quinine up to MacArthur.

Always - I always, right up to the time I managed to resign from the Navy expected some day to get a bill for four ships.

Male voice: Did they get there?

Oh, yeah, two of them got there just as nice as you please.

But when Melbourne - when Melbourne found out that the office was too active for them to do anything about, they went into apathy for a while and then they got reinforced by several admirals, and they finally got brave enough to put the brakes on it. By that time there were enough troops in the area so the danger was over, so I went home. I wrote myself some orders and reported back to the US.

But I used to hear - for the next two or three years I'd run into officers, and they would say, „*Hubbard? Hubbard? Hubbard? Are you Hubbard that was in Australia?*“ And I'd say, „*Yes.*“

And they'd say, „*Oh!*“ Kind of, you know, horrified, like they didn't know whether they should quite talk to me or not, you know? Terrible man.

You go fighting a war all on your own like that, you know, and start bypassing things and it's a pretty bad thing to do. I want to caution you about it. Liable to get in trouble.

I think the war was fought by fellows who didn't care whether they got in trouble or not. And after the war was over all those who wanted to keep out of trouble stayed in - dirty remark.

But there's a case of responsibility which is quite interesting.

My God, what starts happening if you take responsibility for your own little zone and then don't care who tells you you shouldn't, you know. Lord, what things start happening in that immediate vicinity. Wow! Funny part of it is, only when you, yourself, decide not to take that much responsibility, do you fall in. Only then do you start to get it. And you have trouble right from there on out.

Well, we have a question period here. This is your half-hour, not mine.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Yeah. You said on the 19th, that there is no such thing as responsibility-irresponsibility?

There isn't, really.

Male voice: It's a sort of a person's causatively saying, „*I'm not responsible*“ is how it winds up?

Well, that's a peculiar one. Irresponsibility doesn't run. That is the only test I have to back this up.

If there was such a thing as irresponsibility, it's not necessarily true that this would work out, but this is one of the rationales on which we proceed in research: that if it won't run, it isn't. See? And a nonactuality won't run.

„*Look around here and find something for which you do not have to be responsible*“ doesn't run, runs, doesn't run, it doesn't get anyplace, doesn't do anything. That's entirely on what that rationale is based. On no more than this.

„Look around here and find something you can't help,“ is the same Responsibility Process, almost.

The reason why Help and Responsibility and Create, Problems and Change are always cropping up is that all other computations extend from them. And undoubtedly there is some kind of a combination which amounts to irresponsibility, but it is not irresponsibility. Now, just exactly how that's explained, I don't know.

Thank you, Jack. Is that it? All right.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, wouldn't you say that responsibility is that help is more basic - that responsibility comes from help?

Yeah, yeah. But they're still separate commodities to some degree. The two are not the same but they interlock. And you can find them interlocking and not interlocking.

For instance, you can help somebody without having consciously taken responsibility for him. You can imagine a situation like that.

A fellow is lying there with a broken leg after an accident, you didn't really take responsibility for his having been in the accident at all, but you did patch up his broken leg.

Now, afterwards you can conceive that you did take some responsibility for him. Don't you see? In other words, they can stand mentally separate. They can stand separate mentally.

Because these five things are so charged, they easily identify. And they merge awfully easily.

They can become themselves a great, big blur, see? And taking them apart one by one, just by definition, does some remarkable things.

I might or might not remember, oh, I probably will, to tell you a process on this particular line.

There is a process, „*Invent an identity*,“ by which you say, „*Invent a person*,“ and then some such command as „*Tell me his idea of (one of these five buttons)*.“ Now this is the fastest mind-changer you ever saw. But in view of the fact that you're pulling stable data out of the case, the case goes into a rather tremendous confusion. It comes out of this confusion fortunately if you substitute mock-ups for the invent.

The basic process was „*Invent a person*.“ The reason you can still use „*Invent a person*“ - this will probably be important to you later on in this course, so we'll take it up again; but I'll just hit it in passing so that you'll know it exists, and won't take you all by surprise - „*Invent a person*.“ Now, maybe this fellow can't mock up, you see, and if you told him to „*mock up*,“ his understanding of putting a mental image picture out there is beyond him, well, he is obsessively mocking up, so when you say „*Invent*“ you do get a mock-up out there in the darkness, anyhow.

And then you say, „*Now tell me that person's ideas on...*“ and then just take one of these five.

Now, let us say you're getting nowhere on the subject of Change. In other words, the case is not changing. Well, I could go further; I could give you a horrible example of a case that's been in the shop. And I'll take this up again later in the unit. But I'll just go over it very rapidly here.

This case keeps presenting a service fac. And the old service facsimile is, of course, is a defensive mechanism. That's a good old-time defensive mechanism. It protects all the aberrations, and it's the coating on the Rock and certainly isn't the Rock.

So, this person keeps chattering away, this particular pc, he's the bugbear of the HGC occasionally - he really worries them - and he chatters away obsessively about - all on the service fac. And every time you change an auditor or something like that on him, because he's been under processing quite a long time - the new auditor is always taken in by the convincingness of this individual on his service fac.

Well, his service fac does happen to include his PT problem. Duhh, boy, this was a killer, see? His service fac is his PT problem and nobody will ever go anyplace else than this because, of course, you can't unless you've resolved his PT problem in some fashion.

All right, this is a case in extremis. And to unsettle the case you could directly run Change. Directly. You could say, „*Invent a person. Now tell me that person's idea of change. Thank you. Invent a person. Tell me that person's idea of change. Thank you.*“ All right, now you'd unsettle the case. Just like you run Change on SCS to unsettle Start and Stop. Not to get any results. You don't want any positive results, but you want to unsettle the case so that it then will shift. So, „*Tell me an idea of change.*“ All right. Now, the individual has got Change unfixed, you can expect something else to happen. So the next thing that's going to happen to this fellow will be, „*Invent a person and tell me his definition of a problem.*“ See? And we'll run that one until we've shaken loose all of the nonsense that he must have as stable data on the subject of problem.

By this time the case will rather be in a horrendous confusion. But we couldn't care less. Better for him to be in a confusion than to be half-dead the way he is now.

Now, we will take up this PT problem, see, and we'll run it. But if the service fac is still in the road, we'll just apply some good old-time Scientology and we'll run, „*What will it get you into? And what will it get you out of?*“ which is one of the oldest processes known on a service fac. Just alternately, you - „*What will it get you into? What will it get you out of? What will it get you into? What will it get you out of?*“ It was used on this chap with a broken back...

Male voice: Oh, yes.

..very successfully. A service fac.

Now, the only reason you'd monkey around with something like that is because the individual can't be audited because he's always presenting his service fac with such

forcefulness that you never can get past it to get any auditing in, see? So, you might chip it out of the road if it still persisted after you've done these first two things.

Now, this person has been null on Help, and this is what makes the case a case. There is something wrong with this individual's concept of help. See, that's a rare one. Help won't run on any quarter of this case. Well, why won't it? There must be...

Male voice: It's not there.

Huh?

Male voice: Help hasn't been run on them. It's a valence.

Help's been run on anything an auditor could think of, and it just exactly goes nowhere.

Male voice: Yeah.

Now this is about the rarest case on record. This is like the giant horned exboo in the mountains of the Himalayas, you see. I don't think he's very standard. He isn't.

Now we'll have him invent a person and tell us that person's idea of help. And it will be, „*Help is impossible to give anybody*,“ or something, you see? He'd be totally wound up on this particular subject.

Ordinarily in running it these definitions will shake out of the case. Well, in this particular instance we're just going to give it a frontal attack. This attack is beginning this afternoon, by the way, on this week's auditing of this PC. And I don't think his case will survive it.

So, „*Invent a person. Tell me that person's idea of help.*“

Now, we might as well go all the way and run this particular experimental Clear technique, which is what this is, it's Clearing by Definition.

„*Invent a person*“ - and by this time we will start inventing them at various quarters of the body, you see, above, and below and beyond, give it location and probably shift it off to „*Mock up.*“ „*Mock up a person. Tell me his idea of creation*“ or creating or creativeness, see? Get that shaken down and then beat it to death on Responsibility.

Now, certainly by this time - the same process on Responsibility, see - by this time we certainly will have altered the key factors of the case. And then we'll just proceed with this other.

Now then, theoretically you could clear a case simply by clearing these five buttons. Theoretically. But in view of the violence of the Rock, and some various other factors, it might not be feasible. So it's highly experimental and it's an experimental excursion into Clearing by Definition. We've done lots of things by definition, so let's try to clear by definition and see if we get anyplace.

We'll have more on this before this course ends.

We find out that an individual gets along as well as he can change his mind about things. Well, this is a process which directly tells him „*to change his mind or else*,“ see, sort of a thing.

And it's a project and I usually start a project along about the time an ACC comes along, and about two-thirds of the way through and two-thirds of the cases are all bogged down and it never will something or other, why, we usually trot something out of the ragbag and patch it all up and get it going.

But you'll find every case that bogs down or every case that is being boggy has a misdefinition on at least one. But where you get a misdefinition on one, that misdefinition then identifies (to get right back to your question) and associates itself tightly as an identification with the other four.

Now, breaking those apart and breaking that down is a primary goal of auditing. This is a method I was giving you of doing it directly.

They all do associate one with another, naturally. But where they totally identify, you get a total mess.

Does that answer it?

Male voice: Yes, Ron. One more question attached to that: In having a person „*Invent a person, and tell me that person's ideas of change*,“ you're going to strip off valences doing that, aren't you? Oh, I'm sure you're going to do a lot of wild things. But the wildest thing you're going to do is strip off stable data. And that puts an awful lot of data into motion in the case, and puts an awful lot of confusion going.

Oh, there's a brand-new rule I'd better tell you. It's a brand-new rule: The first incident - this is one of the oldest rules we have, this part of it - the prior incident, the earlier incident, always should receive the greater attention for lasting and final results, you see? That's back to getting basic-basic off the chain, you know? Now, that prior incident idea can also be run into the first, second, third, fourth postulate idea.

Where an individual has a field, he can be assumed to be inhibiting with the field a creation which was made before the field. So, the rule is: Don't ever monkey with fields. Leave them alone, unless you also at the same time - the borderline case would be - unless you also at the same time handle the creation.

So, an auditing command such as, „*Find a creation that is masked*,“ would be just about as close as you could come to auditing what will become a technical term with you, rather than field, which is rather formidable, a more technical term which has greater use is inhibitor -o-r - inhibitor.

Male voice: What was that command again, Ron?

Oh, that's just - that just gives you the borderline. It's not a - really a fine process. It does some interesting things though with fields.

Is - I think it was, „*Look around here and locate a masked creation*.“

Now, that tells you what a field is. A field is something that is masking a creation.

A field is also something else. A field is a shattered creation.

Here's a planet. It was perfectly spherical when it was mocked up; it was just doing fine and it was going along swimmingly and everything was swell and all of a sudden it went poompf. Got John Foster Dulles as secretary of state or something and it went boom, see? And it wasn't any longer in its orbit, and there it was, you see? All right, what about this planet? To get rid of the actual planet - we're not now talking about the mental image picture, see, let's just put it into a broader material universe phrase - to get rid of the planet, I'm afraid you would have to treat its perfect form, see, its moment of perfect form.

It almost can be said that all things are primarily mocked up as perfect form. Now, this gives the lie, for the first time, to some of the Vedic hymns. It claims that all was chaos and the chaos all came together and made something. And I think that's commie propaganda. Don't think it's true at all. That's about the fourth postulate.

All right, it runs this way: Nothingness; postulate one: perfect mock-up; postulate two: fragmentation and chaos inhibiting the perfect mock-up or as a result of the perfect mock-up; fragment three, a recompos- pardon me - postulate three: a recomposition of the fragments into a solid whole; postulate four: disintegration or inhibition of this third thing.

Now, you can go five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, on down the line, and you finally get to a Ford automobile. And this all by itself will tell you why it is so hard to as-is MEST; it's a recomposition of chaos.

Well, the chaos came originally from the fragments of a perfect form, see? You get the idea? This is a very revolutionary principle. I don't know - can't tell you positively whether it's always true or not, because a thetan could start right in and mock up chaos. See? Yes?

Female voice: Could you say it over so we could hear it twice and maybe get it written this time?

All right. Zero is nothing. See, that's just thetan potential. One is perfect form, of course, in perfect space. Two would be the inhibition of the perfect form, usually by its own fragments, but you also could have other fragments. Three, a recomposition of these fragments into a new form. Four, once more the aspect of disintegration of this third form. Five, of course, would be a recomposition of form. Six would be a disintegration of that form. Seven, and so on.

Well, now to take apart this little scale you have to hit the first perfect form.

This is kind of the way it works out in auditing. As long as you audit perfect form, you get rid of the inhibitor.

Now, we just draw a conclusion. This is probably the way the MEST universe got here and became permanent. I don't know on what ten-millionth variation of this we are now proceeding, see? How many times has that wall you see disintegrated and then been made up again and disintegrated and been made up again.

Hm?

Male voice: Well, this explains a question I was going to ask about - there are two types of case: the one who's got pictures and doesn't know it (busy unknowing his pictures) and there's the one who's busy who's got his pictures, who's busy unknowing the MEST universe.

Yeah.

Male voice: And you've got these two inversions sitting right here...

Yeah. That's right. That's right. You'll find a case sitting along these lines. Every once in a while you start auditing a wide-open case who has pictures and has no control over them and doesn't know it and they all just appear magically, and he doesn't know from where, you know, a nice irresponsibility. You audit him for a while and it all goes black. Or it gets into shooting comets and all that sort of thing. And my, is that case disturbed. Well, you've just shifted him up scale, not down scale. And you went into the earlier cycle of disintegration.

Now, if you always handle first postulates, why, you always undo the second stage. So inhibitors are undone by handling perfect form.

And one of the reasons you use simple forms in Step 6 is to make sure that they will be perfect forms. And the automaticity of form doesn't enter in.

And now when you ask an individual to invent a person and tell him his idea of (something of the sort), boy, you get muck flying around the like of which no pc ever saw before because you're pulling out stable data.

But why did the stable data exist? They existed on an earlier disintegration which the pc didn't like, and so on, so each stable data is keeping an earlier disintegration going, and you theoretically could walk him up scale.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Is this connected with the scale of substitutes in Creation of Human Ability?

Very, very much parallel to the same thing. You might say the scale of substitutes, the earlier version.

We could get another one, is the first, second and third, fourth postulates on Know and Not-know, and this would be the mental reaction to it. And there eventually gets to be a physical action called Know and Not-know. And the physical action of Not-know is your second postulate in this particular case. You get the idea? As the individual runs along, the individual first not-knows everything and then he knows some part of it. You get the idea? So this first, second, third, fourth postulate, and that old Not-know Scale are not in coordination. They're not the same thing.

When we say first postulate we mean Not-know, see, on the old scale. And there we're in the field of pure thinkingness, pure knowingness, and so forth, and we're operating there.

Well, this other one describes form, and this is a form scale. In both cases you audit out the first postulate.

One of the contests of Not-know could be said to be (this is a far-fetched one): you make such a perfect form that everybody fixates on it and not-knows everything else.

Typical example of this: a beautiful girl shows up and the boys completely forget what they were talking about, thinking about, their bickering and everything else goes by the boards, you see? It's possibly a form method of not-knowing, something on this order.

Yes?

Female voice: This is a question on a different line. At the time of conception of a new body, is the thetan there and then does he make the pictures of the prenatal period and, well, create them and take responsibility?

Isn't that interesting?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

But that's all I can say about it. Yeah, is the thetan present at the moment of conception? Does he make those pictures as he comes up the line? Evidently there's some interlock here that has not been explored. And this comes under the heading of a much wider question, is: Do you make all of this all the time? And do you make everybody all the time? And is your individuality actually your compartmented part of making everything else too, and saying, „*This is me, this is I, while all that over ...*“ If that were the case then you would have to some degree predetermined your new body and had a finger on it all the way up the line up to the moment that you got it.

This is quite fascinating. As I have said to you before we have never totally resolved this question: Are you everybody or are you just one amongst many? And although we lean rather toward „*there are many and you are one amongst that many,*“ and it seems to work out that way, nevertheless we seem to have capabilities of being everybody too, which is confusing. That is a problem for OT. That's definitely an OT problem.

Yes?

Male voice: How does willingness fit into these five buttons and what you've been talking about on this scale? Willingness is responsibility since true responsibility cannot exist in absence of willingness.

Male voice: Would you say they are synonymous or is willingness...

No, no. Willingness is subordinate to responsibility.

Male voice: Willingness is subordinate to responsibility?

Yep. Yep. This is worked out by auditing tests, by the way, how we arrive at these seniorities, and so forth, by auditing test.

By auditing willingness alone, do we arrive at the same result as we do when we're using responsibility? And the answer is no, not arf [half]. Not even vaguely.

So, you'd say a person could be responsible for something under duress. You could say that. But it isn't necessarily true because he's then not really being responsible for it, you see? Actually, somebody else is being responsible for it, and he's merely being responsible for it on a via if it's responsibility under duress.

And as you audit responsibility, people come up through this cycle and all of a sudden themselves begin to be willing to be responsible.

All right, then willingness to be responsible is responsibility. And we may be saying responsibility when we say willingness.

Male voice: I wondered.

Yeah, we may be saying that, but the thing doesn't completely resolve a case. Willingness alone does not resolve the case.

A young girl being willing to commit sin is not necessarily a better young girl.

Male voice: Is that because they don't communicate the two ideas?

Yeah. Now say that again?

Male voice: When you say responsibility, you are also communicating willingness.

Yes.

Male voice: You say willingness, you are not communicating responsibility.

Correct. Correct. Very, very smart. Thank you.

Female voice: This spring, willingness came in as a gradient on that to help break the „*have-to's*“ and the „*musts*“ and the „*shoulds*.“

Yeah.

Female voice: And a couple of times - working both ways - it was said, well, „*Could you be willing*“ and all of a sudden these musts and have-to's just began to disappear, that had been standing there like blocks before.

These two things are interactive to some degree.

Male voice: Yeah, to me it seems that creation is senior to those because you have to create the willingness to create the responsibility. Is that correct?

Yeah, that's right.

Creativeness is the basic impulse of everything, and even if it's thought. And you get this, of course, as your senior button all the way along the line. It sometimes, however, cannot be directly approached, and these other four buttons give us a method of approaching it.

Yes?

Male voice: Is consequences a shift of responsibility?

Uh-huh. Uh-huh. Willingness to accept consequences is also a test of responsibility. It doesn't audit clearly or cleanly but it's still a test of responsibility. A person is unwilling to be responsible if he's unwilling to accept the consequences for, so he must have the idea of consequences before he has the idea of irresponsibility.

And a person who is totally impressed by consequence is a person who is quite irresponsible. And therefore we get the direction of social law as tending toward the creation of criminals. For instance, the most dangerous person in China or India is probably a woman. Quite interesting: the women are probably much more dangerous in comparison of the sexes than men. Much more.

And the most tremendous framework of consequence is erected around women in China and India - tremendous consequences. And they erected these things originally, possibly, because women were dangerous basically or something of the sort and then came up the line and enforced them, and the longer these things have been in action, the more, you might say, irresponsible for the community at whole, the women of India and China have been. Until they arrive at a very, very high irresponsibility, oh, about -I don't know the exact date, I wouldn't even pretend to know it, but it's back there in terms of hundreds, up toward thousands of years - when they had to invent suttee, which is one of the more fascinating things. If a man dies, you burn his wife or wives.

Well, why did they do this? There was a wave of husband poisoning going on which immediately succeeded no divorce. They got the idea that there could never be a divorce, and they enforced this on women so they wouldn't go flying around. So the women acted as a counter to this by poisoning their husbands. And the husband-poisoning became so common that then they invented suttee, and the wife got burned alive on the pyre which took away the body of a husband. Do you see? And this thing just went from one irresponsibility to the next.

Now, this again did not make women more responsible, you see? And none of these remedies have ever resulted in a higher responsibility.

All you need is about a thousand more traffic laws to have nothing but a 100 percent accident rate. Get the idea? All you need is a few more consequences.

There's always a sleeper along with every series of consequences that causes the thing to apparently work. And that is the actual social nature of man. And the actual social nature of man gets him over even law.

I wouldn't give you anything for a fellow who was totally restrained from doing something solely because law exactly operated. I wouldn't give you two bits for the man.

It's just like a hound dog. He's no good unless he'll kill chickens.

The fellow, in other words, who is made totally social by law, duress and consequence doesn't exist unless we call „*totally social*“ a man who is totally irresponsible. This becomes a very interesting enigma that the courts are always trying to solve.

Now the courts have awarded total irresponsibility by not punishing people who are insane. Well, they'd have to do this eventually as an end product, wouldn't they?

Audience: Sure.

Once they'd run out of consequences, they'd sooner or later have to make an opening for insanity, and so they have.

And insanity is more and more used as a plea - more and more and more used as a plea.

Now, there's a motion on foot to call all criminals insane.

Well, in view of the fact that the people who are doing this don't know that there's a cure for criminality and are just talking about it, and haven't yet cured a criminal of anything, why, it makes it a rather dangerous social experiment to call all criminals insane and turn them loose.

We've already had a case of this. We had two boys who had been given psychotherapy in institutions. They were two criminals, more or less; socially disorderly cases. And both of them had been just monkeyed with by the prison psychologists and psychiatrists and so on to a point where they'd become relatively unauditably. In other words, they were not only not helping them, but they were also making them unauditably.

Fernando handled one of these much to his sorrow. He hasn't been in jail since. We raised him up the line a little bit, gave him a little bit of reality, and I heard from a lieutenant of police not too long ago that he had just for the fun of it run through the records and he hadn't found the boy's name, and this was very odd for this character not to have been picked up for drunk and disorderly conduct or petty theft or something like that over a period of a year, and this had never happened before since the boy had attained the age of 18. So we must have done something.

But the main barrier we were into was this psychiatric revulsion on the part of both of these cases. That was probably the main barrier we were trying to overcome. They were certain that no mental therapy could do anything for anybody. This they were very certain of. They had no other certainty; that's what the prison had given them.

Now, we get consequence and responsibility as an interplay and we don't find it workable in absence of actual social consciousness.

And man is fairly - he is a social animal, if you want to call him an animal in the frame of the psychologist. And the psychologist is trying to convince us that he's not; that he's a social animal by duress.

But actually a thetan is a social being. And his willingness to have a third dynamic is the only thing that keeps things wheeling. His willingness to work is the only thing that keeps factories running. It actually isn't pay. It isn't anything. These are only appearances. And it's quite amazing.

When you look this over, you find out that the willingness to work; the willingness to be orderly; the willingness to be social; the willingness to handle, manage, and run a family; all of these willingnesses have as parasites all of these agencies that are supposed to make it happen. And we see all these agencies failing, failing, failing, failing,

failing. Well, that's because they're only parasitic on a basic willingness anyhow. And this responsibility is quite interesting.

An auditor leveling consequences at his preclear is in a dangerous auditing position. He's not going to get very far with it. To some slight degree once in a while it's allowable, just to some faint degree. Like a guy is drowning because he hates you and he doesn't want you to rescue him, you know? And you start to draw back a little bit from the bank and he quickly overcomes his hatred of you and gets himself salvaged.

But again we are leaning upon the preclear's social sense; his sense of at least wanting to save the first dynamic, you see? But it can't be leaned on very much without reversing it, and we get off over onto this irresponsibility kick whereby we manufacture with consequences irresponsibility.

Treatment of the insane with electric shock is a totally manufactured irresponsibility. And they wonder why they have to come back and get more and more shocks and so forth.

I was told the other day by some layman - a layman is somebody who believes psychiatrists - that electric shock was a very good thing, because he knew some fellow who had had some electric shocks. He had been crazy before and he'd had some electric shocks and for three years the fellow had not had a recurrence. And he was telling me this and this was fine, and I was very happy to hear this.

And I said, „*Well, what did the fellow used to do?*“

„*Well, the fellow used to be the manager of a restaurant.*“

„*What is he doing now?*“

„*Well, as a matter of fact he's on relief. But he hasn't been sane - he hasn't been insane since. You see?*“ Figure that one if you can as a gain, huh? We burden the society with one guy. We burdened him one way, that didn't work, so we burden him the other way, see? It's the same way.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, would you tell me what it is that causes the lag between becoming a Scientologist, going to lectures, being audited, and actually using all this in daily existence twenty-four hours a day? What is the lag?

Female voice: What causes it?

Nothing. That's just the slowness of educational reaction. It is man's unwillingness - man's unwillingness to be sure.

He has been fooled so often. He has been fooled with and fooled so often; he has been given such extravagant promises so long, and even I was guilty of - a bit on the side of an extravagant promise. I had done it; other people didn't do it. Don't you see? It was unintentional, but it for sure gave us a little bit of a curve, see, and it gave people a lot of downcurve that was not too good. Because it played right into the hands of the same thing you're talking about.

He's been fooled so often. He's been told all he had to do was dedicate himself to God, and be totally irresponsible and go and live in a cave someplace and be a hermit and live on berries, or something like this. And all he had to do was do that and he was all set. And when he exteriorized from that body, why, he found out he was dragging along all of his can't-haves, and deprivations, and irresponsibilities, and unwillingness-to-creates, and everything else, and he was much worse off the next life.

I imagine many a thetan who has gone looking for heaven has been terribly disappointed.

But because of this, the speed with which he'll pick up a reality on something is quite slow.

And Darwin mentions this fact in discussing horses - the length of hair on horses. It's quite amazing.

They take a bunch of horses on the hot plains in Arabia and they take them up in the mountains. And while they are up in the mountains for several generations they grow hair to protect themselves and then they turn around and bring them down to the plains again. They'll keep that long hair in that horrible heat for four years, or pardon me, four generations, he says. Four generations before they finally trust their new location enough to adapt themselves to it.

Rabbits will do the same. You take an Arctic rabbit, quite white, and you bring him down to Arizona. I've actually seen this. I don't know whether Darwin's remarks are correct or not, but I do know that this one is correct.

And I'll be a son of a gun if every winter he doesn't turn white. You look at this, you know, you say, „*The damned fool, you know!*“ Sun bouncing off all the rocks, and everything, the whole environment red and brown and here's this glaring white rabbit just cutting his own throat, you might say. A coyote or a wolf a mile away can spot this rabbit.

And yet for many winters, all the winters I knew this rabbit, he turned white. Now probably in his next couple of generations or something like that he'd get the word. There's no snow in Arizona! And you get any living being going through more or less this same distrustful cycle.

Male voice: The rabbit cycle.

Particularly on anything that is intimate as his own mental machinery. He does all sorts of weird things to protect that mental machinery; he'll go on being crazy for years just to keep from getting sane, because he's afraid he'll get crazier.

Take hypnotism. Every once in a while you're going to get a preclear that's got an hypnotic reaction. You should know what it is. His eyes are either glazed, and he agrees with everything no matter what it is, or he's got an eye flutter and his eyelids will go this way. You say, „*Close your eyes,*“ and his eyelids will go this way, see? Just flick-drrrrrr. It's pretty hard consciously to make your eyes flicker this fast, you know? Well, undoubtedly when he went into hypnotism, and he was first hypnotized five or six million years ago in space opera, because that's a - hypnotism is a space op-

era gag - he undoubtedly was totally convinced this was going to help him and he's never since gotten out of the rut.

We have a pc that turns up periodically that one time had a conflict with Salter, the great Salter, the great hypnotist.

And Salter covertly hypnotized him. And I think just only recently we got him over this. But he's been boxing around with this for years.

Well, undoubtedly his great faith in the therapeutic value of becoming a total effect has led him since that time to be very distrustful of Scientology. See, here was something else that was going to fix him up, as long as he could become what he considered to be a total effect of being audited.

See? Only auditing isn't being a total effect - not arf! [half?] See, but it was because it - hypnotism is a total... Get it all involved and identified, you see? I don't know on what slow curve the populace at large would go through this cycle. But I know that it is a cycle that they have to, to a marked extent, go through because if you try to catalyze the cycle, all you've done is grab a bunch of people off who are in a state of awe, shock or fear.

For instance, all right, we make an OT and we put him out on a set of lectures and he demonstrates conclusively that he can bust vases at will or raise women's hats in the audience three feet off their heads or something like that, you know? Or levitate bodies a thousand feet above the city or mock up gods or something of the sort that can walk all over the public buildings. So he could do all these things, you see? Well, the rest of the populace then simply says, „*Here is something else to be afraid of,*“ and go into a consequence sequence.

And their responsibility, what little gold you've got, disappears in the aqua regia of your own shock. See? What little responsibility they've got goes by the boards, and all you do is create this wide sweeping irresponsibility by these boys.

I've spoken of this for many years and I still get into arguments with people. They don't view this. They want it all to happen at once. It's got to happen quick. And they say, „*Well, why don't we do something of this character that's highly spectacular, you see, and impresses everybody.*“ And they don't realize that it's just throwing what little gold you've got left back into the creek.

Male voice: I know of a case that committed suicide because all of his stable - he was an engineer, and somebody levitated something for him. He went and committed suicide as a result.

Yeah?

Male voice: It just unhung his stable data.

Yeah.

Male voice: Too much confusion.

All right.

Male voice: Right.

That's right. There's a good case in point.

Well, we're way overdue. Your Instructor is getting very, very nervous.

I haven't mentioned this before but you've got a couple, three, very good Instructors there. I think that they'll do right by you.

But I want to give you a tip. I want to give you a tip about your Instructors and so forth. And you can get around them. This is the way you can get around them, and so forth.

Just do exactly what they say.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]