

IMPORTANCES

A lecture given on
8 November 1959

Hi today. Did you survive last night?

Audience: Yeah!

I understand there were people falling on their faces, is that right?

Audience: Yeah!

Oh, that's terrible. Hate to see effects produced like that. It's very bad, very bad.

Your general state of processes today actually leave the one that you were running rather in the dust. It's a tremendous process and so on, but we're way out in advance of it. That's why that particular process is relegated to PE Co-audit and for large groups and so on. And I feel I should tell you its limitations. It does have limitations because sometimes the preclear interprets it to be more communication. He doesn't run out old communication, he adds on new communication, don't you see?

And he just starts stacking the bank up, you might say. And if a person isn't making good progress with it, there are two things wrong. He is not in-session. He's not in-session. That is to say, he's unwilling to talk to the auditor. And boy, when they're unwilling to talk to the auditor, don't audit them. Get them in-session. That's a nice tip right here. And the people that read high on those meters, they're just unwilling to talk to the auditor. That's something for you to remember.

Definition of in-session: Interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. And unless those conditions exist, you don't get any auditing done.

Person who's sitting there, withhold, withhold, withhold, withhold, withhold, see -- total individuation. And finally, the more he's audited ... He knows -- he knows that auditor can look right straight inside and read all of his pictures. He knows that. And he knows that if those pictures get read, kkkkkkkk! that's it -- he's had it. He's done some terrible crime! Actually the crimes that people have done that they withhold from auditors are so laughable, ordinarily. Something like they strangled a kitten when they were two, you know. In their married life, four years ago, they winked at a man.

Crime! Crime rampant. Send for the O-Gay-Pay-Oo and J. Edgar Hoover, see. FBI and the state police and the local gendarmes and so on, will be right there with a big net.

Other people hold to their bosoms the fact that they know they're crazy. And the person who mustn't find it out is the auditor. And of course, that's nonsense. First person to find that out is the auditor.

You say to a pc now -- you say, "From where could you communicate to a mother?" And the pc says, "Well ... Now don't tell me." After about a half an hour of this, if an auditor's worth his salt, he knows. But the reason the pc can't answer it rapidly is because he's afraid if he does the auditor will find out he's crazy. But of course, a person who is trying to hold it to himself as a secret that he's crazy, isn't. Because truly crazy people have no responsibility for being crazy! The only crazy people to a crazy person is the auditor and all the other people. He's the only sane person left on Earth, which is a unique position.

The only people who are absolutely convinced, without a shadow of a doubt -- no grays, all just black and white -- that they're absolutely sane, are in institutions. They're inside looking out

For instance -- by the way, they're the only important people on Earth, too. I don't know if you knew that.

Very often you walk up to a janitor and you say, "Hey, where's room 24?" or something like this, you know. You should be very careful talking to janitors that way. They're much more important than corporation presidents! Infinitely more important. There isn't a waiter in a restaurant that isn't more important than the governor general. And the most important thing in the world is, of course, something like an ant or a mayfly. Boy, are they important! Wow!

Sometimes, because of pressure of business and that sort of thing -- and factually, it's almost impossible for me to get my work done. Nobody could do my job, you know. That's not possible. One day somebody said, "By golly, God probably couldn't hold down your post," you know, being sarcastic, you know, but being mean. And I thought it over and I said, "I think you're right."

But the only reason, you see, I can do my work at all is because I'm not important, see. It's kind of a reverse look -- I'm not important. I'm probably the least important person in Scientology. Must be! Obvious, for the excellent reason nobody ever asks me how I feel. Nobody ever asks me, "Is it too much work for you to do this?" They never ask me that, you know. They just load it on the desk. See, they give it to me amongst lectures, so on. They never say, "Can you do this?" They work on a total certainty that, "Oh, well, that's Ron. He'll do it." So I am obviously the least important person in Scientology.

If I were important at all, why, things would be different. They'd be totally different. We wouldn't be anyplace, because you have to get in there and pitch, you know? You can't count how tired you get or how many bugs are flying around through the epiglottis. You can't count that you need a vacation or anything like this. You've just got to keep the show on the road and other people's necessities are much greater than your own. So they're important, you see? I don't necessarily say that's a sane attitude simply because I have it. It's just I'm hung with it and that's it.

But if you want to find some important people -- real important people you have to go to some place like India. And you have to find an untouchable. And although they're, supposedly by everybody, supposed to be the least important people on Earth, actually they're much more important.

I've looked into the skull of an ant, though, carrying a burden of a leaf or something like this and, man, did he think he was important! Wow! You sort of put a little beam on him and direct him to go elsewhere, you know. The immediate reaction you get is, "You realize that if you interfere with me, the Earth will probably stop turning upon its axis! Do you realize that? Do you realize the sun will probably fall out of the sky if something happens to me?"

It's only the little people who are terribly important, and only the real crazy ones. A person can get so important that he never draws another sane breath as long as he lives. That's a -- odd commentary, but very true. And basically it's because importance itself is what swells up and makes a reactive bank. Importance. You might say solidity equals importance and nonsolidity equals unimportance. It's quite remarkable.

Importance is a -- is a tremendous factor in dealing with people. And every once in a while you get a pc sitting in the chair that you can't audit and doesn't seem to get anyplace and so on. Well, he's just doing everything wrong and upside down and so forth because he's too important to be talked to. And the importances that he assigns to some of the most innocent phenomena would shock the rest of us. And they just can't give out and tell the auditor anything.

Now, under modern processing it's rather easy to break through this particular barrier. But "From where could you communicate to something?" and so on, doesn't happen to be a process which itself immediately breaks this barrier of importance and withhold and so on. It

doesn't break down underneath -- before that process. Therefore, a great many people in co-audit units -- some percentage which hasn't been established but is probably less than 50 percent -- well, considerably less, maybe only 20 percent, 25, something like that, not been established but something on that order -- sitting there not in-session. And when they're not in-session, naturally they're being addressed by mechanical auditing and so forth and the person isn't really interested in their case and so forth and they're not in-session and they start to run a communication process, they just add communication onto the bank and do something else. They never do the command straight.

It isn't a matter of "From where could I communicate to a cat?" It would be: First they have to find a cat. And then they have to find out whether or not the cat is an acceptable cat to them. And then they have to find out whether or not they would dare be in the vicinity of the cat. And then having established this fact, they have to choose whether or not it's going to be verbal communication or done by Morse code or something. And having chosen this, they then totally neglect to find a location and simply say they've answered the question. It's very interesting looking into a pc's mind and finding out what he really does do with an auditing command.

The more they're withholding, the more superimportant they are as a person, the more nyeahh they're doing the auditing command. That you can count on. And the crazier they are, the more important they are and the more important are the crimes which they must be withholding.

And I'll let you in on something: If you can't tell a Scientologist what you've been up to in your life, you'll never be able to tell anybody. Scientologists, you know, have a reputation, oddly enough, amongst humans. They do! They have a reputation. This would be rather odd because I'm sure nobody has -- it would have to be me that would scout down some odd factor like this -- have to go around and ask non-Scientologists who are vaguely associated with Scientology what they think of Scientologists. And they have very definite opinions, oddly enough. They consider them very easy to get along with, very understanding, (you'll laugh at this one) not at all critical, and that they can be trusted. And that's what people who are around Scientologists normally think of Scientologists, no matter what they're telling the Scientologist!

Normally, they'll tell the Scientologist, "Well, you shouldn't be interested in such things and when I was young, I was interested in the affairs of the world, too, but I got over that. It's a rather adolescent idea. Here we are -- here we are in this tremendous morass, quietly sinking down, nobody's troubling anything, and you come along and offer somebody a rope. Huh! How come you're so good that you can't sink in a morass, too?"

But in spite of what they tell Scientologists, they do have amongst themselves a definite opinion of the character of a Scientologist, which I consider is rather remarkable.

I've plucked this out of the mouths of boardinghouse operators, you know, and out of restaurant keepers and out of non-Scientologist staff in organizations and other perimeter people, you know. And they all seem to have just about the same opinion. There must be some truth in it.

And if a person can't tell a Scientologist about it, he's had it! God help you if you told a psychiatrist about it! A psychiatrist receiving a piece of information concerning the fact that four years ago the wife had winked at another man: "Ah," he'd say, "Ah. Mmmm. Freudian connotation, it means definite sex starvation. It means a suppressed bearing on the libido. I think -- wouldn't be any chance of you having a libidoectomy, would there? Well, no, I thought not, I thought not. I didn't think you could afford 20,000 pounds. So the best thing for you to do, Mrs. White, is to go out and have affair with another man and that will discharge this compulsion to be faithful." Really, I shouldn't -- I shouldn't be sarcastic or say mean things about psychiatrists, I really shouldn't be.

Once upon a time when the US was busy getting disentangled from England -- this is something very funny about that, you know. I've now started a backflash on the line and I keep telling -- I tried about a year ago to make a joke out of this and tell some people over in England

“You know if you don’t watch it, you’re going to become an American colony, you know.” And they don’t think it’s funny! That’s right. And they stand there and tell me, “Well, it might not be a bad thing, you know. It might not be too bad, you see,” and so forth, and get very reasonable about the whole thing. It might be happening -- who knows?

Anyway, America is under a tremendous mental healing onslaught these days. And the best thing that you can say about it -- it’s a mental healing onslaught that has as its byword, “Nobody can do anything about the mind. So therefore, anybody who tries to do anything for it or about it, you see, has to do it according to the statutes.” And you say, “Well, that’s very interesting, let’s see now, according to statutes, so on, just ... Now, do you mean that you’re supposed to do something for the...”

“Oh, no! No, no. No. No, no, no. No, no. The reason we use electric shock is it’s lawful.”

There’s one state in the United States -- Michigan -- where a medical doctor, if he did not electric shock the patient, could be arrested as it’s against the law not to. Yeah, you know, total plan.

But those boys are in much worse shape -- much worse shape than anybody else is. Think of having to stay in there and pitch knowing darn well you had no answers; knowing darn well the statistics were totally against your ever doing anything for anybody and having to say for the benefit of the state legislature, “Oh yes, we do a great deal to help these people. We do a great deal to help these people,” and knowing positively and definitely through personal practice and experience that it never did anything to help anybody, but only worsened cases. A man who is in that one -- he is withholding failures! And they withhold failures and withhold failures, and it is so common and ordinary to go down in the padded cells and find psychiatrists and attendants -- former attendants of the asylum in them, that -- it’s a grim business.

And once upon a time there was this big battle up in the northern lakes. And somebody, I think it was Oliver Hazard Perry or some such great naval hero said -- after they’d whipped a British vessel, he says, “Don’t cheer, boys, the poor devils are dying.” You know, that sort of thing -- very touching sentiment. I think we should adopt that sentiment.

Matter of fact, a lot of you miss the boat entirely -- you do, with psychiatry and so forth. You feel these fellows are -- are all evil and they’re not -- they’re merely spun in. And you actually avoid them or cease to try to overwhump them or cease to try to do something for them. Do you know that a large percentage of them -- all a psychiatrist would have to hear is that, “I want to help your wife and family. We’re not so much interested in you, but we would be very, very happy to help your wife and family.” And you think that’s -- sounds very funny. Give them a little literature or something like that. Oh, you’d have his wife and family under processing right now.

I gave a lecture to a series of psychiatrists in Washington, DC many years ago. There were twenty-one of the leading psychiatrists of that whole district, and eighteen of them offered me their wives for processing. Pathetic! You see, when it comes to something they really want to have happen, they know they’ve got to go to somebody else, no matter what they’re telling the public.

So, therefore I’m not being supercritical. I’m just trying to give you some facts in the case. That’s a soft field. They’re not tough and hard and all in agreement and presenting a united front and so forth. They’re just a sort of an idea peoples got and you try to enter or penetrate that particular sphere of action or influence and so forth and they just fold up, quick.

We caused a fantastic amount of upset in Washington, DC by officially sending a representative from the HASI over to the American Psychiatric Association just to find out if they were being ethical according to our codes. And boy, they were sending us literature for months. They were trying to prove to us that they had a code of ethics and that they did do something ethical and so

on. And then they went and rewrote the medical code of mental healing, and we've been responsible for a complete rewrite of those codes in the United States.

But they don't dare adopt the Code of a Scientologist! They don't dare, because it has a horrible line in it. And that has to say by charging people for doing things and not charging them for not doing things. And if that single line could be enforced upon all healing, we would have it made. We'd be the only gainers. If we absolutely made it law that a practitioner could not charge for no results -- if he got no results, he could make no charge -- and if that sort of thing became general, people would have to break down and admit they weren't doing anything. Because you'd have every patient who was disgruntled and upset and had been cut to ribbons and chopped up and charged to death and so forth, you'd have them right back on their necks.

We get a very small amount of this in Dianetics and Scientology. And one of the reasons why organizational activities have to exist in Dianetics and Scientology -- left to my own devices, taking no real responsibility on the line, I could just tell all of you, "Well, just go ahead and do what you please and have a good time, and push the gospel through and that's it," and that sort of thing. But I found out that here and there Scientology gets into bad hands. And it gets into the hands of somebody who cannot be audited. Because the person who just has the little tiny secret about having winked at a man four years ago or been found in the wrong bed or something of that sort -- this person gets up to a sane enough point where they don't care. And they find out that they patch this up most easily by exposing it and getting the two-way comm out of the road and so forth.

It's quite -- it's quite pathetic, by the way, that there's many a husband -- many a husband very, very angry at his wife when his wife has done nothing. He is angry at his wife simply because he is guilty of overt acts against his wife. Sounds utterly incredible, doesn't it? See, he then dreams up motivators. He dreams up reasons why he did these overt acts. And those reasons why are not true at all.

And vice versa. There's many a wife who is just furiously angry with the husband -- privately, covertly, down at 1.1, you know, on the subject -- who is simply angry because she has done something to the husband. It's something like you beat a dog and then you have to get mad at the dog because you beat the dog. See? It's some kind of rationale that explains, then, that the dog bit you or something of the sort. The dog was lying on the hearth rug wagging his tail as you came in, you walked over and kicked him in the head. Now, to explain why you kicked him in the head, you have to dream up some rationale about how the dog looked like he was going to bite you or it was really a bad breed of dog or the dog had thought some overt thoughts against you.

But any one of us, even the best of us, occasionally find ourselves outside the pale slightly. You know, we do something that isn't agreed upon as being perfect optimum conduct. In view of the fact that nobody in Western civilization has ever defined optimum conduct, we can find ourselves outside very easily. You know, an American is found in America eating with his fork in his right hand and an Englishman is found in England eating with his fork in his left hand, you see. Eating with his fork in his right hand, his left hand, who's supposed to eat with what fork where? One fork is the other and so on. It's not right conduct, you see? You just change countries and it becomes wrong conduct. Get the idea? And manners and customs and the ways we regard things and so on, we just shift a boundary or go over to another race or something of the sort.

I remember -- when I was in my teens I had the -- the pleasure of being able to wander around enough to become rather conversant with about twelve different races, most of them aboriginal and apparently much lower levels of civilization -- by which we mean simply that they are not mechanically civilized, that's all we mean by that -- twelve different races. And I became struck with the idea that they were so different, that each had such different ideas about right conduct, that there couldn't be any meeting ground amongst them but that there must be some common denominator in their existence. And the common denominator that was finally isolated by me was survival. They were all trying to survive. That we could bet. And they were united on this

one common denominator. But there was hardly anything in any one of those races that was considered survival that wasn't considered nonsurvival. elsewhere.

As I remember vividly, as a young man about seventeen, getting into severe trouble with a Japanese host -- I didn't make a pass at his daughter. He almost never forgave me. And don't think that didn't have me grogged for a while. I was being a good boy.

Well now, let's just don't break it down to races. When we get as far away from established codes of good conduct -- when we get as far away from this individually, we also separate in terms of what is good conduct. And practically every person on Earth has some slight difference from everybody else on Earth on the subject of what's good or bad conduct. Every person has his own opinion of what's good conduct. Every person has his own opinion of what's bad conduct and they only apparently amalgamate into a racial idea country by country. Every person in that country has just a little shading different than everybody else. There's some slightly different opinion.

Now, you owe most of your aberrated condition to the fact -- I'm sorry, I didn't mean to be -- I didn't mean to be complimentary. You got a case, too. Anything that you think is wrong or nonoptimum about you occurs because of your surprises in the past at discovering something you were doing was not considered to be good or optimum or acceptable by some person that you were living close to. You were going ahead and doing what you thought was the right thing. And you found out, much to your amazement, it was the wrong thing.

These slight differences of opinion on what was correct and what was incorrect, by the way, start all the rows that occur in marriages. Now, I'll give you an extreme example. A little boy comes in, there's -- his mommy's got a typewriter sitting on a table and it's got white keys, so he says, "Isn't that nice, now I'll help Mommy and I'll take a lead pencil and I'll do the right thing and I'll color all the keys of the typewriter," you see -- or the piano, "color them all black," you know. And he gets licked for it. He has an awful time trying to straighten this out, you know? It just isn't quite right. He didn't know he was doing wrong and then he found out he was doing wrong.

And that is the cycle of practically all conduct everywhere. You thought you were doing right and you found out you were doing wrong. Well, who are all these people that set up all these laws of what's wrong? I don't know, we set them up ourselves. We decide what is wrong conduct and what is right conduct, and there's no general agreement. And you can't go open up the Code Napoleon, you know, and read down -- "Right conduct. Wife fails to speak to one at breakfast - - improper conduct," you know. See? You'll find in some other family -- wife speaks at breakfast -- wrong conduct. And there's no security, you might say, on what we are doing and whether or not we're doing it right or otherwise. And it makes an insecurity.

People go on doing jobs in offices and with organizations and so forth, and they think they're doing right. They -- by their 'own lights and their own values, why, they think they're doing right. And then all of a sudden they find out it's all wrong and it's a great shock to them. And they find out these things are all wrong just two or three times, and after that they feel insecure. They're not quite sure, because they have been invalidated. Their sense of values has been invalidated. And they get to a point where what they think -- when they get pretty bad off along this line, they get to a point of what they think must not become public property because it might be wrong conduct.

And you'll get some of the weirdest opinions of what one shouldn't tell the auditor! And don't always think that when you're trying to get something out of a pc that it is some crime that has to do with rape, murder and arson. It's probably got something to do with not wearing the right dress or something to do with -- something to do with not having been appreciative of something.

Or they just can't be audited by the auditor and the auditor is a very bad auditor and he ARC breaks them all the time and he's very bad and it's all bad over there and so forth. You come to

dig this out, you'll find out that the basis of all this reaction to this auditor is the fact they can't talk to the auditor! Well, the reason they can't talk to the auditor is not necessarily because the auditor -- don't take the easy way -- reminds them of some other person they could never talk to. That's the easy way out.

It usually hinges on something as definite and as present time as this: They sat down and they said, "My, what an ugly looking specimen of human being." See, said something like this. They thought this, you see, and... "He reminds me of Uncle Charlie and I bet he's twice as dumb." You know? That's an overt act! It tended to individuate the individual. And this overt act is the reason the auditor's a bad fellow. Got the idea?

And you're sitting there and the tone arm is sitting at about 4.5 or 5.0 -- as the auditor -- and you just can't get this pc to talk and it's high arm and then you don't seem to get any facts out of the case and just can't seem to break it down and case making no progress and so forth. Don't be so quick to blame it on your skill in handing out processes. And don't be so quick to blame it on the process! We've had processes that worked for years and years and years.

For instance, this ACC is only going to specialize on how do you administer a process and get sessions started. That takes a lot of know-how. And I think that's the best thing I can do for Scientology in Australia, rather than give them a whole bunch of new processes. I'll give them a bunch of new processes too, but let's get the address to the case that makes the case run! Let's show them how to get these cases and shake them out and run them! Let's get some Clears down here, see. That's going to be done by auditing skill, and that's the best thing that I think we can teach people in this ACC that's coming up.

But you, in addressing this case, don't at once suppose that because it's got a high E-Meter arm and because the fellow won't talk and the process doesn't seem to be getting anyplace and all that sort of thing -- don't be so quick to blame yourself or -- and don't be so quick to think it is some fantastically high crime! It'll be some little thing that doesn't amount to anything. You say, "How could a person go through absolute torture and have nightmares and lie awake nights for fear somebody would find this out? How could anybody be worried about this?" That's usually what happens.

But in this -- just the general run of these things, the reason processing takes so long is because when you don't start a session -- when you haven't got a pc in-session (interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor), the processes have to break down these little bits and pieces of things. They have to break down the unfrankness of the person. You're waiting for the process to do it. And good golly, that takes forever. You can just go a hundred hours just poom -- just waiting for the person to finally get up high-toned enough in spite of the withhold and everything, they suddenly say, "You know, I thought you were a bad auditor at first," or something like this, you know. It's quite remarkable, but boy, that's an awful waste of time and it's an awful waste of Clears to go at it this way, to break it down with a process.

There's only one exception to this sort of thing. If you can't take a person down on the tone arm practically at once by getting them to get frank with you and tell you what the score is about all this, if you can't break that down almost at once toward Clear for that person's sex and if the person has been going on for years and years and years of processing without any gain or reality on Scientology, only then do you say, "This person has something in his past which is this lifetime and which if discovered would put him in prison." Or "This person has been doing something consistently and continually that he can't tell one person in particular -- a Scientologist." And that would be overt acts against Scientology in general.

This person has been in there kicking the show to pieces very often, while saying, "Well, we're supporting it all," and so forth. And it leads directly and immediately back to a criminal background or criminal activities. We have found this over a period of years.

But I have never yet, around the world, ever heard of a Scientologist calling for the police. Somebody robbed a cashbox once in an organization, and I -- we had him by the ear practically

and I had to plead with the whole staff! They were saying, "Oh, no, Ron, don't send him to jail," and so forth, "we can straighten him out. We can audit this person -- now we know this person's so unreasonable recently. Don't turn him over to the cops."

Scientologists are against law and order by superduress. They think law and order should come about by improved cases. And they're right! They're right. Putting people in prison doesn't stop criminality; it increases it. Nobody'd let me put that person in prison. I didn't want to very hard myself, so I just skipped the whole thing. Actually, they were picked up a week later for impersonating an officer. I don't know, their luck must have gone bad.

But you only find -- you only find that these nonmoving cases that just never move and nothing ever happens and that go on for years with hundreds or thousands of hours of auditing -- the only way that can happen is just if they ever did talk to a Scientologist they'd have had it. Because even a Scientologist, they feel, would do something to them for what they were doing. It's usually magnified in the person's mind but it's usually not very good.

We've found out, for instance, that every major push or area upset that we have ever had was occasioned by such a personality -- no gain in auditing over years and years and years until we've begun to recognize that fact. It's the first question we ask. Has the person ever gotten any benefits from auditing? How long has he been around? So forth.

Well nowadays we don't get violent on the subject but we are apt to reach out and grab that person and sit him down and have a little talk with him on an E-Meter, and bust that tone arm down anyway.

We are our own best forces of law and order. And all unlawful activities actually stem from aberration, not from differences of opinion. They stem from obsessive individuation from their fellow man. And somebody was very right when he said that the criminal is antisocial, because he's obsessively individuated. And a person who is totally individuated from an auditing session is not necessarily criminal, but he's got some overt acts that you've got to get off, otherwise he continues to be individuated. And he's so individuated, in other words, he's so "only one" -- of course an auditor has no part in the session at all. And he's really sitting there self-auditing the whole time. No matter what the auditor's saying, that person can't be put under control, for instance. And you say to the person, you know, "All right, take your right hand and touch the top of your head." No sir! He's liable to take his right hand and sit on it. He'll do something else!

You try to run something like old Start-Change-Stop on him, old SCS, something like that -- boy, they practically fly out the windows. They must be different! They must be different to such a degree that they cannot communicate with anybody. And you try to run a communication process on a person like that and they start going pretty wobbly. They put new communications on the line. They do strange and weird things with communication. Communication to them, in the first place, is not explicit or expressed. It doesn't mean anything to them. You might as well say, "Where could you abracadabra to a mother?" Communication isn't possible. Communication is something they put on a machine over here which talks. They never talk. That'd be fatal.

What society at large faces is the realization not so much that people are people -- society faces a necessity to realize that anybody who is, originally was trying to do what they thought was best.

It -- if you try to break down somebody that you've had a violent argument with, you'll find out the argument was preceded by considerable effort on their part to do what they thought was best. That idea might have been quite aberrated, but they thought it was doing the best. And if you ever want to know the person you've been the angriest with in your life, it's the person that you tried most to help and failed. And you're doing what you thought was best and they never accepted your help and they never got better, and boy, you wind up willing to kill them! And that's how a society falls apart.

Everybody thinks that everybody else's standard of conduct must be much different than their own. There must be great differences here somewhere or another. And they consider the other people so different than them that if they do one tiny little thing which seems to be against the social custom, they become to that degree unauditible. Because that's the basic upset in the bank in the first place. And if they've thought a bad thought about the auditor, you don't get them over the ARC break, they just go on ARC breaking. They keep on saying, "Oh, you're doing all wrong and I can't sit here and I can't listen to that woman any longer, and I'm not going to answer another single question. Go ahead and talk, I'm not going to answer you one."

It's a horrible fact that almost nobody suffers from anything ever done to them. The basic aberration is denial of self, invalidation of self -- the most fundamental aberration. It doesn't mean there aren't aberrations on other dynamics, but that's the most fundamental one.

Now, when this person has -- has done something to somebody else, he is his own worst critic. And he goes along that way for a long distance. And as long as he's relatively sane -- relatively sane -- why, he is rather critical of himself. Feels a little degraded, feels like he quite -- hadn't quite played the game. He did somebody in one way or the other. He was responsible for something that he shouldn't have been responsible for. And he better not let other people find it out because he's really not quite as good as they are and all of that sort of thing, you know? That sort of thing runs through his mind.

Until you get the immediate crimes out of the road, they don't audit. You're asking processing to dredge up these crimes and wash them out unexposed and undiscussed. Processing can wash them out unexposed and undiscussed. It is possible, but it takes an awful long time.

So much so -- well, it used to be said -- auditors in the US did a series of -- I was processing a bunch of people and they did a series whereby I was taking regular HGC pcs and running them for five hours, and the other HGC pcs were being run for twenty-five hours by their auditors, and we were getting the same results. And they thought, "Boy, this is something," you know. Well, it might have been better insight or faster skill or closer "prosepah." I don't care what that was, I do know my subject.

But -- but, it did work out this way -- I found out those people couldn't withhold information from me. They'd sit down in the auditing chair and they'd say, "Well, I'm going to withhold this from Ron," you know. Pow! And they'd just hand it to me, basically because they rather favored the idea that I would find out anyhow and they might as well cut their throats now as later.

So, I never had pcs that were otherwise than in-session. And these other auditors doing thoroughly as good a job, the pc wasn't in-session so they weren't making the same gains in the same amount of time. It took them five times as long to make a gain as it did me. Well, that was just mainly -- the main factor was, the pc that I had was in-session.

You say, "Well, confidence has something to do with this." No, it isn't confidence; it's lack of overts. And the pc sits down in the auditing chair and all of a sudden spills all of his overts.

Girl says, "Well... "

You say, "Well, what goals do you have -- what do you want to accomplish? What do you want to get done in the session?" so forth.

"Well... "

"What goals do you want in this session?" I say.

"Well... Well, I might as well tell you now. I've been married before and I've never been divorced, and I'm married again and if my husband found out he'd kill me!"

I say, "Fine, now you've got that out of the road, what are your goals for this session?"

And they say, "Yeah, what do you know. I did tell him. Lightning didn't strike. Ceiling's still there."

That was the way it was. And yet somebody else would have fished around with that for a long time without very much happening. Just the fact that they figured I would find out -- and as a matter of fact, I'm pretty good at finding out.

You finally -- if you've seen enough people, you can look at a person twenty feet away and you say, "That boy's got a charge on him and the charge is right now, and there's something wrong right here." And you'd say, "Well, that's it."

As a matter of fact you can touch a person in the arm and tell whether or not he's had -- got an overt against you. There's a lot of little tricks, once you learn. And people who are superindividuated from other people are particularly noticeable, and it's some sorrow to me to see some of the great leaders of the world so individuated from everybody else that I've got my ideas of what they've been up to.

Now, there are various ways of running sessions. You'll find out that a session that starts on an emergency basis is one of the most successful sessions. Then you really see Scientology working with great rapidity. There is no thought of withholding. Somebody has been hurt. Somebody is in trouble. Somebody is right on the edge of something. And boy, they give right now and they obey the auditing command because they're under duress, heavy duress. And you see Scientology pull them right out of the hole.

And one of the most spectacular things to do is to give somebody an assist immediately after they're injured. You have some trouble holding them in-session sometimes. Something on the order of -- oh, somebody's been banged by an automobile fender.

For some reason or other I never see many accidents. They tell me lots of accidents happen in the world and I just never seem to see them. I'm never around when they happen. I don't know why. I feel rather -- rather fortunate or something of this sort, when once in a blue moon I can go around the block the other way and find an accident and actually administer some processing and observe some actions and reactions and that sort of thing.

But I've had a person who has been hit by the fender of a car while on a crosswalk recover almost at once from practically what must have been a broken hip. You know, "Touch the hip, touch the fender of the car." Cop comes along and says, "Sir, we'll have to call for an ambulance."

"Sir, you had better get out of here. I'm a doctor taking care of this. Now, touch the hip, touch the fender, touch the hip, touch the fender, touch the pavement, touch the fender, touch the hip, touch the fender. Yes, that's right."

And the guy -- grog, grog, you know. Pick up their hand and make them do the -- touch the fender, touch the -- bang! you know. The somatic comes off in an awful hurry. Boom! All of a sudden they say, "Boy, that's pretty sore."

You say, "Yeah, touch the fender, touch the hip. All right, that's good. Now here's my card. Officer, you'd better send for an ambulance if you are going to."

In order to do things like that you have to control the whole environment. It isn't enough just to audit the pc. But you can do some very spectacular things at the moment of impact. You can patch up kids' aches and pains and so forth. There's nothing -- nothing better than simply making them go to the point where they were injured and touch it -- touch that exact location. Boy, the somatic flies off like mad!