WHY PEOPLE DON'T LIKE YOU

A lecture given on 2 January 1960

[Clearsound checked against the old reel. Omissions marked „>".]

Hiya.

Well, I'm actually - I'm actually very indebted to you for the applause and for staying here today. I was fairly sure we were going to have nothing but empty seats today. But I see you're making it. I see that those of you whose overts are not too great are still here.

That's what I'm going to talk to you about today. That's what I'm going to talk to you about. The title of this lecture is *„Why People Don't Like You."*

Now, you paranoids just polish up the fingernails because you're in now and the others are out.

Oh, I tell you, something very, very remarkable has just occurred in Scientology - something very, very remarkable. You know, I knew sooner or later I would hit some sort of a button along the line which would make somebody uncomfortable. You know? And I just had some small notion that before some people got Clear, they were going to appear to themselves to be in terrible condition.

I had an idea that some people were going to get up to the point of finding out they weren't Clear and that in the process of doing this they might feel a small strain. But I didn't have any idea whatsoever that it was going to be quite as bombastic as it has been. This is with violence.

When we put our finger on the exact button necessary to resolve the case, it was something on the order of pushing a guided missile trip, as far as some people were concerned. Where a person had been, a small vacuum now stood. And in some places in Scientology, unfortunately at this time, there are small partings in the air where people left through.

Now, you think I'm kidding. You think this is just exaggeration but it's not. It's not. Now, factually, you'll hear - you'll hear all sorts of things from here on out - I mean, rumorwise and fieldwise and so forth. You're just going to hear all kinds of things. That's for sure, because I've already heard it. I've heard some of the most interesting things you ever heard of.

Actually, as far as I know, in checking it off; only one person in the whole world has been sacked. And that was

- on a course that Dick and Jan were on and that was

because the person wouldn't give anybody any gen and because the person had the organization in peril because of his own actual crimes. And that person was pshew! sacked, and told, *„Now, write down all of your overts and come back.“* And he has and that's all straightened out. But beyond that, nothing has happened to anybody except they've blown on their overts. But they have told people they've been sacked.

Now, what's this, and why am I talking about this organizationally? I'm talking about this, ladies and gentlemen, because I want a third dynamic in Scientology. And I'm very, very happy that we have discovered this. And I couldn't care less about the randomity that may be caused by it. Because we've got to have a third dynamic in Scientology and that's it.

Unless we are a closely knit group, unless we're each other's friends in this, why, it'll just go on happening that I'll somehow or other have to front up and you'll have to defend, and we'll all have worries about it one way or the other and we won't really get the show on the road. It'll just sort of get on there just a little bit. And that's no good, is it?

All right, so let's have a third dynamic. Let's knit Scientologists together so they can look each other in the eye, and so that - the fact that a fellow is a Scientologist, why, you can immediately and instantly trust him.

Well now, with the materials we have at this time, we can't do any less than this. Because let me tell you - in the ancient West, they used to talk about a six-gun being a dangerous weapon in unknowing hands. But believe me, believe me, fellow Scientologists, this little instrument in the hands of somebody whose own ability to handle his own life or to use information is bad - is worse than any six-gun ever invented by Mr. Colt. Correct?

Audience: Right. Obvious.

So we have no choice now but to have a very, very clean organization.

[Please note: At this point there was a break in the original master recording. We now rejoin the class where the lecture resumes.]

Whether I have an opportunity to group process you or not, I've got to use any and all of the time I have at this congress to try to give you all I know about this particular facet of Scientology. Isn't that right? That's the least I could do.

This isn't something - this isn't something that you release in a slipshod fashion and leave people in the know, halfway. Now that's right, isn't it?

Audience: Right.

It can't be released poorly.

Audience: Right.

All right. If we're going to have anything connected whatsoever with a third dynamic, then it must be that the people in Scientology will have to have both the technology and the opportunity to be Clear, and should get there. But there's evidently now something new about clearing. There is a stage of clearing, of getting Clear, which is getting Clear on the third dynamic before they get Clear on the first.

Now, I've told you for a long time that auditing was a third dynamic situation. And sure enough, we have to clear somebody on the third dynamic before we clear him on the first. And all those case failures that we have had to this time have been because we've been trying to clear people on the first before we cleared them on the third. Do you see that?

An auditor-preclear situation is a third dynamic situation. That's a third dynamic situation. And clearing a person starts right there in that auditing session. Now, any HCA can tell you better than I can - I think the number of the Auditor's Code is 9, though, isn't it? Isn't that it? Whichever one it is. It's *„two-way comm must be established."* It's a breach of the Auditor's Code actually. We've had it with us for years. But what did this mean?

Well, this meant, essentially, that the preclear had to be willing to talk to the auditor. Well now, several things have to be guaranteed before this takes place. And one of the things that has to be guaranteed is that the preclear has some security in talking to the auditor that that information will not be falsely used. Isn't that right?

Audience: Yes.

So this leaves us with an organizational responsibility heavier and bigger than we have ever had in the past. We've now got to go all out and make sure that a certificate means, wherever it is to be found, that confidence can be reposed in the person as a confidant. Isn't that right?

Audience: Yes. Uh-huh.

That organizationally, the information passing over organizational channels and so forth is inviolate we have to be able to guarantee that, right?

Audience: Right.

Well, the technological fact which kicked all this off is that you did it. And that's a tough bullet to chew. Nobody on Earth, anywhere, ever had the power to aberrate you, except you. When you've managed to gulp that one down, your throat may feel raw but you will feel much better generally, because you'll stop going around looking for all of the bad things that are happening to you.

Now, we've all of us been *„motivator kids“;* we've all of us been motivator hungry *„Look at what's happened to me!“* See? Arrows, bullet holes. arsenic. And us poor victims, somehow or other, must struggle along to our doubtlessly degraded destiny of being victimized.

Oh, I'm - it's unfortunate that this is so popular. This is so popular that all I would have to do is write a book saying *„You are a victim,“* and go right back up to the top of the bestseller list of the Times. But the only truth in it would be this one fact: You are a victim of your own delusion that you can be a victim.

And that's not palatable. That's not very palatable because it says you are responsible. Now, I well remember when Advanced Procedures and Axioms was released - and we're at another point. Advanced Procedures and Axioms - well, actually, the book was written toward the end of 1951, was released, I think, in 52, and as soon as that essay in there about full responsibility hit many sets of hands, we lost Dianeticists just like pouring them down the chute. There they went.

That was just responsibility. We didn't even - we just told these people that to get anyplace they would have to take some responsibility! They'd have to admit their own responsibility! And all around the world these people went boom! *„Where is the nearest exit?“*

Well, how much worse is it now? We have discovered another one of those terribly unsavory factors but look, if people are going to get Clear, it is naturally across the spikes of unsavory factors. Because the unsavoriness of the factor was what restrained them from getting Clear. Isn't that right?

Well now, now we have a much worse one than full responsibility. I'll tell you about responsibility. Responsibility isn't very tough. It's too easy; it is. But we've got one now that's much worse than that.

We say, *„Your husband hates you? What did you do to him?“*

Look, I have a terrible problem. How am I going to keep all you people and still - and still tell you that you have to face up to this one? Honest, it - in workaday world to-day, with all of the overts which you've stacked up the track until now, you can be shot.

That doesn't make a bullet any less painful, you see, to say that you caused yourself to be shot. A fellow is run over, he's hurt - whatever the explanation of it is. There isn't any getting away from this fact. He has finally gotten his bank and his past and his various factors of beingness and aberration stacked up to a point where he can be jolly well killed. And it doesn't do any good to say to him, as he lies there bleeding, *„Your overts brought you up to a point of getting shot.“* I'd go so far as to say it would create an ARC break.

And yet, unfortunate]y, that's essentially what I am telling you right this minute. I'm saying there you sit with the engrams this way and that way and - and the machinery going that way, and the somatic in the skull, and I say to you this horribly unsavory

fact: I say, *„Well, you did it to yourself. Congratulations.“* And that doesn't make you feel any better.

But if that was all there was to it, I'm afraid we'd be finished right at this point. But that isn't all there is to it. There is another fact along with this: that you can demonstrate it so fast to a person that he'll get dizzy practically watching the engrams blow. We've discovered fast processing - very fast processing!

Now, all you've got to do: The fellow's got a great big engram. There he sits, you know? There he's been sitting for years. All you've got to say to him: *„All right. What have you done to the engram? What have you withheld from the engram?“* you know, and it'd go phoo!

I had a person tell me not very long ago, *„I had an intellectual understanding of this causation but nothing was blowing. All of my overts seemed to be over here on one track, totally disconnected with all of my motivators, which were over here on this track. And I was just paying attention to motivators over here on this track.“*

And I had run a redefinition of Responsibility Process on this person. The person up to that time had been running Responsibility as *„being in charge of.“* Nothing blew. And I got the process Responsibility redefined and run properly and all of a sudden this track over here connected with this track over here and this track over here started to go boom, thud, boom, gong, bing, zoom!

After about a half an hour of this, this person says, *„There's - there's some hope for my case. Yeah, I - I - I - I got it. We can straighten this out. All - all I've got to do is - is admit some causation on these motivators, and I've got it made.“* So we have a saving grace. We can actually bring about a reality on this fact with somebody rather rapidly.

Person's stuck in a session: ah, well, it's all right to say the auditor did this and the auditor did that. And some auditors aren't so good; most of them are pretty good. A lot of them are excellent. And sure, the auditor did something to the preclear, and the preclear doesn't feel too good about it. Now, it isn't that it's right for the auditor to do something to the preclear. That's - it's not that it's right for an auditor just to butcher a preclear. That's right, because what he'll do is key in the pc.

But to free the pc out of that session, it's only necessary to find out what he did to and withheld from the auditor. As far as auditing is concerned, it doesn't matter a bit what was done to the preclear. The more attention you pay to what was done to the preclear, the less auditing and the less clearing you get done!

Now, we've known this fact one way or the other. We've known something about this. I've had the definition of Operating Thetan for a long time. We've been trying to operate along this line. And what I've done is make the most fundamental applications of the Operating Thetan definition that could be made to direct auditing and found out that it was what blew engrams, track, bank, somatics and all the rest of it. These things blew up. Pc at cause. And you've all heard that, haven't you? Pc at cause. *„Well, yeah, just-naturally. That's it, naturally. That's what I was saying.“*

But you were saying at the same time, *„Well, PC at effect, of course, too.“* Oh, no! Get off of that. Get away from that horse's head because that goes nowhere!

The only effects you can experience are those which you yourself dream up to experience. That's fantastic! It gives us a brand-new look at cause, distance, effect. The truth of the matter is more like cause, distance, cause. All is cause, The Buddhist, you know, never got this one wrapped up. And his answer to it was have nothing to do with cause and have nothing to do with effect-leave them both entirely alone-making himself, therefore, totally guilty of the sins of omission of never assuming cause, which was the surest way in the world to spin anybody in.

But he knew something was wrong with this cause, distance, effect, and that's all I wish to call attention to here. He did know something was wrong with this cause, distance, effect.

But what's wrong with it is effect! Tsk. You're flattering yourself if you think you can cause an effect without the cooperation of the other fellow. All of your ability and slyness must be devoted to getting that cooperation.

Now, where you have - where you have an individual who is obviously the effect of somebody, and you audit him as having been the effect of somebody, nothing happens. Now, that alone has caused us to mark a lot of time in these last ten years. We've gotten an awful lot done, an astonishing amount of things done in the absence of this particular datum. But now, boy, all of the time that was wasted on that, totally devoted onto this other thing - wow! Wow! Man, you ought to see cases go to pieces under this one. Zip-bang-thud! Because you're not paying attention to untruths; there are no lies in auditing.

In other words, you're not auditing in the direction of a lie that the preclear's condition is the result of an other-determinism than himself. You see, I could have figured this out ten years ago if I'd been that much smarter. I have to apologize once in a while for having been stupid about all this.

But we could have figured it out this way: If auditing pc A in 1959 can clear up a circumstance which occurred in 1699, and the circumstance clears up without any of the personnel in 1699 being present, then obviously the person we're auditing in 1959 did it all. If it clears up, he must have done all of it. It's worth looking at, isn't it?

But trying to draw a plot of the universe on this basis becomes a near... I feel for people like the Jesuits and so forth when they eventually have to tangle with this one. They're great figure-figure people, you know? They're great philosophers. Actually, they're pretty smart people. They turned out - practically the only educated men in the last couple of thousand years were turned out in Jesuit schools.

But they're very good at figuring things out and making graphs of it all and figuring it out and postulating it and straightening it out. And when they try to make a graph of everybody in the universe being cause... Actually, it's dead easy. All you have to say is, *„Every man in the universe is cause of his own participation,“* and that's it.

And where he has participated unworthily, all you have to do is knock it out by knocking out the cause of his own participation, and you'll free that zone of evil or mishmash or discreditable creation or whatever it is in the universe.

But as long as he holds that in place, it will continue to be an evil. And as long as men hold these things in place - these discreditable participations - as long as they hold wrongdoing in place, as long as all this remains buried and knocked in the head it's going to continue to be an evil nation, an evil world, an evil universe. You want to free it up, why - *„hear ye, hear ye, the kingdom of heaven is at hand,"* But don't *„repent ye, repent ye"* or you will put it a long way in reverse.

Now, man, by holding discreditable participations, by holding his own overt acts in place and covering them up and leaving them there, can actually cause a stimulus-response mechanism of one kind or another throughout the various dynamics, which gives life the appearance of evil. And that's all the evil there is. Which, alarming truth, will do a lot of monks out of a job because there's no joss to burn anyplace that will free a man's evil. You can't burn joss and let some deity someplace take it all on his back, because you've just assigned some more responsibility elsewhere, and made it just that much more difficult to blow anything! Does that appear to be reasonable?

Well, all right. Why don't people like you? That's what all this leads up to. They don't like you because they've done things to you, and there's no other reason. You see?

- [sound of glass being knocked over.]

More than one way to prove a point.

Now, you actually perform, to some degree, an overt against a person - looking at this in a very loose, sloppy fashion - by letting a person do an overt to you. And that's about as close as you can get to performing an overt is to let somebody perform an overt against you without doing something about it. Because he'll wind up with a mechanism which we will call lessening the overt - the mechanism of lessening the overt.

The individual who performs an overt act against someone or thing, person or being has one basic mechanism for making it less harmful to himself. Remember, it's his own overt acts that are going to harm him, so he has a mechanism by keeping this from happening and that is he lessens the object, or reduces or makes less important the object he has done the overt to. And if you want to spot an overt act, just find the critic. The critic is always the little tag end that sticks out on an overt act having been done. The person tries to lessen the overt by criticizing or reducing the thing he has done the overt to. Got the idea?

% [There is a gap here on our old reel which is missing half % of the above paragraph plus all of the following paragraph % and the beginning of the paragraph after that.]

Well, I'll give you a mechanism. I come over here and I put a scratch on this podium. Now, this is a very crude example here. I put a little scratch on this podium. Actually, all I've done is stain it with some tears from year to year. But I put a little scratch on it, and then to make that less of an overt act to the podium or the management or

something of that sort, what I do is say it's just an old podium and isn't much good anyway. So that doesn't make my overt act so great, you see?

Now, I can live with that overt act as long as I believe that this podium is old and not much good. But if I find out then, that the management just bought this podium brand-new - imported it from Malaysia, Honduras or something especially for this congress, and actually that it has a piece of the true cross and the bones of Saint Peter in the thing, then I have to say, *„Oh, I'm guilty of an overt act,"* and decline accordingly, or recognize that I have performed an overt act and as-is it. Only that never occurred to anybody before Dianetics or Scientology.

The reverse was true. The person said, *„An old podium, no good."*

The person says, *„True cross, bones of Saint Peter,"* and *„Oh, my God, I've done it,"* you know? That's the way it's gone. You get the idea?

So here's a perfectly - here's a perfectly self-respecting horse. And you go out and you ride this horse and then - unfortunately you haven't been careful in saddling the horse, and you've got a burr under the saddle or something of the sort and this irritates the horse, and your spurs are very, very sharp and you rowel up the horse, and then you keep sawing at the bit, and get the horse all upset and so forth, and he acts mean at this point, you see? He conceives that he had better participate with an overt himself and he flips you into the nearest ditch. You go around and tell everybody it was a mean horse. It squares it all up, see? Nothing aches. Feel all right about it. You recovered okay.

Be careful not to discover that this horse is noted as the gentlest, most considerate horse in the whole stable, who is usually reserved for children and is the property of the owner's eldest daughter who is a paralytic. If you discover that, the only answer you have, of course, is to say, *„I'm guilty of an overt."* See, *„I've done something wrong."*

Well, all right. No criticism always tells you where the overt is.

Now, let's look at it in reverse. Young playwright puts a play on Broadway. Most of the critics are comme ci comme ca, you know, usual lukewarm - until they find out what the public thinks, you know, and then they can cheer or boo and they might have an opinion of their own and be cause, don't you see? - except one critic.

And he says, *„The play Johnny Come Lately shouldn't have come at all. A dog could write better dialogue."* And this goes on by the column, you see, and he just destroys the reputation of this young playwright, you see? Then is the time to suspect that he knew something earlier in this relationship, that it didn't start with the play. He's already done something to this playwright or a playwright like him. And as a Scientologist you go back on the backtrack, you find out that he killed a blond playwright back in 1608 or something, you see? It all comes out of an overt. There is practically no such thing as honest criticism.

Every once in a while, I strike a comm lag because I'm on the verge of making some comment on some former life or something like that. I'll just have to get over withholding all this in spite of what the psychiatrists say, you know? But I have read some

of the criticisms, pro and con, along the line about a certain person I was once and still am.

And all of the savage ones apparently were the people on the opposite side still going along the track, because you never quite saw so many divergent opinions about one set of speeches. How could there be this many opinions about that set of speeches, you know? Having to study them each time I go to school doesn't help any.

But these things - these things, you eventually say, *„There must be a lacking validity in all this criticism.“* Now, you can say that it is this way or it is that way, but to go from saying, *„It isn't too bad, except that...“* and then go into a scathing, personal criticism of the person who was doing the speaking or something like that, tells us something entirely different is at work than a speech criticism. You got the idea?

Well, I can go into this a lot more deeply and show you a lot of cases on it. It isn't that we don't have any liability. It isn't that we don't very often merit getting our silly heads kicked off for some of the things we do, but do you know we almost never get shot for our crimes? You'd be amazed what are picked out as crimes.

You know, a fellow's done this and he's done that and he knows it, but all of a sudden somebody is shotgunning him from some other quarter about having done something else entirely different. He gets the idea after a while it isn't the crimes; there's something else going on.

Now, there is such a thing as decent conduct and carrying our weight and all that sort of thing, but there is also such a thing as living in the vicinity of a great many people who have committed overt acts against us. And that's rough! That's rough. And our overt is letting them do it.

Now, the easy manager - the easy manager who permits himself to he robbed at every hand is a villain, because he's going to wind up a lot of people in the soup. He makes it too easy to have overt acts committed against himself; and eventually degrades their opinion of themselves and himself. You got the idea?

They used to say *„I do not like you, Dr Fell. The reason why, I cannot tell. I do not like you, Dr. Fell.“* This was in keeping with other thinking in 1879, if you want to call it that.

They - but it had truth in it: *„The reason why, I cannot tell.“* That was sticking out like a sore, bandaged, mercurochromed thumb. *„The reason why, I cannot tell. I do not like you, Dr. Fell.“*

Well, what'd he do to Dr Fell that he couldn't tell anybody about? And that's why he didn't like Dr Fell.

Well, you say, well, what's Dr Fell? Is he a - just a totally negative figure in all this? Oh, yes, unfortunately. Because if people hadn't done things to him, even though he kept running into class with pink pantaloons on, or none, even though he made smart cracks at everybody, if nobody had done anything to him, they'd think Dr Fell was all right.

They must have done something to Dr Fell in order not to like Dr Fell. You get the idea? A person breaks down his own affinity with the universe.

Now, let's look at this lessening the overt. When I kick the podium and say the podium is no good that lessens the overt but it also lessens my visibility of the podium. And what we have connected and collided with here, head-on, is the whole mechanism of not-isness. And that's a discovery worth announcing.

That is not-isness. Those things we have done things to, we must then not-is. And that's all there is to it. And there goes reality and there goes engram banks and there goes visio and there goes sonic and there goes confusion of identities - one can no longer see an identity clearly and confuses it with other identities because he's what? Got it not-ised. It means he must have done something to it, and then his second mechanism is to lessen the overt.

Now, people who criticize you are trying to lessen the overt. That's right. People who criticize you are trying to lessen the overt. People who don't like you are trying to lessen the overt. People who are stopping you from progressing along some perfectly decent path are lessening the overt. They're saying you don't exist.

And if they suddenly found out that you did exist, they would be suddenly and tremendously guilty of a tremendous number of overt acts. I've seen this happen. Pathetically, I've seen it happen in Dianetics and Scientology; I've seen it right in front of my eyes. I've seen a fellow go from a proud, cocky, if somewhat contemptuous individual right down to a total creep, just poom, on the sudden recognition of what he was doing something to.

I remember a newspaper reporter, and there was a little girl in the office and she'd just been straightened out and she could walk now. And the newspaper reporter was saying chya! chya! chya! - you know, standard journalism. And the little girl came out with her mother and she was saying, *„Gee, it really feels good to walk, you know? Gosh! It really feels good to walk. That's all right.“* And she was being very cautious about it and so forth. Newspaper reporter stood right there and spun in. He went right down for the count.

Just a couple of years ago, if it was then, one of the most profound critics of Dianetics and one of the fellows who had - did the most to Dianetics to slow it down and who got paid the highest went up to the Mayo Clinic and kicked the bucket.

Somebody who may or may not be at this congress had been around and talked to him. But this fellow had been suffering for years. It didn't take this congress person to talk to him. He knew. What he'd done is, every time he'd done something to Dianetics or to one of you or myself or something like this or slowed us down, he'd have to say, *„Well, it's just a gyp and a cheat and a fraud,“* you see? Then he'd do something else and he'd say, *„Well, it's just a gyp and a cheat and a fraud,“* Get the idea? And one day he couldn't say that anymore and that was the end of him. Do you get the idea? He had to recognize that he was guilty of overts,

Now, that's the hard way to go out! I'm not holding him up as a horrible example. I'm trying to show you this mechanism of lessening the overt. Because it lessens, it less-

ens, it lessens, it lessens and then can't hold it, can't hold it, boom! And it just goes in reverse.

And the terminal it's done to goes up, and the person goes down. And we get the exact mechanism of propitiation: Not-isness reversed. See that? It just goes bang! It's a horrible thing to watch. Now, somebody's been expecting this to happen someday in Scientology and Dianetics.

The Einstein theory I've occasionally mentioned - it's been mentioned to me was considered the greatest mathematical hoax of the late twenties. It was announced from the Berlin Mathematicians Conference stage as being the most terrible, the most fiendish, the most awful, the most villainous, the most fraudulent thing that had ever been perpetrated upon mathematicians of the world.

Three years this theory was slugged. The very person who announced it became its greatest authority within six months, suddenly. Now, people have expected this sort of thing to happen sooner or later in Dianetics and Scientology in the United States.

There is some magazine called Comm Lag magazine and someday you'll see its editorial director walk into the HGC and say, *„Kill me,"* you know?

But who cares about such a mechanism? Who wants such a mechanism? Who wants everybody in propitiation? Not I and not you. You get a pc who is in propitiation, you run - you say, *„Say A."*

And he says, *„Say A."*

You say, *„Thank you."* You say, *„Say B."*

He says, *„Says B."*

And you say, *„Thank you."*

And you do this for an hour or two, and he says, *„I just feel wonderful now, you know?"* He doesn't feel any different. He's just got to propitiate you because he'll be 'et if he doesn't. That's a person who is no longer capable of lessening the overt. The only mechanism the person has is to lessen the overt. You'll find this person has been chopping up practitioners and auditor-like people for millennia and billennia. All of a sudden one day, they see you, and they say thoo, you know? *„Yes."* Hey, you got an automaton on your hands; you haven't got a human being.

So who wants this mechanism to take place?

No, let's fool everybody and take it the other way. Let's just get them all by the scruff of their necks and run out their overts in life and straighten them up and make them walk proud.

Boy, that'd be - that'd be something new, wouldn't it? That'd really be something new. Actually, you have it in your power to do so.

And you watch, now. That's what's going to happen, that's what's going to happen. Therefore, one of the first things we ought to do is to make sure we are a third dynamic which is sufficiently trustworthy, sufficiently straightened up and dedicated and

representing what we say and do in ourselves to a degree that it will inspire confidence.

That's all you have to do from there on out. You talk about dissemination programs, that's the key dissemination program of all time. Isn't it?

Now, it's very easy to pull that one off And we're already off to a quite a start here. I released this information from Australia and I - there are about twenty-two on staff at HCO WW -

- Susie's holding down HCO WW -

and four people blow, just like that. Interesting?

Then they tell everybody they've been fired. They go around and they say, *„Been fired. I mean, Ron's flipped. He's gone out of his mind. He fired us.“*

Fired them? As Bonnie said a little while ago, *„I've never known you to be so indirect as firing somebody from 12,500 miles. You usually do it in person.“* He's right, see? It's a pleasure.

Somebody that's been chopping us up one way or the other, been slowing us down, I usually like to take it up with them. Make sure they know.

Well, I was down in Australia, and all of a sudden, why, four people blow up in Suzie's face. They just scatter like quail. They leave her manning the ramparts all by herself. She's doing accounts over here with this hand and writing franchise holders with this hand, you know? I don't know what she was doing with her feet, but it was probably pumping up the ice machine or something.

I get home, the poor girl is worked half to death, you know? And I hear from all around, *„Ron fired us!“* I fired them? No, I didn't fire them. I didn't even hear about it. I didn't even know anything about it.

- Dick and Jan could tell you that.

I thought everything was going along fine, and Suzie just didn't want to upset me that far away; and she didn't think I'd wander around and notice, so that was it.

But what was all this? Four people go pshew out of twenty-two. Oh, but we cover up on the backtrack. We look up these people quickly, after I got back, and we find out this and this and this and-they had overts. Their nickname should have been Mr. Plenty Overts. They weren't bad people; they just had overts, and they were very much afraid these would be discovered, and they knew very well from the bulletins I was putting out from Australia that *„Do not send to find for whom the bell tolls; that fire alarm gong is going for thee.“* That's what they had it figured, see?

What would have happened in effect? I would have come back, and they would have come in, and one of them - another of them, they would have come in and said, *„Ron, we've been very bad children. We've been very bad people. And we have done this and this and this.“*

And I would have been very mean about the whole thing! I would have said, *„Ha! Staff auditor, front and center The auditing room is the first door on the right. Now, let's square this*

thing up and straighten it up." That's what would have happened. But nobody waited for that to happen. They went pshew!

Now, the mechanism is that man is basically good, and when he suddenly discovers that he is guilty of evil, he takes himself off so he can do no more harm. And that's the mechanism of blowing. That's the mechanism of sudden departure. That's the sudden departure from an auditing session. That's the sudden departure from an auditing question.

Pc's sitting there talking about ARC break, ARC break, ARC break. No, uh-uh. No, what's happening is pc's doing something to the auditor. Pc's doing something to the auditor. Main thing the pc is doing to the auditor is probably withholding vital information about himself and his case and isn't establishing two-way communication with the auditor, and this withhold can get so violent and so tough that it practically blows the pc out back through the wall! The pc couldn't stay in session if he had both hands on big steel handles and was handcuffed to them. He'd blow! Do you see that?

Student comes in - student comes in. Student says, *„Oh, the Instructor is bad, and I'm leaving, and no more.*"

Oh, yes, there - there was something going on that wasn't quite optimum, but. it wasn't that bad. We check up the student and we find out: student, day before yesterday stole an E-Meter from the class. Yeah. Something goofy like this.

They decide they are harmful to the organization, harmful to you, harmful to us and take themselves off so they can't be harmful anymore. And that is what is known as a blow-off. And it's occasioned totally and completely by overts and nothing else. Now, the proof of it is as soon as they get their overts stripped, they come right back in.

This fellow blows session, get him by the nape of the neck, *„What have you done, Son?*" Get those overts stripped down and those withholds stripped down, really break this thing down, run some Responsibility on the thing, and he comes right back into session, crash! no matter how many corny mistakes you're making with auditing. You get the idea? They weren't what took him off.

Therefore, we've been fooled continually. Well, it's operated in a very good wise. It has made us concentrate on smoothness of auditing, and we have that. It's made us concentrate on techniques, techniques, techniques. It's made us develop this, that and the other thing. We've got all the stuff now. Now it's almost as if planned. Now we can face the fact that it's somebody's overts. But this was the inevitable datum.

Now, I'm telling you now, not about a datum that was dreamed up an hour and a half before the congress started; I've been living with this one now for several months. And this one has been stripped down one side and the other because it is so alarming and so full of potential, it means so much to us as a group that it had to be examined from every quarter and every possible flub taken out of the thing before we got general release on the situation. But even the interorganizational releases have already begun to produce blows. People are disappearing before we can get our hands on them.

So you're going to see some things that appear to you to be punitive. For heaven's sakes, don't interpret them as punitive! All we're trying to do is get anybody who holds a certificate anyplace to hold it with clean hands. That's all we want.

Any case who comes to us for processing must be processed by an auditor who has clean hands or that auditor, by the way, will not locate their overts! It's the darnedest thing you ever saw. That is tacit consent!

Auditor will sit there, can't confront his own overts, so boy, does he carefully miss the pc's. And you get nothing done. So technically it becomes a must. Now therefore - therefore, we have to straighten this up at an auditor level - we certainly have got to straighten this up at a field level, but there isn't very much to straighten up. It just runs like this: If a fellow has done overts against Dianetics, pcs, Scientology, associated personnel, organizations, anything like this - we've set up a channel and a groove right this minute - all he's got to do is sit down and write them all down and send them to HCO WW if he just can't stand it. Get the idea? All he's got to do is write them all down.

Now, how will it be handled? Actually, the individual will either be told to write down what parts of these he can be responsible for and send that in, too, or he'll be shoved in the direction of some Scientologist who will be all too happy to help him out. You got the idea?

And as we know, then, we've got this one and that one and the next one all straightened up, we can simply mark them *„Clean hands," „Clean hands," „Recommended without reservation."* And that way Scientologically, as auditors, we can straighten it up, but also fieldwise. It isn't that we've got to be a clean group; it's that technically we now recognize that the only way were all ever going to get Clear is to be a clean group. Do you get the difference?

Well, it's a brand-new look. It's got some jolts in it. But there isn't anybody under the sun going to be punitive about it. Nobody's ever a punitive when they can be effective.

Thank you. Thank you.

[End of tape.]