

The Melbourne Congress Lectures
Melbourne, Australia

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 person 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 neeahh 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 everyplace. 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 fo

(incomplete)