

## THE ANTISOCIAL PERSONALITY

A lecture given on  
25 August 1966

How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

And this is the what?

Audience: 25th of August A.D. 16.

By George, you're right. Twenty-fifth of August A.D. 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This article and lecture—you will see something of an article on this later—is not necessarily dedicated to a government, any particular government. And it is not really dedicated to the East Grinstead Urban District Council. And I would not say that it was, you see. And any similarity—you know, they put this on the beginning of books, you see—any similarity between actual individuals and this lecture are totally accidental. And the name of the lecture is: The Antisocial Personality.

Now, I told you I would keep you advised on such ethics matters as might concern an auditor. And this is one of those lectures. I sat down and I've very, very carefully made up what must be a complete list of all of the characteristics of a suppressive person, and put this together on the basis of the interrelationship between that individual and the society around him, that individual and the auditor and that individual and himself. And I hope you can see some benefit from this. Now, ethics, as you know, has as its basic purpose getting in technology. That is its primary purpose, and it doesn't have any object of social betterment.

And it goes this far in getting in technology: that if people are going to advance casewise, they must do so in a relatively unsuppressive environment. And you can't have people advancing casewise when they are in a suppressive environment, and suppressives don't advance casewise.

So you might say ethics and the idea of suppressive persons and the idea of potential trouble sources, the idea of a roller coaster—what makes a person get better and then get worse and get better and get worse—these things are, all of them, part and parcel to an auditor's bag of tricks. If an auditor doesn't know about this and doesn't pay any attention to this, then he very soon breaks his heart.

I just had a long letter from an intern here giving me a bunch of data on what auditing a suppressive-type person had done to him personally. That was interesting, you see—not what it had done to the suppressive, but what it had done to him. Well, he very soon had begun to believe, you see, well, Scientology didn't really work and he wasn't getting anyplace and his ideas were wrong and that he really couldn't audit. And all of these things began to creep up on him, you see. He was auditing somebody who was yak-yak-yak-yak-yak-yak, invalidate, invalidate, and, you know, had eighty thousand hours of auditing and he'd never gotten any gain, and so forth. And he knew that his father was suppressive but had murdered his father last year with hot flatirons, but that hadn't done him any good either, so ethics didn't work.

And this auditor felt like a goony bird. He was flopping around with no goals left, you see. He'd come up against this brick wall. Well, if he'd really known his ethics and really known what his characteristics were of suppressive persons, he would have taken one look at his case assessment form as he began the pc—or he would've done one—and the person had been eight thousand hours in auditing and had been audited in Milwaukee, Mexico, North Pole and hadn't ever gotten over his sciatica; and had been audited in Los Angeles and New York, but

somehow or another he kept at it even though it had cost him a great deal of money. And he'd never had any improvement, particularly in his sciatica and so on, but he'd kept at it because, well, he just kind of wanted to show people it didn't work, you know.

And the auditor at that moment would have exercised any HGC auditor's prerogative which is simply not to audit the pc. That's the least he would have done. See, any HGC auditor can say, "I don't care to audit this pc, period." And that's it. And it's been that way for many, many years. Every once in a while Ds of P get enthusiastic and say, "Well, that may be the custom, but here we don't really exercise that," you see, and kid the auditor in and get him in there pitching again. Actually, it's a bad thing if he does so, because it's enforced help, you see, and so on. And they won't get a very good result on the pc.

Do you know that you'll get a better result on a pc if you simply take the auditor and run O/W on him—regardless of his grade of release—just run a little O/W with him on that pc. You ought to make it as a little experiment some day. If you're in an executive auditing position—you know, your lower-grade-type auditors—and just run a little bit of O/W on the pc before they audit them. The pc will make marvelous gains. It's fantastic.

So the auditor in this particular case, had he been able to have called off what are the characteristics of a suppressive—bing-bing-bing-bing-bing!—why, he wouldn't have sat there getting his anchor points punched in. Now, it's one thing to have a critical pc and another thing to be trying to audit a suppressive pc or a pc who is a potential trouble source. These are quite different things.

The critical pc—of course, a pc can become critical simply by having a withhold or an overt on the auditor. That's the first thing you check. You don't sit there and take it on the chin. Pc was all right yesterday. Today he says, "Well, are you sure you've gotten your—ever gotten a classification for. . ." and so forth. I never would say anything—it would astonish me if I saw an auditor do otherwise than say, "All right, is there anything being withheld. Have you committed. . . ? That's it. That's it. That's it. That's it. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. What?" That would just be that, see. Well, fellow would give it to you and say, "Hmp-hmp." And if the fellow just went on nattering and complaining about having been audited thousands of hours and not having gotten any case gain and having been shoved into it because of his wife and proving to her that Scientology didn't work and that sort of thing. . . I wouldn't sit there and take that—not as an auditor.

You see, I personally—I've never done anything in the universe that I owe anybody Scientology. See, I don't owe anybody Scientology. That's why we've made that much progress, which is a remarkable fact that when you are too propitiative (far, far too propitiative; you know, you feel that you've been mean to people and you're trying to make it up and all of that sort of thing), why, you get into all kinds of reactive complications—all kinds of them. And you get so that you really can't help people. But the main thing that you get into is the fact that you then do anything—you don't do proper actions; you do anything to help them—and you let them get away with anything and you exert no control of any kind whatsoever. So you really don't have a very good run in it.

But I never owed anybody Scientology. And I trust you didn't either. So there isn't any reason to take a knocking around. One of the first pc-control techniques there was... This sounds very rough. We didn't know at that time, you see, that it was a withhold that made the person critical. And the person would get choppy and refuse to do what you said and refuse to go back through it again—old Dianetic-type auditing. And the control technique was simply to get up and say, "Well, when you decide you're going to, why, I will come back and audit you," and walk out of the room. I vividly remember it. That was actually in force before the official publication date of the first book. So that goes way back into pc control.

Now, in view of the fact at that time I was getting my first psychoanalytic-type pcs—you know, pcs who had been into psychoanalysis and were now swinging in toward Dianetics—and got a tremendous number of failed cases, tremendous number of roughed-up people . . . It

was interesting, you see that I, in scouting around in an average level of the society, was not in actual fact running into the failed psychoanalytic patient or some of the very, very, very rough cases that the society had. I was running into and had acquaintance with some criminals and some insane and so on, but not the people who had been—let me be more explicit—had been roughed up by psychotherapy, whose actions and behavior had been more or less confirmed or perverted by psychotherapy, you see. They're a special—very special type of case. And it was this type of case on which an auditor could easily fail that we got a tremendous number of in the first Foundation. And they were very, very hard to handle, and today I would recognize pretty well what the bulk of them were.

They were either SPs or PTS. But one of the things that they were PTS on was, of course, the psychoanalyst and the psychiatrist. Now, let's be more explicit here so that nobody gets adrift on this. You all know this but I'll give you the data.

What we call a suppressive person is a person with certain behavior characteristics which we will cover here and who suppresses other people in his vicinity. And those other people, when he suppresses them, become PTS or potential trouble sources. And they are called potential trouble sources because they really do make trouble. They roller-coaster, they natter, they go up in smoke.

Now, because a person is raising the devil does not make him a suppressive person. The suppressive may be sitting back there with a covert Mona Lisa smile. And the PTS is busy going up in smoke or running around and doing weird things. PTS is active. PTS might be going insane or being put in the local asylum or something like that. You haven't got the source of the social difficulty. You've just got the PTS. And this person is PTS, a potential trouble source, simply because they are intimately associated with a suppressive.

Now, if you recognize that, all by itself, a tremendous burden would come off of your auditing. You would know what you were looking at. Joe is okay today; he's gone bad tomorrow. I remember a notable case of this. One psychoanalyst, a very prominent psychoanalyst in New York City, very well known—I took this psychoanalyst, just in a demonstration, and sent this psychoanalyst right straight up into seventh heaven. See, the psychoanalyst was in beautiful condition. Got rid of her "schiosis" or whatever else she had. She felt terrific. You know, I just erased the secondary, actually, necessary to resolve her case. Felt fabulous. She'd been trying to get at this for years in psychoanalysis and couldn't . . . She was in Jungian analysis, by the way, and couldn't find it in having been a druid.

Anybody says to you, "Well, Scientology is weird because it believes in past lives," why, I look at them rather oddly and say, "Aren't you familiar with the subject of psychotherapy?" Be mean, you know.

And they say, "Well, yes. Oh, yes. I'm a professor of Uptygup, you know."

And say, "Well, why is it that you didn't know that one of the primary branches of psychoanalysis and so forth—that of Professor Jung—believed implicitly in returns to druidism. See, we're not being new at all."

I don't know whether it's in his immediate textbooks or not, but I remember this case vividly, and that was what she had been jumping around in. She had been jumping around trying to pretend she was painted blue, living in trees in her past lives. This is Jung. Jung and Adler were the principal squirrels in psychoanalysis. And she just went right up to the top of the Tone Scale, man. She was in beautiful shape. She stayed that way for three days, and she crashed harder than anybody I've ever seen crash. Terrible shape—sick, miserable, moaning around. And in those days I took the psychoanalytic explanation. It wasn't that we were doing psychoanalysis. It was just—if you understand what I'm talking to you about on this—was because we accidentally were getting into psychoanalytic patients and practitioners. They were moving in our direction.

And we used to attribute it to the fact that she'd not been benefited but had just hit a manic—get that phrase; “hit a manic”—had become manic for three days. Therefore one could say it was very dangerous that she was processed and all this. I know today exactly what happened to her, all these ages afterwards. She hit an SP, man, and he plowed her through the wall. I even know the guy's name. She maybe hit more than one. But boy she sure went through the wall. And that was simply a roller coaster—better-worse.

There is no such thing as a manic—a person gets on an enthusiastic euphoria that life is great. It's just that psychiatrists hate people in that condition, and so they promptly caved them in. They go bow! The guy says, “Wow, at last I realize I can be sane, and isn't the world wonderful!”

“Oh, my God! You're in a manic. We have to give you eighteen extra shocks and transorbital leucotomies and trowokkkh!”

So there has arisen this thing known as a “manic condition” which is very harmful. And there's a thing called “euphoria” which is very bad. That's so if anybody says he got any benefit or did anything good, why, they can plow him in quick. There are no such conditions. See? The guy got better. They couldn't stand it and they caved him in. Bang! Whoever was in his vicinity that was suppressive caved him in quick.

Now, when you as an auditor see that sort of thing, know what you're dealing with! Don't be a reasonable idiot! You're in this field, no other field at all. You're in the area that I'm talking about in this lecture. You are not in some new factor which has just arisen. I want to be very positive about it because if they developed such a thing as a “manic personality” to explain away somebody feeling good or getting better, then they will develop this theory again. And when I say “they,” I mean suppressive-type psychotherapists. They will develop it again. And they will develop it individually for you, and give you lots of reasons why it really didn't work and why the guy caved in, and how it's very dangerous to process somebody because this happens. And this is the only mechanic of it happening.

Now, I have trouble impressing even executives in this organization. Every once in a while they'll think, “Well, there's some other reason why a person has a worsened condition.” And the weeks go by and the weeks go by and I will repeat it several times and all of a sudden they throw away the rest of them, and they to their own satisfaction have isolated the fact that it is contact with a suppressive which has worsened the pc's case. It was not the auditor, it was not the Case Supervisor, it was not this and not that and all the other thousand things that can be blamed!

Now, you hear of somebody going along all right and then getting worse in, let us say, the Poughkeepsie Foundation, see. And you have a tendency to say, “Well, they don't know much about auditing in the Poughkeepsie Foundation and so made the person worse.” No! No! No! No! No! Give your fellow Scientologist a break. He was trying, too—always!

Don't blame the auditor. Don't blame the past auditor! Don't blame the past HGC! Get off of it! There is only one reason it happens. And maybe in this HGC there was an SP. That's very doubtful, but maybe there was. But that isn't that HGC. Do you follow? That was an SP, a suppressive person. And honest, please, it's the only reason. There aren't no others.

You will hear this and hear this from pcs that come in saying, “Well, I was out in Portland and they ruined me out there. They audited me on processes they shouldn't have audited me on.” And he's learned some patter you know, like “They overran it, you know. And they did this and they did that.” And he's learned this various-patter line, and he'll give you these explanations and so forth. Well, I know he's right there and I know he's very persuasive. But please, for my sake, don't buy it, because there isn't a word of truth in it.

What is true is that after his case improved he encountered a suppressive, roller-coastered, and is now actually an ethics-type pc. And you've got no business doing anything with him at all!

He belongs to the EO (Ethics Officer)—owned property—and belongs to nobody else. And you say, “Well, our Ethics Officer’s no good, and so forth. Because, after all, he’s been to see the Ethics Officer and his case didn’t immediately improve.” Well, I don’t care whether his case improved or not. If he’s an ethics-type person, he’s at least off the technical lines.

If ethics did no more than that we would all make it. Even those people would eventually make it, do you see? But as long as they stay on the lines, knocking around, you have, in actual sober fact, a situation where people are, in many respects, caving in simply because we have let ethics-type personnel along in our lineup—we put them in the technical lineup not the ethics lineup. Do you see?

And if Ethics was just a place to put them, at least the rest of us would make it. And if there was no place to put them at all, I assure you that we would not make it at all!—that serious.

Now, I speak from the vast gold mine of experience of the First Foundation. Never talked to you too much about the First Foundation. I didn’t have control of this organization—just by dint of personality and shouting. And it wasn’t in operation twenty-four hours before it started to squirrel, right in its own internal actions. People were being told that auditing was not a scientific-type activity—auditing was not a scientific-type activity. Being told it was an art, that it could not be learned, that it was a sort of a knack you had.

And they were being told this by Mr. Joe Winter—Doctor; the late. And his overt was that he and the publisher had arranged it—because I was “too hard to do business with”—they had arranged it to do a more agreeable book by Joe Winter on the subject of Dianetics which would get the medical doctors interested in the subject. That was his overt. He did—he wrote such a book. It was, I think, *A Doctor Looks at Dianetics*.

And there were people around there galore, and they were just tearing Standard Procedure to pieces. People that I had trained just prior to that activity were actually still able to get results. And people around there couldn’t get results. And I couldn’t hold in technology. Because I (1) didn’t have control of it, and (2) didn’t have ethics. And we could never hold in technology until we finally got ethics.

So curse ethics if you want to, think it’s terrible that here we are, who owe the rest of the world our services, being mean, too. And deplore it all you want to, but realize that it has great value. And if you as an auditor are in great disagreement with ethics and so forth, then you must also be in disagreement with auditing people and getting gains that stay there.

Because if you go into a practice of auditing suppressive persons or continuing to audit a person that you recognize as suppressive, you’re going to get your heart broken because he isn’t about to go anyplace, man. That’s our biggest source of losing auditors, see: tie into and try to audit a suppressive, don’t recognize it, and there they go. And the other one is they must be able to recognize a case gain and a loss of case gain and recognize in those two actions—remember you’ve got to be able to recognize a case gain before you can recognize a loss of case gain—and to see in those actions an ethics situation, not an auditing situation.

It’s perfectly all right for the individual auditor to turn around and put on his ethics hat. If he hasn’t got an Ethics Officer closer than eighteen thousand miles or something like that, why, let’s put on his own hat, put it on himself and become the Ethics Officer. But he has to be an Ethics Officer when he’s an Ethics Officer and an auditor when he’s an auditor. They’re two different guises. If he sees a suppressive or a PTS situation and does not recognize them and realize what to do about them, he will not last very long as an auditor, or if he does, his own case and progress will be completely stopped. I speak the truth. This is what we learned in the first Foundations—dearly bought.

It isn’t whether there are good guys in the universe and bad guys in the universe. It just so happens that there are guys in the universe who—really no different than other guys, if a little bit weaker and stupider—are more susceptible to not being here at all and who think they are

someplace else, being fought by people or things that aren't there either, and behave like a bunch of northbound horses, you know, and make a horrible mess out of their lives because they're fighting things that aren't there for reasons that don't exist! And they look like a bunch of apes—worse than that. If you could see with an inside view the visio of an SP, it would startle you half to pieces because you wouldn't know there was anything quite that gaudy.

He doesn't see the world around him. He sees a three-dimensional motion picture of enemies always attacking him. Now, once in a while you have run into somebody who didn't have a wall there who had a picture of a wall. You run into these people every now and then. It's very funny. I don't know how they even manage to walk in and out of doors, but it's absolutely true. The wall isn't there, but a picture of the wall is. And it frightens them half to death when you start auditing them or running Reach and Withdraw on walls or something like that, because the wall shakes and it looks like it's going to go to pieces. And you think they're going OT because they can now erase matter. No, they didn't have a wall there, see? Notice that the wall isn't erasing for you. If the guy was OT, it would.

Now therefore, this is where the universe is really a mock-up. It's really just a very thin, flimsy mock-up. Of course, it is a mock-up, but to you and me it has solidity. Well, this other bird, he doesn't have the wall there that you and I have. He has another wall there entirely. Now, that person isn't necessarily a suppressive person. This is what we call dub-in, using the phrase out of the motion-picture industry of putting a sound track on top of something that isn't there.

Now, that guy, when he starts to run one of our contact processes, gets into huge cognitions and gains because he finds out that his mocked-up wall isn't the wall that's there, that the wall that's there is the wall you and I see. And this brings him tremendous relief. Well, that does not make him suppressive. That is not even one of the characteristics of a suppressive, particularly. We're not interested in that characteristic as a suppressive characteristic. All I'm trying to tell you about is, as that wall is a mock-up for this person, so is every one of us a mock-up for that suppressive. We aren't there. In the places we're standing, God knows what's standing there—pink alligators, Martians, FBI agents—something else.

Now, somebody will say, "Well, he's just taken paranoia and specialized on it, and so forth, as a primary source of the thing. And of course, we know paranoia and we've always known paranoia"—just dismiss the whole thing. Hell, what they hold up and call a paranoid is such a mild version of what I'm talking about that we haven't any interest in it at all. A paranoid simply believes people are against him. Sometimes people are against somebody so they say he's a paranoid, you see. Works both ways. There's homicidal maniacs and so on.

No, this has nothing to do with psychiatric classification because it really, mostly looks totally sane. Once in a blue moon you get one of these boys in an institution—once in a blue moon. But I really think he would look so normal to the average psychiatrist that he'd be let out at once.

Now, they know that there is somebody who believes people are against him. Well, this is not as simple a definition as that. It is a person who is surrounded by identities which are different than those others see. And others have different intentions. They don't have the intentions you and I have noticed in people. They have entirely different intentions.

This is an interesting point of view because it's sort of like the fellow lives in a sort of Cinerama. He's in a cave filled with Cinerama, except we are the dramatic personnel when we walk in and out of his lives. Now, you see a paranoid usually is delusive. He has fictional people walking in and out of his lives, in that he doesn't have to have anybody walk into and out of the room to have somebody in the room. Do you follow? No, in this particular case of the suppressive you really have to have somebody walking in and out of the room for him to have been confronted by one of his fictional people.

This is a very, very, very hard thing for a sane person to envision, that somebody could go through life fooling everybody on this whole line. But they exist. The exact anatomy of what's wrong with their case is they're stuck on the time track. They are stuck somewhere in life in some activity where they're in a very tight spot and are being surrounded, badgered, tortured or injured in some way by a people or a group. And whereby that has happened to all of the rest of us at some time or another, we have moved on up the track. Well, the suppressive never has. He has never gone another inch beyond there. He is there totally. Today is that point on the track. It is always ten o'clock. Do you see?

Time does not move for this person. To get him to run an engram is next to impossible, because a person has to have a concept of motion on the time track in order to get from one end of an engram to another. And you have to be able to go over something in order to erase it on the time track. And of course, this person is not about to go over anything because he is in no place else but this precise, instant in time.

Now, all of us in an aberrated state can find a point on the track where we're (quote) "stuck." In other words, we have for a long time had an incident there we didn't notice before. Now, that's not the same thing. The suppressive for a long time has had the world there and didn't notice. See? There's the difference.

Now, this person is simply in that condition. There he is. Only he's sitting right here amongst us being a revolutionary being put down by the Spanish Inquisition, and we're all priests. And I don't know, but I think he even sees us in robes. And he says weird, out-of-contextish statements to us, every now and then, which he hastily covers up, because he's also learned that he mustn't be told that he's wrong. And that's his world. So of course, he butchers everybody.

Now, you'd have to know something about the mind before you could know anything about the anatomy of a suppressive. That, of course, lets psychiatry and psychoanalysis out. Now, let me give you, in rather rapid order, the actual attributes, one right after the other in a very machine-gun fashion. And this is "The Antisocial Personality," I've called this. That's because you, in speaking of it and so on, actually marry up with old technology, because they've looked for this fellow called the antisocial person for a very long time. Freud uses the term. Psychologists use the term. It's been used for a very long time. They know there is such a thing as an antisocial personality. And this is the personality for which they were groping. We're calling it a suppressive because it's more explicit.

But if you were speaking of this broadly or generally, well, you'd be very clever to say, "Well, an antisocial-type person." You're on technical firm ground. Now, this in actual fact is quite adequate as a discovery of some magnitude. The attributes of the antisocial personality would, in psychology, be an isolation study and a discovery of considerable magnitude to the psychologist. He'd be terribly interested in this. He runs into them all the time, doesn't know what he's looking at.

Out of this, by the way, you could make up a type of personality-analysis test that would isolate these birds at once. You would just have as many columns as I have attributes here. Make up a gradient scale on that column, see where the person is and you would—if he rode low on the resultant graph, why, you had one; and if he rode high, why, you didn't. It's almost worth doing.

But, it would be of only great value if you were trying to go through a firm, fast, and straighten it out. You've got the Bide-a-wee Biscuit Company on your hands, and in the line of organization why he's asked you as a Scientologist—because the Scientologists seem to be very well organized and succeeding—what you would do. Well, if you had a personality test of this character, it would be of great value to you. You'd just deal them out and those people that flunked them, why, you would set those aside and get them off the assembly belts and the firm would promptly recover—just like that. Bang! Of course, there's always the danger that it's the G.M. Anyway- . . . Not if he's asking you for help.

And this is the first attribute: This person speaks only in generalities. And that is the first thing we noticed about them. They never spoke in anything but generalities. It wasn't "Henry said it"—ever. It was always "Everybody said it." Such a person will get one letter in, criticizing the magazine, out of seven thousand avid readers and will immediately report, "The readers all think . . ." One instance becomes "every."

Now, every human being has this tendency to some slight degree. But this person pushes it home too hard. Any piece of bad news becomes an "everybody." It's what the community thinks of you, you see? See? One casual remark dropped someplace or another becomes immediately the total public opinion of England, you see. But it's this generality—the use of generalities to a totality—that give us the hallmark that was first noticed of a suppressive. They use this to pieces.

Now, it affects PTSes, so PTSes will echo it. When you hear somebody says, "Well, everybody in this community just hates Scientology," you know you're talking to a PTS or a suppressive—immediately. And you don't have to further qualify it. Now, if you want to find out if it's a PTS, it's somebody told him. And if it's a suppressive, he dreamed it up.

And this is one of the hallmarks of an ethics-type personality and is this antisocial personality. Now, of course, it has—people just haven't been doing this since we've been around. They've been at this for a long time. I imagine they were busy telling Nero—such suppressive persons as he had in his vicinity would hear one whisper from one guard and immediately this became the opinion of the population of the entire empire. "The people of Rome," or "All the people of the empire believe . . ." Some pish-tash that was uttered by some little goose that was down in the fifth corridor, who's just stubbed her toe, you know, and this becomes public opinion.

Now, the newspaper tries to bring about a public opinion, and you very often find newspapers dealing in sweeping generalities they ought to be shot for. Now, I'll show you borderline generality which you might not think is a generality sometimes, but "865 dead on holiday"—banner headlines, you see. You know, I think if that many people took a holiday that was not the news story. I think that dealt with the minority. You get my point? The newspaper has got a headline there about the people that died in accidents on this holiday which unfortunately involved some 27 or 28 million people. And they speak of the 800 in a certain way so that it looks like holidays are sort of dangerous or roads are dangerous.

Airplanes have been catching it of recent years, and yet the airplane has a better safety statistic than the railroad. What they did was continue to carry more and more and more and more and more people, you see. So when they did have an accident it was very spectacular indeed, but statistically and so on was less accident per passenger mile than the railroads had, and is—I think—a better statistic by far than some of the other means of transport man uses.

But the statistic on steamer passengers being carried, and so on, is very much on the decline, because you don't have very many steamers carrying very many passengers anymore. It's not a high traffic volume anymore. So if one steamer went up in smoke per year they would have more casualty statistic than the entire airline history for that year. Do you follow? Passengers carried—very small numbers.

Newspaper doesn't bother to explain all of this, but the newspaper itself is, of course, a generality.

Now, this generality is a big factor. Now, it doesn't make a person who simply says, "Well, they're mad at me," inspecifically—that doesn't make him a suppressive person. But if he's using it to push things down your throat, it rather tends to. "Everybody at school believes you're no good." "They," "all"—these sweeping things connected with bad news. There's great value in knowing this, because the rebuttal of course is, "Who is 'they'?" "What is 'everybody's' name?" And the guy—he's either PTS and has simply just been told this, and



therefore he isolates it and makes him feel better, or he's suppressive and is mad as the dickens because he's been trapped.

All right. That's the first characteristic: deals in generalities.

Second characteristic: Such a person deals mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression. Now, of course we know that. But did you ever know anybody who never said anything good about anybody ever? Well, that person was a suppressive. There's no further qualifications necessary. That person was a newspaper... I mean, a suppressive.

There's the hallmark of the suppressive because that is the extent of the operation in actual fact. They also do bad things to people, but there certainly—there isn't anybody good anywhere, anywhere, you know, ever. And it's just they deal mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression. That's their stock in trade.

Now, if you told this person to tell Bill that you certainly appreciated his bringing you home last night, that person will never so tell Bill—never, never, never relay a complimentary remark, and never relay good news, period. Good news does not pass. It might become an outright lie. The good news won't pass, but it might become an outright lie and somehow or another become bad news. But they will pass bad news but altered, worsened.

3. (This is the characteristic of which I was just speaking): The antisocial personality alters to worsen communication when he or she relays a message or news. Good news stopped and only bad news, often embellished, is passed along. Now, that is a common characteristic to that type of personality. It isn't that you gave them good news or you gave them bad news. This is not this, now. This is the other one. The other one is this: Whatever passes through their hands is altered. They alter the communication. If they say it's two—three. Ah-ha. If you said it was Tuesday, it becomes Thursday, you see? There's always an alteration of the communication. The communication does not duplicate, the communication alters.

Now, if you had this old test that they use in the army of they have a whispered message passed along through a dozen men, you know, to find out what comes out the other end... Well, actually, in the British Army they commonly drill them not as a demonstration and so forth—they get them so they actually will pass on a relayed communication. But if you were to go down that twelve men, you would only find, at the outside, one or two of them had altered the communication and you would have your hands on people who were either PTS or suppressive. The altered communication. They usually worsen the gist of the communication, but they certainly alter it. You get the idea? That's a distinct difference from "the person deals in bad news." See? This person alters communications that flow through him.

And the next characteristic is a fact that a suppressive, the antisocial personality, does not respond to treatment, reform or psychotherapy. No response. Now, you actually never deal with the serious ones. They're running the London Daily Mail and things of this character. They're running the great banks of the world—the serious suppressives. They're not in actual sober fact accessible to you. They're the insane ones. I mean, the insane one is not really accessible to any psychotherapy. He's so batty that his close staffs normally know it, but when he's moved up in position in the world and so on, he's quite able to make this the norm—makes this the normal circumstance of existence.

You see, he would shoot at you, only. I mean, the real bad one... It isn't that you won't get one in the auditing chair. But the real bad one—he really never does come and sit down in the auditing chair, do you understand? And he, and the people he influences, are the only people on the planet who won't.

So he's not open to being audited. I'm finding it a little bit hard to make the point, because you say no case gain and so forth, this sort of thing; yes, that is the characteristic. But I just wanted to point out to you that you don't get this guy in the auditing chair—the worse ones—you don't

get him in the auditing chair at all. He's back there screaming some place about you. But he would never come in and sit down in the auditing chair.

So we, of course, knowing enough about the mind, can sandblast these people and blow them up with Power Processes used in various ways. And we could blast through with CCHs. And somehow or another, we could undoubtedly do something for them—if we had to. But that's today. That's today. And it's only because we know the anatomy of what they consist of and we know the rest of these things. We could do something for them today.

But it would take very, very, very heavy teamwork. It would take an organization, and it would take one preferably who had an institutional access to really take on this line of country. And what this is meant by, is that the person who comes along who hasn't been helped by auditing—well, we can modify that and say, well, if he hasn't been helped by lower-grade auditing, if he hasn't been helped by the usual or ordinary approaches of auditing and so on, then that person is an SP. So we can say that he isn't benefited by psychotherapy because we're not in that business. He does not respond to treatment, that is for sure. He does not reform, that is for sure. And the psychoanalyst never came within a thousand miles of him. And the psychologist doesn't even recognize him. Let me give You that characteristic again: He does not respond to treatment or reform or psychotherapy. No response. No change.

Now, if you say auditing—and auditing is not psychotherapy and is not a normal human activity at all—but he won't respond to the lower forms of auditing. He won't respond to grade auditing up to, let us say, IV.

Now, a very skilled auditor in an organization and so forth can undoubtedly take these people and blast them to pieces if he could get them to stand still. But if you started picking up every one there was, you would need an institution. It's not that this fellow has acted insane in a society; it's the fact that he would go insane the instant anybody looked like he was going to do anything to him mentally. The one thing this fellow can't do is confront his own mind! Now, recognize that as one of the motivations of his activities with regard to Scientology. He does not dare confront his own mind! He would go into trembling fits! He would go into piercing screams that they would have to put him in a padded cell for years if he took one tiny little look at his own mind. You understand?

And that's why you when you come along and you say we're going to audit people, we're going to process people and we're going to do something with the mind, that's why these guys go mad! You follow it?

They're right up there to the heads of states saying, "You've got to shoot these people! You've got to kill these people! You've got to do something about these people! Auhhhh!" You know, they talk sanely, like that. And of course, a state that would listen to them has that type of person in charge of it. I wouldn't mention any names. Bulkey down in Victoria; Smith, Rhodesia. I don't want to get any libelous remarks out here, so I'll simply deal in truth. You got the idea?

The second they deal in their mind, those spooks that they carry with them all the time move slightly, and they just go, "Zyaahhhhhhh!" So it isn't what you're doing. You're just wasting your time to explain to these people that you're not doing anything bad, all you're doing is helping people with their minds. It's the thought that anything that has anything to do with the mind of any kind whatsoever that drives them into screaming terror. That's the kind of nut in the back of this newspaper chain. They've got one like this on the East Grinstead Town and Country Planning Committee.

Recognize what you're dealing with. Don't be reasonable! You can't talk to these fellows about psychotherapy or about the mind or reason with them in any way. The second you've lifted the tiniest curtain of the subject, they've gone into irrational, screaming fits. They would want nothing less than your execution. And your crime is not what they say your crime is. Your crime is the fact that you have almost made them confront something that they cannot and do

not dare confront! And you've almost exposed them because they see they're not under good control, and they recognize that if they lose control they will undoubtedly be put away. They know they're that close to insane. And that's why they get mad at you particularly.

Now, that was the fourth characteristic.

And the fifth characteristic is: Surrounding such a personality we find cowed or ill associates or friends who, when not actually driven insane, are yet behaving in a crippled manner in life, failing and not succeeding. The people in this person's vicinity just fail.

You say, "Well, there's a family and they always had bad luck, you know. They lost a boy and then the other one flunked in school, the other one's in prison and so forth. Then there was Jessie Ann. And Jessie Ann, of course, well, she's been in the insane asylum for some time and..." Family looks awfully unlucky. Get smart. This family isn't unlucky; this family has got a suppressive in the middle of it.

Now, they make trouble for others. Now, when you try to treat those people in the vicinity of the suppressive—and here's what's very important— they don't recover. They get a little bit better and they get worse, and they get a little better and they get worse, and then they really get worse. And then when it looks like they're really going to recover then they die. Suppressive couldn't stand that; he just wiped them out then.

This is what you're up against. You have a broad familial pattern of sickness or something like that, and you don't do anything ethics-wise about it and so on, why, you're not going to get any success on any member of that group—unless you handle it from an ethics viewpoint.

Therefore, if you didn't know that, you could make an awful bust out of processing people. When you have a group of people who are commonly a rolley-coaster bunch, or kind of sick and unlucky and all that sort of thing, and you don't suspect there's a suppressive in amongst them and that they're all PTS, and if you've got some other kind of explanation like "They lived in the swamps, and of course they were fever stricken" . . . I don't know. Who the hell was making them live in the swamps?

And 6 is something which is a saving grace. The antisocial personality habitually selects the wrong target—habitually. They're always selecting the wrong target. Now, this becomes very funny. If a tire went flat they would blame their companion. But they wouldn't connect it on the basis that the tire went flat. The tire went flat, so they got mad at their companion. Now, you say, well, that's a human characteristic. Well, human beings do tend to get mad at the things around what they're mad at, and so on. But this would be on the basis of a disassociate. The tire is flat. Now, being mad at the companion has nothing whatsoever to do with the tire being flat.

And it'd go to a point of the ice box is making a dreadful racket in the kitchen—see, rat-a-tat-tat and so on—so they go upstairs and fix the pipes in the attic to the hot water system. And you, very often, will see these people and you consider that they are ineffectual on the job. They're ineffectual on the job that if they did notice anything was wrong they would fix something else. If they were served a notice by the Salvation Army, they would go down and report to the jailhouse or something. They can never quite figure out where what was which, see. And this goes in reverse. If they want to straighten out something in the society, then they will attack the people who aren't doing it. When you get a government going like this you know exactly what you're dealing with. For instance, we're not messing up the insane; the psychiatrists are. They're attacking us, see, and they're not attacking the psychiatrist. Do you see?

You get the tremendous gap there. It's a wrong-target situation but they'll get enthusiastic on a wrong target the like of which you never heard of. This isn't defensive as far as we're concerned; this is just remarkable because it's a saving grace. Because they attack a wrong target they don't succeed very well. That means they're ineffectual. They're kind of goony. And you needn't be anywhere near as afraid of them as people have become. Because there's

that one fact—that one fact—that sixth characteristic: wrong target. You can absolutely count on it.

When you've got a suppressive general and he's got a ridge that has to be cleaned out and so forth, why, he sends all of his troops into the valley. If he has to, to win the battle, knock out all the artillery and placements and so on, why, he will have the enemy's water supplies polluted. It's as wrong target as that. If he should shoot at A, he shoots at B.

And you will see this person, as a—well, as a woman in the middle of a family, something like that. She will spot the wrong reasons for things and then settle these wrong reasons. And it gets pretty goony, if you listen to it, after a while. "Well, let's see, Bill failed at college." And you expect some remark—"Therefore, we won't send Pete to college. We will send them something else," you know. "We should go on a diet." There's a disassociation involved in these things which is sometimes hard to catch, because you don't catch it to what was going on. But you get them lined up. But you watch for this wrong target. But it serves you in very good stead because he'll never attack the right thing.

And here's another saving grace in dealing with these people: They don't complete cycles of action. If they start to put an apple on a shelf, it will only get halfway there. That's for sure. If they start a war in Zanzibar, it won't be completed. That incomplete cycle of action—it's just a total dramatization. They didn't have to complete those cycles of action. If they completed one, they'd find it out, then they would redo it. They mustn't arrive and they don't arrive, and this is because their time sense is loused up. They don't have ideas of consecutive events. So they don't, therefore, complete cycles of action.

These, by the way, are all empirical; these are not theoretical. I didn't tell you that. These are not just theoretical extrapolations where I sat down and figured out what would be this personality and so on. No. This winnows out [of] just thousands and thousands of hours of observation, shaking down the common characteristics. The characteristics these people have in common. These things are not necessarily themselves associated with one another. These are just things that you know that these were the characteristics which were common to all of them. There are a lot of other characteristics that you could equally apply, you see, but you wouldn't necessarily—they aren't necessarily common to all these suppressives. Some have them, some don't. And this is empirical—that is to say, picked up by actual observation and experience in life.

And that's one of the wildest things to watch you ever had anything to do with: He can't finish a cycle of action. You watch a suppressive trying to finish a cycle of action and so on, he changes his mind and goes over on a wrong target. They'll shift between wrong target and cycle of action, you see. They start to finish a cycle of action, why, then they will shift the target to something else. There'll be some reason why they can't finish that cycle of action; they've got to do something else. And suddenly you'll look at them and you say, "Hey that hasn't got anything whatsoever to do with what you were doing, and you don't have to do that in order to do something else." They just know you're wrong, man.

Now, 8. Many antisocial persons will freely confess to the most alarming crimes—when forced to do so, will have no faintest sense of responsibility for them. That is when such a person does confess to crimes you will find out, "Oh, yes. I killed the baby. Yes, yes. Yes, I murdered all the policemen, you know. Bluh-uh-bluuh, bluh, bluh."

You say, "Well, what was the baby doing to you, you had to blow its head off with a .45?"

"Well, I really don't know. Don't know. Very sorry for it, yeah. You got anymore babies to shoot?" You know? No sense of responsibility at all. They drive you mad.

They drive a policeman mad when they try to interrogate such fellows and so on. The fellow will confess to all the crimes under the sun, you know. And reformers go mad on this, you know, because after the fellow's confessed to all these crimes, he says, "So what?" The idea of

crime is—well, you think they're a crime; he doesn't. They don't have any classification of behavior, different types of behavior—that there's such a thing as good behavior and bad behavior, nice behavior and pleasant behavior. There aren't different types of behavior. And they certainly take no responsibility for some of the wildest crimes, and this is one thing that shows up. And when you hear this, boy . . . because maybe the guy has fooled you right up to that point, see. You hear about how he murdered his wife and corrupted all of his family. And he's sitting there; he's got a pleasant smile on his face and so on. Oooh! Hey, wait a minute. That is a suppressive characteristic, and you'll find the rest of the details then, unobserved before, will now start to fill in. No responsibility for committed acts.

That sort of thing happens. It can go off into any branch of crime, by the way. It isn't one type of crime or another type of crime, -or one type of behavior or another type of behavior. It's interesting that they explain kleptomania by "the hand wandered over and took something and put it in the pocket."

And they stand back and watch the hand detachedly do this. It's marvelous. Yes, well, they took all of the money out of the cash register. Yes, yes, yes, yes. And if you pin it down, why, what they actually did, was observe their hands take the money out of the cash register and put it in their pockets. And they did so with a little bit of surprise and maybe even a faint feeling of reproof, like their hand shouldn't be doing that. But they don't have anything to do with it. It's marvelous.

Now, the antisocial personality supports only destructive groups and rages against and attacks any constructive or betterment group. If you knew a person was a suppressive and so on, you could forecast at once what his reaction would be to a decent group or to a criminal group. And if you had one, for instance, in a parliament or a congress and you wanted to know what type of group they would try to legislate against, you could pick it up like that, because any group that is a betterment group they will legislate against; and riots-smiots: "So they're all rioting and killing each other out in Cleveland. Well, that's no reason to do anything about the I Will Arise Society in Cleveland. But you say the police department there in Cleveland— you say that they were attempting to preserve property and so forth. Well, shoot them." Do you get the idea? "And that there were some ministers around and that they were actually counseling moderate action and so forth. Well, we'll have them investigated."

It's a reverse. It's the negative of the positive. It's what you would have normally been led to expect as law and order they will reverse. You know, you support the rioters and you attack the people who are trying to prevent riots, you know. You support the wage earners, and you put the bums into the millionaire class if you possibly can, see. You reward down statistics—we would put it—consistently and continuously.

Now, regardless of the group, character of, the actions which are approved by this type of personality are destructive actions. Well, it was a good thing: he walked in and blew his head off with a shotgun. And that was a bad thing: she made a cake and gave it to the kids.

So if you have a good action and a person approves of it, he's probably not suppressive. But if he—a person seems to be disapproving all the time of good actions, you can't quite figure out what this is all about. Well, don't be so far adrift. You're talking to a suppressive.

These good-bad actions—you know, these actions: "Well, it was probably a good thing that the atom bomb hit Hiroshima because now they've been able to . . . The war was a good thing because the scientists were able to invent so many new things. . ." What's that, you know? Well, what that is, is suppression. It's the approval of a destructive action and the inhibition of constructive actions.

Now, they, by the way, will attach themselves to constructive people to try to smash them. They will go that far. You will find it in Hollywood. Boy, oh boy, man. If you ever started to clean out Hollywood, you'd have a ball.

And the eleventh one: Helping others is an activity which drives the anti-social personality nearly berserk. Activities, however, which destroy in the name of help are closely supported. Really, anything that helps somebody is bad. And things that don't help are good. But if you've got a real mixed up mess, whereby you've got the witch doctors are uniformly killing off all the villagers, but making a big play out of what a good thing this is, why, they'll support those witch doctors down to their last penny and ounce of energy: "Man, those guys are great!" See?

The idea is to get rid of everybody. You can more or less extrapolate these characteristics. If everybody became miserable, then you could get rid of them all; they would all disappear and then they'd all die. And this fellow would then be safe, you see. Well, that works out fine except the people around him aren't the people who are around him. So, of course, it won't work out, ever.

And then the last one: The antisocial personality has a bad sense of property and conceives that the idea that anyone owns anything is a pretense made up to fool people; nothing is ever really owned. And you listen to these guys sometimes; they really just pretend that people own things and so on. You watch that characteristic, it becomes almost pathetically amusing. The reason they took the car and smashed it up and the reason they smashed your car up is because it isn't your car. You bought and paid for it and sweat yourself to pieces paying for the thing and you've safeguarded it and taken care of it and so on, but it's not your car. You're just pretending that it's your car.

Now, you could say that there could be two or three more. And you could say that a tremendous feeling of importance or dominance and so forth had to do with this. Well now, they've assigned those characteristics to the paranoid personality, but they do not belong.

The fact that some guy thinks he's terribly important and another guy thinks he's unimportant, and so forth, has nothing whatsoever to do with suppression. It's another characteristic of the personality, and some guys are rather ridiculous on the subject of importance. But if you ever really want to see important blokes, why, go down and talk to some ditch diggers or some charladies or something like that. Now, they are very important people! And you think these people, because of their station in life, would think of themselves as unimportant people. Well, it goes almost inversely, that the lower down a fellow is the more he has to assert his importance. If you ever want to see somebody bridle about importance, you want to take somebody who is not really very important, and then he becomes very important.

As far as dominance is concerned, they have dominance in the society totally mixed up with suppression. There's nothing wrong with dominance. Well, I say there's nothing right, wrong or otherwise. It's just dominance is dominance, you know. George dominates his business. He dominates his family, or she dominates something or other—so what? See? It's what do they do with this domination that counts. That they dominate has nothing to do with anything. Do you follow?

And that a person thinks he's important or doesn't think he's important—they've assigned that as characteristics of paranoia. And I have seen some people who did think they were outrageously important—fantastic—and harped on it all the time. But that was just a crazy psychosis in the middle of it. You won't find that all suppressives conceive they are important. It's not a common denominator. So there are many other characteristics which you will find in this field. But I do not think that you will find them as common denominators.

I've just given you a dozen common denominators by which they can be recognized. These will hold true. Now, on top of these, there will be all kinds of wild idiosyncrasies—wild idiosyncrasies, odd differences, personal quirks and peculiarities. You will find these things go on. But they don't hold across the boards. Don't think, when you've met one who thinks that he has to have a green hat on all the time and he'd be safe, then that all SPs have to have green hats, because they don't. This was this peculiar SP.

But the other dozen characteristics which I've just given you, I think you will find hold pretty true throughout any and all of these suppressives. Now, you watch these things and you'll . . . They are things, by the way, which are very startling to auditors. He gets some overts off this guy, and this guy has robbed his little brother's piggy bank and hit his sister on the head with a hammer, and he's just sitting there, you know, talking. Wife owned some property, and so he lost it in a gambling game. She's been destitute ever since. He left her in Omaha.

You look for some reaction on this meter, see. You look for this guy to cognite; you look for something to happen. You've gotten fantastic overts off this guy and you're getting no tone arm action either. Well, the pathetic part of it is the overts probably aren't even true. He's probably just trying to horrify you. He might have done them, he might not have done them. But if he did do them he had no responsibility for them. You watch these kind of things.

So you should know those various characteristics. You should know what they consist of And if you know them as common denominators, when you see one of them, this doesn't prove too much until you've got it married up with two or three more. Now you know. And you say, "ahhhh, ahhhh, ahhhh! No wonder Josie Ann roller-coasters all the time," you see. "Look at this guy Pete." You know, whatever it is.

Anyhow, an auditor's skills depend upon his recognition of the situation he is auditing. And when you have some isolated series of characteristics which give you a certain expectancy, they become valuable. And if you have a dozen characteristics which when you have perceived them in a pc and which when they add up to several others of these characteristics of the dozen, you now know what to predict. You're going to predict no case gain; you're going to predict catastrophe; you're going to predict a total mess in all directions. And somewhere along this line you better unload, because you are auditing an ethics-type case and you got no business doing it.

When you see somebody roller-coaster—they felt good and then they felt bad—you say, "Well, Scientology has harmed them." No, Scientology didn't harm them, but by being audited, they attracted the notice of a suppressive who then proceeded to cave them in fast! And you do an S&D on somebody and find the wrong suppressive, why, you'll get a rolley coaster—a Search and Discovery. You'll get a rolley coaster; you'll get a person worsening. But also remember the situation can occur that you did a perfectly good S&D, and then one week later they met another SP. See, that condition could exist also.

Well, I hope that this will be of some service to you. It's a gruesome subject. I hate to run this type of thing into your lap. But I would rather tell you than have you find it out in an auditing chair. I think maybe it would be of some service to you. Now, there will be an article published on this particular subject. But you should know these twelve characteristics.

Thank you very much.