

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

INDIVIDUATION

A lecture given on 25 November 1959

Thank you.

I'm not going to give you a demonstration now on this particular lecture. I'm going to give you a short talk on the subject of individuation and some of the things you'd better guard against in Scientology.

First Melbourne ACC, 25th November.

Now, what we're up against in Scientology is we're trying to fit, an organization and organizations and people, in amongst a tremendously aberrated society. We have to adopt certain patterns of agreement with the society. If left to our own devices, we would not.

As a matter of fact in the earliest days of this, I didn't. And as a net result we might have gone far and fast, but at the same time, eddies of confusion developed of sufficient magnitude to completely overset and upset organizations and everything else.

I didn't even control the early organizations of Dianetics and Scientology. Now, we've only started to pull out of the rut since I had to assume responsibility administratively as well as technically and so forth.

Our upward curve actually begins somewhere in the vicinity of about 1953. And with many vicissitudes here and there throughout the world, the more order that has been established in organizations and in communication lines and qualifications, in technology, and so forth, the further and better we have gone.

Now, people sometimes in the United States look at the early hysterical, commotional burst of Dianetics as being a tremendous upsurge and that was known far and wide, and that there were tremendous numbers of students involved, and there were tremendous numbers of preclears and tremendous numbers and all of that sort of thing. Well, that's all strictly, to be very technical, "for the birds." They just tore everybody to pieces; that's what happened. And right this minute we have many more students, many more preclears and many more Scientologists than we ever had early Dianeticists. And they're making more progress and things are calmer all the way along the line, and everybody could live.

But the point is simply this: we *are* operating in a very aberrated world, where counter-creativity is the order of the day, and creativity itself is at minimum. Very little creativity, tremendous amount of counter-creativity that busily eats up nearly every mock-up put up.

Now, safeguarding organizations and that sort of thing would be very simple if we did not become ourselves guilty of overt acts. Inadvertently, one way or the other, in trying to fit into a very, very neurotic society, any kind of an administrative system which is at the same time using people within its ranks who are splendid people, but who aren't Clear, you get a condition of the development of overt acts. It's almost impossible . . . it's almost impossible not to, because the society at large.

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

Trying to make forward progress, every once in a while you find yourself stepping on the wrong head. Get the idea? Then you say, "Well, I shouldn't have done that."

This is *easily* true, that our progress is much greater when we take no punitive action of any kind in any direction. Our progress in dissemination is much greater when this happens. But our progress in administration spins in. In other words, we might disseminate, but we get out to a point where we're not administering. And when we get out to a point where we're not administering, why, there's some guy way out there on the end of an outpost and somebody shoots him down in cold blood, you know? What are we going to do about it? We can't do anything about it. We've disseminated way beyond any organizational reach.

Well, the society itself is absolutely certain that anybody that puts up a mock-up these days ought to have it knocked down. It's on a create-destroy almost total closure. Well, that shouldn't be a discouraging fact to anyone, but it certainly should be an understood fact.

Now, one of the things that happens is very lamentable. The word is around that in Scientology organizations the life span, you might say, of top executives is very short and lots of top executives get sacked, and therefore there's a tremendous turnover organizationally in Scientology. This is just an idea that is around, here and there. Well, actually, as far as personnel is concerned, there isn't a terrific turnover. People drift in and out of organizations, but they usually drift back.

You look into an organization over a period of time, and you will see that somebody has been there and moved out in the field and come back again, he's moved out in the field and he got some auditing and straightened out, and he's back again. And it moves around, and the population stays pretty constant.

But top executives do blow off. *They* blow off. And of course, they're so visible. They are so visible. You see, they're carrying a public-front representation and so forth. And one of these boys goes up in smoke or disappears off the organization, looks like the whole organization must be getting fired or sacked or something bad happening to it.

Well, I want to take up with you just this one fact, because the fact that with all of the confusion and upset that we run into in the society, if we in Scientology can't handle this thing, we're licked. And it's just this: that holding things together administratively brings about two things in the executives in Scientology and the people in charge of things. It brings the isolation of command, and the overt acts incident to administration. And one of the things causes the other. Person gets out of touch, doesn't understand the situation too well, and then acts, then finds out he acted wrongly, and he's got an overt act on his conscience, and they start building up this way and they blow themselves off posts.

It's been an awful long time since a top executive was fired. Actually, they quit. Actually, they quit. Now, I have been known to stop their paychecks two and three weeks after they disappeared. That sounds very funny, but you don't know the workings of these things unless you are right up against them, in tight, looking very hard at them. And that's more or less the *truth* of the situation. They have blown themselves off, or they've caused a circumstance to exist that they can't exist in anymore. And I would say—oh, there have been some that have simply been grabbed out of the

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

line and booted out the front door. That's for true, you see? There have been some, but they're not in the majority to any way, shape or form. They blow themselves out. They blow themselves off post. And why do they do this? Isolation of command, overt acts, one more action.

It's almost impossible to administer a large number of people with absolute justice. And where the justice cog slips a little bit and they do something to the people, they're guilty of an overt act, don't you see? Then they recognize that they are and they've had it. So this one other factor is altitude. Altitude.

Now, you face up to one of these people that's famous in Scientology and that sort of thing, and if you as an auditor slip into a weak valence and start flubbing the dub on it, I'll growl at you, real hard, because that's normally what happens. Some guy is in an area, whether he's a field auditor or part of the organization or anything else, and because of his altitude he never gets any auditing. He's the Association Secretary, or he's the Director of Processing or the Director of Training, or he's in charge of a field operation of one kind or another, or he's the most important or best-known auditor in the area—in someplace—and immediately, any time anybody walks forward to audit him (he asks them to audit him, something like that), it kind of gets to be a sort of a self-audit. You see how?

Person sits down in front of him, says, "Look at all this altitude I'm looking at," and goes into a weak valence and starts to stammer and spit. Well, don't do it, because it's wrecking the works.

For instance, I have had auditors blow on me on several different occasions over a period of years—many auditors blow on me. I've also gotten a lot of good processing. But I've had auditors blow on me.

Unpredictably, somebody sits down and starts running something that's just a little bit offbeat, or that requires an analysis with an E-Meter, or something of the sort; the next thing you know they're going. .. They've forgotten the auditing commands, and they turn the E-Meter upside ... it isn't that they can't audit. It's the fact that they think they're looking at a source-point. And looking at a source-point, they are then incapable of being anywhere but an effect-point. And an effect-point can't audit. You hear me? Well, the devil with this being an effect-point.

The administrative future, in particular, of Scientology depends on us getting over this one. That one right there. And getting over something else: Not taking responsibility for source-points. Failure to take responsibility for source-points leaves these birds working hard, unaudited. Leaves them in amongst the lions and tigers, unaudited. They're usually fronting for organizations. They're fronting for staffs, and that sort of thing, and they become willy-nilly guilty of overt acts. And then they chop somebody on staff, and they're guilty of an overt act there.

And the next thing you know, why, their whole idea with regard to staff is just shoot everybody. Get the idea? It just builds up from a little overt to a big overt. They suddenly recognize that they should fire everybody.

Well, that's a highly dangerous condition for a staff to exist in. And that's a highly dangerous condition for a city to be in that has a very important auditor who's looked to as the most important auditor in that city. And for this guy, trying to hold down what he's doing and do what he's doing and so forth, sooner or later is going to commit some overt act one way or the other,

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

administratively or in some fashion. He's going to steal somebody's pc—not even know he did it. All kinds of weird things going to happen. He's going to wake up one morning and find out, well, he just committed a lot of overt acts. He kind of realizes he isn't doing too well. And he wants somebody to audit him. Who does he get to audit him? There isn't anybody else in the area to audit him, because he's got altitude.

Well, this is some ... this is quite a thing. Now, you in Scientology have got to take responsibility for such people because they can't take responsibility for themselves. They cannot do it.

On a staff and in an organization you see somebody looking hectic, overworked or something, well, don't try to cave in his anchor points and pull a bunch of sympathy on him, something like that; just insist that you audit him! That's all!

Well, maybe he says, "Well, I am being audited." Well, check up on it! Is he? It's just as simple as that. Is he being audited? He says, well, his auditor is quite good and so forth. Ahh, you got a right to see his profiles. Is he changing at all?

Now, that sounds like a hell of an invasion of privacy and an upside down of the command line and every other confounded thing you ever heard of. Well, you just better turn it upside down. Of course, that's a horrible weapon for an executive to have to face, if his staff is told by me that he better be checked over once in a while by his staff. Right away he'll say, "Well, Ron said that and therefore they're making a victim out of me, and they're trying to victimize me." Well, what are you going to do? You're going to lose somebody there sooner or later. He's going to blow himself off the post. He's going to blow the whole thing wrong side out.

Now, maybe this is all right if you hope to get promoted and promoted and promoted. If you want to get promoted there are so doggone many areas of Scientology that need somebody in that you can't practically count them at all.

No, top figures in this particular business are not expendable. They just aren't. It's up to the staff, it's up to the auditors in the town, to see that such people are processed and to keep them from going out the bottom. Get those overt acts off them. Get that isolation off of them. Get them back in there pitching again. Don't let them slip and slide and skid around, and then stand there being effect-point and saying, "Of course, well, we can't do anything about him because he's source of Scientology in this particular zone and area, and there's nothing we can do about it."

Yeah, well, you're a source of Scientology in that area, too. And something else is you've got a situation on your hands where everything you've got in that particular zone, every vested interest you have, is being jeopardized by somebody who will go this kind of a course. He does something administratively or to straighten something out, and then he finds out—wasn't much of an overt act; it was a little bit of an overt act. It wasn't quite right. It just had a curve on it. The later data came along that said the pc actually hadn't been shot by this other auditor or something of the sort, you see? Later data said that the action was really an overt act.

All right. We move into the next line up. We get another little overt act and after that it gets very easy, and they commit another overt act, and they commit another one, another one. They're perfectly legal things, you know? They're perfectly reasonable things. They're things that people

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

do in corporations all the time, only we're not a corporation, don't you see? We are a corporation but that's just to agree with the law, you understand? We're something else.

Actually, you can't even run a Scientology organization the way you'd run Jaguar Limited or something. It just won't run that way, that's all. I know; it took us years to find that out. And we know how to run one of these organizations now but that's beside the point.

The point is, we *can't* go on an administrative line which is a stuck one-way flow, which adds up into numerous overt acts and which finally separates out one of the most able guys you've got in the area right on off from the staff, the post and a blow. They just walk right straight up that line. Of course, this fellow did come in and tear up the front hall and wreck the Coke machine, and that sort of thing, and they had to sack him, this executive did; had to sack this fellow. Good friend of his, but he had to sack him. I mean, just to make things straighten out, that was the only thing he could do.

Only he realizes he's maybe got other overts on this fellow, and he doesn't know for sure whether he should've sacked him or not. And he thinks maybe he should've been able to straighten him out because he's a Scientologist. He should have been able to... So he failed the fellow somehow, and that he sacked him is an overt act. And he hears three or four weeks later that the fellow is practically starving to death and... Oooh! Here we go, you see?

Next thing you know, why, this executive, believe it or not, Scientologist or not, will be picking on some file clerk or somebody in the organization, wanting to sack *them*. For what? See, it's just overt act goes into overt acts goes into overt acts, which gets into compulsive overt acts. Then they realize they're doing wrong. And then they realize they're victimizing the organization so they know very well what they should do. They should be absent. To prevent themselves from doing further harm, they take themselves off. And that's the way they go, every time.

Now, you've seen in just one area several Assoc Sees go. HASI Melbourne has seen several Assoc Sees go up in smoke. Don't think there was any different mechanism than this operating. These were good men, all of them. And they all did a great deal for this organization. But in the earliest times of an organization, you get the greatest randomness and commit the most overt acts, so you expect a more dishabille, tangled-up condition early in an organization's history than later ones.

Nevertheless, these people committed this little action and that little action and separated themselves out further and stayed in the isolation of command and went out further and tried to stay on this earth's administrative pattern one way or the other—which is the isolation of command, which invites overt acts—and did a few more and a few more and a few more, and finally in practically all cases—most cases—were writing me letters, begging me to let them leave.

What's the mechanism? They wanted to cease to act in an area because they had begun to believe they were damaging the area. Do you understand that?

Well, that this condition existed falls straight back onto the fact that people considered they had altitude, didn't get them audited, let them drift too long, and to stay in an administrative pattern

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

like good soldiers, went ahead and accepted and absorbed their overt acts. You understand? Why, it's not called for. That's not called for at all.

By and large, the organizational population, you might say, of Scientology is very stable. Very. Seldom changes very badly, but its executive stratas change all too rapidly, and that's why. And the remedy for it, *technically*, is now in our hands. Very easy for it to be in our hands, too. But technically, is now in our hands.

Now, part of the business of being in charge of something is to have secrets, according to this society at large. You mustn't tell why George was really fired. It's all got to be secret. The communication lines have got to be wrapped up in cotton batting one way or the other. There's some things going on; there's some planning; there are things going to happen someplace, and one has to keep that under wraps and something else under wraps. And next thing you know the guy is... the guy is a case. He might be a Mest Clear, but he'll wind up as a case again. Because right in present time he is restraining things. Now, you could clean this up slick as a whistle by putting him on an E-Meter and finding out ... just shaking him down for all of his overtacts. And then, not punishing him by wrecking his authority and position because you now find out what some of his overtacts were. You get the trick?

In order to keep going you'll just have to have a higher tolerance and be more outspoken. You see that? You just have to have a higher tolerance and be more outspoken. That's all. Don't be so eager and anxious to counter-create against somebody, see? But actually just shake them down for all the overtacts, all the secrets, free up that needle, straighten them up, and get it square. You see that?

Well, if this is the case in our own organization, think what must be the case in large corporations. Think what must be the case in large governments. Look, they don't know anything about anything. They got communication lines, but no communication formula. They think they know all about it. They're so bad off they don't even know they don't know. And that's as bad off as a guy can get. Why this fellow doesn't know there's nothing known about anything. You know? That guy is a stupid fool. You get some idiot down in the barnyard or something of the sort, and you'll find out that's more or less his state of mind. He doesn't know anybody doesn't know, you know?

Well, let's take presidents and prime ministers and dictators and heads of department and ministers of state and take the heads of corporations and so forth, the heads of organizations, and so on: You have the men that run this planet. You have the men that run this planet—that's them. And look-a-here, if we lose our own executives, where we can do something about it, if we're dull enough to stand around as auditors on somebody's staff and let him blow himself right off post because we never grab hold of him and say, "Here, we have a right to have you stay as clear as we can get you!" If we don't do that, ah, do you wonder there's as much war and stupidity and unrest and execution as there is?

I could tell you right now that I could go to any corporation president—I don't care who he is—put him on an E-Meter and have him about 100 percent improved over anything he's got, just with the trick I taught you of shaking a meter down. Just do that! And there'd go his ulcers, you know? And you say, "Wow!" This guy will say "Wow! That's really something. That's really something!" Then clean him up the rest of the way.

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

All these guys, practically, have trouble familiarly. Oh, they're having trouble with their wives and their daughters, and this and that and so on, and their son-in-laws and all of this sort of thing. Well, why? They're so darn busy they can't pay much attention to the family. But it's worse than that. Because they're a source-point, they tend to put other people in a weak valence. See that?

Well, doggone it, get over the idea that you're in a weak valence because you're in a subordinate command position. I found ordinarily I had to be in a much stronger valence than the man in charge to get anything done.

But you could really make tremendous progress on the upper dynamics if you just started shaking things down in this fashion. If you opened up marital relations counseling, and took husbands and wives and simply take the trick of pulling the needle down, and then make them tell each other—my god! Marriages would patch up all over the place and the divorce rate would fall and zingity-bang, you see? Simple trick. It doesn't even require that you run anything of a process on these people.

How long does it take? Well, you better make your rates awful high because it doesn't take very long. That's real... being really effective.

Now, if you were to go around and pick up a few corporation presidents, manage to meet them out at the golf club or something like that, and they say, "What are you?" You say, well... You don't give a damn for the truth. If you know it's a lie, it's okay. You just tell them you're a psychiatrist or something of the sort. Say whatever you are; it doesn't matter. If you're in too much trouble, write me a letter and say, "I've represented myself as a psychiatrist at the Bide-A-Wee Golf Club and I have no credentials of any kind." I'll get you some.

Or you meet this guy and if you just look at him and say, "Well, what are you? What's your line of business?" You know?

And the fellow says, "I'm president of the Saxony Mills Corporation, you know, Limited. What's your line of business?"

You say, "Well, I'm a psychiatrist."

And he says, "Oh, you are, you are. One of those headshrinker fellows," and so forth.

And you say, "Yes, yes, that's right. How are you doing?"

And he says, "Well, I'm doing all right. I suppose you're really interested in insane people and that sort of thing."

"No, no, no, mostly interested in corporation presidents."

"Well, what could you do for me?"

"Well, quite a bit as a matter of fact, but we're out here at the golf club right now. This isn't a professional sphere," or something like that. "But here's my card, and I'll come around and see"—

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

you don't make him make the appointment—"I'll come and see you or you report to my office two o'clock next Tuesday."

And he says, "I have a board meeting at two o'clock."

You say, "Good, be at my office."

Shake him down on the needle. Next thing you know, why, you'll have to shake his wife down on the needle, and his daughter down on the needle. And the next thing you know, why, you explain to him, "You know, why you're having so much trouble with your various departments is the executives of each one of these departments is just as guilty as you've been." And then he says, "Fine," so he feeds all these guys through the hopper. Now, you haven't done an awful lot of processing there. Actually, you're just clearing needles and keeping them straight. Well, it'd be quite a thing.

Now, I'm not advocating you do this professionally. I'm not advocating it, I'm not *not* advocating it. I'm just saying this is something to do.

Now, if you got mixed up in governments—I already know that I *can't* go into the Senate office building without winding up processing senators. I always get wound up processing a senator.

Once in a while I get reversed and process a lobbyist. But I've never been able to go up to the Hill in Washington without getting involved as an auditor. Never have been able to. I mean, I've even kept my mouth shut. Of course, they have some vague idea of who I am and that sort of thing.

I had one lovely dinner one night. Halfway through the dinner—it was a absolutely fabulous dinner. It was wonderful. And I was sitting there slopping up the lobster and all the rest. And everything was going along beautifully, you know, and finally, why, the political boss that was sitting alongside of me looked down the table at another fellow there who was quite well known and said to him, "You realize that when I introduced Hubbard to you, he's the Dianetics Hubbard."

Right away, everybody—like this. That was the end of the dinner, as far as I was concerned. I didn't get a chance to eat anything else. Out of revenge I threw them all into engrams.

And one 1.1 started to work me over one way and the other way and expecting I had to defend everything and so on. It's quite interesting. Everybody expects me to defend Dianetics or Scientology to the last ditch. Well, that's fine. I'll go that far. But then they expect me to defend all the conditions of the world and the hell of a state the world is in. Well, that's not so good, because if it wasn't in a hell of a state, we wouldn't be here. Get the idea? So challenging you with the fact that the world is in terrible condition ...

It's very funny. People come around to me all the time, and I'm sure they come around to you, and tell you accusatively that there's just been a murder or a car accident, or that things are running very badly in some quarter or another, or tell you about some quarter of your operation or something of the sort, or that you had a student and he's now going all over town saying so-and-so and so-and-so. What they're doing is saying, "You do something. You do something. You do something. You do something." It's just like they're wound up cuckoo clocks, you know? "You do

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

something. You do something." They expect you to immediately solve all the problems of existence, just as they are, just as you stand there, or explain them all away to them.

Now, I finally developed a mechanism. When people jump me—sometimes people jump me right after a lecture. They're always sorry for it because I always hang them with it.

And they say, "Such-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so is the case," you see? Oh, I don't know, "The fire department is out on strike, and four babies were just murdered down the block" or something like ... something I got nothing to do with. Nothing, you know?

And I'd say, "Well, why aren't you doing something about it?" It's a very emphatic defense, you know? I don't do it unless I feel kind of ornery.

Some little kid comes along and wants to know about something, I'll take an hour and a half and explain it to him, you know, because he really wants to know about it. But somebody else wants to give you all this junk it's just a counter-create, see? So I just turn it right straight around on them, splash, you know?

But the basis of this—being responsible for everything: Well, that's fine. Be responsible for everything if you've got to be responsible for everything and get something done and so forth. But you aren't necessarily responsible for everything that ever happened anyplace. What you *are* responsible for is your own overt acts, your own isolation from your fellows, and for your own failure to help guys here and there who couldn't be as responsible as they might be or are blowing themselves out into the middle of nowhere. See, these are the only things that are important. All else is dross.

Now, as far as being responsible for existence is concerned, and how responsible one is, and so forth, well, you can take just as full a responsibility as you can possibly take right up to here. And of course, by doing anything about man or about the mind or solving some of these evidently too simple secrets for great minds to wrestle with—as I've told you before, the only reason I got it whipped is because I'm not a great mind; I'm just a simple idiot, you know? And ... Very simple. That's an overt act against myself I'll have to run out. And ...

The thing adds up to the fact that sure, I can be responsible for everything, but my being responsible for everything doesn't return any sanity to anybody. See? They've got to take over some of the burden, too. And boy, I get rid of it as fast as they'll put their hands out, let me tell you. Anytime anybody wants to speak up and says, "I want South Indonesia," man, they got it! They act as though I'm in charge of it and maybe I am, but the point is they get it.

Now, here's the thing that messes up all the control and command lines there are, is just secrets and overt acts, the narrowness of the public. Evidently you get into the idea that the public mustn't be let in on anything, that it would be scandalized if this were the case, and horrified if that were the case, and so on.

Particularly in an executive position, or in a large city as its principle auditor or something of the sort, you get so you're saying, "Well, I hope nothing blows up because a..." You know? And you get feeling responsible for everything that's going wrong. And finally you get tired of being responsible for Joe or Bill or Pete or somebody down the block, and all he seems to be able to do

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

is mess up every family he walks into or something like this, you know? And so you just shoot him. You know, in some fashion, you shoot him. And then you find out that, actually, the last family he messed up he didn't mess up, and he was actually trying to put the thing together. And you shot him just at the wrong time, just as he was winning. And here we go. See?

All right. Well, now you can be as responsible for that area as other people will be responsible. And the reason you shot him, of course, was to make him more responsible. But shooting him didn't make him more responsible. Let me point that out. It never does. All it did was to protect, momentarily, somebody else.

Now, anytime you shoot a guy, you got the job of rehabilitating him. But how about this? You've got the job of rehab ... shooting him, and then rehabilitating him; who's going to rehabilitate you if nobody else anyplace takes any responsibility for anything? You very rapidly get on a super-stuck flow. You see? There you are. See?

Now, right in this unit, this 1st Melbourne ACC, you're marked people because you have been through this ACC. You're marked people. You'll be expected, then, to inherit all the responsibility for all the counter-creations and everything else at. .. You'll have altitude.

And you're up in Port Darwin or south Honolulu or lower Chicago, and well, there's just nobody else around that's been through this ACC or any ACC. And there's nobody around but HCAs or HPAs or something. And you're trying to take care of something; you're trying to do right, and you're trying to go along with it. And somebody sits down in front of you and takes up the meter and hands you the cans and goes tongue-tied, do you see, because you have altitude. Well, you get a copy of this tape, and you play it to them. Because there's no sense in just knocking yourself to bits from there on out. You got the idea? Just because you're taking over a zone of responsibility. There are people right here who have done this executive-wise in organizations. There are people here that have done this in cities, and in field operations, so forth, and finally blown themselves halfway into squirreldom and three quarters of the way out of Scientology, you get the idea?

Female voice: Yeah.

They get wrapped around and shaken up one way or the other. All because of what? All because of what? Because nobody is willing to share the responsibility for their altitude, and nobody has really understood the fact that it is the sorry companion of command that one goes alone.

One walks with the ghosts of his own misdeeds, and otherwise he's totally alone. And you get too much operation and protecting too much public front and holding too many facts to your bosom and too many secrets you mustn't disclose, and next thing you know, you wonder what you're doing there. And you have to move off to north Phoenix or Mexico City or Rio or Melbourne or Darwin. And maybe you'd do much better in Tokyo. And maybe Scientology isn't quite right. Maybe you'd kind of better move halfway out of it. And then let's just keep a big toe in it somehow or another.

Well, you just blow yourself off the perimeter.

How do you do this? It's just because you didn't get anybody else to share your command responsibility anyplace. That's the way you wind up, *if you don't watch it.*

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

The only thing that can do you any harm, actually, is your own overt acts. The only way these come about is because you're on an administrative or public responsibility level, which puts you in a position where you have to act against your fellow man according to the optimum solution. And because you find occasionally that your ability to see, and so on, wasn't quite as good as you thought it was, and you shot the wrong dog, you see? That adds up to another one. That adds up to another one. Now it gets real easy and it starts to get kind of automatic. And the next thing you know, why, you say, "Well, before somebody else gets shot around here, I'd better get out of this vicinity." See, it's actually still an optimum solution. But that's going pretty far to make a solution optimum because you're needed where you are. You're not needed in lower Chicago and upper north Amboy. See? You're needed where you are.

Now, once again, organizationally, the Director of Processing should be fully and thoroughly responsible for all cases on staff and particularly, *particularly*, executive cases. And horribly enough should also be responsible over into HCO for cases. Particularly, the Assoc Sec ought to take some responsibility for HCO cases, and HCO ought to take some responsibility for organization and field cases. Some responsibility ought to be taken in this regard. But basically the D of P, the Director of Processing, is the responsible person for organization cases, HASI and HCO, and for field cases. Really, this person is the responsible party, because this is the party that will do the processing. That naturally leaves the Assoc Sec directly responsible for the case of the D of P. That's the way it ordinarily works out you'll find.

Now, you can't leave a staff auditor standing in there forever, unaudited. You can't... You at least better clear up the needle on him once in a while. You see, you're talking about a short operation. You've got to get clever at this, you understand. You've got to make this a quick one. Make this fast. Don't be slumping around doing it slow. Get so you can knock needles down.

Get so you can get real clever at this sort of thing. And then if you knock them down into a weak valence, why, find out their unwillingnesses at giving up the information and bring them back up again.

There's no trick on getting these low needles up. It's just getting the person to take responsibility for what he just told you. See? You've taken the full responsibility for his telling you, and now he hasn't taken the responsibility for telling you, and he'll go down into a low needle status every time.

Now, keep this thing squared away, and you'll be able to live with yourself and your fellow men. You'll be able to live with yourself and the other girls, and you'll be able to take care of your show in Scientology. But you'll find out the closer you get to the top in any area or in any organization, the less actual liking you have for the idea of spilling your guts to an auditor. Because you *have* committed overt acts. It's for sure—for sure.

In the ordinary course of human existence, you commit overt acts. This is it. You have secrets, and things you shouldn't disclose, and to disclose them is an overt act. And, you know, you get all these kind of *rish-rash-oo-ow*. And for a while, why, you'll think all this is very tenuous and extremely delicate and has to be very carefully handled and all that sort of thing. Well, you'll break down out of that fast enough.

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

But you're not going to make it unless the people around you are willing to take some responsibility for *you*. And I know; I speak from experience, bitter experience, over a period of many, many years. I have given congresses when I was so damned sick I couldn't stand up. I've stood up to the public front when my heart was just like a piece of lead. This has been a rough go. Very few people take any responsibility for me.

Now, we've recently had a couple of blowups throughout the world, of executives blowing off of posts. They didn't blow off because they were sacked off. They blew themselves off, basically. These people are well worth salvaging. You understand? And the only reason they blew off is just their compounding overt acts against the staff and the organization and Scientologists. To do an administrative job, they had to stand in there and hold their own feelings down, you understand, and act in the direction they thought was best on the third dynamic or some upper dynamic, you see? And they just let themselves go, and finally the first dynamic just swamped them.

Now, for me to say "Well, you shouldn't let yourself get in that condition" is nonsense, because you *will* let yourself get in that condition. You'd be . . . wouldn't be in Scientology otherwise. You understand? Scientologists aren't people who think very well on the first dynamic, oddly enough. But you sure as the devil better not let people stay around in executive roles, and that sort of thing, unprocessed, because you're going to lose them. And you need them.

There's a great deal of hammer and wrangle and bang where it comes to putting Scientology out through the world. And the people who carry the guidon, more or less, the people who are up there fronting and so forth, are usually there because they can cover up what they themselves feel best, and still be effective on their job. You understand? So they're terribly good at it. Awfully good at it. And nobody ever tears the veil aside. But you're Scientologists; you ought to recognize what's going on.

Now, it isn't actually bad motives or misdeeds, or anything of the sort. Oh, occasionally there are some misdeeds involved in it one way or the other. Pardoning the ladies, you wake up in the wrong bed or something of the sort. These things are rather inevitable in this alley-cat society we live in.

But where your forward progress is concerned, you're not a group of people that is following a person. You're not following a person, you're sharing in the building of a new knowledge and a new world.

People look on this as being "my science." Yeah, I own all of your postulates. I bought them one day at a raffle. Like the devil I did! About the only thing, as I told you the other day, that I have done is organized and put together, and maybe I can look a little bit better than anybody else has been looking for a long time, and so I can see it. But if you can see it, well, so help me Pete, it's yours. Got that?

Audience: Yes.

All right, if it is yours that far, then you're going to be fronting, yourself, along the line one way or the other. And one fine day you're going to feel like blowing off or blowing out or quitting some area or quitting some organization, or blowing yourself off of the top or something like that. Well, you certainly better look at this as a master fact of the whole thing. Your isolation, combined with

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

your overt acts, combined with your secrets, combined with this weak-valence proposition, and so forth, has put you in an unauditable classification, and you better get yourself some auditing. And as I say, get this tape played.

Now, if you're being fronted for in some department, some area, some organization and so forth, by somebody, let's not be so hot and heavy on "Audit only the pes that walk in the front door because they're money." Let's not be so warmed up about auditing only the preclear in the field and that sort of thing, because 111 tell you one of the two greatest Scientologists alive are dead now because they forgot that. That's right. George Wichelow is one of them and Peggy Conway is the other one. And these people are *dead*, and picking up some mock-up someplace or another, and completely lost on the show, you see, for a while, simply because of one thing: always auditing the other fellow, and nobody paid a bit of attention to their case. Up to a point where they just practically didn't think there was anything could be done about their cases. You see?

Now, nobody took any responsibility for them. What responsibility I tried to take for them, I probably didn't try hard enough. You see? Instead of saying to Peggy, "Peggy, you go in and see the Director of Processing tomorrow morning, and they're going to give you an auditor, and you are going to get some processing before you go to South Africa. And that is it, Peggy. And of course, if you don't want to, I can always yank every certificate you've got. Otherwise it's on your free choice."

Now, I didn't say it that tough. I simply said, "Peggy, go in and see the Registrar and get yourself signed up for some processing before you go down to South Africa." And she said, "All right," happily, and that was the last I ever saw of her. She didn't do it. She gets down to South Africa with this tremendous altitude, tremendous public presence, a trained actress, so forth-very, very famous in her day. Nobody ever knew that girl was in trouble. She had a lot of personal affairs banging her around one way or the other. She was getting raked over the coals at home, and an attorney that handled a lot of her legal and monetary affairs turned totally traitor on her and sold her down the river for thirty pieces of silver while she was that far away—South Africa—and it killed Peggy.

Ah, but if somebody had been able to pull a needle down on her that would have been an entirely different proposition. Now, the Scientologists down there tried all they could, *after* she collapsed.

George Wichelow walked off a BScn Course in London; went back over to Jersey. He was feeling bad, and he was mad at himself and mad at everybody else. He only confided to his wife that he felt bad. He didn't confide to anybody else. Nobody took a look at him and saw that George was nervous and upset. And he went off the end of a rock. Fellow fell overboard into the water, and George dived in to save his life and didn't make it. The guy came out, but George didn't. Lack of processing.

Now, there's too much of this sort of thing. If the people are going to carry the ball in Scientology, somebody has got to help carry them. And if you yourself are carrying the ball very heavily in some area then you for sure better make sure that you're in shape to carry the ball without falling on your face. Or blowing yourself off some post from some misguided idea that the post would be better off if you weren't there. Because that's always a lie.

Hubbard, L. R. (1959, 25 November). Individuation. *First Melbourne Advanced Clinical Course*, (5911C25). Lecture conducted from Melbourne, Australia.

Oh, I know organizations try to convince you they got along much better before you came along, but they don't try to convince you very hard of that. I know they give you the idea a little bit like you're horning in on something occasionally when you show up suddenly out of the blue, but they don't mean it.

Any one of us that knows what we know now have a certain value, vested value, in remaining in the mock-up for a while, hum? So let's see if we can't make it stick.

Thank you.