

## TRAINING METHODS

A lecture given on 14 November 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Thank you.

I want to talk to you now about what you could call Standard Operating Procedure, but more particularly it is the series of techniques taught in the HCA Course and the common denominator of these techniques. And I hope at the end of this hour you know more than you did at the beginning of this hour. And I hope I do, too.

Now, I'm merely going to read the HCO Bulletin of October 28, 1956: *„The following training processes are recommended as necessary to the education of an HPA or HCA student..“* (You realize HPA, that's United Kingdom equivalent of an HCA.) *„...from the moment of his enrollment until his graduation. It does not particularly matter whether the HPA or HCA has been indoctrinated in the 'very latest techniques,' but it does matter that he is able to run the following. If he can do this, then he can carry on with almost any other technique.“* I'll repeat that. *„If he can do this, then he can carry on with almost any other technique.“* As a matter of fact, he'd also be able to carry on with psychoanalysis. I mean, it just would go that widely.

Now, the first of this series is Confront a Preclear. You can all have copies of this bulletin if you wish. This is a Training Bulletin which simply goes to training activities, but you can have one. All right.

Now, *„Confront a Preclear,“* number 1: *„This is done by the Indoctrination Course. The student is taught how to handle communication with the preclear by dummy sessions and demonstrations by the Instructor.“*

The dummy sessions are, of course, those six, formerly five, processes which merely assume the attitudes of auditing and handle acknowledgment, origin and the other parts of the communication formula. And we call those dummy sessions, but the odd part of it is that they are tremendously therapeutic. They're very good sessions.

And we „*Confirm and grind in auditor-pc relationship and Rudiments -- 'Look at me. Who am I?' and Reality Scale.*“ We teach all that during the two weeks Indoctrination. No HCA student these days gets out of Indoctrination under two weeks. We just push him right straight on through with this.

Of course, there are other things which are taught to him during that period. A clarification, a new assessment of what he is doing and why he's doing it, and what his goals are, and so forth, are all brought in. He is also taught a tiny little bit about the fact there is an organization here, and there are Instructors, and things like that. He's given a reality on his environment as well as these things. He's also taught a small amount of nomenclature.

But these are all additives. And we can add so much to these two weeks of Indoctrination... Take somebody who is brand-new, who has not even had a basic course: we run him through two weeks of Indoctrination and we have a great tendency to expect of him everything that the rest of us have learned in all these years. And that is not possible, and all it does is confuse the person. So that we keep it simple and what we really grind on are these dummy sessions and the auditor-pc relationship and the rudiments and the Reality Scale. Now, that's all we really grind on during that period.

Let me tell you something a little bit aside about this whole matter of confusion. This is policy, and it is going into effect; it is already in effect elsewhere. It is not, probably, totally in effect everywhere yet. If an auditor is called in suddenly to an HGC or a clinic, and is given a preclear -- and maybe he was only informed Friday or Saturday and brought in to take a preclear on Monday -- no briefing on the latest techniques, no coaching as to how he is to run the preclear, is to be undertaken. There is the preclear, there he is.

Now remember, he's in a new environment, and he's already nerved up a little bit because his auditing results in this particular case are going to show up in black and white with an exclamation point. And now, to this slight tension -- and there's a slight tension; there is, very slight, but it is there -- we now add a tremendous amount of briefing. On Monday morning we feed him full of all of the latest data, all the processes, procedures, auditing, that has gone on and been developed since he was in school. We tell him what he's to run on this preclear, which has never been run on him, and he has no objective reality or subjective reality or anything else on it. He will lay an egg, but thoroughly, because he will be so confused that he won't know which way he's going.

So if he's hired that fast, we don't brief him. See, that's just policy. We just don't brief him on anything. We say, „*There's your auditing room, there is your preclear -- audit.*“ Because after all, this fellow has been trained, he has been getting results, and why chew him up, why invalidate him, why confuse him?

Now, if we hire somebody on the HGC from the field... And we try to do that; we try to hire them from the field rather than from the school. We try to keep, actually, D. Scn level if we possibly can in clinics. It's very hard to do, mostly because people get successful and they got their own part of the world nailed down, or something of this sort, and it's a disturbance to them.

But if we can grab him with any advance at all -- it isn't an emergency -- we bring him in and give him two weeks Indoc. Now, we don't care whether he left Indoc four months ago, see? We just do that. That lets him get used to the environment, get used to the clinic, get used to the people around the place. Gets him so when he gets up in the morning, he'll be able to find his shoes in his new room. Got the idea? He settles down and he gets relaxed about the whole situation.

We actually don't try to indoctrinate him particularly. We just put him through Indoctrination Course. He just takes whatever every other student takes. Why? That is just to let him find the environment as much as anything else. Then we give him extra duties. The pattern that has been established for this is, he's given extra duties which get him around into other branches of this and that, than merely auditing at the clinic, you see? He's asked to do some procurement, and he's asked to do some test grading, and he's asked to do this and he's asked to do that. That is optimum.

But somebody comes in, we put him at work in the clinic, why, we don't do very much teaching. But as soon as -- this person who has been put to work on an emergency basis -- as soon as possible after this, he is pulled off and put back through Indoctrination again, see, if only for a week. We let him do his job on the preclear. Then we pull him off, and not because he did a bad job or a good job, but we know that he could use some auditing, he could use some relaxation, he could use a new address to life in general, and we give him a new start point.

Now, if we're using Indoctrination for all these things, it must be pretty good -- must be pretty good -- and it is. Actually, the technology of teaching an Indoctrination Course which has been gathered together now is quite formidable. And when we have to change personnel in an organization, we get rather upset if we have to change an Indoctrination Instructor, because it's, „*My God. Who... who'll we get?*“ You know? „*How much training time have we got in order to train this man?*“ so on. Because Indoctrination is so much harder to teach than an HCA Course, there's no comparison. It has so much more precise technology connected with it. And it's a pretty important unit.

If you were going to do any training anyplace, just remember that. This Indoctrination is a gee-whizzer. It isn't a light dust-over. You make or break that student in that first week or two of Indoctrination. And if you break him, boy, you've given yourself a lot of trouble for the remainder of any studying he'll do.

All right, now; just giving you the emphasis of Indoctrination. And that, then, occupies an enormous sphere in the HCA training schedule, although it only occupies one quarter of the time. An HCA Course now goes, theoretically, eight weeks.

We'll keep a person in Indoctrination for seven of those eight weeks, if necessary, teach him how to remedy havingness and send him on his way. He'll get results. Get the idea? It's the only technique that he knows; it's the dummy sessions and Remedy of Havingness. He'll get results. It would be better to do that than it would be to fill him full of a lot of processes. Got it?

That's the theory, the philosophy, behind modern training. And modern training is pretty doggone good. You look at the results that it gets and so forth. If you were to

look at the profiles of the students coming out, just as a cross section of students, you would be amazed, amazed. The profiles are now very, very good. We get critical, very critical, of an HCA Course that doesn't enormously improve some profile.

All right. Well, with Indoctrination laid aside, what do we teach him? „2. *ARC Straightwire. This is run as the first process audited by the student on a fellow student...*“ See, he's out of Indoctrination now. He's auditing. He is an auditor. He is no longer doing dummy sessions. And we run ARC Straightwire. Why? It's not therapeutic. I just tell you that bluntly: It's not therapeutic.

A limited use of old-time ARC Straightwire is enormously therapeutic, and after that it declines by the square. We have found that run over a long period of time it picks up all the rest points on the track, as-is-es them, and leaves the fellow in a mass of confusion. So its limit of usability is the discovery that he has a rest point in the past; and after that, skip it. Don't erase what you just discovered: this treasure that he just found of his mother sitting there crying. She was still; she did exist, you see? And this might make him feel very, very sad. Well boy, if you knock that one out, he would then feel very, very confused. He pinned her down finally. He got a good picture of her sitting there still, crying. See? So you see the limited scope of this ARC Straightwire.

Then why do we use it? That's so the auditor can get a reality on the fact that somebody else has a bank. We let him take a look at a lock. We let him take a look at facsimiles, really, but usually these facsimiles which turn up are simply locks. And we let him take a look at this, and he gets some reality on the existence of it.

Now, just as soon as he knows what he's looking at, we reverse this and we run an allied process. „*The barest elements of ARC Straightwire are used, and then the therapeutic version is undertaken, on the basis of (quote) 'Tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting' The basis of this process is to give the student subjective reality on the time track of human beings, and to demonstrate that people slide back into the past and up toward present time as they remember various items, which phenomena should be pointed out to and observed by the student.*“ You start doing „*Something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ on a preclear, and he starts sliding up and down on the time track.

So we first show them they have pictures, and then we show them they can slide on them; it is there. And you know the phenomenon is, a person dives back a little bit into the past and comes up to the present -- just repetitive questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 and 5, probably ran like this: Question 1, near present time; question 2, a few months ago; question 3, two years ago; question 4, three weeks ago; question 5, almost present time; question 6, four years ago. You got that? It's back into the past and up, and then deeper and deeper into the past, then shallower into the past, and deeper into the past, and so forth.

And the whole phenomena of the time track can be observed, then, under this ARC Straightwire therapeutic version, which is „*Tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ But remember -- remember -- that that too is not very therapeutic. It's not very therapeutic compared to a number of things because in the final analysis it'll reduce havingness. That's for sure.

The best possible version of this that communicates to practically any preclear alive is *„Look around and tell me something you wouldn't mind forgetting“* You got that? But that wouldn't give this student any reality on anybody's time track. So we just choose the lesser of two evils, and we use that particular process.

*„3. Subjective Havingness.“* Now, why do we do Subjective Havingness? -- this terribly difficult, abstruse technique, and so on. Well, we're just giving him more reality on the time track, that's all. And now we have added to facsimiles, not just pictures of something that happened, but pictures he makes up. And we get the other type of track phenomena that we are interested in, in Scientology.

*„Subjective Havingness. This should be run both to give the student reality on the bank of the human being and upon havingness itself. If the case being audited on Subjective Havingness is a black case, then the student is required to have the preclear mock up a blackness or black objects in the blackness and remedy the havingness with those, regardless of any dope-off, until the individual has a clear field or can go on to some other process.“*

Now, we teach him a total Remedy of Havingness. That is, *„Mock it up; push it in. Mock it up; let it remain. Mock it up and throw it away.“* Those are the three complete steps of a Remedy of Havingness as they have finally evolved and developed.

It's terrific auditing. In my own auditing, if I take a preclear on, I make fairly sure that the preclear is in communication with me and his environment somewhat. And without taking too much time, then, I make sure that I can give him a Subjective Remedy of Havingness. I patch him up on a Subjective Havingness basis. Why? Because then I can't get him into trouble. After that, I can't get him into trouble, you see? Because if he gets too bad off and facsimiles get too thoroughly in restimulation, we can always remedy havingness and kick them out. So number 1 is communication, number 2 is Subjective Havingness. Got it? Now, ARC Straightwire, and so on, is a training process. But these two processes, Confront a Preclear -- get the preclear to confront an auditor, from my viewpoint, you see, in auditing somebody -- that's number 1: communication. Get him to find out he actually can sit there; it won't kill him to talk to me, and so forth. And then the next thing is just this one thing, Subjective Havingness. So that is your second step on any SLP. Got that? That's your second step.

All right, now, number 4: *„8-C, Part A, B, and C,“* -- this is what we train them in -- *„with emphasis on A and instruction with regard to the preclear's ability to handle decisions. This is the first walk-about process and is vital in the training of a Scientologist.“* 8-C, Part A is the one there that's given the stress; 8-C, Part A. So if we're using this for training, it certainly would belong, then, on an SLP, wouldn't it? Hm? And it certainly does. And I'll tell you much more about it than is on this mimeo in just a moment.

*„5. Opening Procedure by Duplication, old style. The 'not-know' version could be run, but it is a little complicated.“* Boy, I bet you thought you'd never see that one again. Op Pro by Dup. When it works, it's a killer.

Now we give them *„Over and Under on the Bank, making things solid.“* That's just Over and Under, number 6.

Number 7: *„Keeping Things From Going Away, in terms of small alternate objects, with concentration on the fact that this is a Havingness Process, and also holds things still.“* Just keeping things from going away, on two objects in the room, other mechanisms.

Number 8: *„Terrible Trio, both sides, the 'can have' for the preclear and 'can't have' for the pre-clear's enemies.“*

*„Training should be completed with a very fast review of the more recent processes, and giving these into the student's hands, not as something in which he has been trained but as something he can use as fast as he attains reality upon them.“* We give him a rundown on what we're doing these days. But we teach him these other things.

*„Of the above list, the first six are the most important, from the standpoint of training“* But, of course, the Terrible Trio is most important from the standpoint of therapy.

*„Throughout training the student should be carefully monitored as to his ability to communicate with his preclear. Auditing procedure should not be neglected, from the moment of entrance into Indoctrination until graduation, since it is style of auditing we wish to achieve rather than teaching of processes.“*

*„When the student is taught data, he should be given a high power of choice over the data in which he is instructed, but he should be instructed in such a way that he can achieve the reality of the data, since it is true and factual.“*

Why wouldn't you bother to teach anybody a technique like S-C-S, Stop-C-S? Why isn't that included in such a training regimen? We want him to boot himself through this on his own time, if you please. Very therapeutic for an auditor. He'll run it on people. Good stuff. But look, if he can do all of these other techniques, he can certainly do S-C-S and Stop-C-S and any dozen versions of it, don't you see? You got the idea of it?

Well, why is this training procedure? Why? Why is that? It isn't part of this mimeograph, but I'm going to tell you: Because these are the key confronting processes. These are the key confronting processes. That's very important.

I'm going to define awareness for you in a way that is tremendously usable: Awareness consists of a willingness to confront. Anything of which one is aware, he has some willingness to confront. That is all there is to awareness.

We're trying to increase people's awareness; we're trying to increase people's awareness. Well, we have a way of doing it now directly, after six years of fumbling around. Why does somebody drive a car so much better if you run 8-C, Part A on a car? Why can a person go flunk a driver's test and come home, get audited on 8-C, Part A, with no further instruction, and go back and pass it with the highest possible mark, without learning any more about driving? That's because we raised his awareness of the car, just that.

Now, if we raised his awareness of that car, other cars and the road by making him confront that car, other cars and the road, and then just before we let the Examiner examine him, why, we had our pc walk up to the Examiner and confront him a few times -- making the Examiner stand there obediently -- he would have a driving capability that that Examiner had never before seen. Do you see this? Now, we have in-

creased his awareness of a task by increasing his awareness of the parts of that task. We did that by making him confront parts of that task. And that, today, is auditing.

The Reality Scale will be seen at once to evolve from this fact. At first an individual is unwilling to confront anything. And then he's unwilling to confront a line, and then the line and a ghost of a terminal. And then he no longer has to confront the line, he can confront the terminals. And then he doesn't have to confront the terminals to know completely; he only has to be able to confront the agreement. And if he can undertake and confront, himself, the responsibility for creating a postulate, then he is able to create reality.

As far as auditing is concerned, it boils down to this -- in the work-a-day world of auditing. I'm not now talking to you about high theory. We can talk about considerations; we could talk about ways and means of going about these things; we can talk about ways and means of improving these things and place other evaluations on other things. That's all very, very important -- all of the Axioms, all of the Dianetic Axioms, the processes of thought, the grades of mind, all of these various things. But from the standpoint of the practical, work-a-day world of auditing, we're not interested in making -- let's be factual -- we're not interested in making our preclear create a universe, whap! and shake God by the right hand. See? We're not interested in that. We're interested in putting somebody back in the run. We're interested in putting him into a condition where he can perform, where he can associate, where he can be social, and where he can live this game called life.

And that all falls out of just this one thing: Confronting -- his awareness, his confronting. Got it? It's horrible simplicity. You don't have to accept it at all until you experience that fact. Don't have to accept it for a minute unless it works. This one, however, I think you will find works all the way through.

Why do we teach a student ARC Straightwire, which honestly and amongst ourselves, is rather bad for the preclear? That's to teach him that he can make a preclear confront a bank, see?

Preclear is always willing to sit there and maunder around into the past. All of a sudden he says, „*What do you know! I can make this preclear confront the past. He's got something there to confront.*“ We make the student aware of it by showing him that it's possible to get somebody to confront it. So it wasn't just what you thought there, originally. You thought it was a simple thing, that he simply ran it and the other guy said it was there, and so he said it was there, and that was it. No, by golly, do you know he'd never become aware of it necessarily if the other fellow simply said it was there? He could go around and talk to 8,722 people in succession, asking each one of them if they remembered things by looking at pictures and get a „yes“ from every one, and still not have an awareness of anybody else's track, because he didn't make anybody confront one. That is left for auditing.

Now, we run „*Something you wouldn't mind forgetting*“ which makes a preclear confront all of the horrible, nasty, mean, wicked and unpleasant things there are. And the technique just saws through very nicely. And the auditor just sits there and says, „*What do... Ha-ha! What do you know! I got this guy confronting murder and rape and sudden death. Ha-*

*ha! Lookit, I've got him confronting them.* “ And therefore he can then, as an auditor, become aware of the existence of those things in somebody else's mind, because he has made somebody confront them. You understand? The step of confrontingness intervenes. And that is what monitors, for this work-a-day world, circa 1956, the awareness of people.

All confrontingness does is give us a road back to lost abilities, lost awarenesses. That's all it does. It is really not even an essential part of the philosophy of life. But it is this fantastic thing: a road back, a means, an ability to regain awarenesses.

One of our evening students stopped me the other evening and he asked me, *„What about this whole track?“* he said.

I said, *„Well, it's interesting. It's electropsychometric phenomena. It's been measured on a electropsychometer. You'll find it in people. Psychometers respond to these questions.“* Tried to let it go at that.

He didn't let it go. He wouldn't let it go at that. He said, *„What's this thing called Para-Scientology?“*

So I said, *„Para-Scientology is that branch of Scientology which exceeds the reality of an individual.“*

And he says, *„What's that?“*

And I said, *„All right.“* I said, *„You right now are quite aware of your own track, and your fellow students' tracks, but you probably are not aware of whole track in any way, shape or form.“*

*„That's right,“* he says.

I says, *„Well, then the whole track is Para-Scientology to you.“* And I said, *„Your realm of Scientology consists of your track, your student's track and the fact that you're alive, and are walking around and communicating to people.“*

*„Oh!“* he says, *„Oh well... Yeah,“* he said, *„but what would Para- Scientology [be to] somebody walking down the street?“*

*„Well,“* I said, *„that would be the whole of Scientology, except the fact that he is alive and there is some hope. You say to him, 'You alive?' You know, he's asked you, 'What is this thing called Scientology.' You say, 'Well, are you alive?' And he says, 'Yeah, yeah. See? See? Know that.' And you say, 'Well, Scientology offers some hope for greater ability.' Fellow can accept this; he can accept he's alive. He can accept that Scientology embraces this aliveness and the fact that there's some hope for being more alive. And that, in its totality, is Scientology to that person. And everything else is Para-Scientology.“*

*„Well!“* he says. *„How, then, do I get any awareness of these things?“*

See, right away he wanted to peel back that curtain called *„Para.“* *„How do I get any awareness of these things?“*

And I said, *„Well, you look at them; you investigate them; you view them; you make up your own mind whether or not they exist, and so would roll back the curtain. And if it rolls back upon a different scene than those which I have described to you, that's your good fortune. And if it rolls back on*



*the same scene I have described to you, why, that's my good prediction. But it doesn't have to roll back on any scene at all. That's all up to you.*“

Only reason I'm telling you this is not because I'm smart; merely because I've had to discuss it often. And it gets down to this fine point: If you say, *„On your own determinism, you may confront life or not confront it, as you wish. And having confronted it, you may accept or reject any part of it or any description of it which you have received from us,*“ and you have actually persuaded somebody to confront more of life. And in that mechanism alone you have increased his IQ and improved his profile.

Now, watch that. Watch that carefully, because it tells you at once that a great deal of mechanical grinding in auditing might not do as much as ten minutes of clever auditing -- very clever auditing.

Ten minutes of clever auditing might only consist of a question such as this: We have a young man who has been hurt in a race. He ran off the track and he bumped his head on the steering wheel, or did some other horrible thing. By the way, from the number of race cars I've seen rolled here in the last couple of years, I believe they're building them that way. But I've seen more cars roll and people walk away from them than ever before. It's quite amazing. Racing has improved.

And we find this young man: He's bumped his head on the steering wheel, and we say to him, *„Where did you do it?‟* (Not really *„What happened?‟* see? That's what he's willing to talk about.) *„Where'd you do it? What part went wrong? Where's the car now?‟* Got it? All of a sudden the somatic is liable to kick out, because these guys are not in bad shape, see?

He'll say, *„What happened to my head bump?‟*

Life taught him not to confront his gear shift or the steering wheel. See, that was the effort of instruction: *„Don't confront me! I'm dangerous! I carry two guns and smoke dynamite. Don't confront me.*“

And you, the auditor, say, *„Oh yeah? Why do you load those two guns with water, and why do you have candy dribbling out of the end of that dynamite you're smoking?‟*

Somebody says, *„I'm foiled. Curses.*“ Because the truth of the matter is there's no dynamite and there are no guns, from a thetan's viewpoint, that are dangerous enough. There isn't any such thing as an extremity of danger to that degree. It's only when we get into the complexities, the protectivenesses, when we have responsibilities for other things, people, when we've inherited a vast myriad of other problems, that we can conceive of this thing *„too dangerous to confront.*“

Therefore, it is very, very easy for an auditor to peel back all of these additive assumptions that *„things are too dangerous to confront‟* to the naked truth of the matter: Nothing is too dangerous to confront for a thetan. And this is the action of auditing. His awareness fades and is pulled in upon himself to the degree that he says things are too dangerous to confront.

He is no longer capable, he says, of confronting these various things. *„The steady grind down there at the factory is too much for me. I am no longer willing to confront this steady grind. I*

*just can't face it anymore. I can't face it. I can't. I can't. I can't. I mean, the monotony of going to work every morning and standing there all day long spitting into the tobacco bins. I just can't stand this,*“ you know? Get the idea? I don't know why he can't stand it. This is a -- but he seems to have a reason.

So as an auditor I merely show him he can -- on his own determinism, of course.

Now, he was standing there on somebody else's determinism, probably, resenting the duresses and problems which had forced him to stand there, so as to have a paycheck, so as to feed his stomach, so as to feed some other stomachs, so as to have a roof over his house rather than the usual, fashionable holes. And his determinisms were switched on this pretty badly. Determinisms were badly switched in some fashion.

And the truth of the matter was, he wasn't confronting things; things were making him confront things. You got it? So it was a no-game condition. He wasn't doing it. See, he wasn't making himself confront all these things. He was saying, *„All these things are making me confront all these things, and therefore I don't have any decision in this. I have no share in this. I am not capable of facing this any longer because one of these days, why, these postulates will win out, and I'll just stand here rock-bound forever with the soles of my feet rooted into the ground, growing downward toward the center of Earth for eighteen thousand miles.*“ I know that's difficult to do, but they manage it.

So what you're handling, in essence, is determinism of confronting. Now, you make a preclear make himself confront, and you've done it. See? You make a preclear make himself confront. Got it? It's very fascinating. The truth of the matter is you're making him confront things, and you're another determinism. So therefore, he must clearly understand that it is otherwise. Truth of the matter is, he's there under his own election.

Where this comes in is, did the preclear choose to be audited on his own determinism? If the preclear did not, then this law of confrontingness (him doing it) is thoroughly violated, and is violated so much that the therapy which extends from that point is zero or less. We got this now?

Now, an auditor would have to patch up, then, the decision of the person to be there. We'd have to get him to make the postulate that he wanted the auditing, that he wanted to be there, and that it was on his own choice; it wasn't because his wife or his job or something else forced him to be there.

This, by the way, is the make and break of many cases, and it never comes under the inspection of the auditor unless the auditor willfully looks it over.

*„What you doing there?“* is a technique I used with considerable success on a fellow. *„What are you doing there?“* Fellow walked in rather apathetically, said, *„I want some auditing. You're the only person in the world that can audit me,*“ and so forth.

You know, I always feel mad when people tell me that. I'm sort of one of these guys that *„love me, love my dog“* sort of things, you know? *„Love me, love my family.*“ *„If you're my friend, you're the friend of my company and regiment,*“ you know? Very much this sort of thing. It starts lots more fights if you look at things that way.

But the truth of the matter is, somebody comes up to me and tells me, „*You are the only one who can audit me. Only you,*“ they probably, usually, are merely trying to beef up my ego. But the sober truth of the matter is they insult me by insulting all of my friends, see? All of my fellow auditors and people I have trained, and that sort of thing: They're invalidating them. And by invalidating them, they invalidate me, you see?

So somebody comes in with this kind of a pitch, I usually give them a bad time. First place, I know that they've got an only- one-can-help-me sort of thing. Well, that's perfectly all right. As a matter of fact they used to have a custom in Europe, which was a fascinating custom: the noblest knight. If the noblest knight would touch their wounds, they would heal -- or touch their illness, or something of this sort. People would be dragged across a thousand miles of wilderness up to some castle or another to have the noblest knight of all lay a hand on the leprosy or something of that sort. It was a good way to get leprosy scattered around.

Anyway, the truth of the matter is that this is not particularly flattering. It means the person is so important they need this special attention, and all kinds of manifestations.

I always jump sideways when somebody tells me how much the solution of this case will do for Scientology. I instantly get out my little book mentally and I put them clear down at the bottom of the list, which reads, „*For consideration in order*“ -- and they go clear on down to the bottom of the list. „*If you just solved this little girl's case, it'll do so much for Scientology in Keokuk. You know, everybody has their eye on this case. And it's a very famous case,*“ and that sort of thing. I just put the little girl from Keokuk way down at the bottom of the list.

Unfortunately true, because experience bitterly has told me that the people who come in „*that only I can audit*“ and this case, „*the solution of which will do so much for Scientology,*“ are alike more trouble for me and the people around me than I care to list up. They are dynamite cases. So when something like this walks up, I'm apt to be a little bit snide and pleasant with reservations, snarly occasionally.

I had such a case one time, and I says to the person nothing, nothing but this as an auditing question: „*What you doing there?*“ Guy walked in, said I was the only person in the world could audit him, wouldn't go through any kind of channels, wouldn't see anybody else. So he just came in and sat there, and I just asked him, „*What you doing there? What you doing there? What you doing there? What you doing there?*“ That's all.

We get more of these cases abroad, by the way, than we do at home.

„*What you doing there?*“ Boy, person had more answers that were off the subject. And I just wondered how long we could keep this game up. I wasn't auditing him; I didn't start a session, didn't intend to do anything for the person or anything else. I just kept asking him, „*Well, you're sitting there. That's you sitting in the chair. What are you doing there?*“

Explanations, explanations, excuses and so forth. Finally he came around to the fact that life had sent him. At one time some saints had sent him -- that life had sent him, and so forth. And after a while he says, „*Hub! I'm sitting here because I decided I needed some auditing*“

And after he'd said this six or eight times, and I knew it wasn't wearing out -- it actually was an idea he had come by and so forth, I said, „*All right, then go see the Registrar and report over to the clinic.*“ And the person did, as mild as a lamb.

Months later, I find out that I cracked his case during that session! He had decided to do something on his own determinism for the first time in his life.

Well now, here's the value then, here's the value of these computations. SLP 8, in its final form, is simply a number of ways to remedy a person's willingness to confront and to be there and to find out where he is. Many top processes, a great many processes -- all of which I will list for you and go over with you and so forth -- but that is simply the common denominator of the whole thing.

Now, I have talked to you about training and said this was the common denominator of training solely and entirely because it really is the guts of SLP 8 right there.

You realize after a student had gone through all of these processes and learned to do them well... You can remember doing Opening Procedure by Duplication, can't you? Wonderful. I mean, wow! Grind, grind, grind. You know, you do that an hour and a half and -- I've got to tell you more about that -- and it's worse than not doing it at all. You have to do it much longer than that. But the grind, grind, grind of this...

Actually, at the time, we considered it simply necessary in training because auditors weren't duplicating commands. They'd keep chasing off and Q-and-Aing with the preclears, and we put this in there as a discipline. And now I'm having quite the reverse trouble. It's almost all my persuasion is worth trying to get an auditor at the HGC to shift off on to some other process.

„*Oh, but this one is working*“ he says. „*Doing fine. We're going into our fourth day of 8-C, Part A.*“

„*Your fourth day! You've had twenty hours of this.*“ „*I didn't estimate that case,*“ I say to myself privately, „*as needing twenty hours of 8-C, Part A. Well, he's doing fine. He's still turning on cognitions and so forth, and...*“

Well, so this one really laid one in on the track; it said you should continue a process.

All of these things have -- as many of you I'm talking to at this minute know very well -- they have a considerable background, a considerable history. Each one of them, really, has its own mass of adventures.

It's quite interesting, though, that number 6 -- Over and Under on the Bank, making things solid -- is the least monkeyed with by auditors these days. They're doing it the least. And of all these processes it's probably the toughest, the strongest and the basic undercutting process of the whole series of cases. The roughest ones will respond to Over and Under on the Bank. It's twice as wild as running engrams. You're just running an engram a minute, I mean, as far as that's concerned. It's quite a process. But it's interesting that people aren't running it.

That tells you that today, in 1956, we as a group are less willing to confront the heavy incidents of the bank than we were in 1950. For instance, if I'd come out with Over

and Under in the fall of '50, or in the spring of '51, wow! It's a good thing I didn't; you can do it wrong so many ways.

But if I had, boy, there'd have just been no holding anybody. You'd have had people chasing up and down the time track, and -- „*All right, what are you looking at?*“

„*Oh, I'm looking at a doctor bending over my mother here.*“

„*Well, that's fine. Make it solid.*“ I can just see this now: The blood would be spattering in all directions.

And today we're walking straight back up to that action. I believe it's bec-- many auditors have not run this because they have not envisioned the tremendous amount of action contained in it. That is, they considered it not too adventurous. It didn't have too much motion connected with it.

Actually has a tremendous amount of motion and action connected with it. But it's directly making somebody confront the very heaviest parts of his bank -- thud! -- by letting him avoid them. See, you find the center pin where he's hung up -- that you get with an age flash -- and that's what he's supposed to avoid. You're going to permit him to avoid that by never hitting it. And then you get him to hit everything else. And he eventually obsessively starts to hit this center point. I mean, he can't avoid it; he can't get away from it. He just keeps running it.

And you say, „*No, no, no, no, let's go earlier. And let's go later, and let's make it solid,*“ and so on. And eventually he simplifies the whole thing down to just letting it go. He just does not pay too much more attention to it; it simply releases. And after that he's perfectly willing to confront it.

But there is an extremity of confrontingness -- that number 6 as given there.

Now, the activity of an auditor these days is governed by a law, which is an interesting one, which says that if you start any confronting process, you better flatten it.

Now, let's look why that is. We take any process which is a direct confronting process, we make the preclear confront it, and we don't finish it. That means we didn't really make him confront it, don't you see? He never reached a satisfactory confrontingness from his standpoint on 8-C, Part A. And therefore, an auditor who starts one of these confrontingness processes, no matter what version -- and get this clause in here -- which then turns on somatics (got that?) must then flatten that process regardless how many hours of the intensive it devours, and must make a note that it is not flat, if at the intensive's end it is not. Because it gives the preclear a failure, and it gives the auditor a failure.

If one of these confronting processes then turns on somatics... You just sailed into the blue, and you decided that you would run 8-C, Part A and, you know, get the guy going here a little bit here, you know, and square him around before we got started on something real. And he felt the wall, and he says, „*Yes.*“

And you say, „*What you wiggling your head for?*“ you say, „*It just wiggles.*“

*„That's funny. I never wiggled my head before. Hurts. Neck... neck hurts. That's what's the matter. Got a pain here in the neck.“*

Oh brother, you've had it. I mean, that's it! Don't you see? You have found something he will almost confront, and the action of confronting it is turning on somatics, which tells you that he can almost confront it, that he is not entirely unwilling to confront it, but that something around there says he sure as hell better not. Don't you see? You've just been presented on a silver platter with why people have difficulties with their banks. See, there it is. It's lying right in your lap.

I mean, you asked him to feel the wall; he got a pain in his neck. He can do it almost, but supposing he walks up to the wall -- flop -- puts his hand on it. He's all set. And he walks over to the other wall, and he flops, and there's nothing happening, you know? *„Oh, I can keep this up as long as you can,“* he says, and flop and so on, flop, so on. Skip it! One of two things: He can either confront it perfectly, which is doubtful at the beginning of any auditing career (people have auditing careers these days, you know) - - he can do it -- or it is just so far above anything he is capable of confronting that there is no edge in.

Now, in any process you discover a slight ability, or knowledge of an inability -- which is, by the way, an awareness itself of an ability; an awareness of ability is a knowledge that one can't do it -- and discovering that, we better it by improving his ability to confront those terminals connected with it. Got it? We confront those objects which are associated with this ability, and we will improve that ability to confront.

But there has to be some ability there to be improved. And sometimes there is so little ability there -- as in the case of 8-C, Part A -- to confront a wall, that there is nothing to improve. Don't you see that? He's not able enough to do it so that you can improve it. Then you just better do it a few times and say, *„Well, it didn't turn on any somatics; he isn't comm lagging; he isn't -- there is no real consideration or interest in this sort of thing. We had certainly better find something he can't almost confront. Let's find something he can't almost confront. Let's find something that there is enough awareness connected with so that the awareness can be improved.“*

Now, this boy who is a very bad case and goes around and flops his hand against the wall and flops his hand against another wall and flops his hand, and so on, and he just walks around, and he seems to do it very well, the auditor is actually making the body confront the wall. And a good auditor can do this rather easily. He can make a body walk.

I seared myself a few months ago by making one walk and talk! I went back home quickly. I said, *„Skip this.“* I hear of people all the time going around and interfering with the queen's vocal cords, and making her make some kind of speech that she didn't intend to make or doing something in congress or making somebody sign letters. But you know I suspect them myself, because that scares me when I really do it. That just scares me stiff. I mean, I all of a sudden envision a long vista of being dead in their head for I don't know how long, you know? Otherwise, I'm perfectly willing to confront anything!

I suppose somebody someday will have to run me: „*Be dead in his head,*“ you know?

Now, abilities are all positive. They are not negative, which is the only other thing you really need to know about anything. They are not negative. Abilities are not inabilities. Sounds like an awfully obvious remark, and I'm sure that it is too obvious to be easily assimilated everywhere, but it's true. Don't process the inability; improve the ability and you always win. Got that?

You can just skip noncommunication as a process. You can just skip it entirely, and you will always win.

You can occasionally win with some noncommunication process, you know -- inability process: „*All right, give me three reasons why you can't drive a car.*“ The guy gives you three reasons, decides it's silly, and he can drive a car. Something dumb like this, you see? That's an inability direction. We make him repeat the inability or dramatize the inability or dramatize the noncommunication to make him recover from it. No, we don't do that with success.

We do quite something else with our best success, and our best success always comes from processing the ability to make it more so. In other words, we find something he can confront and then make him confront it better, without reaction. Got that? We don't find something he can't confront and then force him to confront it.

We try to pick this up at all times at some propitious point of the DEI Scale, and we'll find out that there's plenty left there to improve. And you improve a little bit of a pre-clear, you can improve something else, and you can gradually wind him up and get him out of the mire.

The positive way of processing is to process the abilities to improve them, thus you will increase both the ability to confront and thus the awareness, and thus the ability, and thus the livingness of a pre-clear.

Thank you.

[End of Lecture]