NEW TRAINING SECTIONS

A lecture given on
15 May 1962

All right. Here we are 15 May AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we got a lot of territory to cover. I've had a week off. Did any of you see the quotes around the off? I ought to take a week off one of these days.

All right. A new thing has happened after a year of teaching the Special Briefing Course at Saint Hill. Anniversary, you know, passed a couple of weeks ago. We always celebrate anniversaries. We haven't got our patent serve-it-up-in-a-hurry copper kitchen out here going, so that we can serve up a party real fast, so I had to change everything around to celebrate it.

And this is quite interesting as an occasion because it lays down a brand-new pattern for all training courses in Scientology and this course is laid down in the Academies.

Now as is usual, when you get a course overlap of this type, you get advanced material being taught at the fundamental level then it is up to advanced students to learn the fundamentals. And there's about where you fit right now. Oh, it doesn't do very much. It just makes it necessary for you take a whole HPA course while you're here. But you're doing that anyway, so what's the difference.

Frankly, no course materials have been altered. Course materials are the same as before, but a whole new section has been added and a tremendous number of checkpoints have been added to the course. And this is the advent of the Practical Section.

Now, as we have learned, people can confront doingness. They can confront doingness, when you kick them in the back of the head, hard.

With what glee will people confront thought. It's marvelous, you know. It's a—they go around and there's a thought and they'll confront that and there's a theory and they'll confront that and there's another thought and they'll confront that. And they're happy as clams and they'll just go around confronting thoughts.

Now, don't mistake it. I'm not running down Mike's section here. Data is very important. But there is something a little harder to confront than data. And that is its application and doingness.

And right away with the advent of the Practical Section—it ran fine the first day. you see, it's a little bit harder to confront the doingness of it all. You can get somebody to pass a bulletin that says, "At the given instant when the pc screams 'I do not want to be audited by you,'" you promptly say to the pc, "Shut up." you see, whatever the bulletin says, you see.

And you get the fellow in session. See, you got—you got the bulletin down pat. I mean Mike gave you the okay on it and everything. And you got that all set and everything. That was easy. And you sit down in session and the pc rears back and says, "I don't want to be audited by you."

And you say, "Uh—uh . . ." See, that's—that subtle difference. There's a lot . . . It's a very important difference too. And sure enough, we put in—well, we put in a whole Practical Section to take care of this difference. It's the third pin of training It's always been there more or less. you had the Comm Course, you've had Upper Indoc courses. You've had various doingness activities. But now this puts it in as a parallel section to actual auditing with a bunch of new TRs and a lot of other things.

But this doingness—people will confront thinkingness before they will confront doingness—is quite marvelous because the first day the Practical Section ran beautifully. See, there was quite a few people being checked out and everybody was happy about it and so forth. And I came down today, in the afternoon and there were four students with two Instructors.

In other words, not only will people do this, but the course started to dramatize it. Here were ten people in here studying theory with great avidity and only four of them had moved over into the Practical Section to brush up on their TRs and things. That's quite marvelous, because let me tell you, there's not a single one of you here could pass the Practical Section. And every one of you have got to go all the way through it. I know somebody who's just about ready to leave. You see. You've had it, see.

But anyhow, and here were four students, see. Four students were sitting there, getting checked out on body motions to the E-Meter and so forth. And here were ten sitting in here listening to tapes happily and reading bulletins happily, you see and then the practical room was practically empty.

Now, this can go too far and you can get to a point where you won't do any theory. That's not what we want. We want a decent balance in these things. But right now at this particular stage of the game, those of you who can do practical, of course, would check out on it rapidly. See. And those of you who can't certainly better learn it.

And here's the background music back of this new course design.

You yourself could learn a great deal about the constitution of the human mind and reaction of pcs if your technical application of procedure was perfect.

If your procedure was perfect, you would never get any of these wild varieties which you think sometimes exist in the mind. They don't exist in the mind. They exist in your procedure. You see?

So a lot of your understanding of the mind is blurred for lack of an absolutely perfect application of Scientology to the pc. And you'll see these things just whir off, just whiz-whiz-whiz-whiz-whiz, see. And you'll see all the wheels and where they turn and—and so forth, you see? Because at no time is the pc being distracted by any oddball activity on the part of the auditor. See, at no time—at no time.

But let's look at this now. Let's take an auditor and every time the pc . . . Well, the rule is that when confronted with the unusual, do the usual. And that is one of these nice, large, solid stable data that you can hang onto that will get you over more falls and slumps and crashes than you ever heard of.

Now, you see, the pc has a different case than any other case in the world. We admit this. We agree with this completely, except today there's not one iota of difference.

Yeah, but the pc, he thinks he's got a different case than everybody else in the whole world. Well, he hasn't. Not in terms of basic fundamentals. His case is—runs exactly on the same fundamentals as everybody else's case. He's a thetan. He's here. So all the fundamentals must be the same or he wouldn't be that knuckleheaded. You get the idea?

He's right here in this universe, see? He's here in this universe, so he arrived on the same course as all of his cohorts, buddies and fellar thetans. So it's obvious that he must be running on the same fundamentals. But everybody thinks they have a very unusual case.

So they sit down and give you a sales talk of unusuality. And you—I don't care what you expect from a pc, sooner or later the pc is going to sell you the unusuality of it all.

In other words, you look on the pc as a salesman of differences. A pc will always come up with the unusual. It's always different. It's always unusual. He's always going to do something else. Well, that's his privilege. Nonduplication might be said to be the common denominator of his whole case, so why shouldn't he come up with unusuals? Every time he starts in dramatizing, he comes up with something different, doesn't he?

He comes up with a nonduplicate of the human race. Well, that's what his case is—a series of nonduplicates. So he's sitting there and of course he's nonduplicating What else can he do with the bank he's got?

And God help the auditor if he ever does anything but the usual.

The second the auditor buys the unusualness, the auditor teams up with the pc's reactive bank and the reactive bank of the pc and the auditor then process the thetan called the pc. See, after that there's nothing else happens. We've got a reactive bank busily processing the pc along with some help from the auditor. Ha! Happens to be the last checkpoint here on HCO Policy Letter 3 May 1962, PRACTICAL AUDITING SKILLS. There's a long checksheet here and on the last of it, it says "holding constant against adversity."

Well, adversity is just being solely unusual and holding up against it is just doing the usual. I mean it's as simple as that. It's terribly simple once you get the grasp of it.

But as long as everything looks all different to you too, you're going to get the wildest ideas of the human mind you ever heard of if your auditing procedure is wild.

If your application of auditing to the pc is wild, inconstant, variable, wobbly, then you're going to get the wildest ideas of what the human mind is all about. And you get a lot of help in getting these ideas, too. you sit down and one day, why, you're auditing this—this well, this cop. And he's going yippety-yap-bop-bop, something of the sort and—and "The world really doesn't understand me. I am sweet and kind and good and every time I shoot somebody, an innocent bystander or anything, people get down on me. And they're mean to me," and he's going on like this, you see.

And the auditor says, "You know, this—the world really is being mean to this fellow, you know."

And he's prepchecking or something and he says, "Well, who's been mean to you?"

And all of a sudden the cop makes a terrific resurgence of case. That's not according to the rule book. How do you make all this resurgence suddenly? Graph does a jump. He loses his lumbosis and his pistolitis—dreadful disease cops get. What happened?

And you say, "Well, you know, you really had better run motivators on the pc because if you don't run motivators, why, look it there. I would have missed this cop."

Of course, you don't notice in two months. He fell on his head and shot the Chief of Police. But that's beside the point.

You totally misinterpreted what happened. See, you Q-and-Aed with the situation. You didn't hold up against adversity and you said, "Oh, you poor fellow. You mean to say these criminals groan and scream when they're being shot and you just—so that—you just—and it affects your migraine. You poor fellow. Now, what criminals have groaned and screamed at you?"

No, the only resurgence you got in the case is it's the first time anybody had ever gotten acknowledgment through to him. you see, you got the same case resurgence that you get if you acknowledged anything or anybody. It's pretty hard to punch an acknowledgment home, but in this particular case, what he did was interpret sympathy or something like that as an

acknowledgment and he won in spite of the fact that you ran a motivator. See. And the motivator had nothing to do with it. And Prepchecking didn't have anything to do with it. you would have gotten the same effect if you had been sitting in his office, see?

So right away you say, "Well, is there something about this overt-motivator sequence?" you see and you go astray and so forth.

Well, now look, if you really, really knew your auditing head-on, the situation would have been something like it was, "Well, this guy keeps on going like this, he probably never been acknowledged, you know." And you say, "Well, gee-whiz, all right. Well, doggone. All right. And go on and scream. All right. Mm. Good. Bothers you, huh? Good. All right. Hm. Yeah, I got that. Yeah, I got that. Somebody really ought to give you a hand. Now, let's see. Now, what have you done to a criminal?"

You see and you would have gotten the effect of an acknowledgment followed by the effect of the Prepcheck. You see how it could be misread?

Now, there's a terribly broad example, a rather nonsensical example but who would do anything but vary their procedure if they didn't have a good, tight, standard thing called standard auditing? See, if they—if they didn't know that existed, then who could ever blame them for varying their procedure?

In other words, they're moving on both sides of a highway and they don't know it exists. They're driving in both ditches and out across the plains and herding the ponies up in the hills, you see. And they don't know there's a highway there.

Well, instead of blaming auditors, I should say that it's only recently that I finally corralled all the factors that make up an auditing session. I've been watching auditors for a year and I know now that, thanks to the data, the final data that came home on this was missed withholds.

And I know now that for every action of the pc or everything a pc can do, no matter how unusual, there is a standard auditing response that handles it.

Now, you see, you couldn't call it a standard response unless it actually handled it, see. But if it actually handles it, now you can call it a standard response. You see, because Scientology is totally dedicated to being workable. I know this is not popular in some parts of the world. You'd never get a job in the US State Department with that type of a—of a motto. You know, "be effective." You never would.

And Scientology's peculiar that way. our index rule is, "does it work?" Not, "is it true?" but "does it work?" Oddly enough, it has to be true in order to work, but that's beside the point.

Now, if these auditing responses work and work in all cases, then I have a right to lay them down and say this is what they are, you see. Only because they work. And then say, "Well, you go ahead and learn them. you learn these responses because they'll work for you. See, I know they 11 work for you."

And then I've got a right to bite Quirino's head off and so forth—he's in charge of Practical Section—if he doesn't make the thing work, don't you see? Because there is something there.

Now, one of the favorite methods of teaching in universities on this planet is teaching against the hidden standard. You walk into class and there's students there and there's somebody lecturing and they give examinations and you can even get expelled from the college for flunking the course, don't you see? And the only thing they've overlooked is the fact that there's no course material.

You know, there it's just growing in universities today. Most of you've been out of universities too long to appreciate the fact. But there are more and more courses taught in universities which have a hidden course. It's a hidden subject. And the student is there. He's very wise. And the professor's very wise. And it's a whole bunch of double talk, you know.

Did you ever meet a friend and there was somebody else present and you met this old buddy of yours and you started double talking with this old buddy and the friend had to stand there and he thought you were both saying something to each other. You know? And of course, you weren't.

Well, the student is an innocent bystander to this double talk and he sees the professor and he sees students and everybody is doing well, so he says there must be a subject here, you see. Must be one. And everybody is so sincere about it, you know.

Subject like art. you should read some of the late curriculums that have come out. Very, very interesting, art appreciation, music appreciation, domestic relations. Can you imagine somebody daring to teach a course on domestic relations who had never even heard of a corner of the human mind? What a dog's breakfast that life must be afterwards if led off these principles. The textbook is invariably written by somebody who murdered his first eight wives, you know. Something like that. And it's a hidden subject. And the world is getting used to having hidden subjects.

And everybody's got his re—trained response to the hidden subject. And the trained response to the hidden subject is, you look alert, you're agreeable, you go along with it, you memorize everything you're told to memorize, you take your examinations, everything But actually it's just all a sort of a—an agreement because, really, we know there's no subject there. You know, Art Appreciation. Who the—who the—how the hell could you teach Art Appreciation? Yet they manage it. They manage it.

I ran into somebody one time. you should have seen that girl's home. She had taken Art Appreciation at the University of Southern California, LA. It was marvelous. The place was just full of books on the subject of art. Everywhere you looked, here they were propping up the bureau and bright maroon curtains, you see and scarlet table cloths with green pimentos on it. She sure had art appreciation. The person was wild.

She was taught this subject called Art Appreciation and it was the wildest double talk you ever listened to in your life, you know. "The rigiflubit sallpupilob" you know.

Yet obviously, hundreds and hundreds, thousands of students have been taking this course. Obviously, they were all in perfect agreement there must be a course there without anybody ever demonstrating a course.

Well, do you see, actually—actually, I'm being a little bit mean on the subject. Of course, you know, mathematics is an exact subject. Do you know there's a swindle called calculus that's been going on ever since Newton—I think he did it for an early issue of Punch. It's marvelous, you know.

You go in there. The professors are teaching it and students are figuring out things with it and you go up to a senior and you say, "How many times have you used calculus in your calculations of various things since you had calculus in your freshman year?"

"I never have."

"Well, why don't you use calculus?"

"Well, it's . . . "

And of course, you get education's just become some fantastic grim practical joke.

But most people confuse education totally with thinkingness. So they get into a habit pattern of two things. One, they can be in perfect agreement that there is a subject without ever coming near the subject, see, because that's an automaticity in school. You can go through school without ever understanding anything Give back the right answers, you're all set, you set out of school and at the other end people let you live. I think that's the reward of graduating from school. You got an old school tie on, you get issued your rations.

Now, that's combined with the fact that all of your earliest training is classroom-type training that is all based on data. Data, data, data, data, data. In the early days of engineering it used to be a joke. Engineers that came out of school could not compare to engineers that were out practically functioning and operating in the field. It'd take them three or four years to close that gap. Oddly enough, they close the gap much more rapidly than the practical engineer. They closed it much more rapidly, but they still had a gap to close because they had everything on think, see. They weren't—hadn't done anything practical.

Now, engineers in the last thirty years and so forth, they get things like testing machinery and they get a little bit of doingness mixed up with the engineering school. You got chemistry labs and physics labs and things like that, that is coming in stronger and stronger, but it is nevertheless not really doingness.

So we break up when we give doingness an equal part with theory. We tend to break up an automaticity on which everybody is sitting And that's the idea that education is a confront of think. See, education is a theoretical process.

So in adventuring this new division of Scientology training, I know we may have a little bit of difficulty without my postulating it. It's going to be hard to keep in. Because it had only been in here 24 hours before it was out. You see? Now, there's—there's a parallel.

Now, when you stop and think that there are three sections and one is the Theory Section and the other's the Practical Section and then there's an Auditing Section. We've got two-thirds doingness for one-third confronting thinkingness. That's heavy, isn't it?

So you see, it'd be adventurous to make it 50-50. That would be adventurous enough. But we haven't made it 50-50. We've made it 66 and 2/3—33 and 1/3. So skin it down to one-third of an investment of your time on theory and two-thirds of it on practical and auditing and you should be able to get by.

But that's about what it takes. That's about what it takes. So this is a very heavy emphasis that we've embarked upon here. Much heavier, you realize as you sit there right this minute that this is—this is crushed. I don't know, I have not counted up how many drills have to be compounded according to this May 3rd Policy Letter, how many actual drills. There are a lot of repetitive things on the E-Meter that all come from one drill, but—two drills, you got your Model Session, you got various things of this character and you've got your practical process. But it means quite a few new TRs. Quite a few new TRs. We get a TR for each one of these pieces of doingness.

Now, this is actually quite a technical achievement. You might not—you might not grasp the thing at first glimpse, but after you're auditing one day up here three or four months from now and you're back home or something like that and you're auditing somebody and you suddenly look back on it and realize you haven't any trouble with any pcs. you haven't any trouble at all with any pcs. Nobody's ARC broke and nobody's busted up and some of the students you're teaching aren't, aren't that lucky. They open up their E-Meter and stick their foot in it. And your reality on this will be shockingly great. Toward the end of your course, when the

auditor across from you is auditing flawlessly and you all of a sudden recognize something fantastic is going on here, do you see? It's a tremendous thing.

And when you yourself are delivering this, you all of a sudden find that you have terrific altitude with the pc. And where the hell does altitude come from because you're not grunting or straining—you're not holding your mouth in some peculiar way. Haven't got your tongue out between your teeth or anything, you know. And there's no grunt, you know. And you say, "I've been sitting here, just got through auditing for five hours" and you feel fresh as a daisy. "What's going on?"

Well, only those things—those things would only happen if it were true that for every action on the part of the pc there is a proper response on the part of the auditor. And for everything you want the pc to do, there's a proper causation. There's a proper way to cause it. And if you cause it properly and respond properly and it's all very usual and these things are well done by you, you under—well understood, well grooved, you will get this other result. And the other result will be just—it looks very, very relaxed. It's very easy and very satisfactory type of activity.

Now, there's a lot of these odd bits, but they're countable. And if you look over this sheet of May the 3rd, perhaps, 1962, one of the—possibly your first reaction as an old time auditor was what? Is that the totality of auditing skills? You might have had a surprise that there were that few things could be put on both sides of one piece of paper. See, there were that few things that made up the actuality of handling auditing.

And you think it over. That's quite remarkable that on two sides of one piece of paper you could write down everything that you did in terms of a coded system, of course, and that they'd only amount to two or three dozen—a very finite number.

I bet a lot of people that first early on with auditing, they think there must be thousands and thousands of responses. They just must be uncounted responses. You have to be so clever. You know? And they count on their cleverness. And they hope they can be clever enough to handle the pc. There's no cleverness in handling the pc. There's standardness of handling the pc.

You start getting clever while you're handling a pc and you'll be up the river quickly. No paddle either.

No, that's—it's remarkable that there are these few practical auditing skills. There are not many.

Now, the way a student ought to move into this is on this basis: There are certain definite stable data of theory—if you did not know these things, you wouldn't even know where you were going or why—and those are the fundamental bits of theory. The very fundamental bits. And they, of course— and now we are talking about the HCO Policy Letter of May 14th, Issue II, CLASSES OF AUDITORS. And the—there are a few bits which are inescapable—theory. You really have to have those in order to proceed at all.

And then there are certain practical actions, which if you can't do them, the pc is liable to wind up in a tight ball of yarn.

And then there are certain auditing skills—that is to say auditing, you know, just straight auditing the processes—which if you did them on a pc, you would find somewhat successful or unusual in some cases.

And you can tie a bundle of these things together. You can tie a certain level of theory and a certain level of practical drills and a certain auditing activity, you can tie them up so they don't come into conflict and they tend to complement each other to some degree.

Now, there'd be many ways of doing this. And the way which we have laid out here on May the 14th, 1962, may not be the best and most refined way to go about this. Any old D of T looking this over has probably said, "This should go there and that should go there and if we just had the Auditing Section lag a bit behind the other two sections, everything would be much better." And yes, there's no doubt about it. That there—this will stand a small amount of shifting.

It'll be mostly the shifting of what we do when, rather than the shifting of the whole doingness, you see. There'll be some juxtapositions and that sort of thing. You can expect those.

But this thing is based on several things. And let me give you a very fast resume on which it is based. That if you took an auditor and you were going to make an auditor and you grabbed him by the scruff of the neck and ran Op Pro by Dup on him and SCS—that's all you did, see. We didn't give him any other auditing. He didn't have a chance, you see? We just ran some Op Pro by Dup and we ran some SCS of one kind or another. He'd get the idea that there was something to control. And you would knock out the two principal things which upset an auditor.

Op Pro by Dup. you know, was invented just for training Didn't have any other purpose in the world. It isn't even a cousin to CCHs although it's included in that, in some of the lists given. Just invented for training. It's how long can you make him grind. How long can you endurance it until both the auditor of it and the pc of it find out that it—duplication—won't kill them. And they eventually find out the hard way that duplication isn't going to kill them and after that and only after that can you get this type of an action—Do birds fly? Do birds fly? Do birds fly?

Actually, with no Op Pro by Dup. you get something like this. you get tremendous, overwhelming necessity to say, "Do birds fly? Are our feather friends airborne?" They won't duplicate an auditing command. And the—a D of T can go absolutely around the bend listening to this because it's so easy for him to do.

He doesn't ever realize he ever had any trouble with that. And yet you listen to these birds. It's—they know how to do it right. You change it. They just go on to obsessive change. Until you run most auditors on Op Pro by Dup.

One of the things which auditors to this day do very well is give a repetitive command. You can see somebody sitting in a session, why an auditor any day of the week. He's happy to sit there and give a repetitive command. "Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you can have. Thank you. Look around here . . ." Gad! You'll go on for five hours. And do you know that before he actually studied auditing or anything like that, do you know he just would have gone bzzzzzzz at the idea of repeating that single phrase twice.

So you forget how vital it is to have that one under your belt. Now, you understand these classes are laid out for Scientologists, not just for the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. So naturally, we have to start in our auditing with what an auditor needs most.

Now, it's all right to say well, maybe we ought to start him with a Straightwire. And maybe that's best. And they sit there. The fellowJs probably already been in co-audit. He's probably done a little bit of this nonsense, you know.

Well, let's just drive him into the wall. Let's do it the hard way. You're going to have trouble with this, let's pick up what you're going to have the most trouble with at the beginning of the course and just give it to him.

As far as SCS is concerned, you do him very much SCS, you'll wind up with no allergy to controlling or being controlled. And you find out that runs out the badness of control. Most people you meet out on the street, you say, "Control good or bad?" They say, "It's bad."

You ask a motorist he passes in the road, "Is control good or bad?"

"Oh, it's bad." Screek, crash!

Number of automotible accidents has nothing whatsoever to do with the highway department. The better highways they build, the more automobile accidents they have. Has to do with the feeling people have that control is very bad.

Well, of course, they have been miscontrolled since birth in the society in which they find themselves and they've been busily miscontrolling themselves. And they get ahold of a piece of machinery and you miscontrol of a piece of machinery and you're a statistic. About all there is to that. It's simple.

Now, an auditor who will not control a pc has a hell of a time. Man, he just gets run over every day of the week. He comes out of a session, he's got tread marks all over him.

Pc says, "Well, I actually have an awful time with windows. Let's run some process about windows."

And the auditor says, "All right. Look at a window."

And the pc says, "Well, I'm tired of that process actually. I object mostly to those andirons over there."

"All right. Look at the andirons."

Never seems to get anyplace, you know. I think you will agree with me out of your own experience, those are the two worst hurdles for an auditor to get over—Control and Duplication. Long since, it's been learned in training that those are—those are the mean points. So, well, let's put them first. Let's put them first.

Now, that means that a student auditor in HCA courses in Academies is actually going to be run on Op Pro by Dup before they have a chance to do anything, see. That's a funny thing to be doing Well, I don't know, you might as well crowd them and if you've got an Auditing Section, there's somebody going to stand over them with a whip, you can crowd them into doing Op Pro by Dup. Stand there and say, "Come on, come on. Give them another command. I know you're falling in. Give them another command."

"Oh, what is its weight?" Aw, you can bull them through it.

By the time an auditor, a beginning auditor, has had it and received it, why, something will have changed. Something will have changed. Now, the only reason that we would include it here and try to run anybody at all on Op Pro by Dup here, is very many of you have never had it flattened. Ha-ha. We refer to case repair, of May 14th, HCOB. Maybe you've never had it flattened. I don't know how many hundred hours it takes to flatten it. But I'm perfectly willing to set up an experiment.

Now, along with that, assists. Now, I will say this. That's probably written backwards. It should be assists and Op Pro by Dup and SCS. And how do you get somebody to do an assist when there's nobody hurt? I think a D of T can probably get over that problem. But I'll bet you there are very few, very few HCA/HPA courses that teach very much about assists. They're quite spectacular. I've had more people absolutely swear by Scientology and they've never had any auditing but an assist. I remember a down-at-the-heels, that's what you'd call a tennis bum. you know, a professional hanger-on of country houses, gentlemen-type character,

you know. He never has a penny in his pocket. Cynical, hard-boiled, everything Nothing was true. Nothing existed anyplace. He one day thoughtfully closes his hand in the door.

And he comes in. He's holding his hand up, you know. Blood dripping, you know and "Oh, oh, oh, oh. I don't know what I'm going to do about this."

And I said, "Well, go back and touch the door until it doesn't hurt to touch the door."

And he—I made no effort at all, see. I didn't particularly care whether this pc went through the bottom of the earth or what happened.

"Oh," he said, "that wouldn't do any good."

I said, "Yeah, I'm not kidding you." I said, "After all, I'm the man who knows the subject of Scientology and that's Scientology. And you just go back and keep touching the door where you hurt it."

"Oh, I couldn't do that."

And I said, "Well, you're going to do it. Go on!" I said, "Do it!" So he walked back down the hall and I could hear him back there. Thud, thud, thud. Thud, thud, thud, thud, thud, thud. "Ouch," he says. Thud, thud, thud.

He came back in and he said, "It's all right." He said, "What happened?" He says, "That's Scientology?"

I said, "That's right. That's Scientology. Give me a cigarette there."

The guy was practically climbing the walls to have auditing, you know. I would just—I didn't even give him an assist. That's the point I was making.

So it's a very good thing for somebody to know. And you can get a good reality on giving assists and receiving assists and so forth. Very peculiar things happen sometimes. Touch assists and so on. But look it, that's all physical action, isn't it? That's sort of getting people's bodies used to bodies.

Now, if we're going to cut out the Upper Indoc, which has been teaching people erroneously to do CCHs too ferociously, we certainly had better have body mauling here someplace and where better to start than in the first unit.

See, the first activity. Let's body maul them. Assists. Op Pro by Dup. SCS. Let's get it off their chests right now.

And there's another point about this—is those are the least likely to goof up the pc if they're done wrong Nothing much going to happen if you do those things wrong. Because they're self-correcting. Good Op Pro by Dup corrects badly done Op Pro by Dup. Good SCS corrects badly done SCS. And any kind of auditing will correct an assist. So what's the—what's the difference, see? So it's the most corrective kind of auditing because it's selfcorrective auditing Not all processes, you know, are self-corrective. Engram running isn't self-corrective.

You run the engram of running the engram and then run that wrong and then you run the engram of running the engram and then you run that wrong and then you run the engram of running the engram of running the engram and the pc by that time is so looped up, he doesn't know whether he's "graming" or "eming" And the only thing that you can do about that time is start back and find something more fundamental and run out auditors. And look at the complication you're in, see. Not so Op Pro by Dup. SCS or assists. You just do more of them

and it corrects what you're doing, see— self-corrective processes. So that gives us the auditing level.

Now, we're talking about auditing, auditing—auditors. We're not talking about auditing the public. But anybody could be started that way. That's Class IA we're talking about as an Auditing Section and we get Class IB, we get ARC Straightwire done in Model Session and Havingness. That also could be reversed. You could have the Havingness first and then ARC Straightwire. Wouldn't matter much which way you had them.

But now you've got a sit-down type of process and it's not going to ruin anybody excessively because ARC Straightwire is actually not self-corrective, but Havingness is.

But why ARC Straightwire? Well, it gives them an idea of doing the repetitive process verbally, having done repetitive duplication physically. But, once more, it's not wasted auditing for the auditor.

Do you know every now and then through a unit, somebody is suddenly going to turn sane that didn't know he was nuts. And that process, ARC Straightwire, still has that power. A few commands of the thing and the fellow says, "Oh, it's fantastic."

But it gives an auditor a reality on a bank. In general, it'll give reality on a bank. Very few cases won't see something, contact something They have to be pretty much of a black, black, black five, you see, to not get some reality on ARC Straightwire on the time track—the cyclic aspect of the time track and so forth.

Well, that teaches them volumes about time tracks, doesn't it and so on. But once again, the therapy value of it is, is every few cases you're going to get somebody who is really stark staring mad. He's at least basically neurotic. All mixed up, messed up. And you run a little ARC Straightwire and he comes out of it. That process still has tremendous horsepower. A little bit of it, so on.

There is, by the way, just to bring you up to date, there's a later ARC Straightwire which is positive-negative. I really needn't say anymore about it. you just run the positive-negative versions of each one and of course it just—you can feel the bank just coming apart. Bssssssssah. You know, communicate-not communicate. Real-unreal. You know. Affinity-no affinity. And you get all the seamier side of life tied up in it and these fellows that every time you try to run a pleasure moment on them they give you a moment of agony. Can't run ARC Straightwire very long without being in the middle of agony. Well, this keeps that from happening

All right. Now, your next step up the line of processing, we would be into Prepchecking and CCHs. Just Prepchecking and CCHs, done preferably by form. you know, the old Form 3 and Form 6A. And supposing—supposing you had done those things, the first ones kind of badly—the first level Op Pro by Dup and SCS and assists, you know—kind of badly. And the next one you've done is a little smoother. Kind of bad. By the time you got that up and had these people so they could audit and they started auditing this, they would be coping with something. They would—you would start to get actual good case advances.

And that would be a fairly logical progress for a case. In actuality, if you knew all this and you were just auditing the public, of course, you'd just go into Prepchecking from scratch. But you can mess up people like fire drill with bad Prepchecking, so it isn't, of course, in the lower classifications. You can miss more withholds than people can count if you turn it loose in an Academy without any fundamental auditing. They're learning to prepcheck before they've learned anything about auditing and that's pretty crazy.

Now, of course, your next classes, as far as classes goes, goes up to your Routine 3 processes.

Now, how would you get somebody from Prepchecking and CCHs up ta a Routine 3 process without doing any 3D Criss Cross? He'd have to do assessments of some kind or another. Well, that's quite a little puzzle. It's quite a puzzle. It may not be fully solved here. But we get ta Class IIIA and we get here Havingness, getting rudiments in, Dynamic Assessment, Prehav Assessment, Problems Intensive and I could add any kind of an assessment you could dream up. Anything that gives them experience in assessing. And none of that has any therapeutic value except maybe the Havingness and getting the rudiments in.

But of course, if you just sat down and spent a lot of hours just getting rudiments in on a case, why, the guy would feel lots better. So it could be called processing But get him to do a lot of assessment. You know? Get him— get him used to the idea of running down a column of things and finding out if they react or don't react.

And of course, a Problems Intensive is lovely for that. you can do a Problems Intensive, find the prior confusion to what hung up, scrub the whole thing, add to the list and do a new assessment. You can do Assessment by Elimination on a Problems Intensive list, see? See, you can da all kinds of things with it. But just practice in assessment before we turn loose on Routine 3.

And then at least as current processes go right now, you'd turn him loose immediately into a Goals Assessment when he got to a Class IIIB and you wouldn't monkey with anything else. That's because cases can be a bit loused up by doing a wrong 3D Criss Cross and whereas I can straighten out anything you've ever had happen to you here, this is also going to be done in Port Darwin. There is nothing in Port Darwin. You get the idea? See? Because this is set up, of course, for the world. Not just here.

All right. So that would be your progress in auditing. Now, let's take— let's back up a step here and let's take this Theory Section. Now, at a Class IA, you've got the Auditor's Code, E-Meter Essentials, basic scales and dynamics. That's your Theory Section. Well, that just gives some background music to the fundamentals of Dianetics and Scientology, doesn't it? That's all.

A fellow can't proceed very far without knowing these things exist. And you got your Practical Section and we hit that heavy.

We teach the fellow how to do some CCHs. You know, just drill, see. His zero, one, two, three. We teach him about Model Session. We teach him complete E-Meter check items. We're hitting him with an E-Meter. He's not even going to use one in his Auditing Section, don't you see. Because at this stage of the game, we couldn't—we couldn't hope that he could use anything. He'd just goof with it. He's not going to do CCHs at that particular level. But we look over here and we find the CCHs, heh, include Op Pro by Dup and twoway comm in the CCHs and that sort of thing.

And we're not going to try to teach him that, as he's auditing in that section, at all because we're not going to do Op Pro by Dup and SCSes with any two-way comm. We're just going to do it on the heroic level. See? There's several auditing styles amongst which there is the heroic.

And he's going to have enough to worry about trying to do his Model Session and ARC Straightwire up in his next class. And then finally he's going to have too much to worry about—about Prepchecking to learn anything about CCHs at a higher class. These are basics and CCHs—we teach him how to do the CCHs early. And then we've assuaged his curiosity and then he can do it the hard way later.

All right. And that's—so Class IA consists of this Theory Section with some of these fundamentals. Practical Section, whole bunch of stuff. TR, give him a Comm Course, give him various things that we ordinarily give him, you know. And teach him something about Model Session. We work him over at this level and then give him Op Pro by Dup and SCS. I

think a student at that level, by the time he had reached the top of Class IA, would feel that he had achieved something

He might be battered and I think he would be unbowed. But I think he would be in pretty good—pretty good idea that something was happening and that he knew something for the time.

And then we move him up into IB and we get the Theory Section and of course, the old comm formula. Well, that's taught alongside of ARC Straightwire. And if you'll notice here and after, your Theory Section is combining at Class IB and Class IIA. Your Theory Section and your Auditing Section are hand in glove. They're happening both at the same time. And you say, well, the optimum way to handle this, of course, is to teach your theory in one class, you see and your practical in one class and then later on audit the things in the next class up.

Yeah, well, that's all right, but we're auditing students. And you're not going to be—you're not going to get a subjective reality on the doingness of this thing unless you audit at the same time they're studying it on these upper classes.

And they're going to say, "Gee, what do you know," you know. And their interest is going to be on it. And if you kept repeating this thing of Class IA of teaching early and auditing at an upper class, if you didn't stay in parallel with IB and IIA, your students would get confused because their interest, the interest of a new student when he starts—first starts running into ARC Straightwire, this stuff kind of, kind of—fabulous. Particularly if you were running on a plus-minus version, which you probably would be.

This is very fabulous. He'd get very interested in the communication formula. He'd get very interested in other things that goes along with that level, don't you see?

He probably would reach back and study some more scales. He heard of those in the class below. Well, what do these scales have to do with it? And he'd see some of these things in action. He'd think this was pretty good. And you get your Class IB would be your communication formula and E-Meter tapes and tapes on the theory and attitudes of an auditor and Code of a Scientologist, basic materials on ARC and ARC Straightwire and basic materials on havingness.

Your Practical Section is just drills, drills, drills on Model Session of the May 3rd HCO Policy Letter and your Class IIA, of course, is your HCOBs and tapes on Prepchecking and tapes on CCHs and Axioms. That's a sort of a knife in the back that you suddenly shove in there.

You'll be treating theory lightly right up to that point, you see and then you show him it has teeth in it.

And then you give him handling the pc, the Practical Section and pertinent items in the practical processes and then your auditing session which I've already given you.

Class IIIA, why, you give him the various tapes and bulletins on assessments and so forth. Well, there's one point I must mention here is the theory checklist—the checksheet must go to the most fundamental check item first because he's going to be auditing on this stuff and as he's auditing, he can then get the flowery ends of it. you get the idea?

In other words, right at the first of his theory checklist and right at the first of the practical, you give him the most fundamental that he is going to use in the auditing of that section or that class. See?

You give it to him hard—and right away. And then while he's doing the auditing, give him the fancier versions, the more expanded versions, the supplementary material, the lectures on the subject. You know, all of that kind of thing follows in while he's actually doing it and he

finally finds out there's quite a bit to know about this. See, at first it looks terribly simple to him. Then it looks terribly complicated and he can't do it. And then he gets supplementary lectures and it finally brings it back into focus. That's the theory by which this operates.

Now, this course will be operating on the basis of a checklist per class which carries all three sections. In other words, all three sections for one class. You get one sheet of paper and it's got a class and when that thing is finished, you've got that class. And you get another sheet of paper and you get a class. Don't you see, with that? That's the way these things should be issued in the Academy, too.

And it's got all the materials on it ready to be checked out and so forth. Oddly enough, with maybe only tiny variations, as far as we're concerned here at the Special Briefing Course, your checklists are the same as they are. Oh, you know, we haven't changed the checklist. Your checklists aren't going to be changed any. But they'll be juggled as to where they belong in the classes, don't you see?

What you've passed, you've passed. What you have to pass, you still have to pass. But there's just—we'll parallel it with the classes not change the subject matter, so don't be getting the idea that you will now have to pass all of them all over again or something like this because that's not true. But you'll have to pass them for various classes.

Now the auditing—this I should mention—the Auditing Section has done well and received well certain processes, so it's got a check-off too. In other words, he's received Op Pro by Dup and he's given Op Pro by Dup. He's given SCS and he's received SCS. We're talking about just a worldwide checksheet, you see?

He's given ARC Straightwire, he's received ARC Straightwire. He's given the—a Havingness and had found a Havingness Process and audited some and he's received some, don't you see. That's just all part of the checksheet.

And then we get down and we're not interested in that for you guys. See, we're not interested in those two Auditing Sections for you because you're quite advanced as auditors. Although I might find some of it if I see—don't see better duplication.

Anyway, what you're mainly interested in is this Prepchecking. You actually get off the launching pad with Prepchecking. That's your first hard auditing assignment. And that is occupied with the form type of Prepchecking, particularly the last two pages of the Joburg and the Form 6A done in Prepcheck-Sec Check form as released recently.

You'll be getting off the launching pad with that as having given it and having received it, don't you see?

But actually, your pc will have to be checked out for unflat questions before you have passed it. In other words, we're getting your final examination down into your practical auditing so it doesn't take you so long to get it passed. Okay?

And similarly, your auditing given and received and so forth is checked out for your IIIA and your IIIB. I think you'll find this very easy to do on this particular class. It's very simple to carry through because you're doing exactly this except you've got some new TRs, and you've got your Practical Section which is going to be harder and tougher than it has been in the past.

But you're getting by very easy on the thing At HCA/HPA level, of course, those two first grades will be very tough and they will look very tough and they'll look like a very high hill to climb for people. And you, frankly, are not even climbing either of those hills for a hill of beans because it's minimal as far as we're concerned. But we're very interested from Class IIA up. We're terribly interested and terribly detailed as we go on up.

Now, that doesn't say we're not interested in the whole of the Practical Section because I expect all of you to get a total checkout on all of the TRs of the Practical Section because I can't miss this opportunity of swinging you into line to a vitally important activity which is the delivery of highly standardized auditing And you deliver that, you'll find out more about the human mind than you ever thought existed because your own errors introduced into the session aren't giving you false data about the mind all the time, see. And you all of a sudden will find you are looking at a very relatively easily understood set of mental mechanics. Water is never muddied up by something else going on. More basically, your pcs will be very happy.

This is—we are very interested in this and I want every student who is here to get a good cracking on this practical. I'd be very interested in doing that. And students who are well along had better just start sweating on it. You know, just get into the Practical Section and get checked off as fast as you can. Shouldn't take you too long to do that. Things will look much happier when you get there.

Right now the only thing that is wrong with your auditing at all is here and there you wobble. And every time you wobble, you get a session tied up somehow or another. And you—one zig and the pc hands you a zag and after that you're zigzagging

But I think you're doing remarkably well and we're at a culmination point. And we're going for broke now. We're going for broke now. I'm trying to make Clears. And I said yesterday, I told a couple of people that I hadn't been trying to make Clears. That actually is not true. I have been trying for the last year. But I have been trying to make dynamic Clears and finding the road through to a highly stable, highly permanent state of Clear.

I'm not interested in any other state. And we could have been making other types of Clears and everybody would have been much happier with us. People would have been going out of here and in a month or two falling on their heads, but—and some of them remaining very stable and so forth—but as long as there was any question mark in it at all, I wasn't interested in approaching that hill at all. I'm just interested in making auditors, and pushing straight through the GPM, finding the road and the way through the GPM. I'm pretty sure we've got that very well taped.

We've learned a tremendous amount about auditing and we're going for broke right now to make some Clears. And who knows, maybe in the next four or five years we might produce one.

And if you're not Clear in a few months, I'm going to be mad at you.

Thank you.