

TRAINING: DUPLICATION

A lecture given on 24 January 1962

Thank you very much. It's not deserved; I've been very mean to several of you in the last day or two; very, very mean, with good results. Okay. What is this? Audience: 24th. It's the 24th of Jan. AD 62. AD 12 - 1962 - in the Year of Our Travail, especially yours. All right. Now, I have some good news for you. Going to sit down in this lecture, if you don't mind. But I have some very, very good news for you, some excellent news for you; that if you were beaten over the head, tortured, treated with sarcasm, hammered and pounded and generally abused, you eventually decide to find out - you go past, you see, merely attacking Ron, you see, that breaks down and you go past that, and you say, "Well now, if this much fuss is being made about it, maybe there is a right way to do it," and so you try that for a while and nothing much happens. And then if you are hammered and pounded and beaten some more, then you decide to do it right, and then all of a sudden there's tremendous dawning on every hand that there was something here. And that has just happened on this good day of our Dianetics in 1962. This just happened. Several of you in just the last session you ran discovered that 3D Criss Cross worked like crazy; just discovered it - brand-new discovery. Some of you have not made that discovery yet, but many of you - the majority that were having any difficulty with this - all of a sudden it dawned that there was something here and that it did work and that the session ran like a hot bomb, and all became suddenly well. Now, the old-time student here who has had a great deal of training - I will say this, a great deal of training shows up along these lines - got results with 3D Criss Cross at once. The second it was presented to them they started getting results with 3D Criss Cross, which is quite interesting, see. They looked it over, they said "That's okay," they started listing and everything, and the next thing you know, they were getting results with it. But those of you who have just come up to the nervous state of newly created IIB didn't measure up this well. And you've been floundering and falling on your heads now for the better part of two weeks. It has been pretty gruesome. I mean I have actually suffered for you. I didn't suffer for the PC. I can always straighten out a PC. If I can straighten out a PC, why, I don't worry about the PC particularly. But I suffered for the poor auditor, sitting there doing exactly what he was told (if doing it backwards), and with Ron shouldering the total responsibility of it all going bad because it probably didn't work, suddenly waking up, deciding to do it right, and then the second step: finding out that it worked like mad. Now, that is quite a win. That is a win for me. However, it tends to validate this system of activity, a system of activity which begins with apathy. See, you confront somebody in apathy, "Nothing works anyway and there is no way to do anything right anyhow. But if you did do it right nothing would happen, because there isn't any way to do it right because nothing would happen if you did do it right." Now, it is sometimes necessary in action to throw a bit of a hand grenade into that particular type of activity and just say "Yow, yow, yow!" outrageously, you see? Say, "Well, look a'here. You're only writing on one side of your auditor's report." And the person says, "Well, yes, of course I'm only writing on one side of the auditor's report, and all auditors do, don't they?" "Well, they mostly do, but you shouldn't, you see?" And then, "You should have known better than that, see? It has never been published or released, so you should have known about it." Expect the student to have picked it all up telepathically, expect the thing to have sort of leaked in through the pores by association with the tile, or something like that, you see? Doesn't much matter. Now, this is very pertinent to you in the training of Class IIs. When you start training Class II auditors you should recognize this for what it's worth, and it's a little lesson that I could teach you on the subject of raising hell. That's the title of the lesson, "Raising Hell." Now, there are two ways you could get somebody out of apathy, see? They don't know and there is no right way to do it and there are probably no results anyway. Now, there's two ways to approach this problem. One is on the route of making auditors and the other is on the route of auditing. Now, the way you make auditors differs entirely, of course, from the way you audit PCs. There are two routes here that we employ, not necessarily for the betterment of cases but for getting the job done. Of course the net result of all this is the betterment of all cases, but there are two routes that we actually employ and you should recognize these as distinctly different routes. And the first of these is where a person is concerned as an auditor. And we have always had a bit of line on this, and you found in an Academy in the old days where they didn't have this policy in force they made very bad auditors. Wow! Terrible! And that was this type of an approach: "Well, we know you can't audit because you have a case, and we'll try to patch your case up, and if we get your case up, why, then maybe some day you will be able to audit." That type of approach does not work in the making of auditors. Just write it down to that. You see if we admitted that the auditor had a case then nobody on this whole planet would ever be sprung. Do you see that? So this is just a piece of arbitrary snarl. Do you see? This datum must not be true! It isn't that it is true or isn't true, it just must not be true! See, there's no logic to it at all. It just must not be true, because otherwise you would never bail anybody out of anything because there would never be anybody to audit him. And true enough, over the years watching Academies that practiced the idea - the D of T if he had the idea that "If we just processed all these students and somehow or another if I just gave them all a little bit of a case gain, and I got them all in shape so they could confront their PC and if I could get their cases from getting in their roads, why, then I could make them into auditors." And this goes out as far as this: "If we only let 'good' people into the Academy. . ." We don't know what this "good" person is. He lurks out someplace under the rhododendrons or someplace but he never seems to have come near any organization to date, this "good" person, you see? "Now if you could just get 'good' people," that's the other song you hear, but that's just a little bit of a downgrade. Immediately after you hear this "good" people action the next tune that you hear being played on the out-of-tune street piano is "If we just could audit all of the cases in the Academy, why, then, you see, they would all be able to audit." And they of course have propounded a piece of nonsense. You see, if there's nobody to audit all these cases in the Academy, how the hell are they ever going to get audited? And you don't have an Academy at all, you have an HGC. So this quickly defeats itself as a philosophy. So very early, I think it was about the 7th ACC, this philosophy was entered into the training of auditors. And the philosophy is workable; it is not necessarily true, it is not necessarily easy, it is not necessarily kind, sweet or good. It simply works and it is in a workable line, true. But it's only a workable truth. And that is, simply, "Auditors do not have cases," period. That is the one thing that we must insist on. Now, it goes as far as this, that if he's slightly warm and you can see a mist on a mirror held against

his mouth, he or she is in shape to audit. If they can be dragged to the chair and if an E-meter can be propped up in their vicinity, they're in condition to audit. This goes to a total extremity. They could be sitting there with both legs cut off from a street accident, but they are in shape to audit. That's it. That's just it. It's like when nations get down to the last – they're getting the conscripts from their 14-year-old class, you know, and the 72-year-old class and the 14 year-old class; anybody who dares walk back in through, you see, from hospitals or anything else, anybody who dares come anywhere near the assembly officers who are putting together new regiments, you see, is instantly just stamped hugely "FIT FOR COMBAT," see? We don't get it from that particular thing, but it just gives you the idea. Now, when time goes on and a nation gets more fit to work, they start then saying "Well, this person is not fit for combat and should be audited," and that sort of thing. But let me call something to your attention: that we are not a nation but we are certainly a people, and this is very germane. We are not in that condition today where we can say "Well, let's take this person and let's audit him for a while, and maybe he'll learn how to audit some day and – you know, if we get his case out of the road, why, maybe he can audit." We're not in that condition. We're not that wealthy. See, we're just not that wealthy in people, nor are we that far advanced along the lines. So this datum not only has been true but will be true for quite a while. Now, oddly enough this is a workable philosophy, totally workable as a philosophy. It does work, and today is one of those days when I have seen this philosophy work. Some people with Class IIB who are so far from clear they would have to have a moon shot to comprehend it (talking about cases now, see, just casewise, bluuuh! see?) have actually been driven in toward the absorption of data, the regularities of practice, to an actual recognition that what they were doing ended in a very, very powerful, fine gain for the PC, and that they could do it. That's much more important. Now, this is one of those days when that philosophy has worked out. Now, I don't say that you're in horrible condition. I'd say when you get some processing and so forth you will probably get up to being in horrible condition. Compare the way you – the condition that you were in a couple of trillion years ago, or 500 trillion or something like that, whatever the outrageous figure might be, and you're not in such good shape these days, you know? And for you to actually start putting together a being – not a human being, anybody can put together a human being. You just take some electronic shock waves and some implants and kick him and destroy all their self-determinism, then destroy other determinism, and then racket him between destroyed self-determinism and destroyed other-determinism, and you fix him up real good and get them to accumulate all masses and never as-is anything, and you've got a human being. All right, so you just – it'd be no virtue to make one of those. Let's move it up just a little bit further – but to make a functional being, to take a big seven-league boot stride in the direction of making a functional being. Now, that has happened, and that's just happened just in the last couple of days. This sort of thing has been coming up. I'm very happy about this because it's far more significant than you might realize at first glance. It means that the thing can be bootstrapped. Now, we expect somebody that's been under training for a half a year of heavy duress and so forth to be able to pick up a process and be able to do it, but I was very proud when those older students just did that and were able to do that and just kicked it off from the starting line and that was it. Well, that was a little victory in itself, but it was not particularly a victory for this other philosophy because they have had good case gains and they are a long ways from where they were. The other people who have just come up to Class IIB have not had very significant case gains yet and they were able to do it. Now, that was very important. Well, you see, this philosophy works, and it's a distinct philosophy: If he's warm he can audit. Get the idea? And that you can actually bring enough pressure to bear and enough training to bear on an individual so that he actually can do a properly laid out comprehension and action as far as the PC is concerned and arrive with a tremendously significant result. Now, that's a victory, because if that weren't true we as a people would never make it. We'd just never make it, that's all. There would be a few able guys and they would quickly go out the bottom through auditing seven and a half hours a day. I've already scolded two or three Saint Hill graduates who have left and who all of a sudden sat down to a grind of auditing of about seven and a half hours a day and just didn't do anything else, didn't really bother to train anybody or try to pick it up or push it through. They were just going to audit people, audit people, audit people, audit people – well, they can't audit enough people to do any good. It's just a spot in the ocean. Now, if you looked around you would find out that there aren't on earth at the present moment enough auditors to give enough sessions to enough people to make any significant gain in the society at large in the next century. The mathematics are all against it. If you never made one more auditor, if we just took the auditors we had at this particular moment and everybody audited hammer and tongs, seven and a half hours a day for the next ten years or something like that, you add it up and you compare it to the world's population and you get a drop in the bucket. It's a discouragingly small amount. And if we never trained another auditor, the auditors that had been trained would have long since gone by the boards before they even got halfway through the population of New York City. You see, the mathematics are dead against it. Don't think that you, with your auditing, cannot make a change in the society. You certainly can, you certainly can, but you would be making a, Check this against original17:30 actually ((reco))a aco and a pobre society. In other words, you'd be making the society of the rich and the poor, the aristocracy and the slaves, and so forth. It wouldn't help but do that, because of course you could pick out people here and there and put them into terrific condition and never fix it up so they're ever backed up, see? Well, they – oh yeah! They've got a big zone of influence, that's for sure! And they'll get things done, that's for sure; but let me assure you they would not, all of them, be tempered by the peculiarities that I suffer from which is that man should be free. Not even after you'd audited them would they suffer from that peculiarity uniformly, let me assure you. That just wouldn't be done. And give it a decade, give it two decades, something like that, and they would be starting to get a little bit impatient. Enough victims would have been deposited on their doorstep for them to start erecting the stocks and the whipping posts. The next thing you know, we'd find we had two or three classes of citizen. We would have the clear and the slave, you know? We'd divide the whole society up in some kind of a line. It would just be forced upon us to do this. That is actually a very dangerous direction in which to proceed because that direction has always led civilizations into decay and chaos. There is no such thing as a successful civilization which is made out of slave masters and slaves. I assure you that it is not successful. It's never been successful and it never will be successful. Now, it's attractive and it can be

practical but it's not successful. It has no great duration and it doesn't make anybody much happier. So this is quite interesting from a point of view of a long look. Very few of you ever give a long look to Scientology, you leave that up to me to a marked degree. Well, thank you; but when I look in the crystal ball and, look up the line a century I can see a number of pictures presenting themselves, a number of aspects of what might come of all this. And don't think you can fire a shot of this volume and magnitude in a planet of this type without creating an effect. It might be a slow effect, just to the degree, you see, that it is practical. Its speed actually is determined not by the inertia of the masses but by the efficiency and effectiveness of what you're doing. And you can't let go of something like this in a society or a world of this type or size without having repercussions that don't just go up a century. They'll be still racketing up the line until this planet is a billiard ball. Now, it might become a billiard ball sooner than you think. But not all of you will forget Scientology even if you go to another planet. So you see we've never fired this shot silently or without effect, you see? I'm not degrading what you, yourself, as one person can do. But if you're going to do the job fully and wholly or do the job effectively, then the job will be done rather swiftly; and in doing the job relatively fast you save many of the cataclysmic aspects of what might happen because of the entrance upon this scene of Scientology. In other words, the more rapidly you do it the better the job is done. It's just like auditing a PC. You see in one PC the world at large, you see? He is the microcosm and the world is the macrocosm; and you see that what is happening to a PC – you know that if you audit him slowly and poorly he makes thuhh, and he goes duhhh, and he gets a little bit better and in about two or three days he says, "Well, maybe I'll make it. Maybe I'll bla-bla-blah . . ." and all of a sudden he doesn't feel so well, and so on; he didn't get much of a result and he slows down and goes into third gear, and he puts it all on the back burner, and so forth. Well, those fits and starts would be the fits and starts of the track of the civilization in which we live if we did not approach this problem effectively and do it with fair effectiveness. And part of that effectiveness is make enough auditors. Now, you're not enough auditors. You just aren't enough auditors, that's all. There just aren't enough. We're not against a quantitative proposition here particularly, but when I say "auditor" I mean somebody who merely audits. You have to combine in your repertoire the ability to train auditors and then you're enough, then you become enough auditors, don't you see? Right away, just the people in this room would be enough auditors if they trained auditors. And providing you did your job superlatively well and you knew how to make an auditor do his job superlatively well, you see, if you knew that, with that kind of progress you would wind up with enough auditors. Then you could do the job, you see? That could be done. But not otherwise. I know I myself at times have felt rather muscular – mentally muscular – and have stood up baring my breast to the tirades and freakeries of fate and fortune and have said, "Well, this is enough. Just – I could do this all by myself, you know, just standing on my head, you know? No help at all. I'd just do it all by myself. That's easy, you know?" I just felt tough that day, you know? And before noon I didn't feel so tough. Now, in my particular levels of training and background I would have perhaps, not necessarily, but perhaps more reason than you to believe that I could do the job all by myself, see? I have done jobs all by myself and they were not necessarily easy jobs. Now, I did get away with them. I don't think I could do this one all by myself, see? Different type of job, it goes out in terms of longevity. It embraces many more lives and beings than anything else that's been attempted in this corner of the universe for a very long time. Well now, the better it is done, the more rapidly it is done, the more effectively it is done, why, the smoother forward track it will have. So therefore you are busy learning to audit. You are busy learning to audit and in that you are making progress and that's very, very good progress. We do not have here the facilities much to train you how to teach auditors, but by training you we can certainly give you a model and you'll know how to handle somebody else when you're training them, and maybe you'll profit by some of the mistakes we have made. But don't try to profit in the direction of being kind. Don't try to profit in the direction of "If we just process him then he will be able to audit." Don't profit in that direction because there's no profit to be had there. If he's alive he can audit. He walked into the PE Course, he is a long-term Christian Scientist, until he got so many overts on Christian Science that he became a Rosicrucianist, and then had too many overts against Rosicrucianism to remain anything but a theosophist, and has arrived to prove that Scientology doesn't work. You can make him audit. You could teach him to audit; you really could. But now we're getting to a dividing line: Why that many handicaps on the auditor, see? Why go quite that far afield to teach somebody to audit? No, there are people around you at once, in your immediate vicinity, that could be taught to audit well and those are the people to put lots of time in on. They are the people to put time in on, because if you make them very good auditors, of course they can make auditors. And it is better to have – right now, the way we're going – it is better to have a lot of crackerjack auditors than an awful lot of very mediocre auditors. See, that's better. And you sometimes look over "Who are you going to spend time on?" Well, the natural impulse is to take this bird I just described who has so many overts on Christian Science that they had to take off into Rosicrucianism, got so many overts on Rosicrucianism that they became a theosophist, and have wandered in to prove that Scientology doesn't work. Well, unfortunately you could make a tremendous error, and do you know that instructors will do this? Even an instructor here, now and then, catches himself; fortunately he catches himself doing it. He's so outraged by the performance he sees in front of him that he gives that person more time than he gives the apt auditor who needs just a little bit more coaching to do a very fine job. Instead of that he'll give this total dud, you see, a tremendous amount of time and pressure trying to get them up to a high level of mediocrity. Remember that, when you're training auditors, take those that are very apt and give them the most time. See, that's the way to go about it; and let the others drift along. Let them drift along. They've got a certain rate of absorption. And it isn't that you should let them go. You shouldn't let this fellow go; oh no, oh, nothing like that, see? You might downgrade him a little bit in the zone or area in which he's being trained but you don't forget about him. But he plods along at a certain rate and that certain rate has very little to do with anything you're trying to teach him. He's just kind of slobby. For anybody to assign the length of time it takes for somebody to learn something is adventurous. It can't ever be factual. I'll give you an experiment in this. Take one datum and try to teach it to somebody with the old educational processes of the 17th ACC. Those were very interesting processes, by the way. Try to teach him this datum. Take any datum in Scientology, say it to him and have him repeat it. This is the simplest of all these; just say it and have him repeat it, you see, and say it and have him repeat it, and then say it and have him tell

you what it is all about, you know, by giving you an example of it. You say it, he gives you an example of it. That is the wildest thing you ever did with anybody. That is quite incredible. As simple as this mechanism is, it has considerable horsepower and it is a very interesting thing. I have seen that datum move a very tough case, by the way. That was what was interesting about those educational processes. They were very limited in that they didn't move very many cases, but they could knock aside this "no effect" proposition on training. Now, I recommend those to you. We actually don't have any students bad enough to start chugging in with these educational processes, and assign somebody to say a datum and he's supposed to say the datum back, and then he says the datum and they make an example, or any of the combinations of those processes. There were about three of them. But they're awfully good for the fellow you have despaired of utterly; they are much better than auditing. You assign a student to teach him with this system, you know? You of course don't have to use Scientology data. You can say, "The cat is black. All right, now tell me "The cat is black." And the fellow says, "Well, there are a number of instances I could think of where a cat wouldn't be black." And you say, "All right, good, good. But now, just tell me this one datum, 'A cat is black.'" And you'll finally get them to actually be able to – you say something, they can say something. And then the second grade of that is you say something and they can understand it. In other words, let them duplicate the words and then let them duplicate the understanding. You in essence are doing this in training, only you're doing it live. You see, you're doing it all the way. You read a bulletin and then you go in and see Mike. Of course some of you wish you hadn't but that's all part of the game. But look a-here, he's not trying to be unreasonable with you; he's just trying to get you to do one thing – that's the one step of the educational process. In essence what is happening is this: I have said something to you and then he's trying to find out if you can duplicate it. And don't think this isn't therapeutic. It is! It jolly well is! But we're not interested in it from a therapy line. We're interested in it from the basis of the communication of a datum, and you get finally so that you can actually take a datum and so on. Now let's look at this. This process has been going on for six months or more with some of the older students here; and 3D came out incomplete, not well stated, just brrrr! you know, and that's it. And they did it at once and got results with it at once. In other words, it took them – oh, perhaps 10 minutes to understand it; this is length of time to look at it and read it. I mean it was that fast, you see, and they could put it into action and they could do something with it, and all of a sudden this happened. Well, this doesn't mean that they've become puppetized, it simply means that their ability to duplicate it has now gone over into a second stage – understand – because of course they weren't given any data to duplicate. Now, you look at the original issue of 3D, or the original mention of 3D that was given to you. Why, the first mentions of it are just some scribbles in the case histories, you know, in the case folders, the first mentions of it, and then there's a rather incomplete description of 3D Criss Cross that doesn't amount to a hill of beans, and then there's class rumor. Well, what I'm showing you is there was practically nothing there to duplicate in the way of wording, and yet these people had actually gotten to this point, where they not only could duplicate the datum that was said to them but they could get what this was and they could understand what this datum was and put it into use. Now, look at that as a considerable gain, and look at it for just what it is, as a gain, a training gain. And that's quite remarkable. Now, the comm lag on others who hadn't had that much training has been something on the order of ten days to two weeks, to first duplicate the wording – and complain because there wasn't any wording, don't you see? They were still in a step where they had to have the exact words. And then finally, it took an amplification of a bunch of exact words and a lot of individual notations in case folders for them all of a sudden to do what they were doing and get a result, and the understanding is dawning. See, that's slightly different action. Do you see this as a training mechanism? Do you see where this winds up as a training mechanism? Do you see what its stages are? In other words, your first gradient of the thing is no comprehension of the words. This is your first gradient, see, no comprehension of the words. Now, it's quite shocking to find that morale is suffering, and all sorts of things are going wrong in some HGCs, by being made to exactly duplicate a bulletin. Do you see where they are there? Do you see where they are on the training step? It would not matter, by the way, as far as their ability to learn was concerned – let's look this over. Let's say we were just trying to increase a person's ability to learn. Learning rate – that was the only thing we were trying to increase. Let's just think of that, see. It wouldn't matter if we were teaching them automotive assembly books; you know, manuals used in Detroit for the assembly of automobiles, to a person who is never going to assemble an automobile and has never assembled one and hasn't even played with toy cars. See, it wouldn't matter if we were doing that. Or the "Works Progress Administration History of Socialism and its Development in the Northern Part of Arizona," you know, there's probably volumes of books on that. They paid them if they got out some stacks of paper on the Works Progress Administration. They'd get somebody who was out of work, so they made sure he didn't do any because otherwise he would have been in work, and all he had to do was pile up old clippings and papers, you see? They didn't have to relate to anything. And then at government expense they were published between very thick covers in very heavy volumes, and they were quite available for a while. You could get them to hold up corners of desks where the leg was missing, you know, and they were very useful; but they were the most non sequitur nowhere as far as data was concerned you ever cared to cast your eye over. We could use that, do you see? We could use the "Legal Code of the Early Church of England as Interpreted by the Catholic Church." We could! I don't care what you're using, as long as there's some data stated. Doesn't matter how much dunnage or how little dunnage as long as there's some data studied. Is data there to study? You would still do this. You'd still use this as learning rate. You see where we are? See, we'd read it off. We'd have the individual sitting there and we would read it off to the individual. This would be the stylized auditor type of approach on this, and we would say, "All the churches of Northumbria were deprived of their windows because of a window tax which was three and six per window per sabbatical." ("Sabbatical." That's what it said, see.) And we tell the individual, "All right, say that." You know? "Now, what did I just say?" you know? And he'd say, "The window tax – window tax? What about window tax is this? What's sabbatical mean? What's this? Yeah. What book are you reading, anyway? Where did this come from? What part of Northumbria are you talking about?" You get all this confusion? And you've got an example now of your first step. As you try to merely get him to repeat a line of sounds (you don't even call them words, you see?) he gets tremendous confusion. So your first state in which the person is in is one of tremendous data

confusion which blows off at any attempt to duplicate data. So it blows off at once that there's an attempt to duplicate data on his part, he starts blowing off this confusion. "Northumbria? What Northumbria? What sabbatical? Two and six? Two and six window tax. But who would have been taxing them? Uh - who - what tax? What is a tax? Was there anybody taxing anybody at that particular time?" Now you get down to the communist level of this, we would have had a communist cell meeting to discuss whether or not capitalists should exist, you see, because we've mentioned tax. In other words, it just would have hung up on some button some place or another, and would have come into a total collision with this button, and from there on we never would have moved off the button. This is of tremendous use, by the way, when you're handling committees. You know, the art of getting something done through a committee has never been perfected. This has never been perfected in the history of man. If you don't want to get anything done, appoint a committee. And don't put anybody on it who has an individual responsibility for any piece of its work. Just give it in general to the committee. Now we've really got malfunction in screaming exclamation points, malfunction from here on out. Well, similarly, the way you can park any committee or any board - and some of you might want to know this sometime; it's sometimes of great moment for you not to have something discussed, and not permit them to come to any conclusion or pass a motion. Committees, being only a medium of half-thought-out averages anyway, generally will arrive at the wrong decision about most anything. You know, they haven't got much of the data, and they're not really interested, and nobody there is responsible, and they sort of just want to get rid of it all, you know? And they get into that state of mind, and they're suddenly discussing something that is a very, very important point that is going to affect the longevity and management of this company or group, and man, you just are not about to get something like that. The way you want to do this is just introduce any button that will cause them to take zero responsibility. Just introduce any button that will reduce their responsibility. Anything! It doesn't matter. Give them a restimulative word. Just do it by symbols. You see, you're trying to paralyze this committee, that's what you're trying to do, you see, just overtly, so they won't make a wrong act. They say, "Well, I don't know. Shouldn't the pay plan that is being brought up someplace - shouldn't the pay plan - this pay plan - maybe we could check with the guy - it's being prepared by the accounts department. Pay plan, shouldn't that be thought up by someone - pay plan?" And you say, "Well, yes." You can just see it now, some outrageous damn thing that nobody could put into execution, you see? Nobody's particularly interested in this thing, so . . . One of the principal buttons that is used in this is the word study, see, and that just hangs everybody. Just introduce study into the thing, you see? Bang! And it just hangs the works here. And just say, "We'll make a proposal that the matter be given further study," and hit study hard. You get it parked right there. It'll just stop. It's gorgeous! You don't have to introduce like that. You can say something, "Well, wasn't the last time this type of proposal was proposed, wasn't that - " you know, there was a fellow by the name of Bellham who was just hated throughout the whole organization, you see, just say this word and everybody went Eeeee! and so on - you say, "Wasn't that last proposed by Bellham?" Everybody of course takes no responsibility for it instantly, you see? And then they will get into a discussion about Bellham, and you're all set. But they just derail on a button like that! And you'll see somebody do this, you'll see it when they're studying like this. This fellow's got lots of overts on the Sabbath. So you say "sabbatical," he's wondering if this is connected with Sabbath, and you just get into a total discussion of "Sabbath. Is it right to have a Sabbath? Where was the Sabbath originated? Really wasn't it a pagan introduction in the first place?" and we go on and on and on. It has absolutely nothing to do with what we're studying. He'll derail right at that point. That's very interesting. Now, you'd think this person would have to have lots of auditing to get rid of this. No, there is another system that gets rid of this and that is it sort of teaches him that he can ride past these hung points, see, that the hung points don't keep him from duplicating. And he gradually learns this, you see? These buttons that he's got really don't keep him from duplicating something. See, even if it's upsetting and he doesn't like it he can still duplicate it, and eventually he begins to see duplication in its proper light. Duplication is duplication. It is not running out buttons, it is simply duplication. It just is itself, that is all. Now, you couldn't see at all unless you could duplicate. You've got to be able to look down that row of doors or something like that, you look down the row of doors and you see that there was a row of doors there. You can play this on some PCs in processing with the most fantastic results. You just say, "Well, what's over there along that wall?" And some fellow will say, "Oh, uh - uh - must be students' lockers. Those doors don't fit very well at the top, do they? Well, they must be some kind of students' lockers. They were probably put in there for some purpose or another." Then all of a sudden he'd say, "Well, do you have a carpenter working for you?" What did you ask him? You said, "What's down that wall?" you see? Actually all he's got to do is look down the wall and say "There's some doors there," but he always does it the hard way. Just watch him at first glance and he will just do it the hard way. That's the way it will roll off of this whole operation. You ask somebody, "What is over your head?" just ask them that sometime. "What is over your head right now?" Say it very meaningfully so that they really understand that it's over their head, and you mean now. And brother, you're going to get some of the most interesting discussions you ever heard of. Things which are threatening them, and so forth; well, they're not quite sure. Some girl says, "Well, yes, I know my hair looks rather messy, but uh . . ." You get all sorts of oddball, offbeat derailments of the whole thing. Well, what's over your head right now? The ceiling, of course, is what's over your head right now. They always manage to miss the obvious. And factually, it takes a lot of drilling before people will observe the obvious, and that is all there is to that step, is obnosis: the observation of the obvious. "What is in front of your face?" just ask somebody sometime who has low havingness and can't reach much. Just ask that question, "What is in front of your face?" Of course, the obvious answer is "You are." But, you know, you can get some of the most conditional and oddball responses you ever want to heard of from simple questions of that particular type. Well, that's because the individual isn't really adding significance's into everything, it's because every time he thinks of something significance plunges in and he thinks he's got to pay more attention to the significance than he pays to what was going on. In other words, what is happening to him right now, you see, is less important than what might happen to him or what is coming in on him or the consequences of all of it. He's consequence-happy so he's really not in present time at all. Well, when you take this parking button called "study," people tend to go sort of "Ummmmm," you know, on this anyhow, and that's a very good button to work on

because it's inflow of data, therefore the duplication of data, and no more important than that, just the duplication of the datum spoken. You understand, I'm not now saying a datum like "a problem is postulate-counter-postulate." I'm not talking about a significant datum. I'm talking about any datum, either significant or nonsignificant. You could say, "There is one Christmas in a year," and some people will promptly say, "Well, that is insufficiently important. Of course everybody knows there's one Christmas in a year." You'll get all kinds of chitter-chatter and so forth. The only thing you've asked them to do is repeat this after you, what you say. You say, "There is one Christmas in a year." And the person would say, "Of course I know there's only – any damn fool knows there's only one – what – what kind of a thing is it – you think – what – what is this all about?" And you say, "Well, all right. Good. But – just – just – let's just repeat this after me, There is one Christmas in a year." "Well, there's no sense in it. Of course, everybody knows that there's one Christmas in a year," and so forth. And they're into the terrible non significance of it, you see? You stated something sufficiently non significant that they can't do anything about it. There's nothing there to attack and they just get terribly disappointed, you see? You say, "Most men are male." You know, "Most men are male." Or you say, "Women are females." "Women are females. Well, of course we know most women are fe – what are you talking about? Naturally," and so forth. "Naturally, of course, everybody knows that. What – what are you saying that for?" And you will get – all of a sudden the fellow becomes very curious about you, and what your motives are and what your intentions are and what you're trying to do here. Well, it's a fantastic proposition. You just say, "Women are females." "There's one Christmas in a year." "Days begin at midnight." Some people would not realize that, you know, and they'd say, "Oh, really? Do they?" And you say, "Well, all right. But 'Days begin at midnight,' I just want you to repeat that. Just 'Days begin at midnight.'" "Well, that's a funny thing. I never knew that before, you see?" And they've just flown off into interest, see? And they're all stuck on the interest, you see? And you're just saying, "'Days begin at midnight.' That's what you're supposed to say." And the fellow says, "Ah, well. Why should I go into that, you know? 'Days begin at midnight....' What are we studying here? Is this a lesson in Scientology or about time? Or is time part of Scientology? Are there any axioms about time? Oh, I see! Oh, I see! Yes, I see! The days begin at midnight! And it's – oh, what axiom does that refer to anyway?" And you say, "No, no. Just repeat after me, 'Days begin at midnight.'" "Yeah, but why?" You get the whole idea, see? In other words, they have an automatic reflexive mechanism. They're going on a total basis of stimulus-response and nothing else. Just total stimulus-response. But what's responding? The person or a bank? And this is just another way of digging up a thetan. Eventually you get to a point where the thetan responds. You say, "The day begins at midnight." He says, "The day begins at midnight." It doesn't bother him any if the day begins at midnight or the day doesn't begin at midnight. Has nothing to do with it. You just say, "The day begins at midnight." He says, "The day begins at midnight." "Good!" All right. You say, "Christmas comes once a year." He says, "Christmas comes once a year." Right? Now, people who don't like this and are still enturbulated on it say, "Well, you're making a slave there," you see, "that's slavery," or something like that. "That's something very deep-seated and very significant. There's something very significant about this operation. If you can get a person to do this, he of course thereafter is a slave, see, obviously!" – except the data is never borne out. The only time you really get a person to talk back sensibly is when he can do this, because he can observe what he's talking back about; and up to that time you get people talking back about things that aren't happening, and that's very disconcerting. Somebody comes in and raises hell with you because of the hussars that are all over the front lawn. And you go and look, you don't see any hussars on the front lawn. And you ask him to go look and see if there are any hussars on the front lawn and he says, "Why should I look? I just know." And you say, "Well, that's fine. Well, let's go look at the front lawn and see if there are any hussars there." "Why should I do that? Are you doubting my word?" And now we go off into a discussion of whether or not you think he is a gentleman. Do you see the various excursions that we get on this? He starts with some unreasonable premise and winds up with an idiocy. All you're asking a person to be able to do is simply duplicate a datum. You say, "Christmas occurs once a year," and he says, "Christmas occurs once a year," and it doesn't bother him and it doesn't not bother him. Now, at the same time this individual can turn around and do something else which is quite interesting. This individual can cause himself to be duplicated. So, he has a brand-new thought all of his own little own, and he said, "I'm going to paint this house green." And he goes out and he says to somebody, "Paint the house green." And the person says, "Um-hmmm-mmm. Viridian, eh?" "No, no, just green." "Oh, well. There's lots of greens, you know? Green, there's lots of greens. There's lots of types of paint, too. What paint store do you deal with? Well, I tell you what I will do. There is a house over in the next county that is painted a particular shade of green, and we will write them a letter and find out what paint company they got the paint from and what shade it was, but of course you will have to go over and take a look at that house first to find out what color that house really is." And you'd say, "No, I want this house painted just common, ordinary, run-of-the-mill, just green." And they will try again. They will say, "Some paints don't last as long as others." If you can do that, you yourself have developed the ability to get yourself duplicated on your own ideas. And you'd be surprised; if you can do this well, you'd be surprised as your ability rises how the duplication occurs with the greatest of ease. You go out and tell somebody to paint it green, he pulls a color card out of his pocket and says, "You want this one or this one or this one? You want that one? That's it. All right." He goes and gets the paint and he paints the house green, does a good job of it and that's all fine. This cuts down randomness like mad. In other words, by learning to duplicate you can get into a state where you yourself can be duplicated. Now, this is not exactly a processing activity. This is the process of life and livingness that is most significant. And it's havingness like mad because you start to have the things that you're surrounded with. All right. Beyond duplication comes understanding. Understanding comes after duplication, not before. Now, how much understanding do you think this fellow did when you said "Christmas comes once a year," and he said, "Well, why are we taking that up? It doesn't seem to have very much to do with the process," and so on and so on. Well, you'll find out nearly everything he's asking you summates into not understanding, or trying to understand. You've told him the datum "Christmas comes once a year"; this is the datum you've told him. Now, he tries like mad to understand that datum and he can't grasp it. He'll just work himself frantic trying to understand this datum, to understand what datum is there, understand your motives in trying to get him to understand this

datum, trying to understand what the datum applies to, try to understand why there is nothing there to understand; and you'll find out most of his "Ooooooo-oooooo-ummmm" is just some kind of an effort to understand. And this is why study is such an important button, because that's "getting somebody else to understand relieves anybody of any responsibility for understanding." Every government in the world at the present moment is totally seized with this as a mechanism. This is their operating mechanism. They don't have to understand anything because they can always have it studied, you see? And that just absolutely stops any progress in a committee or anything else. You've stopped it instantly and at once. You say "It's going to be otherwise studied so therefore you don't have to duplicate any part of it; if it's going to be studied, you don't have to understand any part of it and therefore all we expect from you is to execute something which you have no comprehension of and haven't found out in the first place." And you get the usual democratic processes when they are totally abused. They're pretty mad. See, democracy does not work in the absence of understanding. It can't work. Now, here's your second thing, then. If responsibility for understanding depends on personal study - and it does - why, then of course you have raised the person's ability to comprehend, or understand. Not only does Christmas come once a year, but now beyond that point he is capable of understanding and studying "Christmas" and "once a year" and what this refers to. Now he's capable of finding out that it's a totally unimportant datum. Up to that time it might be important, it might not be important; God help us, we never would be able to find out whether it was something we had to know, or something that we didn't much care about, or something we're liable to be shot because we didn't know, or something that we'd certainly better forget in a hurry, or something that goes along with the fact that most peoples have shoes, the bottoms of the soles of which are dirty. You see that? So classification of the importance of data is the thing which lies up there as the second step. Well, that's your third step. Your first is non comprehension, non duplication, confusion. Your second one is merely the ability to duplicate. And after that we get the ability to comprehend, to understand, and therefore get the ability to observe. Judgment lies in that field and this is a road to judgment. Now, nobody has really ever bothered to teach anybody judgment before in the last 200 trillion years. And you're not going to find much judgment in any bank you've got. If there had been much judgment in it, you wouldn't have it as a bank. Look at that. If this valence had been capable of enormous study, differentiation and judgment, you wouldn't have it as an aberrative valence. Isn't that so? So this has been a scarcity on the track. So you have here in essence, a new skill. It's going to be very difficult to process it into somebody because they've never had it. They were capable of observation once, but how did they observe? They always put a curve on the observation in order to make a game out of it or something like that. Pure observation, pure study, pure duplication, pure comprehension, or pure judgment have never been a study in the field of philosophy. They just don't exist. You just will not find these things as subjects of discussion, even. They are touched on very slightly by the Plato's and Socrates' and so forth of yesteryear, but just touched on very slightly. Totally avoided in religions and religious philosophies. Oh, they're just avoided like mad! Oh, it's just like showing them a snake spitting in their face, you know? HUUUUH! Comprehension, understanding, duplication? Oh, no, no, no, no, no! That's what you're not supposed to do! And of course we know what the source of all this is. The greatest overt there is is enforcing a non-comprehension. That's an overt! You don't believe it? Take somebody sometime, you say, "What have you done?" Oh, this girl has got withholds, she's got crimes, she can't wear any of her frocks because they're so bloodstained, you know? She doesn't dare reach into any of her purses because of the asps she's stacked away at one time or another, you know? She can't even open up her own medicine chest with any feeling of security because of the arsenic coming out, you know? And we say, "What have you done?" And she says, "Done? Well, I ate dinner." And you say, "Well, what have you withheld?" "I haven't withheld anything." "All right. Good. Well, what have you done?" "Oh, I sat down here a while ago." "Good. Well, what have you withheld?" "Nothing. I never withhold anything. My life is an open book." And you go utterly mad trying to security check this person because you can't find any responsibility on which to hang the Security Check. You've got to increase their responsibility before you can find any withholds. They're there but they're totally muzzled, you see, by the irresponsibility of the attitude of the PC. You see, one of the ways you tell if a case is gaining is whether or not it's getting more withholds off. Well, that's just a way of saying "Is the case gaining in responsibility?" Yes, the case is gaining in responsibility, because they're getting more withholds off. Weren't withholds up to that time. But you can take this same person, this same girl, and you could say, "What doesn't your family know about?" "Oh, well, that is something else. Well, they don't know that I poisoned Joe, that I shot Pete. They don't know anything much about where I hid the body last month. They don't know what happened to the children. Ha-ha-ha-ha! They - ah..." see, and "don't know" is still a button. All the way down "don't know" is still a button, all the way down and all the way up. It's a button the whole way. You can always security check with "don't know" and "not know," when overts and withholds are passing right over the PC's head like these orbiting space flights that aren't taking off, you know? See, "don't know" goes all the way. So a study of not-knowingness has been approached by philosophy by two philosophers - notably two philosophers: one is Kant and the other one is Spencer. They've concluded that what wasn't known couldn't be known. Oh, how interesting! In other words, the closest approach philosophy has ever made to "don't know" or "not know" has been that you couldn't know. That's interesting, isn't it? So, as I tell you, there has been no road to judgment. Now, for many years I've been trying to teach you characters judgment. It has been a tough and difficult job. Judgment on the subject of another being, the ability to understand what was going on in a session, and operating with judgment so as to do the right thing about it. Now, do you know what bars you from judgment? It's just the not-knowingness of it all. Well, where's the not-knowingness of it all come from? It begins first with duplication. There is the entrance. Oh, of course you could security check it out. "What don't people know about you?" and so forth, and smarten the guy up no end; but that's a processing approach, and we're not now talking about a processing approach because there is nothing there to process to. You see, processing processes to what is there, see? Now, if a thetan ever got himself in bad condition, he's invalidated his own judgment, he's come off of his own judgment. The whole lesson of this universe teaches a person not to duplicate, just as it teaches him not to communicate. You know, there are only two crimes in this universe that you have committed and that you have made others guilty of having committed: One is being there and the other is

communicating. Those are the two crimes. There are no other crimes than that, being there and communicating. Now, if those two crimes are crimes, and those things have been made into crimes, then there's only one other thing that you can possibly make up your mind about it: A person has to learn, you might say, not really learn, but become comfortable with being there and communicating. And the way and the route one would take to bring comfort on the subject of being there and communicating would of course be duplication of a datum. Now, a datum is a location which doesn't have to be pinned down. A datum is a location, a cousin to a thetan, you know? All data is a sort of a cousin to a thetan. You know, he's an idea, he thinks sometimes and he's got ideas and he can communicate ideas. You can always put a whole stack of ideas into your thetan briefcase and have no mass at all. So it's ideally portable, most portable thing in the world is an idea, so thetans chased out of here and chased out of there begin to use ideas for location. They feel comfortable when they have an idea, you know. And that idea that they feel comfortable about is an identity. Even though the identity is mobile, they feel more comfortable with an identity than without one because it gives them the sensation of being located. They like this. So what's the conclusion here? The conclusion is that you can learn to have judgment, and the way you learn to have judgment is just those two steps: duplication of data, and, pursuant to that, understanding. There's the duplication, the understanding. You don't get it this way: you don't get understanding and then duplication. Now, what you should know about this is it's any data would serve as long as it is data, any data. "Classification of the Geological Formations of the Middle East as Observed by the Geological Department of Serving After the Fact of the Appointments from the Rockmount Foundation, Appertaining Only to Schists and Slides of the Lower Saudi Arabian Canyons," in 185 volumes, folio, see? That's data, you know? It's wild data, you know? "Anamorphic schists are often found most closely blended with hornblende." You say to the PC, "Anamorphic schists are most closely blended with hornblende." Well, this would be a "fascinating" situation. He would wind up, of course, with a drill. He would wind up with an ability to do something, and he would also wind up with judgments on the subject of women, which I think is marvelous. Nobody could wind up with that. I've been trying all these years. It's impossible. And yet he could, by studying the anamorphic schists for the formation of hornblende. Very interesting! Now, beyond that you cannot go in the teaching of judgment. You cannot teach a man how he should judge something and still have him judge something. You understand that you can teach a person data. Yes, by force of beingness in you, you can relay communication and understanding to people and they do understand it. Well, I'll give you an example of that. One ACC I did nothing but lecture. Nobody processed anybody this whole ACC and they all had marvelous profile gains. I gave them two lectures a day and we went over all kinds of data and so on. Well, that was just a relay of understanding and comprehension, and they felt better and they had a bunch of cognition's on the thing and life looked better to them. You understand? So that was in itself a kind of a processing. That had one of the highest gain ACCs we ever had, which is interesting. Now, this is totally possible, and without that possibility of course we'd never get anyplace. So that possibility natively exists. But let's take the other one. Let's take the other one. Let's raise a level of skill on the subject of judgment, just overtly and directly create a level of skill on the subject of judgment. We would do that by duplication. All right. What's this amount to here? What's this amount to? We are doing this - you do not see how this is working out according to the educational processes of the 17th ACC; first reason (to have no withhold from you, and so forth) is it wasn't realized or rationalized from those directly. What you're dealing with right this minute stems from prior understanding to the 17th ACC; 17th ACC is an outcrop of that understanding of how to go about these things. Nor are you dealing necessarily with a preconcerted effort to give you understanding. You're not dealing with that either. You are dealing accidentally with two different things, and one of those things is just the action of understanding and duplication, you're dealing with that, and at the same time you are dealing only with the data of Scientology which you can learn. But incidentally the data of Scientology is being used to develop in you judgment, not on the subject of Scientology. Now, you don't notice this because you're learning judgment across a pretty high, beefy line. This is a high-voltage line, you see? So if you can learn judgment off of this line, marvelous! Because this line, of all others, would tend to destroy your self-determinism and judgment, wouldn't it! Yeah, you're not given any chance to think what life's all about. My God! Is there anything else to think about than what life is all about? Isn't that right? Well, I'll give you what life is all about, and then you don't have to think about it at all, and you're all set, and that's it, hm? Well, the data is true so therefore it tends to stick, right? Do you know that a lot of you, unbeknownst to you, have run straight through having been taught it. And some of you haven't noticed that you've gone through having been taught it. You've come up on the other side of the thing into a realization of it; and now you have the realization of it, not because you've been taught it, but because you realize it. And this is what we know as "making it your data." You've often said this to a student but some of you perhaps have not looked too closely on what we mean by "make it your data." In other words, he has to go along the line of duplication of the data to an understanding of the data, and with that understanding of the data he has the final step, which is the realization, totally self-determined, of the existence of the data. And when you're dealing with truth you always have this fourth step. You have the ability to realize and to perceive. So you have first this "Thaa! What wall? Don't ask me to duplicate anything." Then you have simple duplication, and that's followed by understanding, and that is followed by realization or own comprehension. So therefore one's own self-determinism is restored on such a track. Of course it's most rapidly restored on such a track by teaching the person the exact truth of something. There is the truth of something, he is able to duplicate the truth of something after many travails, and this truth of something is immediately pursued by the understanding of that something he has been taught. You understand that that is a stage; he's still dependent on you for the understanding of what's been taught. And your next stage up is a realization, which he reached at a sudden step up the line on his own bootstraps, so to speak. He regained an ability to understand, and so then he himself could realize. That's the route that you're taking. That route has total self-determinism and other-determinism and, of course, therefore, pan-determinism all mixed up in it, all at one fell swoop. The person becomes pan-determined over the data. The person can not only understand why they learned the data but why the data was taught to them, and understand and realize - of course the realization includes the independent truth of the datum regardless of having been taught the datum. And with that, of course, a person has reached a high peak of the ability to judge something. A person then

has judgment. There's no other route that I know of. I mean if this is not a perfect route, all right, so it isn't a perfect route. There is no perfect route. Perhaps there is a perfect route, but there is no perfect route to hand at the moment if this is not a perfect route. But there is this, that it is the first route through to such an end product. It certainly is that. And it is married in against an entirely different function. So you get a side play of the same thing. That is to say, you've got this thing doing two things. It wouldn't matter – well, your instructor has the horrible idea occasionally – he says, "All right. Now, what time span is there in an instant read? How soon must the read occur after the thing, an instant read?" I don't know how many answers you've got. I wouldn't set it right for worlds; not for worlds, I wouldn't set it right. Gives the instructor a marvelous opportunity. He can say, "Yes. But that tape, see? What does it say on that tape? That tape!" And you say, "Well, actually, it's a half a second, a quarter of a second, a fifth of a second, a tenth of a second, it doesn't matter. I mean there – there it is." "Ah, but which one is it on that tape?" "Well, I can't tell you what that tape is. It doesn't matter whether it's a quarter of a second, half of a second, a fifth of a second, and so on, so on. I mean, all these answers and so on" – natter, natter, natter, natter. And he says, "Flunk!" And you go back and snarl, and run up a whole bunch of overts against me, and so forth, and listen to the tape again. And you say, "Well, what do you know? Hang on, let's see, what was it on that exact tape? Oh, gorbimey! I never heard that before! A twentieth of a second! Twentieth of a second! Kaaa! All right," and you go in. "Twentieth of a second." "All right, that's it." Now, you see, it'd be totally pedantic (and we're not doing it on this other system) for the instructor to say "What are the first seven words in the fifth paragraph of the third bulletin written in 1959 in the month of June?" See, that is just becoming a memory contest, and if you'll notice, nearly all study is devoted to memory contests. And nobody is asking you to engage in a memory contest. Somebody is asking you to engage in a duplication activity. If you can duplicate the data your memory will come up sooner or later – even yours. It's very, very horrible; some of you first confronting this thing, you find it ghastly! You find it utterly horrible. It's the most terrible thing you ever confronted. Recognize the mechanism you're up against, and recognize that not for a moment is anybody going to relent on this datum. Also find out, as you go along, all of a sudden you're able to understand things you weren't able to understand before, which is all quite peculiar; and you possibly have never noticed this, but you're now understanding things you never understood before that have to do with other things that have nothing to do with training, nothing to do with the subject matter you're training on, which is quite amazing. You get something going like this, why, you've made gains in another direction, and that's what an auditor has to have. An auditor has to have comprehension. He has to be able to understand what he is looking at. He has to understand what is going on. An auditor who gets into this kind of a situation is a dead one, he's lost. The PC says, "Ah, women are such a bore!" And he's pulled the same gag you might have pulled on the committee, as far as the auditor is concerned. He said that fatal word – two fatal words: He said women and bore. These things are not compatible, outrageous! One can't possibly marry up those two words in the same sentence. Whoever imagined they could become bored with women? This is incomprehensible, and the auditor just sits there and he starts some kind of a natter, natter, natter, interrupt the PC, you see? "Women, bore? Women, bore? What are you talking about?" And instead of saying "TR 4" cheerily, and going on with the session, he says "Natter, sub-natter." He does all kinds of things, says Q and A, "What did you say? Where are we going? What are you doing? Why? Why did you say that? Have you got an engram there? What's happening in the thing?" and so forth. In other words the auditor goes into a "trying to understand," do you hear that? PC can sometimes put you into a "trying to understand," and you'll find yourself having a hard time auditing the PC for quite another reason. You don't audit PCs by telepathy, and this PC isn't talking very much or loudly, you see? And you say to the PC, "All right now, what is your opinion of women?" And the PC says, "Ummm-ummm." And you have to say "What did you say?" Not to understand what the PC says is a misdemeanor of the first water. The PC is sort of putting you on a point where you are made to think that you don't understand the PC because you can't understand what the PC's saying. I remedy this usually quite well; PC goes – tips over, is all curled up in a ball, head is down in the chair, mouth totally compressed against the curve of the arm, and is saying "Ummm, ummmm," and so on. I don't risk any ARC breaks on my part or theirs. I say, "Sit up. That's right. Sit up. That's good. Now speak up." And the PC says, "Ummmmmm." You say, "All right. Now, what was that answer again?" "Oh, women are such a bore." "All right. Thank you very much," you know? "All right." In other words, I make the PC communicate to me, which may be tougher but you'll find out that you'll run up ARC breaks when you don't. You pays your money and you takes your chance. In other words, if you leave him in that condition, you're going to have – soon you're going to be totally out of comprehension of what's going on with the PC. You're also going to feel that you don't comprehend what the PC is doing, and therefore you can't observe anything that's happening to the PC and all sorts of things go wild. But let's get back on the other thing. Let's take an auditor who cannot happily duplicate a datum, a non sequitur datum, but always insists that he hang up on a button. And the PC says, "Women are such a bore," and he knows that this can't exist, and he himself has lots of trouble with women, and his immediate response is "Why is women boring? What is this?" and so on, and go squabble out of session here. "You've challenged me. I don't believe that. That hasn't anything to do with this. Just why did you come to that particular conclusion? I don't see what there is in the auditing command that would make you come to that conclusion." The PC finally says, "Well, it was just a cognition!" And the fellow says, "Well, it's a cognition. That's a remarkable thing to say when you come to think about it, you know? It's a remarkable thing to say – just a cog...." But the PC says, "But it's just a cognition. You know, I just said it, you know?" He says, "Well, all right." And the auditor goes on, you see, and audits him a little bit longer, and the PC says, "But all men are stupid, when it comes right down to that." And stupid, you know, that's a button, so the auditor says, "Stupid? Who? Oh? Who? Who? Who? What did – what did you say again?" "All men are stupid." "Why did you say that? Do you have a picture there?" and so forth. "What's going on? I mean, have you got an ARC break? Got some withholds? Are you withholding something? Is that what you're withholding, that all men are stupid? Just exactly how does this add up?" and so on. And the PC says, "But it's just a cognition. I – I just – just – I – I – I just had the idea. I'm sorry. I'm sorry." And you then have a PC who won't blow anything. You have a PC who is punished for cogniting. You have a PC who is punished for auditing and therefore have a PC who is punished for getting rid of pieces of the bank. And if you audit the PC in that framework the PC will make no gain because

they're being taught not to blow anything, because they don't ever dare mention anything; and they're made sorry every time they open their mouths because there's no comprehension. They look up, the auditor's trying to understand, trying to understand, trying to hear, trying to hear, trying to find out what it is, what it is, what it is, where it came from, where it came from, wha - da-da-da-da-da - if you'll just - you don't - no, no - you've got the auditor on trying to comprehend, trying to comprehend, trying to comprehend. And of course you haven't got an auditor at that stage who is capable of duplicating what the PC said. My God, I've heard PCs say some of the most outrageous things you ever heard of in your life. Now, this never startled me particularly, but once in a while I have been startled by something. You notice that you're normally most startled by overts or withholds the PC has which pertain immediately and directly to you, or to somebody you're close to or like, you know? You're immediately influenced by these particular overts and withholds. Well, what if the whole session - supposing the auditor were in such poor state with regard to duplication that every bit of the auditor's auditing was as reactive toward the PC as your sudden Rrorrr! when the PC has just told you some fantastic lying withhold about you. Now, you know your own startlement when you've heard one of these occasionally. Well, supposing they're trying to understand - "Where did you hear that?" you know? Right away you're just yanked out of it sometimes, you know? He says, "Well I - I have a withhold. I - I saw you...." You say, "Yes, what?" "Well, I saw you up at the corner of the lane up there the other night with - well, you know who." "Well, who? Who? Who?" you know, "Who? Who did you see me up there with?" and so forth. "Oh, well - well, you know. We needn't really go into it." "Well, what's this all about? Where did you hear that? I mean, did you see that yourself? Did you see it in person? Were you there? What time was it? Well, did anybody else see it?" you know? You'll get caught off base, and you will ask more questions about it than you ordinarily would ask about something else. That's your effort to try to understand because you're hung up on some kind of a button that concerns you intimately. Do you see that? All right. Now, an auditor who can't duplicate runs the whole session in that frame of mind. Not just things that relate to him, but anything that relates to anything, the auditor has the same greeting of that - the same greeting from the auditor. The PC says, "It's been a nice day all day." The auditor says, "What? What? Where? Where? Where? I mean, where did you hear that? Oh, you - you what? Today. Oh, you're talking about today, not yesterday. Well, I thought it was a nice day today too, that is, this morning, early. Yes, let's see. What were we talking about? Oh, yes. The auditing command was - what was the auditing command? Yes - yes. Have I withheld anything from you? All right. Have I withheld anything from you?" You watch it, man. Therefore, if you get a zone or area where the auditors are having one awful time trying to duplicate a bulletin, what must you also assume? That they've been in there endlessly trying to understand the PC, trying to understand the cases, being hung up on all kinds of wild-ball buttons, and they're right down there at the first stage I gave you. They're in that stage. See, if their morale is going down because they can't pass any bulletin tests, you would know at once how they've been handling PCs. Do you see that? So duplicative training is absolutely essential. And it is successful. Now, you can make up your mind to that. Now, what I've talked to you about you may or may not have found very burningly interesting. Naturally, it doesn't apply to you personally. But in training auditors you should know it. The baptism of fire that causes people to look so pale and so drawn under the thing is, for instance, duplicating under resentment. See, they go through all kinds of emotional bars on this particular thing. Learn like mad but it's all resented like mad, you see, because "Uhhhhh! It couldn't possibly be - uhhhhh!" and so on. Well, they pass through that one too. But sometimes you see a student here who goes around for the first two or three weeks, and they get paler and paler, and shadowier and shadowier, more and more hollow-eyed, more and more gaunt, things looking worse and worse. Or they look more and more apathetic. You can hear them the way they start up their cars, and things. You can hear about how a new student is going, you know? At first, why, they start up their cars in a sort of a puzzled way; and then they start up a car, you know, very angrily indeed, you see? You can hear the gears crash about three times as they get up the drive, you know? And then eventually they wander up the driveway running into both sides of the verge; you know about what state they have reached, and so on. That's all done by training, and it is not the route of processing. Don't consider it a processing route. It is just a route by training because it is a new skill. You very often have been asked in the past to memorize "the structural components of a Mark VII space vessel with gyro rotators, complete, all number parts." I'm sure you've had to do something like this. I'm sure you have had at some time or another. And the funny part of it is you wound up at the other side being able to look at the space vessel; and on the other side of that somebody says to you, "Oh, well, these Mark VIIs - these Mark VIIs, they - they - they sure fly low, and they sure fly slow, Mark VIIs do." "No, no, no," you say, "you don't really understand this ship, you know. You don't understand how to run one. No, when you first get them into the outer area of an atmosphere, you see, you turn on the coolers, you see, at that moment. See, you don't slow them down as you come in. Just turn on the coolers way out there, you see, so that you supercool the whole hull, you see? That's the way you really handle these things. And then you come in, hit the atmosphere on a skip, always hit it on a skip the first time, you see? And then sort of smush in, you know, with everything super cooled. Come in fast, don't lose your speed, you're all right, you see? And then have your counter-blasters in excellent condition so that when you come down toward the surface, and that sort of thing, right at the exact proper - and so as not to waste any fuel - these Mark VIIs, you really have to pour that blaster to it. And if you pour it to it very suddenly and very quickly you stop, you see? And then you land all right. And the reason they're having crashes with them is they just don't understand them. And somebody comes out and watches you land a Mark VII, you don't land one that way at all, but you sure understand one. You understand how to land one; but every time you land a Mark VII you land it entirely differently than at any other time you ever landed a Mark VII. You never land a Mark VII the same way twice, yet you always land them and they never crack up and everything is fine. You got the idea? But you never drive the same ship the same way two days consecutively running. That's because you understand it. Routine and rote, in other words, are a poor substitute for understanding. And the place I'm trying to get you to is a place where you can process by realization, process by comprehension, process by the exercise of judgment. If I can get you to that point, I will have considered it very well worth doing, no matter "ow 'eroic" it has been on the way. Thank you.