

## **OPENING LECTURE**

A lecture given on 15 October 1956

[Start of Lecture]

Well now, going to be seeing a lot of you people.

Well, thank all of you for being here.

Don't be surprised if you feel tired at the end of this week. Don't be surprised.

We have a situation in this ACC which requires a considerable amount of application of thee to the grindstone. SLP 8 has been formulated; it's a fait accompli.

The situation is here that this particular series of processes, numbering twenty-six, must be known inside out, because there isn't a case it can't crack unless the case be dead. And that's only a case, then, of knowing how to whistle back the thetan so that you can process him into making an embalmed corpse walk up and down streets.

But I'm telling you this quite factually and without reservations. I've been at work now for over a year trying to bring up to date these various factors that were loose and rattling around in Scientology. And it amounts to a gradient scale of about twenty-six processes which we're going to call SLP 8, for no reason at all except that it is the eighth in line. And it has been in formulation for about a year.

Now, you're going to do more than twenty-six processes on people -- several more than twenty-six processes. The processes you're going to do start, very bluntly, with the fundamental process used as an auditing process of Indoctrination Course: Indoctrination 1. Dummy Session 1 will be the first process you're to use on your preclear. Got that?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, we'll just go upstairs from Dummy Session 1. Now, Dummy Session 1 is run sitting down, and also can be run standing up. And you will run it both ways.

You understand that the techniques you're going to run are going to be a graduated series of techniques, one to the next; you're going to flatten each one and go on to the next one. And as soon as you've flattened one, why, check it off, you see; that's done as far as you're concerned. You're trying to get this many techniques done. If you try to do them too rapidly, you will immediately overreach your case and find your case capable of doing the next technique very easily, but with no change. That's always the symptom of overreaching a case. All right.

Of course, at the end of this six weeks I expect you to be able to handle individuals and groups on a basis of just postulate placement. You want to know what my goal is for this unit?

Audience: Sure. Uh-huh.

I want every person here to be able to take over in his area or in his auditing, individuals and groups, on a sufficient command level, you might be able to say, and control level, that there'll never be any particular question but what everything is running right in that particular area. That's my goal for this unit. Have to teach you how to reach, teach you how to start, stop and change, and teach you how to make people confront things.

Now, we've accumulated quite a bit of experience in handling PE Courses, Advanced Courses, and so forth. And for weeks one, two and three, in the evening you're simply going to attend something that will serve as a model on the PE and the two stages of the Advanced Course. And then we will go on from there for the remainder of this, and we will knock in the remaining types of courses that you may be called upon to teach. You got that? There's a special method of teaching which is used; their method is contact, and so forth.

Now, you're going to find something amazing in taking this course. You're going to be taught the most fundamental fundamentals that you ever fundamentaled with, in a way which brings them home fairly close and lets you re-rationalize them. We discover rather uniformly that when a person is unable to adapt a new technique, it is ordinarily because his fundamentals are somehow or other awry. So although we will be teaching you how to teach these courses -- because we expect you to be able to teach these courses well -- privately, on a 1.1 level, we're giving your fundamentals the most thorough overhaul we know how to give them. You got it?

Our mission, to a large degree, is an educational mission. And we have just recently learned that we have, contained in our subjects, the entirety of education -- the entirety is there. And you know how long it's been there? This is a shame to me. How long has it been there?

Male voice: Always.

How long has it been there actually, in Dianetics and Scientology? AP&A. It's the Logics, John.

John: Yeah.

Weirdly enough, you just yank the Logics aside, put a new name on them called „*creative education*,“ and you've got it made. We've had it all this time, and the authorities in general around the world are becoming very, very interested in our role in education. This is what they're buying, our ability to educate.

All right. So therefore, in this Advanced Course we have to teach you how to educate. That is why you will be given these courses routinely, just routinely, just as they are given. And I will drop out, occasionally, an hour out of your evening schedule and talk to you about giving that particular course, how it's given and why it's given. As soon as we've got these three courses out of the way, I'll get in there and pitch with you, and I will teach you this thing called creative education, which is Scientology. I'll teach you this thing, show you how it shapes up.

Now, this is the first ACC -- I hate to tell you this, but this is the first ACC that we haven't had to start in and teach an HCA Course. Let that soak up. This is the first one. Now, that's terrific. That's terrific. All we've ever been able to teach in an ACC Course prior to this time is a modified or improved HCA Course, as best we could.

Why? Because we had, always, in the ACCs, people who were sufficiently shaky in their fundamentals, sufficiently shaky in their auditing and command of the subject that we certainly would have been shooting way over the heads of over half the class every time we tried to teach them an upper-echelon subject.

And so we're signaling this by teaching you an exact, precise auditing procedure -- SLP 8 -- which is simply the good parts and the workable pieces of six years of Dianetics and Scientology, aligned on their own gradient scale. We'll teach you the whys and wherefores about this particular SLP 8 and show you how it includes any of the phenomena that you have encountered. It actually simply subdivides in half, the subject does. There are two separate compartments of theory and action, and these are laid out rather easily.

Now, we're terribly interested, we're fascinated, I might say, by the fact that Scientology goes as well as it works. This is so true, You never saw this thing blowing out in all directions wider than it is at this moment. It isn't going out because it's advertised. We do not advertise Scientology. And from here on, we will never advertise it as such in periodicals. We will also discourage the press from writing any kind of a story about it, good, bad or indifferent. Why? Because we don't need it, we don't want it, and we're putting factors on our comm line that don't belong there. Scientology goes by word of mouth. And it goes by word of mouth as well as it works.

Therefore, part of the dissemination of Scientology, and the most essential part of it, is the expertness of its personnel -- particularly the expertness of its key personnel. And when these people are good, both in making Scientology work and in handling and controlling people, individuals and groups, then you have Scientology at a high roar. That is the way it disseminates.

Now, wherever you have seen an area sort of caved in on itself or upset, there's a horrible fact goes along with that: Scientology hasn't been working in that area. It hasn't been working well in that area. That's all. That's the only explanation that we need.

Now, part of the workability of Scientology included its existing state of codification, its technique, you see? That was part of the picture.

Now, I don't know now how we could really not crack a case. I really don't know this. I'd have to figure out some way to go about it. You know, I'd have to probably be run on this. Figure some way to not crack a case.

But do you know you could take the finest processes in the world and if they are not understood -- they're not understood -- you have a diminishment of their value and use. More important than this, if the person who is using them does not have a subjective reality upon their usefulness, you might as well let him stand there and throw ham omelets at the preclear. You got it? Takes a subjective reality and then it takes an objective reality. And it takes both realities. And when a person has both of those realities there's no stopping him.

You can take a poor technique on which an auditor has a high certainty and a good technique on which he has a low certainty, and give him the two to audit on a preclear, and the techniques reverse in their value. The one that he has a good reality on works on the preclear well, and the one he has no reality on, even though it's a better technique, works more woodenly. That's quite remarkable. So it takes both of these things, then, doesn't it?

Well, as we look back across all of these years of training and practice, we see certain data and certain factors which loom up and become more important than other data and factors; they become much more important. And that is one of them. A person doesn't have a reality on a technique, you might as well as give him crowbars to use on the preclear or something of the sort. It'll at least produce a more observable effect, any day.

So your role as a preclear here is not to get good or hot, or anything else. You people are good people and you're in good shape. We're not worried about you. Your role as a preclear is just get audited. Now, don't get into a confused role about the preclear just because I've said that you should have a reality on the technique. There's no reason for you to stand back three feet alongside of the technique and watch whether or not it's working. Who's being audited? You are. So the responsibility of you as an auditor, while you're auditing a preclear, is to make sure he gets a good reality on the technique. You got it? That's the auditor's responsibility. It's not the preclear's responsibility.

Now, many of you guys are very obliging about being audited. You're very well educated preclears in that you will make an improperly stated technique work. An improperly expressed and an improperly run technique, you will sit there and Hobson-Jobson the thing around until it works, just to be obliging. Just because you're a good preclear.

Well, I'll tell you why it is all but impossible for an auditor to foul me up in an auditing session: because I'm the most obliging preclear you ever ran into. Anybody can tell you, whoever audits me, I audit very easily. Unless I'm audited in unworkable

processes. And then I don't audit easily. Why? Let me give you an example, just exactly what I'm talking to you about here:

Fellow tells me, „*Can you see that wall over there?*“

And I say, „*Yes.*“

And he sits there and looks rather -- just get the mock-up of the fellow sitting there, and he's auditing me, and he says, „*Can you see that wall over there?*“

And I say, „*Yes.*“

And he says, „*Well? Well? Well? Well? Well? Can you see the wall over there?*“

I say, „*Yes. Yes, I can see the wall over there.*“

He says, „*Why don't you look at it?*“

„*Because you never asked me to!*“ Now, you got that?

All right. How many of you people would obligingly look at the wall when asked „*Can you see that wall over there?*“ Well now, you're taking enormous responsibility for the session that isn't yours to take. That's not your responsibility. Your responsibility is to obey the auditing command and not do anything else!

So the fellow looks at you, and he says, „*Can you recall a time when you were unhappy?*“

And you say, „*Yes.*“

And he says, „*What was it?*“

And you say, „*What was what?*“

Now, I'm not trying to build you up into belligerent attitudes as preclears. I'm trying to show you that an expert Scientologist only makes a bad preclear when he is too intensely willing to make the subject work even though it isn't being audited on him as such. You got it?

Male voice: Yeah.

Now, there's other types of preclearing which are quite interesting, is one of them, auditor tells you to look at the wall -- „*Can you see it?*“

„*Yes, I can. Yeah, fine.*“ Did you just look at a wall? Or did you do twelve other things too? You got it? Now, that's not your responsibility to monitor as a preclear. Go ahead. Look at the wall and think of twelve other things. If your auditor isn't hot enough to spot that, to hell with him. You're not trying to fool your auditor; you're actually just smoothly in session. But the only real bug that we run into in auditing Scientologists is their enormous willingness to be audited and to make an unworkable, unobeyable auditing command function.

Now, this doesn't mean you're supposed to be very literal-minded people. But this does not then permit your auditor to sort himself out. So he goes on in his auditing career saying, „*Can you recall an unhappy moment?*“ And sometimes people say, „*Yes, I well recall when my Aunt Agatha caught her neck in the wringer and...*“ -- what are you laughing

about? Somebody has been living in farm belts, I can tell. And the person goes on, does that.

The next one is „*Can you recall an unhappy moment?*“

And the fellow says „*Mmmmm... er... um... “*

He says, „*Well,*“ he says, „*that technique doesn't work on him.*”

Well, the funny part of it is, is that technique doesn't work. The diffident auditing command -- the unobeyable auditing command -- never works. Except you as Scientologists get very obliging and work it around so that the fellow said, „*Can you recall an unhappy moment?*“ and you work it around so that he really said, „*Would you please recall an unhappy moment?*“ See, you work that around, make it workable, and so you're altering the session all over the place. You as auditors ought to be able to catch that up in yourself. That's the first lesson you've got to learn, is communicate.

I'm going to give you a lesson right now. Right now. A very important thing. Whenever you have a discrepancy in results from one preclear to the next, the discrepancy is not the technique you're using. That's news to you, most of you. You think of techniques as some harder to run than others. The discrepancy is not the technique used. The discrepancy is the communication employed to utilize the technique.

Where you have preclear 1, preclear 2, preclear 3, and we run some corny process like ARC Straightwire on them and it works on 1, it doesn't work on 2, and it works mediumly on 3, the only difference was not the case level of 1, 2 or 3, but... That's too broad a statement, you see? You say case level -- what's that? The communication factor involved in the delivery of the technique is the only variable. That's all the variable there is in auditing. And until it's pinned down it can be a very wild variable.

To one person or to another person it is less difficult or more difficult to communicate. In other words, you have a varying degree of communication. This fits on a scale which we call the Tone Scale. But that is the variability in technique. If you could communicate -- if you could communicate and communicate only the highest technique we have to the lowest preclear we have, he could do it and it'd work. Do you understand this?

Let me go over that again. Let's say we have a technique which we call „*Zed Opera*“ gobbledygook title here, „*Zed Opera*“ -- and we know that Zed Opera only works, we say, on people who are exteriorized and who have excellent perception in present time, while exteriorized, of everything in sight. That would work on a wild, spinning psycho -- inside, outside or upside down -- if you could communicate it to the psycho in such a way that it was the only thing communicated to the psycho at that time. Are we getting there? That's the only thing communicated to the psycho at that time. That's the trick.

And that's why we have different techniques. Because they're what communicate most easily to the psycho at that level. But the whole stunt is the communication of the technique. That is the stunt. And you do that by varying A and R. And boy, are we

back in kindergarten. We vary A and R, and so we can raise or lower the reachable level of communication -- A, R, C.

C is the most important corner of it, and we vary it, and we have to match scale with it, and the techniques match scale -- their R. And the degree of affinity -- space, and so forth -- employed, is the affinity, which of course also monitors the C. There are people around you have to scream at to get them to do anything.

I'm not saying it's good to stand around and scream at a preclear. There are other ways to communicate with them. If you have to scream at them there are better ways of communicating with them.

So the variability in techniques is actually the variability of their communicability. The sorting out of this factor and the understanding of this factor will be the foremost considerations stressed in this ACC. The variabilities of communication.

Now, here's a fantastic little thing. In London we got awfully pushed. We got things straightened out organizationally a short time ago, and accidentally opened the front door (the right way to for a change), and so many preclears rushed in -- they'd been carefully keeping that one closed, you see -- and so many preclears rushed in so suddenly that we were reaching in all directions for auditors. We were really scrabbling.

We reached into course and took out a five-week -- it's HPA in London -- a five-week HPA student. And the moment that the Director of Training discovered who we'd taken out of there, he went straight up and a mile west. „*Oh, no!*“ he said, „*Anything but that,*“ knowing this person would undoubtedly ruin all of us. She'd ruin the preclear, she'd ruin everything.

„*Oh,*“ I said, „*I don't think so. After all, she's alive. She can sit in the chair without being propped up.*“

And the first day in auditor's conference I found out she wasn't doing so well: She had no basic training, the Instructor had undoubtedly expected her to repeat on the course two or three times, and she just had the longest, most involved, significant report you ever listened to. Brother, that was involved. It seemed that there was a tremendous amount of significance in the way the preclear got his shoes flat on the floor -- the flatness of his shoes, and so on. She just couldn't isolate anything.

On top of that, because the mix-up had been sudden and quick, what do you think happened during the assignment period? The worst, spinniest preclear, the most queasy case we had, was assigned to her. It was a boo-boo. It was an error.

Well, I had to make this error good. And I was running the auditing conferences. So after listening to this terribly involved report, which I cut short after about fifteen minutes -- not because I was bored; I was fascinated. But I saw the other auditors in there getting restive, and they wanted to get on their way and so forth, so I fixated her attention very carefully by getting in front of her, and I said to her, „*Now, what session did you run well in Indoctrination Course?*“

„*Oh! None of them.*“

„Well,“ I said, „do you remember Dummy Session 1?“

„Oh, which one was that?“

I said, „The one where you moved your hands.“

„Oh, I... I remember that,“ she says. „I remember that.“

I said, „Well, that's called Mimicry-Dummy Session 1 Mimicry.“ And I said, „Now, I want you to get the Indoctrination Course mimeo, and I want you to read over how that's done exactly. And that's it.“ And I sent her forth at that moment to get that. And the next day at auditor's conference she had the most involved, significant Auditor's Report you ever saw. So I fixated her attention very carefully, and I said, „Now, did you read that on Mimicry?“

„Yes.“

I said, „Have you tried it on the preclear yet?“

„Well, not yet.“

I said, „Well, now, listen. You'll have to start it out now... You know, first thing in the morning you just start running Dummy Session Number 1.“

So the next day she came into auditor's conference, and she started to give me another half-hour report that was full of significances, and so on, and I said, „Have you started on Dummy Session 1 yet?“

She says, „Well, I've read that, and I've studied it very carefully, and as a matter of fact I got the Indoctrination Instructor to show me how it was done again. But I have to flatten the present time problem, and I have to do this and I have to do that...“ She'd heard this word somewhere. As much as she knew about it.

And I said, „Now, listen. Listen. Tomorrow morning you are going to run Dummy Session 1 on the preclear.“ I said, „Is that right? Dummy Session 1 on this preclear.“ The preclear by this time was practically spinning in, see?

„Well,“ she says, „Oh! I must run that.“

I said, „Ahhh! Ahhh!“

Well, the next day she did. She ran it all day. She didn't have anything to say at the auditor's conference. She just sat there and she was stoned. She just sat there.

„How are you getting on?“

She said, „I... all right.“

Well, this person not only had been the spinniest case we had, given to the youngest, least experienced and most out-of-present-time auditor we had, but had also bought 50 hours and was going to get another week.

Well, as time went on, by Tuesday of the following week, she all of a sudden became an authority on Mimicry. It was the darnedest thing you ever saw. Now, just what she's done with Mimicry I don't know. I tell you that factually. I don't know. The reason I don't know is because -- I wish I could remember this verbatim -- she said on



Auditor's Report: „*We're getting along fine with it. By the way, we've run Dummy Session...*“ See, she'd run Dummy Session Number 1 by this time for about 25 hours, see -- Dummy Session 1! -- with gains all the way. And she said, „*There's something about this.*“ She said, „*You know that it doesn't work as well with the preclear's eyes closed?*“ „But,“ she said, „*we're getting there.*“ Preclear came out of the psychotic band. If we'd had those sessions being observed -- had we had a spare Instructor to observe a few of those sessions -- we probably would have learned plenty.

The next week she was given another preclear, who was a routine, easy case. She was told to run 8-C, Part A as the easy thing to do. She came in that night having run the afternoon on Dummy Session 1. Now nobody can get her off of it. I'm afraid I've established a career there which will be totally Dummy Session Number 1.

Now, this was a fascinating experience, but the auditor who doesn't have a comparable reality, by the way, to the accuracy and gain of the technique just has an awful time with his preclears, that's all. And the time with the preclear always comes out of communication. It always comes out of communication. The extraordinary upsets, all the variables -- the wild ones. You're talking to him -- so are twenty-nine circuits. He's also afraid of car motors and there's one two blocks away that you haven't heard, but he has extended hearing.

Wow. How many communication lines are entering there? It's your job to get one to enter there so that you can get two to enter there. One, from you to the preclear, and two, from the preclear to the environment. That's two sets of communication lines. That's all you want. That's why we called it Straightwire back in 1950: it was stringing a straight line past all of the vias. Got it? When you can do that you've really got it made.

There are some techniques that do it easily on low-level cases, and would just be ignored by a high-level case as being too elementary. But the high-level cases still gain on them. As we make the techniques more complex and handle the greater number of factors, we then get into an upper strata of auditing only because we've gotten into an upper strata of communication. Got it?

We'll learn all about that before we're through; we really will. I'll probably learn more than you will. These ACCs always manage to teach me an awful lot. He's over there thinking, „*An awful lot I shouldn't know.*“ And some of the things they manage to teach us lowers our trust in human nature. And one of the things it manages to teach us every time is something that you will, somehow or other, sooner or later in this unit, suffer from.

It has taught us that on an educational basis the communication of Scientology may sometimes be acknowledged but is not always received. And therefore, we have a tendency to plug things, have a tendency to go over things. We sound much more kindergartenish in an ACC, actually, a lot of the time, on some stupid point, than anybody ever did in HCA. People are young, bright and hopeful. Even HCA students and even HCA Instructors are young, bright, hopeful, optimistic, filled with trust, filled with the love of human kindness.

But you get to an ACC; by that time you're embittered, sour, and you've too many times said, „*Jones, get your preclear to really touch a wall.*“ See, you've said this several times -- twenty or thirty -- and you go in and he's running 8-C on him. After all that instruction to get his preclear to really touch a wall, he's still running 8-C. Is there anything wrong with that? He's run his total knowledge of Scientology in front of your statement. You've told him to get his preclear to touch a wall, and he has bent it around a via, which goes this way: „*The best way to get a preclear to touch a wall is to run 8-C, Part A on him,*“ so therefore he's doing it. So therefore he's obeying your Instructor command, isn't he? He must be obeying it perfectly. But you don't want him to do that at all. You just want him to get the preclear to knock his head against the wall, to kick the wall, to feel the wall, to beat his fists against the wall, to go around and look at the opposite side of the wall, and inspect the wall, to lean on it, until he's actually sure a wall is there! And that's what you ask him to do, and he's running 8-C, Part A. Got the difference? We're awfully literal-minded people, then, in ACCs.

The reason we have 8-C, Part A is because it's a terrific process. It's just terrific. And one of the things it does is eventually introduce somebody to a wall. That's one of the things it does. If this were all that it did, that would be all right. It does so much more than that, it goes in so many different directions, it includes so many hidden processes, it's one of the most complicated processes in Scientology! And this was put on as a via to get your preclear to really feel a wall. So you see how stupidly literal-minded we are?

So you just develop the habit of asking, „*Do you really mean that?*“ Because it may sound a little outrageous to you; it may sound a little complicated, but usually it'll sound too simple. And if we can just cut this thing through to fundamental fundamentals, we've made it in the shade. You got it?

What educates on an HCA level? A complicated process, of course. But you, you're older and smarter. We can communicate a simple one to you, we hope. Got it?

Well, if I were sitting here looking ahead at the next six weeks, such as you are, I'd feel qualms. You know why I'd feel qualms? Because the difficulties attendant on being fundamental are such a terrible strain. It's a case of how simple can you get. Well, if you could get simple enough you could mock up a whole MEST universe, solid.

Even the stupid subject of quantum mechanics says -- a law, by the way, which we evolved and then I found it in the textbook. Isn't that horrible? They're stealing our stuff a year before we wrote it. Usually doesn't happen. And that is, as mass approaches infinity the force required to move it approaches zero.

Male voice: Oh, no. Really? That was in the textbook?

It was in a textbook, yeah.

Male voice: And we thought we...

As mass approaches infinity the force required to move it approaches zero.

Male voice: I thought we were so smart.

The funny part of it is, is we explained it satisfactorily, and they had no explanation for it. We tested it and they never had. It's in a German textbook.

Male voice: Which one?

Now, that's right in quantum mechanics. That's a fine subject: Nobody understands it, and it isn't used for anything. It's the most complicated subject in the world. But we evolved a little basic mechanism there. We said as mass approaches infinity the force required to move it approaches zero. In other words, if you had an automobile an infinity big it would require, to run its engine, zero gasoline. That's the *reductio ad absurdum* of this. You got it?

Now, as you shed complexities, you're able to achieve with simplicities. Do you know the greatest contribution in jurisprudence in the last two years was this single statement, and it was accepted resoundingly by all of the bar associations across the United States: When you have a tort or a brief to write, you say quickly what you want to say and then put the seal on it and let it go. And this hit the world of law like a whirlwind. Everybody took this up everywhere. Great, resounding lectures of the most complicated nature you ever heard of have been given on this subject. But attorneys are now writing out -- writing out a brief somewhat in this fashion. They're saying, „*The plaintiff is owed three thousand dollars by the defendant.*“ Sealed. That's the total filing. That's become the custom.

Now, what kind of a force was it could overcome to this degree the entirety of jurisprudence in the United States, which nothing has ever overcome? What force was it that could overcome this? It was just a whisper about simplicity. And that overcame the entirety of jurisprudence so they're all clicking into line at the maddest rate you ever saw. Now you get what I'm talking about?

Of course, this is literally true: The less force a thetan employs in handling objects, the more objects he can handle.

I was quite amazed one day to find out that I had lost my proficiency at weaving -- as a thetan. Made me very sad, very sad. I don't know why, but I evidently was startled once too often while I was busy weaving things together -- baskets and junk, you know -- by people coming along and being terribly amazed that a basket was being weaved there with nobody weaving it. So I began to have other purposes for doing this nonsense. Second I got enough purposes and enough methods, trrrrr! I couldn't weave baskets anymore while standing in thin air. See, all I needed was a few more methods.

Now, in view of the fact that a person is only auditable in the direction of more methods and more game, getting him back to a simplicity becomes the biggest trick that has been pulled since the construction of this universe. Ordinarily, if you just try to pull him back toward a simplicity straightly, you cost him all his game, and he collapses. And that's the end of the case, practically. Got it?

So just how you do this, and how you do this easily and well, to the benefit of the auditor and the preclear and so on, is our study in this ACC. And I'm very glad to have you here. [End of Lecture]