

TRAINING AUDITORS: THE ANATOMY OF FAC ONE

A lecture given on
9 March 1952

If you were to take a person you were training as an auditor at a moment before they had put their hands on a single case, you were to cross-question this person with the relationship to how he felt, you would probably discover that he had a certain antipathy toward doing anything else about another mind.

The mind, after all, has been granted supernatural tendencies, it back through all of his lives has been very definitely connected with the supernatural, He has many things against touching the mind of somebody else. Quite in addition to that, Service Facsimile One, plus its overt acts, practically prohibits touching somebody else's mind, Service Facsimile One says, "Touch them". And then its overt acts finally pile up and says, "Don't touch anybody else's mind".

Well, this is something which you as a - an instructor would have to overcome, You would have to demonstrate to this student that it was possible for him to do something to somebody else's mind without himself blowing up or inverting or having somebody come along and issue him a summons to appear before the great temple priest or something of the sort.

Now, it is perfectly true that a person beginning to audit is subject to, to some degree, restimulation. It's not very dangerous. Actually is overrated in the amount an auditor becomes restimulated and gets somatics, But do you know, I don't know of any auditors going off the pin because they were auditing. So that theory and danger isn't there.

You'll find them superstitious to this degree: You will find that when they audit somebody, they think if they audit somebody, then they're going to have to take over the facsimiles they're taking out of that other person. Well, the way this really works out is quite simple.

The student starting to audit, or the auditor starting to audit somebody else, suddenly clips some overt act of his own and he thinks - at the moment, he fails to differentiate, and he thinks he's actually rendering these pains to the preclear, and it merely turns on his motivator against himself. You see how that would be?

So he'd pick up the somatics the preclear is picking up because anybody has literally billions and billions of incidents which they can turn on, and so they would just match up an incident. They'll say, "Look what I'm doing to this preclear, I'm sorry I did to this preclear," and so on. So he gets the somatics himself in an effort not to get the preclear to get the somatics.

Actually if you want to play around with it, you can move over into the body of the preclear. You can move the preclear's body into yours. You can do all sorts of weird, weird things that are quite valid, but you don't have to. And just routine auditing doesn't contain these things.

All right. The best way, I would say, to get over this would be to demonstrate to your student, as an instructor, the existence of a facsimile and the storage of pain. Remember you're probably dealing with somebody who has no indoctrination in the mind at all. Or if he does have any indoctrination, it has been in some other direction.

Let's take an indoctrination that a psychoanalyst has had. He's had a pretty good medical background and so on, and he still tends to treat with structure. He still tends to dramatize overt acts against his patient. He evaluates. There's one of the main differences. Your psychoanalyst, in his attitude, evaluates for the preclear. He tries to own the preclear. He tries to get the preclear, his patient, to transfer to him. He wants to be boss instead of letting this person free, whereas an auditor is trying to set this preclear free - give him his own self-determinism back. See, that's an entirely different viewpoint than your psychoanalyst has.

Now, it's interesting to note that if your student is grounded in some old-time psychotherapy, he will still tend to try to translate everything which you tell him into the terminology in which he was trained. This is something like taking MERSIGS [Merchant ship signal flags] and translating them into Japanese, and Japanese - translating them back into English, in order to get a signal through. You don't need the Japanese as a step. If you could just translate it straight through, just as what it is, Scientology, and the application thereof, you find it much easier.

Your Jungian, your Adlerian, and your Freudian - classic Freudian - are doing a wonderful thing. They have taken Facsimile One without recognizing what it is - Freud did this right out of the blue. He must have keyed in Facsimile One in 1894, the second he started to work on somebody else's mind and burst forth with his libido theory. Because Facsimile One has a lot of sexual shut-off in it; it has a lot to do with sex. And Lord, it's got a censor in it - the censor that keeps you from doing anything else. All of these various conflicts and complexes in it are just set up as a routine.

In other words, he did have a map of Facsimile One, but he was trying to say that Facsimile One is the human mind, and it's not, The human mind doesn't operate that way; Facsimile One operates that way.

So you'd have this trouble with a person grounded in psychoanalysis. He would try to tell you all the time, as you tried to instruct him, how this translated itself into the censor, the libido, the thisa, the thata, and he'd keep on restimulating for himself, and try to restimulate for you, Facsimile One. That's why their people don't get well. They come in and they have all this stuff pointed out to them and they - just getting Facsimile One, Facsimile One, Facsimile One - restimulate yourself, boy; restimulate yourself, boy. This is the way to get well, this is the way to get well. Restimulate yourself. They might as well be standing there with a machine and cranking it.

So, training this student, it is absolutely necessary for you as an instructor to demonstrate to him the existence of a facsimile and the extreme simplicity of this facsimile - the very, very simple thing this facsimile is. And that's what you should do immediately and right off the bat.

The best way to do it is with an electropsychometer. Set him down, put the cans in his hands. Pinch him - good and hard so he can feel the pinch - and show him the needle of the machine. Watch it dip the second he's pinched. He watches that thing dip. And pinch him hard enough till it dips. And then say, "All right, go back to the moment I was pinching you" - well, he can do this easily. "Now run through and feel again this pinch." He does and the machine dips. Well, that's very, very peculiar - the machine dips.

"Now run through - run through your resistance to this effort I'm putting into your arm. This effort I am putting into your arm, run through your resistance to it." And he'll watch the machine dip, dip, dip, dip. Many times you'll have to go through it a lot more times than you'd have to through a real incident. And shift his attention, if you have to, to get that up, shift his attention to the top of his shoulder, whereas you pinched him on the arm. And get that effort. And get that effort to register on the machine. All of a sudden, he says, "That's very strange. The pinch that went into my arm was stored or recorded somehow."

Now get his emotion as he was pinched, and you'll see that there's a little emotional curve bob. Particularly - you want to pay attention to this - do it suddenly. Pinch him suddenly Just reach out suddenly and pinch him, without telling him you're going to pinch him, and you've got a nice emotional curve to show him on the machine.

Now, he knows he's got the somatic out, Now show him this curve bobbing. Very often they'll run the somatic and the curve. You see the effort - somatic is part of the effort.

Sometimes they'll just run the pain without running the effort. But you direct them through on this, time after time, and get their thoughts when they were pinched. And then have them try to get some feeling of your emotion while they were pinched. And they'll see all of this registering

on the machine, and all of a sudden they will see the machine settled back to where it was before you did this to them. And you see - "Now, you see, you recorded a facsimile, and I rubbed it out. And it was on record."

Actually, as simple as this may seem to you, it is quite revelatory to some people. It would knock a psychoanalyst practically off of his chair. He would try to say, "Well now, let's see, you got a delusion or a hallucination or something of the sort that this was taking place, and that hallucination deluded it?" or something of the sort. He would not care to look at a real recording unless you were to show him a picture and you were to say, "Now look, that's a picture. It's got a house in it. And I take this eraser and I erase the house. I've still got the sheet of paper. Now, that's all we're doing. Simple. Nothing to it. But let's not try to make it complicated, because it's easy." All right, The next thing that you could do, still showing him the machine, would show him that his thoughts had recording value. You say, "Do you remember your father?" The machine does a little bob, rather, "Did your father ever punish you?" The machine does a bigger bob. "Let's recall a time when your father punished you." The machine does a big bob. "Now let's remember it, remember it, remember it." Bing. All of a sudden the machine isn't bobbing, and he is not bothered. And he realizes suddenly he isn't quite as bothered about this.

Now, that's straight memory. That demonstrates that he can be in present time without very - any close contact with this facsimile and pick things out of it.

That's memory: picking things out of a facsimile which isn't even brought up.

Or, as in the case of being pinched in the arm, you can take the whole picture - the whole facsimile - and hold it up and run it across him again. This demonstration will demonstrate to him that this exists and that something happens. You demonstrate phenomena to him.

That's the first thing your student has to know. The phenomena exists. And you show it to him with a psychometer and with pinching him and a few other things - just the basic phenomena.

All right. The next thing, if you're teaching him to audit, is not to ask him to try his skill 100 percent on a preclear the first time. Actually, he'll be scared to death. This is something he mustn't touch. He's superstitious about it. He has gained the idea that the phenomena exists, You can even show him that past lives exist by the machine behavior. You can account for various things for him. But this still has not gotten across this one bridge - he hasn't touched a preclear's mind yet.

Now, he expects the preclear to blow up or something strange to happen if he does something to this mind. So what you do is take a - old copy of Self Analysis or the Handbook for Preclears, even better, and you put it in his hands and you give him a preclear. And you make him read this thing to the preclear, Make him make the preclear recall these things. And give him a little indoctrination along in this line and his confidence will come up the line.

Then have him run what you might call emotional curves on the preclear a little bit: feeling this emotion, feeling that emotion, getting it here, getting it there. He'll find out the emotional curve exists. And then you can assign to him running a secondary.

Now the running of the secondary, as you know, is not very complex, but many secondaries are badly shut down. You have him run a secondary: have him go from the beginning to the end, get the exact moment and all the perceptions on the preclear when the preclear received some bad news, and run those through to the end of the incident - maybe ten minutes later, maybe an hour later or a day later - and keep running that through, over and over and over and over. But remembering that if it doesn't spill, it has overt acts before it, so have him go find the overt act again. But again, this is just emotional. Just emotion - that's all you want out of these incidents. That is running a secondary.

You could even permit him to run an engram and validate for himself, either in himself or on a preclear - particularly on a preclear - the fact that things are recorded during periods of unconsciousness.

Now, oddly enough, this is not hard to demonstrate. Your psychologist, whenever he moved in on this science, tried to give somebody a PDH and then run it out. And, of course, the PDH would lie on... That is to say, he would drug him and say things to him and so forth, and then say, "Well - well, this - this science doesn't work, you see, because we can't get it back."

Well, every time you PDH somebody, it's liable to lie right on top of Facsimile One, and it's impossible to pull the thing off. So therefore they say he can't record during unconsciousness. Great.

Now, you see, it isn't necessary to do that. If you want to prove this, just shut off somebody's blood flow. There's a jugular vein here - their blood flowing on either side of the esophagus. And you just press those with your thumb and forefinger a little bit and the guy will get a little bit dizzy. And then you say, "Run back through it again," Ask the fellow, "Now, did you perceive anything in the room while you were feeling that dizziness?"

He'll say, "No." Or "Yeah, I know everything that was going on," One way or the other.

Run him through this little period of uncon- you don't have to hurt him. He goes through it a few times, and all of a sudden he becomes aware of the fact that there was an automobile that went past when he did that, there was this that went past, there was this or that that happened, the sensation of him sitting on the chair. All of these things were there. But to straight memory they were covered up.

Now, better than this, take him down the track to an incident where he hurt himself - the preclear hurt himself. And take him back to a time - maybe he hit his thumb with a hammer. Crash! Well, obviously he knows everything that was there. But after you've run him through it a few times, all of a sudden the incident gets wider and wider and wider and wider. There was more and more data concealed in that hammer blow. And this demonstrates to him that effort and emotion do cover up perceptions - effort and emotion cover up perceptions. And that there was data buried in a moment of unconsciousness, because there was a moment of unconscious when he hit his finger with a hammer. You see? So you can demonstrate this phenomena to him. Very simple.

If you want the student to get a further reality on this subject, make him be masochistic to this extent: have him take his right foot and stamp on his left toes. And then take his left foot and stamp on his right toes. And then run out the right foot only. Run out the right foot only. And he will be able to see that his left foot keeps on hurting, but his right foot isn't hurting now. That's a very simple experiment, but it demonstrates to him that a facsimile was what kept his right foot hurting, and it demonstrates to him that you can do something about it. And that that's what auditing does. These are little proofs, easy ones.

But his first address to the other mind, as I say, ought to be the handbook. Let him take it easy. He will get up to a point where, if he hit a terror charge, he would run it out instead of run away from it. Let him become accustomed to his tools, little by little, each time gaining reality on what he is doing.

He has to have subjective reality, furthermore. An auditor who does not have subjective reality on this subject finds it very difficult to understand what is happening to the preclear. He can study until he is the best-read person in Scientology, and he still will not be a good auditor if he has never touched physical pain in himself, if he's never experienced an emotion out of a facsimile. If he doesn't have any reality on this, he is not a good auditor. And he will actually cut down the preclear.

Now, I have seen somebody trained in an old psychotherapy doing a job of auditing when auditing had never been done on them, And I stress this “an old psychotherapy” for this reason: there you’re going to have the most trouble. A medical doctor with a terrific, terrific fund of information, with enormous backlog of skill, with obviously a basic purpose of making people well, would apparently be the most valuable student that you could get. And so he is the most valuable student that you could get. But unfortunately, when you try to train him, you’re training up against a precept that structure monitors function, not the reverse.

And you’re going to have to scan him through practically his whole medical education. Because he will do this to a preclear: He will run the preclear to find some reality for himself. And he’ll keep asking the preclear, “Now, how do you know? Are you sure this wasn’t just this right hip’s calcification?” or something of the sort, And his unreality to a preclear who is a bit foggy with anaten will knock the preclear right straight on down the Tone Scale.

So when you’re training a person who has been in psychotherapy or in medicine, you take particular pains with the establishment of subjective reality to that auditor; otherwise you will be losing a potentially very valuable auditor, because he’ll be a bad auditor when he ought to be a good one.

Now, you pay attention, then, to establishing subjective reality in him, knocking out precepts, his old postulates - not so much what he has been taught, but what he himself concluded during his boyhood and during his medical training with regard to the body. It doesn’t take much time to swamp this up. And he can then reevaluate an enormous amount of data, which immediately becomes available to Scientology and to his preclears.

There is one doctor in New York City who was taught Straightwire. I taught him Straightwire. He learned it crudely. He hobson-jobsoned it; that is to say - the reason I use this word hobson-jobson is because when the British soldier went to India he learned how to speak Hindu, or something of the sort - at least he thought he did. And the Hindus had a word they call - that sounded like hobsen-jobsen. And so the British Tommy went in there and he said that that word after that was Hobson-Jobson. That’s what you call hobson-jobsoning something.

You will find these people will hobson-jobson, They’ll take a word... All of a sudden you say, “Now, this machine goes whirrr, whirr, whirr and bap, bap, bap, and this guy is told that he will no longer be able to experience sexual pleasure,” or something of the sort.

And the psychotherapist is liable to say to himself - without telling you - he’s liable to say, “Oh, yes, yes In other words, that machine restimulated his libido theory and gave him this concept.” “Oh, no. The machine installed the libido theory.”

“Well, how did it install it? I mean, after all the human mind works in this fashion and ...” You see, you’d be off to the races immediately.

So you must be careful when you’re training students to know that they know what you’re talking about. Don’t leave anything hanging up in the air with them.

All right. Now, all the training in the world is not going to overcome a lack of this subjective reality. And all the training in the world is - that’s only education, after all - is not going to make an optimum individual or a Clear. Your best auditor is way up the Tone Scale. He has been completely swamped up himself. Then he can commit all the “overt acts” he wants to against this preclear. In other words, he can make him get well, and that might be an overt act to the preclear, you see?

And he can do most anything in this. Furthermore, he can think faster. And furthermore, he doesn’t have any difficulty with the realities of the thing, because his own sense of reality is very, very high.

So any time you're training auditors, you better encourage them, by this process of taking it a little bit at a time and a little bit at a time and a little bit at a time, to get their hands wet, you might say, and dirty up to the wrist in other people's engrams. And get them to work on each other and get your advanced students to work on the earlier students up to a point - with good auditing - so that you wind up with students who are cleared.

Now there's - you got all the tools, there aren't any bugs left in this. There are no bugs left in it. There's nothing left hanging out. You've got the tools, you learn the tools, you apply them with good reality, with good confidence, well learned - you get Clears. All right, then you've really got auditors. Then you've really got auditors.

If you could, for instance, clear a medical doctor, you would have somebody that could go around creating more miracles in less time...

Now, as I was saying, this medical doctor in New York City was doing very, very bad Straightwire. He was unable to give more than about fifteen minutes, at the outside, to a patient.

Patients come into their office just in streams, you see, one after the other. And they have to do a short stopgap something or other for them. The patient wants something done for them; they're not going to stay around there for hours and audit and be audited. One of the ways a doctor can do this is have some auditors around to handle his patients - but, beside the point.

This doctor was a specialist in Parkinson's disease. And people would come in there with Parkinson's disease just on assembly lines. And i this doctor knew enough about Straightwire to knock out some maybes... And, by George, he was turning off Parkinson's disease something like three out of five.

And how much time was he giving on the thing? It was just patient after patient. And he called me up one day and he said, "Someday I'm going to learn some more about your subject." He says, "It must be able to do better than this," And I went over and talked to him for a little while over in New York one day and found out that he was using the lowest possible order of Straightwire and was getting results like this. Why?

He was a doctor; people went there to get well. He would knock out a maybe; it gave them an excuse to get well. Bang! So their Parkinson's disease would turn off. He was completely unaware of how long it would stay turned off, but, mind you, he'd never been able to get anybody turned off on Parkinson's disease with regularity before. So he was quite interested. But the odd part of it was, he was taking it as routine. Nobody said to him, "Well, there's times when this can't be done and times when it can be done, and so forth." He just happened to come over one day and heard a talk by me, and he said, "That's a very interesting idea." And he went back to his office and went to work and never talked to anybody else about it.

By the time he was talked to and told "Well, this can't be any good," and "Really you should do all of this with a globe of the world hanging as a pendant from the left chandelier," or something - when he was told that "all this other stuff ..." and "it was a modification of something else" - he had so much reality on it that he just looked at these people and he said, "You're crazy! This works," And went on collecting twenty-five dollars, twenty-five dollars, twenty-five dollars, twenty-five dollars. It was a wonderful business he was generating over there. I think he's still very, very much in business. I haven't heard from him from [for] ages. He never did learn any more about this subject than that.

You get the person out of the maybes, and then he gets well. He went away with this thought firmly fixed in his head. He didn't even know some good smart ways to get them out of the maybes. He just sort Of said, "Are you in a maybe?" and "What was the last time you felt indecisive?"

And the fellow said, "Well, I guess I was on the train going in from Long Island," "And what were you doing?" "Well, I was reading a paper." "What were you reading in the paper?"

“Well, about a stock market crash. I remember the incident very well. As a matter of fact, that was about four days before I got sick,” “Oh, yeah? Stock market crash. How did that influence you? What did you have in the air at that time?” so on.

And the guy says so-and-so and so-and-so. “And I didn’t trust my partner,” “Well, has your partner worked out since?” “Oh, he turned out to be an awful crook.”

“Oh, well, then you found out that he was crooked and the stock market crash was imminent and so forth, and this...” And the doctor doesn’t even know what the fellow’s business concern is, you see? And the fellow says, “Yeah?” and laughs suddenly and stops shaking. Well, so he said, “This is fine.”

Now, you understand that if you give an auditor just the conviction on one tool - like your Chart of Attitudes There are auditors out all over the country now, they have the Handbook for Preclears. It gives them a chart of attitudes. They’re not even working overt acts with that chart, by the way. They don’t know about it, most of them. They’re working it as counter-attitude. “When was this done to you?” And they take this chart and they take this book, and they’re giving a few hours this way and that. They’re using it. Sometimes they don’t even give this book to the preclear, They just work with those techniques.

And the next thing you know, you have a preclear who is way up the Tone Scale, And they call these people swamped-up, optimum, super, something of the sort, merely because they never saw anybody up that high before. It’s somebody - like saying, “Look at that fellow standing up there on the Empire State Building.” Look at him, clear up in the stratosphere!” Oh no, he’s not in the stratosphere.

But what I’m telling you is that a broad, foggy, unreal knowledge of this subject is nowhere near as valuable as one scrap of real information which you have seen produce a result. The techniques in the Handbook for Preclear will produce that result.

If you were to take these students and train them to deliver Straightwire processing - just straight memory on all the attitudes in the charts as overt acts by themselves against the other dynamics ... If you were just to teach them to use this chart, to ask the questions column by column, and you were to tell them - by the way, there’s two additional charts on that. There’s two additional columns - there’s fourteen buttons, not twelve.

The top of the column is “win” and the bottom of it is “lose.” A preclear who’s low on the Tone Scale can’t win - he won’t win - and up at the top he will win. And the next button: He’s completely free at the top of the scale and at the bottom he’s completely restrained; he’s dead. So what you do is run “restraint” and “degrees of restraint.” When he’s tried to put restraint on the world around him, he has restrained himself. Now, you just run these, then, as a Straightwire process.

If you trained a student to do nothing but that and sent him out to the old soldiers’ home to practice, he would come back saying, “Well, what do you know, what do you know. Gee! There’s a couple old fellows out there in the Spanish-American War, and one of them had lumbago so bad he couldn’t walk, and you know, I worked on him for about a half an hour this morning, and he’s walking!” Sure, we know he’s walking, It works.

But that is a lot better than to give him a whole bunch of odds and ends of technique which he unclearly understands - willfully misunderstanding - and he has no subjective reality himself.

In other words, introduce the subject to him step by step with all the reality which you can give him on the subject - not by telling him he has to believe, because he natively, inherently, is himself belief.

Not by telling him he has to have faith, because he natively is faith, but by telling him that “Here is data, phenomena which you can understand, which can be understood, which is real. We’re only asking you to find out for yourself that it is real and then apply what you know out of it is real to others and get results.”

(Recording ends abruptly)