INSTRUCTORS' BUGBEAR

A lecture given on
9 October 1962

This is 9 Oct. 62, lecture number two. I'd better talk to you about something that you're more interested in.

Just a final comment on that: I haven't given you all the information I have on that, but the final question I was asked here was about the technical, "hope it'd be more simple." Yeah, your technical will be more simple, but remember there's two HPAs on the floor in any one of these co-audits. Listing will probably be meterless – most of their auditing will be meterless. And it'll be worked down to a point where if a guy can get into trouble with this – with experts watching the thing – why, he'd really be quite a guy.

There are several technical little bugs that have been worked out already.

You give a See Check as the person comes in and you have a dunce unit – the rock slammers. And because you'll have all kinds of people, why, you'd just better take the rock slammers and you'd better relegate them to a certain category and certain handling, you see. That immediately takes the sour apples out of your co-audit and they'd run fairly smoothly.

Now the technical aspects of this are either whipped or whippable. And they give me no qualms at all. If that's all I had to worry about, it'd be a long snore.

The various aspects of clearing . . . This is about clearing. This is just a lecture on clearing. I'm very interested in this. I´d be very happy to go on talking about it the rest of the evening, don't you see? But I want to talk to you about some of the aspects of clearing as they are influenced by auditing quality: clearing and auditing quality. And these two things are extremely closely associated when done by the expert.

He clears as fast, in actuality, as he is bright and delivers good quality auditing. Now, that's as fast as he clears. He clears then as slowly as he flubs.

Well, you want to find out why somebody isn't getting Clear fast ... You know, your – it's a hell of a criticism of the auditor when that tone arm goes up to 5.0 and sticks. It's already proven that it's the right goal and yet there's that tone arm up there at 5.0 and it's not now moving and it's not coming down and that is the right goal, and you're listing on 114 lines. And as far as you can tell it's all going off like hot butter and yet there is that tone arm at 5.0. Now,

that is not criticizing the pc. Learn right here at the incept that it is a criticism which is leveled straight at the bosom of the auditor doing the auditing. Learn that and you will have learned a great deal.

When I say learn that and you will have learned a great deal, I know what I'm talking about, because there are some people who won't learn that. They will resist learning that for a while. You see, they'll keep looking for what is wrong with the pc. There's nothing wrong with pcs. There's a lot wrong with auditors.

Now, some pcs require more cleverness on the part of the auditor than others. Because they – apparently the individuality of life was all attained by goals. Now, that doesn't mean that people are individuals because of goals. It means that they are odd individuals because of goals. They were all different people, don't you see, and then they postulated themselves a great cracking, big goal and here we went.

Well, a goal is a symptom of individuation. And from that point on, this guy is going to act differently with a different set of overts. And therefore, each person acts slightly differently in processing.

But when you realize that YOU can pick up such a goal as "never to be detected" – well now, that's quite interesting. What does that speak of the technology? Well, this thing says it must never be detected and yet we detected it. That's quite interesting, isn't it? That speaks very well for the technology.

So, I can tell you right at the incept that there is no goal that is too difficult to be found and therefore no individuation that is too difficult for you to crack. You've got to do it by the book and you've got to be clever. And you've got to be able to audit smoothly – auditing quality.

Many a fellow has the idea, many a girl has the idea that auditing quality is associated with sternness or is associated with immovability or is associated with being able to repeat the auditing command or is associated with "the auditor must always be right," or some other quality that has nothing whatsoever to do, in actual fact, with auditing.

Some new individuation has moved into the sphere of auditing and whenever this new individuation is moved into the sphere of auditing, you get some new difficulties.

So to an Instructor watching a half a dozen auditors audit, he may think that he needs a half a dozen different sets of rules to overcome the peculiar difficulties which these students are experiencing and that is not true.

What he needs, as an Instructor, is a tremendous ability to detect variation from the standard rule. And man, this variation is sometimes so clever and is sometimes so adroit and is sometimes so well hidden, that one never does connect with it apparently.

I'll give you an example: This person is apparently unwilling to have the pc talk.

Apparently this person has to stop the pc from talking if the pc talks. The pc must be stopped. You'd swear their goal was "nobody must talk." Pc says, "I have a pain in the head," and the auditor almost holds up stop lights and stop signs, and hands out speed tickets and breaks out a dog muzzle and so forth, you see, because the pc has said something, the auditor's upset.

So we work on it on a straight basis of communication and we tell this auditor that the auditor must let the pc talk. And by golly, we don't solve it. We just don't solve it.

These sessions this auditor is running continue to produce fantastic ARC breaks. And yet now the auditor is apparently letting the pc talk, to all intents and purposes. Then we come in one day and we find out the pc has been talking for an hour and a half in answer to one auditing command and is getting very ARC broke in the process. So we didn't spot that one. That was wrong. This auditor was not trying to stop the pc from talking.

The ARC breaks this auditor got stemmed from the unwillingness of the auditor to face any confusion of any kind in the session and went on giving the auditing command even faster the moment it appeared there was going to be a confusion in the session.

Now, that's an interesting point, isn't it? Some confusion arose. Did the auditor acknowledge it or did the pc answer it? And this auditor's answer is to get away from the confusion and so gives the auditing command five more times, even more rapidly, to get five commands away from that confusion. But, of course, they can never get away from the confusion.

Now, the pc is only interested in doing only one thing: stopping the auditor to get back to the confusion to unravel it. Did he answer the question or didn't he? So they have the auditor trying to get on with the session and the pc trying to stop the session and then you'd think offhand, well, there's something wrong with the pc. No there isn't. There must be something wrong with the auditor, if the auditor didn't take up something in the session that makes it necessary for the pc to stop the session to get it taken up. You see this?

Audience: Mm-hm.

It looks like the auditor's trying to keep the pc from talking. See, but that really wasn't what was happening at all. The auditor wants the pc to talk, but on some other subject, if you please, than a confusion.

One method an auditor uses to take off, then, is discoverable only in this zone: that an auditor can leave the session on the forward track, as well as walk out of the room. You follow that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

The pc can be left at time-point A in the session, while the auditor is taking off and trying to get to time-point G, without ever paying any further attention to time-point A. The

auditor is ignoring time-point A and is trying to leave the session by progressing forward to point G as rapidly as possible.

You'll find somebody is having difficulty reading his meter during the rudiments only because rudiments are something this auditor has had enough bad luck with that the auditor wants to get over them fast. And the auditor gets over these rudiments fast, while the pc gets stuck in rudiment one. And the auditor is clear up there to the body of the session, but the pc is left in rudiment one.

Now, in an effort to avoid giving a session, you see, in an effort to avoid facing the confusion in the session – let me put it that way – the auditor actually refuses to set up a session, unwittingly refuses to set up a session. Do you see how this could be?

The auditor *knows* he can't get in rudiment one – always had trouble getting it in – so he doesn't get it in. Gets a conviction that it can't be put in, don't you see, and therefore rapidly moves to two before one is in. Now, of course, two won't go in, because one is out. And then moves to three before the pc can stop him to get two in. And then goes into the body of the session with the pc madly out of session.

Now the pc, somewhere in his skull, unwittingly is trying to work out the session and get in-session while the auditor is running the session.

And most of the pcs that give you the most trouble are the pcs who do the least. They never explode in your face, they never walk out of session, they're not dramatic – they just aren't in-session. Auditing isn't biting. Auditing isn't biting at all, because they're not in-session. And they apparently are very easy to audit, except they never make any forward progress.

And the – it doesn't much matter what the auditor does. The auditor can go over and try to get all the rudiments in, and so forth, and they all kind of go in. "Meter isn't working," don't you see? They kind of get all the rudiments in and he gets into the body of the session, then he starts this and that, and doing this and that, and asking him some questions, and ...

The wonder of it is that anything happens at all. But you get about a quarter of an inch of gain out of that session – very undemonstrative session. It's just sort of sitting there, sawing wood, doing nothing, you know. Only get a quarter of an inch of gain out of that session and should have had five miles.

Your "good" pc is produced by an auditor who never gets the pc in-session in the first place. This pc isn't sufficiently in-session to ARC break. Pc is ARC broke.

Oh, it's a very funny thing. You could start sawing into a session of this particular character – somebody's running the session in this way – and you know, sort of getting it all in with a lick and a promise and it's sort of a tacit consent that very little auditing will occur and so forth.

You want long listing, you see, this is the way to get it. Everything is sort of shallow, nothing is very deep, nobody really inquires into anything very hard and we'll sort of sit here and get it all dusted off one way or the other, and when we finally wind up, why, we will not have had an ARC break, which is apparently the primary objective of the session. Well, of course, they didn't have an ARC break by having one the session's entire length. In other words, no communication, no understanding.

See, everything is just kind of out on the fringe and nothing is ever really introduced in. Don't you see this?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

You've stood alongside and watched a session run, I'm sure, whereby the pc is just "Yeah, birds swim? Yes. Yes, birds swim. Oh, yes, birds swim. Yes, yes, birds swim, yes. Yes, birds swim and so forth."

And the auditor is saying, "Do birds swim?"

"Yes."

"Do birds swim?"

"Yes."

"Do birds swim?"

"'Yes."

And everything's going on, and they move through to the – they use up every bit of the auditing time. That's the one thing that you can say about that session, is it used up the entirety of the auditing period.

All right. You get somebody in there who isn't avoiding ARC breaks, who isn't avoiding upsets, who is trying to look good as an auditor, who's doing all kinds of additives. His slew of additives have been added to what he's supposed to be doing, you see.

You get somebody in on the same pc and the guy says, "All right, now." He says, "Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

The pc says, "No. No, no, not me! No. No, no. No, uh-uh."

"All right. All right. What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?"

Pc says, "Ooh gee, I guess just about everything that's wrong. I mean . . . " And all of a sudden starts opening up as a pc and suddenly you'll find that old tone arm just coming on down, just as nice as you please. What? With standard auditing.

But what is standard auditing? What is the standard from which we are departing? Well, it's this cycle: It's asking the auditing question of the pc who is sitting in that chair – see, not some synthetic pc – but of that pc that is sitting in that chair, getting a response or an

answer from that pc, which is then understood by the auditor and is acknowledged by the auditor in such a way that the pc knows he said it. This pc knows he said the answer and did properly answer it. Now, that is the auditing cycle.

Now, when anything interferes with that auditing cycle or additives go in, you get one of these corny, weird, offbeat, god-'elp-us sessions. Do you see what runs it adrift?

Now, it's – this auditing cycle is a terribly simple cycle. And terribly simple people such as myself don't seem to have too much trouble with it. But more brilliant people figure their way through this thing and arrive at some kind of a mutated answer to it that produces a no-auditing situation. And how they've managed to do this is the subject of his Instructor's nightmares. That's what the Instructor is there for.

He's trying to find what else they are doing and point it out to them in such a way that they realize they are not doing what they should be doing. It is a terribly, idiotically simple thing. And of course, some very bright person could very easily miss it.

You would be amazed if you engaged in a catechism – Catholic church hasn't got any monopoly on the English language, we might as well take part of it – if you engaged in a catechism of an auditor who consistently was getting the TA swinging up high on the pc and asked that auditor searching, seeking questions regarding what was supposed to happen at these various parts of the auditing cycle – what a pc was supposed to think and what a pc was supposed to do at various parts of it, and you will find something that is completely astray. Inevitably, you're going to find something that is really goofy.

I'll give you one, an actual one: "Well, so long as the pc refuses to make up his mind to be audited, there's nothing you can do about it." How do you like that one? In other words, all auditing is on automatic. It depends on the happy accident of a pc deciding to be in-session. And the auditor has nothing to do with getting the pc in-session. You understand that?

Now, why do these things exist? I'm not just being hard on people who have that sort of theory. I'm trying to make it easy for them to audit. Where do these things come from? They're all a bunch of oddball considerations that exceed this terrible simple simplicity. And when I say they're oddball, I mean!

But where do they come from? Now, it's all right for you to say, "Well, it stems from their goals." We *know* that and nobody need emphasize that piece of technology. Somebody who has the seventh dynamic, "thetans," as an oppterm or "an introverted person" as an oppterm or has "people interested in themselves" as an oppterm or "people who talk" as an oppterm are going to have a hard time with auditing.

Well, you can see that and I can see that and oddly enough we can surmount it fairly easily. Oddly enough, we do. It makes a tremendous change in one of these people when you get that item, and it adds up to something that interferes with auditing – makes a big change to

them. Big change. There's hardly any substitute for it. When you find their goal, it makes a big change. When you get the goal listed out, that's a terrific change. See, s there are big changes along this line.

But if I were to tell you that because a person had an oppterm of such-and-such a characteristic, he then could not audit, we have entered upon 0 very dangerous piece of ground. We have said that no man can rise superior to his aberrations and that is not true.

A man *can* rise superior to his aberrations – as even some character who has some horrible oppterm that he just discovered has realized that somehow or another he was getting by and he was trying. And his oppterm and his goal are right in the teeth of his ever getting anything done about it, don't you see? And you is yet getting somewhere.

No, a man does not have to act his aberrations out to the full, that's for sure. Man can rise above them. He may not be able to stay above them, but a couple of hours of session, yeah, he can rise.

Now, when we get down to eases on the subject of auditing, then, it is not good enough to say that his item and his goal oppose his being a good auditor and therefore he can't do it. That is not good enough.

We know that his auditing will enormously improve. We know he'll probably never become a top-notch auditor until we've got these things wrapped up and he's Clear, but nevertheless he can audit.

So there is another channel which might – because this other one is so heroic – it rises up there like the Colossus of Rhodes, you know. It's completely visible, you know. It's his item, it's his goal and so forth. And it's so visible you might never see this other one. You say, "Well, get him cleared and he'll be able to audit." Ha! Fine.

There's another one, even when you get him cleared, he might run into and that's the one the Instructor works with. That's the one you'll be working with when you're trying to make a co-audit function, when you're trying to make some HPA student toe the mark.

This one: He's got a hangover from some group or some philosophy or some activity – not necessarily associated with his goal line – as to what is supposed to happen, what he's supposed to do to make something happen and what's supposed to happen when he, the auditor, does it. And you will get things out of the pc – you'll get things out of the pc and then you do something with them and what does this indicate with the pc. You know? I mean, you ask him questions of this sort. Now, you've asked the pc something, and he's responded such-and-such a way. Now, what does that mean? See, this is a searching type of question, see. You actually can get – likely as not, get the auditor actually laughing at himself over some of the things he expects.

Let's say he was part of a society that preached only one philosophyonly one

philosophy: that there was no reason why you couldn't decide to be anything you wanted to be and immediately become it. And all men were weak and evil and guilty and stupid simply because they couldn't do this. That, by the way, is a rather familiar one on the track.

"Well, why don't you decide to be Clear?" You know? "Go ahead. Go ahead, decide to be Clear. All right. Can't do it, huh? Hah! Shows what you're made of!" See, it's a sort of a weird way of making nothing out of thetans and so on.

Well, this person actually is operating in an auditing session on the basis "Well, if this person just made up their mind to be Clear, I wouldn't have to go to all this work." See, they think the other person is terribly weak because the other person just cant suddenly make up their mind to be Clear and they're having to audit the other person, don't you see, and they're auditing past this limitation.

They don't recognize they themselves are doing it. But an Instructor talking this little point over with them might discover a great deal concerning this, you see.

And they say, "Ah, well, if he'd just make up his mind to be Clear, I mean, there – I mean, I have to go through all these motions, you know, and ask him these questions and so forth. And actually there's no particular reason why I should, because all he's got to do is make up his mind – what am I saying? All he's got to do is – all he's got to is make up his – well, no, I couldn't do that."

See, he's got a terrifically fixed idea of what's supposed to happen, so therefore everything he is doing is being done in the realization – according to him, you see – is being done in the realization that it doesn't have to be done anyhow, so it doesn't matter what he does because the other person should simply be able to make up his mind to be Clear and then be Clear. So therefore, the other person is guilty of having a session. You see?

All right. That would be only one of thousands. See, only be one of thousands. "Why should you ask anybody a question?" Give you another one: "Why should you ask anybody a question?"

"Because, you see, they know the answer to everything and they know what you know, beause they - what am I saying?" See, it comes to a dead end here. The guy all of a sudden realizes he's talking pure, unadulterated idiocy.

You know that people go around aware of the fact that everybody can read their minds? And so therefore there's no sense in anybody asking them questions, because everybody should know everything about them anyhow and every question is a complete insult.

Do you know that there are people around that every moment of the day is a missed withhold on the part of everybody? Do you know that people are a missed withhold? You know how you become a missed withhold to such a person? Do you know how you manage

to become a missed withhold to them? You said, "How are you?" And you should have known! You should have known! You get the idea? And because you didn't know how they are and therefore asked them a question how they are, why, this immediately indicates that they are a missed withhold. And they go around all ARC broke and upset twenty-four hours a day. You see? Because they're a missed withhold to everybody. Because people keep asking how are they: "Have you just been to class? What mark did you make?" Doesn't matter what question is asked them ' they are sort of going on the basis of all the time everybody should know what they're thinking: some kind of an obsessive idea. And they never inspect these things. So therefore the pc should know what they're thinking.

Do you see, that's very far-fetched and far afield. I'm – all I'm saying here – I'm not trying to give you a multiplicity of examples – it's just "What is this person doing when he is sitting there running this cycle of auditing?"

"Who makes the E-Meter read?" This is the type of question you would ask an auditor, see.

"Who makes the E-Meter read?"

"Well, the auditor does."

"All right. How does the auditor make it read?"

"By asking a question."

"All right." Now, the Instructor has to be a little slippier. "All right. If the auditor makes it read by asking a question, what does the needle fall on?"

The auditor says, "The question."

And the Instructor says, "That's right," and goes happily upon his way. And he missed the freight train, don't you see. It's way over there and over the horizon by this time. See, he's missed it.

Actually, this person is actually there and thinks that when he says, "Do fish swim?" that this action of his voice *here* makes the needle respond over *there,* although, he can observe that the pc has hold of the cans, that he himself doesn't have hold of the cans, and that there is no voice impact in this meter, he actually has always gone around believing . . . And the Instructor who didn't ask carefully, you see, would get an apparency of answer that sounded very logical. It sounded quite correct. "Yes, the thing reacts to the question. Yeah, the needle reacts to the auditor's question."

Completely overlooks the fact the auditor in all sessions – and the auditor has overlooked it too – is actually sitting there in front of his meter and he asks the question which makes the meter read, and all the time sort of thinks it's silly that he's clearing these things, because he knows the answers to them. So therefore says, "Well, what's the use of a meter?"

And he's never answered this question satisfactorily to himself.

In other words, these are things that the person has never revealed to himself. These are things that a little searching and look-over of just the auditing cycle, with or without a meter, would suddenly disclose to the auditor's own view because they look silly, even to him, you see. They look silly to the auditor.

This auditor all of a sudden says, "You know, I realize that there is no point in ever clearing up an ARC break, because the pc-reactivity is hate and the pc hates everybody, and you've got to as-is all this hate. And if you don't as-is all this hate, then the pc isn't going to get any better. So the best way to do is to get the pc into a level of hate and get the pc to hate you and then he'll be in ARC. So therefore, you should always ask your auditing command in such a way as to stir up the latent hate of the pc."

You start examining these – the rationale behind this and examine some of the other things that go into just this cycle, and repeated cycle of auditing and you're going to get astonished.

It's the auditor who makes the tone arm go up and hang at 5.0. Auditors should be in command of session. This is stable datum to this auditor. He hasn't got any other stable datum to go along with it, see. Auditor should be in command of this session. Auditor is in command of session. Therefore when pc suggest anything or pc say anything, then this means auditor no longer in command of session, so therefore pc must be suppressed. You get this?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Now, people who that – who don't even have command or control in their goal, see. I mean, there's some side play or another. Do you get this?

You say, "Do fish swim?"

And the pc says, "You know, I've just had – well, I've had a whole avalanche of answers to that question 'Do fish swim?' and the answers could be yeah, no, and. . . "

"Ah! Now, now, now, that's enough. That's enough. Now, there's just one, just one, just one – just one answer. Now, that'll be quite plenty."

"Yeah, I know, but I have a little avalanche here."

"No, don't give me any more, now. That's it. That's it." "I guess I stayed in command of that session! See, I. . ." He's sitting there watching, you see, and he says, "I guess I stayed in command of that session!" You see?

"All right. Do fish swim now? Do fish swim?" Two hours later, "Do fish swim?" He's added the bank mass by suppress, see?

Now, his cycle of action, you see, is being just alter-ised to that degree. There's something awry in the cycle of – the auditing cycle of action. There's something missing here

or there's too firm an adherence of some kind or another. There's too this or it's too that. There's something wrong with it.

And basically, you'll find that there is some misconception on the part of everybody who's having any trouble auditing. There's some misconception there someplace of what they're doing.

Now, you say to them, "All right, what happens if the pc makes a suggestion to you about the session that you examine the rudiment question again? Would you do it or not?'

Some fellow will say, "Absolutely not! Absolutely not. Not under any circumstances."

And we wonder why this is and then we discover something like whenever there's a confusion in the session, the auditor doesn't want to confront the confusion, and so the best way to get away from the confusion is to put time track between self and the moment of confusion, so therefore give eight or nine more auditing commands very rapidly, please. And that puts time track in between them and the confusion. And of course, the pc at that particular time can't leave that confused area, don't you see. Pc can't leave it because there's a confusion in it, and pc doesn't understand it. And then we come back and get the brass ring as the merry-go-round goes around and we find out that the auditor does not *understand* the pc a lot of the time and fakes understanding of pc. Does not know whether auditor understood or not. See?

And, we find out that the auditor has interpreted that he would look bad if he did not pretend to understand – when auditor does *not* understand. So there's the source of your confusion and it's right part of that auditing cycle.

Auditor asks the question of the pc and the pc hears this question, and the pc thinks of the answer to this question, and he says it to the auditor, and the auditor *understands* that answer, and *acknowledges* it, and the pc now knows that he has answered the auditing command. And all is as-ised and we go on along the track, see.

And this auditor is running his sessions this way: Ask the question of the pc, pc answers, auditor understands half of the answer, doesn't quite get the other half of the answer, decides that he'd better pretend that he understood it, acknowledges the pc's answer – which says that it's understood, don't you see – and the pc at this time gets a funny feeling about it – and all of a sudden there's a little confused area in the session and the auditor asks the auditing question again.

And the pc says, "I'm confused about the last answer."

And the auditor says, "Well, answer this question."

And the pc says, "I'm confused about the last question."

The auditor says, "Answer this question."

The pc says, "I'm confused about the last question."

"Answer this question."

"I'm confused about the last question."

"All right. Well, listen here, now, have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" That's another process, see. "All right. Let's have – have I missed a withhold on you? Missed a withhold?"

Pc says, "Well, I'm just confused. I – I don't know quite whether

"Missed a withhold? Missed a withhold? I know there's a withhold here, missed someplace. Yes, yes, that's right, that's right. All right, well, we can't get the withhold so let's run some O/W, O/W, O/W. Yeah. What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld? What. . . *Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*. See if we can get down the track, here, a distance from this." Because the auditor has committed a crime. He's lied to the pc. He has said, "Thank YOU." And that was a lie.

The auditing question was "Do fish swim?" and the pc said, "Well, often time, but not in hot bean soup."

And the auditor heard – the pc had said, "No." That's all the auditor got out of it, see, "No."

And the auditor says, "All right. Thank you."

Well, the pc knows very well that he didn't really put across this statement which was "Well, fish don't swim very well in hot bean soup." And the pc somehow or another knows the auditor never got that. And the pc doesn't know if he answered the question or not and it hangs right there. To some tiny little degree, the auditing cycle hung up right there.

And then the auditor, not wanting to take up the auditing cycle, can fly off down the track and do something else, but not take up what was really wrong. You see that?

So a simple study of the auditing cycle – or what is understood by the auditing cycle, or what the auditor is trying to accomplish in a session, or what the auditor thinks he should do in a session – just a simple take-up of this sort of thing produces sometimes the most revelatory results.

You say, "Well now, how does a pc . . ." You know, the Instructor has to be clever on these things. "How does a pc get over an ARC break? Hey, come on – how does a pc get over an ARC break?"

Auditor says, "Well, he uh – had a missed withhold, and so forth, and uh – you pick

up the missed uh – withhold, and uh – well, I don't know how a pc gets over an ARC break."

And you say, "Well, why don't you figure out how a pc could get over an ARC break? What's an ARC break? How does a pc get over it?"

This auditor might have been telling you, "Pcs can never get over ARC breaks." But the pc (auditor) had not defined either the AR – what is an ARC break, or how you got a pc over an ARC break. And on the examination of this situation, was actually condemning the pc on the point of ARC breaks because "nice people never get angry." See, nice people never get angry. So if nice people never get angry, of course, this is the answer. This is the idiot's answer, see.

Therefore, if the pc doesn't get over an ARC break, then the pc is not a nice person. Now, where the hell does that wind up a session? May I ask you that? Where's the session supposed to wind up?

Well, of course that doesn't solve it at all. But the person, in articulating this, has always thought that was a sort of a solution to the session, see. That sort of solved the whole thing.

No, it absolved them. And they mistook the absolution for the solution. They made themselves not guilty of putting the pc into an ARC break by adjudicating that the pc who had an ARC break was not a nice person.

I know, it sounds completely idiotic, but this has been sitting there as a substitute for not getting pcs out of ARC breaks. So therefore, they have never studied the thing any further. No further study has ever been given by this auditor on that subject. There wasn't another moment's study ever given to it. Why? Because he had a solution.

All right. Now let's get back to the Achilles heel of all training.

Psychiatrist has eighteen thousand electric shocks behind him, and you're going to teach him Scientology. You think he'll make it? The man's been in a university or a spinbin or something for twelve years.

You know, it's a good thing we don't recruit from people with the standard requirement that they be in a crazy-house for a half a dozen years, you know, like the psychiatrists do. I just thought of that one. I think that's delicious.

Now he's been trained for a dozen years and he's all diplomaed up. And the state supports him, and the hospital supports him, and everything supports him but results – he hasn't time for those. And now you come along and you're going to try to teach him to be a Scientologist. Well, that's very interesting, because the one thing that stands in your road – there's one thing he doesn't know: he doesn't know that he doesn't know. See, that's the one thing he doesn't know.

Now, what makes it so apparent that he knows? Impacts of overts. I refer you to what I was saying about Zen Buddhism. You know, some people run a car into a brick wall sometime and come up with the idea that they know something.

You know, an impact is always substituted for a knowingness. They know.

Well, when you've committed a tremendous, fantastic number of overts against anything, you conceive that you know something about it. But it's an inverted knowingness. You see, it's the total cycle of individuation.

Individuated out, individuated out, out, out, out, out; knew absolutely nothing and then came back on the reverse curve and came back into the center of impact; so now one knows one knows.

Only, of course, you ask this psychiatrist what does he know – well, actually he can't tell you anything that he knows.

If you were to sit there and harp at him as to what he knew – I don't know, I think it might be an interesting thing for a Scientologist to do someday: go call on a psychiatrist and ask him what he knew. You're liable to get some of the most brain-cracking responses, because you're going to de-individuate him out of an obsessed interiorization into whatever he's doing. Insanity. He'd be liable to start gibbering, you know that? He's liable to go mad! You know, maybe I've found a button here on how to drive a psychiatrist nuts. "What do you know?"

Now, you'd follow this cycle, you see:

You'd try to teach him something to know. But, of course, that room has already been rented. It has occupants. So you can't, because he already knows. So, of course, there's no way to teach him anything that you know.

But at what level does he actually know? He knows at the level of impact. That is, he knows at the level of obsessive interiorization. This is how he (quote) knows (unquote). You got to reverse that cycle. See, the one thing he doesn't know is that he doesn't know. And you're – sometimes can be completely fooled, just flabbergasted in instruction in trying to teach somebody something. You can absolutely be flabbergasted. Stonied, I think is the better word.

You say to somebody, "All right. Now, this building is fifty-five feet long, fifty-seven feet long."

And they say, "All right. Good. I know."

"And it's twenty-two-and-a-half feet wide."

"Yes, I know."

You know, you'd fly in their face and say, "Well, how do you know? You never measured it."

The fellow will never tell you it's on the basis of "Well, I just looked and I'm good at estimating distances." You won't get that type of response out of that type of person, see. He will just say, "Yes, I know."

Well, if you're getting that type of response out of somebody, become a little bit puckish and a little bit adventurous about the thing and start skirting out, just a little bit further, to things that are more and more impossible that he knows. They're liable to do some of the weirdest reactions this way.

"Well, you know everybody in this block hates you, you know?"

"Yes, I know. Because – no! Wait a minute, wait a minute, what are you talking about?"

You say, "Well, I knew if I knocked long enough on that door, somebody would open it. Hello!" You get the unorthodox method of approach here.

You'd be fascinated about this cycle of the individuation, and the person tries harder and harder not to be part of it and finally becomes what he's trying not to be, all because of the overt and the withhold, and how that compares to knowingness.

And you've got this individual, then, that you're trying to teach something to and he already knows and doesn't know that he doesn't know.

Now, you try to attack this in many ways. You say, "Well, there's a great need for knowledge of the mind in your profession."

You know, a psychiatrist is liable to say, "Why?"

You're going to get the most – the most weird, erratic responses along this particular line. I'm just trying to give you a notion about it. And if you can keep up asking questions – this is a sort of coffee-shopping, on an unorthodox nonrepetitive command basis, you see – you keep asking questions, punching around one way or the other – all of a sudden the guy will realize that he's looking at complete idiocy. And you can spring him out of something like that.

We're not now talking about bad auditors or Scientologists or something like that, I'm talking about this on a much wider front: somebody who is absolutely fixated on the idea that he knows, but boy, he sure doesn't know what he knows.

You come along to somebody who is running an auditing session and you say to him, "Well, why are you asking the questions of the pc?" Well, you're going to get randomity. The answer is going to be this and the answer is going to be that. The answer may be sensible and the answer may not be sensible. But the end product of all this will be that the person either now knows he doesn't know or knows that he knows. And a new piece of certainty is added to his auditing.

As long as you leave all of these things uninspected by the auditor, as long as he thinks why he is doing it is something or other – it isn't a matter of criticizing him or showing he is wrong. Now, don't get the idea that that is what one is advocating. You're not really trying to disprove what he is saying, call him a liar or something like that. You're merely trying to get him to *inspect* something and what you do to furnish the inspection is the simplest possible cycle – the auditing cycle in the simplest form. Just ask him to inspect this.

"All right. Now, why do you ask the questions? Good. Good. Now, why do you think the pc answers in the first place? All right. Why does the pc keep on answering?" These, of course, are imponderables, man. These are braincrackers. These actually are considerable questions, you know.

All right. Why – but you're asking "Why do you think?" See. And "All right. Now, why do you think the pc requires an acknowledgment from you and feels lost if he doesn't get it?" And make him go over this cycle and ask it two or three times. He'll jog out all of his memorized reasons and he all of a sudden will take a look at "Well, why the hell? Why does he ask an auditing question? And why does it make any sense anyway to the pc?"

And you may do this to the auditor: you may cause him to – like the centipede, you know. You ask a centipede how he walks, you know. It's a fatal action, you know. Maybe this auditor can't audit for a day or two but the truth of the matter is you've made him inspect the action. You've made him inspect the action. And in inspecting – well, he's asking a question: "Now, what does the pc do in an ARC break? What actually happens?"

Now, don't call him out, just accept whatever he says, don't you see. "Well, exactly why does a pc – ?" Now get very searching, you see. "Why does a pc recover from an ARC break?" Oh, buy any stock answer you've got, see, but come back and ask him again, maybe.

The guy finally says, "Why does he recover from an ARC break? Because he doesn't want to be mad at me anymore." And he sort of looks up and he says, "What do you mean, he doesn't want to be mad at ... What did I say?" you know. "He doesn't *want* to be mad at me anymore? Well, he didn't *want* to be mad at me in – well, yes he did. By George, you know, I think all pcs really are just sitting there waiting for a chance to be mad at me." The guy's auditing will improve.

I'm giving you an idea about the – the fellow is inspecting what he is doing. This is a very crude rendition I'm giving you. But a fellow – get the fellow to inspect what he's doing and try to find out where those deviations are coming in from the ordinary auditing cycle. Because when he's got some cockeyed reason for it, there's going to be some cockeyed action following it.

It's the reason why he will never let the pc give the extra end items toward the end of session. Toward the end of session the pc is never permitted to give the additional items. Well, why? You could stand there and pound your brains out and guess and guess and guess. The

thing to do is to askthing to do is to ask. Ask the fellow why he does that.

Only you don't even know what he's doing wrong if you just ask him to inspect the cycle of action. Ask him what he's puzzled about in auditing. "What puzzles you in an actual session?"

"Ohhwee!" And right away he's halfway to answering the question. He starts telling you what puzzles him in session; well, it's what he's having trouble with in session. And it usually isn't anything that he's being taught. It's something that he has added into the situation which doesn't exist there in the first place.

This is all off the cuff, but it comes on the basis of . . . All additives occur in the presence of misunderstanding – or in the absence of understanding, to state it the other way.

When you get an additive, you didn't have understanding – until you've got all additives and no understanding.

You want to see somebody doing something idiotic that he thinks is the exact, right way to go about it? Then obviously there was no understanding of how to do it in the first place. Don't you see?

But you don't look at it perhaps on this other very, very narrow viewvery tiny view. You say the understanding is the reason for no additives and the misunderstanding is the reason for the additives, because it may look to you that the person understands what he's doing and yet you have these odd additives.

Well, when you see an additive you're looking at a misunderstanding. And this is picked up on meters as "disagreements with." Well, a disagreement simply registers as a no-comprehension-of.

And educating by disagreement is a fascinating activity. You simply get the fellow to pass over the thing while he's holding a meter – a pair of electrodes and every time it ticks you ask him what have you disagreed with. You wouldn't ask him, by the way, "What didn't you understand?" Now, I'm showing you there's a synonymous action here, see. You wouldn't ask him this, "What did you misunderstand there?" or "What didn't you understand?" This wouldn't bring anything out. You ask them for the symptom of the misunderstanding. It's the disagreement. They'll wrap with a disagreement.

Well, underlying that disagreement there's a misunderstand.

Oh, I am sure some fellow has felt awfully silly. He has gone out and he has jousted windmills and he's torn things down, and he's busted up the millstones and he's just fixing the thing, you know, just fantastic, you know. And then he finds the fellow standing there was not a ghost but a miller. See, his whole destruction was based upon his misunderstanding of who was standing outside the mill.

That is the subject of comedy. That is also the abundant subject of tragedy in life. But in knowledge itself, which is the woof and warp that you deal of – with, and so forth, disagreement occurs after the misunderstanding.

And the way to set some auditor back to battery, of course, is get him to inspect the cycle of auditing and find out what's doing. But a much surer method you are using in your classes all the time right now: And that is simply that you are consistently – you're putting people on the meter; you ask him to read a bulletin while on the meter, you clarify the thing. Or ask them, "What – give me twelve things out of that bulletin that you can agree with." And you, of course, will inevitably have drop into the hamper the twelve things in the bulletin they disagree with, you see. Those can be clarified. You can trace it back to them.

Because a person cannot do what he does not understand.

He can give certain limitations to his understanding and do some small sphere of it. Like a girl running a computer does not have to build a computer, but let me point out to you that she is not building computers. She is running computers. Therefore, she understands the running of the computer and therefore she can understand the computer. If somebody were to ever come along and tell her *why* she was running the computer and enlarge her understanding of it, she would be a good – better computer operator, any day of the week.

You can always increase work output, you can always increase comfort and you can always make people more relaxed by letting them find out what they're doing and why they're doing it. This is inevitable, because you've increased the understanding. But people cannot do what they do not understand.

Those are two facts that I don't think any philosopher has ever joined up before. They are facts that stand very squarely in the road of good auditing. Listing will go badly, sessions go badly, Model Session falls apart and so forth.

There is some misunderstanding on the function of the auditor or the cycle of auditing action. It does not depend on the person being evil and therefore he's a bad auditor because he's basically an evil person, see. That is not the explanation. There is a misunderstanding of what he is doing or trying to do.

And sometimes as in your part on the subject of psychiatry – I no longer make this mistake – you can't dig psychiatry or understand psychiatry. That's truth. That's truth, you can't understand them. The reason you can't understand them is you really don't realize that they haven't any goals or aren't doing anything that you would think they should be doing. So therefore they're incomprehensible to you. They're perfectly comprehensible to themselves – perfectly comprehensible. They are not trying to cure anybody. They are not trying to make anybody well. They are not trying to make anybody sane. They don't have anything in common with any of those things. They no longer care for them or understand them or want to have anything to do with them.

You're trying to understand them on your own framework. You see, you'd like to make people well and you'd like to make them feel better and that sort of thing. And, of course, psychiatry is not understandable upon these basics. It's just not an understandable subject, then, because the basics by which it's being understood are incomprehensible.

Now, on a fantastically minor scale, some auditor isn't doing a good job because he just totally misunderstands what he should be doing as the auditor. Well, he doesn't have to have a very esoteric understanding of it. He doesn't have to be very informed as to what he is doing, but his misunderstanding will be so wild as to sometimes just make you feel like you've been snatched baldheaded. You'll say, "What? Not really!" See?

I'm trying to straighten out this person's mind. I'm trying to straighten out this person's thinkingness. And therefore, the things they think, I've got to correct. Now, the only way you can straighten anything out is to correct it, isn't it? And the only way to correct anything is to change it, isn't it? So therefore, in order to change the pc you've got to correct the pc. So therefore, you have to tell the pc something different every time the pc says something." Of course, you're going to find far more idiotic responses to this in some kind of a co-audit than you'll ever find in any group of studying auditors. And there, it will become so ridiculous as to be fantastic.

But you can bet your bottom dollar that if you do not understand what is going on in a session that you won't be able to handle that session and at the bottom of all error is misunderstanding. That's not said on a think basis.

Some fellow's car, you know – this is an old problem of ours, is why does somebody's car go enmest? Why does this guy's car fall apart, and why does that bird's car stay together? And why does one cook turn out good pie and another cook who has twice the intelligence always turn out lousy pie? See, what are these vast differences?

Well on the subject addressed, the person doing it has adequate understanding to the task.

See? This fellow's car that isn't going enmest, the best way of expressing it or a good translatable way of expressing it, is just to say, "Well, he understands cars." See?

This fellow who makes the good pie, well, he just understands pie, that's all. You'd find out that would follow through and be true. Now, this fellow who makes bad pie, you ask him about pie. And by golly, you're going to find out he doesn't understand pie.

You put him on a meter and ask him – now, this is the meter question that compares with this – you put him on the meter and you ask him what he disagrees with about pie. And you can run it down, pull it as a Prepcheck chain and after that you've severed his individuation channel, see. I mean, he's ceased to be – go this cycle of individuation on the subject of pie. All of a sudden he can understand pie and he can make one.

There is the whole subject of recovered abilities. There's how you recover any ability which you once had. You just restore your understanding of it. How do you restore your understanding of it? Well, it's unfortunately a very negative thing. You delete your disagreements with it. And if you can take your disagreements out with it, your understanding of it will restore. Then you can study it. You can look it over and familiarize yourself with it. And you can do it.

Well, in this lecture I've taken up some of the bugbears of an Instructor.

There are many ways you could go about the subject of instruction. But I think if you go too long and try to instruct too long without taking to heart the principles which I've just given you, I think you will come a cropper in a large percentage of cases. And they're the ones that'll break your heart.

A person can't audit – they don't understand what they're supposed to be doing. Why don't they understand what they're supposed to be doing. Because they disagree with certain things that they are doing.

If you wanted to follow it back down on an instruction-auditing back-check basis, pick up the disagreements. They could then familiarize themselves with what they are doing and then they could audit. Doesn't matter what their goal is – you'd still get by it.

Okay? All right.

Thank you and good night.