

## THE BAD “AUDITOR”

A lecture given on  
19 March 1962

I see some of you have made some progress and some haven't. I don't see anybody has totally retrogressed, however—except you, of course.

The—that clock up there is two-and-a-half minutes slow. Beg your pardon. Five minutes slow. Shows you. I go away two weeks you lose five minutes worth of time just like that. Five invaluable minutes. Now, you can think back down your time track when five minutes would have been a long time. Just before you ran into the brick wall. Another five minutes. Wouldn't that have been marvelous?

Well, tonight we have a subject which I must approach with considerable diplomacy. A subject which, however, means much more to you than you would at first glance recognize and one which if you're ever going to train anybody, you had better know pretty well. It took me quite a while to work this out. I sniffed around the edges of it and finally hit it right on the button. The bad “auditor.”

You notice the bad “auditor,” the auditor is in quotes. Because there is no such thing as a bad “auditor” the auditor is not in quotes. Do you see? But frankly, before I go any further, do not expect me to do a condemnatory dissertation and spit my teeth out on the subject of how bad a bad “auditor” is. Because I'm not going to.

Frankly, people who have this combination wrong with them deserve an enormous tribute for auditing at all. It must drive them straight up the wall.

Now, this is based on HCOB of 8 March, supplemented 15 March 1962, AD 12. I notice these are two different time strata. It's HCOB of 8 March 1962 and HCOB of March 15th, AD 12. And so there are two entirely different time tracks.

Now, I am not at any time ever going to be found in a situation where I am ranting and roaring about how bad auditors are. This is not true. I have enormous confidence in auditors. And I always feel when an auditor is not able to make the grade with a pc that it is I who am at fault, not the auditor. Because the willingness and good heartedness of auditors has been proven to me time and time and time again over a long period of time.

The difficulties which people have in learning to audit are two-fold. One is technology, adequacy of—that comes under the heading—and two, my lack of experience with their troubles in auditing. Now, those are the first and foremost difficulties with auditing. As soon as I find what you don't understand or I found out that you don't understand it, under the second heading, I can pretty well be counted on to remedy it rapidly because I only have my auditing to judge by until I observe somebody else having trouble auditing.

Most of the modifications which you have gotten throughout 1961 and thus far into '62 have been modifications which have come directly out of part two of which I just gave you. They actually don't come out of the first part—technology, adequacy of.

But now we have a piece of technology which gives us the key to an auditor's having difficulty. So you see, we've got a number one boost in the first part I just mentioned to you—technology, adequacy of.

Now, this technology, of course, pervasively speeds up cases and does a lot of things. Every time you get a new piece of technology, it of course speeds up all cases. That's about the first thing you can expect of it.

But this does more than that. This tells you why people make mistakes. And that is all there is to it. This tells you why people have difficulty learning and so on. This tells you an enormous number of odds and ends about human behavior. And therefore if I weren't so interested in making you an excellent auditor, this would have come out under another heading entirely, advance, which it came out under March the 15th, you see. It wouldn't have come out under the heading "The Bad 'Auditor'." It would have come out under the heading of "Suppressors." But I wanted to call this to your attention and I was most interested in the fact that this does explain the diffidence and difficulty of an auditor.

And therefore, if you are ever a D of T. this data is absolutely priceless because this tells you why you're going to have trouble with every student that you're going to have trouble with.

This person that we're talking about who becomes a bad "auditor" would, of course, have rather an exclusive corner on this aberration. In other words, you recognize that all aberration is, is a concentration on a single ability. For instance, the communist is crazy because he is totally concentrated on the third to the utter abandonment of the first. That makes him crazy, you see. I mean, his concentration is so enormous that he looks insane.

Now, if you look this over, you'll see, then, that a person who is utterly mad, as viewed from a psychiatric viewpoint, is describable as sane. Let's look at this now. The psychiatrist collects madnenses and when he's all through collecting all the madnenses, one sample of each madness in his spinbin—they call them hospitals; they don't know better—when he's got one sample of each, he then actually has a chart of sanity, you see? And that's why the psychiatrist has never been able to understand sanity and that's what he can't understand. The psychiatrist can understand insanity, but he can't understand sanity. And this is the main difficulty that the whole society has with the psychiatrist.

You know, he never has a sane conduct. He has insane conduct and to him the absence of insane conduct gives us sanity. But by that same definition, the only sane man would be a dead man because he'd have a total absence of insane conduct, with one exception—catatonia. And that would throw that out, too, you see?

So the psychiatrist has nothing like sane conduct. He could not describe sane conduct. He has no observation of sane conduct. Therefore, any one of you or any citizen in the United States or England or France and particularly Russia, brought up in front of a psychiatrist to find out whether or not he is sane or insane, could be taken with any response to be insane by the psychiatrist. You see?

And he said, "Well, do you eat?"

"Oh," the fellow said, "I eat. Oh, yes, I eat. I . . ."

"Crazy, he eats."

"Well, you—you think this is right?"

He says, "Well, have you ever eaten any strange objects? Or eaten anything odd? Or anything strange?"

"Oh," you say, "well, in the normal course of human events, I was out camping one time. We used to eat ants and dirt."

"Ah, well. You've had it."

Now, of course, what he should ask and possibly even does, is whether or not the person exclusively eats ants and dirt. Now, this person eats nothing else but ants and dirt, you see, he's perfectly insane. That's for sure.

You see that insanity is a nothing-else-than. That's what insanity is. It's a fantastic concentration on any sanity to the exclusion of all other sanities and then the fellow goes nuts. There's no reason why you shouldn't be able to eat ants and dirt. But if you never wanted to eat anything but ants and dirt and you felt you couldn't ever digest anything but ants and dirt and you felt it'd kill you to eat anything else but ants and dirt and you never thought about anything else except eating ants and dirt and you never did anything but go find dirt and ants to eat, you'd be crazy.

Do you see that it's the degree? Now, that's why you, time to time, have thought you were crazy. You see, because all sanity has its lower harmonic, its mockery. Every sane impulse, every sane action has its lower harmonic and mockery. It's intensity of and to the exclusion of anything else that makes something that is pretty nutty. Do you see?

We would not consider a person mad for drawing squares on walls, but now we get a person who does nothing but draw squares on walls and doesn't do anything else but draw squares on walls and doesn't want to do anything else except draw squares on walls and couldn't draw anything else on walls except squares and must fill up all possible walls with squares; we don't get an architect, we get a nut. You see, it's to the exclusion of other things.

And so, with that small preamble, you must view this subject of the bad "auditor" as one of degree. Now, you are often leery of your own sanity, as I started to say a minute ago, only because if you ever read a full catalog of insanities, you would find you in it repeated several times. You see?

"Insane patients do . . ." And then we just list a whole bunch of things, you see? And then you look down this list of things and you say, "Huh, wait a minute, I do that. Huh, well, wait a minute, I do that. Huh, I do . . ."

That puts you on a beautiful withhold because you go out in the society, you don't tell everybody you think you're nuts, you see? Inevitable.

This is one of the most generalized mechanisms you could imagine. The person—what does he do? All of these various things. An insane person, you see and what does he do, you see?

And actually, if you listed all insane things that all insane people did, all you would do—you know, without any degree of it mentioned—you'd just get a sane person, that's all. You're liable to do any of these things, see? There's no accounting for what people will do. It isn't even in an unguarded moment. They will do some of the wildest things, but if they don't do anything else, that's what makes it insane, see? I'm sure maybe sooner or later, you have had an impulse to join the army or something like that. Well, it'd just be degree of how you join the army. And of course, if you joined a new army every week, we would get it up to a highly insane level.

But you, reading this list of what insane people do—this has "impulse to join an army." And you've had an impulse to join an army, so you classify yourself, you see? And similarly, every auditor reading this bulletin, "The Bad 'Auditor'"—let me say this: Every auditor except those who should have thought this—said to himself, "That's me. That's me." He wasn't even grammatical about it. Just that was it. We had him labeled now.

That wasn't true. That wasn't true. Everybody's got a little bit of this. Well, the last time you saw a buzz saw buzzing and didn't put your finger in it is easily explained. You didn't want to see your finger lying on the floor, no longer attached to your hand, you see? Well, that's perfectly rational and understandable.

Therefore, you would say to yourself, "Well, I must be trying to suppress things if I don't want to see my finger cut off lying on the floor."

Well, nobody does want to see his finger cut off and lying on the floor, at least until he can mock up a new finger in exactly the same place with the same mobility as his old hook. A little bit easier in space opera. You go down to the tin shop and they bang you out a new finger. But . . . That is if you've got pull with the commanding officer of the armorer or somebody, you can always get a new finger.

But these humanoid bodies are triggered to live only once. The philosophy of "live only once" the philosophy of "when you are dead, oh, boy, are you dead" gives you a superprotect, a superpreserve, a supersurvive computation with regard to the body and you get so that you mind losing fingers in buzz saws. And so you don't want to find your finger on the floor, so you tend to suppress actions which would lead to finding your finger on the floor.

Well, that doesn't mean that you classify under this heading. Anybody could run any of these processes and lines with a considerable benefit. Anybody could run any of them, see? And they'd get something out of it. Don't worry. But the case we're talking about starts running this thing—and this isn't even the worst case—and they start running this thing and they say, "Agggghhhhh!"

And you say, "Give me another one."

"Agggghhhhh! Oh, no, no."

And you say, "Well, give me another one."

"Agghhh. Oh, no, no. No thank you. Mmmm."

And you say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, I don't know. My God."

"Well, what's happening?"

"Well, my whole spine just turns into total, solid pain. Let's not think about it anymore, huh?"

You ask them a question and you get, "Oh, no!" And then they finally give you one, see?

That's the case I'm talking about. You see, that's the reaction we're talking about. Not, "Ugghh. Hey, what do you know? Ooomp, you know. Ooomp. Haw. My stomach feels funny. Urp."

"All right. Here's another one."

"Oh-oh. There went a bullet."

See, we're not talking about that reaction. We're talking about, "Oh, no, my God, please. Not another one. Oh, no."

You know, I audited a guy through a terror charge one time. He was lying on a couch. Tell you how I got that terror charge off of him one time. It might—it might amuse you. You might find somebody sitting on a terror charge and you might want to try this. I told him to, "Go to the beginning of track and scan all the way forward to present time. Thank you. Go to the beginning of track. Scan all the way forward to present time. Thank you. Beginning of track. Scan all the way forward to present time." Take him four or five minutes each time to come the whole track, see.

Of course, I was sticking him in the engram necessary to resolve the case. That's all. That's the only reason you do that. You're not trying to erase track. You just erase the illusion of

moving on the track because the guy's been stuck in this particular engram for a very long time. And after about the third or fourth one of this, the terror charge turned on and he was lying on the couch. And I am not kidding you. The couch was perfectly even and its legs sat perfectly on the floor and there was nothing uneven about this floor. And the person started vibrating. He was shaking with such terror and such violence that the couch was picking up and banging against the floor. I've never seen this happen before. I watched it with some amazement. I told him that was very well done.

And found him in an incident that he'd been sitting in since mmm, whereby he and his friend were out on scout and they got captured by the other tribe and he watched his friend spitted on a stake alive and broiled to be eaten. And then he went mad and they threw him over the cliff. They didn't eat him. And he had been stuck in that thing ever since. It isn't even much of an incident as incidents on the whole track go, see? Boy, he really must have been—what we know now about him is, man, man, he must have really served it out of the deep-freeze every day: human steak, you know?

But he actually was in such a terror charge that that whole couch just beat against the floor at some low, droning note. Well, it was beating up and down just about an inch and a quarter, something like that. Just banging! I thought the whole couch was going to shatter. I ran him through it. I just sat there and ran him through it from beginning to end, having stuck him in it with scanning, you see?

“What's going on?” Ran the thing out. He was sure never the same again. It took a tremendous terror charge off of him.

Well now, if a person can contain this much terror on the whole track in a single incident, imagine—because that must have been free track or I would never have discovered the incident, you see—the amount of charge that's possibly there in a valence which is dictating terror, you see and which is all composited on terror and that sort of thing, which is terrified of anything appearing anyplace.

Well, now what is the exact action of a person who is terrified? It isn't just terror that this is in, but terror is a very good one to describe it with. Terror is as the result of something having appeared engrammatically and then later on threatening to appear again. Remember that a secondary or emotional charge can only exist later on the track than a physically painful incident—technology of 19—late 1951, early 1951.

The only way you can ever get a grief charge or a terror charge or an anger charge or something like that is after the fact of physical pain. If you trace this back—if you find a loss of an ally. Let's say you find this girl and her father's dead. And you run off the death of the father. And you're bleeding tears off the death of the father and that's fine and you run this thing out and it looks like it's disappearing and so forth: do you know that you can ask them a question which drops them immediately into the similar engram which lies below that terror charge, see? You'll find that there's some similar physical pain engram, overt or motivator, which lies immediately and directly below that grief charge that the person is experiencing.

In other words, a person cannot, actually cannot experience a misemotional charge independent of having received physical pain.

In other words, your emotion is always lighter and is always secondary to actual physical contact and pain. That's why it's called a secondary. That's where the word came from.

So you—one day you're riding in the car. You're nine years old, you're riding in the car, the old man has had a few snifters too many and he goes off the edge of the road and you bung your shins up and you feel bad about the whole thing—physically. You're not hurt seriously.

You're twenty-eight years of age and you read in the newspaper how a little child has been killed in an automobile accident and you feel very sad. The very funny part about it is you

wouldn't feel sad if you yourself hadn't had some pain connected with a similar incident. Do you see?

The way to knock out all secondaries, of course, is to get at the engrams and run them out and the secondaries pour off like mad. But sometimes the secondaries lock up an engram, so if you don't get the emotional charge off, you can't get at the engram. And that's very important. And a lot of auditors have noticed this. Before they got off a grief charge or six or eight or ten or fear charges or anger charges or something like that, they never did find the lower incident. But after that they found that after they'd run this grief charge or something like that off . . .

And you realize any misemotional charge compares with a grief charge. You can run off terror, you can run off fear, you can actually run boredom off, you can run apathy, any of these things as well as grief. I don't know why the psychoanalyst only found grief as his tone scale. His tone scale consisted of just two things: apathy and grief. That's as far as he ever got up off the launching pad. Because he really didn't consider euphoria an emotion. That was life. But he thought euphoria was bad, too.

Now, when you got into a physical pain situation, you could later on expect to get an emotional reaction to a similar situation. Now, that is everything on which this bad "auditor" proposition depends. I mean you remember that relationship between the engram and the secondary.

After you've had a few automobiles wrapped around your head, you do one of two things: You either get used to having automobiles wrapped around your head and decide that you are now familiar with this phenomena and to hell with it and go on or you decide that the threatened appearance of an automobile or the threatened—well, anybody is in this state—a threatened accident must be instantly suppressed, you see?

You're going down the road and you see a fellow coming your way and he's weaving from side to side and you go 'Agggghhhhh," and the passengers all try to put on the brakes and that sort of thing, you know? Suppression. They're trying to suppress something from happening. They're trying to keep something from happening. That's their action there because it's obvious that an accident might occur. Well, that's visible, isn't it?

All right. Let's take this person who has been in fifteen wrecks and hasn't become familiar with them yet. Hasn't lived along the M1. And this person—accident before last was with a red car. And they just look way up the road and they see a red car and it's parked. But that's enough. They instantly suppress the red car.

Now, you could ask them immediately afterwards, "What automobiles and what color were they, have we passed in the last five minutes?" and he'd tell them all, but he wouldn't tell you the red car. See, he'd omit the red car because that must be suppressed. Now, that person's pretty batty. He's not just around the curve, he's a bit around the bend.

Now, in earlier activities we called this a restimulator. The red car was the restimulator of an accident. And then car, any car, would be a restimulator... Well, car tire tracks would be an associative restimulator for a restimulator.

All right. These are all substitute, substitute, substitute. You have the real car in the real accident. Now, the person substitutes similar situations to the first accident. He associates those to the first accident. So every one of those he starts reacting to as though it were the first accident. Now, you call that a restimulator. So any situation or environment which is similar to that first accident in which he was really hurt he tends to suppress.

And the very funny part of it is if you ask him to spot everything in his environment at the moment of restimulation—you see him turn pale all of a sudden and you ask him to spot everything in the environment—just that way. You just say, "Well, now point out everything

there is here.” That’s a good auditing command on somebody like that. Experimental I’m talking about—experimental auditing command.

You say, “Point out everything there is here.” And you just keep that up, see? And every time he slows down, you tell him, “Go ahead, now. Point out everything there is here.”

And he points out a few more.

And “Well, point out everything there is here,” you see? And he’ll point out everything and he’ll point out everything.

Now, look. If you’re what’s wrong with the auditing session, do you know he’ll never point to you. If you are a restimulator for this person, he will never point to you. He will always omit you. By the mere process of elimination, havingness and familiarity with the environment, he may very well, finally, point his finger at you and at that moment heave a sigh of relief.

Well, you’ve all of a sudden ceased to be a restimulator for that particular accident. In other words, that is the action of keying out. The person without knowing what the earlier instance was has the lock vanish. That’s a key-out.

The first key-in is the first time he ever got a restimulator for the original accident. This accident’s been riding along just fine. All of a sudden, the same car’s coming, the same circumstances, under the same situation, all from the same direction, at the same time of day, the same day of the year, you know, riding with the same girl, you know, with the same guilty conscience and all of a sudden, boom! He has an awful pain in his stomach and he goes on having this pain in his stomach. And doctors analyze him. And they give him barium meals. And you don’t dine well on barium meals, you know. And they decide that he has to take bromides and listen to political speeches—anything—anything, you see? Put him to sleep. Get him quiet. And just nothing does anything for this stomach.

And then you come along one fine day and you say, “Well, have you ever had an accident to your stomach?”

“No. Never have.” See?

That’s a dead giveaway. He’s given you the suppressor. Now, just think about it for a moment. A person walking on this planet in the space of any two years who has not had something give him a knock in the stomach or who has not knocked his stomach against something doesn’t exist. Or who has not eaten something that slightly disagreed with him. You get the impossibility. Almost anybody would say to you normally (no somatic in the stomach, you see), “Well, did anything ever happen to your stomach?”

“Yeah, yeah. I suppose. Yeah, probably. Oh, yeah.”

But not this guy, see. Not this guy. You say to him, “Anything ever happen to your stomach?”

“No. No. No. Never has. Never has. No. It just mysteriously got ill.”

Here’s the somatic, you see, which calls him a liar at once. You as a Scientologist know damn well something’s happened to his stomach; he’s got a somatic in it.

“Anything ever happen to your stomach?”

“No. No. No. No.”

“Well, now, are you sure nothing has ever happened to your stomach?”

“No, No. I couldn’t think of anything.”

Well, he’s not going to try either. Ha-ha. You’ll finally get him on the E-Meter and spot it on the time track. The person goes through horrible sensations, something is liable to appear or something like this. And then if you’re lucky all of a sudden, this time he socked somebody in the stomach or time he got socked in the stomach suddenly turns on and this automobile accident, you see, turns on, whereby he hit his stomach on the dashboard or something like this, you see and there’s the accident.

The person who says to you, “No. Under no circumstances has anything like this ever happened. I tell you now! Never! It never did!”

Of course, this fellow’s lived for 200 trillion years. You know it’s a damn lie. You see? Just on the law of averages. On the law of averages. Not with any degree of aberration. But you, as you sit, have certainly done to some slight degree practically everything that could ever be done anyplace with and to anyone, you see?

And this person tells you—he’s sitting there. “Well, what kind of weather are you having? Well, you’re having weather? Fine.”

“Yes, I like to go fishing.”

And all of a sudden you ask him, “Well, did you ever have an accident or ever have anything happen to your stomach?”

“No!” “No-ho-ho-ho. No. Never have. Never.”

Sort of “What are you going to do about it?” you know?

You can find it with the E-Meter and suddenly present him with some interesting pictures and he can fit these into place and you can work these out and probably get rid of his somatic.

What you’ve run into is a suppressor. A person is suppressing restimulators using the original power of suppression in the original painful incident. And that is a suppressor. Just before he was hit with the car, he tried to unmock one car—crunch! You see, he’s had a terrific impulse to unmock this car. It hit him anyhow, so that made him lose. But later on, it’s that same crunch, see, that comes down and unmocks the restimulators.

Now, he finds out he can unmock the restimulators and because it’s no longer there in the bank, the first incident appears to be unmocked. A thetan never gives up. See? There he is lying there, you see, squashed as a bug, you know. Green juice. I don’t—some—on one planet or another it’s different colors, you know. Splattered all about, you see? And there is the car utterly triumphant, snuffing contemptuously through its radiator. Not even a slight dent, you know. Not even any green stains on its bumper. Not even ruffled. But in this guy’s bank, you have a totally wiped out car. There he lies stone dead, but his picture is of a totally wiped out car. Thetan never gives up. He couldn’t mock it—unmock it in actuality, he will mock it in the bank.

That’s why it takes you so long to run an engram. You’ve run off the unmock. And then you can find the actual incident, don’t you see and then you eventually can erase the incident and get the pain.

And you know how long it takes very often when you’re doing a Touch Assist for the physical pain to turn on. You—sometimes you’ll audit the guy for a half an hour before he gets any physical pain out of the incident. Well, you’re running into the suppressor. And you have to get the suppressor all the way off before the physical pain is connected with and all of a sudden ouch! And there it is, you see? And then you get off little other pieces of the



suppressor and you get these little flicks. That's why he doesn't get the somatic all at once. And that's why it didn't run out instantly after the accident.

Now, if he wasn't suppressing and if he wasn't in such a games condition with MEST, this is what would have happened: The car hits him, splat. Knocks him into a telephone pole, splat. He comes around and drops on the road again and gets run over by a bus, splat! And if he didn't feel so undignified, he simply would have said, "Well, splat, splat, splat. What's a few. . .?" And he would have picked the body up and dusted its clothes off and so forth and it would have been totally uninjured.

In other words, the somatic would have run out as fast as it happened. But because of his not-is, the somatic stays in place. And this alone is disease, aberration, physical malformation and all the other difficulties he suffers from—are all contained under the heading of not-is.

Now, a person goes through various phases of not-ising—suppression—talking about the same thing. He goes through various phases of not-is. He not-ises slightly or not-ises more. And a person's impulse toward not-is, if failed, can turn into an alter-is.

Now, a person's alter-is can turn into a not-is and his not-is can turn into an alter-is. So a person can have a suppression stacked with a change. And that is dub-in. See, you get a—you get a suppression and he knew the suppression wasn't successful, so he alter-ised. He knew he couldn't suppress, so he alter-ised, you see? So you get dub-in. It usually happens below the level of unconsciousness, hence dreams. And they're just alter-ises of the things you can't not-is.

Now, when you get into a situation as an auditor where you feel a little bit leery about auditing somebody, you have entered a specialized field of suppression.

Now, some auditors have difficulty only auditing a certain type of pc. In HGCs this gets to be traditional. A D of P who knows his staff auditors very often will have to be very careful with one or two auditors. One, he doesn't dare assign a certain auditor to audit a young man because no auditing occurs. Or the pc will just be torn to ribbons or some mal-auditing activity will occur. You don't dare let a certain staff auditor audit an elderly lady. Something bad will happen as a result of the session.

And yet, these two staff auditors, one that can't audit the young man and one that can't audit the elderly lady, you see, can audit every other type of pc with perfect equanimity but can't audit one type of pc. Now, that's what you call the most selective condition of a suppression.

Their suppression on this particular type of being is the prevention of a restimulator. They're afraid something is going to appear. That is the only way you can state it adequately. They're suppressing something.

This person puts them into a certain frame of mind, so they have to suppress this person. And what result do you get? We get the immediate result that one way or another, in a—ten thousand different guises, this pc must not talk to that auditor. Pc mustn't give up withholds. Pc mustn't do an auditing command. Pc mustn't ever change. Pc mustn't ever originate. And how many ways can this be expressed? Well, they're just invariable, the number of manifestations we get out of a suppressor.

How many ways can we keep a pc from communicating? Well, we can let the pc go on forever without an acknowledgment. You wouldn't have thought of that at first glance as just a method of preventing the pc from communicating. You see, you never let the pc—you never direct any of the pc's communication, so the pc is just left to fish and wander, you see and steers all over the place and doesn't know where he's going. And the auditor says, "Well, if I just let him go get good and lost, he's not going to say a thing. Ha-ha, ha-ha. But if I got in there with a couple of smart questions, ho-ho. Oh, well. That's a different proposition. He might suddenly reveal something. Something might leap up about this that would be harmful

to one and all, particularly me or him. who knows?" But that's a good way to keep him from communicating—by never directing his communication. Don't you see?

Oh, there's many ramifications of this. Pc starts to answer the auditing question and the auditor instantly acknowledges. The pc doesn't answer the auditing question, you see. Pc says, "Mm-hm. Ah . . ."

"Thank you! (We'll keep him under control here real good.)" "Now, have you ever seen any mice?"

"Ah, yes. I . . ."

"Thank you. What are you upset about?"

"Well, I wasn't upset about anything."

"Oh, well, you look upset to me" and so forth.

"Oh, well, yes. I was a little . . ."

"Well, you—I don't see any ARC break registering here. Thank you. Now, let's see, let me see."

How many ways could you keep a pc from revealing something? How many ways? Well, there are just thousands and thousands and thousands of ways. And it's the composite, one or another or composites of one or another of those ways that combines every auditing fault. Once an auditor knows the form of auditing, once a person is trained into the form of auditing, if he persists along any of these ways, I can tell you now, since I've gone through this with a fine-toothed Ron, to recognize exactly what he's doing. This took an awful lot of worry and work on this thing, of trying to sort it out and exactly what the conditions were.

No, he's just using a method of suppression and that's all.

I'll give you a method. If he doesn't ever learn how to audit, he won't ever get anything revealed, will he? But he's willing, isn't he? Perfectly willing to audit, but can't ever learn how to audit. You never get the pc to reveal a thing, do you?

Well, that is the slow freight out. See, that's the slow freight. You see that mostly in an Academy. A person grinding on through—can't do the TRs, ha-ha-ha. Just can't seem to get any of the TRs, you see? Can't sit there and look at somebody, you know. Just can't do it, you know? Can't do 1, 2, 3 and 4, you know? Just muffs one or another of these things. Goofs up, see. Does it for months and months and months. They actually have been.

Well, the actual fact is that if you keep a person at it long enough, he will run this out. He will find out—unless it is absolutely potty, you know, totally neurotic and psychotic in intensity—a person will eventually run it out.

Person says, "Oh, well, pcs. They don't—aren't going to reveal anything that's going to knock my head off, you know." They get used to it.

In other words, they get used to it by familiarization. Now, that's the only cure we had to the bad "auditor" in all former training. Some of them, however, never did get used to it by familiarization. There are two courses you can take about automobile accidents. You can either have enough of them so that you get familiar with it, you see and skip it. Or you get to a point where you totally suppress all automobiles. And some people, in studying auditing, take this other route. They are in a minority. They are only about 20 percent or something like that. But you just keep it up forever. You can train and train and train and train and train

and train and train and train and train and train and train. And it's just taking them so long to get over this by the route of familiarity that it hardly counts.

Now, that's 20 percent. Now, about 30 percent get over it rather slowly. Well, it's a case of, "Well, another six or seven ACCs, we'll have an auditor."

And then 50 percent of them, in varying shades of gray, get over it rather rapidly. Rather easily. Well, they're all getting over the same thing. Every one of them whether they're nutty on the subject or it only bothered them for their first week of training. We don't care which. But they're all on that band.

The length of time required in training is directly proportional to the number of suppressors you are trying to overcome in the student. And that establishes the length of time in training.

Now, I think, from what I've seen around here, that a person would be pretty darn well trained after about four months. A person should be pretty well trained. They should be putting up a pretty good show after about four months.

If they go into their fifth month or six month, we can consider them at least guilty of having a shade of gray, here. There must be a shade of gray. If they go into the sixth month and haven't learned yet at all hardly, we'd say, well, that's starting to look suspect. That's starting to join up with the 20 percent, don't you see?

But it all comes from the same thing, is how—how much is a person going to suppress. What is this effort to suppress? How great is the effort to suppress? Because, you see, they're dealing with the root stuff of human aberration and of course there is likely to be revealed from the pc . . . Don't think of this now in terms of withholds and how somebody would spank them if they found out. Well, let's not worry about that.

Let's just take the idea that if they had an automobile accident and if another automobile accident showed up like that, they'd have to go through all the pain and agony of the automobile accident they had, they're not going to have anything to do with the automobile accident, that's all.

So they say to the pc, "All right, now . . ."

They were—they were fine. They were doing fine. Their first two weeks at the Academy, they just did swell. You'll find this, too, by the way. You'll find this abundantly. Just did fine. And one day they were saying, "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting"—they're running this as an exercise and they're sitting there all keen. And the person says, "An automobile accident with an E-type Jaguar."

They didn't even hear the answer. See, the suppressor is right there on automatic, see? They quit.

"Oh, well. Something you wouldn't mind forgetting. Where's the Instructor? Do you have an ARC break? Why not?"

And they all of a sudden don't like auditing. The one thing they mustn't reveal and the one thing they were trying to get rid of in their own case without ever revealing it to them, you see, was an automobile accident with this type of car. And by God, the pc sat right there and handed it to him, you see?

And the person says, "Brakes, see, scream, you know. No, thank you. No. Ha-ha. No. Ha-ha." "Now, why don't you answer the auditing question?"

They frankly wouldn't even have heard the answer to the auditing question. Because they just would have gone clunk. Gone. Everything would appear rather dazed. If you run them

through the session and tried to find that piece of the session, it'd be gone. And you'd know what it was, too. Because you went over it long enough, you'd at least get what the pc said, but you wouldn't be able to analyze what the reaction of the auditor was or why. You'd know it was because the pc said a restimulator of the auditor and the auditor's suppressing that.

Well, then you just check back kind of similar incident in the life of the auditor and—bang!—that would knock out that suppressor. But in view of the fact that several hundred trillion suppressors exist in every case, to run out each and every one of them, individually, would be very nearly impossible. Therefore, it requires a much better approach.

It requires drills of suppression, familiarization with suppression, not familiarization with incidents. Let's familiarize with the mechanism and the identity of who or what would suppress. And we get these things sorted out and these things out of the road, we can start clearing up this particular mechanism.

Now, who is the person—who is the person with the field, the Black V, the invisible field and so forth? This is a person only in a tremendous suppression.

A person with a black field, of course, is more prone to suppress at night than in the daytime. It's natural. You go around walking around the dark streets of the town and you're liable to have things appear that you can't recognize because you don't have enough light to recognize them, so you just go walk around the corner and you go oomph, "Oh, well, that's a newspaperman," and you go past an alley and you oomph, and, "Well, that—that's a horse—old tie-up stand for a horse," and you go around the next corner and you go oomph, and you say, "Oh, that's a—just a restaurant sign." By the time you've finished a few blocks of walk, you've got a black field for a while, see, because you're suppressing all the blacknesses, see? Blacknesses are just difficulty of recognition, that's all.

Invisibility is rarer, but people who are suppressing glass objects, we learned a long time ago, will develop invisible fields. Yeah, you can actually put out a glass ashtray and tell them to, "Try to make it disappear. Thank you. Try to make it disappear. Thank you. Try to make it disappear," and their field will change.

"Make the window vanish. Thank you. Make the window vanish. Thank you. Try to make the window vanish." And you'll get a change in their field. Those are not good processes, but they give you an idea of an invisible field.

And of course, the person who is suppressing thetans has an invisible field. He has a total nothingness involved and other types of suppression. So you'll have suppression of visible things, suppression of invisible things, suppression of matter, energy, space, time. You get suppression of almost anything you can think of.

And anytime you suppress anything in a certain time stream, you, of course, are also suppressing time. So time becomes the primary suppression. And therefore, you get the instantaneous quality of the reactive bank, so that all time is now in the reactive bank because of the suppression of the reactive bank. And that is simply not-ness in the reactive bank.

All right. As we look this thing over, then, we see that almost anybody is trying to suppress something. Anybody is trying to suppress a lot of things, not just something, lots of things. I'm not now talking about trying to suppress bad things about their past or anything like that. They're just trying to suppress things, see?

They suppress the impulse to put their finger into a buzz saw. See, people just—normal human conduct calls for suppression.

And now we go from that into suppressing things which are likely to appear. And then we go from that into suppressing things which are likely to become known about them—we get the withhold. And then we get suppression of things that others are liable to think. You're really

doing a honey then, suppressing other people's thoughts, you know? Man, I tell you. If you want a good failure, try that. It leaves more invisible fields scattered around and various things like that. And you get various complications of suppression and various automaticities of suppression.

Now, it's only the person who has suppression of banks on total automatic, completely out of their own control, utterly lost and completely nuts on it, that actually are damaging as auditors. And such people are damaging as auditors because they will not let a pc ever reveal anything. So therefore, the pc gets totally stuck in everything he utters. And if a process works today, that auditor is going to change it to another process tomorrow because if he kept on with a workable process, uuuuuu. That auditor will only run processes which are totally inactive on the case. He will only run processes that are flat. He will only change processes that are changing. There's the primary source of Q and A.

It's actually quite horrible when you look it over. If the pc is trying to get rid of a withhold, the pc is trying to reveal something, the auditor will totally Q-and-A with him and say the pc must never reveal this thing Doesn't matter what it is. Just it mustn't be revealed, that's all.

So the auditor's attitude is to goof, ARC break, not find it on the E-Meter or only pick up something that he's well aware will be very, very safe, out of which nothing will occur.

"Now, do you have any withholds?"

Well, he just misses that one and that one and that one and that one and then picks up this withhold where the person says, "Well, yes, I do have a withhold. This morning I sneezed."

That's safe. That's all right. He can have that one. So he works on times the pc has sneezed. There's going to be nothing ever reveal itself on this channel and he'll work that channel endlessly because it's a perfectly safe operating channel, because nothing is ever going to be revealed out of it. Perfectly all right with him.

You come around to the back of this auditor and he's running the end rudiments, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

Clang! the needle goes, you see and goes spung! and shivers on the side of the pin. This person says, "All right. That one's straight," and goes to the next end rudiment.

They'll do it. And that, of course, we know by present technology is a dangerous auditor. Now, that is a real dangerous auditor because that auditor, willy-nilly, all with the very best of possible intentions, doing their very, very best, will ARC break anybody that is ever audited by them and drive them out of Scientology. He isn't trying to do this, see? All he's trying to do is do a good, safe job that isn't going to upset anybody.

And they know how to do a good, safe job that isn't going to upset anybody: You just never find anything out. You never let anything be revealed.

Now, naturally, you refer this to the field of study. If the person looks at the paper and never lets the paper reveal anything to him, he never can learn, can he? And if he's hearing a tape or something like that and he never lets any of the sense or meaning of the tape ever come through to him, why, he never has anything revealed, does he? So that's a perfectly safe action. Funny part of it is he'll sit there and listen to hundreds of tapes. That's a fact. I mean, he'll sit there and listen to tape after tape after tape and never register anything off of any of the tapes because that's a safe thing to do.

Everybody to some degree is suffering from a staggeringly bad memory. I'd say if you'd killed as many women as you have or killed as many men as you have or something like that or disrupted as many lives as you have, normally you're going to have some slight suppression. So you listen to a tape four or five times before you've got it verbatim, you see?

I'm talking about this as a—as a total thing, you see. A person sits there and listens to this whole tape and it's on the subject of how you should do the TRs, you see and listens to this whole tape from beginning to end and comes through at the other end and the Examiner says to him, "All right, now, what does TR O consist of?"

And the person says, "Well, it's like the twist, only different."

And he really can't understand how he doesn't know anything about it. It looks like such an innocent activity. But the last person to notice this about himself is the person. That's what makes it grim. Because, of course, that person is in the total suppression.

So the one that you worry about when you're training people is the person that doesn't have this wrong with them and they know it.

"That doesn't apply to me. You see? It has nothing to do with my auditing. It's perfectly normal and natural that Isabel today, while I was auditing her and so forth, she had an ARC break. Any auditor auditing her would have had an ARC break. And when she left the session, I went and got her back, didn't I? How can you perfect—say that I was ever trying to suppress anything about Isabel? I've been trying and trying and trying to find out about why she drinks water."

And this doesn't seem reasonable to you. You can assume that this auditor was suppressing something on the subject of Isabel because he won't let Isabel give or get rid of her case or get audited. And yet the auditor will audit Isabel, which is very fascinating.

So frankly, the person would help them out and this is the only exception to a person's helpfulness—there's just this one exception to helpfulness. A person will help another to the degree of his tolerance to stand something being revealed. And that's to what degree he will help another. Revealing something establishes the degree he will help, so that this works into blackmail and dossiers and everything else. "If you don't help me, I am going to reveal about you."

You get that mechanism. Well, it works the reverse. The person will help somebody unless that person is likely to reveal something. That would be the most natural thing in the world. That consists of the coordination of the suppressor and the bad "auditor." It also is a bad student.

But remember, I'm not saying these in any reproving tones. I am simply calling to your attention that we have the mechanism. And it's taken us an awful long time to find this mechanism and you'll find this mechanism will work like a bomb. Once you get used to using this mechanism, why, you will understand why auditors won't pull withholds.

In other words, this is what keeps people from employing the technology of Scientology. And I've been looking for that for a long time—the—that little point. Well, why won't they employ it even when they know it sometimes? And if I could find that button, why . . .

That actually is all the importance the button has. It's the importance of learning rate and the importance of application. It has, of course, vast case repercussions of one kind or another. It produces dub-in and various things.

But frankly, from our point of view and from the point of view of this lecture, we're only interested in the degree that it inhibits good auditing.

And I stand for that.

Thank you.