

# STUDY: GRADIENTS AND NOMENCLATURE

A lecture given on  
6 August 1964

Well, what's the date?

*Audience: Sixth of August AD 14.*

What?

*Audience: Sixth of August.*

It is the 6th of March.

*Audience: Sixth of August.*

Somebody back there says it's the 6th of March. It's the 6th of August AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we have another lecture today on study.

Now probably, just to get off in high gear here, so the taxi cabs won't run up too big a bill out there this evening – just to get off into high gear, let me tell you at first that, of course, no field of study including Scientology texts of earlier times includes these principles.

So this is a very adventurous thing I'm doing because it can rebound on a critical, you see, at Scientology texts because they are not written this way. They are written in an effort to make people understand what you're talking about but they do not go according to these principles and future Scientology texts, on the other hand, will go according to these principles. And you will see this suddenly entering and coming over the horizon. However, you have at this time only a bulletin or two which represent this. You probably have noticed of recent times that the more recent bulletins are much easier to study and that is a direct result of this study of study. Leave it to me to study study.

But it's very interesting that your grades on examination, since I have been talking to you about studying, have increased from five percent in the nineties-five percent of the class in the nineties – to sixty percent of the class in the nineties. That's one of these astonishing leaps, you see? It is too astonishing to – well, it would be totally unlooked for. Now, you are already being trained above the level of modern education, that is to say modern education as she is taught. One shouldn't be grammatical about low-grade things, you see? I've been amusing myself lately by making grammar agree with the disrespectfulness with which something

should be regarded. That's very interesting – the mood with which you use grammar, you see? And you do that too, you say, “She ain't a – gonna come.” Meaning, of course, that you had a highly disrespectful attitude towards what she said about it, don't you see? A lot of unexplored nuances in language and that sort of thing which are quite amusing. But of course, that's just amusing.

In the field of study to improve the ability of a student to learn by altering the character and methodology of teaching is the exact aim here. Now, this is quite an interesting aim: that is, just to alter the ability of the student to study and to learn and improve it by simply altering the teaching methodology. Now, you see now, that in itself is rather adventurous, because you say, “Well, I could make the subject easier to read,” or something like that, but how about changing the subjective reaction of the student to the subject by the method of teaching which is employed? So, you see how far we have reached here. We are now handling in this subject the subjective reaction of the student to the subject by the method we use in teaching it. So, if you want to see some pandeterminism at work, that's it, don't you see?

Now, study normally would simply be, you told somebody something and he was supposed to study it, you see; and if he didn't like it, why, you reported him to the headmaster, you see? That was how we achieved subjective reality on the student. In universities it's done by mechanisms of expulsion, a grade system whereby if somebody doesn't make a grade he is expelled.

This lightly goes on – he's not permitted to go into the next grade. You see that very commonly, but this goes up to a point where somebody is expelled. Now, that was how they tried to give the student subjective reality on the subject he was studying by, of course, punishment. How else would you expect, don't you see, the thing to conduct itself in the physical universe?

So actually, beyond an effort to present the facts and say a subject was there and then provide a school technology which made the individual guilty if he didn't know it, the whole subject of study and training had not really much advanced beyond that point. That was about the high tide of study.

Now, quite accidentally someone with intuition or insight – some professor, some teacher someplace, in some school – would depart from this rationale. He would depart from this method of teaching and he would try to invite the understanding and the interest and the participation of the student; and such people were very rare and people really tried, students really fought to get into their classes. And that was about as far as it had advanced.

Now, when we recognize that education is not very successful we have made an enormous stride forward. Now, the educational authorities who are responsible for the education

of children and adults refuse to recognize this fact and so they really don't really try to improve it.

But when you are down against a practical subject such as Scientology where you have trained this auditor as best you could and then you see him sit down – you have an element there which is missing in most educational technologies. They teach the engineer to build a bridge but then nobody in that university is forced to sit down and watch him build a bridge, much less go across the bridge he has built. So you see, they do not in actual fact get a very good look at whether their educational methods are successful or not. We teach somebody ancient Greek. There is nothing wrong with learning ancient Greek but the teacher then never really is a witness of the student speaking to the ancient Greeks, see? He doesn't pay too much attention to this.

So therefore, in studying study, I avoided all those fields where observation of the student was not easily attained, the actual doingness of the student was not easily viewed. That ruled out a field for the study of study, you see? So immediately engineering technology, we could learn nothing from that because, of course, nobody ever sits around and watches whether or not the engineer builds the bridge, you see? So it had to be something as intimate as Scientology, which is, the Instructor teaches the student how to audit a case and then, oddly enough, is able at that very minute to have him turn around and audit the case, see? So this, of course, has a tendency to force progress and advance upon us and we are able then to make a further advance because we have an instantaneous inspection of the results of our study.

So, perhaps one of the reasons why the civilization has not made considerable progress in this line is because very few subjects are in this category, whereby the subject instructed is not instantly practiced before the professor. Do you see that? So that therefore gives us – gives us you might say the driver's seat in this subject where – of study – because we can see instantly with no comm lag at all. We don't find out whether or not this fellow turned out to be a great and famous barrister, don't you see, twenty years hence. We don't find that out, but we find out whether this person became an auditor before the day is out. Can the person use this principle? Well, we walk right over into the auditing section and there is the same auditor that we've just had in practical and we've just taught him something in practical and there he sits, you see? There he sits with his bare face showing. Right there! And when the Practical Supervisor also does auditing supervision, he continues to work very, very hard to put his practical across to a point where he sees it all of a sudden in a session. You see? So, we probably have a closer look than anyone else.

Now, there's a great zone of tolerance in most studies. They expect the student to be very amateurish. Let's say we're teaching a craft like silversmithing; now, we don't expect he is going to heat up any silver without burning his fingers, see? So we get a, big gradient win: He heated up some silver without burning his fingers, see? Well, that's all very well and that's

fine but we don't expect him to make a tea service that is going to please the general manager of the British Silver Trust in his first few weeks of silversmithing. We sort of would expect that fellow to go out and hang around silversmithing and improve his design and work with a master and gradually get there and when he is about fifty, why, turn out some cracking marvel of a piece, you see, that the general manager of British Tea Services, Limited, or something of the sort, would approve of and buy and use as a standard design, you see? There's always this comm lag.

But there was a field, not to stretch it too far, there was a field where instant inspection was feasible and so that field lent itself peculiarly to study on the subject of study which would be analogous to Scientology and that was the field of photography. Now, when you tell a student to take a picture of a tree and he goes out and takes a picture of a tree, you in very short order are going to see a picture of a tree. And if it is upside down and if he has cut it in half and if he didn't hold his camera level and if he had camera shake, all of these things are immediately and distinctly visible. Furthermore, we have a direct and exact result of a combination of actions which, of course, is important. Can he put a sandwich on a tray? Well, all right, he can put a sandwich on a tray, but that's not a very complex action. Can he make a sandwich and put it on a tray? See? All right, well can he make the bread, you see, and make the filler and make the sandwich and make the tray and put it on the tray'.? You see how this field – you could suddenly start broadening, see, out a subject.

Well, I'm afraid that we're in – very close in – to that kind of a subject in Scientology. It's a subject of complex actions. It's not a subject of simple actions. No matter how hopefully a person in a co-audit when he first comes in – I'm talking about a HAS co-audit – believes, no matter how touchingly he believes that all it is, is he has to sit there and nod, he very, very soon becomes aware that he is engaged in a complex action. He is expected to say something and this probably strikes him with the greatest of shock when he finally realizes he is expected to say something and that it is up to him to get the person he's auditing to say something.

Now, we've got a double complexity: he not only himself has to say something but the person he is auditing has to have something said to him which will cause the person he is auditing to say something. Do you follow this through? Then he's got to hear this and then he has got to acknowledge it. Well, he probably finally masters this, off a canned piece of paper or something of the sort, and he finally masters this and he feels very triumphant, only to discover that the person who sits opposite him in the co-audit, as it changes around, is not the same case. He gets different pcs and these pcs have different cases and this is pretty grim, because we knew all we had to say to somebody was, "Well, how is your mother-in-law getting along." and we had a good session going. But this next fellow hasn't got a mother-in-law, so that is a total stumbling block and you would be amazed how big a stumbling block that

might look. Now he has to enter the technology, if he's told that he has to do something with problems, he has to enter the technology of problems. What the devil is a problem? In order to talk to somebody about problems, or dream up things about problems for the fellow to talk about, we have to know something about problems. Now, he's away into the significance of the mind, added to the actions which he is performing.

Now, the normal way we go about this is to get him to perform the simple actions and then add the complexities to them one after the other, on the basis that the person would become confused if given too much too fast.

So, we have a new discovery which we have made, long since, called gradient scales which applies in the field of study and that you teach somebody on a gradient. Well, what is meant by "teaching somebody on a gradient"? Well, a gradient of course refers to a grade which is sort of an uphill looking sort of picture, don't you see? It's a little bit more so each successive step. What we mean by a gradient: It gets steeper or it gets more complex or it takes in more the further you go.

Well, that's a gradient and as long as we attack a gradient – as long as we attack the subject on a gradient of complexity, we give him this cycle. We move along into more and more numerous actions, but we try to teach him each action that we're going to add to – we're going to add to this action – so we're going to teach him that action so well that it doesn't worry him. And then our next action that we teach him – this has its own complexity, but it's done in combination with this first action. But if the first action is still worrying him and he hasn't got that down, then our next action is going to throw him.

When you see somebody getting confused, then he hasn't gotten down the more fundamental action he should have gotten down before he advanced into more complex action. It isn't that he doesn't understand the more complex action – he's not even confronting that action; he's still confronting this more basic action. See, he hasn't learned that basic action.

Well now, the only place you can err in this area is trying to start in too high on the gradient and you can make that mistake and you can make that mistake with the greatest of ease. It's the easiest mistake to make because nothing else is done in the modern university except make this mistake. They don't educate – they make that mistake.

Modern education is really the art and science of making the mistake of too steep, too quick, before anybody has learned anything about it.

For instance, I've seen German taught with ferocity and velocity and the next thing you know, we were learning all about Schiller, whoever the hell he was. "What's Schiller, where are we? How come?"

"Well, that's just in the lesson text. See, that's the fourth week's lesson text."

“Yeah, wait a minute. What happened to the alphabet?” Nobody can read a German alphabet in the – that’s used only to English Alphabets. You can’t read – one of those Gothic Alphabets. It’s just gobbledygook! Looks like bird tracks! Well, all right, you’re going to teach somebody about the nuances of Schiller, are you? When it doesn’t even look like words on a page! He’s not yet convinced there are words on the page, you see? He thinks the printer spilled some ink. He thinks his book has been damaged. Nobody bothers to teach him the German alphabet. Where was he supposed to learn it? We look in vain for where he was supposed to learn the German alphabet, because it’s not any part of the syllabus of that course. Ah, but it’s German 1; where the hell is German 0? Well, they must assume that that must have been in your last life.

So, you can make with the greatest of ease the mistake of entering a gradient too high.

A multimillion pound activity was carried on in Africa teaching a number of tribes down there “Soil Erosion: The Techniques of Preserving Soil and Preventing Erosion.” Parliament up here was just appropriating money, along with peanuts, and so forth. It was back in the days when we were all comrades. And they were appropriating money for these groundnuts – peanuts to you Americans – which never grew and nobody could do anything with them after they’d grown them because there was other things they did it with, see? Same time they were pouring this *flood* of money, as a support program to groundnuts – they got into soil preservation and preventing soil erosion. And they poured the money into this and they poured people down there and they had people in an airlift going down to Central Africa to solve these staggering and fantastic problems they were having in trying to teach these natives how to not erode soil. And the native was taking this in just about the way oil takes in water. I’m sure he was being polite and gentlemanly about listening but brother he was really paying no attention.

And it took a Scientologist in the middle of the program to straighten it out. He did it with gradients which we already knew about. He just decided that the government had cut in too late. The native didn’t have any reason to not erode soil. Well, there was all of Africa full of soil – how come we were preserving it? It seemed to be the most bountiful substance he ever had anything to do with. And this dropped back to the fact that he had no idea of future. So this Scientologist sat down patiently and ran around and wrote them up something that they used in the program and one has never heard about it since, so it must have been very successful. No more billions are being promoted in that direction anyway.

Just this: That you had to teach the native that there was such a thing as the future and that his future welfare of his children and tribe depended to a large degree on his still having pastures to graze and areas to grow things in. And they taught them this very carefully and considerable enthusiasm greeted soil erosion.

Now, you very often make a mistake in a Comm Course when you find a new student comes into that Comm Course and you are teaching him this and you're teaching him that and you're teaching him this drill and you're teaching him that drill and he doesn't know how to sit in a chair, man. Now, you could go more fundamentally than this – you could go more fundamental – maybe he didn't know why he was there. Maybe he came in by mistake. Maybe he still has some weird idea about how come he's there. Now you're teaching him a Comm Course.

Well, you're not teaching a Comm Course to anybody that's there, so our basic gradient on education is to get somebody there. That sounds too simple but almost every elementary teacher in the world is making that mistake today. They are teaching children who aren't there. And you'll find the most marvelous increases in IQ and learning rate take place under that very, very funny simplicity and most of their big educational strides made with Scientology are simply based on that one little tiny factor of getting the student there.

Well now, they don't know what they're doing, some of these teachers. They think they're doing something esoteric or wonderful when they tell the student class – when they tell the class each morning to “Look at the front wall, look at the back wall and look at the ceiling and look at the floor.” Maybe they're doing it “because Ron said so,” but it seems to work and this seems to have a great deal of workability and the children all appear to have an enormous increase in intelligence even though this is only used for five or ten minutes each morning.

Well, that's quite marvelous if it's only used for five or ten minutes each morning because the process obviously isn't run long enough to even get into the zone of having to be flattened. Nothing is going to happen here to a case to amount to anything. What they haven't noticed before is that the children weren't there to be taught and of course they look more intelligent if they are there. Try and run an IQ test on somebody who is not sitting at the desk taking one.

So, actually this is completely aside from the ramifications of havingness and other factors that would be involved in this – that first step is just to get somebody there. That's the first step. Now, maybe in a Central Organization somebody up in the Academy may be saying to himself, “Well, the Letter Registrar already got the person here.” “Getting the person here is the duty of the Letter Registrar. The person came in to take the course, didn't he? Well, the Letter Registrar was supposed to have written him letters, so obviously, then, the person is there.” I've already had this explained to me. Do you see the rationale? No, they've got a body in class. They've got a body in class. Now, why the person is actually there? They don't know that.

Well, the fads hit this course. Yeah, once in a blue moon we'll have a new fad – not once in a blue moon either – everybody will get on a fad thing. For a while, a year or two ago,

I've forgotten exactly when it was, "the problem they solved by coming to Saint Hill" was in vogue and for a while, why, everybody was just making marvelous TA and gorgeous case gains and so forth – "the problem they solved by coming to Saint Hill." "What did coming to Saint Hill solve as a problem for you?" See? And then they would run this out and they'd square it up and it's marvelous, and so forth. And I don't believe I ever thought about it very much, but my laughter on this situation would be based on this very elementary fact: That they weren't really running a Problems Process at all, see? They were simply making the person aware of the fact that they had arrived at Saint Hill.

So, we don't do that anymore because we've got a little checksheet which goes in and out and is sometimes skipped and sometimes put back in again, which has to do with getting the person to go around and spot the locations of everything around here, see? We take care of it with a little checksheet. They're supposed to get this and supposed to get that and they're supposed to look over this and supposed to that, don't you see? So, there is a Touch Assist familiarity, so that – that wipes out two things: the vast mystery of where they have arrived at and the fact that they have arrived.

So, your first gradient in education is to get somebody there. It doesn't much matter how you solve it. I have shown you here – get the little kids in school to spot the ceiling and spot the teacher and spot the floor and so forth. You've got them there now and they respond by appearing to be far more intelligent than they were before, so you say, "Well, look at the tremendous IQ gain this gives." No, nobody is smart where he is not.

All right, so there – there is the idea of education by gradient and the – repeat – the mistake YOU can make in education by gradient is a big mistake and that is: failure to undercut the gradient, failure to get simple enough, failure to get the primary action. You must get the starting action that the person can be made sure of so that he can then go on to another action and become sure of that and go on to another action that he becomes sure of, you see?

Well, now if you haven't ever gotten a low enough or simple enough first action for the person to become sure of, then the person advancing into the next zone finds that very, very complex and starts to feel sort of spinny and then the instructor starts going mad trying to explain to this student what this is all about – this step two, see? Well, he has never gotten to step one and from there on his education is a complete mish-mash. And if you want to unscramble anybody's difficulties with training, and so forth, then you will just have to find the gradient that they overlooked or skipped or missed, after which they entered into a confusion.

And this would be very easy to find on an E-Meter, extremely easy on an E-Meter and that is simply: the E-Meter would register an early moment of confusion about study or training and it would register it repeatedly, that is two or three times if it's never been resolved. It would only go *flick*, or something like that if it had existed and then been resolved, you see? There would just be the residual charge left on the time track. But if it's repetitively



reading, if it reads several times and seems to read very strongly as he discusses it – gives you in other words tone arm action – why, then you know that it has never been resolved to this day.

Now, the difficulties that men have with their minds are those which have ridden forward with them into the present. Those are the difficulties that have to be treated and handled – the difficulties which they have had in the past which have ridden forward to them into the present. You can always get a registry on a difficulty somebody has had in the past simply because it is pictured on the time track as having had a difficulty. But if it is not riding forward with him into the present, you are simply using auditing to contact it again and it will blow. It won't restimulate particularly, it usually just blows.

For instance, if you have had somebody get a deep, a very heavy surge, let me put it this way – if you get somebody got a – get a heavy surge on a meter in a session, you can actually put them back into that moment of the session when they got the surge and you will get some ghost of that surge. That's not riding forward with them in the present time. You actually took them back into the past to find the surge. But you can get that surge back again because what you did was get the impression it made on the session. You didn't get the original reading – that blew. But then the fact that it did do this in the session is still a matter of record which can be picked up.

So therefore, accordingly, you could go back into the time track of an individual and you could get an emotional reaction for everything a person had ever been emotional about. Or you could get heavy reactions – it isn't that the reactions are necessarily heavy or soft – but you could get reactions about what a person has been emotional about that he is still emotional about.

Now, get the slight difference here. One is simply the impression on the time track of having been emotional. Well, you'll get a – you'll get a needle read on that. And the other one is a moment on the time track when he has been emotional that he is still emotional about. The thing has never been cleared up, in other words. And the difference between those two reactions is one will fade instantly, the first one – he has simply been emotional about something; he is not still emotional about that thing, that's long since gone, you will simply get the *whooh* on the needle – that needle's going to move, just contacting the earliest point or the point when it occurred, see, you are going to get a needle reaction.

But the other thing that you're going to run into, if it is still current, it will repeat. It doesn't blow through just being contacted – it now repeats and you can get more repeat. Well, that means it has ridden forward in time and has never been resolved.

I just make this point to you. As an auditor you are only interested in those things which the individual has never resolved. You're not interested in just those things which he

didn't resolve. You get the shadow of a difference between? He didn't resolve it, so what? He never did find out how to get along with his commanding officer, but – he never did – but it's not riding forward in time with him. It isn't even capable of being restimulated, therefore it will read once and go *bvop* and it flattens; see, it's right now, it's out. Now, you could revivify him or regress him to that moment in time and start running him through incidents which are not in restimulation and oddly enough you could get some built up that would go into restimulation.

As an auditor you have considerable power over the mind, you see, you can do some interesting things with it. So, there's two reactions here that you are interested in: There's the reaction that simply was there and isn't bothering the fellow – it hasn't ridden forward in time with him, but you can get him back to it and it reacts on the meter; and the other action is one that has not only been active at the time but is active now without any difficulty whatsoever. You don't have to go back in time to find this thing. It's going to react right away and the only meter difference that you will see between those two reactions is that one, the one which is still with him and is riding forward in time with him, and so forth, that one is repetitively reading. It will read and it will read again and it will read and it will read again, you see?

When you are checking out things you have to make sure that you've got something that will repeat. One of the main faults that you make in R6 is that you do not ever ask for the repeat read. Well, I wouldn't give you two nickels and a collar button, anytime, ever, for a one – read checkout – *achto!* Now, do you see why? Is maybe you checked it earlier and it read. Well, when you check it again, you might get the earlier read, you might get the moment in the session when it read before. Do you understand?

So you are only interested in a read that will repeat itself. Reads that don't repeat themselves have either blown, or they haven't ridden forward in time, anyhow, so the devil with them.

If you can't get something to read twice, skip it. If you can make it read twice, realize that it's riding forward with the pc and is therefore worrying him. Still worrying him to this day.

Now, all of this is necessary technology, as elementary as that may be, that's necessary technology to an understanding of how you would locate somebody's early confusions with regard to an educational subject. Because of course he was confused; he was confused every time he attacked a new point on the gradient, but he unconfused afterwards. The meter will still register those moments of first confusion, but they will register as only *onces*, so they're not important.

This, then, I have to tell you so that you can see and evaluate the observation. And then you get used to this and then you get some subjective reality on it, you realize what I am

telling you is true. “Yes! Oh, he was very confused the first time he looked at the letter ‘A.’ He didn’t know what that was – that was – yeah.” Well, you get a read – one shot, see? You get a small read there on the needle, the needle moved.

“What about the Confusion about the alphabet?”

“Yeah, the letter ‘A’.”

Whoom! – the needle moves and you say, “All right, now about the letter ‘A,’” and there is no motion. He isn’t still confused about “A.”

But let’s take this bird now and we say, “What about the letter ‘A?’” and it goes *whoompf!* Now it’s done it once. “What about ‘A!’?” *Whoompf!* “Well, how about – how about – can you tell me something more about being disturbed about this Formation of the letter ‘A?’” *Whoompf!* Now, you suddenly realize this bird can’t w-rite, see? You just – from your various observations of the pc, you’ve suddenly remembered having observed this, see? You didn’t need the observation until that moment, but this guy cant write. Well, you want to clean up his writing. Well, let’s find out what underlay that Confusion

Now, ARC must have preceded all misemotion and bad reactions. You don’t have a bad reaction unless there has been ARC in the first place. There’s got to have been ARC with something in order to make a bad action occur. You’ve heard me say that often enough. Well, all right, how about this – how about this confusion? Do you address the Confusion in itself? No, it’s just sort of an out-of-ARC subject. It’s never the Confusion that the person is supposed to be in, by himself and the Instructor and that’s why education breaks down.

Now, let’s go over that again. It’s not the Confusion that the student is trying to learn and the Instructor is trying to teach him. If they are having any difficulty with that at all, then that’s a guarantee that it isn’t the right Confusion You can just chalk that up with a great big red mark. Student can’t learn it – you follow me? We’re talking now about a heavy reaction here, not just a little old light brush-over-the student can’t learn it, and the Instructor can’t get it through the student’s head.

Now, what are we looking at? We are looking at a lower point on the gradient which was skipped, getting back to what we were talking about in the first place. Here’s this point on the gradient that he didn’t master and then went on to the next point. With that next point he had enough Confusion to cause him to be overwhelmed and he never did get that point. And when you look it over on the meter, that’s the point you’re going to get. You’re not going to get the original point – you’re going to get the next point on the gradient.

So, one of the sneakers that made this very difficult to solve was the fact that the thing the student is apparently having trouble with is never the thing the student is having trouble with. And you can save yourself a great many Instructor hours if you recognize that and get a good grasp on that, in actual fact. Now this, of course, follows the pattern of the mind,

doesn't it? If the pc knows what is worrying him and if he is worrying then – if he's worrying – then that isn't what he's worried about. See, we know that. If you know all about what's wrong with you, that isn't what's wrong with you, brother, because of course, that would as-is and cease to be wrong with you. That's elementary, see?

So, this applied to education gives us this other weird look – that this same set of data applies in the field of training. And what the student is *very* confused about and unable to move forward into and what the Instructor *can't seem* to teach this student is not then the right point of address for instruction. That must then immediately, just by that adjudication, that must be the wrong point of address. And the Instructor just pulls off of that and takes a better, longer look at this situation. See, that's elementary, see?

Let me give you an example – this becomes – this is terribly elementary, very, very simple stuff. You can very easily overlook it: one, very easily not credit that this has got this much jolt in it. I know an Instructor in a slight state of shock at some of the results that he's suddenly getting applying some of this material, you see, on a student. "And did you know...?" You know, that sort of thing – didn't realize it was that strong. A Theory Instructor is checking out a student on a bulletin and gets to paragraph three and decides the student can't pass it. But the student has been having such a dreadful time that the Theory Instructor decides that this student had better have a little bit of instruction. He's not going to give him a pass on this but he just – quite ordinary – he's just tired of having him foul up on this particular point. The student there can't ever seem to get beyond this point, see? So he says, "Now-now-now-look, look-look-look-now. Can you get the idea that bla-bla-bla-bla," and he takes up, you see, the third paragraph. And the student gets all foggy, and the Instructor says, "Now, just a minute. Let's see, how can I put this a little simpler? How can I put it a little easier?" See, the Instructor actually is reaching in the right direction, but he's still staying on what the student is supposed to be confused about, that's the mistake he's making. "But how can I get this a little simpler? Now, how can I get it a little lower on the gradient?" Now this student can't get it and the Instructor can't teach him.

Now, the first thing you should know at once is that we're one or more steps beyond what the student was really confused about. Now, it goes this elementary; you then go back and find what word in the second paragraph – which obviously has been handsomely passed – the student didn't understand. And it may not be a Scientology word at all. It may be some common English word, just like that. And all of a sudden, why, the student says, "Oh."

You see, this is not prior in time just because it's the earlier paragraph in the bulletin, it just happens that bulletins happen to be written more or less on a gradient. That's why you get the apparency of the earlier moment then.

But they've actually gotten to this point then and they didn't grasp the lower point of the gradient, so the upper point of the gradient is just *bvuuurrrr!* And the moment they get

into this upper point of the gradient it's, "God! You know?" And the walls are getting closer and there's little bright spots appearing in front of their eyes and they feel sort of headachy. It's physiological.

It's no wonder the French over there – of course in a harder time, during Napoleonic times we could have said, "Who cares how many Frenchmen get killed?" do you see – but today we shouldn't have that calloused attitude and we ought to do something about the French educational system because they drive more students to suicide than you could easily count. They're *specialists*, specialists at making students commit suicide. The American university leads in as a close second. They just disgrace the fellow and send him down to skid row, if he errs. If they've made the mistake of too fast a gradient, then they condemn the fellow. Crazy! You get how severe this is.

This gets into – here is another salient point, I should not just interject in here, but I should give you full blast, is: Study can produce a physiological reaction and it can produce some pleasant ones and it can produce some confoundingly unpleasant ones. You can have some of the wildest physical reactions just from the fact of study that you care to have anything to do with. And this isn't just studying Scientology, man, this is studying how to paint barns – and it's not for nothing some student will be sitting there at his drawing board or something like that and he'll be getting more and more – he'll be getting more and more and more and more spinny, and he feels sort of weird and he's making himself spots in front of the eyes. And he's making himself sick trying to study any further. And of course, if he's being pressured forward against time, for a final examination, he cannot sit back and go for a walk in the park, he can't do anything like that. He's got to sit there and wrap the towel around his head, don't you see, and swill up the coffee and of course he's just keying himself in like mad, he's tearing himself to pieces, and so forth. It's no wonder.

Well, what is the trouble with him at that moment when all this happens? Well, the trouble with him is not what he is studying, it's what he has failed to study, just before. This is always his hang-up. When you get a physiological reaction you've got a skip on the gradient, that you can be absolutely certain of. You've skipped the gradient. You are all of a sudden going into something or other, and you are studying how to lay sticks of wood across a path in order to subdivide the thing and measure it up to be concerted or the number of grains of potassium bichromate that you're supposed to pour in if it is a British manufacturer as opposed to American manufacturer and you say, "*What's this?*"

Now, it isn't just a missing datum. Don't get that idea, see? It isn't a missing datum. It's something on the subject of the mixture of chemicals or – see, it can be an analogous – it can be an allied subject where a more fundamental datum is or exists on... See, the gradient was skipped on an allied subject, see – or it was just the paragraph ahead of this in the text. See, it's not always the paragraph ahead of this in the text.

Sometimes the fellow all these years has wondered, “How do you really measure something when it’s of irregular shape?” you see? And, “*How-h-ow-ha-h-o-w?*” And then all of a sudden he’s got this thrown in his teeth, you see? “Well you measure out this concrete walk and you so forth and so forth and now the calculus which is superannuated on this subject, is so on...” and he’s trying to understand the calculus – he’s trying to understand the calculus – and trying to understand the cal – .

There’s nothing wrong with the calculus. He doesn’t know how to measure a walk – and he’s been keyed in by some sentence that went right along with what he thinks he’s worried about. It’s right there next door – only it’s a blank.

And you know, the whole subject goes blank? The whole surrounding area goes blank. It’s like you shoot the top off one skyscraper and the whole town disappears. I mean it’s that peculiar a phenomenon, see? You say, “Well, how could that whole page disappear?” You know, or “How could that whole textbook disappear?” If a student is having very heavy going he will have words vanish off the page.

I just had an experience a very, very short time ago; I was trying to look up a word in the dictionary that was included on a page which I was having a hard time coming to grips with, and you know, the word had disappeared out of the column and I said, “Come off it now, it couldn’t possibly be missing out of this column. It must be in this dictionary!” And – specialized dictionary, and so forth, and I just sort of gritted my teeth and concentrated me eyeballs on it and, by George, it was right there. And, you know, it hadn’t been in the column a moment before?

In this particular instance, I however, know what I don’t quite understand, I know what I have skipped doing and I’ve got to go ahead and do something about it, because it’s just getting more and more and more into my road. I do not know so that I can bark them off, the complementary absorbing colors by rote. I can’t tell you every color combination which absorbs every component of white light, except one, you see? That sounds very complex, doesn’t it? It is! But it’s this kind of an action.

But going on and studying beyond this point, which I went ahead and did, because I just didn’t sit down and figure out a color wheel and get it all down within an inch of its life – it’s lost back there. See? I crowded on past it. Now, somewhere in the vicinity of that is a noncomprehend. I have got that bit of noncomprehend pretty well spotted but that isn’t what I’m studying now and that isn’t what I’m having trouble with. I’m actually running into a point where things are disappearing off a page, much less headaches. But just going beyond this, beyond this – well, there’s something back in that area. It is very easy and so on, but nobody has made one of these wheels; there isn’t an illustration of one which gives it by complementary colors in this textbook. And there are no wheels that give you primary colors in terms of what absorbs “not them” from white light, see? What absorbs “not them.” No list of

what doesn't absorb them, so that would sort of have to be compiled and I'd have to sit down and draw this whole thing, I'd have to memorize all of these points of the thing and then I know I would have it straight.

And about that time when I started to do this, something would fly up and hit me in the teeth like, "What the hell is cyan?" see? "What's this cyan? What shade is cyan? I always thought cyan was blue, obviously it is not blue. I have all my life been told by medical examiners that when you fed somebody cyanide they turn blue and..." See, here is a big bunch of confusion going on here and there is probably some foolish word like that kicking around in that area someplace, so I'll just have to go back and look over this area, because I know when it began, you see? That is I know the point that occurred before it began.

See, you can get clever enough to spot where are you at. And all you have to ask yourself or all you have to ask a student, "Where weren't you having trouble? Now where are you having trouble? Good. It's at the end of where you weren't having trouble." See, that's very simple, isn't it? So the formula is that you find out where the student wasn't having trouble with the subject and that meant that he had gone that far on the gradient successfully. And then find out where he began having trouble and you pick it up right at the tag end of where he wasn't having trouble and it lies in that immediate area. You can actually circumscribe it within a few words. I mean, you can do it that precisely. You can pinpoint. You'll have the half a paragraph that it's in or you'll have – sometimes you can get it down to the half a sentence that it is in and then you start plowing it out. But don't expect the student to be able to tell you exactly what it is that he is having trouble with, because that's why he is having trouble with it.

So, instruction would consist of guiding a student along a gradient of known data. It wouldn't be inventing new solutions to the student's confusions. You start inventing new solutions to a student's Confusion, you're just going to get in more and more trouble. Why? Because you are already giving him – he has already got something he doesn't comprehend, now you're going to give him an incomprehensible that solves it.

Good instruction is a system of backtracking. A student will go forward – you can almost leave that on automaticity. He will go forward like a shot bear. *Zarroom!* He'll go into a subject. And all of a sudden you'll hear these – you'll hear this loud scream and the paws are smoking, you see? Then you hear a thud you know? And then you feel the atmosphere around you shake. There's something happened.

Well, exactly what did happen? Well, he went right over the top of one point on the gradient, thought he understood it, didn't understand it, went into the next point of the gradient and ran into a brick wall. So the trouble with him is, it wasn't the next point on the gradient, the trouble with him was that last point on the gradient that he thought he understood, but didn't. So therefore, it becomes very difficult with a student sometimes to spot this, be-

cause he's so positive that he understood that last point. Yet the evidence that he didn't is sitting in front of your eyes: He's having trouble with the next point.

See, this fellow says, "Oh, I learned how to sit in a chair, I learned how to sit in a chair." You're teaching a Comm Course, see? "I learned how to sit in a chair. I know all about that. It's sitting in a chair and looking at somebody in front of me that is absolutely impossible! That's terrible! I can't do it anymore!"

You say, "Well, let's see." Here – here's... In the absence of this technology, one's reaction might have been, "Well, let's see, how can I fix up a drill here to get him to look at that student?" Now, you see how that would lay an egg and extend his training? See? "Now, how can I figure out something whereby he can confront this bird?" Nah-nah-nah-nah-nah – this is not – you are at the wrong point of the gradient, see?

Here's just a practical application. You say, "Well now, it's about sitting in a chair, see, that was – wasn't that the drill you had immediately before you had the drill of confronting the pc? Wasn't that the drill, huh, wasn't that the drill?"

"Well, there was a little thing that came in between there," he suddenly remembers.

"What was that?"

"Well, that was sit in the chair comfortably and of course that's impossible."

"Oh, oh, there was something else in this thing."

"Yeah, well, anybody can sit in a chair, actually you can force yourself to sit in a chair for hours."

"Well, how do you go about sitting in a chair?"

"Well, you sit in the chair and you bring your heels together, you understand? And if you bring your heels together hard enough and press them in, you can press the calves of your legs out against the outer sides of the chair and you can keep yourself awake and erect."

What the hell is all this?

See, knowing the principle of undercut on the gradient, you see, you would find that out. But if you didn't know the principle you would just keep knocking your brains out, trying to train this person how to confront another human being. And they haven't – they actually wouldn't have any trouble confronting somebody else except they are trying to confront two things at once. They are confronting keeping their heels together and they're... See, they haven't learned how to do that and now they're trying to confront something else at the same time. Their attention is split and they are starting to get very headachy. And then you find out there's something wild about it they haven't understood, like: "Well, why do you audit in a chair?"



“Why? How should you audit?”

“Well, couldn’t you audit lying in a bed? I get very tired auditing.” You See?

All kinds of wild little things come up. You don’t pay very much attention to what they’ve got to do. You don’t try to solve those things. But these considerations have got to get into the fresh air. Now, all of a sudden we’ve got this fellow – he suddenly looks this over: “Oh, you mean you just sit in a chair? Oh, you – oh, wait a minute, that takes some doing! Oh! What do you mean, just sit in a chair? Just sit in a chair! No, you can’t just sit in a chair! Impossible!”

“All right. Now, just tell me what’s impossible about it.” You don’t even have to be an auditor to instruct, see? I mean you don’t have to do a lot of clever auditing: “What’s so impossible about it? What’s impossible about it?”

“Keeping your back two-and-a-half inches from the back of the chair, and so forth, is impossible because you have to keep – well, actually, you have to keep measuring if it’s two-and-a-half inches, don’t you?”

It’s pretty hard to believe until it has happened to you, but the whole next paragraph after the sentence which contained the word one didn’t understand, can just disappear right out of this world. It can do the wildest piece of disappearing anybody ever saw. It just vanishes. Almost a white piece of blank page and try to check the student out on this and you can check him out on the whole bulletin, but, by George, there’s no paragraph there; no subject matter there of any kind whatsoever. You run that back, you’ll find out there’s something just prior to that collision they didn’t understand. And if they didn’t understand that with great violence then you must realize that it’s just before that; and you start running some student back, I don’t know quite where you’re going to wind up. Well, I wouldn’t try to wind up outside this lifetime, but I don’t know quite where you would wind up. Become interesting what would go on.

Now, there’s the primary mechanism of study. A study is a con – a study – I almost used a five-dollar word – I will use a five-dollar word – is a concatenation of certainties. It’s a string of certainties. And these are a string of confidences and competences. There are many, many ways to promote these feelings of competence and confidence, and so forth, but the best way to do it is just a head – on thing of just making sure – not that the student walks slowly, but to make sure that the student walks certainly. Don’t hold somebody back because you’re not sure he’s walking certainly.

The other point is, is *always* let a student get into trouble before you help him out. Don’t ever help out a student before he’s in trouble. This guy is doing his Comm Course drills right straight through to the bitter end, he does them like a little wound up doll, everything is beautiful and smooth and so forth, well, what are you trying to do – find something to train? I

mean, what are you going to do, rack this guy over until you can find something – till you create something that can be wrong Or why would you – why would you do anything with it? See, I'm just making the point: Why would you do anything with this? Your participation is not invited there by any difficulty. You see, why worry?

And that is one of the reasons why study uniformly spread across a group is a mistake. See? Students run into trouble that the Instructor doesn't detect and other students aren't running into trouble and they just try to make a medium average of trouble for the whole course, the whole class, you see? Well, the way to do is to let a student run into all the brick walls he wants to run into and the only thing you've got to be alert for is a *student who has run into a brick wall*. Now, when he has run into the brick wall, recognize that he has hit a gradient, hit a stage or a point beyond where he didn't understand something; that elementary.

And the next must is: Don't ever take up with him what he doesn't understand. It's a waste of trouble – waste of time. He doesn't know what he doesn't understand. Always cut it back. "What were you studying immediately ahead of this?" Same formula I gave you before, "What moment there weren't you in trouble?"

"Oh, I wasn't in trouble over this and that, and so forth, that was all easy."

"All right, what moment did you get into trouble on it?"

"Oh well, it's – oh-oh-oh – terrible and terrible and terrible, *oh-oh-oh-oh-oh...*"

"All right."

Now, you've made a bracket there, haven't you, you've got parentheses; you've got the point of no trouble and you've got the point of trouble and now you must recognize that in the dead center, between, you will find the real trouble. Now, the clever Instructor, knowing this, could spot it right on out. Actually he doesn't have to be terribly clever, but it's a matter of 'All right, you say you were doing fine with this bulletin right up to this,' and we finally spot it.

I would even go so far, if I were having a lot of trouble, to slam the guy on the meter. Meters are made to be used. And I'd say, "Now, you're doing all right on this first paragraph, you're doing all right on the next paragraph and you say you ran into trouble here about paragraph five. Well, let me look at paragraph five; yeah, there is a typographical error there in paragraph five. That's perfectly correct, there is one. Now, let's see, you had number four – number four, you didn't have any trouble with number four, paragraph four here, which starts so-and-so and so-and-so; you say you didn't have any trouble with that?"

"No, no, I didn't have a bit of trouble with that."

“All right, now let’s see, let’s get down toward the end of paragraph four – paragraph four here; now, will you please listen to this sentence: ‘So-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so...’ clang! What is the meaning of the word ‘disability’?”

“Oh, well, Christ! Nobody could define ‘disability’!”

You got the idea? It isn’t even that any big mental quirk sits behind it. No vast amount of case has to be taken into it. He just doesn’t dig this word, man! Why he doesn’t dig it, we don’t even care, but he doesn’t.

Now, what’s very interesting is this is one of the first points of research, 1947, is the influence of a mislearned word on a life and that was the point of research. I’d picked up some of this from Commander Thompson on association of words and there are numerous other things about this, but I had jumped to an unreasonable assumption about this. As far as I was concerned it was relatively provable or unprovable, but it was relatively nowhere. They talked about association, they talked about this, they talked about that. Then I assumed, “Then it must be that a word will make somebody sick.” Well, what could be wrong with a word?

So I started tracing backwards and getting people to redefine words and that sort of thing. I won’t say I had any remarkable luck because there was no auditing technology that went along with it, but believe me people were sure interested. I wasn’t using any method of testing at that particular moment that would have given me what the result was if it was.

I lost a lot of people I was working with. I know that’s a direct result. That is to say, they walked out and went back to work, and so forth, and didn’t turn up in my office anymore. But that still didn’t demonstrate very much for that period, because it wasn’t well followed up. I didn’t have somebody on a Telephone to call them all up and say, “Well, why didn’t you come back the next week?” You know? But those that I did contact on the thing, “Oh, I feel fine now,” or “You know, it’s really something else that’s worrying me these days, it’s the fact that I haven’t got a job in Mexico,” or something, you know? Certainly what was worrying them ceased to worry them, that was about the only thing I established out of it.

Now, we find GPMs and the tremendous mass and significance mixed up with those and we must assume then, that all significances expressed as symbols – words, that is all significances expressed as words, which of course are a symbol of a significance – are locks on the GPMs. We know what’s at the middle of this hurricane now. Now, we walk back and we take a look at this thing and we are going to find out that any word that you handle which is not in the GPMs is in actual fact to some degree a lock on the GPMs.

And if not on actual GPMs, certainly on implants. They got the best of all worlds covered. Very heavy locks, capable of producing a considerable amount of commotion in somebody’s skull piece. Your skull bone could throb for quite a time. See? So when you got a – when you get yourself a – when you get yourself a good look at this, you recognize then

that this is a symbolical effort and one of the first reactions is simply become afraid of all words; then the next immediate action after that is to – well, to say, “To hell with it,” and become very stupidly adventurous about it; then eventually fall back into something sensible, like don’t stand around and chant a known end word at somebody’s face for half an hour. Not that you will do much to them, they might be stuck elsewhere on the track, but you certainly louse yourself up.

So, when we – when we examine this broad subject of teaching somebody something, we are examining the subject of relaying data to a person, which he can receive and understand in such a way that he will be able to use the data – the definition I gave you the other day just stated to fit in with this exact rationale that we are discussing now – and of course all of those are being done with words – words, motions, actions or examples. But there’s some words mixed up in this.

So, when you get words on a bulletin, when you get words on an Instructor’s comm line, when your words are going over to one of your students, well, don’t be so sensitive about the Scientology vocabulary because, listen, you can make as much catastrophe in not naming a distinctly different part as you can in naming one too complexly.

I ran into an example of this in this parallel course of study: Basic lighting and basic profile lighting and I got toward the end of the book on portrait lighting with which I’d had terrible trouble. All the way through I was just running into trouble on this thing, trouble – trouble and somehow or another getting through and getting it crosswise and getting it straightened out, and so forth. And I found out the sin there was that they had called two distinctly different things with the same word, “basic.” And I was called upon, I said, “Now wait a minute” I said to myself, “before I take this exam, I better review what I’ve got here. The – let’s see, there’s three types of lighting, and one of them is Rembrandt and one of them is butterfly and one of them is... I can’t think of it! Now let’s see, let’s go over this again,” and then I remembered that all the way through I had sort of dimly been – this is just different patterns, positions in which you put lights, not to hang you up on those things. Fancy names, aren’t they? Rembrandt and butterfly: makes a butterfly because when the nose comes down it leaves a little shadow underneath the nose and you could imagine it to be a butterfly, see? And when the photographic lighting makes a little shadow underneath the nose, why the pro calls it butterfly lighting. And Rembrandt is the face plane nearest the camera is less lighted than the face planes further from the camera but not line lighting – but this one is less lighted. It’s very pretty – very pretty lighting, but those are – there are not very many – there are not very many ways you can put lights together. Here’s these two; and what’s the other one? What’s the other one? I can’t think of it, what’s the other one, you know? Oh, well, I’ll go back and study it over again, so I study it very, very carefully, study it all the way through, study it, study it, look it over, now I’ve got it all, I’ve gone back, good. “Now, there’s three kinds of

lighting there. There – Rembrandt and butterfly and where did it go?” I look down into me head, have I got a ‘ole’ in me skull these days? And finally I said, “There’s something very funny going on here,” because I didn’t quite know anything like at that moment, because I was studying study, I didn’t know the power that a messed-up definition could have, you know? And I went back and I looked and I looked and I looked and I looked and I looked and I finally found what it was.

It’s – there’s a whole school of lighting, a whole system of lighting, known as basic lighting. It’s just elementary lighting. You’ve got two lights and you shine one on the front of the being and you shine the other one on the side. *That’s* all! And the ways you do that and the way his head is turned or shoulders are turned, while you’re doing that, gives you this whole school of lighting. There’s nothing fancy about it. The other two are the fancy lightings, but this one, which you simply – almost says, “Turn light on the subject,” I couldn’t get and that was because under butterfly lighting there is a type of lighting, called basic profile lighting, which everybody realizes is a butterfly lighting, but all professional photographers call “basic profile.” So, under butterfly lighting we have a kind of lighting called basic profile, but over here, under this other, this whole class of lighting is called basic lighting. And because they hadn’t sufficiently had a differentiation in their nomenclature, they didn’t have enough terms in other words – louse up, total Confusion, see?

Well, that was the Instructors’ Confusion that was the people who were teaching you’s Confusion, because you obviously were going to fall into that trap. They just dug a pit, put a stake at the bottom of it and covered it up with leaves, man.

And you’ve got one right now. Now, prepare for a little line charge. You’ve got an insufficiency of nomenclature. I know you’d never dream you had, but if you figure how many things there are in the mind that you – that you already have, you realize there’s not much nomenclature for it. When you realize the few little things in the mind that the medicos had and the vast array of nomenclature; we’ve got a tremendous number of parts and things in the mind and not much nomenclature. And actually we don’t have enough nomenclature and that would be the last sin in the world you’d think you would accuse Dianetics and Scientology of, but it’s true. And you will agree with me in just about a split instant.

There is a thing called an ARC break assessment and there’s a bypassed charge assessment and hardly one of you monkeys have ever been able to tell the two apart or do either one of them. And I’ve lately watched you falling and falling in more pits and walk into more bear traps on this one subject than you can shake a stick at. Because a bypassed charge assessment is not an assessment. It’s an auditing by list and the name of it should be “Auditing by Bypassed Charge Lists” or “Auditing by List for Bypassed Charge.” It’s not an assessment.

Now, you've begun to believe, you see, that an assessment is something that doesn't have anything to do with auditing and that's true. An ARC break assessment has nothing to do with auditing. You simply sit there and you reel it off, with your pc usually gritting his teeth to powder. And you finally see your meter react and you indicate the bypassed charge and you don't answer and you don't acknowledge and you jolly well had better not. If you value his sanity or yours on R6 material, you just sit there, man, and you reel this thing off and you find the bypassed charge and you indicate it right now. It's usually done in the middle of an ARC break.

If you audit a person in an ARC break you will put him into a sad effect. So of course it can't be auditing! But unfortunately we have instantly, immediately afterwards, called a thing a bypassed charge assessment by which you take the same list but treat it differently and the person is not ARC broke when you have done it, so that is auditing.

And this has been a source of enormous Confusion to one and all, apparently. Why? Because both terms have the word "assessment" in them. So it's an inadequacy of nomenclature. There's a missing word, you follow?

All right, so that's all the trouble you are having with regard to it. There isn't – the trouble isn't any worse than that, see? You can see that you could audit – auditing by list has to do with cleaning up each question, after all that's the Joburg and that's these things and you just read the question until it's clean. Read it and get it answered till it's clean and you go to the next one and you read it and answer until it's clean. Auditing by list. You can take the R6 list and you can do this with it.

So, we had the same list, which gave a Confusion and we had the same word attached to a process which gave a Confusion, and so forth. So it's very, very hard, oddly enough now, to get auditors to *do this*. Well, that's funny, that it gets hard to get auditors to do this. Therefore, it must have a subtractive or a detractive action in excess of merely being misdefined. They couldn't do it; auditing Supervisors were walking around in circles, "Now, look! Please do an ARC break assessment on this pc, because he is blowing," and so forth. Come back, here is the fellow busy auditing by list, you know, doing a bypassed charge assessment, you know, cleaning up everything, listening to the pc, you know and so forth, all this sort of thing, you know? "No, no, no! You know? Read the thing down the list and when you find the charge, and so forth, why, indicate it to the pc and that's all there is to this."

"Oh-oh, I see."

So, in other words, a term can be confused by being used for two different distinct purposes. You could enter Confusion then with not enough nomenclature. As a matter of fact it's probably, in the field of the mind, has been a more serious sin than too much nomenclature.

Because the things were named in identification with one another. Do you follow me now? You've got this type of response? So of course, that will very shortly, as soon as I get around to pushing out a bulletin, that will very shortly become, of course: ARC break assessment is done so-and-so and so-and-so and not auditing; and then there's Auditing by List for Bypassed Charge and that becomes a completely different action. Now, you'll find out that's teachable.

So, we've covered now two things here and these two things are: If you take a person up the gradient too steeply he will get lost at some step always because he is confused about the prior step and he will blame the step he is lost in, while being stuck, in actual fact, in the step he really didn't get out of – , and that's what makes it a masked area and which makes it upset; and that the responsibility for the subjective reaction of the student in a very large measure lies with the Instructor. Boy, that is a new departure, see? The student's attitude, and so forth, is really today with Scientology and what I am teaching you here, right in the hands of the Instructor.

If you want to, you can almost produce the mental reaction you want to at will. You could blow a student off a course. It would work both ways – I'm not saying you'd do this, but this fellow is on course and you blow him off the course. You just with malice aforethought say, "Well, all right, we're going to blow him off the course."

One of the ways to do it is say, "All right, now this is two people sitting in the chair there; they are actually both preclears and they are actually both at the same time auditors and there is no particular difference between the word 'auditor' and the word 'pc,' and so forth, and they really don't mean anything different at all. All right, very good. You got that straight now? Good." You won't have him there in about 24 hours, if he's green grass off the street. See what I mean? You could overtly produce that reaction.

All right, now some guy is blowing and just as he leaves and you say, "What word was it that I didn't get there?" You will find out he'll stop moving, because you've already got part of the charge, see, just by indicating it's wrong with the words. All right, he'll stop exiting, in other words. "Now let's trace it back. At what moment did you get confused?"

"Well, it was in the last half-hour."

"Good, what happened in the first half-hour?" see?

"Oh, well, it was that word."

"Very good. All right, thank you very much."

"Oh, is that what that means?"

"Yes."

In other words, there's handling of the guy stays or the guy goes. There's the Instructor creating that effect or result with just the method of teaching he is using. Pretty sneaky, huh? You can get further along this line – there's more to learn on this particular subject but that is – but those things stand out like a beacon. The earlier gradient – the earlier part of the gradient – is the one he's fallen down on.

Now, we get to the other section of it is – it is really always a word or phrase. Now, of course a word or phrase can be inadequate. I've got one going right now. I – nobody has bothered to tell me why they use a yellow filter in a certain combination and in all the illustrations here sits this yellow filter. What is it doing there? What does it have to do with something?. I don't know. I haven't been told. I've not been demanded – it's not been demanded of me: Why is a yellow filter there? But yet, that is serving as just a little bit break there. I know there is something about this I don't know.

So, you see the sentence could be inexplicit or it could omit the data or accidentally deprive somebody of the information. A typographical error will do this. The word “cat” is missing in the sentence: “The dog chased a.” All right, now we say to the student, “Now, all right, let's tell us what that action is.” Well, he's confused. Well, you certainly don't have to go very far afield to find out what he's confused about.

So, the fault actually could be with the text, as well as with the student, if the text is not explicit by reason of typographical error or by some other reason, and so forth, the information is not relayed to him in an explicit form, so then he gets confused. So, it isn't always his fault that he is confused, don't you see?

You can sometimes take a hold of the text he's been studying and just take one glance at it and all of a sudden see that two paragraphs have been omitted out of it. They are the paragraphs that define somebody. You see, somebody made a mimeograph copy and didn't copy two paragraphs, you know? This corny. You see that all words in an auditing session are defined, except “auditor” and “pc.” This is liable to bring about a certain amount of confusion.

So, the upshot of the thing is that your confusion is not necessarily the fault of the text, it's not necessarily the fault of the student. We're not trying to fix blame in this particular line. We're just showing you that there was something not understood. It might also have been the fault of his first grade teacher, see? She never told him what some little word like “reciprocity” meant, or something like this. And we've got – we've got ourselves, then, a good look at this. It's treated on the basis of “these are the factors which you must observe as an Instructor.” Now, you can put those things together. You can see why he didn't attain the gradient or you can ask him why he didn't. You can locate the point where he didn't move from one point of the gradient to the next point, you can isolate why he did this.



We can see that nomenclature and other things could be responsible for this. Lack of definition could be responsible for this. We can see lack can be responsible for it as well as an existing thing can be responsible for it. And we see also that the individual would not have really a clue about what he was confused about or he wouldn't be confused and we see that the Instructor who is doing the best job of instruction is actually never trying to solve the problem of what the student is confused about. We see the good Instructor would never do that. Why? He's already one gradient late, so he just gets more confused than the student, because he can't understand why the student can't understand, see?

It says, "Cats are sometimes white."

"Yes, but I don't know why they are white, and so forth. Actually didn't – didn't Ben Franklin say something like that? I'm not sure whether Ben-I-uh-where-what is this-where-where-su-sa-su-dah..."

"Well you see, cats – well, did you ever see a eat? Did you ever have a eat? Uh-uh-uh-do-do-do you-do you know anything about cats?"

Uh-let's-uh-let's go get a dictionary and look up a picture of cats." It's all a waste of time because it happens to be in the earlier paragraph where it said "feline." See, he doesn't know what that is, see? He didn't know that applied to cats, but he hung up on this earlier one.

So the apparency of his Confusion is almost never the Confusion he is actually in. An Instructor knowing this won't have any real difficulty answering the foolish questions he is asked, and so forth, because he just never bothers with them.

He wants to know what's going over the top. But somebody asks the Instructor the Definition of something: "Yes, yes," he says, "a *caterwump* is a ba and that's all."

Okay?

*Audience: Okay.*

Good enough, thank you.