ACC COMMAND SHEET (cont. 2)

A lecture given on 30 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Hiya.

The mixed emotions with which you look at me today!

Anytime you bat out thirty case analyses in forty-eight hours or less, you really have to get in there and cook. You really do.

Two or three of you flubbed badly on - after the case analysis. I unfortunately gave you a little latitude and told you you could scout some more and then, of course, you laid one in on top of it, which made the stuck button disappear and after that you could only get a rise. That you must be very careful of.

Just as a passing note, once you've got a meter to stick, it is the easiest thing in the world to lay things on top of it. And if you were to lay something on top of it which was accumulating or adding to the case, then you will get a problem laid in by Scientology, the resolution of which can be rather fantastic.

You get the idea? You get a stuck button and then the auditor comes along and he starts sticking other buttons on top of it. He doesn't go back to the original stuck button with any success at all because now the other things he has added onto it are being successful in adding to the case. Do you understand that?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

All right. So, the best thing to do is, even if the needle is rising, you go back and take the last thing that stuck and run it. You get the little rule on the thing?

This is the thirteenth lecture of the 20th ACC, July 30th, 1958. The title of this lecture should be additional material on the Command Sheet or the Command Sheet continued.

First, however, let's take up another subject: a subject called responsibility. I'll probably wind up in giving this Command Sheet in the last two minutes of the lecture but I must say something about responsibility right here at this stage.

Responsibility has many definitions. It has many aspects, manifestations. Responsibility can be simply taking care of something. It can be controlling something. But in the final analysis, it is admitting some share of the survival of, taking part and sharing in the survival of, if a thing is surviving.

Therefore, Help resolves responsibility. You run Help, it'll unwind responsibility. Help undoes responsibility. The therapeutic value of Responsibility as a button, and when being run, totally depends upon the knowingness which is blown into view. So, if you run Responsibility with many resultant cognitions on the part of the preclear, then the cognitions themselves will make a relatively permanent gain.

But if you run Responsibility without additional knowingness or cognitions, you might as well forget about it.

This is not true of Help. Help can be run in the foggiest mass of no-cognition you could imagine, into the center of identifications and cross-inverted identifications. You're not even identifying with the subject anymore, you re identifying with something which is the reverse of the subject.

For instance, a fellow was good so long that he identifies everything with evil. You get the idea? The minister's son's plight.

And Help is not dependent upon cognitions, evidently, but simply will run! And the muddiness of the preclear finally straightens up and he eventually does get some cognitions. But even if he didn't, something was going to happen.

Now Responsibility, then, is a limited technique but has great exploratory value and you should regard it as having exploratory value. Just a moment ago I was talking to Dick about this and we brought up a point here that's quite interesting. If you run Responsibility on somebody who has a present time problem, then everything you ran Responsibility on so nicely will key back in, short time later. So, it's a good test; it's an interesting test.

You run Responsibility on Father and the pc at the end of a short period of time begins to feel much better, he tells you. You let him go out of session and an hour or so or three or four hours later, he comes back and tells you that the problem with Father is still all there again. It isn't the Responsibility doesn't work, not at all. It's that you were running a pc who was out of session and could not cognite. Simple - simple as that. It's awfully elementary.

Responsibility requires cognitions in order to work and a pc who is out of session to a greater or lesser degree doesn't cognite, which is quite interesting. But if you were to run Help on somebody, the thing that you ran Help on would to some degree, without a cognition, key out and stay out. Might not permanently change his case or personality or anything like that, but it would certainly key out and stay out. Not so with Responsibility.

This is all based on limited observation, of course, but the way I've been using it is an actual test of an existing PT problem on occasion. Have somebody run Responsibility on a preclear for a short time and then ask the preclear if that which was addressed has come back again, and if it has, then you go for a PT problem and you really find one that time.

It's a question, then, of being out of session. All of auditing cures somebody's out-of-sessionness. A pc is always to some slight degree out of session and as his auditing continues, if it is doing well, he is getting more and more into session with periodic and momentary bursts out of session, don't you see? Short, shorter and shorter. And eventually he can actually tolerate being totally in-session. And the only person who can tolerate total in-sessionness is a Clear.

This is very, very fascinating. But it's so awfully easy to understand. If this individual has no anxieties about his environment, he, of course, can sit in the chair and relax utterly and therefore follow the auditing commands perfectly. But this we only get from a Clear.

So, your pc is always to some degree out of session, to some degree out of session. At the beginning of an intensive, he is further out of session - if you're improving his case - than he is at the end of the intensive. If you cleared him, he will be practically totally in-session at the end of the intensive.

What do we mean by *„totally in-session"?* That is, selectively in and out...

[Please note: In this point in the lecture a gap exists in the original master recording. We now rejoin the class where the lecture resumes.]

He is more or less in and out of session as we roll along, but he's out of session to the degree that he has anxieties concerning the environment.

Now, these peak when he has an unexpected or unusual present time problem. Do you understand that? He's kind of used to having all of the aberrations he's got. Even if you restimulate one, he already has the experience of having had it for some time, a few hundred million years or something like that. You know, he lived with it. Every time he saw a post he went mm, you know, a little bit. Something went neuggh. Every time he saw a girl, he says, *„Walk easy, boy, walk easy."* But now all of a sudden, a bill collector is waiting home on the front door. Now, this has future and it has potential and it has different stress than he's used to. So, all you've done is pique his anxiety about his environment, and he's further out of session by about ten thousand times than merely because he is aberrated. Do you see this as a sudden stress? Now, in clearing somebody, you're collecting a preclear from all over the universe. You're collecting one - you're collecting his dispersed attention. It can go so far as to collect the remote viewpoints from which he is viewing things. It's quite remarkable. There are some specific techniques that show an individual to be all over around himself. Oh, that sounds real weird, but you will all of a sudden have somebody who is looking at the room from the right side and seeing it from the left side at the same time and is not able to get the room into focus in any way. And even if you, in extreme cases, put a blindfold over his eyes, he would be seeing the same silly setup.

I remember one in particular who was an archery expert and he was very worried when this happened. The points from which he was looking were so many, so complex and so confused, were so invariably mixed up that in auditing itself he was concerned. But then he went out that Sunday to the archery range and man, he was looking at that target from way over to the right while he was looking at the target from way over to the left, while he was in back of the bow pulling the string on the target. And when he fired one arrow, it was at what target, from which bow? Now, here was a case of: not only was the person's attention fixed on many things, but the point from which the attention was coming was varied. Now, how complex can you get? You might say he had sets of eyes all around him, extending somewhere in the neighborhood of, I didn't ever ask him, but I imagine it must have been four or five feet to either side. He had remote viewpoints. He didn't just look through his eyes; he was looking from everywhere.

Now, look-a-here, that is a real anxiety. You not only have to keep your eye on everything but you have to make sure that you aren't there yourself doing the looking, because what you're looking at might bite. Now, there is composite out-of-sessionness.

Now, as you pick up the pc's attention from here, there and everyplace, you're picking up at the same time the things he is mocking up to keep his attention fixed on. But why does he keep them mocked up? Well, they're so dangerous he has to watch them! And in this you have a totality of explanation of exactly what a preclear is doing and what a Clear isn't doing.

So, you're deintensifying the anxiety of an individual and bringing him up to a more real attitude of security and with this you get, of course, more thereness. The individual does not have so many bugaboos which are frightening him out of being where he is. So, starting with this peak thing called a PT problem, where he'd better not be in the auditing room - as a matter of fact, he'd better not be locatable at all! One thing wrong with being in the auditing room is people might have the address of the auditing room! Do you get the idea? He'd better not walk out of the auditing room either. He certainly had better not be home or at the other end of a telephone because Lord knows what's going to happen. Why, as a matter of fact, his recent life in the Greek Empire taught him exclusively that when your wife was trying to collect alimony or support money, it usually occurred (when it wasn't at once paid with interest) that one of your favorite servants slipped a bit of hemlock into your morning brew. And you kicked the bucket with some convulsiveness. All these little lessons one has learned.

Now, they key right up on a PT problem. But even if the PT problem isn't there, you are still dealing with somebody who had better not be there. And the more he is capable of being there, the more responsibility he can take for what is going on there. But if he isn't there at all, he dare not take any responsibility for being there. So a PT problem situation is a no-responsibility for the session.

Going on an upgrade to a person who is just normally anxious and insecure, very little responsibility for the session - some - possibly as high as being nice to the auditor. The responsibility level: being nice to the auditor. Auditor says, „*How are you this morning?*" Responsibility level: smile and say, „*Fine.*" See? No further responsibility of any

kind. If you please the auditor, you've at least got the auditing room kind of there, under control, you see? And you can go on worrying about all those very, very important problems, such as the missing state of ammunition in spaceship X-97 which has only been wrecked on planet Zeknu for the last eight billion years, you see? These important considerations can be gone into much more thoroughly.

Obsessive agreement is one of the mechanisms used. Pc isn't there, he's merely agreeing with everything you say. Now, if you get one of these agreement cases with a PT problem on top of it, you've got real trouble because they go into an hypnotic trance. They dare not be there to such a degree that they aren't.

You've got a total irresponsibility for the session. And if your auditing command included such a thing as, *„Get the idea of being a frog,"* they might leave the auditing session croaking. Literally true.

The common denominator of all hypnotism is irresponsibility To create an hypnotic trance it is only necessary to demonstrate to an individual that he has no responsibility for anything in his vicinity of any kind whatsoever and the hypnotist will take care of it all. Hypnotist is going to take care of everything. Well, compare this to the attitude some pcs take toward the auditor.

You'll find the agreement case, the hypnotic case - they're similar - just liable to be in this sort of thing. You could actually produce a considerable change in this case if you were a little bit dishonest and merely wanted to produce considerable effect. You'd simply explain to the preclear how he had no further responsibility -he already has little enough - just explain to him how he has no further responsibility for the auditing session at all. And now tell him that he is nine feet tall, feels wonderful and so forth. He'll go around for three or four days telling everybody how he is nine feet tall and feeling wonderful. Of course, they will wonder a little bit that he's still got his cold and he's still got this and he's still got that, but he will believe it for a very limited time. He's in a trance.

Now, a trance would be defined as that state where the environment is so dangerous, the past and future so unpromising, that the only safe thing to do is take all thought, orders or anything from somewhere else, not necessarily from one source, but from somewhere else. You have an explanation for hypnotism in this mechanism.

Now, it's not your job as an auditor to knock anybody's responsibility down, but to increase it. How do you increase it? By taking their attention off all of those things which of necessity they think it must be on - obsessive attention, obsessive fixation - and handle this mechanism of mocking things up so that you can keep your attention on them. Total explanation for the creativeness.

Now, when one mocks up very bad things, so he can keep his attention on them, he's taking no responsibility for the badness of the thing. Therefore, he can't admit that he is mocking it up and you get your *„I don't know what I am doing"* state of case where the individual has a reactive bank.

The reactive bank is all the bad things that the preclear has to keep his attention on, for which he has not been responsible, he thinks, and which at the same time he cannot say he is mocking up. And you have your total mechanism of the reactive bank.

If the reactive bank is that irresponsible - it's that collection of mental image pictures known as facsimiles and more positively classified as engrams, secondaries and locks - if that reactive bank is something for which he can take no faintest responsibility, he, of course, is in an hypnotic trance with regard to it.

So therefore, he absolutely receives the orders from this thing. They are literally received, as any old Dianeticist can tell you, utterly and literally received. It's that collection of pictures the pc is taking no slightest responsibility for making because he took no slightest responsibility for anything that was there and he copied from. See, he takes no responsibility for the actual thing he copied, therefore he takes no responsibility for the copy. Therefore, he takes literal orders from these pictures, their words, phrases, scenery and so forth. Do you understand this? Now, this accounts for the command value of the reactive mind. It finds the thetan in hypnotic trance with regard to it. So, no matter whether your case is apparently wide awake or only half awake, you're still dealing with a relatively hypnotized person.

When this gets to be very, very savage, when the hypnotism is so deep that it's even taking place in present time and all you get is obsessive agreement, you say, *„It's raining today"* And the preclear says, *„Yes, yes, it's raining today,"* and you say, *„The sun is shining out today,"* as the next statement. And he says, *„Yes, yes, the sun is shining out today"*

„You feel fine."

„Yes, yes, I feel fine."

„You feel horrible."

„Yes, yes, I feel horrible." See?

Well, what are you looking at? You're just part of the reactive bank as far as he's concerned. And therefore, everything and anything you do can go in, just as though it's a reactive bank. You see that? Hence, the seriousness of an ARC break. An ARC break makes you something bad and everything you say after that is liable to go in on an hypnotic channel so therefore nothing had better go in. And he just isn't alive to your orders. Don't be fooled by the preclear who is a little bit antagonistic and then all of a sudden is very agreeable. Don't be fooled by this PC.

Pc came up to me after an intensive, and somebody - this was years ago - PC came up and said, *„You've-urr-done very well with me."* And I took one look at this pc and this pc was falling apart at the hinges. Took a look at the profile and it had dropped and I went and got the auditor and gave the pc another week.

Why? The pc was into propitiation. And darn you, don't you ever mistake a pc driven into propitiation for a pc gotten well. Don't you ever make this mistake. You can tell it in the funny way they look at you, as a matter of fact. Yes, they feel fine now. It's such a cautious propitiation; it's such a cautious statement. They are so anxious to please. The case has been worsened, not bettered. A profile would tell you this at

once. But you can always drive a pc, particularly an antagonistic one, down to propitiation. It's very easy to do.

Now listen, the worse off and the more hypnotic a pc is, or a civilization, the less there is there to audit. Sure, maybe we could dream up some kind of a lightning bolt that'd play around the White House day and night and then we could go down and say, „*Well, we'll turn it off.*“ And we'd turn it off and then we'd turn it on again. Then we'd tell people, „*God's mad at the government and therefore it better do something or other.*“ Old-time OT trick.

Do you know the net result of that? To put people in an hypnotic fixation, as far as you're concerned. They become less responsible, less able. You are running in a society then, with more crime, more perversion, more broken-down channels, you see? So went Arabia, India; many, many countries have already gone through this fate. Many of them. And so, it is not a good thing to do.

Nor is it a good thing for you as an auditor to do. Because the more you fix the attention of the pc and the more you teach him that he cannot have any responsibility for what is going on, the more you kick back his contributions to the session, the more you insist on auditing him when he's terribly dispersed, you audit him with some technique that's over his head, why, the worse he's going to get. That's for sure. The less pc you're going to have there, therefore the less orders that are actually being handed out and received. It's one thing to hand them out; it's quite another thing to receive them. And as a result, you've got individuals who are not going to get well and that the next auditor is going to have more trouble with.

So there's two ways you can go: one is overbearingly on this responsibility factor and the other is to go more and more responsibility on the part of the preclear, more and more in-session, which all adds up to what? More security on the part of the pc. More confidence, more security, and you yourself can build that in an artificial way. You build that up with good ARC with the pc.

You give his objection some validity. Sometimes he merely tests you out; he dreams up an objection and hands it to you just to find out whether or not you will accept it. After you've accepted three or four, he doesn't become overbearing. Funny part of it is, he relaxes. If you kicked his teeth in for objecting - if you kicked his teeth in for objecting, he would have a bad time of it. And you'd find out he'd just go on out of session and he'd quit. And you have just removed your most potent ally in an auditing session, the pc.

Now, where you have difficulty in an auditing session, you've neglected the responsibility factor and that's for sure. And that's about all there is to it.

The pc's responsibility for the session must be increased, not decreased. It's all right for a pc to sit there and not take responsibility for the session; you can't interfere with that either. If you challenge him with it and force him to take responsibility, not lead him to take responsibility, he'll take less responsibility. But he will come up through bands where his irresponsibility is so great, that he doesn't know whether he's going to blow session or blow the roof or settle back into apathy or just quit, or lie down on

the floor and die. He has not made up his mind exactly what he's supposed to do at this point of the game.

Well, you as an auditor, by simply keeping a steady hand on the helm, and steering the session right straight on through, will of course, be the winner. If you want to win, you pay attention to these factors. You increase the security of the pc in-session; you increase the ARC and by doing this, you increase the responsibility.

Now, in light of this, we're going to take up this Command Sheet, in the light of what I have just said. And if you think that you can know all there is to know about auditing by knowing a bunch of magic incantations known as commands, you have not accepted your responsibility as an auditor.

Your responsibility as an auditor is sometimes antipathetic to you for this reason alone: you have been the unwilling custodian in too many lives and too many places, not here, for people's minds and people's thoughts. And your final end goal in all this is just this one thing: you want to please people. You know, when a case is totally out of the bottom, all you have to do - or with any case, by the way - all you have to do is have him mock up people who are pleased with his condition. In front of him, behind him, above him, below him - that works almost all the way to the bottom. You could probably run the case on somebody lying in a hospital bed, dead unconscious, and they'd get it and they'd run it.

It works on anybody. It works all the way up to the top to some degree. To maintain ARC, there must be a willingness to please. But when all there is left is a willingness to please, a desire to please and an obsession to please, you can't audit, because it is the total irresponsibility to end all irresponsibilities. And you sometimes will please the preclear when you ought to be auditing. You understand me? And I have actually spotted, not the dropped ashtrays, not the covert hostility, not the meanness on the auditor's part, but his very kindness as the principal villain in getting auditing done. He finds the preclear is not pleased, so he does something else. Of course, the preclear, 90 percent of the time, is not pleased with what he is running into; he's not pleased, that's all.

Well, if you want to please him, totally, there is a technique you can do it with and if you find yourself suffering from the necessity to please - only please preclears, why just have him mock up people who are pleased with their condition and he'll clear too. That would be right on the dramatization line, see? Q-and-A, changing a command off, because of the auditor's feeling the preclear doesn't quite like what's going on, is a cruelty Every time the pc says he doesn't like something, something like that, take it up! As-is it and carry right on with what you're doing. If you Q-and-A with him too, you've sunk him. You're talking to a bank by that time, not a pc. The bank has much more authority on a pc than the pc, remember? Now, as I say, in light of this, we're going to take up these auditing commands. They are not necessarily the most pleasing version, but they are certainly close to the most effective.

I'm just going to take these off and read this right straight down from the top. [See HCOB 28 July 58, COMMAND SHEET FOR HGC, CLEAR PROCEDURE] ON ALL COMMANDS: BEFORE AUDITOR GIVES THEM, HE MAKES CER-

TAIN HE HAS PC'S ATTENTION ON HIM AGAIN AND OFF LAST QUESTION.

Now, why? Please, why? Of course, nothing I have said in the first half-hour of this lecture has anything to do with that statement, does it? Do you realize, by piling commands on top of a pc who is already interiorized into the last command, every time he tries to come out of session, he keeps running into your orders which are now parked on ridges. And he'll go out of the session auditing himself. See? He saved up all of your commands, it looks like.

If you're trying to collect somebody's attention, then for the love of Pete, realize that you could devote an auditing session just to TR 1, TR 2. Just forget the rest of it across the boards and just do a splendid TR 1, TR 2. You know? No - no process. See? Nothing. You just give a command; when he executes it, you acknowledge it. We don't even care if it's duplicative or not.

You could, absolutely, you could take a room full of people - not Scientologists - you could take some people that are kind of interested in you or what your work is. Somebody makes the mistake of mentioning that he might be interested in hearing what you do. You know, somebody makes this error and you're right in there, pitching.

And somebody asks you to give a session. What is one of these sessions that do so much good? Well, you have two choices. One is to take the host, throw him back into birth or a prenatal, roll him up in a ball on the floor, pat him on the head, tell him, *„That's a good boy,"* and put him back in his chair again and bow to the rest of the people present. It's very effective. It's good showmanship, I'm sure. But it's...

Once in a while you'll get one of these: you're trying to put on a good session, they go back into a prenatal, roll up in a ball and go on the floor, in spite of anything you can do.

But the safest thing to do is just do TR 1, TR 2, not even with a duplicative command, you see? Duplicative comes a little bit later up the line, doesn't it? TR 1, TR 2 - you just give him an ashtray and you say, *„Look at the ashtray"* And the fellow, *„Well, I'll do anything for a game, you know?"* Looks at the ashtray.

And you say, *„Thank you. Good, good, good."* And you keep on acknowledging him until his attention is back on you again, see? And you say, *„Fine. Now, turn the ashtray over."* And he says, *„Don't know what I'm doing, you know?"* And the fellow then says - fellow then says, *„Well, I did."* And you say, *„Good, good. Fine, fine, fine. Swell. Okay, fine. Okay, swell, fine, okay, good! I got that. Thank you very much for turning the ashtray over. Good, good."* And the fellow, *„What's this all about?"* See? And he looks at you. And you say, *„Now, notice that the ashtray is green."* And the fellow says, *„Hm. Yeah,"* he says, *„mm-hm."*

And you say, *„Good, fine, okay Good! Good! Very good. Tha-a-a-nk you."*

„All right. All right."

And you say, *„Now, notice that it is an ashtray."*

„Yeah, uh-huh.“

„Good, fine. Good, fine, okay, good, fine. Thank you. Thank you very much. Well, thank you.“

„Yeah, yeah..“

And you say, *„Does the room look any brighter to you?“*

And believe me, you pick most people off the street and run that for about ten, fifteen minutes and so forth, the fellow will say, *„Yeah! You're sure brighter to me. As a matter of fact, you're the only real thing in the room.“* Rest of the people sit around, that you're doing this in an audience for, and they'll say, *„What was he doing? What was the mysteriousness of the ashtray? Maybe - maybe this has something to do with spiritualism. Maybe it's the sacred fire,“* or something of the sort, you know? They're just totally adrift. They didn't know that all you did for about ten minutes was just collect somebody's attention with great thoroughness.

Weirdest things will happen. Why do you suppose you see elderly men giving babies watches and gold teeth and things like that to play with when the baby's crying? One of the first thing a man will do - a woman picks the baby up; she's got to have all of it right away quick - but the first thing that a man will do who is very inexperienced along this line is try to attract the baby's attention, if he doesn't know any - if he doesn't know his business, you know? He tries to attract the baby's attention; he'll show him a bright gadget, *„Da-da-da-da-da-da-da. Oh, don't cry Da-da-da-da-da-da-da-da.“* What's he trying to do? He's trying to yank his attention off of whatever it's fixed on and back into a gold watch or gold teeth or candy or something of the sort.

It's amazing. I found this out about girls very unfortunately, very, very young. I found out when they were mad at you, their attention yanked off of it very easily by giving them a box of candy, a new dress, or something like that. Disillusioned me. I put it this way to myself when I found out how easy this was - I put it this way to myself: well, their anger was insincere. I don't know what I considered sincere anger was.

Then later on - later on - later on I finally discovered the horrible truth that they merely wanted reassurance of your affection; that was the only thing they wanted. And when you presented this in a solid mass form, why, they were convinced. And that was about all there was to it; it was a very simple mechanism. Served to collect their attention quick from the old quarrel. What was easier? It's too bad every young man doesn't learn this and then there would be a very, very calm civilization here, I'm sure. Frankly, all you'd need to know about a marriage.

Guys around the organization have marital troubles, something like this, I get hold of them, give them some advice like this. Of course, the cat's out of the bag now. What I'd tell them is out of the bag so it probably won't work now.

Yeah, you give girls things because you like them and to centralize their attention off of all the bad things you've done or said.

Well, if you as an auditor give a pc a good process and get his case up the line and solved, what have you got? What have you done? You've taken his attention off of all the bad things you've done and said, too.

Awful lot of ARC breaks are patched up by finding one good, valid Rock and running it out. Got the idea? All right. That's the single most important thing in auditing, the collection of attention and the holding of it. But the attention must be held with the responsibility of the person giving it, not with an hypnotic trick. You can't ever startle or shock a pc into giving attention. His attention comes to you to the degree that he is taking responsibility for the eight dynamics. This is the easiest way in the world to diagnose a case, if we must use that nasty word „*diagnose.*" It's just the degree of attention that the person can exert during an auditing session.

By the way, the test of this is, some people, you just mention things to them or when they start to get up toward Clear - on their way - you just mention something to them, it blows. You can find the most beautiful Rock - you find a whole Rock that has to do with cutting people's heads off and machines that cut their heads off and beams that blow their heads off - and boy, this is a gorgeous Rock and just all you have to do is mention it, and it blows. Oh, how disappointing. Never got a chance to audit it.

In other words, toward the end, why, Rocks will start blowing on just two-way comm. Well, that's because the pc can exert a sufficiency of attention on any given thing, which attention is under his control, to actually cause himself to realize or know or blow or as-is anything that confronts him. Now, that's quite interesting.

Now, we've already gone over CCH 0 here, but I'll read the commands here.

„Is it all right with you if we begin this session now?" „The session is started." Now, that's good. *„Session is started."* A good substitute command and so forth is simply: *„Start!"* And the person says, *„Start what?"*

„Start the session. You're in session now. Sit down."

And don't let me catch you going around gassing with a preclear for fifteen or twenty minutes and then starting a session. Boy, he's been in-session for the longest time and the second you get him to sit down in the chair and start talking to him, don't lead up to a long prelude. Auditing, to some auditors, is unfortunately a prelude to auditing. They never really get down to auditing. Well, the best way to cure that - best way to cure that is never monkey around and then start a session. Best way to cure that is set them down, start the session, straighten out the E-Meter. Get the idea? And just put the start of session ahead of everything you're going to do connected with the session and you're always safe.

Otherwise your pc is liable to go into session; you're not in session but the pc is. And then the pc is going to be

very upset when he finds out that he is in-session but you're not in session and three-quarters of an hour later you have said, *„Start the session now."*

He says, *„Start the session? Holy cats!"*

Well, you've just taught him he was wrong about being in-session. Whoa-ho-ho. Now, you want him to go into session, huh? Well, you want him to go into session according to the rules, not the way he went into session.

You'd be very safe if you met your pc at the bottom of the stairs and you said, *„Start!"* and took him on upstairs and sat him down and discussed the lunch hour and put him down in the chair and adjusted the E-Meter cans and so forth, and then went to: *„What goal might you have for this session?"* You want to get the beginning and end of the session adjusted properly. The end of a session is an end of a session and boy, when you end a session, end it! And it's very interesting that if you've ended a session, your pc continues to be in-session, you'd better end it again. You just better work on ending it. You just better get his attention and end it.

He's liable to say, *„Boy, that was ..."* You know, postpartum yap-yaps about what went on and so forth are all right but he is still acting as though he's obeying auditing commands and he's still giving you something that sounds like it's running right on in-session. For heaven's sakes, end the session again.

You say, *„Look, look at me, look at me."* The guy looks at you, you know, and you say, *„END OF SESSION!"* Pfhew. See, something like that.

And he says, *„Oh ho-ho, ho-ho, oh, session ended. Oh, I get it, I get it, I - yeah."* And you say, *„Now - now, the session has ended. We can talk about the session all you want to, but we're not still in-session, you understand?"* *„No, we're not, are we? Well, what do you know?"*

You know, I've seen pcs come in to an HGC auditor and all week long be in-session. You know, every time they see him, they're in-session. Every time. You have that happen to you. That's just a fixated attention that goes on the same scale as obsessive agreement and hypnotic lines, and so forth.

And the pc who was very bad off, of course, never found out when he started session, never found out when he ended it. Don't be surprised if he's totally in it.

„What goal might you have for this session?" we have already covered.

The present time problem: *„Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?"* That is there with malice aforethought. That's to point up the purpose of a PT problem and what it is. Make the auditor say it every time, the pc will get it too and he won't start g-handing you a bunch of garbage off the track. Been a long time since some of you have heard that word *„garbage"* but it's been restimulated by case assessments, lately.

And if the pc tells you he does have one, you say, *„Describe the problem to me,"* and when the pc does, *„Does that problem exist in present time now?"* And pc says that it does - it's a fact he lost a chariot back in the Byzantium Empire and he bet with this tout that came into the arena, you know. And he bet him his chariot and it was all very involved. And this - present time problem? The pc says it is. The pc said it is. Well now, he's the final judge on the matter, but boy, you'd better not give him very much time on this PT problem.

You say, *„Well, that's interesting. That's interesting. Fine. Now, describe the problem to me."* And the pc does, all over again. See, you've already gone through this. *„Anything worrying you? Describe the problem to me,"* and *„Does that problem exist in present time now?"* You see? You've done that once and he gives you something that's way out of present time.

Then you acknowledge the fact that you have heard it and so forth. And you say, *„Describe the problem to me."* And the fellow says, *„Well, so-and-so and so-and-so and I lost this chariot and it was the matter of the Blues and the Greens. And at that time the emperor was married to a prostitute because he was such a Christian emperor and he had made a law against - he'd made a law against betting, you see? And actually..."*

And you say, *„That's fine. That's very good, that's very good. Now, does that problem exist in present time, now?"* *„Uh, da-a-a-a. Well, the chariot does."*

And you say, *„All right. That's fine. That's fine. Now, describe the problem to me."* You didn't say the problem about the chariot; don't ever get pulled downhill by this. That's a Q and A, see? *„Describe the problem to me."* And he says, *„Well, it was a yellow chariot, just like my new Buick, and..."* See? *„You know,"* he says, *„that finance company skip man has been sitting on my front porch for two days."* You say, *„Wow. Well, well. Well does that problem exist in present time now?"* And *„Boy,"* he said, *„you said it. Boy, you said it."*

And you say, *„Well, that's good. Now, describe the problem to me."*

„Well, skip man sitting on my front porch and he's going to take my new Buick and I have to park the thing blocks away from the house. I have to hide it all the time because he's got another set of keys and he's going to get into the thing and he's going to go away and so forth." And he says, *„Boy,"* he says, *„ever since I lost that chariot back in the Byzantium Empire,"* he says, *„nobody else is going to repossess any of my vehicles."* And you say, *„Good."* All right, now, you have to ask yourself the question: do you want this thing keyed out or run out? Well, obviously, it's a going concern. The credit company is a collecting agency of one kind or another and it collects all sorts of things, new cars and people's bad tempers and so forth.

So, you just have to take your choice between the two processes that can be run: one that will get rid of the problem and the other one, key it out. Now, Responsibility will simply key it out: Problem of Comparable Magnitude to that problem and *„that problem about the..."* You get so helpful, sometimes. I hear auditors saying, *„That problem, that problem about the bill collector. That problem with your wife. Give me a problem of comparable magnitude to the problem with your wife."* Boy, that's being real helpful but it keeps the problem from shifting. And you can run Problem of Comparable Magnitude to it and the next thing you know, well, the finance company will find some other way to take care of the whole thing.

When is a problem, present time problem, over? When is it ended? When the pc no longer has to do something about it.

Now, the two commands: *„What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"* which is the temporary key-out sort of a situation. You said the problem doesn't amount to much and you just keyed it out - or something that may hang on for the rest of the time you're auditing him, at which time you would use, *„Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem."* These are both repetitive questions and this is a process and it follows all - these both follow all the rules of processing. But the auditor frequently asks *„Describe that problem to me now."* And *„Does that problem now exist in present time?"* Or, *„Does it exist in present time now?"* That is to bring the pc into a description of the problem. You know that somebody can go on with a predescribed problem. The auditor

described the problem and then the pc ran it and then the auditor described it and the pc ran it, and so on. The problem never changes. Don't be surprised if it doesn't change. There must be something going backwards here - one kind or another.

Now, on an ARC break, you say, *„Have I done something you feel is wrong in this session?"* He's liable to find all sorts of imaginary thing - that's real or imagined. You don't care whether you really did something or you really didn't do something.

Don't go justifying yourself because you're trying to force him to take responsibility by yourself getting off a responsibility point. And the moment he finds you're irresponsible, man, he'll go out of session so fast it'll make your head swim. So, you mustn't ever justify your actions, statements or mistakes. Your mistakes are your mistakes.

Now, an ARC triangle has the letter *„R"* in it - reality. Reality in a session depends upon the reality of the session. So, you have a headache. The pc says, *„Is something wrong with you?"* You say, *„Well, no. It's all right."* Boy, just bust the *„R"* all to pieces, will you? I mean, that's what you've succeeded in doing. You've just broken *„R"* all up. You do have a headache; you've said you didn't. And you're going to find the ARC going in the session. You say, *„Yes, I have a headache, but I can audit you."* Get that *„R"* in there.

„I feel you're not willing to audit me."

No reason to tell him, *„Well, it's probably not your imagination."*

I settled a pc one time that was having an awfully hard time in session. He sat down and he said more or less just that. Just that. He said, *„I feel you don't want to audit me."* He said, *„I feel you're just really not interested in my case."* And I said, *„You're so right."* I said, *„I've had an awfully busy afternoon. I really have not been terribly interested in your case because you've done too much complaining; you've upset too many people. Despatches keep coming back and forth here concerning you and your case and I consider it a little bit of an imposition, and I think you just wanted attention from me. That is exactly the way I feel about it."* And the pc said, *„I thought that was the way you felt about it."* And the only thing he got out of it was feeling all of a sudden that he was right.

So I said, *„Under those conditions, do you still want me to audit you?"*

He said, *„I'll be awfully glad if you took over the case and looked over the case, and so forth."* He said, *„I'll promise to be much better in the future."* I said, *„I don't care how much better you promise to be in the future; just make sure you are."* And I did - did an investigation of his case and - and found some points of interest and straightened these things out and got the case wheeling, patted him on the back. He has never had any ARC trouble with me since, but before that time, he did have. Truth of the matter is, I thought he was a complete schnook; I didn't like him. He felt this - and then the fact that I said so - wouldn't say so. I found out the only thing that pays along the line of this sort of thing is to be totally honest.

Even if it comes to the point the fellow says, *„I feel you're just auditing me for the money."* If you are, you better say you are. That's right. You'll blow it. You'll blow it out of you and him and out of the session.

Now, when we look over the rest of this, we see that we have to have a couple of processes extra to clearing processes. One of these is Start-C-S and the other is Connectedness. We need these as stopgap or emergency or assist or ally processes. Neither of these two processes will clear anybody or ever cleared anybody. But they are the hottest assist processes we know of from a standpoint of getting a pc under control and getting him wheeling in the session. That's Start-C-S.

The other one - the hottest process we know for bringing down an obsessively high meter, for keying out our own blunders, for wiping off a stuck point that we can't otherwise get rid of - you could take Connectedness at the end of a session where you still have the pc stuck like mad and by running some Connectedness, get rid of the thing and bring the pc to PT. See? It's - the best method of bringing him to PT is not TR 10, but Connectedness. Connectedness will never fail because it leaves nothing on automatic. TR 10 leaves something on automatic.

„You notice that wall," you know? Well, is he noticing the wall or is the wall noticing him or is the wall first or he second? Well, don't leave that up in the air. *„You get the idea of making that wall connect with you"* and you've got it right on the button every time.

Commands of Start-C-S are: *„I am going to tell you to start. And when I tell you to start, you start the body in that direction. Do you understand that?" „Good." „Start." „Did you start the body?" „Thank you."*

Now, when we run Stop - we don't run these in rotation, we run mostly Starts and Stops and we run Change only when we got Start or Stop somewhat flat. We would run Start and then we would run Change and then we would run Stop, you see, in just that rotation, but then Change again. Now, I'm telling you straight; I don't care what this sheet says.

You run Start and then your individual activity, then, concentrates on Start until he feels he got a good certainty on starting the body. Then you run some Change. You run the change version of this and when you've run the change version of it, why, you get the thing wheeling again. And you'll find that all you did with Change was unsettle Start, so you can run some more Start, don't you see? Then you can run Stop and Change, and Stop and Change, and then Start and Change, and Start and Change, you see? Vary these around. But Change fits in between the other two, always. Improperly listed here.

„I'm going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction. Somewhere along the line I'll tell you to stop. Then you stop the body. Do you understand that?" „Good." „Get the body moving." „Stop." „Did you stop the body?" „Thank you."

And Change is: *„Do you see that spot?" „Good. We will call that spot A. Now you stand here. Okay"* (Auditor indicates another spot.) That is spot A he stands him on. *„Now do you see that other spot?" „Good. We'll call that spot B. All right, now when I tell you to change the*

body's position, YOU move it from spot A to spot B." That's incorrect, please make a proper change on this.

"You change the body from spot A to spot B." "Good. Change the body's position." "Did you change the body's position?" And pc says he did. *"Thank you." "Do you see that spot?"* and so forth. But that - that is given correctly in the second line, *"Change the body's position."* I'm sure I don't know why that typo crept in.

Connectedness is: *"You get the idea of making that (object) connect with you."* If the pc isn't looking at the object: *"Look at that (desk)." "You get the idea of making that (desk) connect with you."* Always, *"You look at that (object),"* and then *"You get the idea of making that connect with you." "Feel"* can be substituted for *"look"* in the case of a blind man.

Well now, that's as far as we've got on these particular command levels and we will take this up some more. I've gone over this often enough that if you make a mistake early in the session, now, you're a genius.

Thank you.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]