

ACC COMMAND SHEET - GOALS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
28 July 1958

How are you today? How are you today, huh?

Audience: Fine, good.

If I seem to talk rather staccato, it's because I've been listening to some Jose Greco's ballets and...

Well, here we are at the beginning of your auditing half of the course, you might say. You all know how now, you hear me?

And from here on we're just going to go for blood and get everybody cleared up. Okay, that's what we're taking up today.

This is the eleventh lecture of the 20th ACC, July 28, 1958. And this lecture begins with the Command Sheet for the ACC which is revised, brought up to date, modernized and fixed!

Now, up to this time I've been letting you think for yourselves, letting you figure it out and wander your way through it.

By this time you have found out that there's something to what I've been telling you and you have some small reality on it. You have been capable, I am sure, of bringing yourself up to cause-point.

Now, on any material in Scientology, whether the TRs or anything else, if you do not bring yourself to cause-point while you use it, you are simply being the effect of Scientology and L. Ron and all the other good auditors and swell guys that have helped make this thing come true. You understand?

And we don't want you as an effect. This is not what we require.

But in view of the fact - in view of the fact that a great deal of truth has dropped out, we can tell you that you can come to cause-point because no matter when back on the track, you had your share in the origin of the postulates and considerations that spun everybody in. Okay? So you might as well become cause at the level that spins everybody out. And it's not actually even very much to ask anybody. All it requires is that you're sane, stable, have a self-control that man has never before exhibited. That's all it requires.

In diagnosis, which we call "scouting," which is - because it isn't diagnosis - there's never been a disease called the Rock. There have been kidney stones. But we're under no circumstances or sense diagnosing any illness, certainly no illness of the body. Because if you start running down for illnesses of the body while you're trying to find the Rock, you're going to find yourself on a rock, you know that.

And we look this over and we find out that you are capable of coming up to cause along this line and using it and I do not want you as an auditor becoming a total effect of all the cognitions and so forth. Not that there's anything wrong with becoming an effect, but you might still feel to some degree, here and there, that you are going through some little rote activity that's like a magic incantation that drops a certain number of herbs in the stew pot and a certain number of green and blue devils will jump out. Now I don't want you doing that. And I want you to audit with understanding.

But the gross and total understanding of Scientology today does contain some very worthwhile and well worked out material.

Now, I have been using Clear Procedure. I've had Clear Procedure used on me and I've watched you using Clear Procedure or some reasonable or unreasonable facsimile thereof, and I know that you need a standardization at this point.

You have six auditing periods left. That is to say six, you might say, intensives left, three to give and three to receive. And then at this point we're just standardizing this thing so there'll be a minimum amount of arguments.

All right. The definition of an auditing session would be: the general activity dedicated to debarrating people and making Clears. Your goal in an auditing session is to make a Clear.

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

The definition of "auditing" is: an activity of a highly specialized nature taking place between two people with the goal of producing a Clear or a total dynamic Clear or an OT.

The immediate goal and intention is toward OT, always. It is a third dynamic activity and its first product is the first dynamic. Always something for you to know that you're trying to get people up to the first dynamic. And if you think your pc is being mean because he's totally first dynamic or something of the sort, you are being very wrong. He's being mean because he's an inverted third and he comes up through an inverted third and he's definitely on a buried-in and inverted first, you see.

The Clear that you will produce will be a first dynamic Clear. Once you make a first dynamic Clear, he's got to go for broke or else. Clear is an absolute state. It is tremendously better than any state anybody has ever envisioned before, but in view of what can be done it is a limited state. Now, let's remember that.

Now, when a person is a first dynamic Clear, he's just a Clear. He has been trained as a con man. You now have a very, very fine con man. You understand that? He would go up to the third dynamic on subsequent auditing and when third dynamic was clear, he would find that there was somebody else in the world he didn't have to be a con man to, and then you would change his ideas concerning being a con man.

As far as criminality and other activities concerned, which would immediately involve or debase the first dynamic, that he can see, he'll alter these things. You don't have a Clear criminal, you understand. You have a Clear educational pattern.

An individual who is Clear on the first dynamic will, of course, not compromise the first dynamic knowingly, but you have to find out something about the third dynamic to find out whether or not the third dynamic compromises the first dynamic, don't you see? So as he lives and as he reaches out into the society, he perforce will start, just in livingness, the clearing of the second and third dynamic.

Now, you will find many people becoming Clear and immediately thereafter getting involved in the second dynamic. I think that's very interesting because the period they'll go through for a short time, and then they'll see about this second dynamic, don't you see? Clear is a first dynamic activity.

Now, if you wanted to clear to a total dynamic Clear, you would follow more or less the same activities you follow now. But let me point out something to you. When you examine this goal, when you get to know something about this, you will say, "Well, gee, that's easy. Why did I ever have to be told this?" It works this way. An individual who has come up to an awareness of self has conquered his own reactive mind.

But let me point out to you that there are still people out there. You still have a physical universe which is a form made out of chaos in its present state, and you have reactive banks right on up all dynamics. Now, how do you expect this person to be at cause-point at least over all of these reactive banks on the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth dynamic? Now, that is asking a tremendous amount of an individual.

Now, he's already junked and jettisoned his own reactive bank. This really only permits this: he is no longer ill - he isn't getting reactively ill on this, that and the other thing - but he himself is able to be at cause over, you might say, himself. With that awareness of self he can now change his mind, view and understand the remainder of the universe.

You can do this also in an auditing session and catalyze the process enormously.

Now, if you think for one minute that I'm underselling the state of Clear, there aren't enough light-years on all total spaceship routes in this universe to give you an analogy of the difference between a Clear and an aberree. You see? An aberrated person with a reactive bank and so forth - from there to Clear is such a vast step that it has been the hardest step to take, and that has been a really vast step. It's big.

But looking directly at Clear and knowing the rest of the picture, you shouldn't then come around and overstress Clear. So it isn't a matter of overestimation or underestimation; it's just a matter of stress or understress or overstress.

Now, if an individual cannot be responsible for himself and his activities and he says he is Clear, he certainly couldn't be. Once you strip out the reactive bank, an individual is capable of taking responsibility over his own first dynamic concerns, and by this reason not any longer being interiorized into the reactive bank, can view the environment around him. And viewing it, has started upon an understanding of it.

Up to this time he was looking at everything in the environment via some sort of a misinterpreted picture in the reactive bank. So therefore, the reactive bank up to this time was telling him, "Now, I am supposed to ..." "Now, it is supposed to..." and so on and you just had an automaton. And it's like bringing a doll to life to make a Clear. There's a big difference here.

Now, you have to understand in an auditing session that you are overcoming vias. Let us take experiment one. This is a research experiment.

We have an individual listen until he hears a sound outside, then make a picture of whatever made that sound and pull it in and take a look at it. And if he can do that you will find something astonishing. He has already altered the character of the picture. He's already via'd it, you see, by making a picture of it and looking at the picture. Thetans do that all the time. Instead of looking at something directly, they make a picture of it and then look at the picture.

But your pc hasn't really even been doing this. He makes the picture and then he alters the living daylights out of the picture so it's good and safe, you know. "Any change is safe." That's his motto.

When you see some girl doing some fantastic thing with her marriage or something like that or shifting around, or some guy all of a sudden grabbing off some waitress or something of the sort, you know, and having a big string of dates, whereas, as a matter of fact he's got some good girlfriends, you see. You know, he's just running this motto - it's a motto analogous to "anything is better than nothing" - and that is "change is safe." See, he thinks change is safe, so "any change is safe" is his motto.

And he may be in a very secure position, but to be safer he will make a change. And thetans do this obsessively all the time. So when he hears a bird outside, he makes a picture of this bird so

that he can look at the picture and find out a lot about this bird. Only he knew doggone well that it was a sparrow, so he makes a picture obsessively of a cardinal, not because it's prettier, because it's different.

If it was a white swan, he'd bring it in and he'd have a picture of a robin. You see that?

Now, what's he done? He's put a via between himself and the MEST universe and he's put in an interpretation between himself and the real universe, the remainder of the dynamics. And then the reactive bank becomes the composite changes which he considers necessary to make in order to view anything.

The first of these changes are in terms of mass so you get a reactive bank, mass, mass changes. There are also inversions on this line. So mass changes then add up into thought changes.

Now, he makes a picture of the cardinal and gets a sparrow and then instead of looking at the picture of a sparrow, he says, "Ah, Audubon!" Now, here's a new thought and a consideration. "Isn't it pretty?" is also a consideration between himself and the picture of the sparrow. You see, the picture of the sparrow simply is! It isn't pretty or ugly or this, that or anything else. It simply is, but he vias it.

Now, a few dozen more vias and you have him writing a dictionary so that he incidentally can add the word "ornithology." See, he writes a whole dictionary just to get that word "ornithology" in, which has vaguely something to do with this picture of a sparrow which he took of a cardinal and which was supposed to be an exact duplicate copy.

Now, get this, boy. First, there's a mass interposition that's the reactive bank and then sitting on top of this reactive picture, of one kind or another, you have considerations ad infinitum. "Isn't it pretty?" "Isn't it nice?" "Casper makes better ones."

Now, these vias get up to a point where they are totally identified and you get your A=A=A=A. At first they are only associated but then they become identified, obsessively identified. He has tried to get so far away from them that he walks toward them and as he tries to go away from them with various considerations, he runs back into them again. And in trying to differentiate and never associate, he eventually runs into, first, obsessive association and then he runs into identification. Hence the silly answers you get when you're running a Help. Do you follow this closely?

Now, at any time you ask this individual to look at the wall or ask him repetitively by duplication to look at this wall and that wall and so forth, just old 8-C, you will get a - high probability that you will get - a series of considerations running off.

Now, what are those considerations? When you ask him to look at the wall, he looked at a consideration. After you've done this for a while, he's liable to come up and say, "You know, I've always just looked at pictures of walls with my physical eyes and I have never before looked at a wall. And there is a wall and, wow! It doesn't bite. I can look at a wall." Don't you see?

So the result - and this is very germane to auditing - the result of this consideration - picture in the pc causes him, whenever you ask him to look at anything, to look at an associative and identified chain of considerations which starts him "thinking" (quote) (unquote), but any thought he thinks brings him closer to confronting.

You confront a psycho with something, he just goes into a disassociation and identification and anything he thinks has nothing to do with the subject at all.

But you take almost anybody and confront them with somebody and they are liable to get a whole bunch of varied considerations.

Try and tell a funny story to somebody sometime without reminding them of one which has nothing to do with the story you just told.

Now, when you confront a person with a thought, you very often generate other thoughts. I'm not saying anything bad, with thoughts really being in between the individual and a picture. What is bad about it is if they have to be and if this changingness is there simply to make him more safe. Safe from what? - if you please.

Well, he's got ideas on what's dangerous. And no one of you would ever be able to draw up a bill of goods on what the rest of you individually would believe is dangerous. It would simply include the entirety of the universe when you finally got through with the entirety of the human race.

We say, "Mother" to somebody and he says, "Yes." And we say "Mother" to somebody and he says, "Mnnnnh!" And we say, "Mother" to somebody else and he says, "Huh?" Well, there's three different reactions; then do we conclude mothers are safe or dangerous? No, as auditors, we have to conclude that mothers are. And you're always safe to make that conclusion.

It works like this: the individual, confronted at any time with problems particularly, terminals, the MEST universe particularly, goes through: take a picture of it, add considerations to it, mask it, alter it, via it, park it all in the reactive bank and go nuts.

Therefore, when you confront your preclear with anything, you get vias you don't even see, particularly if he's below apathy, and what you're watching is a case "de-viafying."

Now, your psychoanalyst was so incapable of doing anything like this that he added vias. He didn't think there were enough vias, he was so scared. So he said, "It's all sex." You know, that's cost me an awful lot of blind dates, Freud has. It's all I hold against him.

People say, "Well, I don't know. If I start thinking about - about the second dynamic or dates or anything like that, I'll probably go crazy, you know?" Some guy whistles at a girl and she faints. She didn't use to back in Greek times. No sir. I know.

He was talking about the second dynamic. He was already too many steps removed. He had to talk about the guy or nothing, so he was already running a via. And then he'd find someplace where a little boy finds a little girl's toys lying on the pavement or something like this and this became very significant and is the primary and fundamental circumstance in the case. So then the analyst sits there for the next - oh, I don't know how long they - what they call an intensive is two eternities, I think is their finite count for processing - and he sits there for the next two eternities telling the patient what it is all about.

Give you an idea of how these dopes don't savvy. It's quite interesting case of - fellow was given a CO2 therapy; I told the auditor to get that off the case. The auditor could have been much more thorough about it but we took it off with lock scanning and didn't get it all off.

But every time the individual - every time he went to sleep under the CO2 or whatever you do in CO2, throw up or spit at analysts or something - it has some magical connotation. If you put CO2 in liquor, it has a magical connotation and if you put it in patients it has a magical connotation. Nobody has ever isolated this, but this doesn't stop them from using it. So the fellow would go to sleep and he'd see a picture on wall A and when he would wake up they would ask him where the picture was and he would find it on wall B.

Isn't this cute? Do you know what the stupid jerks thought they were doing? They thought they were establishing whether or not he was fully awake because if he could tell the picture had been changed in position, he was fully awake. But do you know what they do to their patients with that? The patient thinks he's crazy. But this is a standard activity in what they laughingly call the field of healing in circa twentieth century, place: Earth.

We have a pc right this moment who thinks he's nuts because the picture changed position every time they gave him C02. He never has found out to this moment that they changed the picture. And even when this was more or less pointed out to him by the auditor, he still couldn't figure it out and didn't think they would do anything like that.

Audience: Oh no!

Now, there's putting another via on the line. Let's put another via on the line; lets knock a fellow out, change the room furniture and wake him up again, and say, "Well, how is it now?" You know?

Therefore, you don't evaluate for the preclear because you're just putting in more vias, and therefore you are not particularly surprised - you are not particularly surprised at all - when your preclear comes up with some non sequitur comment pursuant to your efforts to make him look at something.

Sure he looked at it and he got a via. All you're really doing is pulling vias off a case, and that is auditing. And you're taking the thought vias and the mass vias, and these thought and mass vias simply add up to the reactive mind.

The "reactive mind" is made up of masses called engrams, secondaries and locks which contain matter, energy, space and time and identifications of pictures, and all manner of considerations. And these are, and the vias are, and the thoughts are. And when some old-time religious activity comes up with the astonishing datum that man is a datum, he is just data and nothing else, what is he doing? He's looking at a man several times removed from even being able to look at a picture. The fellow isn't himself anymore, he's a datum. Do you see that?

So we find preclears around who are their names and nothing else. They're not a thetan. They're a name. And you're auditing a name. Unless you get vias off the case, he won't get well.

But this has a flipperoo. This has a double bite. When we are training people, it doesn't just apply to preclears. When you ask an auditor under training particularly, to look at something in the preclear's case, you very possibly will restimulate a picture-thought-change pattern. Do you see that?

The auditor looks at it and boy, he's really got to be in present time and right on his toes. And when he gets a little tired or something, he gets picture-picture-picture, thought-thought-thought-thought-thought-thought-thought-thought. Get the idea? And he's supposed to utter the right command, but he doesn't. Hence you occasionally drop ashtrays.

It's rough to audit people before you're Clear. This is certain. This is a fact. It's rough to have just been audited half through the Rock and then flip over to being an auditor. That's rough.

It's rough to be on the job and in class and roaring along at a great rate and all of a sudden you're half keyed-out on something, something happens to totally key it in. Because for the love of Mike you're living with the raw materials of insanity every day of your lives in one of these classes.

But that is expected environmental randomness in Scientology and never consider it anything else and don't ever expect anybody in Scientology to blink or be surprised because you just felt that you had a broken leg while you were auditing somebody. They are much more likely to say, "Well, what happened to the preclear?" It isn't that nobody will give you sympathy. It isn't that people are hardhearted. But when people begin to know the anatomy of these difficulties, they can be effective. And when people can be effective, they stop being sympathetic.

Now, I live in the hothouse atmosphere of aberrations flying around in all directions from one year's end to the next, and so do many of you. We, however, are in a rather concentrated spot

because all the cases that couldn't be cracked in the field eventually wind up in our paws. And there's hardly a day goes by but what we aren't having some kind of a conference on "whose vias have via'd us out the window now?"

And it's always a matter of where do we find an entrance point to this case? And the entrance point to any case is the largest possible via that the preclear can tolerate at this time. And we can get a reality on that point and we can go for broke up the gradient scale. But until we've got our foot in on the first level of reality of the case, we're not on any gradient scale and we're not winning.

We seldom consider what process should we run until we've considered what is real to this case. And we finally find out what's real to the case, we got it made. And there's no reason why you can't do the same. Our secret is out of the bag.

Now, we're not above dreaming up a process to fit the case, but we already have at our fingertips a tremendous number of processes which work. We've got years and years of processes.

Somebody dreaming up processes now is certainly carrying coals to Newcastle. There's nothing wrong with it, and you should never fail to send them in, but they go into a file up here where it's already been submitted four or five times, usually.

How many people have been submitting processes over how many years? We keep them all on file and we check them out as we can on research. That is not our most fruitful area of materials. And yet every once in a while, in every blue moon, somebody comes up with something and we say, "Wow!"

Give you an idea: we have under test a process right now - it was turned in - if you can't find the PT problem, run some Connectedness. And that was a terrific thing. It evidently whips a present time problem into view. Well, wow, nobody ever thought of doing that before - right on the groove and saying it just like that and so on. And it had some use. Do you get the idea?

Never stop turning these things in because I am not the last man in the world that could think, I am merely the last man in the world who could get mad. I haven't gone along with the fact that we should all spin everybody in everyplace at all times, crush all civilizations that arise and worship at the throne of politics and idiocy. And perhaps that is my sole contribution.

But when we get down to a Command Sheet, which is where we've been going all this time, we are dealing with what? We are dealing with a preclear who will go out like a scattered jack rabbit on vias the moment that you say, "Hey son, look." Or "Do you see this, Miss?" They go right out of there on chains of vias, see? Rrrrrrr! Gone. Something just barely showed up and they left the country. You get this?

Well, you have to hack at it and hack at it and hack at it and make them confront and make them confront and make them confront. And they peel a few more vias off and a few more vias off and a few more vias off and a few more vias off and they finally look up and say, "Oh, a canteen, ha-ha-ha-ha." And you say, "You silly jerk! I've just been holding this canteen in front of your face for the last five hours of processing." But they've got to realize it and that is the game of auditing: is making somebody walk through his own vias and come to the realization that there is an isness. And when you can do that, you've got it made.

Now, that is why, more than anything else, we fix a Command Sheet, because both auditor and pc can leave the country on the subject - on the path of vias on occasion. So a Command Sheet is a stable datum which keeps the auditor in session and the pc going on up.

A command is a fixed thing because it has been tried, has found to work, and any variations and vagaries are worked out of it over a period of time, and is reworded and reworded and reworded

until it finally fits all cases; and then as soon as it fits all cases, it'll fit all vias. And when it fits the majority of the vias, you've got it made.

Now, there are a few of these commands like Connectedness, which I am not too satisfied with, but which are, incidentally, the best commands which have emerged to date from my research. They are the best commands, but they are not perfect commands.

Now, we have found many things going wrong in sessions, but the most that goes wrong is a failure to confront auditing on the part of the auditor, once more; hence a Command Sheet. I am being very hard on you today and not very sympathetic and not very much sweetness and light, but I will let you in on a little secret.

We consider when a case is not advancing rapidly or if an auditor hasn't gotten his preclear in-session rapidly that the auditor is failing to confront auditing. That's what we believe. If there isn't a rapid approach to the case and if there aren't rapid gains, then we consider the auditor is not confronting auditing. Whatever auditing might be, whatever its parts are, this we know for sure. A slow freight is a no-confront as far as we're concerned.

We find an auditor spending three-quarters, nine-tenths of his session on the PT problem. Oh, come on now. Come on now. A PT problem is never going to cure anybody of anything. All you want to do is sweep it out of the way so you can get back and straighten out the case.

You realize that every PT problem a person has is sitting as simply a late lock on the chain and in order to cure up the PT problem totally it'd be necessary for you to clean the chain. Well, you clean the chain with auditing, not with removing PT problems.

When we find somebody sitting down and discussing ad nauseam for two hours the subject of goals, we say the same thing: "There's somebody around here that isn't confronting auditing." Because goals is CCH 0. And the only reason you want goals in there is not to do the pc a bit of good, but to help bring him up to PT. If you bring him up to the future, he's liable to become a little closer to PT, you see? So you've sort of in effect said, "Come up to present time."

The actual mechanism that you want those goals for is so at the end of the session you can say, "Has any time passed?" But the way you say it is, "Did you attain any part of the goals which were set up at the beginning of the session?" He usually looks at you blankly and he says, "Goals at the beginning of session? Goals at the beginning of session? Uh-uh-uh-oh, oh, oh, yes, yes, yes. Well, I'd - well, the headache's gone. Hm." So you moved him on the auditing time track.

How long does it take to do this? Just about as long as it takes you to spit out a handful of words, that's about all. You ask the pc something like this, you're not going to let him comm lag a half an hour. If he comm lags fifteen seconds on goals, because it's not a process, I'm right in there pitching right on top of him. I encourage him.

I say, in essence, something on the order of "What goal might you have for this session?" Indifferent, not fixing him with anything. He might have most anything, you see? And he says, "Well, blah-blah-blah-blah-blah-blah, comm lag, comm lag, so forth." I'd say, "You know, this session here. And what goals - what do you want to get out of the session?" I elaborate the question. And comm lag, comm lag, comm lag, you know, "What session? What session? Where? Who? Which? What?" And I say, "Just any old goal, you know? Any little thing that you would care to get ahold of?"

And he says, "Well, there is some small thing I would like to do during this session. I would like to - I would like to make OT." And goddamn, if that's his goal, you've had it. And you say, "Fine. Thank you. Good. Okay. Good. Fine. Thank you. Okay. Good," until the pc looks up after this interiorization and looks at you, and you say, "Phew! All right, now..."

You go right into PT Problem, and its proper wording is, is “Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?” That’s it, see? Don’t run a process. That’s what you want.

And if he says, “No,” and the needle drops off its pin, you ask him again. And then, when he finally comes up with something, “Well, I did have a little difficulty this morning.” You say, “Describe the problem to me.” And when the pc does, you say, “Does that problem exist in present time, now?” You could also say, “Does that problem exist in present time now, right here, in this auditing room, during this session, right at this instant, in the physical universe, as it reaches out there right this instant? Does... ?” See, we don’t care how far you might go on that, but your pc is liable to believe you’re being sarcastic after a while or something.

And if the pc thinks that it does, the auditor says, “What part of that problem could you be responsible for?” And he runs that as a repetitive process. But he doesn’t run it very long before he asks again, “Describe the problem to me.” Oh, he’s been running it, “Let’s see, I could be responsible for her head and I could be responsible for his chest and I could be responsible for this and responsible for that,” and so forth. And before he goes very long, you say, “Describe the problem to me.” Now, you can say, “Describe it again. Describe the problem to me again.” But certainly you say, “Describe the problem to me.”

“Oh,” he says, “The problem - the problem.” Well, his first problem was because his wife was running away with the chauffeur. Now he describes to you an entirely different aspect of it. She didn’t get his breakfast and you say, “Does that problem exist in present time now?” And he says, “Present? No.” He says, “No.” You say, “All right. Describe the problem to me.” You want the problem that does exist in present time. He says, “I haven’t got one.” You say, “Fine. Let’s get on with the session.”

You got it?

Audience: Got it. Right. Yes, wow!

Now, the reason that command is put in there that way is it keeps both auditor and pc on what a PT problem is.

I’ll tell you what a PT problem isn’t. Those of you who have never run any Dianetic auditing occasionally, occasionally have a little difficulty with some Dianetic phenomena that simply pops up. Do you know that you can return a fellow to a - argument he had with his mother when he was seven years old and get a bop on the meter? You return him, see? Now, if you said, “Do you have a present time problem with your mother?” he would say yes. Why does he say yes? Because he’s in the present time of the argument with his mother when he was seven years old. You got that? So he has a present time problem in seven years old. But he doesn’t have one now in the auditing room, in this MEST universe. Now all you’d have to do is say to him, “Come up to present time. Do you have a problem now?” and you wouldn’t get a drop.

In other words, any argument, any problem or any difficulty he has ever been into, so long as he has a reactive mind, will get a drop on the meter. And what auditors are doing, left and right, is they’re returning the person on the track to this morning or yesterday when there was a difficulty, getting a drop on it and then trying to flatten it. Do you know that you are running Dianetic auditing and you might as well erase it as a lock? Do you know that? Hm? The best possible process if you are doing that is simply to erase it; good old Book One. But it’s certainly not a PT problem.

All right, the fellow raced across the street and almost got hit with a taxicab, comes into the auditing session going ha-aha-aha, and you run this - you say to him, “Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?” And he says, “Boy!” he says, “that taxicab - it almost killed me!” And you say, “Well, all right, describe the problem to me.” And he says, “Well, I was going across the street and this fellow brushed my coat-tails and he sneered at me and so forth. And he called me a Republican

And I won't take that from anybody." And you say, "Does that problem exist in present time now?" Now, right there his present time problem is going to fold up. He says, "Why, no! Ha-ha-ha. Whew!"

What gag did you use? You said, "Come up to present time," but you said it in some other way. He isn't at this moment running across the street in front of a taxicab, in the present time problem.

Now, it's quite serious not to get one of these and not to flip it out, but the problem must exist in the physical universe now. And when you don't get that problem which exists right now and don't handle it, your pc's profile is going to freeze right where it is. It's not going to change one single bit. But it is so easy to get them up that you're liable to overlook at some time or another the difficulty you will occasionally have in getting one into view. But they are gotten into view with just those commands.

He says, "No, I don't have a problem," and falls off the pin. Well, it's up to you to direct his attention around a little bit. Another way of going about it would be to run a process on him for a short time and do CCH 0 again. And if you have any suspicion that there's a PT problem, you alternate CCH 0 in its entirety with the auditing until you get it.

Now, if you hang around on a PT problem for the rest of the twenty-five hours, we again believe you're simply wasting auditing. You're not confronting auditing.

The way to do it is to hit this thing in ten minutes max, CCH 0 out of the way, and you're off on the track like a startled gazelle. And you're into auditing.

Now, if CCH 0 wasn't satisfactory to you, or just because you want to do it, there is no reason why at the end of an hour with your preclears - the process you are running, reasonably flat again and deintensified, whatever process you were running - there is no reason why you can't do CCH 0 again. And you do CCH 0 again and again and again and again and again and again and again until the doggone meter stops dropping on PT problem. But don't hang around at the beginning of session because it's not auditing and won't change the preclear. All you're going to do is as-is his havingness for hours and get no auditing done. It's a wonderful way to waste auditing.

If CCH 0 didn't work, well, CCH 0 isn't a process. Audit him for a while and come back to it. So it didn't work again, so audit him for a while and come back to it. And what do you know, you'll find a great basic. You will find that auditing changes people but CCH 0 merely makes auditing possible. And you will find him getting more and more into session, the longer and longer you do this, no matter what you are running on him. So you clean CCH 0 and then you get some auditing done.

If you couldn't clear up CCH 0 to your complete satisfaction, the first pass over - he didn't have a goal. You don't sit around and argue with him for two and a half hours about goals! He's sitting there and he says, "I don't have any goal, you know. Life is just life. You know how it is. I suppose the only goal I could have for this session you wouldn't even listen to." Be a little persuasive, fifteen seconds' worth, twenty seconds' worth, but no more! And say, "Well, that's okay, old boy." And go on to PT problem and go right on down through CCH 0 and get onto what you are doing in that session. Do it a little bit more, get it run a little bit flat and let's go all over it again.

And let's say, "Well, what-what-what goal did you say you had for this session?" you know? He says, "I didn't." "Well, do you have a goal now?" "Well, I at least could have a goal of making you shut up about it." "Fine! Thank you! Let's roll!" Boy, that's an improvement.

Now, because it's a cut communication goal, you'd clear CCH 0 again about an hour later. And about an hour later, or whenever you could run a process and get it flat and get back to it, you

would run CCH 0 once more. And you would ask him, "What goal might you have for this session now?" "Oh, to be able to endure auditing." "Fine."

Well, that's almost good enough, but you suspected he also was nursing a PT problem so you ask him about it again and you say, "Do you have anything worrying you so much you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?" Or, if you ask CCH 0 the second time, "that you are having a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?" "No. Internal Revenue just seized all of my bank accounts this morning but that's all. I suppose I shouldn't let that get in the road of auditing because I'm being audited, you see, to overcome Internal Revenue, and that's why I'm being audited." "Oh, you do have a goal for this session?" "Oh, I do, yeah, that's right."

"All right, well, is that problem really worrying you now?" "Well, come to think about it, that's all I've thought about for days." And you would say, "Well, describe the problem to me." "Well, it's like this. It's this big bunch of goons and they used to have them only in Chicago and now they've moved them into Washington." And here they go, and he describes this problem to you, but you make him describe it as a problem. Don't just let him describe a bunch of bad terminals. Make him describe that problem and eventually he'll line it up so that it's Internal Revenue versus Jones in the auditing chair, see? And he's got two terminals counter-opposed and he'll get all kinds of cognitions just lining this up, see?

And then you run it on: "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." Either one of them is good.

Now, "Responsible for" simply keys it out. Problem of Comparable Magnitude runs it as a process. "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude" is a very good process and would take care of it from here till the end of time.

But any responsibility thing has for its therapy value only the cognitions the preclear gets while running it and it itself simply keys it out. So a lock came in, so you run "What part of the lock could you be responsible for?" And the lock will key out, usually, unless the preclear is totally bogged down with a present time problem - isn't in-session in the first place. Hasn't told you about the present time problem. You're running responsibility for past auditing. All you're going to do is key that auditing out.

Of course, nothing is going to happen to a preclear as long as a present time problem is sitting right on top of the case.

Now, the trick is not to spend the whole session starting a session. The trick is to start it now. And you just start one just like this: "Is it all right with you if we begin the session now?" Okay with the pc, "The session is started."

Now, why do you not say, "begun"? Well, "begun" is an indefinite moment in time and you want him to know that you are already rolling it, so you use a little bit of a strange word there like Start-C-S or something like that. And you could say simply, "Start" and you would start a session. But this is the auditing command which works best: "The session is started."

The goals: "What goals might you have for this session?" Be sure to end the session with "Have we gained anything of your goal at the session's beginning?" And he says, "What goal?" you know? And then he suddenly remembers and this puts him on the auditing time track and actually brings him off the end of the session and makes him realize he's gone somewhere.

And then you run the PT problem, "Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?" If the pc has, we say, "Describe the problem to me." And when the pc does, "Does that problem exist in present time now?" And if the pc thinks it does, we can key it out with, "What part of that problem could you be

responsible for?" Or we could finish off this problem forever and aye by "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem," but it takes a bit longer to do that particular one.

Now, these are repetitive questions, these last two, but no further descriptive name is allowed the auditor in this command.

Now, you cannot describe the present time problem in the command about the present time problem. And every time you have done so, you have mucked up this one, "Describe the problem to me" because the auditor is evaluating for the preclear and it's against the Auditor's Code to make a descriptive title for the problem. It is the problem or that problem. It is never, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to Bill." That is wrong with magnitude because it's evaluation for the preclear, Auditor's Code break, and he will consider it so after a little while.

He described the problem. He's the fellow that said it existed. He described it and then you ran "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem," but not "to Bill." And after he wibble-wobbled on it a little while, this problem goes all astray in his mind and he can't assemble the thing and you've got to come back and make him describe it all over again. And when you make him describe it all over again you've got it made because the therapy comes under the heading, in this particular technique, of realizing what the problem is or what it is not. So you're much more anxious to ask again this question, "Describe the problem to me." And "Does that problem exist in present time now?" You're much more anxious to ask those two than you are, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem."

And if you ever say, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to Bill, to your wife, to this, to that, to the other thing," you are just cutting your throat on PT problem. You've described it. How can you then ask him to describe it again? It's not permitted for the auditor to tell the preclear he has certain problems. And I repeat, it's an Auditor's Code break.

Now, when you've got those out of the road, and they can be gotten out of the road - swish - we get then into auditing itself. And as soon as we get into auditing, we get into such things as your SCS, which is just standard commands. You get into Connectedness which has some variations of commands.

When you have somebody who isn't looking at an object and you say, "You get the idea of making that window shade connect with you." And he looks over at the door and he says, "Okay." You just shift gears and you say, "Look at that object. You get the idea of that object connecting with you." Or "You get the idea of making that object connect with you," which is the proper command, the last one.

On a blind human being you have to say, "Feel that object," and "You get the idea of making that object connect with you." Well, oddly enough, you cannot describe the object to a blind person. You don't say, "Feel that wall" or "Feel this ashtray." You use, bluntly, just "object." You say, "Feel this object," and "You get the idea of making that object connect with you." And you just use it. You use "object" there, use "object" in the other auditing command when you have, "Look at that door. You get the idea of making that object connect with you," see? And that's with the physical body's eyes.

If a person isn't looking at things with the physical body's eyes, you cannot be sure that he will not tear his havingness to ribbons. And even when he is exterior, he's liable to start pulling locks off because if he's exterior, he very often is making pictures (not necessarily) but he's making pictures of the object and looking at the picture and he's not looking at the object at all. And he will usually try to do this. The worse off he is, the less he will confront MEST objects, so you must be very, very plain about this particular one.

Now, on scouting, you say just this question, "How do you feel about men, women, children, rubies, cats, dogs," and so forth. And you just scout on the meter with two-way comm, steering him around

Now, if the pc reads high on the tone arm, gets inconsistent lie reaction, use this: "What have you had to be responsible for?" and use that as your scouting question and keep clearing up parts of it. "Well, what part of that have you had to be responsible for? He says, "Well, I had to be responsible for dressing myself." "Well, what part of dressing yourself have you had to be responsible for?" And then you finally narrow it down and you find items of clothing and other things like this was sticking on the meter, and you just keep sorting it out. You're trying to clear the meter all the time you're scouting. Your end goal is to clear the meter on most things and stick them on some things.

And you run this cycle: you try to stick the meter and then you try to clear the stick with any associated bric-a-brac that you possibly can find connected with that object.

You say, "Boys. Little boys." See, you say, "Boys." It sticks. All right, now we say, "Little boys. Big boys," you see? "White boys." Anything you want to say, "boys," anything connected with "boys" - and you keep sweeping off qualifications of "boys." And they keep freeing, they keep freeing, they keep freeing and all of a sudden "choir boys" just won't move! But now, oddly enough, "boys" clears. But "choir boys," wow! See, fixed! And you follow down "choir boys" and you got it made. Well, those are the commands of scouting.

And as we get into the rest of this, we have just your standard Help bracket on general Help and then we have the Help on an item. This is the best bracket I know for Help on an item:

How could you help a (blank)?

How could a (blank) help you?

How could another person help a (blank)?

How could a (blank) help another person?

How could a (blank) help itself?

How could you help yourself?

How could I help you? and

How could you help me?

And that is the best item, and there's no reason for you to write that down busily because you'll have a Command Sheet early this afternoon that has all of this on it that I am giving you right this moment.

Now, the Command Sheet, as we get down the line, does not admit of an extensive clearing process. It only admits of a fast, rapid, get the English definition for the word, get the general meaning of the phrase.

And you say, "What is the usual definition of the English (or other language) word for (whatever it is)?" And "What is the usual definition of the English word for (blank)?" And he says, "Well, it's ..." You say, "Apples" and he says, "Cabbages." Well, you've had it. That's the usual thing, according to him. And he will run cabbages until you clear it again. He can't look at apples so he always says "cabbages."

Now, you're going to have a Command Sheet on this, the ACC Command Sheet, but I'm going to take it up later. And all I've been able to take up with you today on these commands has just been getting a session on the road. Now, I want you to get these sessions on the road; I don't want you fooling around.

Don't keep monkeying around with stuff that isn't auditing, because CCH 0 is not auditing, never has been and never will be. Do you understand that? Get it on the road.

Now, if I find anybody in these last three weeks not getting the session on the road, so forth, why, I'm going to make sure that they get a little tap. Do you understand? And if you feel a little tap right back of your left ear, you just realize, boy, that session is not on the road in my opinion.

Get auditing done. And it's the number of commands you get per unit of time.

And there's one more thing that I'm going to tell you before the end of this lecture. Don't you ever let me catch you giving an auditing command to a preclear who does not have his attention on you. He is interiorized, interiorized, interiorized in the last command.

You say, "Yes, good, fine, swell, fine, fine, good. Did you get that command? Well, that's fine, good, fine, fine, fine! Hey! Good!" The pc finally looks up and he says, "Dope! Dope! Dope! Oh, hello!" See? And you say, "Good." And you give him the next auditing command. Otherwise you're just going to pile your commands up on a ridge and a ridge isn't a pc.

The end product of TR 2 is get the pc's attention.

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

The reason you run a PT problem: getting the pc's attention so you can give him an auditing command. And what is the reason of goals? It's getting the pc's attention so that you can run an auditing command.

And what is the reason of auditing? Getting this poor dog to present time so he won't be still going over Creative Processing on the very early stages of the track. Do you understand that?

Don't go auditing pcs without getting their attention any more than you would try to sell a fellow tractors who wasn't in the room with you. More salesmen fall flat on their faces by selling tractors to people who are still arguing with their wives at home. Yeah, the guy's sitting in his office, but he's at home arguing with his wife, and you're trying to sell him a tractor. You never will.

And you're never going to be able to sell a pc an auditing command unless he has looked at you with his MEST eyes. You got that?

Now, you can go on "feel" with the MEST eyes closed on the theory that the thetan is awake. And once in a while you'll get the phenomenon on an awake thetan in a body that's asleep and you can go on giving him auditing commands. But you certainly better know your business before you say every thetan who is in a boil-off is in this state.

A body can go out like a light and the thetan is sitting up there obeying those commands just like that and so on but he can't look through the eyes. You just make sure he's acknowledged until his attention is on you and there's some signification of the fact. You'll get used to those things.

Now, here's your Command Sheet and it will be issued in the very near future. And you go right on using, to the best of your knowledge and belief, what the proper command is. When the Command Sheet comes out, if it changes your mind on the subject, simply change without a growl because the Command Sheet has been worked out to help you.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]