THE MOST BASIC ROCK OF ALL - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on
7 August 1958

Okay, we have some burning questions. Adele has one here.

Female voice: On this process, ARC break, I ran it for over an hour of mocking up people that I have known - had breaks with - well, there was no reality on it - is anything happening? Should it be an inventing process?

No.

Female voice: Hm?

No. I don't know what technique you're running. I haven't a clue. I know of no such technique. I have never heard of one.

Female voice: Well, this mocking up a person who will be pleased with your ARC breaks.

Only you've never had an ARC break?

Female voice: I've had plenty of them and I...

Well, are you trying to find the ARC break they're pleased with or trying to find how pleased the person is? This is an auditor flub if you're not only concentrating on the person. You just concentrate on mocking up people who are pleased. You say you have no reality on people being pleased?

Female voice: No, I can have.

Is the auditor selecting the people you're to mock up?

Female voice: It doesn't have enough reality on me, and I don't think I gained anything from it.

Is the auditor selecting the people you're to mock up?

Female voice: No. People from my life.

Did you once mock up a person that you believed was pleased?

Female voice: Yes.

You did?

Female voice: Yes.

Well, what were you trying to do with it?

Female voice: Oh, I just mocked it up.

Yeah, but what were they pleased with?

Female voice: Ooh, with creating a space, or a disagreement...

Oh, we particularized the process.

Female voice:... or a...

Why didn't you just let that go to the devil and just mock up somebody who was pleased with all the tough luck you were in?

Female voice: Well, that too.

Could you do that? And you had no reality on that? You had...

Female voice: I don't see that I gained anything out of it, so I thought perhaps it should be invented.

No. We just didn't do the command. Let us say that way. That's all, because the command couldn't have been cleared, because the command would be executed when you had actually, successfully mocked up a person who was pleased with something. You see? Was pleased with whatever it was. You got that? No, you haven't got that.

Did you once mock up a person you thought was pleased with anything?

Female voice: Yes. Actually you have to imagine that they're pleased, you don't...

That's what I thought.

Female voice: ... usually you don't know when they're pleased.

In other words, you weren't satisfied that you mocked up a person who was actually and truly pleased.

Female voice: Well, if you...

You imagined the person was pleased, not the person was pleased. Is that right? Listen you guys, when you make a pc do an auditing command, it isn't a magic incantation. It won't do anything of itself. You've got to make the pc do it! Do you understand that? You got to make the pc do it! And find out what your pc is doing! How is he doing it? How is he doing it? If you don't ask that question periodically, if you don't search a little bit into the psyche, then you must be dodging. You got it? Now, you have to find out what the pc is doing.

And I may spend fifteen, twenty minutes on one command just finding out what the pc is doing.

And we finally find out that the pc is doing something else than the auditing command. And when we can make the pc do that auditing command, then the process works, and not otherwise, and certainly not until. You got that?

Audience: Right. Mm-hm.

Now, don't expect the simple fact of a process to do anything. It is the auditor who is cause here, plus the pc who is cause here. Do you understand that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Now, you'd have to get somebody, in a case like this - I see I'm lousing up Adele's case. You're being audited this period?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. That's fine. Auditor, get on the ball. Who's auditing her?

Female voice: I am.

Ah, May, you better - you better confess.

Female voice: I...

Now, the point is - the point is you don't just do a command because Ron said so. You understand? You don't do a command because of that. You do a command with another intention and purpose, which is, first, to get the pc to do it.

Now. Now, primary - let's take one a little bit earlier than this - you're doing a command with the intention of making somebody increase his ability to have affinity, havingness, communication, you see? Now, that's a basic intention in doing the command. So, if you are giving the pc some - get this one - if you're giving the pc something to do which the pc isn't doing, you are cultivating an ARC break in the session.

Why?

You say, "Put a fly on the ceiling." Or "Mock up a fly on the ceiling."

And the person says, "Yep."

You say, "Put a fly on the floor." Or, "Mock up a fly on the floor."

You know, he can go along like this and go right straight into the deepest well you ever tried to get a bucket of water out of, if he isn't doing it.

And keeping a person under control while you're doing a subjective process is quite a trick. And SCS is the answer to the trick. Got it? You just take them right up out of the chair; if they can't seem to make the grade and do what you say, put them through SCS all over again. You got it? Because they are avoiding the command to some degree or they don't understand it, or they can't do it, they feel. You got that? But it's all a question of control. If your control was hot enough they could do anything, even the hottest OT process there is.

Some pcs come in, they sit down, they say, "I have no mock-ups, nothing but a black field, there is nothing happening. I have been in processing for the last 8,662 hours," or some other lie, "and nothing has ever happened on my case," and so forth.

And this is not necessarily a challenge to me. I audit them the same way I audit anybody else, but I don't have ARC mixed up with the "dear souls" area and sweetness and light. ARC is factual! You see, it is! It again is. It isn't even being kind.

I showed somebody the other day, auditing - very straight, clean, clear, factual auditing. And there was apparently no kindness with it at all. And I was auditing a pc who was at best - at best, out of the control of the thing which had been controlling him for a number of years, which was already out of control, you see? And I just leveled right straight down and said, I'm not accusing you of being out of control in the session. This is your auditor's fault, not yours. Relax. All right.

And I just audited right straight down the groove. I told the pc what we were going to do, and told the pc to do it subjectively. I told the pc to put up a recognizable mock-up in front of his face. That was one auditing command, that's all. And at the end of one and a half hours, he had executed it.

Very interesting: a black field, out of control, gone nowhere, so on. And I never said another auditing command. It was just, "I will now repeat the auditing command. Put a clear, discernible mock-up in front of your face." "Yeah, but yow - yow-yow-yow-yow-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap, nobody could do that. Well, yes."

"Where did you put it?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, yap-yap-yap-yap-yap."

"Where did you put this mock-up?"

"Well, it's on the other side of the blackness and, of course, I know it's there but it isn't there and so on."

"Now, I'll repeat the auditing command. Put a clear, discernible mock-up in front of your face." Person who was sitting there said, "Good God. We must be adding up ARC breaks on this case just like mad, you know, because you're just chop-chop-chop. You know?" "No!" I'd go so far as to say, "No! Put a clear, discernible mock-up in front of your face." End of an hour and a half the pc had put one there. But at about the forty-five minute break we stopped, and I showed the observer that the needle was totally clean and innocent of any drop on ARC break with the auditor. It almost knocked this observer out of his chair.

I wouldn't tell you this while people up there are there because it was one of them, HGC auditor auditing a paying preclear. I just said, "In no circumstances - no circumstances can we let a preclear go further on the (quote) 'execution of the command': I guess, maybe, you know, gosh, I don't know, you know. Blah-blah-blah." No. One command, executed, is worth a thousand hours of "maybe" auditing. You got that? And in order to find out if the command is executed, you have to bother the living daylights out of a pc, sometime.

And you can sometimes get them so (quote) annoyed (unquote) that they're practically climbing the pole, but, you know, it really doesn't add up to a major ARC break. They really put it down to the fact you must be awfully interested.

Became a laugh - this fellow said, "Well, I'm able to get one over there someplace, and have a very good concept of its being there." I said, "Where did you put it?"

"Oh, over there."

"Where is over there?"

"Well, there in the doorway."

"How clear was it?"

"Well ..."

"How discernible was it?"

"Well, I couldn't see it at all."

"I'll repeat the auditing command."

I got one command executed in an hour and a half and this HGC auditor who had just come on staff, and therefore is going to be subject to a lot of abuse of one kind or another for quite some period of time, had actually been sitting there for the first eight or nine hours of the intensive, giving commands and taking "Yes" and "Okays" from the preclear and thought he was auditing.

He's not auditing! Auditing isn't a pretty picture that takes place in a living room. It's not. It's the auditor wants the pc to do something and he won't settle for less. Got the idea? So, when you say to somebody, "In front of that body mock up a person who is pleased with your ARC break," you should have to go in and press it further! You'll have to say, "Was that person pleased?"

"Pleased with what?"

"Do you know the person was pleased?" And right at that point you would have gotten the same question I just got here, "Well, I had to imagine that the person was pleased." No! No! No! No! No! Never! And you would give the same auditing command. You would say, "I repeat the auditing command." And we'd talk with the pc and finally get the pc to mock up somebody she knew damn well was pleased and that would have been the first auditing command executed! And that wouldn't have mattered if that was an hour deep.

Now, you have done the interesting thing of putting your pc out of control, because the pc didn't do it and you said, "Thank you for doing it." And every time you do that one, your pc just goes bizzzzt! The case goes dingurrrum.

Female voice: The case postulated that in the first place, they'd have to know it...

Oh, for oh-h-h-h-h! Who's her auditor?

Male voice: I am.

Yeah. Well, you make sure that she does her next auditing command.

When you get her again on the next time around, that first auditing command you give her, if you have to sit there for the remaining twenty hours, you make sure that she does that command. She's been slipping out from underneath you, and now she's dramatizing it on this pc.

Hm?

Female voice: The last statement was from other people I heard talking.

What?

Female voice: The last statement that I asked just now, was the auditor talking when they postulated it? Thank you.

What is "postulating it"?

Female voice: Knowing?

If you can make a postulate that you don't know manifest, then you didn't make the postulate.

Female voice: Postulating a postulate and making it stick is actually different.

Well, now, just a minute. If you say, "A wall is here," and you've postulated it, what kind of irresponsibility is that you'd never look to find out if you did it? Or what kind of irresponsibility is that you wouldn't know at once there was a wall there?

Female voice: You'd know.

So there is a postulate..

Female voice: Yes.

.. knowingness. So these things are joined ...

Female voice: Yes.

.. and are essentially the same thing since isness is a manifestation of the postulate.

Female voice: Thank you.

Right?

Female voice: Yes.

Do you feel all chopped up now?

Female voice: No, I don't...

All right. All right. You get in there and pitch. I'm glad you did this.

Female voice: Thank you. I am too.

Because every ACC we have to bring this one up. And then I get somebody from an ACC on staff, and once in a while they haven't heard it. They haven't heard it. They're sitting there saying, "Mock up a man and make him flip-flop. Thank you. Mock up a man and make him flip-flop. Thank you. Mock up a man and make him flip-flop. Thank you." I ask the preclear, "What are you doing when he says, 'Mock up a man'?"

"Oh, I haven't paid any attention to that."

"Oh, what are you making flip-flop?"

"Oh, well, anything that gets mocked up out there."

"Well, what makes him flip-flop?"

"Oh, I have flip-flops all the time in my pictures."

The command is, you know, he's supposed to mock him up and make him flip-flop.

When you get this one across to a pc, the pc does not suffer with an ARC break, that I assure you. He all of a sudden says, "Well, you know, maybe this auditor can do something with my case. He can certainly do something with me and that's something nobody else has ever been able to do." Got it? Male voice: Mm-hm.

Thank you.

Thank you, Adele.

Yes?

Male voice: I have one other little trick that I noticed lacking, speaking as a preclear, and that's knowing what you want the preclear to do. And then control is no particular problem.

Yeah. Yeah. That's - always helps.

Male voice: It seems to be quite a problem among all my auditors.

It shouldn't be a problem of that finite, that small magnitude. We take it for granted that an auditor has an intention to get the pc to do something. And we have to take it for granted the auditor knows what is supposed to be happening. If the auditor doesn't know, he must be in a trance of some kind or another.

When you say, "In front of that body mock up a person who is pleased," and then the pc can't get any reality on it, you must have had too stiff an auditing command, one of these situations. He couldn't have cleared the auditing command in the first place, quite ordinarily. And if your pc and the auditor can't, themselves, arrive at a mutual understanding of what's supposed to happen with this auditing command, boy, they can't run it.

Male voice: Exactly.

Hm. Thanks for bringing that up.

Yes?

Male voice: Something happened yesterday that's got me confused on this process of people pleasers. They'd run it the night before, and I had cognitions in getting me to participate, which is a problem...

Mm-hm.

Male voice: ... to begin with. And the process started to alleviate it. By the next day I started to dope off on it. The dope-off got worse and worse, and I got switched into something else. And I was doping off on that still and I got switched to another process, and I doped off on that and they switched back. So finally I didn't know what was happening.

Mm-hm.

Male voice: Is mocking up a person pleased with the ARC break senior to this process? And you drop down to it or something before you run it or what?

No. It's - it's basic. But I'll level with you.

Male voice: All right.

I put you on a second process.

Male voice: All right.

You know why?

Male voice: No, you must have had a good reason.

Yes, I did. I thought you'd gone out of ARC with your auditor, and that you didn't think your auditor was in there pitching with you on this problem, and that's why you were doping off.

Male voice: Well, I got an awareness of a time track that I was in the middle of it - of nothingness.

Yeah.

Male voice: And there was just nothing.

Mm-hm. And there was sure no auditor there.

Male voice: Nothing, period.

All right. Now, coming out of that was the direction of the correction; how that was executed is probably - possibly something else.

But the point is, you'll find a pc doping off or getting nervous, his havingness has dropped. The only way you have right now of patching up his havingness rapidly is to patch up his ARC breaks with the auditor. Now, if you just go in and patch them up with the auditor, you've got it made.

I can give you a process that would work faster than this other one we're talking about, which is possibly above case level in - here and there. And that is simply this one: "Recall a time you communicated with an auditor. Recall a time you communicated with a pc." First thing you know, you'll get a blow; you get a blow-through of the existing break if it didn't go just on two-way comm.

That's a very, very mild one. That'll work on a case who is awfully mired down.

Male voice: Well, there must be something I'm not understanding about dope-off I get the - I know that the acknowledgment...

Dope-off is a retreat.

Male voice: An escape mechanism.

Mm. And it actually, really only comes into session - I said this in the 4th London ACC, but by God, nobody could buy it and I've retreated from saying it, but I'll tell you again, because it's a matter of leveling with you, and the fact that auditors never grabbed on to it is no reason I shouldn't say it to you - is when a pc's havingness drops, the ARC with the auditor is gone.

When he starts to get nervous or upset, he conceives very easily that the auditor has done something wrong. And when a guy starts to get nervous and upset, it very well may be the process. So what! The point is you can put it back together again by patching up ARC with the auditor, and that's most easily done with two-way communication. Two-way comm, and two-way comm fails, why, you have other methods of doing it.

The simplest of these methods which could be entered into a process, which was in order and was running, would be simply "Recall a time you communicated with an auditor." Something of that order because that, of course, would patch up sessions and so forth and isn't much of a process.

The guy is bogged down in energy and locks and that sort of thing, and he does have it.

By the way, that is a killer as a process for a little assist. Guy just has an automobile accident, "Recall a time you communicated with an automobile." And he'll say, "Wrecks, accidents, accidents, smashups, repair bills, you know, and communicated with it all right," and so forth. And, he's trying to answer it this way, and you have to clarify the command. "No, no, no. When you really communicated with an automobile." And he'll all of a sudden get that "A" in there a little bit. And he'll say, "Oh, when I really communicated with an automobile. All right. Oh, yeah, I remember one time I was driving through Texas and, boy, was I in communication with that automobile." See, and a little flip of the accident will fly off, you know? And you say, "Fine. Fine." Plow the accident out with the power of communication prior to the accident, not by knocking the accident out, see? Get this little cycle I've described to you in today's lecture? Get it? Don't pay any attention to the entheta, the communication inhibition. You might ask yourself why aren't you running people inhibitors? You run people pleasers and you catch the people inhibitors. Got that? Bruce had a question a little while ago.

Male voice: Well, this wasn't exactly a question. This is a comment and thanks, and to say I'm very pleased with your people pleaser process.

Good.

Male voice: Because this afternoon, or this morning rather, there was the biggest reality I really had on processing, was the first command. I was running between fifteen and seventeen hours of disintegrator gun...

Mm-hm.

Male voice:.. . and my auditor gave me one command, and I guess I had a comm lag of maybe about a half an hour or around that time, and I just went whewww! way back where I found that originally a people pleaser was a mock-up of some sort. At least that's as far as I got back. And I just went - the body just went through everything, you know, and it was very fantastic. And I just want to tell you that somebody is pleased with people pleasers.

All right. Thank you, Bruce. Thank you.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Ron, I took a look over this and it seemed to me that Axiom 10, "The highest purpose in this universe is the creation of an effect" is, you know, real true. That it led, though, to the rest of the Axioms, into Axiom 11. And the original game was I'll create an effect to have the game of getting you to create effects which I can admire to...

Yeah, yeah.

Male voice: ... to an interchange of effects which led finally to some breaks which came from all this.

Right.

Male voice: I just want to play this back at you to get a confirmation one way or the other.

Well, that's for sure.

Male voice: That's real wow!

That's for sure. Very good.

Male voice: A real wheee!

Very good. All right.

Male voice: Thank you.

Thank you, Jack.

Now, I hope I haven't put any ARC breaks on the track with this. You'll probably have to patch this pc up now with adhesive tape. She's looking at me with a real haunted look.

Male voice: Yeah.

Yes?

Male voice: You mentioned that in running this process on people pleasers that we should keep it "pleasing people pleasers' pleasers" or something like this and I - on running this I've noticed that there's a tremendous - this whole process on people pleasers has been something I've really worked at hard all my life, I've discovered, and I feel like Bruce does. But I've noticed that there are certainly a lot of people pleasers that have gone very much wrong, and these are evidently the Rocks. Now, I don't quite see exactly what we should be doing to keep the thing running properly.

You should keep the fellow answering the exact auditing command, which doesn't say, "Find the basic people pleaser on the track." See, it doesn't say that. It just says "a people pleaser." Now, the horrible fact of the matter is, is he'll fall through to it, and I don't think there's anybody, even God, strong enough to build a floor to keep him from doing so.

Now, a person who is having a rough time, and who is insisting on staying in the present lifetime, you know, kind of, he's hanging up. And there is no particular reason to shove him through because he just doesn't - he's just got to get just so many locks off, and then he'll start going south. And you can't keep him from going on backtrack. I don't think you could invent brakes that would do so.

But the truth of the matter is that an individual will, for a long time, hang up on late locks on the chain, and the length of time that he does this is actually of no great concern to the auditor except any process, including Help, is a cyclic process.

And it's very cute. It runs early-late, early-late, early-early-early-late, early-late, yesterday-late (today, you know), and then early-early-early-early-early, 1621-today. See? And then 1600-childhood this life, see, and back and forth, back and forth, up and down.

If you're real sharp as an auditor, by the way, you will ask "When?" occasionally. And then when you end up for a break or something like that, you will ask enough questions to bring him back up to PT.

It works just like the old ARC Straightwire processes, and your question has to do with "when?" Doesn't it?

Male voice: Pretty much so. I mean, I still... Well, when I was running this now, I got back into some things that were - had a lot of energy associated with them and what not and they didn't seem to erase thoroughly - handle too well. Then I started looking for something that was - whether it was something earlier than that or not.

Oh, you, yourself, were pushing yourself into an earliness? Were you?

Male voice: Well, I was doing that. Now, maybe my auditor should have - or maybe when I'm auditing somebody I should do something to avoid them from doing that.

No, no, no, no.

Comes under the heading of the first remarks of this when I installed so many ARC breaks in people at this question hour. And that is, simply: never leave what your pc is doing to chance. It's easy to do that. You say, "Well, Ron thought up the process, and the Instructor is making me do it." It's easy to do that, don't you see, and to leave it kind of to chance. But at the expense of being a nagger, at the danger of throwing in some ARC breaks with the pc, you should ask, "What are you doing?" Now, we have another one that we occasionally ask, and that I occasionally ask - by the way, I ask a couple of things on cases evidently, I find out, that nobody - has never appeared in processes, and which scared into view something. With great indignation the other day I found out that somebody had been processed in the HGC for quite a little while, and the auditor was processing a person who was under an assumed name and hadn't found out about it.

And I blew my stack! You know, I - I fulminated! I - "Whoa!" I - "What in the name... What? For heaven... Yes! Well, how do you expect this individual who is sitting there withholding the fact from you to ever confide in you with anything? What's the matter with you? Don't you ever ask him, 'Is there something I shouldn't ask you?' Don't you ever use this question?" And the auditor stands there, you know, saying, "Well, g-gee, Ron. I - I didn't know. I - what question?" "Is there something I shouldn't ask you?"

"No," he said, "I never heard of it."

And I said, "Holy cats. I've never mentioned it."

Soon as I get a pc on a meter, one of the first things I ask them - just in monkeying around with meters besides "Has a girl ever kissed you on the back of the neck?" to make sure that the meter is operating and so forth - I tune up a meter. And one of the questions I ask just to get the case out of the road - sort of - so I can audit the guy is to ask him, "Is there something I shouldn't ask you?" And if I'd get a big drop on it, I know there's no reason to audit him until we get that one out of the road.

I say, "Well, just what is it I shouldn't ask you?" if I get a big drop, you know? "Is it about women? Is it about men? Past record? Name? Rank? Serial number? What is it? What is it I shouldn't ask you?" You know? And eventually it will go off the pin, you know, on something like "That you've been sick lately?" And you get some sort of a social disease or something on the doggone case, you know? And the guy was going to sit there during the next four or five hours of processing from me, or the next twenty-five or fifty from the HGC, holding back this fact? Oh, no. And it's just a meter tune-up.

I've known all along for years that he wouldn't register on a meter unless you asked him this question and got it out of the road. And I've never opened my yap about it at all. It's no part of TRs; it's no part of anything, which is an interesting omission on my part. All right.

Now, there's another one which is much more intimate to this, and your Instructors and other people do know this. And we've never mentioned this one. It's never been mentioned to you; it's a good thing you bring this up because it's just another little piece of the thing that I think everybody knows and the Instructors think everybody knows, and auditors who have been around for a while think everybody knows, but it's no part of a TR, you know, and that's this one: "What else are you doing?" You know? This is the - this is the trapper to finish all trappers, you know? You say to the individual - you say to the individual, "All right, mock up a fly on the ceiling," and he does. And you say, "Fine. Now, how did you do that?" Or "What did you do exactly?" is much better.

And he says, "Well, I looked up there, and I made a fly appear on the ceiling." And you say, "That's fine. Now, just where did you put him?"

"Well," he says, "right there alongside of that light there, see?"

And you say, "Fine."

One of the other questions that we have never mentioned is: "Did you do anything else?"

"Oh," the fellow says. "No. No."

"Well, did you do anything else?"

"No. No."

You just listen to that tone of voice, you know, and you say, "A h-heh-haha-ha-ha-ha-hm! Just what else did you do?" "Well," the fellow says, "I've only got a few hours in processing, and I'm trying to heal up this leg, so I got in another command on it." "Oh, you did, huh? Well, did I tell you to do that?"

"Well, no, as a matter of fact."

"Have you been doing that for the last two or three commands?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, yes. But uh..."

And you say, "Well, if you do anything else besides the process, you tell me every time you do it, so that it can be properly acknowledged." Take up this case - this case is taken up, by the way, at considerable length. What ACC was it, 5th? Fifth ACC we took up this "What else is he doing?"

Male voice: Sixth.

Sixth ACC, was it?

Male voice: I think so.

Had you patting the wall, remember?

Male voice: Yes, that's the one.

That's the 6th ACC.

And the pc was auditing something which was doing the command, do you get the idea? He was doing something else, or he was doing everything on a via.

Inevitably he will go through a certain amount of via-ism, but when he's doing this wholly, you get nothing happening. You are auditing somebody who is auditing something, so therefore he, by definition, is out of session. And you've got to put all of your strength into getting him in-session.

There are certain things you should concentrate on. Now, you guys are along the line far enough so that I can talk to you on the level of a - you don't follow the rote, you follow what you're supposed to be doing, you get done what you're supposed to be getting done. You know? You're supposed to get a pc there into session, and you're supposed to get him to execute the exact auditing command. You're supposed to be auditing the pc not over the top of your ARC breaks, because he'll only worsen. And you're supposed to be auditing a pc who has no PT problem.

But the PT problem and the ARC breaks out of the way, you've still got two to worry about. And that is, is he obsessively withholding anything from you? And is he doing something else? We've still got those two to worry about. And when those two are present, no auditing happens, that's all.

So, in answer to the second part of your question, it is really - you wouldn't say this about an HCA, but a good experienced auditor who isn't aware of the something elseness, and aware of the sudden flips that a case can do, and aware of the fact he was auditing like a little - a little old well-oiled perambulator, you know, he was just going down the street, and it all was wonderful, and all of a sudden he's doing something else in some peculiar line ... Watch for his feet. His feet start twitching. Or his dope-off starts to come on, something of the sort.

Something (pc seldom knows about it) happened between him and the auditor, usually. His havingness dropped from some source or another, and he has some imaginary Code break, or he has some imaginary something or other. He went out of session.

So, your job is to keep the pc in-session and doing what the auditing command tells him to do, to get his attention back on you again, give him the next auditing command and make sure he does that (and we've never stressed this one hard enough), and only that.

See, and these guys that are doing two or three extras along the line know they are getting away with it, and all they do is slide a little bit further out of your control, and a little bit further out of your control, and all of a sudden, thing shows up as practically a blow.

The people who blow on you - we don't hold it against you when somebody blows on you on TRs or anything else - we don't hold it against anybody if somebody blows up in one of these ACCs, because the duress is pretty terrific.

But you know, I can see a blow coming for at least a half an hour. They telegraph themselves at least a half an hour in advance. And when you're really auditing and being sharp, and you have a blow, an actual blow occur, why, it just means you weren't watching. Pc was doing something else. Pc was not doing the command. These are the two commonest things - two of the commonest things.

But there is one more general cause of a blow is there was an ARC break, real or imagined, and this is demonstrated by an apparent loss of havingness on the part of the pc. His havingness drops a little bit, he gets twitchy, he gets odd, peculiar in some manifestation and so on and - you're real sharp - you just look at him and you'd say, "Well now, this boy thinks something has happened here. What's wrong?" You patch it up when it happened.

Now, if he's doing something different, he already is suffering from a sort of an ARC break situation with the session. He has no great security. You know, his security on the auditor is very low. He thinks he has to do more of the session than he should be doing. See? He thinks right away, "Well, I - I just get that extra fillip in there, why, maybe I can..." But when he is doing it and telling the auditor about it, he's contributing to the session. When he's doing it and keeping it to himself, he for sure is out of session.

When a pc isn't doing the auditing command, he's out of session. When his havingness has dropped, he's out of session. It just all comes under the heading of out of sessionness. And you could take this up as one awful big subject, one fabulous subject. This gets to be very interesting after a while.

And of course your Instructors are busy on something else just now so they won't know that I'm asking you guys to watch this. So, they're not listening to me, so it's all right. You tell them - you tell them, if you're repeating a command over again, you're doing something else that apparently isn't auditing and you're just trying to establish that session again, and so forth, you just tell them "Well, Ron told me to do it," and that will short-circuit the whole thing.

Now, you get this? You know, if you ever master this principle of auditing in its thoroughness, you probably could do some of the tricks Christ is supposed to have done. You know? You'd totally put somebody in-session.

You know, I ran an experiment one time - just taking a pc, who was a very arduous pc, and had been making everybody blow his brains out, and all I did for a whole hour was put him in-session and say one auditing command, see, but I put him in-session and got in one auditing command.

He answered the one auditing command. I didn't bridge, because I hadn't bridged into the command. You see, I didn't bridge out, I said, "Thank you very much, and that is the end of the session," and so forth.

The session actually was only two minutes in duration. He had been sitting there for an hour. And I spent those fifty-eight minutes doing nothing but put this guy in-session - nothing, nothing.

We took up every possible facet of how he could be out of session and we exhausted them utterly. We didn't discuss his being out of session because that is a validation of it, but we took up his confidence in anything being able to do anything for anybody, no matter how rarely. See? And we got this little certainty worked up, you know? So that was a good reason to come into session if only a very short time.

And then we took up - we took up what he could trust about me. And then we took up what willingness he did have to be there in the room. All on a two-way comm basis, you know? Any possible willingness? Was there anything under the sun, moon and stars that I could say to him that he wouldn't object to? Just one phrase, one thing I could say to him that he wouldn't flash back against in some fashion, you see? You'd say, "Boy this is certainly picking the bones of an awful small chicken." Do you know what that pc said? I told him at the end of that time - the one command was: "You make that body sit in that chair." He did. I said, "Thank you. Thank you very much. Now that's the end of session." Took him about two minutes to get that command over and get it executed, and finished it off. And boy, you should have seen this - dawn come up, and the sun rise, and the birds sing, and so forth.

And he looked at me, and he says, "Well," - total misassignment of cause, you know - he said, "I've always said that I wouldn't really ever make any progress until I was audited by somebody I could really respect," and so on. And he had it all assigned to the fact this was altitude, that I was me, and he spoiled the whole effect as far as he was concerned. It had nothing to do with it; anybody could have done that.

But man, he was not about to take a command from me, or from God or anybody. You get the idea? It wouldn't have mattered. He could have had the most exaggerated idea of his auditor, and it still would have had nothing to do with it at all. Don't you see? Took a whole hour. And if you don't get somebody in-session that thoroughly you're just going to do a superficial glance at the case. A case is a case. It's an intimate thing. It's an intimate thing rather than a generalized thing.

An individual is - he's worried about whether or not you're interested in his particular problems. He sizes the thing up. Some of you have sized up, "Well, he's just another student, so therefore he wouldn't be particularly interested in my case. He's auditing me because he has to," or something of this line.

And you would be amazed how that'll throw a guy out of session. This sort of thing you have to take up. And there is no TR that takes it up. But I don't see why we'd have to have a TR to take up the fact of whether or not the fellow was right there in-session. Yes, there are certain things we must take up, but certainly nothing can really be taken up until we put somebody in-session thoroughly.

And it's willingness to be there is what in-session means, and willingness to follow an order. And you can improve that by processing in general; take a shotgun blast at the whole thing with just the TRs as they exist, but remember it can be done all by itself.

The reason he does something else, the reason he adds in, "Well, I'll try to make it go earlier so that I can..." You see? The reason why he says, "Well, I'd better stick in this lifetime because I have no reality on any other lifetime," and then he holds it to himself. These are all symptoms of lack of trust. Lack of trust; he feels he can't unburden himself.

I saw an auditor one time blow his reputation up just bango. He was standing with a crowd of people. Standing right behind him was his pc; he didn't notice it. And he was telling the rest of them, in the most sorry details, about the pc's case in a rather derogatory tone of voice. That was the end of that auditor as far as that pc was concerned. You get the idea? The majority of the ARC break.

Actually that auditor could then not run out the ARC break, it was so monumental. Somebody else ran out the ARC break.

In-session! If anybody winds up un-Clear it's because somebody didn't put them in-session.

There's another factor about this you must remember: that all aberrations are, are vias on confrontingness. If you define aberration with a technical - you know, this would be a totally-for Scientologists sort of thing. It would just be so much gibberish to some student or

somebody on the outside, you know? But all aberration is, is a via on confrontingness, that's all it is, so don't be surprised that a fellow has an occasional inclination to throw in a via instead of confront it. You see, because that's what you're running out.

But if you don't know about it, that's the sin. The sin isn't to throw the via in on the part of the preclear, you see? The sin, totally, is not noticing it. That's it.

So, you let him dramatize, and to the degree that you let him dramatize you let him be controlled by the bank, so he therefore must be persuaded to follow the exact auditing command, otherwise he is being run by the bank while you are running him. And he has two auditors: circuit nine and you.

Male voice: When you were making a scout, Ron, you asked the question - on the question, you threw out the word "question," is that for the same purpose?

What's that?

Male voice: When you're making a scout, you said "question" to the preclear, just the term "question."

Yeah.

Male voice: Was that the same purpose in mind? "Was there anything there that I couldn't ask you?"

Yeah.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Yeah.

Male voice: How about the term "language"? What was your - what was your purpose then?

No, no real purpose. That was to spot a semantic lock-up.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

That was the only purpose. That was just diagnostic, but the other was the same thing.

Male voice: Yeah.

"Is there something I shouldn't ask you?" By the way, that's a wonderful parlor game. You want to - if you want to put somebody on a lie detector sometime because you suspect them of something, good, then get them to take ahold of a pair of cans. You shouldn't launch into the sordid details of the whole thing because it'll be such a surprise, it itself will amount to an ARC break and obscure the meter which will not then thereafter read for you. It's not that it's impolite, it's just technically unfeasible.

You have to enter into it right dead - dead on, see? If you can get the mind to do what the mind is doing, you're all set. So, you just say to them, "Is there something I shouldn't ask you?" You know, you say, "Well, did you do this and that?" And "Squeeze the cans." And put them through a little drill of one kind and another, and say, "Is there something I shouldn't ask you?" They don't interpret this at once as a frontal attack. But this is the one thing they are thinking of. There is something he shouldn't say.

And if there's a big withhold here, or a lie, or a misdemeanor of some kind or another that is right there, boy that thing will start falling off the pin. You can spend the next half-hour

holding the cans. It just never occurs to him to put the cans down. He's so engrossed in this defeating you from asking this question. It's quite remarkable.

"Well, what is the question I shouldn't ask you?" Well, he'll think about it, you know, right straight on, you'll get another drop. And you can shake out the answers; he'll sit right there. It's just as though he's being asked to step up and confess that he committed murder, you know, but he'll step right up and confess that he's committed murder.

You don't take a pair of cans and say, "Now, I'm going to find out whether or not you swiped the crockery." You know? Or "whether you got in the cookie jar." No, because he'll throw the cans down. See, about the only possible approach is "Is there something that I shouldn't ask you?" It's pretty wild. It's pretty wild. And the other one is, is "What else are you doing?" These two I've never - I evidently never handed out very much. Have handed the other out, and all your Instructors know of this one: "What else are you doing? Fine, you're doing the command, but what else are you doing?" "Well, I'm not doing anything else except sitting here. That's all I'm doing." "Oh, you're sitting there. Well, do you have to concentrate on sitting there when you're asked that?" "Well, as a matter of fact, yes."

"Why?"

"Well, a half an hour ago when you so and so and so and so and so and so..." Get the idea? "It's about all I can do to stay here and keep on with this, but I want to get Clear, and I suppose I'll have to accept you as an auditor because you're assigned to me!" Otherwise, there's no ARC break visible.

Any time he tells you he's doing anything else, it has some source in mistrust - mistrust of the auditor.

Maybe he's always mistrusted all auditors. That doesn't mean he's not also mistrusting you. You get the idea? Yes, Eleanore?

Female voice: I want to know the exact wording on the new ARC break command.

You want to know what?

Female voice: I want to know the exact wording on the ARC break command, "Mock up a person who is or...

"Who is pleased with."

Female voice: Can you do it "would be"?

"Who is pleased with." Not "would be" or "could be" nor "is being." We shook this out.

These commands, by the way, I write them up on a partial test and then as they are run we normally will find some sort of bugs in them; we shake them on down. I never try to put out a perfect command, crack out of the box, because every command I've ever put out that was a perfect command, I've then said it must stay that way, in spite of the fact that it doesn't run.

Female voice: Well, Ron, your - there are some commands that can be used with some variation in the tense of them.

Mm-hm.

Female voice: Could this be - could this...

There's no variation in the tense of them, because the engrams he's sitting in are obviously all present time. In other words, they have the tag of "now." They've got a "now" tag on them. It was now when they happened. And to get them all out, you don't put a time factor on.

That's what's wrong with ARC Straightwire by the way, is "Recall a time when you communicated with someone." Now, that's indirect because the individual is making past out of what is in the bank as present. And it's the same command and we've used it, and it works and it has workability, and there's no reason to change it at all, because it becomes an entirely different process, becomes Concept Processing when you think - say, "Think of communicating with someone."

Yes?

Female voice: How can we use that command for any length of time? After all, one person doesn't have too many enemies.

There is an understanding of the command again, auditor. It's "A person who is pleased with."

Female voice: Well, it would be an enemy if he were pleased with an ARC break.

Well, that's the preclear's consideration. That's perfectly all right, perfectly valid. But it's just "Mock up a person who is pleased with your ARC break," or "pleased with your condition." I think the difficulty here is with the basic selection of the command: ARC break. I think it's too esoteric.

Female voice: Could be.

And this is just - this is it. Your pc has to be able to understand what this is all about. And when you're clearing a command you always have the liberty of changing the command. Do you realize that? You don't clear a command to foist it off on the pc. Understand that? You therefore must understand the process, not the incantation. See? You're looking for ARC breaks, and you say what is an ARC break to this person? Quarrel. Hah! Fine. This is "What makes you unhappy about communicating with people?" you would say to him, or something like this.

Person would say, "Well, quarrels."

You say, "Good! Good. Fine."

Or, "inattention," or something of this character - he's got some specialized designation for what he calls an ARC break, you know? You can run that just as fast as you can run anything else.

And you can drop back to the standard command which is: "In front of that body mock up a person who is pleased with your condition." Get the idea? And you get almost as far with the same thing - as a matter of fact, further. Psychosomatic illnesses and all sorts of things will start to run off with that.

Female voice: Then I could use "pleased."

You could use what?

Female voice: I'll just think about it a second.

All right. All right. I'll let you back-paddle.

Female voice: No, I'll get it.

All right.

A person who is pleased with your condition. Well, condition can be good and condition can be bad, so that it's normally a very innocent term.

Female voice: So I could use "condition"?

Yes, and you might be way up the line from a reality here at all, you know? You might have to get a concept "is pleased." And do you know that you have to take parts of commands sometimes and have the preclear do those? Now, you'll run into this on present time problem. If you don't know this, and don't have, yourself, the freedom to do this, you'll go up the spout on some cases.

"Invent a problem of..." - you want to get rid of this fellow's worries? Every morning that the pc has come in, he has had a quarrel with a certain person, and you spend the next hour getting rid of this as a PT problem.

Well, this happens maybe twice, and you say, "Well, that's enough. We're not going to run Responsibility, we're going to knock this thing in the head, and it's going to take the next three hours, but it's certainly worth it. So we're going to run 'Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to Agnes.' Or, pardon me, 'Invent a problem of comparable magnitude ...'" What is the standard command that we are using right this minute?

Audience: To that problem.

Hm?

Audience: To that problem.

It's just "that problem," isn't it? I had it run on me wrong in the last twenty-four hours, what do you know? "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem," is the proper one that tested out much better. All right.

Well, now, wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Your pc boggles, is upset, and boy, you're not having trouble with Agnes, you're having trouble with "Invent." Wow! And you find yourself having sailed way up into the blue someplace and not being able to get down. Nothing with which to save grace; you've already given him the command once. Duh! "Invent?" Person says, "Invent. Invent. Invent? Invent?" You said, "What is the English definition for the word 'invent'?"

And he said, "Well, to conceive a new thing of one kind or another."

And you said, "That's fine." You went through this; doesn't seem to trouble him at all. And you give him the first command, you say, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem.

And he says, "Invent. Invent. Invent. Invent. Invent."

"I'll repeat the auditing command: Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem." He says, "Invent. Invent. Invent. Invent. How the hell would you invent anything?" You've had it, see? There's only one thing you can do: is to get him to invent something. And you say, "Well, we'll put that command on the back burner" (words to that effect) and say, "Now you just invent something." "Can't possibly create. Well, I remember when I was studying music when I was young, and I - so on - and I tried to compose something, and oh, gee, this is terrible. And put something up there. Oh, no," and so forth.

And you finally get around and he invents a purple wall for this room, and he's fairly satisfied that he invented it, don't you see? And you get two or three of these and he's happy about "invented," and now you say, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem."

You say, "Good. All right. We're all set now." And he says, "Invent a problem. Invent a problem. Invent a problem. Invent a problem. Oh, I don't know. Well, invent a problem. God, problems, you can't invent problems; they just jump at you and knock your head off! Problem." And so, "Well, we'll put the auditing command on the back burner again and we will go ahead." Unfortunately by this time you've given him two loses. And he'll start to reflect it, so you have no choice now but to give him a win.

So, you walk upstairs, and you backtrack on the thing, rather, and you get this thing squared, "Invent a problem. Invent a problem in this room right here, right now, look around and invent a problem." "Well, well, well. God almighty, how could you ever invent a problem? Well, that ashtray gets spilled. And it's because it's that ashtray, and gets spilled right there. All right, that could be a problem." "All right. Fine. Fine. Now, invent another problem," and so on. We carry it on not much as a repetitive auditing command, just give him practice, you know? We're actually still in the convulsions of clearing the command, and the only thing we've done wrong is to give him a command, but this isn't going to kill him, but it's given him a lose because he hasn't answered it yet.

Now you finally say, "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem you've described to me. That problem." "Oh," he says, "well, the whole world on fire, and everybody dying for millions of years. Yes, that's a problem of comparable magnitude." So you're all set now, pheww! But you know - you know a pc, through not being able to do it, will sometimes just sit there, and sit there, and sit there, and blab something back, and blab something back. And they're just lost, and they're adrift, and they aren't doing the auditing command, really.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, that reminds me, today we're clearing a problem in running Clearing Procedure. We've been running "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"

As a key-out.

Male voice: As a key-out. But I decided before I come here to always follow that with "Invent a problem of comparable magnitude" just to repair the guy ...

Of course.

Male voice:.. . havingness of - on problems, so that we could then have the rest of the intensive without having problems pop up all the time.

Yeah.

Male voice: I just wondered if that's ...

Has a good validity. That's a good validity.

Male voice: As long as you don't spend, you know, half the intensive patching him up.

Yeah. Yeah. If you think he's got a problem that's going to get in your road.

Pc came in, sat down one time in my pc chair and he says, "Well," he says, "we've got to get at this in a hurry." And he says, "We've got to get something done today because I've got to prove it to my wife that I haven't been wasting all of my money.

You know what he got for the next two and a half hours. He got his wife run. And we got her off the case, therefore, he got two and a half hours of auditing out of five. Worked perfectly.

When he got home she said, "Well, I suppose you wasted some more money, yap-yap-yap, this stuff," you know? Chop-chop-chop-chop-chop. ABC breaks. ABC breaks. dramatize

dramatize, more ARC breaks, you know? He told me the next morning he'd cooly told her, "Well, two and a half hours we ran you."

"Well, what about me? Yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap deduh, I just know there's a ..."

"We ran problems of comparable magnitude to you."

"Dizzzzzzith."

She had to come up with a cognition, "Have I ever really been a problem to you, George? George, you mean you worry about me?" I'm playing the exact playback on the record. "You mean you worry about what I say or do? Why, George, I don't mean anything by what I say." Now, the fundamentals of auditing - the fundamentals of auditing are the fundamentals of auditing. And they include a session, and they include getting the command obeyed, and they include all of these little finite things, so the command has to be understood so that it can be obeyed.

And boy, you can put in lots of time with profit. Don't think anybody's pushing you to "get on the process, get on the process." The expense of having a pc out of session and doing something else and not obeying the auditing command, because what good is the session? It isn't one. Do you get the idea? So, the fundamentals of the session must exist before a session can be run. Got that real good? And if you're going to make hay here during this week and a half of auditing that remains here, why, you're certainly going to pay attention to that. And when you see your pc boiling off or flubbing or something of the sort or getting nervous or upset, you'd better certainly find what that ARC break is and find out right now.

Getting auditing done is the number of commands per unit of time in a session. And that's one of these terribly exact definitions: the number of commands in a unit of time in a session. Got that? I mean, that's awfully exact. That's one of these technically precise things that you would just ... If you buttoned up the whole thing and got it all screwed down on the edges and got it exactly laid out, you'd have a Clear. You know, it's one of those silly things that are carried on to its absolute utmost, the whole distance, the whole way, and so forth.

Why, this guy would say, "What? I can actually obey another person's command? I'm in communication with the human race? I can talk to somebody? I can listen to somebody? You mean I can actually do something?" And it's just that revelatory sometimes when the first real auditing command goes across to a pc who's really in-session. Worth doing sometime.

Remember we used to get the manifestation, "Look around the room and find something that's really real to you." Remember that one? And you remember how careful we had to be with that? "Is that really real to you?"

"Well, no."

"Well, is there anything else that really is?"

And we had to go on and on and on till they knew they had actually found something in the room. And I remember one girl that looked around the room; I think the auditor lost a teapot over this. Looked around the room and found a teapot. And it was really real to her. And the thing took about an hour and a quarter, or an hour and a half or something like that, and found this teapot. And that was really real to her. And she clutched that thing to her bosom and wouldn't let it go. Really real to her.

Well, now the trick behind that was not really "find something really real." The trick behind that was getting a pc to obey the exact auditing command, be in-session, be in communication with the auditor and the physical universe. And we got the pc in communication with the auditor, and with one tiny bit of the physical universe, and the person blew sane just like that.

That was what? That was Step VII, wasn't it, of SOP...

Audience: Eight.

Eight. Mm-hm. "Something really real to you." Marvelous. Marvelous thing.

But the mechanics of auditing all by themselves do so much, you know, and you do them so easily, that it's very easy to put them all on automatic and say they aren't doing very much, but they're doing plenty.

So, you run some perfect sessions for me, will you?

Male voice: Yes, Sir.

And when I say "sessions," I mean sessions! Got it?

All right. Thanks a lot.

Audience: Thank you.

[End of lecture.]