COURSE PROCEDURE OUTLINED

A lecture given on 16 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Thank you.

This is the third lecture of the 20th ACC, July 16th, 1958.

Now, I understand some more people got onto Clear checkout. Hm? You got it down a little bit further.

I understand there's some slight hope that somebody will get out of the second TR class - understand there was a hope that there was one or two that would make it before the end of course.

I see some of you have probably had a little difficulty in handling a meter - making it stick and making it rise.

And we're continuing today this rundown on 20th ACC Procedure and I will give you a datum there: If you are a good auditor, it is very hard for you to make a meter stick because two-way communication will unstick a meter. And if you're conducting a very intelligent, good ARC discussion of the Rock, you probably won't get a stuck needle. You have to reverse yourself and talk about hate and interrupt the preclear and not be so ARC about it in order to get a stuck needle.

There is a process known as Two-way Communication, you know, and it is probably the most effective of all processes in reaching the Rock. But if carried out properly it unsticks the needle. So you needn't feel too bad if you can't make a needle stick. You needn't feel too badly about it. It merely means that you're probably a fairly good auditor.

Talk about hate. That is the thing for you to talk about when you want a needle to stick. Whom do you distrust? Whom would you distrust instinctively? And then change the subject quick and you can make a needle stick. Okay?

All right. Let's carry on with this procedure here.

We're going into this now on how to clear a command. This is very interesting, how to clear a command, extremely interesting, because nobody could possibly have imagined the number of ways people have invented to do it wrong.

This is the fate of procedures. That's why they are written down with such exactness. You write a procedure down with great exactness and then the next thing you know, a whole body of Scientologists, someplace or another, will be doing this thing in some complicated way that makes it utterly unworkable.

What have they done? They've simply dramatized the cycle of action of this universe. They just made it more complicated; they made it do this and that to survive more. In other words, they changed it somehow to make it persist and, of course, this inevitably destroys the simplicity and actually destroys the drill.

If you're instructing, you will find that your biggest bugbear. You say to a student, *„Now, I want you to sit there,"* and ask him over and over if cows draw flies. *„Now, I want you to just do that."* And every time he gives you an answer, regardless what, why, you say, *„Okay."* All right, that's simple. There's nothing to it. Nobody could possibly go astray with it.

And you come back. You find out that - person couldn't answer the question. Well, why couldn't they answer the question? Well, because they didn't know what a bear was. And you will in vain try to bridge this gap between your simplicity and this strange impasse.

This, actually, is the biggest single menace to Scientology itself - is that it is placed as a simplicity which has been found workable and then it goes astray with a complexity. People change it, vary it and then all of a sudden it isn't and it doesn't work anymore.

I'm acutely aware of this because Book One is a very good example of having been pushed astray. I was doing all right and then I had to explain it. And I had explained it several times before I wrote Book One. And Book One carries with it the fruits of explanation but they happen to be much more complicated than the original clearing process, which was simply the rising confidence of the preclear to confront his locks, engrams and secondaries. It was just a gradual little gradient scale. And we give the person some security in seeing a lock, just work on it hour after hour. The person comes in - make the person go outside, come back in again, take a look at the room, sit down in the preclear's chair. *„All right. Now, do you have a picture of the room just as you entered it?"*

„Uhhh, I don't know."

„Well is there anything wrong here with the room?"

„No. No. No."

„Well, why don't you go outside again, come in, take a look at the room, sit down in the chair?"

And he would.

„Now, have you got a picture of the room?“

„Well, I've got a little vague blur. It sort of looks like a room.“

„Well, that's fine. Now, go outside again, come in, take a look at the room and sit down in the chair.“

All right. When he finally had a picture of the room, we'd then erase it. We'd go back to the moment he walked into the room and we'd take it from that moment on to the point when he had told me about it. Not only then could he see this lock, but he could also erase the lock. So therefore it was safe to create.

But the number of factors involved in this simplicity were actually, at that time, much too great to be embraced by the existing understanding. There were tremendous factors involved in this. One didn't know, for instance, that a person will not create that which he cannot get rid of. Truthfully, whole track. Birth, by the way, was quite a discovery at that time and the various factors which could enter in if you plowed more deeply were overwhelming. It actually required many years of study before this - we could come back to a simplicity.

And if you're worried about how one of these factors works, you'll certainly find it in some lecture or some book, someplace. You certainly will. That's for sure. Because I could not have told anyone with confidence at that time, *„This is all the phenomena there is to be looked at or this is the only phenomena that is important.“* See, I couldn't have told anybody that. Now, there might have been many other phenomena involved and I was just neglecting them and I would tell anybody who asked, *„Well, I don't know that that's important to it. It might be but I don't know that it is.“*

Well, you find yourself, undoubtedly, occasionally in the same frame of mind. You think that there's a tremendous sea of phenomena surrounding this simple datum and you think these other things are in your root of explanation. You know, you've got to explain these things before you get on with something else.

Well, I'll just ask you to thoroughly examine a simplicity. This was the rule which would have saved the bacon in '47 to '50. Just examine the simplicity and find out if it is adequate. And after you've found out it's adequate - that means then you won't lose it - then go on and explore the complexities which surround it.

Now, the next thing we have on this procedure is how to clear a command. And to discover that a command could be cleared in so many complicated, different ways was quite a shock to me because the whole import of this is to make sure that the preclear doesn't think you're talking hog Latin. See, it must be a communicable statement or command. You tell a Chinese to walk over to that wall - he speaks no English. Well, that's not fair. It's not within his frame of communication reference, you see?

Now, you clear a command to increase the understanding of the command, not to do anything else. Now, this readily goes into a process and all these little odds and ends readily go into a process. You could make a process out of anything, and some people do. But clearing a command - clearing a command is not here a process. It's a prelude.

What would you do with this Chinese?

Well, you'd have to give in a little bit too, wouldn't you? You'd have to find out what this action, walking - what name would you assign to this action, walking? And what name would you assign to this object over here, wall? And that object there, wall, wall, wall, wall.

You could transmit this intelligence and after that you could say, *„You walk over to that wall.“* You could probably continue to use English because he now knew what you meant by that. But you would stick him in the whole session at that point of clearing the command if you didn't again, pretty soon, clear the command again. So you maybe only tell him, *„Walk over to that wall,“* twenty-five times and it would as-is. Why?

Because that's what processing does. It kicks computations around. It destroys these understandings. It builds other understandings. And if you never expected processing to change anyone, of course, only clear a command once. If you just clear a command once and think that is adequate and sufficient, then you have also said that the processing you're going to give is not going to change this person on the time track or alter his understandings or throw him into occlusions and into areas of brightness and so forth. You've just up and said that you aren't going to do anything. Because once you move a person around in time you, of course, move him off the spot in time when the command was cleared.

Well now, some people have been taking another tack. They clear it often enough in the first time so they'll never have to clear it again. Something like storing up boojum. And they run a process with the thing. They say, *„Now, we're going to run a process called 'How can you help me?' 'How can I help you?'”* and so forth. *„Now, we're going to clear this command.“* And they get on the word help and the guy gives them some kind of a super-aberrated definition of help.

You know, he says, *„Well, help is that which you do when you're trying to get even with somebody.“*

And you say to yourself, *„Boy, that's all wrong. I just haven't got a clue of how he could get that wrong.“* So you, being reasonable, which is the greatest sin an auditor could commit, clear the command *„Help“* again! And you keep clearing the command *„Help“* until you get a reasonable response, to you.

But, listen! That's what the process is supposed to do. And all you've done is substitute for the standard Help Process another process known as Descriptive Processing: If you make a fellow describe something often enough and long enough, he'll certainly as-is it. And you know, instead of clearing the command you wind up with an unintelligible syllable which means nothing, called *„help.“* If you don't believe it, have somebody or yourself say a name over and over and over and over and over. You say your own name over several times right now and you say, *„Who the hell am I?“*

No, he's given you a definition for help, and the process is going to - get this one. Now, he'll only become upset, his havingness will run down, he'll become very restive. I've made some tests on this recently. I tried to clear the command, *„Problem,“* and I said, *„What is a problem? What is a problem? What is a problem? What is a problem?“* And I

had the preclear practically up the spout. But I was running an as-ising type of process with malice aforethought to find out what occurred when you did something like this.

The right way to do it would have been this: *„What is a problem?"*

Preclear would have said, *„Well, a problem is something that can never be solved, yes."*

It was up to me then to say, *„Thank you,"* and then run a process gauged to change this state of mind about a problem. And after a little while - then after a little while, clear the command again with just - just once, just clear the command once, you see? And again, in clearing the command, *„What is this problem?"*

Now, it was an interesting thing that in this particular case I'm talking about right now, that the definition of a problem was what was changing the whole way as I ran the process. As I ran a proper process the person kept coming up with a new definition for problems and then a new definition for a problem and then - so on. The most stuck point around there was the definition for problem.

Well, the most stuck point on anybody's case, anybody's case anyplace, is help.

Now, you think because you can say, *„The definition for help is to assist somebody to survive,"* that you yourself to the depths of your being have defined help. Well, what you have is a superficial, intellectual understanding of this syllable: help. And you start running Help back and forth and around on various subjects that are associated with the Rock on a case and, boy, the individual's idea of help certainly shifts.

But you don't shift that idea of help by clearing the command. See, that's running another process and not a very good process. It'd be all right to - if you could, just by clearing the command, change the person's mind totally on the subject of help, everywhere on all dynamics; then we would have no more procedure than clearing the command. And you would just clear the command and you would ask him, *„What is help?"* five, six, eight thousand times and he'd be Clear and that would be the end of that. Doesn't work that way and I'm sorry that it doesn't work that way, but it doesn't. But you do - you have to run Help in brackets on selected terminals. And as you do that, you go round and round on these things, why, his resistances to help and so forth unjam his definitions of help and the next thing we get is probably a cognition.

Well, help isn't something you only do to sick people. Help is something that you could also do to somebody who felt all right, providing he didn't hit you. Well, that's as good a definition as any other definition and that's the one you'd now run on.

Now, what then are you trying to clear? In clearing a command are you trying to clear his idea of this word? No. What are you trying to clear then?

You're trying to clear an understanding, within his frame of reference, of your command. That's all you're trying to clear so that you can run it.

Now, when do you sweat over it? When do you really have to get down and sweat over it? When it is simply gibberish to him. He has no understanding of it at all. Then you had certainly better work on it.

So the only time you get in and work hard on the clearing of a command, the only time you really press on it is when you get gibberish as a reply. In other words, well, now that could be misinterpreted - that statement - until he says it's gibberish. Get the idea? You say to him, „*All right, how can I help you?*" Now, that is the command.

And by the way, in running this sort of thing in clearing the command, the preclear very often makes the mistake of thinking you have uttered your first auditing command. So one of the smart ways of auditing is to tell him, „*This is not an auditing command; we are merely clearing the command.*" And you tell him he's not supposed to follow this one and we're going to clear it. And just to put a little time in on this helps you escape an ARC break with the preclear.

But you say, „*How can I help you? Now, we're going to clear this command, 'How can I help you?' and I want to know what 'how' means to you.*"

And he says so-and-so. And you say, „*Could?*" He says so-and-so.

„*'I' - what does that mean? 'I.'*"

„*Well, in this case it means you, you know.*" „*Help.*"

„*Help. Help. Help. Help. Help. What language is that from?*"

Now you've got a real rough one. It is an incomprehensible. So a wrong understanding gets no further attention from you - just as a little rule, see? You got to that „*help*" and he said, „*Help! That's what my mother used to scream.*"

And you say, „*Fine. Thank you. Now, what does 'you' mean?*" See?

„*You? In that case that's me.*"

„*Fine.*" You've had it. But he did define it, didn't he? You buy it. No matter what he says, you buy it, making a little note on your cuff over here to say the whole command and its clearance again in about twenty-five commands. Certainly no more than twenty-five commands, probably less, and you just mark it down that this command needs clearing later on.

Now, if he starts cogniting on what help means and what the command in general means; if he starts cogniting on this, don't beat the thing to death again by clearing it because he's cogniting his way to a clearer understanding of the command. Got the idea? And that's all you're trying to get him to do. You're directing his attention toward the command so that he will get new ideas concerning his aberrated ideas of this.

Now, many a person will say, „*Help. Help is assistance.*"

And you say, „*Fine. Fine.*"

And you go on and you. . . „*Help is assistance,*" boy, they're seven miles south of nowhere. You would be - you'd be quite amazed if you watched their mental processes a few commands later to have help just become a shadow of real, you know, just a little bit. And help all of a sudden is defined as „*the best way in the world to murder anybody.*" See? „*Help is the best method of killing.*" „*Help is the most terrible thing you can do to anybody.*"

That, by the way, is a perfectly valid clearing command remark. You say, *„What is help?"*

„Well, help is the most horrible thing you could do to anybody."

You say, *„Thank you. Now, what does 'you' mean to you?"*

It's what does it mean to you? You understand? Not what it means to the auditor.

The greatest sin of the auditor is being reasonable and if it doesn't sound reasonable he very often halts right at that point and bays at the moon. He said, *„This defies any comprehension or understanding I have of this universe and this is not the way it ought to be!"* It's actually an invalidation of the preclear and it comes under the heading of the Auditor's Code. The preclear's considerations are sacred until you work them over. But a wrong way to work them over is to work them over by repetition until the command is meaningless.

Now, should you clear every side of a bracket?

In the first place, what is a bracket? A bracket is the directional flows of me to thee and thee to me and him to you and so forth. You see, the directional flows. So there's any number of directions that a flow can occur. You give me a stick. I give you a stick. In other words, the direction that the stick is being offered is the direction of the flow.

All right. So you embrace these various flows. And you will find, wherever you have a thoroughly stuck needle, an interesting condition existing and that condition is: a bracket which will only flow one way, one command. And your stable datum is: when you are operating with a stuck subject - that is to say, the terminal you've selected is stuck (and that will be most of the time in looking for the Rock) - you run, *„How could I help you?"* once, *„How could you help me?"* once. You see, you shift right there. And you don't clear it every time because you clear the whole thing right here at the beginning.

And you say, *„I'm going to run a series of commands that has to do with me helping you and you helping me and you helping other people and other people helping other people and you helping yourself and myself helping myself,"* and so on. *„And we're just going to find and explore this area"* something like this, *„and the basic command is, is: 'How can I help you?' and this command we're going to clear and then we'll take the others from there."* And, if it's all right with the preclear.

And you say, *„How could I help you? Now, what does 'how' mean? What does 'I' mean? 'Help you?'"* you know. *"How could I help you?"* Clear them all. And then you say, *„Well, you understand I will ask you immediately after that, 'How could you help me?' And 'How could other people help you?' and so forth". "Now, what do we mean by 'other people?' Or what do you mean by 'another person?'"* You're going to use that word too, you know: *„another person."*

„Aw," he says, *„somebody that ain't here."*

That's all right. Doesn't matter, as long as he embraces these things, these terms that are going to be used. All right. You've cleared that command. Now, don't weight the processing down with endless repetitions of the command or by clearing and bridging every time you're going to run a part of a bracket because you're just wasting time.

The test of correct procedure is effectiveness and the number of commands you get in per unit of time is the speed that you will get the person cleared. Those are two stable data on which you can always operate, is: That is the correct procedure which is the effective procedure, and as I was just discussing about clearing these things broadly, the most commands per unit of time gets the most auditing done. So instead of getting there firstest with the mostest, you want to get there consistently with the mostest in terms of commands. The more commands you get in per unit of time, the more auditing you're going to get done.

I've been amazed at the slowness, and this is a criticism, with which auditors get across, let us say, five or six commands. It is very slow. It is very slow. And then somebody comes around and wonders why there's this tremendous disproportion between me auditing somebody and maybe an HGC auditor auditing somebody. Get the idea? There's a disproportion. We've even tested it out and have records on it. And they start listening to me auditing and they get some kind of a clue that this isn't the same picture that they themselves present. They present a picture like this: *„Now, how could I help you?“*

And the fellow says, *„Well, and so on, and so on, and so on, well, uh, could I help you? I don't know.“*

Then the auditor sits there for a while. Preclear answered him. The preclear said he didn't know. It was all fogged up but he didn't know. So the auditor sits there for a while and he waits, makes sure, he's very courteous and he finally decides, *„Well, maybe I'd better ask you that question again. Hm?“*

Preclear says, *„Yeah. Yeah.“*

The auditor says, *„Well, all right. How could I help you? Now, that's the command. Have you got the command there now?“*

They come in and they watch me running this thing, I take intention and shoot the guy between the eyes with it and around the back of the head so the bullet meets both ways. And I say, *„How could I help you?“* Bang! See, right in there. *„How could I help you?“* All right, bang!

And he says, *„Uhhhh - by talking a little slower.“*

„Thank you. Now, how could you help me?“

„Uhm, uhm, uhm, uhm, uhm, uhm, by answering up.“

„Good. Thank you.“ Pang. Pang. Pang. Pang. Pang. See?

The guy yawns, starts to go anaten, something of this sort - don't pay any attention to it beyond, perhaps, flipping the direction of flow one is running.

You know, you can knock a guy anaten by running a flow too long. The whole Scientology 8-80 tells you why people go unconscious. It's a stuck flow. It's a flow running too long in the same direction. Well, the way you heal that is to shift the bracket and shift it quick and don't waste any time in the order of your going. Somebody starts to go anaten, starts to yawn and so forth. It's running the wrong way, that's all. You're

saying, *„How could I help you? How could I help you? How could I help you? How could I help you? How could I help you? How could I help you?"* and he goes, *„Uha-uha-uha-uharh-uharhrrh."* Boy, it's about time you said, *„How could you help me, son?"*

Well, they look at this number of commands per unit of time and they say, *„Well, there is no real puzzle as to why you get in twenty-five hours of auditing in five hours,"* because that's essentially about the ratio.

8-C commands. You watch people running 8-C, get the number of commands they get in per minute. You'd be amazed how slowly. Time has very little to do with it beyond the fact that your auditing is being modified by MEST universe time. So one of the ways of whipping MEST universe time is to be quick and precise with what you do. MEST universe time is all based on wait: most people are here to find out what happens at the end of the universe. Sole purpose.

And I'm not offering myself as any vast and incredibly excellent example of auditing. I merely am effective, try to be effective and so on. Undoubtedly - undoubtedly many other - many other much more artistic presentations could be made. Now, I'm not beyond - I'm not beyond making an Auditor Code break or challenging a preclear or doing something like this, mostly because I'm not scared of what effect I'm going to make, but when I do I can usually see it and patch it up in a hurry. Any auditing style that I use is relatively overt. It isn't apologetic and it doesn't have as its first consideration maintaining ARC with the preclear. I maintain ARC with a preclear in spite of auditing him rapidly. It's an ARC in spite of, see?

In the first place, for some reason or other he usually doesn't have any idea that I'm on some other side. He generally knows I'm on his side. And if he gets too recalcitrant, I'll normally take this up with him. *„Do you think I'm on your side?"* or something like that. *„You think I'm here cutting you to pieces?"* Or *„What do you think my basic purpose is in auditing you?"*

And he'll shamefully say, *„Well, to make me well,"* or something like that.

„All right. Shut up. Let's get the show on the road."

Now, similarly with clearing a command. Now, you can hang around with this clearing a command half of the day and your preclear will be no wiser. And the reasons you hang around with it so long is because you don't buy his understanding of what you said. If he tells you he doesn't understand it, that it's incomprehensible or that it's hog Latin as far as he's concerned, then you have to get down and give graphic examples of what you are talking about and get his reaction to these examples and finally define and explain the word practically for him. And then you go on an agreed-upon definition of what this word is and as soon as you've achieved any shadow of an agreed-upon definition, take off from there. He'll find out shortly what exactly, what you are talking about.

It is possible for a person to be so plowed in on help that they would not even be able to understand the word itself.

Now, clearing a command is done rapidly. It is not a repetitive process. Its end goal is understanding from the viewpoint of the preclear, not from the auditor. You clear a whole bracket up with the same clearing and then saw forward.

To repeat what I just said a moment ago, when you have a stuck needle on a certain terminal you want to run one command of the bracket at a time. *„How could I help you? How could you help me? How could another person help you?"* Get the idea? *„How could you help yourself?"* You want one per command, one side of the bracket per command and you'll see this thing free up.

Why do you do that?

If you were smarter and could look into the preclear's skull and watch his flows, you would know that it would be running one, six, three, five commands

for each side of the bracket, you see. Funny part of it is, you never get in trouble running one. One per side, you never get into trouble.

You can check this up with a preclear. I sometimes run this way. *„When is it getting black?"* I say. *„Tell me when it starts to get black."* And the - it's - grays up a little bit and he'll say, *„It's getting black."* *„All right. Fine."* Now, shift the command run. That's a person with a field and I'm trying to clear up somebody's field. I'll run it until it grays down. And if I ran it just one more command the field would go black. This is old Ridge Running.

In fact, a black field, whatever else its reason, is simply the end product of the mechanic of flows. Something that's flowed too long in one direction will wind up with a black field. It doesn't even have any further nonsense connected with it; there isn't any further explanation. It's useful. There's things can be done with it. It materializes into certain objects. You know, on and on and on. And you can do things with it. And you can turn them on and off with thought patterns and so forth. But the mechanic that gets a black field there, regardless of why it is there - you see, why it is there would be one modus operandi but the mechanic of its being there is caused by a stuck flow.

If you could find the right flow that was stuck and you would just trigger that flow on a black field - this is pretty smart auditing - just trigger the flow on the black field; it'd run off on an automaticity that would sound like a machine gun. And the preclear just is looking at this circuit, see, and the circuit is going. He's just sort of looking at it and energizing it and it's flowing. And he's getting more answers to how could people help him than he ever dreamed could exist and he occasionally says one to you just to keep you happy. But he couldn't articulate them if he tried. They're running too fast. That's an automaticity.

That's a highly desirable manifestation in running any kind of brackets, by the way. And if you trigger one and interrupt it, you ought to be shot. Let it run right on out. You know, it's going automatic and flying in on him and flying away from him or something of the sort. Just keep up that particular bracket.

You can usually tell because of his dog-with-a-cocked-ear, you know, attitude. It'll keep going as long as he answers one every now and then in the same direction. Then eventually it'll go out and then he'll take over the automaticity of it.

On any aberrative help computation you will get one of these automaticities. Help is one of the fastest ways of turning these things on. Just, *„How could Mother help you?“* You know? And brrrrrrrr! Thing has just been waiting there to avalanche. So you get an avalanche of thoughts rather than an avalanche of masses and you're back onto avalanches again.

All right. When you clear a command, you are asking for the preclear to understand what you are doing, even though you have a dim idea that he understands what you're doing. Never demand of him the total understanding of what you're doing. He's incapable of it in the first place. Demanding that he clear a command satisfactorily to you so that he understands totally what you're doing, of course, is you just being pedantic. You're just stressing it too much because he couldn't understand all that you're doing anyhow, even if you and he were auditors of equal training and skill and intelligence.

Why?

Because you're auditing his case without his blind spots.

So you always understand more about his case than he understands about it himself. Hence auditing occurs. Now, just like everybody knows what's wrong with everybody else in the world and never notices what's wrong with themselves, this is a standard manifestation.

All right. So far so good. I've beaten this clearing a command to death. I don't want any one of you in giving a command or doing anything like this to make an error with it because it actually bungles the understanding of the whole processing session that follows. A bungled clearing of commands.

And I don't want you clearing a command and then going for the next twenty-five hours on the same preclear without ever clearing it again. Oh, no. Didn't you ever expect the fellow to change his mind?

And if the fellow's cogniting on the meaning of these words as you go along, I don't want to catch you clearing the command. You see how that works out? Because you're invalidating his cognitions, aren't you? He says he's gotten four cognitions on what help really means in the past fifteen commands, so you clear the command. He'll just throw further dependence on you. That's all he will do, or get mad at you.

Auditing is always a matter of judgment and as I've told old-time auditors, Dianeticists, Scientologists alike, auditing is what you can get away with. It's really a very fine definition and the best or standard procedures are the things you're most likely to get away with - things you're most likely to get away with. And if you did them all perfectly you would get away with all of them because they're get-away-able with.

But if you do something a little bit off the side and get away with it, fine, fine. Just don't be so puzzled when you don't get away with it next time. The only way you can be wrong is not to get away with it. See? That's the only way you can be wrong. So

you could probably clear a command in all the ways I have told you not to on some preclear who's very complacent and get away with all of them. Be all right.

But certain conditions would be present, which would be quite amazing as conditions. And these conditions would be that the preclear was full of sweetness and light and understanding and didn't have any real objection to auditors or auditing and could be run on Descriptive Processing. So by clearing the command you clear the preclear's ideas on the subject of „*help*" and the preclear would clear on the subject of „*help.*" See? Person was already a Clear but you, of course, could get away with it. You get the idea?

Now, what we try to teach you here is what you can expect to get away with on all preclears. And then if you go ahead when you're auditing somebody and get away with something else, why, that's fine. Two things to remember: good auditing is what you can always get away with on all preclears. But that doesn't mean that on some preclear you can't get away with something. Hence you can omit clearing a command on some preclears. But then don't be amazed to get your next preclear and find nothing happening. He absolutely had to have commands cleared. You never got anyplace until you did.

All right. Now, clearing a command, then, goes for any and every command you're going to utter and every word of the command. And you clear it once with the end goal of simply getting some understanding between yourself and the preclear what it's all about. You're not trying to make a perfect command.

But sometimes you'll have to rephrase a command. Trying to run Havingness on somebody once in England - they had been brought up in some part of England - they evidently had no such word as have. As near as we could find out, the person from that day to this had just never had any connection with „*had*" or „*have*" except being gypped, and to possess something meant to take it. And Havingness had to be run with the word „*take.*" Worked perfectly well with the word „*take.*"

Now, we take Spanish. Spanish has no word for „*have.*" Really, there is no clear, clean word for „*have.*" There's tener which is again this word „*take.*" Isn't that fascinating? So if you run it in Spanish, why, you've got yourself a similar problem. But the command must communicate. The command must communicate.

Now, you could run a command in gibberish. Just draw up a set of new artificial symbols and get an agreement on which one meant what and run the command with those, too. You know you could do that. You could run them nonverbal. You say to somebody, „*When I do this (tap, tap, tap) that means 'walk.' Got it? When I do this, that means 'wall.' Got it? When I point like this, that means 'you.' Got it?*" See, and you could exchange this even in writing. See, and get this all straightened out so that you could point at him, make a walk symbol and a wall symbol and you would have said, „*You walk over to that wall,*" and that would be clearing a command.

Sometimes you audit somebody who is unconscious or cannot talk; you think they're unconscious until you find out that you have a command system available. „*When you press my hand once, that means 'yes.' When you press it twice that means 'no.' Do you understand*

that? Good. Now, I'm going to ask you a series of questions and when you press my hand once that means 'yes' and when you press it twice that means 'no.'"

Person been lying in a coma for three weeks (this is an actual case, by the way, I'm giving you) and they take hold of your hand, you know - I mean you pull their hand up to a point. First they're very, very feeble since they have no confidence in the communication. And then you ask them, „*Are you in pain?*" You know? And they eventually flip, flip, „*No.*" Next thing you know you're in communication with this person with a fractured skull that will never talk again or walk again and is just slowly dying and so forth.

About the time they merely - they brought them up the communication line to a point of talking to you, why, generally if you're doing this in the hospital, the medical doctor will kick you out and so forth. And if you've told them as somebody did in some quarter of the world that you will stay with them until they get well or made some such outrageous promise, they'll kick the bucket. It's a betrayal, you see, betrayal on the help line.

You can expect, one, a medico to object to any improvement in the case and - that's right, not occasioned by himself - which is one of the help factors; and, two, a patient to get worse when any betrayal of promise is effected by the auditor. These are standard data.

But within those limits your establishment of communication can be very simple; it can be tactile, it can be anything. Someday you're going to audit a blind person who is also deaf and dumb or something like that. And you'll say, „*How in the name of God...*" Well, listen, think of it in this framework and you've got it: „*How do I clear the command?*" And you think of it in that framework, you will clear the command and the next thing you know...

I've audited people in as bad a shape as that. Totally paralyzed, couldn't do anything. Had one fellow, one time, who could wiggle one eye. And I got a yes and no system going and then audited him with yes and no verbal questions. You know, just on the flick of one eye. Pretty wild. Almost - I found out somebody was abusing this person, by the way, and from one session to the next the person had gotten a little worse. And I asked if somebody had abused him in the intervening period and by adroitly phrasing my own questions got the story of exactly what happened, turned around to the male nurse, chewed him out, kicked him in the shins, so to speak, verbally, and he was in a state of shock. It really put him in a horrible state of shock because he didn't know how I could possibly be communicating with this person. Or how this person could possibly have told upon him. And he went into terror, sort of thing.

After that I'd come in the door, he'd stand back and he'd just kind of go white.

But all this comes under the heading of simply clearing a command. If you clear a command well, you guarantee that you're in communication with the preclear.

All right. Let's take up here in the next few minutes here, continuing on with this, the exact application of the TRs to a training activity. Now, the TRs do help a training activity simply by installing an agreed-upon discipline, don't they? And that would be

enough use for them and after you'd used them for that, why, then you wouldn't bother with them anymore in auditing. Would you?

I saw some people yesterday, day before yesterday, particularly, clearing commands, pardon me, checking out with an E-Meter. Saw these people checking out with an E-Meter and they didn't think the TRs had anything to do with it. *„Well, actually, it wasn't an auditing session by definition so therefore the TRs didn't apply."* Well, that unfortunately is beyond criticism. But the abandonment of the TRs when we get in so deep as choosing a process and opening a session and clearing a command - abandoning them then - that is actually sort of abandoning any hopes for the session.

The first and foremost TR that goes to pieces is confrontingness. It's the basic, associated with all TRs, TR. It is the basic TR that permeates all TRs. You can normally tell when your TRs are going to pieces when you are no longer confronting your preclear. When you are.

Now, holding a body stiffly in a chair in a certain position is only uncomfortable if the body is not at ease. So if you've - suddenly catch yourself winding yourself around the chair legs and up through the back or something like that, ask yourself, *„What's going on here? What am I doing?"* And you could normally find out that the preclear has done something that annoyed you in the last minute or so.

Now, keeping yourself going on the subject of the TR is no trick but you have to do it all the time. It isn't something that the ACC builds in and then runs on automatic from there on out, don't you see? We're just showing you that you can do it. Now, you have to take over from there and prove to yourself that you can do it too. It actually makes very easy auditing. And familiarity with auditing improves or should improve your ability to follow the TRs. And as your familiarity with actual auditing increases, your facility in following the TRs should improve and you should find them easier and easier to follow the longer and longer that you audit.

I used to make a practice of - well, some time ago I made a practice of exactly - auditing exactly by the TRs for a while. You see? I mean, I just did everything exactly according to Hoyle - exactly, right on the button - didn't vary a hair. And I found out I could do it hour after hour and it actually seemed to be a little easier to do it hour after hour, and as the hours followed, the easier it got. I decided in that one case to do exactly what I told others to do and see if it killed me, you know? It didn't.

The only time I seem to get sloppy these days is when I'm trying to find something on an E-Meter. And then I find that invalidation has its role because a person will resent like mad an invalidation on a sore button. They'll really react if you invalidate them a little bit or - when I say invalidate, interpret it as challenge - if you challenge one of these lovely betrayal buttons, you know. You can just watch the behavior of the needle. You can't make the needle do anything, you can't make the meter do anything. You say, *„Well, what do you think would betray you if you entered in upon it in this lifetime? What would betray you?"*

„Oh, schoolteachers, you know, schoolteachers."

We still don't get much reaction. If we wanted to confirm their reaction, we could make some offbeat remark - remember we're not auditing, we're diagnosing here - offbeat remark like, *„Oh, I don't know. Schoolteachers don't seem to be very vicious. Do you - really, do you think they are?"* Watch that needle, brother! If that's a hot button it'll go down about fifteen dials, you see? Then patch up your ARC break, pat him on the head and run Help on teachers and you've got it made. See?

But if he didn't resent it, if he giggled and said, *„Well, I guess you're right,"* come off of it. It's no importance, no importance to anybody.

Now, I'm going to mention right here and now and then talk about it considerably in the next lecture: goals and PT problem or CCH 0. Now, CCH 0 includes many other things than goals and the PT problem but CCH 0 has in it two processes: one is a process known as goals and the other is a process known as PT problem.

Now, the goals process is not as important as you might believe but to set up some kind of a goal for the future is to get the preclear more able to look into the future and is a little therapeutic trick that you must never neglect in going by. It'll help a session enormously. A person can actually sit in an auditing chair for twenty-five hours with no goals and arrive with none either. He starts with no goals and arrives with no accomplishments. You say, *„Did you reach anything that - did you attain anything in this auditing session?"*

And he says, *„No."*

And you say, *„Well, why don't you think you attained anything on it?"*

And he said, *„Well, I just - just - it just didn't do very much for me."*

What's wrong? Well, you didn't set any goals at the beginning, goals that could be reached.

Of course, you let him set the goals that he wants. And you keep talking about it and if his goals seem too wide and too outrageous to you, you particularly try to find some little tiny goal that you've got some chance of making in this session. Perfectly all right for him to say, *„Well, I will - I've got the goal of being cleared."* Naturally. But let's also get a goal for this session, huh? And then let's bang his head in at the end of the session to make him realize he achieved it. And do you know that this is a method of moving the guy on the auditing time track?

Now, there are those here who have heard me speak of this before, but an auditing time track is a different time track than the physical universe time track. Things happen much more rapidly and it's vis-÷-vis - thetan versus thetan, you see - and it has the potential of making a brand-new universe all by itself.

So if you don't haul him up that time track bodily you're going to be in trouble. So one of the reasons you use goals is to haul him along on the auditing time track, which otherwise would have no motion to it.

So make him set something that he can attain in this session and at the end of it don't think you're through with CCH 0. Nearly everybody to date is making this error. They

think CCH 0 is ended in its entirety at the beginning of the session and you never further pay any attention to it of any kind whatsoever. Very erroneous. *„What goal could you have for this session?" „What goal could you have for this intensive?" „What goal could you have for this course?"* are each of them legitimate questions and probably all should be asked.

But you should keep hammering on this goal for this session until he gets some kind of a little idea. *„Well, I'd..."* He tells you, well, he'd like to rule earth or something of the sort. But get it down to a point of where he finally says, *„Well, I've got a little pain in this eye and I'd like to get rid of it."* That's certainly minute enough. You sure can - for sure do that in that one session.

„And I've been feeling sort of dopey lately. Goal for this session, maybe, yeah, get rid of that."

Boy, those are real goals. You see? I mean, you could do something with goals of that character.

Now, you give away all of your golden accomplishment when you never mention it again. Here you had the chance to triumph, to crow, to come over him, to say, *„Look! Look what I did for you; I've helped you, you've got to admit it."* You see? You never again ask him about it. He said he'd like to get rid of the little pain in his eye, he said kind of pathetically. And you audit him for two, three, four, five hours for that day, whatever it was, and then you never collected your candy.

It's quite interesting to ask a preclear at the end of the session, *„Well, how's the pain in the eye now?"* At the risk of its returning you can ask him. Go ahead. If it's going to return that easy, it's unstable anyhow. See, don't worry about getting - get him to get the somatic back. He might get it back just a little bit, restimulate the session, you know. We don't care, it'll go. If you've gotten rid of it once it'll go.

All right. You say, *„How's that pain in your eye now?"*

And it's very interesting to see a preclear just go blank. *„Pain in my eye? Pain in my eye? This eye? Pain in my eye? My eye? Oooh, oh-ho, oh yeah! You mean the... Yeah, it's gone."*

You say, *„Well, we accomplished that little goal. Now how about feeling tired, feeling tired all the time and upset all the time? How do you feel about that now?"*

„Tired, tired, tired, tired, upset. Tired, upset. Well, I don't feel tired and upset. Are you trying to invalidate me or something?"

„Well," you'd say, *„well, I guess we reached that goal, didn't we?"*

So when you set up these little goals, make sure that they're real, attainable, and then collect your candy. Got it?

Now, I actually take some of these never-can-change-me preclears and bang their heads in to get them up the Effect Scale or get them down. I don't care which. When they start telling me hour after hour that I'm having no effect on them, I know their main interest is not having any effect made on themselves. There's two way to convince them: that they can be successfully immune to all effect or to convince them that you have had an effect upon them or something can change them. I always choose the latter.

So, we take this thing about goals and we run it, mildly, hardly a process at all. We do set up something that finitely could be reached and then we make sure he reaches it. And very often I make people look at pictures before the session and after the session and ask them if they're any brighter. And they say they don't know; I return them to the beginning of the session and have them look at the picture as it looked at the beginning of the session. And then take - later session and have the picture as it looks now. And they say grumpily, *„Well, yes, it is much more bright and solid."*

And I say, *„Thank you very much. I guess we've attained that, haven't we?"*

You must remember something. The auditor is the god of that time track. And if he won't take responsibility for hauling the preclear along the auditing time track, completely disassociated from any other time track, if he won't take the responsibility for hauling the preclear along it, why, he very often leaves the preclear stuck in session.

As far as problems are concerned, the auditing command that we use here is, *„What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"* And we very arduously dredge up a problem and make sure that there's no slightest chance that a present time problem is in our road when we're auditing the preclear. Now, some of you are going to get into that almost at once. So I have mentioned these two things so as to give you a little bit of a kickoff in that direction. Okay?

I understand you're doing very well and your Instructors are doing fine and that everything is going along swimmingly and that somebody might even get out of the TRs someday.

So, thank you.

[End of lecture.]