

## **BEGINNING AND ENDING SESSION - GAINING PC'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE SESSION**

A lecture given on 17 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Well, here we are, fourth lecture, 20th ACC, July 17, 1958. Just like that.

And you are many days deep now into becoming even more expert than you already were, seeing as how you were already expert auditors. There's no doubt about your expertness. You've got a tremendous grasp of the subject. You have a good grip on your preclear. You've got the whole thing taped. The data that you want to get at, all of these things, you've got it just squared away and all you have to learn now is Scientology and how to audit. So, let's go.

Now, as we look over your current processing we discover that you are - the furthest up along the line are doing short sessions. Right? And you undoubtedly now, at this time, know all there is to know about a short session - except how to begin it and end it.

If you never learn anything else, please learn to start and end sessions. There are people walking around the world to this very day who had a session which wasn't begun, which continued in 1950 and nobody has ended yet.

You think you're just doing drills. You can't just do a drill in Scientology without having something happen. Now, your TRs prove this. Every once in a while somebody goes halfway through a Comm Course, comes rushing up to the Instructor and says, *„My case has just cracked up in flinders and I see where I'm going And so on,“* or *„My student, while I was coaching him, got this tremendous picture and he knows that's the most significant thing in his whole life and it's just blown and I feel wonderful,“* and so forth, *„and we're really auditing!“* No, but you can't go through the motions of auditing if you do it well and properly without something happening. It can't be done.

If there's nothing happening, you haven't clipped the PT problem and the person isn't in-session; he isn't in the room. He isn't on the auditing time track, he's on the physical universe time track. So you really hadn't begun a session yet. Hm? So beginning a session is a gradient-scale proposition. That you say, „*Beginning of session*,“ does not begin a session, but it is necessary to indicate that point from which, on a gradient scale, a session will commence. You see that? You've signified that a session is going to begin and as far as you're concerned, it has begun.

Now, you take CCH 0, the remainder of CCH 0, and make sure that it also has begun for the preclear. It's quite vital to have it begin for the preclear as well as for the auditor. The preclear is part of an auditing session. I hate to have to stress this fact, but he is many times overlooked.

Now, as you come up the line... I'm being sarcastic this afternoon, aren't I? I'm being mean, sarcastic, cynical. But there is no subject (on which a person who has attempted to teach - this sort of thing) quite like beginning, ending sessions to make an Instructor cynical and sarcastic.

You go into an auditing room, you say, „*Well, he understands he's going to be audited and I understand that I'm going to audit him and why say anything else about it?*“ You walk out of the auditing room at the end of the session and walk down the street, not having ended the session, and every silly comment you, the auditor, are making to your friend is still an auditor's statement to the preclear. And so for the next two, three hours till he realizes the session is over, you're evaluating for the preclear like mad. You say, „*It is a nice day.*“ You've evaluated for the preclear if he's still in-session. So get him out of session.

One of the ways not to finish a session is to leave him parked on the track somewhere. Get him back in some past life in the Roman Empire where he's busy being beaten by thousands of slaves or something of the sort and say, „*Well, time is up. That's end of session now. Sorry old boy, that's end of session.*“ And he says, „*Hm?*“

And you get up and ... Can happen. Can happen.

Now, HGC auditors are probably the - undoubtedly the best-trained auditors there are. They get training, coaching, supervision all the way along the line. I doubt seriously that they could be paid enough for what they do. I doubt that. I really do. Because the organization is what it is and because it is going forward, they really don't get paid anywhere near enough. Pay has, with perhaps a few small exceptions, pay has very, very little to do with working as an HGC auditor. Just as pay has very little to do, really, with what I'm doing.

Every once in a while people see me dragging some money out of the organization, you know, a great big cube block of money in one way or the other, and so on. And they say, „*Boy,*“ you know. And then they look around a little bit later and see that we own a new building or we're trying to get some money together for an evacuation center or something like that. And that's all gone, you know. And I'm looking around for money to buy the new baby some new shoes or something like that. And they think, „*Well, what did he do with all that money he had last week?*“ Well, that's already ex-

pended into, back into Scientology one way or the other. Sometimes, perhaps, not economically, but certainly expended.

Now if money was everything, if money was everything and an auditor's skill was determined by the amount of money he received for his services, why, obviously the best auditor in the world would be Menninger.

Audience: Yeah.

That's right, isn't it?

Audience: Sure.

If you follow out this *reductio ad absurdum*, why, you get to some absurd answer like that. The Menninger clinic is one of the better con games going on at this time. They have even a saying in his hometown: What does he do with patients? Well, he keeps them in his place until all their money runs out and then he shifts them across the river to the state institution. Now, that's what they say in his own hometown. That's what they say in his state and this is true. These people operate totally on the ninth dynamic, the buck. And they don't get very far. They don't get very far.

Well, it's all right to make some money providing the money isn't made pointlessly. Money made for its own sake causes revolutions known as socialist states and that sort of thing. Money made for its own sake perhaps is a game, perhaps it's all right, and so on, but it's one of these very thin purposes that easily blows up.

Now, completely aside from the money involved, every now and then a preclear is startled by having the organization insist that he pay something. You know? Every once in a while. And now and then somebody is very startled to have his money handed back to him. Equally startling. Almost anything that happens with regard to money is startling evidently.

We just went down - tremendous thing has just happened here in the last few weeks. Fernando went down to Cuba, handled a case down there where the woman wasn't going to live another two days, something like that, brought her back to life, put her in some kind of order. Found the whole family was psychotic. He was actually in action in the middle of a very psychotic sphere. And when he had helped, they of course went straight over to destroy and they made all sorts of trouble for him. They tried to throw him in jail because he wouldn't stay there for the rest of his life and audit this person.

We had followed through our bargain; we had saved the person's life; the person was now alive. This was much to the surprise of the medicos who were in attendance on the case. But these people became very brutal when they realized he was not going to stay there forever and money didn't have very much to do with it. They had a sort of a slavery complex and they had the example of Castro who has captured some forty-three, I think, American servicemen and spirited them away into the hills. So they thought they could spirit away an HGC auditor similarly.

Well, instead of them spiriting him away, I spirited him away and he arrived in another port and outside of Cuba last night, which was a great relief to all of us here.

Now, this is an example of money. In the first place, not a - a great deal more money than was offered, much more money in avalanches, would not have compensated the organization for the loss of Fernando's services for more than a few weeks. You see? I mean, they could go on and say, „*Well, we'll give the organization a thousand dollars a week for the next fifteen years just for Fernando to stay here,*“ or something like that and we would have skipped the whole deal. See? That's not the operation. It's getting the job done.

You need enough money to get the job done. If you don't concentrate on it a little bit, you very often find yourself not getting the job done because you're too short of money. So money does have a relative value with regard to getting the job done. In the HGC, auditors are not paid anywhere near what they are worth. That's very, very true. I don't think anybody in the organization is paid what he's worth, just by common industrial standards. You know? Our hope, someday, that they may be - there's every hope of this - their income increases and so on. And the income which they make is what the organization makes.

But that has very, very little to do with the skill beyond this - beyond this: you could not run, even if you wanted to and even if everybody on staff were willing to work for nothing and subsist on air and mock up their chow, you couldn't run in this society at this time a free service - could not be done. You must always remember that in your own practice.

You - the trouble you will have will be the people who are riding the gravy boat down the stream, because they're not helping you and there's no cross flow of help. The help is all one way and it gets stuck in that direction.

So somebody - people have to be charged something before they can be helped. I remember vividly many years ago having to cure a fellow of his love of money before I could cure him of his stammering. I had to cure him of his love of money so he'd pay something to have his stammering cured. That really took some doing. I made him give me a five-hundred-dollar check to handle his stammering and when his stammering was all over and he was all set and so forth, I gave him back his check. I wasn't interested in his check - and he started stammering.

Interesting experiment, isn't it? We understand it much better now. I couldn't quite make head nor tails of it at that time. But that's more or less what it amounted to. Right? Well, all this adds up to is, good or bad, your preclear must be willing to contribute something to the session. Money, attention, presence, so on.

Well, when your preclear is busy contributing heavily to the physical universe on terms of a present time problem he, of course, is contributing very little to the session. And therefore, he will get angry at you because the help factor is upset. He can't help you run him, so therefore he is more likely to blow session and get angry with you. Do you see? This two-way help flow is very badly upset where the preclear is really not contributing to a session.

A preclear himself must contribute to some degree to a session. Now, this becomes difficult when the family brings somebody in to the HGC who himself does not want what has been purchased for him. Now, he himself hasn't paid for it, has he? He is

being helped already by the family and now the auditor comes along and starts to help him. Well, in such a case you run immediately into help before the session is even begun. And actually trying to audit anything before you get up to help becomes very difficult because the first thing you've got to solve in the case is the contribution of the pre-clear to the auditing session. And that contribution has to be real, it has to be actual.

The first way, however, of enlisting this in the gradient scale after you start a session - of enlisting this contribution and this aid - is by alignment of goals. Now, if he will simply contribute a goal to the session, you see, you have him helping a little bit.

Now, if his goal is in line with his PT problem, you can get him to contribute his PT problem to the session. And of course, everybody knows problems are valuable - very often quite a sacrifice on his part to give up a problem. But again, this is a contribution. It's offered information, isn't it? One of the first things you've got to get a pre-clear to do, then, is contribute to the session as soon after it begins as possible.

Now, if you're on an obsessed „*got to help everybody*“ - „*can't be helped*,“ you will refuse his contributions and you never get a session running. This seem clear to you? Seem reasonable? Hm? His presence is a contribution. If he can contribute his presence and then contribute his attention and then contribute some information, why, you're off to a good start. But he's got to give this session something.

Now, he can't give the session anything in terms of money after you have arranged for the auditing. That's over and done; he's already made a contribution. You see? But we're talking now about the beginning of session.

Now, your trick from there on is to increase his willingness to contribute to the session. And if he could be persuaded to totally contribute to the session, give himself all the way up to the session, you would then be over the total humps of his case.

In other words, theoretically all you'd have to do is expertly begin a session. And if you expertly began it and carried it forward increasing his contribution all the way - in other words, going on beginning it and keeping it better and better and better, always an upgrade of beginningness, you know; this session is beginning, beginning, beginning, it's better begun, it's much better begun, it's much better begun - you'd wind up with a Clear. You'd never run Help or Step 6 or anything else. It's theoretical, you understand. You get him to contribute more and more and more.

Now, as you get him to contribute to the session, so you might be able to get him to contribute to the personal concerns of the organization. You might be able to get him to contribute to the third dynamic situation in the world at large. You might be able to get him to contribute here, there. And the more you can get him to contribute, theoretically - willingly, you understand - why, the more he can receive. You've got a two-way flow going here.

Now, when you find somebody who is totally obsessed on „*got to help others*“ - „*can't be helped for self*“ - if he's totally obsessed along this line, he's already plowed in and he doesn't begin sessions well at all. And there your expertness is tremendously required.

But one of the ways to do it and one of the ways to handle this situation exactly parallels a case of a little child - very acquainted with this little child seeing as how it's my little child. And the only reason I'm ringing this in is it's just to make it perhaps a little clearer to you about this sort of thing.

This little kid, very sweet little kid, very helpful and very bright, nevertheless had an awful obsession about help: could not be helped. Still a baby falling around on the floor, you offer this little kid a pair of shoes, try to put his booties on it, you know, and rrrrrhhh. You know? Try to give it its cereal, you know, and bluyoow, spit it out. No, I'll do it myself. This sort of a thing, you know.

And if you let the little kid do it herself, why, she'd eventually get into the groove and eat. You know? But if there was anything direct in offered help... I've seen this little kid fall down on the floor, cry, sob, go into tantrums and so forth because somebody was trying to give her an apple. Get the idea? Here was an obsessed help outflow to such a degree that there was no help inflow possible. It was a bad situation, very bad situation because nobody could do anything for this little girl. Undoubtedly it just got through having a rough time with it in the last life, you know? Everything else very sweet, very nice and so forth. But just try to help her just once...

And her nanny and others around the house were getting very baffled as to what they did about this one. Couldn't dress her, yet she liked to wear nice clothes. She'd say, „*Give me some of that jam.*“ Her nurse would start to give her some jam and boom! But the child asked for the jam. You see? Sometimes it would go this way, „*Give me some jam; no, put it on a cracker, not on bread.*“ Nanny going right along, put it on a cracker, not on bread, try to give it to the child, the child would roll up in a ball and scream. This is a baffling situation, isn't it? Of course, it's just a little baby, only about two and a half, three.

What do you do? What do you do about something like this?

Well, she had a papa that knew something about preclears and met one or two in his day. So I taught the child to do some helpful things - no matter how difficult it was to teach the child to do these helpful things - more or less got around to it - which was simply, lay out my clothes. It goes much faster to get the clothes out myself, you know, but I never let the little girl show up without persuading her to help me. She could no more than shove her nose in the door than - help me. See? Get me this. Get me that. Very good at it too, you know, very accurate. Better than the older children.

Work herself to death. You know? Go upstairs and get me a pack of cigarettes. Go in the kitchen and get me an ashtray. Always rush off, come back with it, you know. Run around with her tongue hanging out. You know, just zip, zip, flash, flash. Open drawers, get them all squared away.

Now, at first the child would be laying out some clothes; the child had to lay out all of the clothes. No assistance whatsoever could be given. You couldn't even indicate the right drawer without terrifically upsetting the child, see. Couldn't possibly do it.

And finally, just this morning, my man was laying out a shirt and the little girl came in, got the shirt out before he could put his hands on it, put it over on the bed, started

taking pins out of this shirt. Little girl started taking pins out of the shirt. It's a rather risky proposition, both for the little girl and for the fellow who is going to put on this shirt. The man came over and said, „*Let me show you how to take the pins out.*“ Little girl said, „*Okay.*“ And he said, „*Now,*“ he says, „*you put the pins over on the table as fast as we take them out.*“ They took all the pins out of the shirt and she passed over into his hands quite happily. Ah, this is an interesting change. It's an interesting change.

Little girl is very calm. I haven't seen her go into a tantrum now for weeks.

All I did was set about in the physical universe to work out this obsessive help out-flow. See? I just set it up to work it out, completely aside from the fact the little girl was a friend of mine.

All right, now let's look this over. In spite of the fact it's always a tremendous pleasure for a father to talk about his children, I have told you that with malice aforethought. I've told you that there were more ways of getting a preclear into session than there are included in

the pat processes. Now, this is something. This is something. If you can understand this in this frame of reference, these uncrackable preclears become crackable. Easily.

So when you begin a session and somebody seems rather diffident, your preclear seems rather diffident, rather unwilling, somehow or another, even if it takes hours, you've got to get him to contribute to that session. And as long as he doesn't contribute to the session, there's no session there.

So a session could be defined as that period of time and that activity set up by an auditor and agreed and contributed to by a preclear. And then you have a session. And only with that definition do you have a session.

Somebody sitting in a chair answering questions may or may not have agreed to and may or may not be contributing to that period of time and that activity. The appearance is that they are contributing. But you, understanding people by yourself, which is the greatest human failing there is, know that you would contribute to the session. So you say, naturally the preclear is contributing to the session. Not at all true. And when you start auditing a machine and you start auditing a bunch of circuits - his school valence whereby he sits in the chair just apathetically and contributes nothing - you can be auditing a host of things besides the preclear. No, it's the preclear who must contribute to the session. It's the preclear who must agree to the session.

I don't try to teach people by rote. I invite their understanding of the principles involved. It's occasionally very upsetting to an Instructor in the Academy when I scant and apparently make light of a drill and rather heavily stress the principle underlying the drill, and then tell the person that if they execute the principle they've executed the drill. Because the Instructor very often finds somebody who is perfectly willing to use this as a total excuse not to do the drill or understand the principle. But I don't admit that. I never have admitted it. I have success in teaching ordinarily because I don't worry too much about this thing.

There is no reason to hold back an understanding of a subject if it exists any more than there is a reason to invent an understanding of a subject which doesn't exist. They're equally dishonest.

What is the modus operandi back of CCH 0? It's agreement and contribution of the preclear to the session. How many steps could you put in CCH 0 to accomplish that fact? You could either put one or a thousand.

Now, CCH 0 in its technical write-up is composed of those we have found most effective in beginning a session. They are, as from our viewpoint, the important points. But do you know that they can be done with total lack of effect? It takes this additional understanding of help.

Do you know that Help itself came into being last fall when I wrote the opening guns of a book to be called „*The HCA Student Manual*,“ which was never published. There are reasons why it was never published, very few of them having to do with its text.

Its text is still complete as far as a text for a book is concerned. But after a great deal of this text had been assembled I got hold of the needful write-ups which must now adhere the book, you know, and make it consecutive. And I did several of them. And then I did this first one and it was on the subject of auditing. It has never seen the light of day. It's never even been an HCO Bulletin or a PAB and yet it is the beginning of clearing, because I had to sit

down now face to face and analyze what we were doing when we were auditing. And nowhere in the subject do you find a dissertation on exactly what auditing is. It's always been understood. We've always understood what it was.

And the only thing I could boil it down to was help. I remembered vividly in an early ACC we had a couple of students who were wasting help; and I had a big conversation about this one day, about what were these people doing there? If they didn't want to learn, if they didn't want to do anything for anybody and if they didn't want to get any better, why were they there? This was very puzzling. And we went over this and it dawned on me. I said, „*Well, they're wasting help. They must be wasting help. This is the most help there is, in their minds, anywhere in the world so they're here to waste it.*“ It proved to be true, proved to be true. It was true of both of these people.

Well, don't think if anybody could get as far as an ACC with this consideration, don't think you won't get it in the auditing chair. There it is.

So help, obsessive help, leads to obsessive resistance to being helped. So people who are obsessively helping are usually obsessively resisting being helped. And this tells you that some fellow could be very, very helpful, very, very helpful and die rather than be helped. He's a fascinating character to get in an auditing chair. He's a fascinating one.

Some people believe that Scientologists are harder to audit than people on the street. This isn't true. It's become very untrue, particularly since clearing began to be accomplished rather easily. But if they ever were, it was because we had more people in Scientology who were obsessively helping, you know. And this unwillingness to receive



help would then get in our road as far as auditing them was concerned. This didn't make them any less - this is no crime.

But understanding this principle will make a session take place with people you have never been able to make a session click with before. This analysis of what we were doing when we were auditing, resulting in this idea of „*we were helping*“ in that first essay, was the genus of this help.

Oh, yes, we've known about help and alienists have known about help and witch doctors have known about help. And they very often knew that a mental patient would occasionally be in the middle of an automobile accident or something of this sort and be called upon to help and after that wouldn't be insane anymore, and so on. They also knew eighty thousand other things. You get the idea? There's no evaluation of importance there. That was just one other thing.

But here it showed up. And the anatomy of it showed up and the primary barrier to widespread clearing was dropped. This was sufficiently exciting that the HCA Manual became forgotten. Its preface led to such a necessity to analyze everything, in all directions all over again, that it practically scrapped the book. Without ever changing any of the basic principles of Scientology, it nevertheless changed our viewpoint on a great many things, and the first thing it changed our viewpoint on was getting that preclear into session.

Somebody asked me the other day what's happened to several versions of running Help? Well, nothing's happened to them. They're still there. Wasting help, getting somebody to waste help, of course, is the lowest rung that you can get on verbal auditing. Wasting help. Get somebody to waste help in brackets. You very often do a great deal for the case by wasting help in brackets.

But it's not stressed because it's not necessary. It isn't a vital process. It just happens to be one of the lower rungs of the whole subject.

In nonverbal auditing there is a lower rung - a doingness. If you just get this fellow to contribute to the session, if you just get him to contribute his time, if you get him to be willing to contribute his ideas, if you get him willing to contribute his present time problems or his various concerns to the session, he's helping. Isn't he? And if you do that, knowing you're trying to make him help, you'll be very successful in getting it done. But if you do that just because I said so and just totally on a drill, lacking the intention on the thing, it doesn't become as workable.

You're willing to help him. This we agree or you wouldn't sit down in the auditing chair. But is he willing to help you? If he's unwilling to help you, you've had it.

This was the block over which Sigmund Freud stumbled and fell flat on his face. Sigmund Freud was only interested in himself, his associates and practitioners helping patients and they spun themselves in on it. You should read his essays on the subject and then that last very heartbroken one, Interminable Psychoanalysis. It goes on forever. Sure it'll go on forever. They create a dependency on the analyst by obsessive help and, of course, they make a patient less and less able to be helped.

Hence you get this factor of evaluation. You look right in our Auditor's Code and you'll find several things they needed desperately in psychoanalysis. Desperately. If you just took the Auditor's Code and planted it over to psychoanalysis, they would probably get a lot of things done they never dreamed possible, if they'd just follow that Auditor's Code. You know, we gave them no other information than the Auditor's Code. See, they'd get a tremendous number of things done, perhaps.

But their help goes so far as to evaluate for the preclear. They're always looking for something on the case so that then they can evaluate it for the patients. See? They look for something so they can then sum it up and give it to them. But they look for something, they discover something, the practitioner looks for it, the practitioner discovers it. You get the idea? It's the practitioner that is doing it. The practitioner is doing it and he even thinks that the patient gets well when he goes into the valence of the practitioner. He calls this transference.

Now, here's a fantastic parade of obsessive help.

Now, a drug called LSD 25 which is, we are assured, an experimental drug which is never used on anybody except patients and which the Food and Drug Administration recently informed Congress in personal letters about- when we raised hell with its continued use - they informed Congress it was only experimental and wasn't sent around or anything of the sort. Continuous articles in papers and magazines tell of the useful use of LSD 25.

Do you know why they think it's useful?

Give you an idea of how far a healing profession could go and cease to be a healing profession. They give it to nurses and interns so that they go insane so they can find out how the patient feels. And that's its use.

Now, you think I'm just pulling a joke on you or something of the sort. Truthfully, I seldom joke about these matters although some of the things sound extraordinary. And you track them down and you usually find they're the case.

Now, they go so far in helping somebody as to invent a drug that'll drive you insane so that you'll be just like them. Boy, that's really an extremity, isn't it, huh? Well, some auditors will do this and I myself very often mock up somebody's case just to study it. And you sort of pick a total copy of the case and then sit it over here someplace and look at it. That would only be bad if you didn't know you were doing it, you know? Some auditors will sit down and then pick up the somatics of the preclear. There's an interesting process goes along with this that might amuse you just as a side comment. It's „*Mock up something to find out how it works.*“ And you run this on a fellow a few times and he finds out he's being awfully silly. How could he mock it up if he didn't know how it worked? Run this on an electronics man and he goes into fits of laughter on the thing.

The fascinating part of this obsessive help is that help goes on a „*fail*“ cycle. You try like mad to help something and then you finally can see that you have failed to help it. Your original impulse of trying to help it is so strong that it carries you over beyond the time when you decided it was terminated, into assuming the identity of the thing

you couldn't help. It's sort of like pitching a cannon ball and you say, „*Well, that cannon ball is only going to go twenty-five yards,*“ when it's twenty-five yards from you, you know. So you turn your back and walk away.

You say, „*Well, it only went twenty-five yards.*“ The cannon ball hits the ground and rolls for another hundred. And you just ignore that. Soon as you start to find out this is happening you very often experience a desire to cheerfully kill whoever it was you couldn't help. And this is an extremus of help.

„*You must understand that slaughtering somebody is simply another method of giving him a kind hand. Listen, if he's so bad off that he can't be helped, the kindest thing you could do would be to let him go get another body and try all over again. Isn't it?*“ I mean, that's the basic rationale that goes on below the surface of reason. Perfectly good rationale. „*Life is never being so kind as when it is being terribly cruel.*“ Now, when you get a session going, you can go through a bunch of little monkey tricks with no intention behind it at all and wake up an hour later and find out you didn't have a session going. You know? You say, „*Well, what goals do you have for this session?*“ „*Well, I got a couple of goals for this session.*“

You say, „*Fine. Have you any present time problem?*“ (Don't even look at your meter while you do this, you know.) „*Have you any present time . . .*“

„*No, I have nothing worrying me at all.*“

„*Well, is it all right if I run such and such a process?*“

„*Oh, certainly. Certainly. It's all right if you run such and such a process.*“ „*All right. Let's run such and such a process and here's the first command. We're going to clear the command and the command is, 'What wall wouldn't you mind turning upside down?' And let's clear the command all the way through. All right, now here is the first command and 'What wall wouldn't you mind turning upside down?'*“ And he says, „*Well, so-and-so and so-and-so.*“

And we go on hour after hour after hour after hour.

Suddenly some suspicion begins to enter our sphere of awareness that this pc isn't really in-session. There's nothing happening. He isn't getting any cognitions, he isn't going anywhere, there's nothing occurring.

Now, I'm not going to say you only have yourself to blame for this because it would be a dirty trick for me to challenge everything and anybody on earth that didn't know all of these things, because that obviously took a little bit of knowingness; it took quite a while for a man to find some of it out. But after you know this I hold you totally responsible for it.

Now, here's a whole series of practitioner tricks which are simply open session tricks and have no place in the TRs or any other place. The auditor comes into session. Pc is, you know, alert, bright. Auditor says, „*Well, what do you want to get done in this session?*“ You know? And the pc says, „*I want to become an Operating Thetan.*“

The auditor says, „*Fine,*“ he says, „*well, let's get the show on the road now. We've got a goal. Now, do you have any present time problems? Good. Fine. Now, here's the first auditing command. We're going to clear this command. Now, here's the first command.*“ Get the idea? See, outflow,

outflow, outflow, punch it in, punch it in, punch it in. See? Pc sometimes goes in a hypnotic trance and gets better if told to.

Now, I'll give you a whole series of tricks to get around this type of thing. And you, doing it knowingly, never under any circumstances would fall for it otherwise, any more than I became totally dependent on a little girl coming in, you know, and doing this and that. The only thing I missed when she finally stopped doing it and so on was the fact of her company. She was very cheerful and very quiet by that time and very nice and very social. Still comes in now and then and I'm very happy to see her and so forth but it didn't become a big obsession. You get the idea? Like it had to happen from there on out.

The only liability you ever run into in using tricks of help is falling for it yourself. So know that you're doing it. Know that you're doing it. Then you'll be okay.

At the beginning of session, particularly with a very rough preclear, start inventing things for the preclear to contribute. It sounds very odd but it goes down to the point - although the auditor places the preclear and must place the preclear in the session, never lets the preclear select the place his chair is to go. Preclear goes over to the wall, gets a chair and pulls it out into the room and is about to sit down in it, and I'm auditing that preclear. If I haven't placed the preclear in that chair and haven't placed that chair there, I interrupt the preclear's action, you know, and I move the chair a little bit and say, „*All right, now, sit down.*“ And I help him into the chair.

Why? Well, it makes it to some degree my space. I've placed the person in the session. Now, this trick does not contradict the other tricks.

Now, having decided where the preclear was going to sit, if this preclear by my experience is somebody who blows up when you try to help him, I'm not above running them ragged.

„*Would you get that ashtray over there? Bring that over here? Fine. Put the window up just a little bit, would you? I think the air conditioner's on too cold.*“ You get the idea? Move them around. „*Give me a hand here and move this couch back a little bit.*“ Get the idea? I just take care of the physical environment and get it all set and polished off, and don't eventually arrive with an obsession to have a physical environment perfect before I can audit in it. You get the idea? Get the preclear to assist with this and assist with that and then get the preclear to assist with data. I just lay it right on the line. I have the preclear tell me what is to be audited here (whether I audit it or not) in such a way as, „*What are you willing to contribute to this session?*“ Get the idea? I'll go so far as to look disappointed when the preclear doesn't give me a present time problem. Maybe there is none. I ask for them. And all I ascertain is whether or not the preclear is willing to offer one. Now, this is going up against a rather rough preclear, not somebody who's pretty routine. Get them to contribute at least a PT problem or get them to contribute a confidence or an experience or something.

Somebody's going to laugh in about two seconds because they've heard me use this gag on them. Several here. I will say to them, „*If you were auditing your case, what process*

*would you use now?*“ That's a pretty weird one, huh? I don't particularly use it, but I sure get them to offer a process up.

In other words, I make them give, not me, but give that session something. Give it a lot of somethings. Get the idea? And as long as you keep them in the frame of mind that they're helping this session to keep rolling and as long as you aren't trying to steamroll them by being the only one around there who's going to help, you have gain and improvement. And that's the first and foremost thing you can know about auditing: you begin a session.

How do you begin a session? Well, you begin sessions by saying that they begin and then by doing things to get the preclear to begin them too. Get the preclear to contribute something. Get the preclear to contribute goals. Get the preclear to contribute a PT problem. Get the preclear to contribute answers, contribute explanations.

Sometimes a preclear will say something totally clear. I could make it out if I tried. I just don't put the effort into it to make it out at all. I make the preclear explain it much more fully. Get the idea? If they're not contributing very much, they're being very quiet and very withdrawn in a session, I'm liable to start getting them to beat things half to death as far as I'm concerned, exceed any understanding that anybody ever would need of anything. He started in talking about his difficulties in school and I just sit there. I just don't understand this, that's all. I make him explain it and explain it and explain it.

After a while he gets a little impatient. That's not a breakdown of ARC or anything like that. I've made him exceed his willingness to contribute understanding to this session.

And when I'm satisfied he's got it all taped to his satisfaction and anybody could understand it, even me, why, he's generally lost interest in it. And that, actually, is the technique of two-way comm. There's no more esoteric technique than that, than to get the preclear to contribute thoughts and experiences to the session. He's helping. Let him help that session. Get the idea? Some people do this so obsessively you can't get any auditing done. Well, remember to keep them doing it on your command. Don't lose grip on the control of the session. Have them contribute on your command. If they've got a whole bunch of experiences they've just got to tell you about, and you don't think they're contributing enough to the session - remember that's the other part of it: you don't think they're in there pitching hard enough... You judge this by whether or not they ever had a cognition, by whether or not they're interested, by whether or not they're getting any improvement, by whether or not the processes are biting. If these things aren't taking place then they're not contributing enough to the session. Then you can go off into two-way comm and use this sort of trick that I just gave you. You make them contribute explanations. You make them contribute experiences.

You say you have an awful time, you say, sleeping. Last night you had an awful time sleeping and you do have an awful time sleeping. Just, *„How do you suppose a thing like that could come about?‘* Perfectly sincerely, you see? *„How do you suppose a thing like that could come about?‘* Make them contribute the explanation.

And they say, „Well, when I was very young my father and mother always locked me in a closet and it was very dark.“

„Well, do you think that did it?“

„Well, it seems fairly likely. But I really don't think that did it.“

„Well, have you got a better one?“

Here we go, see? Contribution. Contribution. Contribution.

We take it for granted that the auditor is willing to contribute to the session. We have to point up that the auditor must also be willing for the preclear to contribute to the session before any auditing happens. Now, that's the entire rationale back of giving a session.

Now, the session ends by terminating the necessity of the preclear to help the auditor with explanations, answers and so forth.

Now, the fellow who writes you tremendous volumes between sessions hasn't had an end of session. You just haven't ended the session.

Every time we get a new auditor in the HGC we look for this one: whether or not he will get through the session and get the session ended in time for an auditor's conference. When he's green he very often flubs it. He can't end the session on his own timing. He has a tough time ending a session. It's actually a symptom of a green auditor. I hate to have to tell you that. The preclear has practically nothing to do with it whatsoever.

The way you end the session is to get the preclear to contribute an end of session, on your determination. And that's one of the tricks of the communication bridge. You slide in this communication bridge and get him to terminate the end of session. You see that he's in good shape, you see that he's come up rather close toward PT or - you see this - and you say, „Well, I'm going to ask you this just a few more times and then end the session. Will that be all right?“ That, „Will that be all right?“ doesn't just ask for agreement, it asks for a contribution. See? And he says, „Well, yes, yes.“

„You're sure that will be all right?“ See, he wasn't willing to contribute an end of process or an end of session. See? „You're sure that'll be all right? Well, what could I do to make it all right?“ Well, no, he isn't going to let you contribute that one. He'll say, „Well, it'll - it'll be all right. It'll be all right.“ And he'll come up the track and straighten out and so forth.

And you say, „Now, this is the last command,“ just before you give it. See „This is the last command,“ you say, and you give him the last command. Then he has contributed the end of the process.

Now, has any of this changed to any degree your viewpoint on auditing and beginning and ending sessions, hm?

Audience: Yes.

It's all very well to get it in drill. And in the final analysis the drill is right but it is only right so long as you use it with an understanding.

Now, the number of tricks you can engage in, the number of shabby, deceitful methods you can use to get a preclear to contribute himself and his time and his thinkingness and attention to a session are unlimited. And you can sail right ahead and use any of them you like any time you want to use them. And the only thing I'd say is, don't use them unnecessarily. Preclear is contributing to a session, he's in-session, he's running okay, he's perfectly willing to be audited, don't hold up the show. Get the idea? Don't put the brakes on the whole thing.

But if he isn't cogning and he isn't coming up scale and he isn't getting change no matter what you do, boy, you'd better specialize in contribution to session. You'd better start specializing in it, you'd better send him out for a Coca-Cola and you'd better let him get some air in that room and you better let him do this and make him do that and get him up there until he's really contributing. First thing you know, boy, he's just willing to be audited. You know? Might take you four or five, six sessions running somebody morning and afternoon - something like that - before you finally got him up there where he was contributing. Then you're liable to find out that you have done yourself in by making your preclear too vocal, too contributive. Now, you've got trouble shutting him down, closing the valve off.

But it's better to have that kind of trouble than no contribution. See? He's liable to sit there and want to give you the story of his life, you know, rack, rack, rack, rack, rack, rack, rack, on and on and on and on and on. And when he gets through with that there, he just remembered some bit or piece of four lives ago and rack, rack, rack, rack, rack, rack.

Well, how do you shut that off?

Well, that's your hard luck. Shut it off too abruptly, you've got an ARC break with the preclear.

One of the better ways of handling it is to now specify what you want from him. It better be something you want from him. Centralize that explanation. See? No, I want the factors that make your head ache. See? We're not too much interested in the rest of this stuff, but what do you suppose it is back of that headache? That's the thing, see? He focalizes on it and all of a sudden he's talking about auditors or doctors or practitioners.

Well, what's so bad about them, you see? Contribute something that's supposed to be bad about that. That's fine. And then you cut in there quick as a bunny and you say, „*Well, we're going all right here, though, aren't we?*“ You know? And he says, „*Oh, yes. Yes. Everything's going fine.*“ „*Well, fine. Then we're going to run this process.*“ Great haste, you see. Get in there quick.

There are ways to shutting people off without their ever finding out about it.

The only thing I could add to this beginning and ending of session is simply this: the goals of the auditor and the goals of the preclear must have some agreement or parallelism. And where the auditor has the goal of survive and the preclear has the goal of succumb, you never get any auditing done. The preclear may be obsessed with the idea of contributing his death as his help in this session.

I've gone so far as to describe ways and means by which my auditing could kill somebody that had this other opposite pitch. You'd be surprised the tremendous absorption and interest that was entered into the whole thing. Up to that time there was no interest whatsoever. We just discussed ways and means of knocking somebody off. And you'd think it would be a gag conversation, but it isn't at all. The preclear takes it terribly seriously.

You see that he isn't getting better, that he keeps complaining about getting worse. Well, just assume as your stable datum that he's trying to succumb while you're trying to get him to survive. You're going this way and he's going that-a-way. And the thing to do about that is to get him to contribute a few succumbs verbally until he's willing to buy your goal of survive.

Don't ever make that mistake. When that mistake is made the auditor pays for it very dearly because his goal is flouted. It never succeeds. When a preclear is bound and determined that you're supposed to kill him, you've had it, unless you change his mind on that subject.

So, that's the first thing you do in goals, and by the way, one of the reasons why goals is still so prominent in CCH 0 and really for no other reason than that - and contribution.

Understand a little more about this now?

Audience: Yes.

All right.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]