

COURSE PROCEDURE OUTLINED - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on 16 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

Male voice: I ask them, „*What's help?*“ They say, „*Well, help is assistance.*“

Mm-hm.

Male voice: Or they say, „*Help is aid.*“

Mm-hm.

Male voice: Well, from my viewpoint they're substituting one noise for another. And I usually do ask them to explain that a little bit, rather than just taking that as such. Not to have them change it but just to have them qualify it so I have a little better idea of what they're talking about.

Well now, you've got this - you've got this, is, you may not be satisfied with their definition. But if you do the same thing a few auditing commands later, it'll gradually sink into their heads when you've done this a few auditing commands later that you're not satisfied that they're doing all right. So they'll begin to investigate this thing while they're running an auditing command.

Audience: I see.

And you've channeled their attention. And you possibly will get a change of mind more rapidly. Just another trick.

Male voice: Thank you.

All right. Question period of third lecture.

Anybody have anything that is - let's call first for injustices. Injustices and betrayals. Are there any injustices and betrayals so far?

Audience: No.

No injustices and betrayals?

Audience: No.

None?

Female voice: No.

Boy, I think your Instructors must have you cowed.

Female voice: Oh, no.

Second female voice: Yes, they do!

Instructor is back there saying, „*Yeah.*“

I might tell you that your Instructors are very happy concerning this particular ACC. They say this is the brightest, alertest ACC we've ever had.

Male voice: That's not what we hear.

Second male voice: That's not us.

Third male voice: I don't believe it.

Female voice: ... like that is what they tell us.

Male voice: That's what we hear but that's not what we think.

Female voice: I'd like to say it the other way around. It's the best planned, best run and the best carried out one.

Here-here.

Your potentials here are terrific - potentials of really producing something with this ACC. But only if we work at it.

I don't think we're getting enough blows.

Yes?

Female voice: The - I'd say the - possibly you're not, because the control and ARC and good positive direction is too good. On the part of the Instructors, I mean.

Sure. Sure. Well, of course these Instructors are getting to be pretty old hands at this sort of thing. They're all excellent auditors themselves and this makes a bit of a difference. And the Clear state of case or near Clear is sufficient to guarantee you some rather positive direction.

I think you'll find them occasionally impatient of too many vias. I think about the only place you'll find them impatient - I've found this to be kind of standard about Clears - they'll boggle at too many vias. If there's five or six extra vias on the line they occasionally - occasionally look at it and only then if they understand that it's a game do they then become reasonable concerning it. Then they understand it in the framework that it's just a useless game like crossword puzzles or something.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, I'd like to change the subject here and ask you, does a preclear know when he is chipping at the Rock?

Oh, yes!

Male voice: He does know?

Oh, Yes. Yes.

Male voice: Will he admit this?

Yes, yes!

Male voice: Good. I see.

When you start chewing into it, man... I did a little experimental run last night of comparative value of processes in bringing down a rising needle. I'm still studying this. And the fastest one was Responsibility. That was bringing it down much more rapidly than anything else.

But the rapidity of its coming down with Responsibility did not measure the stability of the process. In other words, it came down more rapidly but it wasn't more stable. Help is the most stable process which you have. Responsibility is awfully quick and looks quite spectacular, but you get resurgences on responsibilities.

Havingness is another method of bringing a needle down and is a very good method. But, unfortunately, Havingness is not as stable as Help. Horrible to behold, but it's not. Not on all preclears does havingness remain stable. You fix up their havingness on Monday and it's shot on Tuesday and you fix it up on Wednesday and it's gone on Friday. You know, that sort of thing. Something is chewing up their havingness. Well, of course, this is standard. This is the Rock that's chewing up their havingness - they've got vacuums of various kinds.

I had a - on this test run - it was quite interesting - preclear was getting all sorts of manifestations and all sorts of things and finally realized that they were using the Rock to produce a certain enthusiastic, ecstatic feeling. Hadn't done it for years, but used to use the Rock to do this. And was getting it and turning it on again and then letting go of it and then getting it and turning it on again. And finally said, „*You know, that's kind of silly to have to pull in an energy mass to make you feel enthusiastic.*“ Which was a good enough goal for that run, believe me.

The person had begun to question the advisability of subsisting entirely off of a type of havingness and centering their whole life and personality around some kind of a stupid mass. The person said, „*But after a while it wears off and then I feel awfully tired.*“ He thought this over. We were doing nothing but Two-way Comm. I was simply trying to bring something down and good Two-way Comm on the subject of the Rock was quite stable and we were getting someplace with it and so on.

But because we didn't clean it up and run any Help, or isolate the terminals Help should have been run on, the preclear finished up at the same height with the tone

arm that they had begun the session on, but theoretically had gone way down, had gotten much better and so forth. And this cognition they got, of course, made them less likely to hold on and protect the Rock and made them more runnable. That was the sole gain of the particular session.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, would OT start somewhere on the Chart of Attitudes, say 11.0, 22.0 or go bang on 40.0?

Well, now give me that again, here, mostly for the record.

Female voice: Would OT start somewhere on the Chart of Attitudes, say 11.0, 22.0 or go bang on 40.0? They'd go all up and down and over the thing. Because here is an educated BP and the gamut of his reactions and actions in life are actually described by this chart. So the individual himself would probably hang somewhere around 40.0 or up and he would use other manifestations.

We've had so much talk about the beautiful serenity of holy men and that sort of thing that we expect somebody that's very high-toned to be stuck up there. And what amazes people is they become more volatile in their emotional responses. And they turn these responses on fast. And they turn off fast. And it sometimes makes them a little bit hard to live with until you get used to this sort of thing.

A guy comes in and his favorite plate is busted and he says, „Wow!“ See? „Rrrr!“ And you'd think the dining room table was going to blow up, you know. And then a couple of minutes later, why, you mention this plate to him and he says, „Well, it's all right; we'll get another one.“ But, you get the idea? You got an impersistence. He didn't go around the rest of the week fussing about this plate. You got the idea? But he could get mad about it.

Now, he didn't get mad because he had to get mad. He almost computed the fact that if he didn't get mad about his plate being busted he'd lose another one. Get the idea? So he said he thought he'd better do this at that point.

Now, later on he'll find, maybe, that this is not an effective approach. Let's say he's working with a child. It's not an effective approach. It doesn't protect plates. Get the idea? So he's just as likely to say, „Oh, my favorite plate. Don't you like me anymore?“ he'll say to the child. The child will say, „What's this?“ you know? I pulled a gag the other day - not giving myself as any kind of example - I pulled that gag the other day upon Suzette with malice aforethought. And Suzette - it was on a matter of some spilled cleanser. And Suzette flipped the whole deal the other way. It was very funny and she said, „But I was just trying to clean up your bathroom.“ It didn't land at all. Becomes a little game. One of the things that you can say and the only certain thing you can say about a Clear and his behavior or an OT and his behavior is that we don't get obsessive persistence along a certain line to prove that it is right or to prove that it is or to convince forevermore and for there on out. They don't hold on to data to suffice them in every situation everywhere. And you'll find the estimates to Clear - when you try to estimate the length of time it takes to clear somebody - it's the persistence of the reaction on the needle, not the fact you can get reactions, which monitors it. As a matter of fact,

the more reactions you can get and the faster they fade out, the faster you'll be able to clear somebody.

Also I don't want you to get the idea that a Clear or somebody better than Clear or striking upward toward OT cannot influence a meter. And I had somebody look at me very peculiarly the other day. I picked up an E-Meter and somebody was mocking up a female GE. So I said, „*Well, can you mock up a female GE and get a reading on the E-Meter? Can you actually mock up a good solid female GE and connect it with the body and take ahold of an E-Meter and make it read 'female'? Will it read 'female' if you do that?*“ And so on. So I slammed one in there good and hard and the meter read at 2.0. I threw the cans down and I said that's that. Somebody else was standing there, they had seen me pick up an E-Meter and make it read at 2.0. And they had the most puzzled expression on their face.

Now, I don't pretend to be in any fabulous state of case particularly, but I would feel peculiar if I could no longer influence the physical universe. I think this would be very peculiar. And I don't think this would be Clear at all. I think this would be below apathy. Get the idea? Okay.

I remember somebody had so many vicissitudes in being Clear. He was Clear three, four years ago and for a while he was - his idea of a good joke was to influence the living daylights out of an E-Meter. And he'd get in the vacuum tube or something of the sort, you know, and start pulling it around and short-circuiting it. And the meter would read high, you know, and stick and then it'd read low and it'd stick. What kind of a case was he, you know? And he'd sit there and look - with nothing, you know, just blank. The auditor would go nuts. Nothing was doing what it should do.

Well, that isn't necessarily a characteristic of being Clear or Operating Thetan either, because that's one of the characteristics of a psycho. The ambition of a psycho is to be totally unpredictable. That's his main ambition. So he becomes totally predictable, which is to say he'll go nuts. Okay.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, I would like a little more on this idea of the auditing time track as distinct from MEST universe time track.

Well, yes. The auditing time track. There is this thing about an auditing session, is, that the auditor and the preclear are setting up a separate agreement to that of the physical universe. The physical universe and general time track agreement of event and so forth is a very set thing and it's supposed to go on a cycle of action from create to survive to destroy and it's supposed to tick off on all the clocks. And there's tremendous agreements that are supposed to register all these things.

Well, you get an entirely new agreement on what is supposed to happen in a certain period of time between two people and you'll get a sort of a new time track. Only it's a new time track. And your auditor should be aware of the fact that he is creating an artificial universe with auditing and part of it is a little shadowy track.

We used to pay sufficient attention to this to actually scan out the auditing at the end of the session. Well, we find out we're using processes today which knock the auditing out eventually anyhow so we don't care about that.

But a time track becomes important - an auditing time track becomes important to you - when an ARC break occurs and we get the dramatization of help-betrayal or help-destroy in the middle of an auditing session. The auditor is there, supposed to be helping the preclear, and he does something the preclear considers is destructive. And we can get the preclear hung up on this artificial time track just as he can be hung up on the physical universe time track. You see? And now we've moved him over and parked him on the auditing time track and we've disassociated him from the physical universe time track. Which is quite amazing. And every once in a while you'll find your preclear still on only an auditing time track. He's not on a physical universe time track. And it will depress his profile. And it's the only thing that'll depress a profile. Processes won't. We've learned all sorts of things about this lately.

A violation of the Auditor's Code, an ARC break, real or imagined and fancied or actual, on the part of the preclear, will park the preclear over on this artificial auditing time track. Do you get the idea? And therefore he doesn't return to the physical universe at the end of session. There is always a little tiny period at the end of session when he fogs over into the physical universe, see? You'll find in his bank and mocked up on the line, you'll find that this auditing time track is something distinct, separate and different from his physical universe time track. And when he clears he, of course, ceases to mock up the auditing time track. Auditing is so valuable to him that he usually keeps a fantastically accurate record of it entirely independent of any other universe. And when he no longer needs it so desperately he blows this too.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

Okay?

Male voice: Yes.

All right.

Male voice: One more thing, Ron.

Yeah.

Male voice: Definition of time track?

Hm?

Male voice: Would you give me a definition of time track?

Consecutive changes.

Male voice: Okay.

Every time you get a change you get a moment in time. And when you have an orderly process or progress of changes you get a time track.

Male voice: That's good. Thank you.

Right.

Yes, Jack?

Male voice: Yes. You mentioned help-destroy. And help in going down in that direction - what is it - you can get betrayal and then blame. Looks to me from what you were saying that betrayal comes just above blame - I mean, follows betrayal.

Yeah.

Male voice: Okay?

The only difficulty with help is this; is help isn't a dichotomy with destroy, it isn't a dichotomy with betrayal, and it isn't a dichotomy with blame. Destroy, betrayal and blame and injustice are all methods of help. One of the ways of helping somebody... Well, I'll give you an old gag, an old story about a Jewish merchant and he teaches his young son about business. So he takes him up and he puts him on top of a big, tall ladder and he's going to teach him his first lesson in business. So he stands down at the bottom of the ladder, puts his son up at the top of the ladder and said, „*All right, now Izzie, I'm going to give you your first lesson in business.*“ And Izzie says, „*All right, Papa.*“ And Papa says, „*All right now Izzie, jump. Papa will catch you; now jump.*“ And Izzie jumps, Papa steps aside and lets him hit the ground with a crash. Papa pats him on the back and says, „*Now Izzie,*“ he says, „*that's your first lesson in business: don't trust nobody, not even your Papa!*“ Now that story does illustrate this fact that people will use betrayal to teach people a lesson.

Yes, and it's an odd thing but you would be surprised that there are undoubtedly some atomic engineers around who believe that the best - they wouldn't do this unless they believed this - the best possible way they could help the human race would be to wipe it out. It can't do anything, it can't go anyplace and there's no hope for it anyhow and they're all miserable and suffering. You know? Shooting the horse with the broken leg sort of a computation. And how many ways can you help people includes destroying them.

So you can - the reason - the only reason I'm stressing this, Jack, the only reason I'm putting any stress on it at all, is because I was fooled in the original investigation of this into believing something odd here. I believed that if you ran Help you would put destroy on automatic. And therefore, didn't fully use the process for some little time. Because I found out that if you ran Help for a little while, automaticities of destroy would show up. And then one day I rolled up my sleeves, tested a little bit further, and found out that Help run further took out the automaticities of destroy. But run just so long, where the person would not accept destroy as a method of helping, run just so long, it would put all destroy on automatic. And the fellow would be running around willing to cut his own head off and shoot anybody, you see, even though he was „*helping*“ everybody. Then he goes right on over and he comes up in a kind of an inversion.

His next strata is to shoot people.

„*How would you help your mother?*“

„Well, take her and cut her up into very small pieces and put her in a stew.“ Perfectly valid method of helping Mother. And auditors will look at this sometimes and be appalled.

But running Help takes over the automaticity, destroy, which is the final test on it. So what you want to do is to put together - if a scale were to be put together - I would suggest that a scale would go together which was the help band and it itself would not include help at all, but all of these methods of helping would go up the band and down the band. You see? They're fantastic. They're fantastic, some of these methods.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, what is the difference between a Theta Clear and an OT?

Well, there really is no grade called Theta Clear.

Male voice: Oh, there isn't?

There really is no such grade that makes much sense between OT and MEST Clear. You get the idea? A Clear, who is independent of a body, you cannot stop on the direction to OT. I mean, you get him going up the line and you don't find there's a finite stop. Well, there is a finite stop at Clear.

Male voice: Which Clear?

MEST Clear. See there, that's a finite stop. The fellow is without a reactive bank. It's quite finite. Quite absolute, as a matter of fact. It is.

Now, as he goes around and mocks up other people's banks and does this and that temporarily in this way, his state will vary a bit. But the final analysis is he doesn't have a compulsive, obsessive bank kicking him to pieces. You know? You must realize that the body is a mock-up in a certain number of agreements. And a body can obsessively do this and do that and do something or other, but then it is persisting and that's already obsessive and it is just a mock-up. So as long as he is fooling around with a body he doesn't have necessarily the tendency to go down scale, but he does have the tendency to be variable in his appearance. That is, the apparency of the state becomes variable. His own state, however, is not varying. Now, that's quite finite.

Now, merely getting him out cures up this vagary. See, if he's stable exterior and no bank and able to control and handle the immediate body and so on, we've just deleted this apparency or vagary. We've improved the state of Clear a little bit, you see.

Now, we go for broke from there on up. You see, a Clear can't necessarily do anything. See, by definition he doesn't do certain things. Do you see that? Of course, this means his abilities are up too, but this wasn't the goal. It was to stop him from doing a lot of things which he really didn't want to do in the first place. OT is an educated Clear. Now he's educated, see. He's doing. And he's a fellow who can do. You see? You might say you uncover the basic personality of a preclear by clearing him. Well, that's fine, but all you've done is uncover his basic personality. Yes, this is a miraculous state: the entire systems of religion have pegged at this thing since time immemorial. I mean, this is glorious and all that, but remember something: that he can't do anything.

Now, he gets so that he can do things which are out of agreement with, so that he's at cause over matter, energy, space, time and life, and we've educated him. And the funny part of it is that it's education that makes the OT, or confidence in the exercise of his abilities, which should be a better definition for education.

Male voice: What were we trying to educate him to do, Ron?

To be at cause over matter, energy, space, time, life. That's all we educate him to do.

Now, there comes a great liability in this because people's hair stands up when you say, well, you'd educate somebody to destroy this, that and the other thing. I'm afraid that if he interfered too much and violated the rights of too many dynamics he would no longer be an OT.

Male voice: How long would he remain there?

Hm?

Male voice: How long would he remain an OT if he started this action?

Well, I don't think an OT could be persuaded to do it because, you see, I've already tried. Every once in a while somebody will come around to me and they'll say, „*Well, why don't you get an OT to do something about Russia?*“ And I've tried to tell them - I think it's even on tapes of earlier ACCs - you try to persuade them that there is some necessity to do something about Russia. They laugh at you. You know, they think this is funny. And so they go over to Russia on agreement with you - if they're going to be pals - and they start looking around and they get interested in a washerwoman who has dropped all of her clothes in the stream and they go pick up her clothes for her and return it to her. And this stands her hair on end and they pat her on the head and say it was her faith in religion that made her do it and she becomes very happy with her life then. And they're all set and they come back and they say they've really done something in Russia. See? This is a matter of dynamics. A Clear is a first dynamic awareness of considerable magnitude. You see? An OT spans on up the rest of the dynamics. And unfortunately, he'll work just as hard to protect somebody's illusions of the Supreme Being as he will their illusions of his identity. You get the idea? And it becomes a much broader game. And when you're looking at it from this side you look at it and you say, that's nuts. You know? I mean, why doesn't he realize that we're in trouble and we should do this and that? Well, his realization that we're in trouble would be worked out like this: he looks at you as having some responsibility in the matter. See? And he says, „*Well, why don't you just - what do you want all that enturbulance over in that area for?*“ Like I was talking to you about yesterday, you see? Not accusatively, but he finds it a little bit hard to appreciate a limited viewpoint.

And, of course, pan-determinism enters into OT at some enormous extent. So to get him involved in a fight he really has to postulate like mad. He has to say to himself, „*I'm not a cop; now I can have a fight with a cop.*“ See? Only he just postulated it, he wasn't serious about it, he didn't bury it; halfway through the fight, why, he's liable to start laughing like hell and the cop starts laughing too for some peculiar reason and there goes the fight. You don't get a persistent condition whereby he fights cops now for

the next two centuries. This is very - it's very odd. The best way to get a view of it is to get there and look.

A Clear - a Clear you should understand as a first dynamic awareness of magnitude. It's a pretty terrific thing for a - to have a fellow just aware of himself.

But now his education proceeds in getting aware of you and others. You find a Clear maybe for the first month or so after he's cleared or something like that, he sort of fumbles around with people a little bit and he's groping his way.

Well, what's he groping his way for? He's groping his way for OT.

We got time for just one more question here.

Female voice: Ron, you said in a lecture the other day that all aberrations was on the third dynamic. Did I get that clearly?

The aberrations - let me modify it. Thank you for bringing it up again. The aberrations in which we're involved are, at this stage of the game, are the manyness of things, which are confused with things with which we want no association. You got this? All right.

To most people, if you ask them one after the other, they won't even talk about the sixth dynamic or even the fifth; they'll just talk about the third. So the basic aberrations which you hit in clearing somebody are third dynamic aberrations.

Female voice: I understand that now.

Got it?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

Okay. Now, anybody started auditing yet?

Male voice: We're still working on the number two today - ARC Straightwire, Communication part.

Oh, very good. Then I had better give you a little tiny rundown on this. Shall I?

Male voice: Yes.

All right.

Male voice: Yeah.

Would you like that?

Audience: Yes.

I wanted to be sure you were auditing some of this. I was trying to straighten out some of these other points.

Now, to run a bracket is the end goal of a process you were doing. Practice in running a bracket. If an Instructor comes up and says, „*That's for the birds,*“ it's not going to up-

set your preclear very much. He's just a little bit back on the track maybe or something like this, but he's not handling anything that is terribly significant, you know? He's not going to be so involved. So we use a light process to keep you from bungling a heavy process like Help. Get the idea?

Female voice: Yeah.

This is just to give you practice. This is not the most therapeutic version of Communicate. I want you to understand that. The most therapeutic version of Communicate is just first dynamic one flow out. „*Recall a time you communicated with something*“ if you're going to recall. See? „*Good. Recall a time you communicated with something Good. Recall a time you communicated with something Good. Recall a time you communicated with something Good. Recall a time you communicated with something Good.*“ And this will free a stuck needle. Just on one side only. You got that? So the process you are doing here is a very artificial process. It's teaching somebody to handle a bracket. And grooving you in to being able to handle a bracket so it doesn't upset you when you get into some beefy stuff. Got it? So we're just increasing familiarity here with this process.

Now, I don't want you to think for a moment that this is the way to run Communication. A better process is, „*Look around here and find something you're willing to communicate with.*“ But a person who is heavily fixed on a Rock doesn't benefit too much from it.

Now, you can study it, if you'd like; as you're running Communication, watch the behavior of your needle. Do you change the needle behavior very much with this series? Or don't you? See? The probability is you won't.

So that is this and this is more of a drill than otherwise. You got that? Now, I don't know - you've handled PT problem already, then, if you're running this. And I want you for sure not to gloss over PT problem. Don't gloss that one over and don't gloss over goals, which I took up - both of which I took up a little bit in the lecture. Don't gloss these things over. Get your sessions started and get your sessions ended. And get them wheeling; get some goals for them and make sure no PT problem has come up and patch up those ARC breaks that might occur.

Now, there may be some cases present who will have to have a special variety of Help. But that, again, simply comes under Help and is given down here and all of you can do it. That's part 5a, clear down here at part 5a; to clean up all past auditing. Now, you got that?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. Now, if you're going to clean up all past auditing clear down here at 5a, then you shouldn't be getting too upset or demanding too much of this upper communication process.

So, I would advise you to go so far as to do this: To start a session, all the way through - goals, PT problem - get it all set; run this bracket (clear the command of it, see, do it very nicely) run this bracket two or three times, watch the cyclic action. You want to know when that communication took place and when it's near present time you can drop it. But don't drop him way back on the track somewhere. You say,

„When?“ And he says, „*Oh, I was - when I was about four.*“ And so you keep on with the command.

And you say, „*When?*“ again.

And he says, „*Well, that's - I don't know, some past life, I guess.*“

And then you keep on with the command. You run it a few more times and you again ask, „*When?*“ And he says, „*Well, that was yesterday.*“ Off. Off with it.

Now, you're faced with this horrible problem. How do you throw in the bridge? How do you throw in the bridge? Well, the funny part of it is if you throw the bridge in right there, he'll tend to stay in PT unless he's mad at you. And you say, „*Well, we're going to - if it's all right with you we're going to ask this just a couple more times.*“ You know? Real quick. And get off of it and out of it. So you start asking more „*Whens?*“ when he gets toward PT. Got the idea? Now, the best and most technically accurate method of throwing in a bridge is - he's coming up toward PT - the last was four, now it was when he was about ten. Now, let's be smart and right at that point throw in a bridge, „*Now, I'm going to ask this question a few more times and then we'll end the process. Is that all right with you?*“ And he says, „*Yes, that's all right with you [me].*“

Now, you ask him „*When?*“ each time. This is the very proper way of doing this. And when he gets up to yesterday you say, „*Well, that's it. Thank you very much. Now, what did you get out of this session?*“ Here we go. See? Now, let's clean up it and let's end the session. Let's stop that session right there. Crunch. See? Cut. Off. Gone. Through. Take a little break. See? Tiny little break, a minute, two-minute break, see? Let him get up and turn around and walk around the chair and look out the window. Get the idea? Get him back again and start a session. Run the same process. You get how this is, fellows? You're going to run five-hour sessions that are only fifteen minutes long. Got that? Now you're going to start the thing all over again. „*Is it all right if I audit you?*“ And you're going to set up some goals and you're going to look for that PT problem.

Now, don't be amazed if the third time you start a session with this preclear you find he now has a PT problem. That doesn't have anything to do with you. He really did have a PT problem. But this has some therapy connected with it, this communication thing, and you scared one into view. Got it? Now, I would advise your doing this particular one of just getting practices in starting sessions, running a bracket, ending a session, take a little break, start a session, run a bracket, end a session. You get the idea? Okay? And as soon as your Instructor thinks you are doing this surprisingly well (that dirty remark), you get going on Start-C-S. Hm? Okay?

Audience: Okay. Yes.

This is merely drill that we're doing up to here, but you've got to be able to do it well.

Do you know this is the hardest thing we have ever tried to teach? CCH 0. Sounds peculiar, but it's true. The hardest thing we've ever tried to teach.

Yes?

Female voice: When you're auditing a Scientologist a lot of times they won't give you a goal until they know what process is going to be run. Then they know what the goal will be.

Well, I'd batter that one down. Of course, an adequate goal is just to get finished with this particular run. I've given somebody who was bound and determined to audit me that goal occasionally, you know? Well, to get the auditing session over with, you know. And then have them argue with the goal. I says, „*Perfectly valid goal, isn't it? Perfectly valid goal: get through this auditing session.*“ Well, they don't like that too much, don't like that too much. And they argue around about it and go north and go south of the point and so forth. And nearly always I can find a little goal that is actual, absolutely actual on the thing. But the first goal is actually adequate. Perfectly adequate goal: get the session over with. To arrive at the end of the session would be to move up the time track a little bit, you know? That's just about the tiniest goal - tiniest beneficial goal there could be. It's not necessarily an apathy goal or anything of the sort. If you couldn't think of anything else, that's it. But if you talk around about it without mentioning the process or anything of the sort, they can generally fish up some little goal, one kind or another.

But don't be surprised if we start these sessions and run these sessions through a few times if you suddenly find somebody coming up with a PT problem that they were not aware of previously, because this communication thing will scare one into view.

Somebody told me the other day the way to scare a present time problem into view was to run Connectedness for a short time and then come back to PT problem. We've got to run some experimental runs on this, but that sounds very good. But this for sure will do this.

I want you to get very excellent in starting session, clearing goals, finding a PT problem.

Do you realize that a PT problem in restimulation can absolutely prevent a session from improving an APA? It just stops it right there, it ends it.

Why? He can never come over onto an auditing time track. He stays over here on the physical universe time track and never moves into session. So you've got to get that one good because you could theoretically put out seventy-five hours on some preclear and never move his APA and never get him any closer to Clear or anything else.

Why? Well, all this time, why, he had a big PT problem going forward. He was being sued or something or other was happening all this time. And he says, „*Well, I'll just put that aside,*“ crunch! „*and then I will get through the auditing session. Maybe I'll get enough out of the auditing session so I can do something about the problem.*“ You know? Nah! Have any questions about this proceeding?

Female voice: Do you clear goals both before and after present time problem? You clear goals before PT problem really. Clearing goal before a PT problem or after a PT problem has this: if you clear it before, he's not really in-session too well. You get the idea? But part of the auditing is actually a PT problem. See? So it's part of the auditing and a goal should be engaged upon before the session begins. If you wanted to be

safe you would clear a goal, a PT problem and a goal. If you wanted to be awfully safe you would make a PT problem sandwich.

All right. Any other question about this?

Yes?

Male voice: I wanted to ask about this nine-way bracket on communication in respect of do you have to clear the word „*recall*“ nine different times or is once enough?

Once.

Male voice: Once is enough.

You clear this whole bracket in one command. If you've been told any differently, it's my fault in not getting a meeting of minds on this. You're going a little faster than I had anticipated with the training. But the trouble with clearing a command is that if it is not done you're liable to have no understanding and if it is done too arduously you're liable to just hold up the session. See, you can err two ways on this.

Male voice: Thank you.

You see, you have words here like „*recall*“ and „*a*“ and „*time*.“ And then you have „*communicate*.“ And then you have „*with*“ and „*something*“ Now the only additional words you have in here is „*you*“ and „*I*“, „*someone else*“ and „*yourself*“ and „*himself*.“ And you look down and you clear each word individually. Don't you see? Just clear all of the words that appear and clear each word once. Got it? And you explain to him that you're going to ask him these in various combinations. That's perfectly all right with him.

And then a few commands later, twenty-twenty, twenty-five commands later, something like that, clear them all over again. Find out if he means anything different here. And he might have an entirely different interpretation of „*recall*.“ You may not have run into it yet, but a lot of people are pretty foggy on how you recall something.

Any other questions germane to this particular part of it?

Well, you people that are still in TRs, get them flat and get out of there. Get the show on the road now. Okay? You can do it. If you can't do it on your confidence, do it on mine and get out of there.

Okay.

Thank you very much.

[end of lecture.]