REQUISITES AND FUNDAMENTALS OF A SESSION

A lecture given on 8 August 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

And this is lecture 20A of the 20th ACC, August 8th, 1958. Now going to take up the rudiments of session. The rudiments of a session.

Now, the rudiments are something you get rid of and then you never pay any more attention to. That's the usual definition, just as a TR is something that you never use again because you just found out that it's not valid.

If you understand cases and understand what makes them well, you won't make flubs. But you can go off into a whole bunch of tearing nowheres, and I do mean a bunch of tearing nowheres, on the wild theory that you can do it all at once or something of this sort with a case. Now I'll lay it right on the line. I've processed more cases, added up more cases, seen more cases processed, directed more techniques to be run than will probably ever be assembled again under one roof in the next God knows when. Now I make that very clear. I lay it right on the line, see? Now, these are the bones on which the visible flesh of Scientology exists, this fantastic amount of research, fantastic. Now, I'm not saying that I have run everything that you will ever think of. That is a very - would be a very stupid thing for me to say. I will say that in eight years I've run practically everything that has ever been suggested to me.

I think there was one new suggestion or two in the last year and they came from old-timers that had been in there for a long time, you know? And they got an idea about something or other and they wrote in this idea and this idea did shed some light on an obscure corner. Got the idea? They'd run into something, they thought this was pretty good and they sent it in.

Well, I always tell everybody that they'd better send in anything they happen to run into, for the very reason that it'd be totally in- stupid of me to say that I had run into

everything and worked with everything that could ever be worked with in the human mind. You see, that'd be a Freudian statement or something.

I have had some humility of one kind or another along this line in that I was perfectly willing to admit at any given instant that I knew nothing about the whole subject. I was not trying to uphold my own integrity because that was not important to me. That was quite important, too. And I was not trying to sell anybody a process or sell anybody a theory just for the sake of selling one.

And people have watched this occasionally with considerable horror, you know? They saw me come off of running engrams and go into exteriorizing people. And then later on, why, they heard me say that exteriorizing people was for the birds. If you didn't exteriorize them into a willingness to be exteriorized, you were nowhere and that frankly we didn't have it made on making them willing to exteriorize, see? I've even sat down and said, *„I've made four mistakes, you know? Here it is, you know? I've made these mistakes,"* and so on.

And the common denominator of anything I've done has been, I hope, honesty. And people, over a period of time, who could cheerfully have shot me in 1951 have turned around and come back and said, *„Well, he seems to be the only one who knows where he's going or what he's doing."* You know? Just because it was an honest line of research. Just totally honest, sincere - there isn't any pitch to it.

Now, we are dealing with firm fundamentals, and therefore I ask each and every one of you to understand the firmness of these fundamentals. And I've had to whip up some of these fundamentals into an understandingly translatable form, into words, just for this ACC right here. So don't think we are not still learning.

But what we know, boy, do we know. We know we know it. You got it? What I'm about to give you as the requisites and fundamentals of a session, we know. Not, you adventure off these at your peril. I'm not telling you that at all. You want to waste your time, it's okay with me.

You start running conditions of one kind or another on a preclear and patching up this lifetime and so forth, you'll wake up somewhere up the line in six months or a year and say, *„Why am I not clearing anybody?"* You're not running procedures exactly and instantly and immediately made and tailor-made to clear people. That's why.

Clearing is something else than putting a person back together again. We know all kinds of ways to put a human being back into a state of being a better human being, you understand? We're not even vaguely interested in them.

You come up perhaps with a new technique that makes better human beings human beings, and a big bunch of new vias on the line of one kind or another, yeah, you're just avoiding making Clears. Don't kid yourself. And don't try to kid me. When I see this, that and the other thing going on, you must be putting some new vias on the line for some reason or other because I can list the fundamentals of what it takes to make a Clear here, in such a very few minutes that they're hardly worth recounting. And when these are dropped and avoided, why, you've had it.

Now you're going to sit there right this minute and say - about the case that you're auditing right now, or about the case you were auditing in the last auditing period - on some of these you're going to say, *„Hey, say, what do you know. I didn't do that, you know?"* Yeah, you will, so just stand by right here. Here they go.

First, willingness on the part of the pc to have the auditor audit him; that's your first requisite to a session. I could bite some of you for always saying to me, *„What process do you use to do this?"* You know, you guys are the ones, you guys are the ones that made me put things into process form, you realize that? We didn't have anything like a process way back when. And the heroic thing about it is, is that I have. That's utterly incredible.

We've got a process for everything that a two-way comm could do. It's fabulous. Dick was saying the other day, *„Oh, God, if there were just four things we could teach an auditor."* Two-way comm was one of them. Judgment was another one. These things - these things are paramount. There's a screaming need for it and there's only one way we can do it and that's to clear you. The only way we can do that is clearing you.

But one of these days, maybe the 21st, 22nd ACC, why, with great aplomb, we'll be teaching people who are spun-in and half flat on their faces two-way comm and so forth with some kind of a process, you know? This will be an interesting thing but it'll undoubtedly happen. Even that can occur. But right now remember that we are processing short of some things. So therefore, we have to have it awfully exactly laid out. And that's no invalidation of you. It's a matter of a communication line.

And evidently a process is necessary to a communication line in this particular subject so that you can codify something. But to do that, for God's sakes, you have to lay down the exact microscopic fundamentals that are totally accurate on every given impulse and leave nothing to understanding at all.

Boy, that's an awful horseshoe to be dropped around somebody's neck with a clank, let me tell you. All right, well, we've done it. Now, when I tell you that the preclear must be willing to have an auditor there, I'm going back through a series of processes designed to do this. One was *„Look at me, who am I?"* That is the ancestor of these processes. *„Look at me, who am I? Look at me, who am I?"* And after a while, he finds out you're not his dentist. Now, when I say he finds out that you're not his dentist, you think I'm inferring that this pc has to be pretty spinny to have such a misconcept. Oh, no, not at all. This fellow is sitting there, he's well dressed, he's bright, he's alert, he's a success in his profession, he's brilliant and you're auditing him. Boy, every time you come off the basis of, *„He's too sane for me to go into things like this,"* you've had it! And about two intensives later you say, *„What is wrong here?"* What is wrong is your incurable, wonderful optimism regarding your fellow human being, his state.

And where this is very touching, and I respect you for this tremendous idea of the sanity of your fellow man, I must condemn it as unwise in auditing.

Now, I don't say you have to run, *„Look at me, who am I?"* on every preclear in order to audit them. I didn't say that. But you for heaven's sakes must have a pc willing to have you for an auditor. Not you because I said so. Not you because your Instructors as-

signed you. He must be willing to have you as an auditor. And if you're hot and you're good, the next thing you know, he's more willing to have you as an auditor than anybody else in the entire course. You understand that? I don't expect you to be good along this line. I expect you to be perfect.

And do you know that he can be put along this groove? Because there's not a one of you here now, not one of you, but what would stay in there and pitch and do the right thing as to the best of your ability. You understand that? But oddly enough, you as preclears don't understand it. And you're afraid this auditor's going to make a flub, that you've got as a pc, and spin you in, and wind you up and not know whether you're coming or going and so forth.

And we get to the next point. Nearly every pc here is so far out of session that I, if I were auditing him, would spend two or three hours simply putting him in-session. Two or three hours. When I got a pc in-session, the building next door could totally blow up and the wall fall in, and he wouldn't notice. His confidence would be sufficiently great as to have no outside influence penetrating his lookingness and workingness with his own bank. That's in-session. Got it? The pc is going into session during the first three-quarters of an auditing intensive. Any allocated period of auditing, about three-quarters of it is spent by the pc going a little bit better into session, providing he's got a very smart and a very good auditor. And while you're looking far afield for magic tricks that will clear cases much faster, the magic trick is sitting right in front of your face. Put him in-session. That's the magic trick.

And what is *„in-session"?* He is so relaxed and so confident, so hopeful, that no matter what he runs into he'll run through it. And the more he's in-session, the more he feels you're in there pitching with him, the more he can run through and the faster he can go through it and the more he can confront and the more bank he can get rid of. You got it? And the further he is out of session, the less he gets done. It has nothing to do with what you run on him. Nothing to do with it at all. And when somebody comes to me and tells me some new trick, and I know damn well he doesn't get his pcs in-session, I could almost cry in his face. But I'm a nice guy and I don't. And I say, *„Good. Fine. Thank you."* It's in-sessionness, it is getting an auditing session going that is important, and continuing that session that is important. And that clears people.

And you could run *„Abba-dabba-boo-boo"* and clear somebody if he had total confidence in you as an auditor and he was totally relaxed in session. Do you know he could look at the whole flam-damn bank and tell you what the technique was? Do you know that? He'd just look brrrrrrrrrr! Whew! *„Hey, I didn't know I was mocking that up. Isn't that interesting? Hm-hm, hm-hm."* Do you get the idea? How do you suppose I found out things from pcs? Why do they tell me these things? It isn't altitude. Fifty percent of the pcs that walk in are less willing to go in session because I'm auditing them because they are superstitious about what I can see. Whereby they'd go down and talk to an HGC auditor, they think they've got to put on a good show for me.

And I rack them over the coals in an awful hurry and spend nearly all of my time getting them squared, curing the altitude factor in most of the cases, not by making nothing out of myself - that's the standard social mechanism. The way you cure altitude is

to make nothing out of yourself, you know? You can play a concerto in A-flat major upside down with rubber gloves on, you know, and play rings around Paderewski. So you sit down at a piano at a party and say, *„Well, I've just taken a couple lessons, I don't play very well, you know, don't play very well."* Standard social mechanism.

Don't use it in auditing. And don't try to overwhump them with how good you are. At the same time, don't let them be overwhumped by how good you are. Because then you've just got an overwhumped preclear, not a preclear in-session; and that's hypnotism. His willingness has got to be up, way up. How do you raise that willingness? Please don't say, *„What process do you use?"* We have certain things that are the fundamentals of Scientology and they have to do with willingness and certainty.

You can make any of these things into a process so that you can ask them, but you've already got your processes laid out from the earliest times in this particular subject. It's just as true today that a person has to be certain of something, anything, to get better, as it was years ago.

We ask this individual, *„What part of this session is acceptable to you?"* We're simply asking for a certainty - old Certainty Process of one kind or another, a willingness process, Certainty Process. You want to know if he's absolutely certain if it's all right if you sit in that chair in front of him.

Well, it doesn't take any magic process or any series of numbers written down to arrive at that one. Is it okay with him if you sit in that chair? Is it okay with him if he sits in that chair? Well, we've got it reduced down to its weirdest fundamentals. Is it okay if you talk? Is it okay if he answers? This is all we're trying to establish. Is anything horrible going to happen because he's sitting in that chair? Good. We can just go on and work and work and work with this.

Now, we can take up the specific relationship of the auditor-pc, one with another, and we can get that thing balanced out. Now, that's your third in-sessionness stage, you see? You're still getting this fellow into session.

Now, don't take it that I'm angry with you because I am not even vaguely. I want to - very, very badly, I want to put it across to you. I want to level straight across the boards with you. I want you to get off of this kick of *„What little wound-up doll process do I run to make these things come true?"* You're trying to make me do it; and you've got to do it. And it isn't some glorious new process that you're going to tailor up in order to get it done.

Every once in a while, I catch an auditor on staff - the case is getting worse, or something, and the case is not doing well and he's trying to think in terms of, *„What total effect can I dream up?"* And the other day, some little kid that's just getting along just dandy on staff as a pc - a couple of auditors blew up on the subject. They just blew up. They got to discussing this. They got to discussing it and discussing it and discussing it and they got more and more convinced that it was some new technique or some new process. Some new technique, some new process was needed, I guess because they weren't smashing him into the chair with a totality.

I went over it with them and I said, *„What's the matter? You've given me a recommendation here first, that you run engrams, next that you run Help in brackets, next that you do this, next that you do that."* I said, *„Have you gone nuts? Is there anything you're doing that works?" „Oh, yes, well, it's - yes, it's, a little bit, you know?"*

„What's a little bit?" CCH 2, 8-C bites.

„You know, well, he has long comm lags and sometimes he has to think it over and once in a while he holds his head." And I said, *„Is this flat? Is this flat?"*

„Well, no."

Well, I said, *„Well, why not flatten it, and then come back and ask me all about these fancy processes that are going to do so much for this guy."* Good, old-time 8-C and he's back running it now and now doing handsomely, thank you, after four days of being monkeyed with, with a bunch of goofball nuttiness that had nothing to do with it. The guy could be put into session with 8-C and with good 8-C and good formal auditing, and patching that up, he was getting closer into session. He was getting more and more confidence in his auditor and they were using 8-C to get him in-session and looking at 8-C all by itself to do the entire job. I don't care what they were doing with the guy. They were getting him into session. Don't you see this? It didn't have anything to do with the process. They did have a process that he was improving on and that he was in good ARC with the auditor with.

And instead of concentrating on making that ARC better, instead of concentrating on this, they wanted to go off into a whole series of gimmicks that sounded just like space opera to me. *„We can't rule the planet with a- with a thought control emanator. Let's get in there now with a super-hypnotic powder and kill everybody and then we'll show them."* They're saying, *„We can't audit so what do we use to audit with?"* Vicious statement at best, isn't it? It's got to be all right with the pc for you to audit him. It's got to be all right for that pc to be in-session. And then it'll be all right for the pc to look at his bank. And then you better know the things that he's supposed to look for in the bank, because he'll just look at bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank.

So you keep putting him better into session, making yourself better off with him as an auditor and guiding him more strongly and securely over onto what you want him to look at in the bank. And when he looks at it well enough, he will confront it absolutely direct.

Now, if it took you 150 hours to accomplish this, you would have done no more than to have made it all right for you to audit him, all right for him to be in-session, and directed his attention over onto what he should look for on the track, which is the basic Rock on the case. When he's got that, it'll tear up - if you've got these other ingredients, it'll tear up lock chains. Why, atom bombs don't even vaguely have this much power and force.

So you have to know your TRs perfectly so you don't flub and keep distracting him. And then you have to know how to be relaxed and expert and facile in handling him. And then you have to be interested in him, otherwise he never adds your attention units to his lookingness in the bank. Tsk, tsk, tsk. Ever think of that? And then he has

to be sufficiently relaxed so his attention units aren't out on the society, or on you on the basis of ARC breaks. And he has to be sufficiently relaxed about what is going on and what is coming off in the session for him actually to look with all of his attention, not just some of it. And do you realize that he would exteriorize at that point? He would exteriorize if you asked him to. Why? Because his attention isn't on anything else. And what is a total exteriorization but a total selectivity of attention.

So he'd, of course, exteriorize from nine-tenths of his bank just by going into session. Most of his bank has to do with safeguarding himself automatically in the environment.

It is so simple that man has looked at it for billions and trillions of years and never seen any part of it. He said, *„What god can I bow down to in order to make my wife fertile? What chieftain can I pay off in order to raise my harvest? What can I propitiate amongst the aerial demons and devils? How many witches can I hire? How many bank statements can I write down as magic incantations to somehow or other get me by and through? How much prestige is necessary in the Mayo Clinic in order - if I say I've gone to the Mayo Clinic - in order for me to be impressed with the fact that I am now well? How many hundred thousand dollars do I have to spend on my crippled child before my guilty conscience is assuaged?"* He just drifted and drifted and drifted and drifted and he's never looked at anything; he always looked at something else. And the motto of all of his days is, *„He looked at something else."* It was raining, so he looked at something else. A war was coming, so he looked at something else. And all it took was one good look by one man, anyplace, anywhere, at any given moment, for any miracle that has ever occurred to occur again.

But if one man all by himself and alone did this in this particular society at this time, everybody else would go into a total overwhump and say, *„All right, one man, you do all the looking for us, and we're all slaves."* That's the way it goes.

How do you get a fellow in-session, huh? Well, I can even give you processes that will do it. How do you like that? *„Greater love hath no man."* You will get with the preclear you're auditing right this minute some of the most startling responses if you use a question that Jan codified yesterday looking over this fact and what we're trying to do, *„Who should I be to audit you?"* Startle half of your preclears out of their wits. *„Who should I be in order to audit you?"* Hm? *„Who would I have to be in order to get some auditing done? Who would I have to be to have you confident of my ability?"* And some of them will say, *„My grandfather."* And some of them will say, *„God."* And some of them will say, *„This."* And some of them will say, *„Well, you'd have to be a little boy."* How the devil we ever get into that, we don't know. And *„You'd have to be a magic snuffbox."* And *„You'd have to be Ron." „You'd have to be Dick,"* or some other better-known auditor.

Now, that's an interesting thing, but you know, the guy never goes into session if he never has an auditor? And if

you should be somebody else, it's absolutely necessary that you're somebody else in order to audit him, then you never audit him, do you? And then you Q-and-A with him and try to be somebody else in order to audit him. Ha! That's a nice trap for you to fall into, isn't it? Hm? That's right.

The session only begins, or begins only, when you, as you, can audit him. Now we can't say *„as him" because he's not in-session yet. Even though you've said, „Start of session,"* don't kid yourself. *„Start of session"* is a bunch of syllables. They're vibrations in the air. They merely give him warning through his remote warning system of how to clam up and brace up so that you don't get anywhere.

Oh, you start a session, you certainly better clear the auditor. And only when you've got an auditor good and clear, then you can go on and get some auditing done. Half the pcs here are halfway inclined to believe that their auditor leaves something to be desired and that they would - they can hear the commands of the fellow two chairs down and they sound very confident, and they say, *„Wouldn't it be much better if I had him as an auditor,"* you know? *„He sounds so overwhelming and I'm so overwhelmable."* Well, I'll clue you, if anybody, while being a pc, has heard any other command in the whole room than his auditor's, he's out of session but royally. Pcs of mine don't hear what's going on in the next room, let me tell you. They just don't hear it, that's all. But they do up to the point where they're in-session.

I was Q-and-Aing around with a pc last night. I was, by the way, auditing till 3:30 this morning. Auditor's Code should always be obeyed; I always learn it when I audit after midnight. I can get away with it up to midnight sometimes, but when I get somebody that's tired or sick, as I had last night, boy, they get more fancy code breaks. I got about twenty minutes of auditing done in about two hours. The rest of it was patching up exterior noises, code breaks, this, that, the other thing and getting the person into session. I got in five minutes of auditing at the beginning of session, and then the pc's - wasn't really nicely in-session because it was kind of an assist, you know? I fell for it and didn't put him well into session. And then I spent the next couple of hours, you know, just trying to - trying to keep this thing patched up so I could settle it. Finally, about 3:10, I had the pc totally, nicely, beautifully, wonderfully in-session. All ARC breaks with me on any time or place or anything else all patched up, everything arranged, adjusted and squared around. Audited him for fifteen minutes and took away his strep throat. See? Five minutes at the beginning, fifteen minutes at the end, that was the actual auditing that got done. The rest of it was getting up to getting some auditing done. Got that? Boy, is auditing effective if they're really in-session. And boy, is it ineffective if they're not. Now, what's a PT problem but that activity going on in the physical universe at this moment which permits a preclear's attention to be exterior to the session and exterior to the auditor and therefore not upon the problem of auditing.

If you don't think this is serious, watch profiles before and after twenty-five hours of expert, excellent, professional auditing on a pc who, all that time, had a PT problem that wasn't touched, and that he never told the auditor about and that remained masked and buried. You get no change of profile, no change of IQ, no vanishment of

psychosomatics or anything else.

Now that tells you how important that in-sessionness is: pretty important, if it can keep every process run from working. So therefore it must be senior to every process run. Just by flat, factual testing, getting them in-session must be senior to any process

run because it can keep any process from working. Digest it, please! Don't monkey with a pc out-of-sessionness; solve it, not the case and then solve the case, because the case is not available to you until he's in-session. When he's in-session, he doesn't hear the automobiles going by. He isn't worried about his present lifetime. He's just as willing to be totally revivified 800,000 years ago and lost in a jungle with dinosaurs eating him up. He knows the auditor's there. Get the idea? A case runs like hot butter if they're in-session. There's just nothing to it. And there are auditors here, right this minute, that have never seen a case in-session. Never have seen a case in-session, and just going bzzzz. And they say, *„Well, preclears are tough, they're hard to audit; they're tough."* No. No. No. No. No. It is tough to audit a pc who isn't in-session. You got that? And there are auditors here, because there are some old-timers here, who have seen pcs really in-session and have seen a case run like a rocket shot by anybody else than the US Army, US Air Force and US Navy. Get the idea? And do you know that the ease of running of a case is not the relative difficulties among cases. The ease of running of the case is relative to the degree of in-sessionness on the part of the pc. So a tough case looks like a tough case to the degree it is not in-session. And the trickery and the smoothness on the part of the auditor that is demanded, is demanded to put the pc into session. So, it's difficulty to get into session that measures the toughness of case. And that is all there is to it.

Given total in-sessionness - that's not a hypnotic trance or anything like that; the person's more awake than he's ever been before in his life. And he's actually up with more trust than he's ever had before in his life. Given total in-sessionness, all cases are totally simple. They're just complicated to the degree that they're out of session.

Now when we're saying, *„out of session"* we mean to the degree that they are bothered by the environment, bothered by the auditor, bothered by this and bothered by that and bothered by something else. Actually, constant harping on ARC breaks is only a symptom of being out of session. But constant harping on ARC breaks ought to be enough. It's not dependent upon the in-sessionness on the part of the preclear but acceptance of the auditor.

ARC breaks come about when the auditor is not acceptable totally to the preclear. And when you have a not totally acceptable person doing the auditing, you get ARC breaks. Well, you needn't feel bad about this because you have to say, *„What person is acceptable?"* And you find out the only person under the sun, moon or stars that could possibly have audited him would be Mother and you happen to be a man. Or it could be Father and you happen to be a woman.

No, don't think it's a criticism of your skill that he has ARC breaks, so much so that I am less and less concerned

with getting pcs' ARC breaks. I audit on a straight, overt, aggressive line, and eventually saws right on through and then we get what's wrong and square it around. In other words, I just tsh-tsh-tsh-tsh-tsh-tsh boom, you know? And the pc is fend off, fend off, fend off, fend off, fend off. *„After all, you are not Krishnamurti swami, someone, and therefore you can't audit me,"* you know? *„And after all, you audit much too well, you're too smooth and you're going to get all of my secrets. And you're going to find out all about that sort of*

thing that I did there back... - and so forth," and therefore it's as much a liability to be known as an expert.

There's guys around that will only let putty-fingered stumblebums that have never been near school audit them, do you know that? And if they find some girl that can learn a couple of terms or some young boy that doesn't have a very hard voice and they say, *"Well, you're my auditor, go ahead."* Oh, ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho! Boy, that's out-of-sessionness but gloriously, isn't it? Now, these two facts, combined with the fact that there is something wrong with the case - there is something definite and specifically wrong with the ease. And some of you right now have a very far cry from a good understanding of this. I hear you go sailing in like this: *"Well, we're going to clear this now,"* and so on. We just clear the command word by word, the English definition for this, the English definition for that, and even throw in, *"What is your opinion of help?"* and *"What is your opinion of a people pleaser?"* or something like that. And *"Here's the first command,'How could a people pleaser help itself?'"* Oh, no! What are you doing? Where the hell did you get the idea that you could run with an unspecified terminal? You've got to prepare a case with constant scouting of two, three, four, five hours' duration to find exactly what people pleaser, where, is wrong with him. And then you can run what is a people pleaser, by, *"How could you help a people pleaser?"* and *"How could it help itself?"* and so forth. He's got to have one! Now where did you get the idea that you could do anything else? What do you do - going to run this case on such a high generality that not even you want to understand it? That takes a scout. And I've been weeks now teaching you how to scout. Did you think it all went out the window because I gave you a magic button? Not for one minute. Look for that stuck needle. Take it right on down the track. Find out exactly where it winds up and then find the people pleaser connected with it. Or, by defining people pleaser, and finding out what pleases people, just by a straightwire, two-way comm, blow stuff, blow stuff, blow stuff until you get that damned Rock undug. And you'll find out it was the first magnificent thing that on a via pleased everybody and then gloriously flopped.

And when you've got that item and it is identified and he knows where it is and he knows what it is and he knows how it is, now run Help on it. Otherwise, go ahead and waste your time because you'll be 8,000 hours to Clear.

You're auditing something. You're not auditing an idea. Where did you get the idea that you could audit this vague idea? That Rock is an isness. It has mass. It has a position in time which then became all time everywhere. It has an anatomy, it has engram and lock chains connected with it. It has a specific identity and the best name for it is a people pleaser, whenever and wherever it is found. But you sure as hell better get that thing spotted and identified before you start wasting and ruining a perfectly fine process like the Rock bracket.

Oh, I know, your HCO Bulletin wasn't specific. It said, however, *"What is a people pleaser?"* It did say that, didn't it?

Audience: Yes.

And then it gave you brackets, and it said you could just run brackets; it'd still find it. It said, *"Find it."* It didn't say, *"Avoid it."* And the best way I know to find it is just get

right in there and chug-chug-chug-chug-chug-chug, bang! Rock! You get the idea? I don't care if you have to go in there with blow torches! Find it. Isolate it. Circumscribe it. He knows absolutely and exactly that that is the Rock and there's no further question in his mind but what this is everything everywhere and everything that would ever be wrong with him or ever has been wrong with him. He's got that totally nailed. He's fifteen minutes to Clear. And if you don't get him to that point, he's fifteen thousand years to Clear.

Hear me. It's the last time I will mention it to you in public.

The definition of a process is: a way of avoiding looking. But that doesn't mean that everything you run isn't a process, and that the best way to reach things is by a process. But as long as you don't realize that a process is simply a tool that opens up tin cans for you, you're never going to see any tin cans, and you're going to say, „*What are we doing? Isn't it nice we have this process because we never have to look at anything.*" It's just another via.

The process is a tool, not a via for lookingness. Oh, I shouldn't run down its value to that extent because I'll make you come off repetitive questions and I'm not asking you to do that. Anything you run on somebody, you ought to run as a repetitive question of one kind or another. I don't care if you rephrase it eight different ways and call it straight-way comm - you know, two-way comm, or Straightwire, or something of this sort. You're still running, to some degree, a repetitive question.

When you go in there and start asking about the Rock itself, you had better - and when you are starting to run it out and - you had certainly better use it as a repetitive question, and it had better be perfectly worded. But you use a process when you've got something to go after, or you use a diagnostic process when you're trying to find something. You don't use a process to clear people. You get the horrible difference here? You could sit and drift in limbo for the rest of time and you'll never get anything done with cases. Now, it doesn't say you haven't gotten things done with cases, but you've got enough done with cases so you now might get something done with cases. You got it? You've gotten enough done with cases so you might get something done with cases. Now that's what's important.

And you're going to have yourselves a ball. Boy, when you can tell me exactly the size, shape and general description of your pc's Rock and what it pleased and how it pleased and so forth, and what the lock chains are that branch off from the thing, and where it's going, boy, he's so close to Clear, don't let him sneeze because he'll sneeze himself Clear. You get the idea? When he's got this thing real well taped - well, the odd part of it is, a process has very often taped it for him, but then the auditor never asked for it. He never asked the dope on it. Why couldn't he ask the dope on it? Well, he was running a process and of course you can't stop a process and ask anybody anything. Processes are just sort of a machine that winds up and just runs forever, you know. No, you have to ask.

You have to find out what he's doing and how he's doing it, and what it is and where it is and what it's doing. And you have to ask him expertly enough so that you're not slowing up the whole case and avoiding the case simply by asking. You see, there's a

nice adjustment point. You can yak, yak, yak, yak, yak as you go down along the line and as-is his havingness and chew it all up and not find out anything either. You see, you can do too much of that sort of thing, but you also can do just exactly the right amount.

And that right amount, by the way, is very well dictated by your interest. If you only do what interests you to find out what this thing is, if you only do what interests you to put him into session, and so forth, and do the other proper thing, you generally do the right thing, within the framework of the TRs, because they're just ways of - the TRs reversed are methods of nonconfrontingness used by humans.

When you start disobeying the TRs, you are using methods of nonconfrontingness, see? So the TRs teach you, if anything, teach you you can confront anything. You get the idea? But they too are tools and for use, but there's the way to go about it.

And, you know, when I see somebody slumped in an auditing chair, auditing and all caved in and twisted up and so forth, I know what he's having trouble doing. He's having trouble confronting. He's not having trouble with TR 0, even though you point to him and say, *„TR 0."* What you mean is he is not confronting. There's something he is avoiding. So let's chew it in there and let's get him braced up, not to make him sit better but to make him confront the thing he's not confronting. You got the idea? Well, let's come off of the little rote patterns of training and get on to some good sense, without taking it as a liberty of doing no auditing. See, that is the horrible, the horrible thing that you face, you get the idea, that at any moment, why, you're tired so you do no auditing by going off into the limbo and not following something down. I catch myself doing it every once in a while to some dim degree, and I say, *„Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh-oh. Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk. Back in the groove, Ronnie. Now, where did this pc start boring me to death? Oh."* And once in a while, I'll go for two, three minutes - this sometimes drives a preclear nuts - two or three minutes without asking him a single question. I just look at the meter and look at the pc and size the thing up, try to get the orientation of the situation, get it squared around so that I understand it. The pc's saying, *„What's the matter, what's the matter, what's the matter, what's the matter?"* *„Shut up."*

The pc is sitting back there - he's sulking now. And you say, *„Now, now, what's the matter with you?"* *„Well, you told me to shut up."*

„I know I did. Now, let's see, the next auditing command..." That blows the ARC break usually. *„I know I did. I was trying to figure your case out and see where we were going."* *„Oh!"* Big understanding blows this thing. New light dawns. *„You have to look over my case, too,"* you know? *„What do you know?"* Now, a process that leads in toward getting him to accept you as the auditor, something on the basis of: find the biggest ARC he has had with somebody on the backtrack as an auditor and just blow it to glory. It'll blow all the locks off the top of it. We use this pattern today to such a degree, and it is so good, that it'll blow an ARC break, it'll blow a psychosomatic right out the window. Find the pleasedness that precedes the illness.

He's having trouble with his wife; find all the times he was happy with her, and poom! Got it? He's having trouble with his throat; find all the times and things and good

throats. Just find some good throats, and zing, all of a sudden the bad throats go. We know the mechanism now, we know it exactly, we can use it.

He doesn't like you as an auditor; he doesn't like you as a practitioner, then some minister or god or priest or devil or somebody was so much a practitioner that ever since, why, everybody who did anything to him had to be this god or devil or priest, don't you see? So find out what was so wonderful about this god or devil or priest, not sarcastically, but just run it out. Just get it, get more of it and all of a sudden he blows through and he says, *„Well, you're okay as an auditor."* Now, you can do something else with this whole thing. You can find out what it's all right - what part of you it's all right for him to confront, and what part of you it's all right for him to have, and find out what it's all right for him to be doing, and what it's all right for you to ask. And just take up the various points that you'll have to be going through, you know, and look these things up. Not a bunch of stupid vias on the line, you know, I mean just right direct.

You're asking him, *„What the hell is wrong with me auditing you?"* You know? I don't care how you phrase it, this is what you ask him. You don't say, *„Well, I think I'm perfectly all right as your auditor, and therefore I am now auditing you and the hell with what you think about it."* See, that probably wouldn't win. But it's better than neglecting the point entirely. You got it? All right, now the next thing that you want to have happen is this pc to get into session. How do you get him into session? Well, it is more you, but it's mostly help. A general Help bracket will assist him markedly. But I'll tell you a much better one, and this patches up ARC breaks and so forth, and it's a process. You say, *„How could you help me? How could I help you?"* And you ask him an odd number of times. That is

to say, you don't ask him one question, then one question. You ask him two *„How could I help you's"* you know, because he seems to be glib on that right now. And then he slows down on it, so you don't ask him but a few of those, then you flip it.

Every time he slows down, develops a comm lag, you shift the bracket. You just shift the bracket. But it's a bracket of two. *„How could I help you? How could you help me?"* *„How could I help you? How could you help me?"* And you just run it enough times until you've smoothed that out between you and that. Boy, he'll have some of the weirdest ideas of - concerning you, but that will flatten them. Now, that also gets sessioning done and that gets him into session. Get the idea? That gets him grooved down the line.

Now, if you want to put him further in-session, prove to him absolutely and conclusively that you can do something decent for him fast. But in order to do that, he's got to have a proper definition or an understanding of five key buttons and one additional button which is Pleased. Change, Help, Problems, Create, Responsibility and Pleased. Boy, has he got to have a good idea of those. And you know, people can have the wildest idea of what *„pleased"* means, or what a *„pleased person"* is that you ever heard of. Boy, really wild! You wouldn't - you won't believe it till you look at it.

You're trying to run a process on this individual, contains the word *„pleased."* And *„pleased"* to him means a broken leg, *„pleased"* means a broken leg, *„pleased"* means a broken leg.

„How could that person be pleased with you?"

„Well, he could fall off a grating and break his leg." I mean, it's totally non sequitur. *„Well, he could be pleased with me by being very sad with me. People believe that people are pleased by being sad."*

When they have a disarrangement on any one of these six buttons including Pleased, you can realize their case is up the spout just by misdefinition. You can straighten out cases just by straightening out these definitions. Well, there's a process you could use on that, *„Invent a person; tell me his ideas of being pleased."* You know? *„Invent a person; tell me his ideas of change."* Get this straightened out.

Straighten him out. Straighten out your semantics. Don't worry too much about whether or not this command is the right incantation; does it mean anything? And don't be so optimistic as to believe that *„help"* to him is - means help.

Now, some of you are running Help on people that don't know what help is. And some of you are running Pleased on people that don't know what pleased is. And you say, *„a people pleaser,"* well, supposing the person didn't know what *„people"* were and didn't know what *„pleased"* was. Boy, you'd be up the spout. Some of them have eight or nine vias on *„pleased,"* if you please - just don't have a clue what *„pleased"* is. Not a clue. But they know what *„pleased"* is; it's somebody with a broken leg. They just can't conceive of anybody ever being pleased with anything, everyplace, at any time. And yet you run a Pleased process on them.

Well, you've got to put your words and processes together. But this again is getting them further into session. And you keep grooving them further into session. And the expertness of your auditing gets them into better and better session.

And then you start for that Rock. Well, you've got to find out what pleases people, and you'll have to lift bales of locks off, and I don't care what process you use to lift those locks off with. *„And what have you used in this lifetime to please people mightily?"* (Ha-ha-ha-ha.) *„What?"* And *„Recall times of doing that. Recall times of doing that."* Boom! Off with this present lifetime.

„Is there any other thing that you believe this?" And we get some generalized illusory thing, and we start running that thing down, *„Yes, that'd please people." „Tell me how it would please people. What sort - what sort of an ashcan would please people?"* You found ashcans, you know? Bang! You found ashcans sitting right there. Fixed! Just like I taught you in the first week, see? And *„What kind of an ashcan would please people? Think of a person that would be pleased with that ashcan."* You got it? And you get that thing straightened out. You can run right on down to the Rock with no more valid a process than that. You can knock out psychosomatics. You want to do something to him to increase his confidence? Just use *„Pleased"; people –* "*What kind of a throat would people be pleased with?"* Ten, fifteen minutes later you got a psychosomatic out of the way that he's had for

years, and he says, *„What! My asthma's gone? Hm, you are pretty good, aren't you?"* *„Yeah, I - I always like preclears to think that."* Get the idea?

Get them in-session. To get them in-session, you have to make them willing to have you as an auditor. Improve their certainty that auditing can do something for them. Square them around. Get them oriented on their words and definitions. Find the Rock by spotting sticks.

[End of lecture.]