

VALUE OF RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
31 May 1962

Thank you.

Now, you-uns saw a demonstration last night. I understand—I understand that a couple people here found out I could read an E-Meter. Actually were several comments on that. I mean, after the demonstration, “Why, Ron knows how to read an E-Meter, you know?” I thought it was marvelous.

Everybody has apparently been going on the thought impulse system—the thought impulse system. You see, life is a great pool, you see, and we are all unsegmented portions of the mush. And you see, when the auditor starts to think the auditing question, and before he asks it, you see, that is when the meter reacts.

So an instant read is when this thought impulse, you see, is transmitted instantly. Then asking the question has nothing to do with the meter, of course. For the benefit of anybody listening to this tape, that’s not the way you read a meter.

Well, here we are at 31 May 1962, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture one.

I’m going to talk to you about rudiments.

This is a very interesting subject—fascinating subject. I have just done a tremendous amount of work on it. Not the rudiments which you already had got and developed and so forth, but tremendous amount of work. How vital, how valuable and how deep will a rudiments process go if run as a repetitive process? Interesting datum, isn’t it, huh?

And we find out that if you took a small spoon and started to empty out the Atlantic Ocean, a rudiments process has that much effect on the reactive GPM.

You get that? I mean I’ve got the data now on it—working on it for a long time here. If I look haggard, that’s why.

I’ve had some comparative runs made on this, I’ve done a lot of comparative work on it, I’ve tried to figure these things out. I find out that that which is kicked into view by Routine 3 is not kicked out of view by any repetitive process known to man. That’s an interesting datum, isn’t it?

But here is the anomaly [anomaly]. Here it is. Here’s the oddity. Why is it that this tremendous bulldozer—Routine 3, listing processes, like 3GA and so forth—why is it that this tremendous bulldozer won’t run forward at all in the absence of these gnats flying against the back of it. Yeah, just why is that?

Well, we have the answer to that, too. The rudiments apply to present time and this universe now. They are a nowness series of processes. They apply to now.

Now, you have a good reality on that in that if you got a rudiment in with a club on a pc—I mean, let’s really get this rudiment in, I mean let’s really work it over. Let’s get down there: “Do you have a present time problem? Hm-hm, hm-hm, hm. How—how present time is that problem? Hm. Let’s see now. And any other type of present time problem that you might have?” and so forth. And we work these all over, and we run responsibility on them.

I even got a brand-new responsibility process. I thought, “My goodness this ought to revolutionize something” Would have revolutionized everything under the sun, about 1955 or

56, but now it's just a silent drop into the ocean and nobody hears of it again, you know. Has that much importance. But anyway, you run this responsibility, "What part of that problem can you be responsible for?" and you run it with all the new wrinkles and everything else, and you just fix that all up just very beautifully, you see? And this present time problem has to do with not being able to eat soup, you see. And my God can this fellow—doesn't worry about eating soup—he eats—he maybe even can eat soup and so forth. He can't eat asparagus though.

Well, if you list the number of articles of food which are commonly considered comestibles, you're licked.

In other words, if you were to use these rudiments processes—this is new data; this is brand-new data, by the way—don't think this is anything that's been sitting around for a long time. You wouldn't have thought I'd been sweating over this with everything that's been coming your way—you know, all the data. But the fact is my mainline research is what I'm giving you right this minute, see.

These rudiments processes are incapable of even denting the Goals Problem Mass. They just won't do it. They will do a little bit of a tiny, oh, a just microscopic key-out. Let's say you've got the GPM keyed in on somebody with a crash. See, this is really keyed in on him. This person, by the way, the auditing or nothing else keyed it in on him you know. I mean they got this in life, you know. They were a citizen of some country, you know, or something like that. They just went all out into the total degradation, you see, of nationalism or something I'm sorry, I shouldn't bring that up, but I mean I—every—the more I see what these so-called leaders of man are doing these days, the more my goal gets invalidated. Anyway . . .

So the basic problem is how to defeat their own nation with a minimum of difficulty for themselves and a maximum of difficulty for their citizens.

Anyway, we got this situation here where this fellow has got this thing keyed-in, you know. He's just black mass from here to Halifax. So we sit down and we run any version, no matter how learned, of a repetitive rudiments process. And no matter how we run it we're going to wind up at the other end of the line with the same way that old Hendrick Van Loon described eternity. He said eternity was the Rock of Gibraltar, and once every thousand years a bird came and sharpened his beak on the rock. And when the rock was totally worn away an eternity would have elapsed.

Well, that's just about the way it would look. I mean it's that—it's that rough. It's that rough. Now, we don't really include Prepchecking in that. We're talking about rudiments processes, see?

Prepchecking can do a key-out. And rather interesting that you can key out any part of it with Prepchecking. You can move it around with the CCHs. And here are all these processes that have to do with havingness, have to do with willingness to talk to somebody about difficulties. They have to do with withholding things from people and they have to do with present time problems, telling half-truths, untruths, not answering auditing commands, have to do with influencing meters and more withholds and problems and difficulties or anything else you want to add up on top of it, plus your middle rudiments, suppressions, invalidations, missed withholds, failures to reveal and careful of. These are the middle rudiments. I want to take those up much more broadly in just a few minutes.

You take all these things, see, we put those into process combinations, repetitive process combinations and we audit them on the pc. Rock of Gibraltar, bird sharpens a beak, see?

I've been over the jumps on this, you know. As I talk to you, by the way, I have a headache from a test on it.

The difficulties of assaulting the GPM are absolutely heroic. They're tremendous in size. How in the name of common sense Freud ever expected, see . . . "Well now, when you were a little girl, did any little boys look at you?"

And the patient says, "Oh, yes, yes."

"Good. You're no longer neurotic." Silly as that, you know. Look at these rudiments processes—they're marvelous. You run them—oddly enough running them you get a good subjective reality on exactly what they are and you think the bank is moving them, and you say, "Gee, we really get someplace."

I can give you some rudiments processes which are killers! These are just test processes. You might care to clean up some auditing on somebody someday. This won't do it very well, but it's the strongest process known. If you're running Routine 3 it won't do it. But that is a Routine 3 process, right? "What didn't you know? What didn't another know? What didn't others know?" Doesn't that sound like a lovely process? It is. It is very effective. It's very effective. It gives a person—it kind of shifts somatics and they kind of feel better and they're happier about the thing. Sometimes when you've had a horribly ARC breaky session or something like that, some form of that process will do things—will do things.

But that process run up against a locked-in GPM has no influence at all on the GPM. You'd swear that it does have until you look up afterwards and realize all the masses are in exactly the same place as they were before. Horrible to report, isn't it.

Now, that process itself is a killer. You run that on some pc sometime in some co-audit or in an Academy and the pc would be absolutely delighted with the whole thing, you know, he will, would feel kind of odd occasionally and so forth, but he'd be delighted. Cognitions, you know—marvelous. GPM—bang

Now, Prepchecking and the CCHs are capable of keying something out, providing it isn't too thoroughly in. Doesn't do actually anything to the GPM. It just sort of can take the pc off of it a bit. And you get a key-out phenomenon.

Then when you start running a Routine 3 process you key it right straight back in again. So you know very well it was just a key-out.

No, the value of a rudiments process run in repetitive process form as a button, swamping up track left and right, you think, phrased up any way you want to phrase it up, the ability of it to affect the Goals Problem Mass is, by the way—well, call it the reactive mind except the GPM plus locks and free track would be the reactive mind. Free track is actually the only thing missing and the only additional thing to the GPM that is in the reactive mind.

There's a bunch of whole track engrams that sit independent of it, which can also be included in. Now there's the GPM and then there's the whole track engrams that are scattered around about the place and so forth, the pc knows nothing about. And the whole of that is the reactive mind.

You can do things with that if you're influencing anything with these repetitive rudiments processes, used on a whole track basis, you understand? That's the only thing I'm talking down on these things. These are used against the whole track. This is trying to audit the whole case of the pc, you see?

I'll give you another one. "What have you suppressed? What has another suppressed? What has another suppressed on you? What have you suppressed on another—or in another?" See?

"What have others suppressed in you? What have you suppressed in others? What has another suppressed in others," you know? A multiple bracket on Suppress.

Stands your hair on end when you first start to run it. You say, “Man, this is going to take up—this is going to clean up the whole track. Couldn’t help it. Makes you feel so horrible.”

Use Invalidate in the same way. use—I’ve already given you the Fail to Reveal, the Missed Withhold, the Don’t Know, all of which are the same thing Careful of—oh, you’d get very interesting results, I’m sure, you’d think. Not worthwhile. None of them are worthwhile. These are all rudiments buttons. None of them are worthwhile.

One time a well-known auditor out on the West Coast sent me a cable to Australia saying—recommending that I test out at once something on the order of “What lies have you told?” or “What have you lied about?” Some such process as that, you see? Because obviously a lie is an alter-is and that actually would be what the reactive bank would consist of. A lie therefore would be very hot. And frankly it follows these other thought button symptoms, and the buttons are just—it’s just—just goes so far and it looks terribly promising and then nothing happens.

But now this doesn’t say those rudiments should not be handled, see, and this doesn’t say you shouldn’t use rudiments. I’m just talking about using rudiments to clean up the whole case—using this button called a rudiment, let’s apply it to the whole case. Nothing’s going to happen. You’re not going to clear anybody with it. I can tell you that.

Now, basically this is because these are all thought manifestations. These are all think-thinks, see? These buttons are all figure-figure buttons. And what’s got your pc buried is the fact that his postulatingness is basically thinkingness on a lower scale, see?

Think-think or figure-figure, see, is below effort on the Know to Mystery Scale, see. It’s actually not—it’s actually not postulatingness, see? Oh, way up, way up here, way up at the top of the scale, see, postulating And he’s thinking he’s below effort. And none of those buttons, weirdly enough, will carry him up above or through effort. They just sort of keep swatting him on the nose and swatting him on the nose and nothing ever happens except he gets swatted on the nose, don’t you see?

He doesn’t go Clear or anything. That’s because you’re below effort. It needs something to carry the pc up through the effort band into the higher ranges of the Know to Mystery Scale in order to get the pc there and that’s your Routine 3 processes. And these rudiments processes will not carry the pc up through that effort band. Very remarkable, but they won’t.

But your pc, because he is below the band of effort with his figure-figure, he’s doing figure-figuringness in the middle of these GPM masses. He’s getting his dictations from the circuits. He’s getting the word from circuit A to circuit B and he’s getting the word of all kinds of conflicting and oppositional identities of one kind or another. And all these identities are in conflict with all these identities, so their ideas are in conflict with all these ideas. And as you audit him, you have to keep him from being obsessively alarmed about present time and defensive, otherwise he is not up to confronting the effort and the masses. See, he can’t; he’ll go r-r-h-h.

And yet all the time he’s sitting there, he’s got a bunch of automatic thinks going. And these automatic thinks are all characterized under the existing rudiments—beginning, middle and end rudiments. Those are the buttons which keep him so involved with think-think that he can’t go up scale.

Now, to get him to go up scale requires something like a Routine 3 process. And the reason that works is because you are labeling masses. Labeling, identifying masses which brings about a differentiation amongst masses and gets the pc up to confronting masses.

Your effort however is not to get the pc to confront masses. Your effort is simply to get the conflict of those masses identified and resolved any way you wish to do so. It’s rather easy to do once you know what you’re doing. He’s been a boy and the boy has conflicts with girls

and the reason boy and girl are suspended right where he lives is because they are in conflict. All right, boy and girl are in conflict.

Now, he eventually—he's never really identified the fact that he has been a boy or a girl or that boy or girl are part of this great mass called a GPM, the gross mass. Boy and girl are little pieces of this mass, don't you see? But he's never identified these things as having anything to do with him. And one day he's labeling—you've got him listing and he's labeling—and he sees boy. He says, "What do you know, you know, boy, a boy. A boy." That gets kind of real to him, and girl—that gets real to him to. These things cease to oppose each other. In other words, you've actually unhinged the tricky, almost-impossible-to-maintain balance of this glutinous bunch of electronic guck called a GPM, you see. And it can no longer hang up and recreate itself.

It's creating itself, you see. He's furnishing the energy while it creates itself. It's very interesting, you see. He's creating with his left hand, gazing at his right hand, you know. Very tricky.

But the identification of the mass, the labeling of the mass is the fringe line between the think-think and the mass. That will move him up into confrontation of the mass, he becomes aware of the mass, the mass blows. It actually is nothing—no trick at all for a thetan to confront the mass. That's not even difficult to do. It's what mass to confront; that is the main thing that worries him.

And the GPM—now that we have some of the anatomy of the GPM by the identification of the various chunks of it—of course, the thing disintegrates and it tends to come apart and various things occur because you're doing this. Now, you can get a pc into the GPM or find out what part of the GPM he's in with a Goals Assessment. That's easily the best way, as I've always said, because it identifies the think-think that is going in and the principal mass that he's got to get out of.

If you want to know what the—what the ambition of the mass is, that—you want to find out what goal the pc has that hangs up that he calls his goal. And of course, that is the first identification of the mass he's sitting in which by being opposed and counter-opposed and not opposed and all that sort of thing is suspended right where he is. Now, you start listing down on this thing, all the pressures and electronic mechanisms and masses that hold

this in place are suddenly—start lifting and as these things lift, of course, it can't stay there anymore, and where did it go, you know? He isn't even aware of the fact that he is in it or being it and he is definitely not aware of the fact that it is of no value to him but quite on the contrary is a detriment.

He'd tell you at first, "Oh man, if I get rid of this . . ." Is an easy and early phenomena of Routine 3. "God, it's a horrible feeling—wait a minute, if I get rid of this I won't want to do anything"

Well, that's because he's—there's some of the old lectures on games, and so forth. He's so fixated on this that he thinks there is only one game in the whole universe and that game is it. And if that's the only game there is, that's the only thing he can play. And for a little while, every time you start influencing this, he says, "Well there's no other game, you know, and if I get rid of this then I'll have no game at all." Where as a matter of fact if you look it over carefully, he's not playing that game, see?

And if he were playing it he hasn't had any fun doing it. See, this thing is all—he's in a heavy conflict about all this. As soon as he gets his attention unfixated off of this, he sees, well, there might be some other games around. And as soon as he sees there's some other games around, why, he can become more fluid and more action and he can start enjoying life. Actually he's in a no-games condition—no (hyphen) games condition. Not in a games

condition. He thinks he's in a games condition but he's actually in a no-games condition, because he isn't playing the game he knows he has to play as that's the only game there is.

So anyway, you get the pc up through this band, and the boost is accomplished by permitting the pc to have his full attention there playing upon the objects you're trying to haul him out of. Now, if his attention is distracted by things in present time, he has just that much less attention with which to address this task of going up scale through the Know to Mystery Scale and he feels—he might have—but he feels like he hasn't got quite enough attention units to look at anything. He's distracted.

He's distracted by the think-think. He isn't actually throwing his own rudiments out; his own rudiments are going out because various masses which also have influential ideas are impinging ideas upon him, consistently, and by pulling these off, you get extraneous ideas off of him which are liable to yank him into PT. But your primary concern is that present time and the operation known as auditing will not drain away his attention.

You keep him up in a high-toned state, whereas he's not worried about the present, he's not worried about the auditor, he's not worried about the session—his attention isn't split in any way. Then theoretically he has enough attention to attack the GPM successfully. And if he is worried about any one of these things, he has just that much less attention to give the GPM.

Well, you're already telling this fellow, "Now, mount this little—mount this little tricycle, here—has one grasshopper-power tricycle, and there's Mount Blanc, now. All right, now just ride to the top of it. Thank you."

It's quite unreasonable, I mean, to ask a pc to go through the GPM at all because, man, it is tough. This is a rough, rough, rough proposition. I don't mean to aggrandize or say how fantastic a GPM is. Its strength becomes as nothing the second that you know about it and know how to get out of it.

But it isn't anything that surrenders to half-baked auditing And it isn't anything that surrenders to a distracted pc. If the auditor hasn't got that pc's every attention on exactly what the pc is doing, then the pc won't be able to overcome the bumps. See, he won't ride any tricycle to the top of Mount Blanc, man.

Then you start—you see that he can't do it and you start getting impatient with the pc. You start buying him airplanes and that sort of thing to fly to the top of Mount Blanc and you eventually will find him at the top of Mount Blanc, but he hasn't accompanied himself.

So, the relationship of rudiments, then, to a Routine 3 type of process is the same relationship as a hedge would have along the side of a road. It keeps the pc guided, pointed and traveling—the same function as small stones might have on an otherwise broad highway. You can't make any speed over this highway unless you get these stones off the road, see. It's a sort of herding, nonimpeding action. But as far as a rudiment or rudiments processes or processes based on rudiments actually moving this pc along that road, they do not. They move the pc no place.

But they can retard the pc from going And if really badly done—if you've gotten down over the weekend and thought it over real carefully as to how to get the rudiments well enough out, you could actually get the pc traveling in reverse. You could actually make him travel in reverse. That is possible under today's auditing. The rudiments would have to be pretty wildly out. The meter would have to be very badly read, indeed.

But you've just got this situation that the make and break of whether the pc goes forward or not—if your rudiments are (quote) in (unquote) your pc will make forward progress because he has enough attention to blast himself through where he's going. And if the rudiments are out the pc does not have enough attention to blast himself through. In fact there is no blasting and the auditor winds up all sour and doing the blasting for the pc. And of course, this doesn't

do any good at all. This gets him to the top of Mount Blanc without having accompanied himself and that is a very interesting state to be in.

They've done this for years in Tibet. They know how to exteriorize in Tibet—they go out the bottom. That isn't why dear old Tibet has busily succumbed now to the ultimate degradation of it all, of it all, of it all. It's got commies on—in it and amongst it.

I ran into somebody the other day who was worrying about whether or not the—any of the old teachings of Lamaism would survive the communist smash of that particular government and so forth. I don't think commie is that active, I don't think he'd get around those cliffs and so forth. No, I don't think so, man. It takes energy. I'm sure the old Lamas have got it pretty well buried amongst the hilltops and in the caves.

But anyway, the essence of what you're doing is to collect to the pc all of his potential power of confronting, his potential power of examination, his potential power of blowing things. Well, in order to collect this all together, you have to set him up so he is all fine with the auditing universe in which he is being audited, which is to say, his auditor, his E-Meter, his attitudes toward the session, his attitudes towards the environment, his worries about the extensional environment out at home and this sort of thing. These things have got to be taken care of and then he has enough horsepower to climb the hill. Otherwise he doesn't have.

Now, if you flagrantly throw these things out, you can get the reverse effect of dropping him further back down the slope. If you try to get a pc to concentrate his attention—you just keep inferring to this pc or telling him that he must concentrate his attention on something while you are making him concentrate his attention on something else, he gets to feeling worse than schizy. See? You keep saying, "Now concentrate on the GPM. All right,

now go ahead and worry about your problem. Yes, worry about my E-Metering. Worry about the fact I keep kicking you in the shins," Do you see? "Worry about whether you left enough money with your wife. And now— now you've worried about all those things? Are you enough bothered? Are you sufficiently agitated and upset? Good. Now put your attention on the GPM." Dz-z-z-z-z.

When he does this, he gets a recoil phenomenon. A pc whose attention is put on the GPM and then suddenly jerked off of the GPM will get a mass straight in his teeth. Every now and then you've see—you've heard of this happening or seen it happening or made it happen to you: One fine day you were sitting in session minding your own business and all of a sudden the window weights broke or something like that—the window came down with a dreadful crash. It wasn't the noise that bothered you. It was the mystery of the mass that hit you in the schnozola. What was that? See?

And you say to the auditor, "What was that?" you see, and the auditor obliges and he said, "That was the window falling down." Well, that's a damn funny sensation, see, to result from a—simply a noise blast. Actually it wasn't a noise blast. The pc's attention was distracted over toward the window and his attention acted as a sort of a pressor beam and it had part of whatever his bank was in focus, and when his attention suddenly swept sideways, it was just as though you took the pole out of the hand of a pole vaulter when he was halfway up to the bar. Uncomfortable.

So keeping the rudiments in includes not yanking the pc out of the session. See? That is an understood part of the rudiments. And something which probably is not sufficiently stressed or commented on because there is no remark made by the auditor that invites this situation.

In other words, you could get all of your beginning rudiments in and then drop the ashtray. All your labor would be in vain, because you see, you have gotten all of the rudiments in and then you have thrown them all out. Why? Because you've got the pc's attention braced into PT. Now you've got him pinned in PT. You've got his attention on something else rather than

the whole track and getting him into session. So he can attack these masses and aberrations and straighten them out.

You've got his attention on something else. And if you've got his attention on something else, he can't do it, that's all. He's like the marksman who is firing for a record to get his medals and his corporalmanship and a pretty girl passes on the road down the side of the rifle range. You know. He didn't get his corporalship, even though he shot the corporal that was teaching him. Pc can't hit anything

It's very funny. If you jerk the pc's attention out of session suddenly and then ask the pc the next auditing command, you get gobbledygook. You may not have looked at it as that direct a phenomena. You may have had other explanations for it. But actually if he's in a dispersal—he's been hit back by something—and you ask a question into this dispersal and he can't concentrate his attention. His ability to differentiate at that moment is tremendously lessened. He confuses things with things. He doesn't know what's going on. He has no attention to concentrate for a moment. His anchor points are driven in.

It is a bad and a sad thing that the rudiments can be put in very laboriously for a half an hour and knocked out in a tenth of a second. See? How can they be knocked out in a tenth of a second? Well, I don't know—telephone rings, you answer it, you turn around to the pc without any further announcement—you know, he's not out of the session or anything, he's right in the middle of session, he's right in the middle of a GPM something or other, you doing something or other—hand him the phone and you say, "Well, it's your wife. she says the police are at the house." I don't think you'd have much luck auditing that case.

Well, the funny part of it is that you can do this as slightly—the person—the further the person's attention is dispersed, as you find him as a pc—the Tone Scale, tone of case, degree of dispersal, degree of nonconcentration—these are all of one breed of cat, you see. And this person who is not well concentrated on what he's doing, you give him a little noise like this—and if he's halfway round the bend in the first place or terribly concentrated on something, you'd be amazed. You can knock ten rudiments out just like that. All of a sudden you examine your fingernail and you've had it, see? He'd have to be terribly dispersed in order for this to happen, but that would happen. See?

Some pc that you're busy auditing—you say, "Did you—did you mind that? I—you know, you—" "Did you mind, did you mind that?"

"No, no, no. No, it's perfectly all right." He might also have added to it, "I always suppress those things."

Doesn't matter what the pc said, the rudiments went out, that's it. It's a sort of a tightrope walk at best. But when a pc has experience of an auditor—that is not of auditors but an auditor—has experience of an auditor, and this auditor has successfully put the pc's rudiments in several times, you will find the pc's anxiety expressed about rudiments, his anxiety about the rudiments being in or not, his anxiety about the present time universe, are of the same breed. They're parallels. They're the same thing. He says he's anxious about the rudiments or something like this. Well, he's anxious about present time, you see?

And after an auditor has successfully put them in several times, pc will sit there in session—my God, you could practically drop the E-Meter, you know, and nothing happens. They don't go out. This is a factor known as confidence. Expectancy. The pc begins to understand that his attention can be properly directed by this auditor. He begins to understand that this auditor is not going to get him into trouble but on the contrary is going to get him out of it. It's—an aura of confidence begins to surround the session and at that time, watch out, because you're going to get too cocky, man! Because the aura of confidence adequate to Prepchecking is probably short of the mark adequate to Routine 3.

In other words you need an even greater aura of confidence. Although the process seems simpler, the auditor has to be far less clever. The stress is so great that the rudiments have to be in much better and they have to stay in very well—otherwise the pc never climbs that band through the effort scale. He never comes out of the mud.

Some auditor could audit Routine 3, I imagine, with the rudiments wildly out, year in and year out, and wonder why the pc was going no place. Well, the pc's going no place because the auditor doesn't have the pc's confidence. Why doesn't the auditor have the pc's confidence? Not because of his domestic or personal reputation, it's simply whether or not he can put the rudiments in. That's all. That's all there is to it.

Now the pc realizes that this auditor cannot put the rudiments in, that he has to lie and cheat and wiggle around. He goes on automatic. He goes on self-audit and he isn't going to blow much of a GPM. Believe me, he's not going to blow anything. He's going to stew and chew and stew and chew and it's going on and on and on. He isn't suddenly and miraculously going to mount up scale. He's sort of going to hang. And this is nothing to be worried about, this is just—only happens when the rudiments are out. It isn't the esoteric personality. It isn't the swamiesqueness of the auditor. It isn't any one of these other things it might be. It's just are the rudiments in or aren't they? And if the rudiments are in, the pc feels confident and if the rudiments are out the pc feels nervous.

Now, when a pc has been audited many times with the rudiments out, he becomes more and more and more nervous. It is terribly to your advantage that no matter how little you expect of the session to do a good job of putting the rudiments in for that session. Because you've always made this little hidden gain alongside of all the obvious gains. And if you're good at putting rudiments in—that is to say, you can put them in—then the pc has learned one more time that you can put the rudiments in and the pc is that much more confident of being able to buck up things while he's in session.

You know the old expression of the pc is able to blow things. Well, in the absence of in-rudiments, the pc cannot blow things.

You get some pc and he's being audited by one auditor—Auditor A. And it's—he doesn't—hasn't had any difficulty. They start blowing engrams by inspection. They've gone into free whole track engrams, you see, and they inspect this thing. Well, he was a headsman in that life and that blew, you know, and he was—and there was this life, while he was—yeah—he made a specialty in that life out of slaughtering vestal virgins. He could probably even get up to blowing lives, you see? And you give him Auditor B—now you understand this is the same pc—you give him Auditor B and one fine day, why, you find the session has sort of deteriorated to Straightwire and the pc has remembered going to bed last night and he's got a stuck picture on it.

What's the difference between these two sessions given by Auditor A and Auditor B? Auditor A: Pc's confidence was very high, rudiments in. See? Only it's not just the rudiments for that session and this is a history of rudiments in. See? And Auditor B: It's just not the rudiments out for that session, it is a history of rudiments out. See, we've been auditing the last fifteen sessions and we have nine of the ten rudiments out, see. Wow, man, that is—and all of a sudden, why, he can't blow. He gets a stuck picture on going to bed last night.

Now you, trying to put—try—find this pc who has been audited by Auditor B. and you, Auditor C, move in and you're going to straighten out this pc, you are. And you start running rudiments and you've gotten nothing but a dirty, messy, twitching needle. No matter what happens, you know, you—it goes tick. There's five words in the sentence and although the sentence you ask him is actually live with an instant read at the end, as you approach it and draw in your breath to say something, you get an action on the meter, and you get two actions per word on down to the end. There are about twelve actions on the meter—this is a terrible exaggeration—and then it goes into stage four when you are finished, you see.

You're Auditor C. This is what you have inherited out of all this, see. "H-e-e-h, well this is an awful low-scale pc. How are we ever going to climb this cliff? How can we ever possibly do anything about this," you know?

Well, quite interesting, quite interesting, you wouldn't find any real difficulty in doing so, providing all you did was sit down and session after session put the rudiments in. And all of a sudden the pc's confidence comes up, his attention is collected and you're back to a point of where you're blowing lives at a crack. Because what are you doing in Routine 3? The pc has to blow a life at a crack, just by labeling

I don't say this is hard for the pc to do. It isn't hard for the pc to do as long as his rudiments are in. And as Auditor C then, you have brought him back to the same state that Auditor A found him in.

It is the auditor, not the state of the case.

The first edge in may be difficult. We find this pc—twitch, clank, thud, stage four, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise—"Have you breathed lately?" Reaction! Tick, tick, stage four, dirty needle. "What was that? That? That? That?"

"Oh God, I wouldn't know. Oh, that's you sitting there."

Well now, you'll see this work out as time marches on. You give him session one. Urrrh. You say, "My God, this pc is in terrible shape! Awful!" What do you mean by that? You mean he can't go anyplace and he can't blow anything. That's what you really mean when you say he's in terrible shape. Because you as a Scientologist are not necessarily impressed or unimpressed by his behavior out of session, except when he natters around and gives you a lot of trouble or something. Or horrifies you with something or other. You're not particularly critical of his behavior.

What do you mean by a bad pc and so forth? Well, it's a fellow who is just a hell of a mess in session. You can't get anything to read; you can't get anything to not read. The pc gets an ARC break; you can't do anything about the ARC break. The pc gets a present time problem and the present time problem is you sat down too suddenly in your chair after you sat him, and you work, work at this for three quarters of an hour trying to blow this thing and he just still got a stuck picture of a session beginning, you see?

You say that is a lousy pc. Yeah, true, absolutely true. You can take a pc that's in that kind of state and work him carefully with his rudiments—I don't care what you run in the body of the session. Of course, you get a long ways if you do something like a bit of a Prepcheck, but it should be something fairly light in the body of the session while the rudiments are this crazy because he isn't going to be able to blow much. So, you just keep working away at it session by session, or short-session the pc if you're doing five and a half hours auditing. Do a session every hour or something. And just get the rudiments in, man. And again get the rudiments in and get the rudiments in, and the person says, "You know," he says, "I—I've got a present time problem. Yes, I have a present time problem." And he thinks to himself, "Why hell, present time problem—we'll just get rid of it. There's no use having one."

Even if he goes out the bottom on the subject of having present time problems. It doesn't care which direction he got, he isn't worried whether he has one or not. And do you know a pc who is really agitated up very often reacts on a present time problem just because they're afraid they'll have one, because they know that it can't be handled. Or if they do have one that it won't be handled. Or if they do have one, they will spend the next four sessions handling it. There are going to be penalties involved in this thing of having a present time problem. They're going to be punished somehow—not audited, punished. Well, that auditor must have the presence, you know, of a commissar.

Little by little, session by session, the phenomenon you will observe is that the pc's needle gets cleaner and cleaner. It's not particularly what you're running on him—it's the fact you're running him with the rudiments in and getting rudiments in. He's starting to get a reality on it. He feels better at the end of sessions. He stops being anxious about whether or not the rudiments are in or not in. He stops trying to run the session himself because it's so horrible being audited. See? All kinds of things occur. And you'll see—actually you should notice it quite markedly at the end of a second session—that the pc's needle, if all goofed up when you took him over, is getting cleaner and smoother.

Now, if you go on several sessions, you actually—it actually isn't terribly significant what you cleaned up on the pc, don't you see? It's the fact that you did it neatly and the pc could handle all of the stuff you handed him to handle. You did it and he did it and, oh, this is a breeze, you see? And he'll be winning all the way along the line. You could interrupt this by giving him some hill to climb that was far too steep. You could say, "Well, there's the Empire State Building there and we're standing down here on the sidewalk. Now, I'm going to teach you to jump. I'm going to teach you to jump. All right. Now, squat down. Bend your knees, bend your knees. Good. Now, have you bent your knees real good? All right. Now, jump to the top of the Empire State Building oh, you couldn't do it, huh? Oh well, that's too bad. I guess we'll have to do something else," you know?

That kind of a reaction isn't going to do anything. You could put something in the body of the session, in other words, which was far, far too difficult for the pc, such as Routine 3 full-blown, "All right, we're going to run on down the line, getting goals." What do you suppose getting goals is but churning around these goals—middles of the Goals Problem Mass, man? Actually, when you're doing a goals list and assessment and nulling, if you did one badly with the pc all dispersed, he would feel like he was in the middle of a roomful of billiard balls or something of this sort. And they're all in motion and the room is in motion. He won't know what the hell's going on. Because goals are simply the expectancies or attempts of these various objects in the GPM, you see—of former lives, actually, is what they are collections of.

So you ask him to do something too steep, too fast, and the pc is overridden in his confidence. He feels like he's had a hell of a lose in the body of the session. So a good way to take hold of the pc is to run something real easy on the pc for the first few sessions. It doesn't mean you should prepcheck less arduously or CCH less arduously or anything like that. But Prepchecking and CCHs is actually just a little bit too high for somebody whose needle is going clickety-clack-clank, hit the pin, twitch, dirty needle. And you say—not because it's a rudiment—but you say, "Do you have an ARC break?" something like that you would say. Well, it turns out that he does have. And why does he have an ARC break? "Well, you breathed." It could get that sloppy, you see? It could get that grim.

You got a pc who is anywhere in that category, devote all of your time to the type of session which you saw me demonstrate last night. Notice each one of those sessions took about 50 minutes? There were two pcs. one of them, the first one, was in good shape to run a Routine 3 Process. First time I ever audited that pc. The rudiments went in very easily, didn't they? Second pc, they went in rough, rough, rough, rough, didn't they? The pc needs some Prepchecking and CCHs and actually needs more confidence on just rudiments alone. See? Somebody can get them in. Actually, he needs the exact session I gave him, see, but needs about three more of them. Pc will stop being anxious about rudiments, and so on.

But there is a pc that needs to be graduated up along the line a little bit and get a little more confidence in auditing. There was a pc who audited perfectly well. You could tell it just this way: The needle of the first pc was not doing anything unusual at all. It was ticking and tocking here and there occasionally, but it was a pretty smooth needle. And the needle of the second pc was going tickety-tock-pick-pong-thud-bang You ought to have seen it today, by the way, when they checked the pc's rudiments out. They checked the second pc's rudiments just to work out the same thing that I was going to talk to you about tonight.

The pc was sufficiently upset about rudiments in general that just checking the rudiments was upsetting to the pc. You couldn't get very much responding. He couldn't get very much differentiation on it. Why? Well, actually from an auditor's point of view that pc could be said to be in rough shape. That pc actually is not in rough shape except sessionwise. Now, with a few cool, pleasant sessions and so forth, you see that needle will—would just sit there and just ride around, and nothing very energetic about it. It would be smooth. And you get the rudiments in, why, they'd stay in. You wouldn't have to keep punching at them and picking at them and picking them up and putting them back and picking them up and putting them back—none of that, you see. All that would come out, providing you got the rudiments in every time.

Now, the first two times you get the rudiments in on a pc, the first two times you get the rudiments in on a pc, you should not expect the pc to respond well to a rudiments check. The pc won't respond well to a rudiments check. The pc doesn't know by that time whether his rudiments are in or out, don't you see? That's the first time—couple sessions with a new auditor. Rudiments check has relatively small validity.

The third time, this should be very manifest: If the auditor got the rudiments in for the length of time he got them in—if he got them in, in the first session thoroughly at the moment he was getting them in, and if he got them in thoroughly at the moment he got them in, in the second session, by the time the third session comes along, you are going to see that the needle has stopped acting up. It looks cleaner; it looks easier. And if that has not happened or if the pc's needle has roughened up by the time the third session's in, then the auditor did not get them in, in the first session, did not get them in, in the second session, did not get them in, in the third session.

You could check the third session quite validly for a check. You know, do a rudiments check the third time this auditor has audited this pc. That would be a very valid check. Check would be fine, providing it was a very precise check. But not as valid as the fourth and fifth check. Don't you see?

And the first two might have no validity at all. Zzzzzzr. Now, that's a generality but intended to fit on numerous grades and types of pcs in numerous states of decomposition. See? So therefore it's a rough hat.

But the point I'm making here is simply that the pc feels the newness of the auditor, probably wouldn't have this auditor if he wasn't—if he had been going good with his last auditor. You see, a lot of things are monitored this way. A lot of factors add up to the fact that the first session—if he's having any trouble at all in auditing—it's going to be fully manifest. In the second session, why, it'll be less so, but it—possibly still be trouble there. Third session it's starting to look smooth and starting to look like something and then you could tell accurately then whether or not the auditor had been getting the rudiments in. After that, rudiments check—bang-bang-bang—hit them right on the nose every time, see. You got the idea?

But it'd actually be unfair to take a rudiments check on an auditor's first session on a—on a monkeyed-up pc, see. It'd be very unfair. For instance, you're going to get—you not only will get one rudiment out, on two or three consecutive checks, you'll get different rudiments out for the session past, you understand?

What's going on? Well, the only thing that's going on is the pc is very anxious about present time and actually can't differentiate between the present time he is being checked in and the session-he just had, and you get all sorts of crossed-up relationships of one kind or another. But that will not exist after a few sessions, providing the rudiments had been gotten in session after session. You see how you check this out in full fairness to everybody.

Well, there's the value of rudiments. Rudiments are absolutely vital. You cannot do without them to get the pc up the hill. Absolutely vital. And they're not going to move the GPM a thousandth of an inch. You see how they fit?

But without them, the GPM is not going to be moved a thousandth of an inch. And there's the peculiarity of rudiments. And one of the reasons why I think you've maybe had a little bit of trouble understanding them or not understanding them—as the case may be—because they themselves do not have the power of resolving a whole case. But if they kept the pc in-session, then they should have the power of resolving the whole case. Problems like this have undoubtedly occurred to you.

So I rolled up my sleeve to settle it and I have actually been many weeks working on this, one way or the other.

And a rudiments process does not have the power of resolving a case, but in its absence a case won't resolve.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.