MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
31 May 1962

Thank you.

And this is, second lecture, 31st of May, AD 12. Different time track than the first lecture. Same subject, only this one is middle rudiments. You will want to know about this one.

The middle rudiment consists of a package question, which handles suppressions, invalidations, missed withholds and careful of. That is your standard, basic middle rudiment. It is a package question, contains those four elements. And middle rudiments may also contain—this is less often— but may also contain the half-truth, untruth, impress and damage end rudiment, the question or command end rudiment and the influence of the E-Meter end rudiment.

Now let's expand the middle rudiment just a little bit further, you see, that would be this package suppression, invalidation, missed withhold, careful of, plus those first end rudiments. Now let's expand it a little further and you could run in "auditor," but less advisedly, and "room," providing there was a tremendous amount of disturbance in the auditing environment.

This would be the extent of any practical end rudiment—middle rudiments. Any practical middle rudiments would have that extent. Because before you got all the way up to all rudiments again, you had much better short-session it and just start—just end the session that you were doing with the end rudiments and start a new session with the beginning rudiments, which is much neater. See, so there is a point where middle rudiments become too numerous and too fancy and actually consist of restarting a session. There's a make-break point there. It is sometimes more economical to start a new session than to patch up the one that is running. And that would depend utterly on how many rudiments had gone out.

Now it's a matter of judgment. Now ordinarily, in Prepchecking and in Routine 3, only one package middle rudiment question would be considered mandatory. Middle rudiments have moved from the category of being a good idea over into the category of being mandatory. You always use a middle rudiment when doing Prepchecking or a Routine 3 process. You cannot get along now without middle rudiments. Because the middle rudiments have gotten sufficiently good that it just makes the case run so much faster that it would be senseless to omit them. And these are the middle rudiments that you would use ordinarily and when you would use them.

Middle rudiment would be, "Blank—" first phrase, but definitely a time span or a subject span, "(Blank), anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" Now that would be, "In this session, is there anything ?" "On goals listing, is there anything that you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" "On listing ." "On Havingness Processes ?" "In auditing ?" But when you get it outside, when you get it totally outside of the framework of one session, it becomes the equivalent of a Prepcheck and must be regarded as such. It's—it is very much better to take, "On the subject of goals is there anything you have suppressed?" as a single Zero Prepcheck question. Crash! "On the subject of goals, is there anything you have invalidated?" "On the subject of goals is there anything you have failed to reveal?" "On the subject of goals is there anything you have been careful of?"

Now, if you were to use these, as a session body, before beginning a Routine 3 process—now this is a Prepcheck session, which precedes a Routine 3 session—you would find that this case would really come up shining on this subject. But there you're going to beat him to death. You might be a couple, three sessions, on this, all told. But it isn't likely. I did a

session identical to this in cleaning up somebody's goal that had been invalidated and it was one of the queasiest of goal mess-ups I have run into in some time and actually did it in, I think the length of the session was one hour and fifty minutes. And I prepchecked all of those questions, and got them clean, slick as a whistle. And got the goal checked out in addition to that. So you see this is nothing very arduous.

But nevertheless, that was a Prepcheck session which was a prelude to a Routine 3 session. Well, of course all Prepcheck sessions are a prelude to Routine 3 sessions, but this is instantly and immediately prior. So prior that it is a Routine 3 session. In other words, you're going to going to do goals on this person, you're going to do a goals list on this person, well, let's just get it all out of the road now.

We've already been working Prepchecking and we got all of our. . . we could—this pc could stay in session now, this pc is nicely grooved in. I mean we've got rudiments, pc knows you can get them in, you know you can get them in on the pc—all this has been going on for some time and you've got the pc feeling better about this lifetime and not so shy. He doesn't expect the police or his mother or somebody to rush in the door any minute and tap him on the shoulder, you know. He can be comfortable.

And now, before you did a Goals Assessment, you'd find it'd be fairly wise to clean up, slick up, polish up, put the fingernail polish on the middle rudiments. And you'd put them on in a Prepcheck fashion. You'd say, "Anything that you'd care to ask, on the subject of goals, on the subject of listing, in finding items, on Routine 3 processes." I don't care what beginning wording you use, it's got to be enough to embrace everything the pc has been up to, on the subject of doing goals or listing or 3D Criss Cross or anything else that has been a Routine 3 type process, don't you see? You get that and you use those as your Zero Questions.

And then of course there must always be four of them. If you said, "On the subject of flying airplanes—" to just get it out of the range of auditing, not that you would use these things, see, it wouldn't matter if it were on the subject of flying airplanes—you've got four Zeros. You've got four Zeros at once. You see? You've got suppression, invalidation, fail to reveal and been careful of, see. It wouldn't matter what you started, you're going to have to do all four of them. What you start is up to you, see. But you're going to have to do four of them and all those Zeros have got to be flatter than a flounder and of course they obey all the rules of Prepchecking.

You've got the overt, you get the action, whatever it was, realizing that things like this, the overts are very often against self. Suppression is against self or something like that. Prepcheck it out, see. If it lasts for two questions, on the second question swing it in there, fish for your What, get that thing all straightened out, run it, run your chain down—I don't care if the chain only went back to last year, see. There's going to be action on it. Bring it back up, check the What, check the Zero. If the Zero wasn't flat, why, find another overt and run that on down the line.

You'll find out this works very rapidly. If you've done a lot of prepchecking, this will amaze you with the speed with which this will go and the immediate return that you will get in terms of auditing. Pc says, "Wow!" you know, "What happened?" you know, "Gee!" This is quite something. Because this is four very, very strong buttons. And they're good, strong, think buttons, man! And of course on the subject that you're addressing them to, why it's, "this lifetime" or, "since auditing occured"—that's within the last dozen years, Routine 3 process last two or three years.

Whatever this thing is, you see, you've got a very finite piece of track and of course it cleans up at once. And don't let him go backtrack on the thing—he didn't audit anybody—he didn't audit anybody when he was two, you see. No, you got this little span. You find out it'll clean up fairly rapidly, but it all depends on how well you yourself can go over the hurdles, you see, with Prepchecking. How fast you can juggle these values and get it in there and get the pc to give you the overt and run the track back and clean it up, check the What and out of

there, you see. It just depends on your basic handling of exact Prepcheck fundamentals. And if you are never guessing, if you know exactly what you're supposed to do and you get in there, bang, you'll find this thing will roll, man. And you'll find goals, you'll find wild things going on, you'll find all kinds of things, you know.

We already have a case, if I may mention it—I don't know who the pc is, but it was quite remarkable—the goals list was all complete, except those goals she had been so careful of she had never given any auditor. See, interesting manifestation. See, the "careful of." Yes, she'd been very careful of those goals and never given them to anybody. And I hope the pc will forgive me for mentioning that, I don't even know who it is.

But anyway, on another pc, who I hope will forgive me, pc on this little Prepcheck I just mentioned to you a moment ago, the hour and fifty minutes or something like that, pc actually sat down and didn't write his goals. See, he had a definite intention, you see, of writing something else. Got the idea? And we even found a goals list which way precedes Routine 3. Quite interesting, earlier goals lists. Pc was sitting there writing down things he wanted to be. See, sometime before. Fascinating base. I knew it must be there, however. See, when you get a good security on Prepchecking, you know it only stays in if the basic is still in. If you've still got the bottom of the chain in, it's going to stay in, man! And that thing is going to knock itself off the pin. So as unlikely as it is, you ask—. Actually the goals list, you couldn't get any earlier than this goals list, see. Obviously there was nothing earlier than Routine 3 had anything to do with a goals list. I still asked for one earlier. Why? Because I couldn't clean up the one I had. There must have been one earlier. And sure enough, there was an earlier one. And as soon as we found this earlier one—it didn't even belong in the body of Routine 3, don't you see?

I imagine you're liable to find somebody sometime that did one in college, "Things you want to be," you know, or something like that. Or did a—something wild like this. You'll find out your goals list isn't clearing up and the pc's having a hard time giving the goals, sitting on some piece of nonsense that occurred ages ago on some entirely different disrelated subject, but was a goals list. And you get the earliest one, each time, you see, on whatever you've got there, clean it up.

Well, that would be—that is a marvelous approach, this is not mandatory. I don't say you must always do this before you do a Routine 3. I don't have to because after you've used—after you've used the middle rudiments on a Routine 3 process a few times and you haven't done it, you'll wish you had! This is one of these obvious things. You don't have to even tell, "You always have to do this," because even if I omitted to tell you about it and just gave you the middle rudiment, you would find yourself trying to cheat on the auditing section by doing it over the weekend on the pc just so you could get the middle—you'd be getting desperate! Because they wouldn't stay in, see, unless you did some fundamental action with it, see.

Now, there is one use of middle rudiments. That's its Prepcheck use. Prepcheck use for Routine 3. Now is there a use of middle rudiments for Prepchecking? Not just Prepchecking middle rudiments, but is there a use of them for Prepchecking? Yes. Yes. Be an awfully good thing—be an awfully good thing—to handle the pc, as I see it these days, and looking at the wins that you are getting and taking a chapter from your book and the wins you are getting right now and as cheerful and happy as you are about these wins.

Set the pc up in Model Session, do some Havingness in the body of the thing and just get the rudiments in. And get the rudiments in. And get the rudiments in. With some Havingness, you see. Now, I showed you middle rudiments last night in the demonstration. There was no reason under the sun, moon or stars to use them. I could have made the Havingness Processes work without them. But I just thought I would show you middle rudiments against a disrelated subject. I thought you might be interested in: what the devil is that? You probably recognized them for what they were. We're going to clean up the subject of havingness. Well, we didn't have to clean up the subject of havingness. We could have found a Havingness Process that worked. I just wanted to show you how they worked, using them as rudiments.

Now you see, you could use these four lines as Prepchecks and Zeros. When you use them as rudiments, you use them in an entirely different way. And don't ever confuse this. You use them with your good old drill, "Have you seen a cat?" Whatever the pc says, you say, "Fine, I'll check it on the meter" and you say, "Have you seen a cat?" You understand? You ask the middle rud, whatever the pc says you check the middle rud on the meter. You do not Q-and-A, you don't go afield, you don't try to dig chains, you don't do anything with it, but take what the pc says. Providing only that it is an answer to your question.

Now this will be a relief for some of—a dirty crack to make! This'll be a relief to some of you, you actually don't have to plow around and wonder about whether it's an overt or a motivator on running middle ruds. Because it's always a little bit of both. You see, they're just think-think, see. And the fact that the guy suppressed it is a sort of an overt. It doesn't matter whether he suppressed somebody else's item or goal or suppressed his own, it's an overt in some way or another, he can't answer it without giving you that. Or how he said it was suppressed. We don't care how it was suppressed. It's just what the pc said, it's just answer the question, in other words. Of course, if we say, "In this session"—which would be your usual start to a middle rud— "In this session, is there anything you have suppressed?" And the pc says, "Uh—how soon are we going to finish the session?" Well, let me point out to you, that's not an answer to the auditing question, you're going to throw your end ruds out. So at that time, you have to insist that he answer the auditing question, simply by saying, "I'll repeat the auditing question."

Supposing he says, "Bla-ll-zzzumm," and you didn't understand what he said, you would say, "I didn't understand that," or "I didn't hear that," or "I didn't get that straight. What was it you said?" Now that doesn't challenge him with anything, that isn't invalidative, that's trying to get the pc's answer, not questioning the pc's answer, see. You want him to say the answer so you can understand it.

By the way the reason TR 4 doesn't work for an awful lot of auditors is they just complicate it up to the stars. All you got to do, you know, is just understand and acknowledge it and return the pc to session. Well, TR 4 often includes, "I didn't understand," when you didn't. See, the pc says, "Bla-zzzmm." And you're going to be a ruddy fake? And sit there and say you understood what the pc said? Heh! You better not! You better not Q-and-A and you better not not-understand it. See, you've got to understand it. So one of the steps you sometimes have to take to understand it is, "What did you say? I didn't get it." "I didn't get it." you see, the onus is on you. "I didn't get it," "I didn't understand it." "I didn't get that straight." Preface it in that way and there's never any ARC break. And you're asking the pc for Havingness answers, you know and the pc says, "Uh—and uh—the phonograph record." What are you going to do? Like a cheerful idiot sit there and buy a nonexistent phonograph record? Well, he didn't answer the auditing question, because something's wrong. Well, you'd better go to the mat right then or your TR 4 is out. You say, "I didn't get that straight. I didn't understand what you were talking about."

"Oh! Well it isn't a phonograph record, it's an ashtray. Ha-ha!"

"Yeah, well, I'll take that."

He says, "Funny you noticed that."

You say, "I didn't notice it." I'd even go so far as to say, "I didn't notice it, I didn't understand what you're talking about."

"Oh well, fine. Swell, oh, okay. Swell, swell."

See. That's TR 4. TR 4 is understand and acknowledge. And you're looking for some fancy system by which to do this and there ain't none. The only—closest you can come to a system is, is you can't be a fake. See, don't be a fake—ever. Pc has a heavy Armenian accent, then

by George, you have to ask him for a repeat about two or three times every time he says anything. Well, you want to know how to throw him out of session? Pretend you understand what it is. Boy, man! You turn false, he turns false, you've got missed withholds now from the pc, you get disinterested in the pc, your ARC drops with the pc, you start to goof. You leave the session being critical of the pc.

You show me an auditor being critical of his own pc and I'll show you an auditor who didn't understand what the pc said. TR 4 is out, see. Don't complicate it, simplify it. It says "understand." That's all you need. Well, make sure you understand it, see. I've had a pc even speak to me sharply on the sixth or eighth time. I just have to tell him well, I just don't get it, I didn't get that, I don't—don't grab it. And the pc says, " Sis-hallu-tha-llrrrum." "Well, what is it? I didn't get it straight." The pc sounds annoyed. It never registers as an ARC break. But this eventually will find you with an ARC breaky pc. "Okay." He says, "Thall-uulm." And you say, "Okay, good." Next thing you know the whole session—session doesn't exist, R-factor's gone, everything is out the window, see.

So this applies particularly to the use of these middle rudiments. It's your TR 4's got to be in. But it actually doesn't much matter what the pc said, as long as the pc answers your auditing question. Pc must have answered your auditing question. And that's the end of it. And then you just check it on the meter. Now that's the way you use a middle rudiment. You don't use it any other way, you don't try to run a chain, you don't do any—you just leave it. Don't Q-and-A and hmmm! You know? Just you—you ask him, he tells you. That's it, you see. You check it on the meter and that's that. Otherwise, man, you're going to go far afield, you're going to go adrift, you're going to go appetite over tin cup.

Now the other use is prepchecking in the Zero Question so that you can use middle rudiments. But the Zero Question, the Prepcheck Zero, "Have you ever suppressed an item?" or something, you see, that is actually not a middle rud. That's a Zero Question. And of course that's handled with the full panoply of Sec Check, Prepcheck, type action, see. You ask him, you don't get a read, of course you don't prepcheck it.

All right, now, and if you do get a read and he tells you and it doesn't clear, why, you're off to the races into prepchecking See those are two different actions. Don't ever get these two actions confused in using a middle rudiment. Because you already have thrown a non sequitur into the session. Now it's all right to drop a few small stones on the road. They're not going to bother anybody. But now, don't start moving boulders onto the highway and stopping the whole session in order to go into whether or not his Aunt Tibia has possibly ever suppressed his libido. Oooh!

I got one from somebody, I will withhold this person's name and send them a bill. They aren't here, but they have been at Saint Hill. Had to stop a Routine 3 session in order to prepcheck out thoroughly some of the background of their difficulties. You do that to a pc, they think you drive wild. You start running. . . I'll give you a subjective reality on this, had a session one time where the auditor—I was worried about a government. We were in some kind of a mess and we ran a present time problem or something like that on governments, you know, just as a coffee-shop thing And, all of a sudden the auditor missed an auditing command and I said, "Wow!" And so the auditor shifted over and ran "What have I done to you, What have you done to me?" As a repetitive process, see. That's dropping boulders on the track and we never did clean up the first one. See, you never come back on the road when you start that kind of thing

So middle ruds are used with great discretion. With enormous thoroughness, but with great discretion. Minimum distraction. You're already throwing some pebbles on the highway. But it's worth it. If you throw them on expertly you manage to get a few boulders off and the pebbles too. See, if you do it expertly. But you don't use these things badly. You must use these things with a—a good rudiment approach. You must ask your question, get your answer, check it on the meter and if it's still alive, ask your question, get your answer, if it's still alive, ask your question, get your answer, check it on the meter each time, and now it's

dead. It's not reacting now. Tell the pc so and get the hell out of there. That's all you do with it.

Now you use a middle rudiment after every What question has been nulled. Now I cannot give you the optimum time to use it in the midst of the Sec Check one—that is the list-type Prepcheck, you know where you do the Sec Check list, the Form 3 list, I can't give you the optimum time to get. . . Because I have a feeling like you could be too frequent. It's been suggested that it's every five or six, if they were flying along, see. If you were flying on down the road and you weren't actually getting much of a reaction on anything and so forth. But after a few of them you would use it. For sure, you would use it at that time, because the pc might have everything beautifully suppressed.

Now if I thought the pc was stringing me a long bend and had it just all suppressed and wasn't paying any attention to what was going on and that sort of thing, I would use it more frequently. But I would sure use it every five or six checklist type questions. And mandatory, that you clean the middle ruds whenever you have nulled a What question. That is absolutely mandatory. You mustn't go on to a new question, a new chain from your Zero, until you have knocked your middle ruds in.

You find out that they will be very, very productive. They will keep the pc flying Now, the way you put those in, is to check the null of the What question. If you find it live, you of course look for the new chain. What did you miss? You must—couldn't possibly have found the basic. Something's wrong here. Well, you correct that. Now if you check the What question and find it null, you do the middle ruds and check the What question again. Don't do the middle ruds and move on to something else, because the middle ruds might have been out and that might have suppressed. You got the sequence? It's a relatively easy sequence. And it runs something like this. You're doing a form type Sec Check, "Have you ever stolen everything? Have you ever raped a widow?" something like this. And, you've done six of these and you've gotten each one off with at least—with just one, see. Well, by that time you ought to put in your middle ruds.

All right. So you found one that repeated twice, then of course you've gone into a Prepcheck type activity. When you finish up your Prepcheck type activity just as the way you do, get back up there, that What's nice and null, put in your middle ruds and recheck your What. Of course if that What's still alive, why, there must be something more on the chain; you can fish that up and then of course, check your What question; if it's now null, once more do your middle ruds. Always the same action, do your middle ruds, check that What question, undoubtedly it'd be null by that time. And then you go on to your next form line.

In other words, you play that What question against the middle rud. That's what's important about Prepchecking, is make sure that you at least get your middle ruds in, after every What question has become null. And you'll find out this does not take long to do. Now, the middle rud standard response, or standard question for this is one of these package questions and I— after the trouble we had getting people to read—people were reading prior reads on the E-Meter and people doing that, I—these package questions make me a little bit nervous. Because they tend to give you the wrong impression. Because in a package question you're actually asking four rudiments in one breath. And it's just a very fast way of auditing. It's short-handing And it possibly might not even be as accurate as asking each one all by itself and that sort of thing, but it does let you cover a lot of ground. And you do it in a package fashion and the package question of course is just, "In this session—" you see, that would— the way—that'd be—always the res—the beginning of it, "Is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" Watching each one.

Now, if one falls, like "invalidated" falls, you just stop right there. It makes a full sentence, even though your breath is left hanging in mid-breath. You have not dropped your proper tone at the end of the sentence, but just stop it. Now how do you proceed? Would you just proceed by omitting the two that are now clean and then go on with, "In this session, have

you failed to reveal—is there anything you have failed to reveal or been careful of?" You see how that would be?

In other words you don't repeat—keep repeating the things you have already cleaned up. Now if you just want to punish this thing to death, you can repeat the whole package after you've cleaned up all the parts of the package, just for the hell of it. But this looks to me like it's getting awfully— awfully picky. Almost to the point of annoyance to the pc.

You checked your middle ruds and you found "careful of" was out. Therefore the next question shortened down to, "In this session is there anything you have been careful of?" see. And whatever the pc had answered you, when you asked the question originally, you had cleaned it, so you say, "Well that's clean," and that's it. And you're out of there and the pc won't be getting all impatient to get going and getting onto something else. It's in the interest of rapid auditing.

Now, that is the auditing question you would use, that was what you would clean up, and how you clean it up I have already described to you, clean it up just as any other rudiment. And now, how do you use it in a Routine 3? In a Routine 3, we have much less definite answers. Much less definite answers. But this is mandatory, that between a shift, I mean after you've finished listing on a list and before shifting to another list, you do the middle rudiments just as a clean-up on a What question is done. Except you haven't got anything to check. You just take that opportunity to get the middle ruds in, that's all. You don't necessarily make him list longer or something like that.

This is not very definite beyond that one fact. When you shift from list A to list B. do some middle ruds between the—in the middle of the shift. And just finish listing one, put some middle ruds in and start listing the next one.

Now, this can be amplified enormously. This can be amplified enormously. And complicated tremendously when you start getting complicated steps into some Routine 3 process. Now I'm studying right now, listing against the needle. There seems to be some validity to this. It's an assessment of the four lines every time, instead of just going in rotation; you list to a condition of the needle, whatever that condition is, probably a still needle. I said "probably," you understand, this is all up in the air. List to a still needle on that list, then do an assessment of all four lines. Find out which one is reacting the wildest and that's the next one you list. See, the complication is this: Where do you put any middle ruds in there? Well, I'd put the middle ruds in before I did the assessment. Complications can occur. The same general law, however, prevails.

Now there's another law in Routine 3 that you'll find out continues to be—in other words, when shifting processes or when shifting lists or when shifting some doingness, put a middle rud in between. That's Routine 3. You use it far more frequently in Routine 3 than you will in prepchecking, you'll find. You have to use it—and because it is capable of slowing up the session, you will have to be able to throw it in there with great glibness and speed and read it fast and get out of there. You see? Otherwise you'll be getting into the pc's hair most God-awfully. He'll think the session consisted of nothing but long, lugubrious middle ruds, you know? Well, learn how to do it fast and get out of there and he'll be very happy about your middle rudiments.

It's all with the speed and expertness with which you get them in. An auditor who gets rudiments in slowly, not carefully. Pc likes to see you get in ruds carefully. But an auditor who gets in ruds so carefully and so laboriously actually gets the pc after a while so he's just practically spinning on the subject of rudiments, if at the same time the auditor despite all the care and labor doesn't get the rudiments in. And you can find out that this type of auditing exists: That the auditor is very laborious on the subject of getting the rudiments in, but never gets them in. And of course it'll blow the pc out of the water, every time.

But because middle ruds come into the body of the session where the pc's attention is terribly fixed on something else, you cannot afford a drag, a slowdown, a fumble, a dished-up stuff, you see. You check it as a package, you clean up the part of the package that was reacting, you get out of there, see. Don't go messing around, pushing the pc's attention around, "Now, well, did you do something?" and so forth and so on. Don't—don't bother with this.

Terribly important that the pc gives you overts and not motivators in the beginning and end ruds, but you don't be so critical in these middle ruds, see. Don't be so critical. Because actually when they throw one out they'll throw another out. You can generally get it on a repetition. Pc's driving too wild on this sort of thing, why, short-session the thing, just end the session and get your end rudiments and so forth. Start in, wind up on this thing, get it all straight again, because it's going to go up in a ball. Learn how to do middle rudiments easily and swiftly and with no great weight.

Remember you're doing in the body of the session what the pc's attention is absolutely mandatory on blowing He's got to be able to blow masses and that sort of thing. You mustn't distract him too much. So get them in there, get them in, get out of there. You're actually throwing pebbles on the road when you're doing middle rudiments. That's why I didn't give you any middle rudiments until I was fairly sure that we had the perfect package on the thing. We haven't monkeyed with this very much, you've heard—you've heard about, "Get the withholds off and get the invalidations" and you've heard something about, "Get the suppressions" but you haven't been given any hard and fast packages or "got to's" on this thing and we haven't—. I've been fooling with this for some days, starting a few days ago, talking to your Instructors about it and we've had it checked out and it works very nicely.

Now, where else would you use middle rudiments? Well, on listing of a goal, you will find you have a different proposition because you're not going to change lists, at least on Routine 3GA. You're not going to change lists but it's when your pc looks confounded and stops listing. Now of course you could be so quick that every time the pc took time to take a breath you threw the middle ruds at him. And this would very soon have the middle ruds just about as wildly out as you could imagine. No, I'm talking about the person says, "And catch catfish—yeah—I always wanted to catch catfish. And then . . . Yeah, put that one down, catch catfish and then . . . Ah, well . . ."

Oh, man, his attention's gone out of session somehow or another, he's blown off something or other. Probably the next goal is "to go away," you know, and he's dramatizing it. A good way to get him right back in-session

again and get him going with a minimum loss of time and so forth—you save a lot of time with minimum ruds if you use them right—is just feed him the middle ruds. Just feed him the middle rudiments at that point. "Oh, well, yes, I am in-session. What have I suppressed?" you know, so on, "—pressed, bang-bang Yeah." He suppressed the next one. He thought it was discreditable. You'll always find there's some goofy answer about the thing or two back there was one he failed to reveal. Or, he's been very careful not to let his rudiments go out. You know? I mean there's something slowed him down. And you'll find every time that whatever his behavior was, the reason he slowed down or fouled up is contained in the middle rudiments. It's magical. The guy all of a sudden picks it up, he starts to run.

What kind of wording do you use? Well, let's say you've prepchecked this thing in and then your middle rudiments are sort of—you're having to put them in all the time—I think I'd take a short session and put in a Prepcheck set of middle rudiments again. I'd get—use the subject of listing Now, you've done a lot of listing with the pc, you see. I'd get them in rapidly, but I'd make it an entirely separate session. Don't decide in the middle of a listing session or something like that, that you've got to get the middle ruds in with a Prepcheck. That's a gross auditing error, see? You're going to take the next session and do that.

You figure out, well, there's something gone wrong here and I don't know what it is and this pc is—just seems to be invalidating everything under the sun, moon and stars. What's going

on here? There must have been some early invalidative action on listing You'll find out that is the most prevalent thing to go out. There's something wrong with listing Don't start throwing, "On listing—" and expect to pick up the whole subject of listing in one session or something like that. Now I'm talking—I'm being a purist, now, you understand? You understand that you could do this and get away with it, providing you did it in a rudiments fashion. You understand you could do this. But I would tend to handle it as itself. I would try to handle it that way.

Now this advice may not particularly hold good. It may be that you can get away with this, see? Maybe you can get away with it. Maybe you can say—pc's having an awful time listing see—maybe you can say, "On the subject of listing—" see. The whole subject of listing, you see, you're talking about various alterations, various changes, of wording and so forth, could take place or be in—and you could—might be able to get away with it. And I think you just did. You've been using it, found it very fruitful. Use something like, "On writing goals—" or something like this, "—is there anything you have been careful of?" was a very hot rudiment. I don't know quite how you worded that or handled it. But he was handling more than one session on the thing and doing it quite successfully.

But before I did that, I would have middle rudiments pretty well in hand. You understand? I myself as an auditor would really have the grip on the subject of middle rudiments and their use before I start floundering around. Because you'll find out that they work in a finite state. They work within the one session you are doing If I thought that this pc had a lot of suppressions on listing and was not eager to list and didn't want to tell me his goals, I certainly wouldn't think of trying to get it in with one slash of the middle rudiments. I would start a session, I would prepcheck a—Zero Questions, all about listing goals. "On listing goals, is there anything you have suppressed? On listing goals—" one Zero, you see, "—is there anything you have invalidated? On listing goals is there anything you have failed to reveal? On listing goals is there anything you have been careful of?" And I would take those four and I'd prepcheck them. Really get to them. Really thrash this thing out. And after that my middle ruds would stay in. And I think you'd find it would probably save you time to do that.

However, I can't give you that as an absolute final statement, because there hasn't been—haven't been very many auditors using this and we haven't any broad auditor experience on it. We just merely know that the middle ruds themselves work like a hot bomb.

Now what corrections we have to make because of misuse and abuse of, that always follows later, doesn't it? Now, you'll find that you will be very happy with these things, normally used, because there are a lot of pcs around on this "careful of" button. Pc's almost sitting there self-auditing, you know. He's being so careful, he's being so careful not to withhold anything. And you have a pc popping up at odd intervals saying, "Uh—I—uh—I—I just thought, uh—I just thought the session was going pretty long. I didn't want to have a withhold. I didn't—didn't want to—" and they go on with this for a little while, you know and . . . "Who's running this session?" I very often will ask them that, you know. It's better to ask them the middle rudiment question. Not as a Q and A, because of their response, but just wait for the next favorable opportunity and ask them is there anything that they have "suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of:"

"Uh—yes, I think I've been careful to keep you informed."

"All right, thank you very much. Thank you. Is there anything in the session you have been careful of? That reads."

"Well I've been careful not to have any withholds. Because I don't want you to get a dirty needle there and have trouble reading it."

"Thank you, thank you. All right. Is there anything in this session you have been careful of?"

All right, now, if it came to a case like that, I would slide the whole question in afterwards, if I was gunning for one thing and weighted it. Then I would say, "That's clean now," or whatever it was. "Now, let's check the whole question. Is there anything in this session—" you see, "—you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? Yes, well, I have a read here on 'failed to reveal.'" Because it would almost inevitably follow. The pc who is being so revealing can be counted on to be not-revealing These little laws you'll see work out and you'll become accustomed to it and it's quite interesting the way you can juggle a middle rud against itself. Because actually it's asking the same question both ways. The "careful of" takes care of it, don't you see?

Now frankly, a suppression and a withhold are different. But they're quite similar. And they echo one against the other. And "been careful of" and a "suppression" are the same. "Been careful of" and "reveal" are quite often synonymous to the pc. In other words it plays a whole handful of cards at the same time. This shoots a lot of line.

You might be curious of where we got this "careful of," where that's been all this time. It might very well be "help," see, or something like that. But it isn't. "Careful of" is taken straight out of psychoanalysis. That's right. Because in my experience with psychoanalytic patients or inspecting and examining them, looking at records, doing that sort of thing, I have found out that there is one thing they all wind up being and that's careful. That is the background music to that thing. And it's quite interesting. And we don't want that in Scientology, so let's take the opportunity of throwing it in with the

middle rudiments. Not because of that but because it is quite embracive. Person starts tip-toeing around in sessions and tip-toeing around in life and "Let's see, I mustn't think of an item because I don't have a piece of paper to write it down and give it to the auditor." That's all "careful of," don't you see. And it all gets a similar registry on that.

Some people are careful not to have withholds, see. Other people are careful not to commit overts so they won't have withholds, see. Other people are careful to find out—to make sure that other people don't find out they have not been careful. Any way you want to play the violin it'll make some interesting tunes. That is one of these embracive package words which doesn't really mean suppression. It means something else entirely different. Doesn't really mean help. I just hooked it out of thin air; I knew it was a common denominator to somebody having trouble.

The end product, the end product of all aberration is being very careful. And that goes hand in glove with some research I did the other day. I was reviewing the overt-motivator phenomena and I was getting it all kicked together and once more ran into the factor, this time with more weight than ever, that doingness is dangerous. And the people consider—the more people consider doingness dangerous, the less they do and that's a direct index to aberration. So of course "careful" fits right in there. Another method for asking for one of these near-center pins of aberration. Quite fascinating You start using it into the middle ruds one way or the other, you'll find your pc will start coming up on this alone. You know?

Now, there's another question I must ask and answer and that is simply this: Do you ever use middle rudiments amongst the rudiments? I haven't answered the question yet. But supposing, supposing your rudiments were leading in a very deteriorated direction. That is to say you've got present time problem, a present time problem and a present time problem and a present time problem and a present time problem and a present time problem and you run, "What part of it could you be responsible for?" and "What part of it could you be responsible for?" and "What part—" and checked it and you still have present time problem, so on, I'd be awfully tempted, if I did that, to run middle ruds, end ruds and start the session. Somewhere in that body of thought-buttons, the like of which nobody's ever collected, we're going to have the answer to this thing, you see. He's doing something in this session. He must be doing something in the session. He's probably lied to us about what the problem is or who the problem is with. He's probably told us an untruth concerning the problem. Or he is trying all

the time he is sitting there to suppress the problem. He isn't running the command. He's trying to suppress the problem, so that he can get on being audited or something like that.

Or he's invalidated something about it or he's being careful to make sure that he doesn't get audited with a present time problem. You see, and you could run on down the middle ruds and straight on down to the end or may— usually present time problems have a "failed to reveal" connected with them. But you could run right on down from there and down into the end ruds and end your session.

And I'd say—I've not been hung up like this, as an auditor. And, well, I could imagine that somebody could get hung up like this as an auditor, get into some kind of a mucked up mess in the session, where what they were trying to clear wasn't clearing They couldn't get it clear, see. Something was really goofed up. I'd take it at that point, run the middle ruds, run the end ruds and start a new session. That is the best way out of it, rather than beating your brains. Your brains don't have anything to do with your thinkingness anyway, what are you beating them for?

But, that is—now understand, I've not run into this problem, so therefore to that degree I'm giving you a synthetic solution. But I could see that the middle ruds might have some use. Might have some use. This pc's got a PTP and you can't clean this PTP, you've run something like twenty, thirty commands on this PTP. Looks the same as it did before. Not having any effect on it at all.

I would assume there's something wrong other than this PTP. And it would be contained in the middle ruds or the end ruds. And so I'd just go ahead and run it right straight on out; start the session all over again. I might even tell the pc we were going to do that. Let the pc run out the amount of groan that he groaned.

But it might be a very bad policy to give a hang-up PTP that much value. I myself have never had this problem, I don't know why I'm wishing the problem off on you, I myself never had it.

But I, once in awhile, hear you talking and say, "What do you do when the present time problem hangs up and you can't clear it?" I hear— occasionally hear this question asked. I should think it'd happen with every other rud out. I think that it must have something to do with that. It probably has very little to do with—something of the sort. If this present time problem's terribly severe, if this fellow's wife has just been taken to the hospital that morning, you're trying to audit him and he's waiting for the baby, why I don't know, you're pretty good, but you're not that good, man! To audit over a PTP of that magnitude. Where the phone's liable to ring at any moment and even bring the phone over alongside of the—of the chair so that he could answer it, you see, if the hospital called. Not when there's a big wait and expectancy and all this kind of thing on a—on a situation. You're trying to do auditing on something else, of course it violates the idea of the pc's concentration. He can't concentrate on anything else.

I'd be far more likely to run a session on him at that time that set him up where babies were concerned or something like that. His whole attention is on babies, whole attention is on his wife. Till it straightens up so he'll be nice to the baby when he comes and won't spit at him. See? I'd in other words, I'd recognize that existence was 80 grim or so interesting or so compelling that to yank the pc's attention directly and immediately off of it would be inviting catastrophe anyhow. Better solution of course is to make an appointment for next week. Sometimes you can't do that. Sometimes you're assigned to the session and that's it. You've had it. "Yours is not to question why" sort of a situation, you know.

Well, one of the best things to do is run an equivocal type session. You're running Routine 3, this happened, you're running the PTP, you see. You know you're going to run a PTP, it's going to go up the hill. It's going to go over the hills and far away. It is happening right now. You see, his brother's being executed, but may be given a stay at any moment. And remind

him when he gets out of session to call the governor. See, we had one last night, didn't we? He had a present time problem, was still running at a high roar today. What could you do for it? You saw what I did for it. I just said, "Ah, women!" And we went into the body of the session, didn't we? Did you notice that? We dusted that one off lightly. In the first place the pc practically sent it on Morse, radio, telephone, every other means of communication plus neon lights, "This is what you're supposed to audit on me. Second dynamic. My problem. This is what you're supposed to audit on me."

If I'd audited that on him, man, that would have been a Q and A to end all Q and A's. He wouldn't have gotten anyplace in the session anyhow. Did you know it was a rule that what the pc gives you in the rudiments is seldom what should be run at a long—on a long-term Prepcheck basis on the pc? Did you know that? You can handle a chronic PTP, that's about as far as you can go. The pc says, "The trouble with my case is I hate cart horses. Always had trouble with cart horses. Cart horses are always stepping all over me. Me and cart horses do not agree. In fact just coming down here to the session today a cart horse ran away and dumped apples all over my Austin. And I have terrible problems with cart horses. You see, my mother looked like a cart horse . . ." And all this has been explained to me. I'm afraid I would consider myself guilty of no session control of any kind whatsoever if I ever had any- thing more to do with cart horses. Not that the pc said it, pc's perfectly willing to say what he please and I'm perfectly at liberty to take it up. But if he knows that much about it, that isn't what's wrong with him.

And you know one of the—one of the ways your prepchecking goes astray, every now and then, is you take what the pc gives you in the rudiments and try to make that right on the pc. Well you can't make it right because it isn't wrong

Somebody gives you a long involved PTP—now a PTP of chronic long duration. You saw me audit a pc one day and I said—one evening and I asked the pc, said well, "I understand you've got a PTP of long duration. What was it?" and so forth and we cleaned it up, because it'd been coming up session, session, session, session, session, see. It was getting a reaction. There was every reason to audit that. But you know—you know half the time they never get a reaction. It's marvelous. If you ever audit a PTP on somebody that doesn't have any reaction, you have just committed a blunder for which you will pay dearly. It isn't you should be shot. You'll just wish you had been before you get through.

Didn't react as a PTP and then you're going to handle it? Oh, no, man. Yet the pcs will very often tell you they have a PTP when they don't have. The way to handle it is quite honestly. "Do you have a present time problem?" The pc, "Oh, yes, yes, my mother was a cart horse." You say, "All right, I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?" You say, "It doesn't react now, either." "Didn't react the first time, doesn't react now." And don't ever take them up.

And when a pc rudiment after rudiment gives you the whole background history of his case and it's all on the third dynamic, they've been kicked out of the communists and they've been kicked out of this and they've been kicked of that and it's all third dynamic, third dynamic, third dynamic, third dynamic, third dynamic, aw for Chri—please, do a dynamic assessment. It's generally on the seventh or the first. It is never on the third. I just absolutely guarantee you it's never on the third. If they know that much about it, that isn't what's wrong with them.

A lot of times your prepchecking goes totally astray, because you're sold this bill of goods. You understand? Well, similarly, I suppose you could get a bill of goods sold to you by middle rudiments. Pc starts riding a hobby horse on the subject of middle rudiments, but never correct a middle rudiment unless it's out. And always tell the pc what you find out. And always tell the pc what is now in. Say, "That doesn't read." Or, in asking a package question, you say, "That Fail to Reveal reads. What is that? I'll ask the question again. Is there anything you failed to reveal in this session? Ah, that's fine. Good, good—check it on the meter." Keep him informed. And never put anything in that doesn't register that it's out.

That is a hell of a thing to do to the pc. And if you can't get something in and it's still reacting and you're going to leave it, tell the pc you're going to leave it and it is still reacting. Be honest, see. And you know, there's very little consequence of doing that in most cases.

There's less consequence in doing that than spending the next five sessions trying to clean up something you haven't got a grip on anyhow. A middle rudiment—you must never make a profession out of one middle rudiment. Don't start a whole Prepcheck on Fail to Reveal in the middle of a Routine 3 or a Prepcheck, see. Don't keep asking it and asking it and asking it, you'll get tired of asking the thing. Pc hasn't leveled with you, it's still reacting. If you're going to leave it, tell him so. "This is still reacting, however at this time I'm going to leave that and see if it won't develop, and come clear later, thank you very much." See, be honest about it. You don't necessarily have to cancel every rudiment that comes up and hits you in the face. You better had, but if you leave them, tell the pc you have done so. And never correct one that is not out.

You check, "Do you have a present time problem?" That's clean. Now don't ask the pc, "Well, how's this problem about your mother seem to you now?" Clang! It's going to read again. So you say, "You see, he was being audited with a present time problem." No, » he wasn't. A rudiment's just something you dust off lightly and get on with the business. And that applies to middle ruds and it applies to every other kind of rudiments. You don't make— don't make a whole session out of a rudiment or you get the pc rudiment-broke. And he'll be very upset. Okay?

All right, well that's middle rudiments. Use them all you want to, get familiar with them and I think you'll have good luck with them.

Thank you very much.

Good night.