

RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
28 June 1962

Thank you.

Well, is there anybody present who has their rudiments in?

Audience: Yes.

Yeah? Yeah?

You look so sad about it! Okay. This is the what?

Audience: 28th.

Twenty-eight of June AD 12. I have absolutely nothing to talk to you about. You are all doing horribly. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture number one.

You know what you're doing? You know if a—an E-Meter—this is a general talk about rudiments—much as I hate to mention it. If an E-Meter got any more sensitive, you wouldn't be able to control it. You're right up there at about zenith on the sensitivity of a meter of that type in a Mark IV. So, you haven't a prayer of doing anything about the—sensitizing the E-Meter to read more sensitively on the person because the electronics of the E-Meter have to be sensitized and the lightness of the needle have to be sensitized and that sort of thing, in order to get a more sensitive read.

So you can't go more sensitive on an E-Meter than sensitivity 16 on a Mark IV. The thing is going to fly around so much you won't even be able to keep it in the middle of the dial. you agree with that? It's already a little bit rough to keep it in the middle of the dial on sensitivity 16, because of course, as you deal with rather aberrated people the needle is fairly stiff. But as you move it on up the line to people who are not quite that aberrated, you still have to have the increased sensitivity to get the read. you won't know that the read grows less, the less aberrated the person is and the needle grows looser. Oh, isn't that horrible. The needle grows looser and the read grows less. So, I think to a very marked degree it's up to your TR 1.

Now, let me tell you exactly what happens on an E-Meter and why you have difficulty with rudiments, when you have difficulty with rudiments. Let us consider here an E-Meter on a totally ARC broken pc. It won't read. you see, that is a known condition. It won't read. But have you considered the gradient of this? And that is, the more ARC broken the pc is, the less the meter reads. Now, it should go by some other kind of a gradient, see? It should be that the more—the more the ARC break, why the greater the response of the needle. And this does not happen to be true. Actually the greater the out-rudiment, the less the needle response is. And that's the little hill you're walking up. And that's pretty grim.

All right. Now, let's apply this to a session. And we find that you very often find your second, third and fourth or your third and fourth of the beginning rudiments out. See? They're out when the needle—when the meter and the session are checked. When the session is checked, your rudiments are checked of the session by an Instructor or something like that, it's most commonly the later rudiments that are out rather than the earlier rudiments, right? Well, now why is this? It's because when you don't get a rudiment in, the later rudiments don't read well.

Now, sitting right up at the top of this is the room. An auditor can make a number of blunders and one of them is not checking what he's trying to put right. And that is a general blunder that gets you in more trouble than probably any other single action. You're trying to put right,

“What about stealing ladies’ boudoir tables?” See. So, you get the middle rudiments in and then you omit reading off and checking “What about stealing ladies’ boudoir tables?”

If you have made this mistake two or three times and caught yourself at it, let me assure you, you will never make the mistake again. Because, after you’ve gotten the middle rudiments in on a What question, the What question very often is still hot. And, all you’ve got to do is leave a hot What question sitting there and your meter from then on is not as operative as it was before. Do you follow that? By the omission here of this What question, on checking it up and straightening it out, your meter becomes less operative. Now, that’s quite, could be quite obvious you see when you apply it to a Prepcheck.

The pc says, “Hm, I can get away with this. Hm, out of session. Hmm, missed withhold. Hmm, ha-ha,” see? “I didn’t tell him at all about those ladies’ boudoir tables I stole in Siam—ha-ha-ha-ha-ha.” See? He might have told you up to the time when you didn’t discover them and then you gratuitously inform him that the “What” question is clean. He says “What goes on here?” You see? Well, actually failure to check what you’re straightening out before you do something else is the secret of inoperative meters in a session.

Now, you essay to get the havingness rudiment in right at the beginning, see? You essay to get this in. And how many of you run the Havingness like this—how many of you run it like this? “Is it all right—look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room. That reads.” Can squeeze test. “Put some beingness in that object, put some beingness in that object, put some beingness in that object.” Can squeeze test. “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

Ohhhhhhhh. You went in one door and you never left by that door. you never went back and said, “Look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room,” and read it on the meter. See, the omission of that step now starts throwing your remaining rudiments in the beginning rudiments out. Very simple.

Do you know that can squeeze is absolutely no guarantee of any kind that the pc is willing to be audited in that room? Did you—do you know about that? Well, that’s a fact. Indicates exactly nothing, except his havingness is up, which was not the question, see. The question is, “Look around here and tell me if it is all right to audit in this room.” you see how that omission there then starts the snowball of error.

Now, we say, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” And the pc has an answer but you don’t ask for it. Oh, so you say, “That’s clean,” and you go on to your next rudiment. Oh, it’s almost, why bother? See? This session is a dog’s breakfast by this time. And sincerity of the auditor and the strain upon his face is absolutely no index of the degree the rudiment is in. A rudiment is in if it’s in.

Now, you would be amazed how many answers the pc has, you’d be amazed how many answers the pc has he never gets a chance to give you. And every time he doesn’t give you an answer, whether it is vital or not, you have a missed withhold. How many missed withholds make a session? That can get pretty grim.

Now, he only starts doing this, by the way, and the meter stops recording this after you’ve already flubbed. One flub on meter—metering the rudiments—begetteth a nonreadable meter. The more you flubbeth, the less you will getteth. See the dwindling spiral till finally the meter is totally inoperative and then it’s all missed withholds from there on. you have nothing else but missed withholds.

Now, that’s your—that’s your difficulty with the meter. It isn’t the sensitivity of the meter. It isn’t that—so long as you are regarding a Mark IV—it isn’t any other oddball action that you’re taking. It’s just that you failed to get a rudiment in and then the next rudiment is harder to read, doesn’t read as much and then the next rudiment doesn’t read at all, see? See, you didn’t get one in at all, so the next one of course, you don’t get all of that one in. And

then you're going to get less of the next one in and you're going to get much less of the next one in. Then you get down to nulling goals or something, see, and you've got a—you've got an unreading E-Meter.

So, you get your session all wound up in a ball. And you get, frankly get into a situation there where you've got the non compos mentis thing—it—I don't know you'd do better if you just read the sparkle in the pc's eye as you said the goal, you see. You've driven him out of session.

Now, there might be several methods by which you could get rudiments in. The one which you are using at the present moment is simply to ask the pc the question, find a response, take whatever the pc says and then test the question on the meter. And if you find a response, take whatever the pc says and you test the question on the meter and if it is clean, you then leave it. That is the system which you are using at the moment.

Now, that system is perfectly adequate so long as you never miss. The frailty of the system is, missing. The pc's a little ARC broken, you haven't got anything going anyhow and you ask him a question, a rudiments question and then you don't get a response and you say the needle is clean and from there on you've had it. See? Now, that's the frailty of that system.

Now, here's another system, here's another system. Your patter would go this way: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That reads. What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" Pc says, "So-and-so and so-and-so." And you say, "Thank you. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Do you agree that that is clean?" Now, that gets you off the hook slightly, see, and probably is a much smoother approach.

Now, here's an entirely different system which is the same system that used to be used on Sec Checking and it goes like this: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" You see, your meter is—you're not watching your meter. See? "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you." Whatever he says. Until he says, "No." And then you look at the meter and you say, "I will check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? That reads. What is it? That. That. That." He tells you. you say, "Thank you. Thank you. I will check that on the meter. There is another read here."

Listen, by the way, if I ever catch any of you or practical passing, "That still reads" as a statement, I'll have your thetan, because that's a wipeout of the statement of the pc and puts him on a stack of missed withholds. You mustn't ever say, "That still reads. That still reads. That still reads. That still reads." That's says flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk. See? What you should be saying is, "There's another read here" or some such statement, see? Another read and you notice it quite honestly. You've cleaned up the reads you got but now you have another read. So it's much more honest. And it makes the pc feel like at least he's gotten rid of part of it. Otherwise if you keep saying, "It still reads. It still reads. It still reads," the pc feels like he hasn't said a word to you. And he blows up eventually.

All right. Now, your missed withhold problem doesn't arise there with this system for this excellent reason, is you've got the pc talking to the auditor about his case. So, therefore by asking the question without recourse to a meter and asking him the question without recourse to a meter and asking him the question without recourse to a meter until he says, "No," you now have him sufficiently in-session with you, you have him sufficiently in-session with you and of course the meter reads. You get the trickery of it? You'll always get a more fundamental read if you do that. And then you—but you'll have to steer because the one you find that time will be totally unknown to the pc. You've plumbed the bank, so you'll have to steer it.

You'll say, "There. There. That. That. That, what are you looking at there?" and he tells you.

"Oh, yes," he says and gives you the thing.

And you say, "Good."

See, there's another system.

That system has disadvantages particularly to an auditor who can't leave the middle rudiments alone. Some auditors have middle-rudimentosis. They null five goals and get in the middle rudiments and they null five more goals and get in the middle rudiments and they null five more goals and get the E-Meter over their head.

You know when you get in the middle rudiments? You only get in the middle rudiments when everything is null. You're getting no reads of any kind whatsoever on any goals. You know in reading goals you usually get a tick on the first one. See? It's when those first ticks are missing that you get in the middle ruds and then you go back to when they started to miss.

It's the first consecutive 'X' is what you go back to. It's the rule of the first consecutive '<X.' In other words you get in your middle ruds when you don't get a read anymore. That's all. That's simple, isn't it? You're not going to go over several goals without getting a read. Let me assure you this is impossible unless the middle rudiments are out. you understand what I mean, don't you?

All right. Prepchecking, of course, it's preordained when you get the middle rudiments in on Prepchecking You get the mid ruds on Prepchecking every time you flatten a What question. You get in the middle ruds and test the What question. That's when you use them on Prepchecking

But in nulling of goals they are usually overused. The poor pc suddenly says, "You know, I've always wanted that goal," as the pc—as the auditor starts to read it. "Oh" the auditor says, "He's talking. God almighty. What are we going to do. It's terrible. Terrible. Send for the marines." And gets the middle withhold—the middle withholds in. Your situation—your situation, of course, is ludicrous. There isn't any sense to it at all. You're getting reads on the meter, what more do you want?

Now, that a pc closes his eyes is not a good enough reason to get in middle rudiments. That a pc says something about his goal—now, listen—pc says something about the goals you're nulling, he says, "Oh, oh, I invalidated that one." Now, look there, that isn't a good enough to get in the middle.... Because look, he's interested in his own case, he's interested in his goal and he's talking to the auditor. You want to cure this situation? You can cure it. Just get your middle rudiments in every time he does it and you've cured it. It'll get grim in short order. So the pc talks about his goals. So he says something about his goals. So where's your TR 4! Don't park it under the chair, use it!

Now, your TR 4 is the only thing you greet that with and you keep right on going, man. you just keep right on going. Your TR 4 is all you use at this point. If you fail to use TR 4, you might find it necessary to put your middle rudiments in. you understand? See? You might find it necessary to use your middle ruds if you fail to acknowledge what the pc says. Because you're stacking up his missed withholds, you see, by the barrel load. He says, "Gosh," he says, "You know, I hope that one stays in, you know."

And you say, "To catch catfish. To catch—to catch catfish. To catch catfish."

And he says, "Uh—is that one still in?"

You say, "To run rum runners. To run rum runners. To run rum runners."

The pc says, "Where is this guy, where is he?" Don't be so afraid of a pc's comm. When a pc doesn't comm, that's the time to get worried. Not when a pc's talking, man, don't get worried about that. Don't ever worry about a pc talking to you about his own case, because that's the

definition of in-session. That the pc is trying to hold his rudiments in, is not a good enough reason for you to put them in. why Q-and-A?

He says, "Oh, oh, I think I suppressed that one."

You say, "Good. Thank you." And go on and read it. He's interested. What state do you want him in? Frozen disanimation?

No, that is not when you get in the middle ruds. you get in the middle rudiments after a What question and before testing it again, you prepcheck the middle ruds but in order to get a goals listing or anything else going, you do lots of use of the middle ruds here and there. But amongst them—amongst them is not introducing them extraneously to keep the pc from talking. And don't introduce them any oftener than is necessary. And in a goals nulling you actually only do it when you're getting blank-blank-blank, blank-blankblank, blank-blank-blank, blank-blank-blank. Hold it. you look this over a minute and you haven't got a quiver on that meter. Your read disappeared. So you, you went blank-blank-blank. That's out. Blank-blank-blank. That's out. Blank-blank-blank. That's out. Blank-blank-blank. That's out. Hey wait a minute, this meter isn't talking. Now—now, let's just get in the middle rudiments. Get them good and clean. And then go back to the first consecutive 'X.' And that's, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. That's in." Ha-ha. You notice after you get the middle ruds in that this thing will now start reading again.

It's very strange to read a goal three times without one of them ticking, you understand? It's a missingness of ticks that tell you when to get in the middle ruds on that.

Now, in listing you get in the middle rudiments when the guy simply says, "I can't think of another blessed thing." Now, I can give you the mechanical law that every time you change from one list to the next list you put in the middle rudiments and so forth. But it isn't any law. That is just an effort to give somebody something to do when he can't think. Truth of the matter is you put in the middle rudiments in listing only when your pc says, "That's it, there isn't another single one, not from here to Halifax and back again is there another one."

And you know damn well, this list, this particular list you're working on has lagged 110 behind the other 3 lists and man, you've got to get that list up there. So you just put in your middle ruds and you'll find he will go right on listing it up to 110. In other words you can boost listing with this thing And the index then is the same as otherwise. Your pc isn't giving you any so you put in the middle ruds. Similarly with goals, pc says, "Well, that's it. We listed 66 goals and I have no other goals and I never thought of another goal and never in my life have I ever had another goal." And so forth. You put in the middle ruds and he gives you another 66. You see?

That's the use of the middle ruds. They're boosters. You use them to boost the E-Meter when it stops reading in nulling You use them to boost the listing of goals or items. And to test the flatness of a What question in Prepchecking and that's the total extent of their use. you can overuse these things like crazy you know? So, a pc talks. I only—actually I—there is one other comment I would make. When the pc starts to snore I usually would think it was time I got the middle rudiments in. But of course—of course I might not put in the middle ruds. I might just kick him and go on nulling Say, "Hey! Reveille!"

"Oh! What's that? What's that? Oh!"

"Okay. Sit back. Relax, but not quite so far." And "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish" you know. Going to sleep isn't a good enough reason. Thinking about something else isn't a good enough reason. It's only when the meter stops reading.

You realize that a guy can be practically snoring and not even knowing what goals you're reading and your meter will still read. On that right goal too. See? I've made test after test out of this thing and it has been phenomenal. The ones that are supposed to be in are in. you can

check out somebody's goal with him practically asleep. See, you're dealing with the reactive bank, not the analytical mind anyway.

So, you can use middle ruds to drive the pc out of session. And of course, they will get harder and harder to get in, because it's a no-auditing situation. No auditing is occurring while middle ruds are being put in. So, therefore the system which I have just given you—the system which I have just given you of calling it off without looking at the meter and calling it off without looking at the meter, asking the question, “In this session have you suppressed anything?” You know, no meter see. “In this session have you suppressed anything? Thank you. In this session have you suppressed anything Thank you. In this session have you suppressed anything Thank you. In this session have you suppressed anything”

He says, “No.”

You say, “All right. I'll check that on the meter.” And you say, “In this session have you suppressed anything? That reads. What is it? That. That.”

Be sure this time you have really walked him into the reactive bank. See? He isn't going to know. It was really why it went out. See? In other words you put him in-session before you do this. See, and it makes the meter read. That's the one you wanted anyhow.

But the other way to, you're not liable to get it unless he's very thoroughly in-session already and of course, why are you putting the middle ruds in is to get him in-session. And then you take up the next one, “In this session have you—in this session is there anything you invalidated? Thank you. In this session is there anything you've invalidated? Thank you. In this session is there anything you invalidated? Thank you.”

And he says “No.” Finally “No.” See? Now, this has a liability that he sometimes says “No” and then says “except.” So you shouldn't be too quick on your uptake on that “No” you see. you know, get a really “No” before you go charging on.

This session—this action also has another liability to it. And that is, is he hasn't given you half the answers and you find yourself pinned to the meter running this against the meter—running this against the meter. Well, I'd only run two of them against the meter before I laid the meter aside and went back to my first system. Don't get yourself caught, in other words.

“In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Ah well, that reads. What was it? That. That. That. That. That.” And he finally comes up with it. “I'll check that on the meter now. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? That. That. That. That. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? That. That. That.”

Oh, to hell with it, man. Come on down to this level. See? Check it. Be happy to check it a couple of times. Check it even three times. Perfectly all right. But don't let yourself get pulled into the fourth, fifth and sixth. In other words, if these things are still hot, why, he's got some other answers. See? And just take it off the meter.

You probably won't get into that mess very often because it usually cleans on one or two. But you could get some kind of an endless mess going here. I foresee it. “In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Yeah, that read. Yes, what's that? That. That. That. That. All right. I'll check that on the meter. In this session is there anything you've suppressed? That. That. That. That. Thank you. I'll check that on the meter. See? I'll check that on the meter. I'll check that on the meter.” What are you doing, a Prepcheck in the middle of a session or something wild going on here? So, I'd tend to come off of it and just put the meter aside and say, “In this session is there anything you've suppressed? Thank you. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you.”

And he finally says, “No, there isn't anything else.”

And you say, “Good, I’ll check that on the meter.” And check it that time. It’ll probably clean. Got the idea?

Otherwise you will run into latent thinks and again run into some missed withholds. You’ll see how that is. Right after you’ve said, “That’s clean” he’ll think of several. Of course, you pull this reactive one and you can expect that if you pull one or two reactive ones, some others are going to fly into the air. you might even find it sensible only to check once before you go back to the repetitive treatment. That would depend on your experience and that’s more than I know about it just now.

But in this system you for sure get the pc into session. I’m not particularly recommending this system to you. I’m not particularly recommending it, because it has a horrible liability when combined with senseless unneeded ruds. Now, if you want to blow a pc out of the water good and quick, use this system on the middle rudiments while finding a pc’s goal or listing or something else, because of course it amounts to no auditing. Amounts to no auditing at all. So, maybe you could combine the two systems. “In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of? What was that? That. That. That. That. That. That. All right. Thank you very much. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish.” See?

So, this system—this system I would believe you would find very valid in the beginning rudiments, rather invalid but usable on the middle rudiments and awfully time consuming on the end rudiments. I believe it’s most favorably situated to the beginning rudiments and there is where I myself would use it. And I’d be sure everything was grooved.

But I wish to forward to your attention the fact that there is a problem there. I’m giving you these different systems and so forth of getting the rudiments in just because you might find them much more useful than the one which you are using. Now, it would be up to me to say well that is the system but I’m not in a position to say there is an exclamation in the handling of this. you want to get them in and perhaps an auditor’s—this is the variance you see—an auditor’s TR 1 is pretty shaky on this pc, not particularly shaky in general, but on this pc, the pc just never seems to get anything the auditor says. Well, let’s groove it. you get the idea? You say, “All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren’t you willing to talk to me about? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren’t you willing to talk to me about?”

And he gets that and he gets that and he gets that and then he asks for his meter read and bang! He can make this pc read that way. See? He gets around these other difficulties.

Now, when you look at this you’ll see that you have a very large number of pcs in terms of—types of pcs I should say—pcs are different one way or the other. But all pcs agree on certain fundamentals. And that is that auditing must take place. Auditing is scarce and it must take place and it must be effective.

Now, you use this type of system on middle rudiments, you’re liable to have a pc biting your head off. “In this session is there anything you’ve suppressed? Thank you. In this session is there anything you’ve suppressed? Thank you. In this session is there anything you’ve suppressed? Thank you. All right. I’ll check that on the meter.”

God, you know, this is in the middle of goals nulling, you know, and he’s coming right on down the line you know, he’s going to get it and he sees the clock going tock-tock-tock-tock and session time running out so that one flattened all right. Nothing happened then. And then you say, “In this session is there anything you have invalidated?”

“No!” Boom! What happened, you know. Honest, the explosion will occur that fast. See, you’re trying the man’s temper. Or you got this girl, she was— know exactly where she was going see—knew exactly where she was going. They were going to get down and get them all at least nullled once you see, this session, and all of a sudden she’s sitting there looking at

the auditor and the auditor's saying, "In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Thank you." And she notices the auditor isn't looking at the meter. Maybe she was not aware of having her rudiments out. And maybe the auditor has injected a missed withhold into the situation all on his own.

He was doing the middle rudiments because the pc had dropped one can down to his side and it was sort of trembling as it hit the chair. See? And instead of saying, "God damn it, pick up that can and put it face up on the table where it—so I can read this meter" the auditor goes into middle rudiments, see? That's not doing what is happening, see? Doesn't give the pc a direct order but tries to use the middle ruds to get around giving the pc a direct order about something, don't you see?

The—the pc keeps scratching his nose with the can. you know? Try to read a goal while he's doing that. Well, it'd be no good whatsoever getting in the middle rudiments because not one of them is, "In this session, have you scratched your nose with a can?" I mean it is not one of the middle rudiments. You just say to him in no uncertain terms, "Put your hands in your lap and stop fiddling with that can and we will get done a lot quicker here."

And he'll be all for that. "Oh, oh, yeah, oh, oh, yeah." Very serious.

In other words, there is a point where rudiments waste session time. you exceed this point and you don't gain from the rudiments but start losing. In other words, up to a certain point getting the rudiments in make your meter read better and then beyond that point, makes your meter read worse. And that has a lot to do with how much auditing time is being consumed which is the weakness of this repetitive command system.

So this repetitive command system would be absolutely wonderful and I recommend it thoroughly for getting in the rudiments on somebody who is very nervy and who is only receiving anyhow a rudiments havingness session. And I'd run it—beginning ruds, middle ruds, end ruds—I'd run them all the same way, see? Crowd it to it. Because what is it? You're trying to get his needle smoothed out and get his rudiments in and get some Havingness run.

All right. Prepchecking, Prepchecking, I'd run beginning rudiments, I'd grind them out man. I'd grind them out but good. you know, repetitive question you know and so forth. Get those beginning rudiments really in on Prepchecking Take your middle rudiments and give those a lick and a promise after the What question, but make sure they're in. See? But just the packaged read. End rudiments, just knock them off, packaged read. See? Not give a lot of stress and strain to them. Well, you can do that with a Prepcheck session because you're releasing withholds all the time and the session is interesting to the pc.

Now, do you realize that a Routine 3 is a different sort of auditing? Routine 3 is actually not as interesting to the pc. Did you really realize that? Basically it's not as interesting to the pc as Prepchecking. It's not getting into something he remembers vividly. It's going somewhere else. It's not as interesting

Oh yes, it's very interesting to him writing his goals. He's happy to write down his goals. He's very interested in that. But beyond that point it is merely anxious. You see there's a difference. Pc with his list being nulled all the way down, he's much less interested than anxious. You know the last half of that list of that—of that nulling. You know? Man, he "What's the goal going to be?" you know. "What's the goal going to be? Or is it all going to go null? Or wha—wha—wha—what's going to happen?" You see.

He actually realizes, basically, that his whole life is hung on this thing by the proverbial thread. He reactively knows he's going for broke right here. He knows that this is an important action. And he responds to the importance of the action, not the interest of the action. It's terribly important, oh yes, yes. you muff this one for him, the next few trillennia he's right in the same mud he's in, but worse. You get this one—he's free as a bird. And

down below consciousness he really knows this. See? So frankly he's not as interested as he is anxious. See? There's a point where interest boils over and he's usually in that state.

Now, a pc therefore has to be pretty smoothed down before you start Goals Assessment and start the rest of this sort of thing And if you have to use an extraordinary method of getting in or keeping in the rudiments, I would say he wasn't ready for Routine 3 because he's going to get far too anxious. He's going to explode far too heavily. He's going to be all a quiver here because one, he's doing something which is very nervy anyhow and the other side of the thing, he doesn't have any confidence in his auditor.

While he's being anxious—it's something like—something like the fellow's ride—finds himself riding on a train and suddenly sees the engineer and fireman walking back down the aisle, while they're going through the mountains and the train is accelerating, you know? What are they doing here? You know. He gets nervy. He wants to know that auditor is sitting there in the driver's seat, man. He wants to know that this is going and he wants to know it's going as fast as possible and he knows damn well it's liable to go wrong and it's too good to be true anyhow.

See, he doesn't express it to you and he really doesn't understand it analytically himself. But he's been sitting in this cage. This cage has been pushed around from head to head, more or less randomly for some time. And it has various inhibitions and so forth. And he has long since realized that nobody could get out of this cage, you see? He's long since realized this. And he's habituated himself to it. And he's reconciled himself to it. And he believes in God and all that.

And then he's got himself perfectly schooled and then by God the padlock begins to rattle. Oh my God! That padlock hasn't rattled—that padlock, that damn padlock hasn't rattled for the last eighty trillion years! He thought it rattled once about eighty trillion years ago, but that's the last time. Is somebody really going to open that thing up? You know. And what you're looking at there is a sort of an incipient prison break the guy can't quite believe in. And even though he doesn't understand this analytically, it's there or its impulse.

So, frankly, in a Routine 3 session especially, you can drive your rudiments out, out, out, out, out, out, by not doing the job. If you can imagine the fellow on the outside of this cage. The fellow doesn't hear the lock rattling now. No padlock rattling. And he listens, you know. He finally peeks through the keyhole and sees the bird is now polishing up the bars on the other side of the building which has nothing to do with letting him out. And frankly he is liable to become hysterical. He frankly does. He's liable to become hysterical. Sees the auditor there, polishing up stonework and so forth, doesn't have anything to do with him. See? Auditor's saying, well so on.

You could imagine what would happen. You get the guy up threequarters of the way to getting the goal and then start to take your E-Meter apart. That's cruelty. See? Sheer cruelty, sadism. And actually you can run middle ruds and Q-and-A and do a lot of indefinite things and so forth. All of a sudden the guy is just saying, "I knew it couldn't be true, I knew it couldn't be true. But still it's really got to be true," and he responds accordingly. Then all of a sudden rudiments, hell. The mechanics of the mind simmer down to a jail break that is going to go wrong And he starts to control the session and try to do all sorts of wild things, don't you see?

So the auditor on a Routine 3 session has got to sit there and drive pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. The more time he wastes, why, the worse off it is, see? Now, he has to balance this sensibly within himself. This he has to balance within himself as an auditor. At what point does he start to drive rudiments out by trying to get them in? At what point does he do this? And therefore it is not even vaguely recommended that this repetitive system be used on R3. Too time consuming. Takes twenty to twenty-five minutes to get through the beginning rudiments. Ooooo! That's a long time. And the pc will begin to respond to this as being a long time. And he won't like it.

Now, theoretically the pc has been audited up to a point where he can stay in-session anyhow before he's doing R3 and therefore if you went into too much weighting of the rudiments, gave him far too much importance you see, why he starts to drive them out himself. You'll see this. The first time you put in the middle rudiments they go in easy. The next time you put in the middle rudiments they go in harder. The next time you put in the middle rudiments, God, he's got a dozen answers, see? You'll see this. You're just putting in the middle ruds too often.

It's the amount of progress made which is the total measure of Routine 3. Actually it's in Prepchecking Routine 2-type—well, not Routine 2 but Class II-type processes—it's the amount of stuff dug up that he didn't remember, that is the index. And all that's kind of cute and interesting and he actually, a lot of time, doesn't even connect it to feeling better or something like that. But not this other, see? He's willing to play the game on Class II but when you get into these Routine 3 processes you're in a different operating mental climate. So therefore, you could find a present time problem. Oh, just imagine you get this guy—you get this guy and he's been listing and he's been listing on his goal and he's listed up to the line and three days ago he had a free needle and he hasn't had one since. And there's a whole bunch of stuff that is coming up and things are going boom, life is getting rather interesting But he all of a sudden realizes now that this stuff is actually going to come off of him.

And you take him right at that time and then start him into the next session and find a present time problem and in that present time problem start to run, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Your pc's going to blow up. That problem is going to get worse and worse, it's going to go deeper and deeper in and the rudiments going to go further and further out and there hardly will be anything you can do about it. In other words what you're running into is the pc's goal is being alter-ised. And the whole session becomes a GPM all on its lonesome, see. you understand? GPM, he depend upon goal. When goal, she alter-ised, you get a mass. Well, the session isn't a mess, it's a mass. There's where it goes.

Now, these are the things, just speaking sensibly about this whole thing, it's a lovely thing to be able to lay down rote, you see—and to a large degree we can. I can—and get this thing squared away and so on. That's lovely. But there is a point, there is a point when you can get in the road of your own feet on this sort of thing. And you never want to falsify the fact that it is clean when it is not, and so forth. But you can handle it in such a way that whereas it might be out, the pc isn't told that it is in, see?

Let's suppose that the pc always has latent answers to it after you said it's clean. Now, I'll give you another phrase that you can use with great usefulness. You see, it was clean, you see, you noticed it was clean. "We have the significant withholds off of that" see. Or "That is clean of important answers." You get the type of phraseology, you see. Now, it could go this far. "At least we have the reactive answers off of it" see? Now, understand me there is no pattern for saying it is clean and it reads and so forth. Now, somebody can come along and tell you that this is the way you should call it. But let me tell you that the statement, "It is clean" is an awfully broad statement and it might not apply to your pc and it might be driving him out of session. Savvy?

So, you should say there, at that point, that you indicate to the preclear that you have not had a needle response. Now, that is technically exact. That is what you do. "Are you willing—are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?" So forth. "Now, are you willing to talk to me about your difficulty?" Now, we say—if we say, "That's clean" he can still think of three or four things you see, that he's really not willing to talk to you about.

Now, if I were heading along on Routine 3 or something I'd be far more prone to say, "Well, we got the worst of that off, let's go on to the next one."

The thing was clean as a wolf's tooth and I wouldn't say anything about it at all if I didn't have any read on it. But I absolutely would not count on the fact that if it read, the pc hadn't thought of anything. Pc thought of something—it wasn't significant—but he thought of it and then the fact you tell him he hasn't thought of anything—you see? That's the phraseology which becomes dangerous.

So, the exact proper phrasing of that must answer this exact definition, that the thing has not read although he may still be thinking of something, you haven't got anything reactive enough to stop the session at this point to take it up. See, you'd—you'd only say that when it was clean as a wolf's tooth. See, you'd clean it up—you'd get all the reads you could off of this thing you see? Then you say to him, "Well, that's good enough for the minute."

"Oh, do I have another one on there?"

"Oh, you've probably thought of some more things but there isn't anything registering on here that will hold up the session."

"Well, I thought you were a dog last night, wouldn't that hold up the session?"

"Apparently not, here's the next rudiment."

And the guy will say, "Oh! I can still think of things and if they don't register on the meter then I necess- haven't necessarily thought about the things reactively so therefore they wouldn't impede the session because I'm not obsessed with them." And you'll have somebody coming in with a big theory. You'll have this all worked out.

"There's certain types of responses," somebody will say to you, "which are important and certain types which are not. Now, I sit here thinking all the time, you're a dog, you're a dog, you're a dog, you're a dog and you've never considered that an important response." If it—if it has rudiments in mind I don't mind saying to the—something, "You're quite right, has no bearing on the session."

Evaluation. Meter has never picked it up. Well, I don't want the meter to pick it up, for God's sakes. Every session we're going to clear off three thousand "you're a dogs." This doesn't give you carte blanche to evaluate for the pc, but if you're going to make an evaluative statement the rule is—make an accurate one. When you say, "That's clean" and it compares to "You haven't thought about anything either" that won't go down, see? But you can make it go down. you say, "That's clean enough to go on now." you see?

There's a lot of things which you can do with this and you'll find out this is normally true. you can make a session hang up, you can make a session hang up by letting the pc think of a lot of answers to a rudiments question which have not registered on the meter. One of the reasons they haven't registered on the meter is that they're not reactive. See, he's just thinking, "Mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm, the auditor mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm, I don't know maybe I shouldn't tell him about Gertrude, shouldn't tell him about Gertrude, I don't know whether I'm willing to talk about Gertrude or not."

The auditor says—has just said, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" you see?

And he says, "Oh, I don't know, I should—oh, I don't know...."

The auditor says, "That's clean."

He says, "That's clean? Hell I was just thinking about Gertrude and she's filthy. Doesn't sound clean to me." He'll get real upset about the meter.

But if you say to him, he's saying, "Well, Gertrude, Gertrude, I don't want to tell him about Gertrude, he's asking me what do I want to tell him about Gertrude, I don't want to tell him about Gertrude."

And you say, "Well, we've got the reactive responses off of it anyway."

"Oh, what I'm thinking here doesn't have any reactive responses, so what."

Let it go. You've created a different atmosphere. If you're going to say something evaluative, why be sure it's correct. And as far as telling people if the rudiment is clean or the rudiment is not clean and the rudiment is still reading or something like that, if you're going to, don't tell them in such a way as to hang them with a missed withhold. And that's the basic rule on that. And if you're trying to get the rudiments in on somebody and get up his confidence for the first time do it the long way around and if your pc's at the other end of the line and trying to come down the line with his goal and Clear and so forth, you make it brief. And those are the basic laws that have—influence rudiments.

And the other thing is simply that if you get one out and then you don't do—you see, you get one rudiment out, the next successive rudiments are going to have a less responsive meter. And then you run from there into trouble. So, be thorough and be fast and be accurate and—but basically what are you trying to do? With rudiments and Havingness sessions you're trying to clean up the needle, you're trying to continue the cleaning up of the needle, bring about more confidence in auditing with the Prepcheck activities and you're trying to bring a nice clean needle that doesn't have ticks and tocks on it up to Routine 3, get the fellow's goal in the least possible length of time and then list it out on four lists to a free needle and find the next goal and here we go. That is exactly what we're trying to do.

And you, of course, could be so formalized in trying to approach this situation that you keep driving madly to Canada to arrive in Mexico. And you keep saying, "Well, we just never get to the point of clearing this fellow you see, because we actually haven't finished the Prepcheck formula rote x-y-z-k," you see. And you look at the fellow's needle, it's clean. Well, if this fellow becomes aware of this you know his needle starts to dirty up on irrelevant auditing thereafter. He gets to certain zones where he deteriorates as a case, merely because he knows where you're going. That's only if he knows where you're going.

These things will all be—got to be kept in mind by an auditor. An auditor is trying to clear somebody, his aim and goal. My aim and goal is trying to train people so they can clear people and get the people cleared at the same time. In this particular unit that takes a little bit of doing but we are doing it and we are succeeding and you may not have looked around lately but clearing is probably swinging in under the 250-hour mark now for the whole ruddy lot. And that's getting down there within finite ranges.

And we have put the dynamite to several cases that were historic with Routine 3GA and those cases to begin with had such dirty needles that the Phoenix laundry would have rejected them. So, we're not anyways unconfident of what we're doing. It is just the ease with which we get it done.

I give you as much rote and formula as I can't pound sense into your heads. That's the truth of the matter. You have rote and formula which get you beyond and past points that require very good judgment. Now, up to a certain degree I use rote and formula. I use things like Model Session and rudiments and meters and standardized types of sessions and this sort of thing and don't vary from these. But actually that isn't just a rote for the sake of rote, that's something that's been built over the years.

But you can get some parts of your parts mixed up in slowing the pc down and after that, why, you're in trouble. Then you wish this car only had two wheels because it could only blow out twice. You see? Whereas it's got four wheels and you get four blowouts before you get to the end. you get the idea?

This is no invitation to depart from standardized sessions, but it is an invitation to understand what you're doing and to be sensible about the use of your tools and to recognize what this thing called an E-Meter is and how your rudiments behave under it. There is no constancy of read to an E-Meter. Your E-Meter reads to the degree that your TR 1 is good and your pc is not ARC broke with you.

Fortunately we have a meter that has quite a bit of tolerance on that. But it can't go all the way, it won't give commands and it won't restrain an ARC break by simply leaping off and giving a confidential, pastor-like talk to the pc. It won't do any of these things so you just have to realize what your tools are. Okay? All right.

Thank you.