REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART I

A lecture given on
10 July 1962

Okay. This is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture of what?

Audience: Ten July.

Ten July, AD 12. Very good.

Well, I'm going to cover repetitive auditing tonight and give the first lecture on this subject as such, because there has been a considerable improvement which, if you dig the opacity from your optic nerves and can read a needle, why, all will be gorgeous.

Now, the contest is not so much to develop a technology that I can do or that a handful of auditors can do. It's to develop a technology which gives routinely good results in the hands of auditors and getting around those things which the auditor is having trouble with, with the simplest possible solution.

Now, we are right back to basics today in auditing. Right back to basics. You can find the ghosts and forefathers and ancestors of practically everything we're doing in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, oddly enough. As a matter of fact, we still use today some of the principles from The Original Thesis, and they are nowhere else stated than in The Original Thesis. The auditor plus the pc—greater than the reactive bank. The auditor versus the pc is less than the reactive bank. So you get no auditing done. Those formulas that are in the back of The Original Thesis still form the foundation of auditing And right along with this, we're back suddenly to a type of activity which all auditors are familiar with. Auditors have always been able to do repetitive processes. They haven't really never had any trouble with them.

The main thing they had to find out and one thing they never could learn very well was when was a repetitive process flat? I remember giving a lecture, I think, in the 17th ACC and there were something on the order of about thirty-five students on that course, and I had just given a lecture concerning comm lags and the three ways you could tell if a process was flat, you see. And I had just given those and so on, the day before. And I came in the following day and this was the burning question, you see, in that whole unit is how did we tell if these processes were flat? And I asked them student after student, front row, second row, third row, fourth row, and there wasn't anybody who could give me any of the answers. That was sad. A certain amount of knuckleheadedness has gone forward ever since that time on the subject of when is a process flat.

Well, now that has been solved in this method of using repetitive processes or questions. These are actually not repetitive processes. They're repetitive questions. And they are flat at a very precise point. And this is the one you will have the hardest trouble with is, of course, when are they flat. There's two troubles one has with that. one is not reading the meter and the other is not believing it. And either one of them bring about a very upset pc.

So anyway, this process design or type has been adjusted to Model Session, June 23, 1962, changed in the HCOB July 4, 1962.

Now, this Model Session is a brand-new designed Model Session. It looks like the same Model Session but it is not the same Model Session. It is the repetitive Model Session. And it is designed with the change of July 4th, which deletes the Havingness from the beginning rudiments but leaves it in at the end rudiments. It gives you your beginning rudiments and all but the Havingness in the end rudiment as an auditing question. And they are just handled as such, in repetitive treatment.

You have here a number of processes, in other words. You have as many processes, if you are going to do them all repetitively. You've got the beginning processes and the beginning rudiments are the beginning processes. And you've got the middle rudiments and they are the middle processes. And then you have the random rudiment which is a random process and then you have the end rudiments which are end processes. It's quite interesting.

You'd think slugging this many processes at a pc in one session would be catastrophic. And if it is not done properly, I assure you it is catastrophic. All you have to do is overrun the process one question. It's just as little as that. Overrun it one question, there is a loud splash, and pc is in the soup. Just one question too many and you've had it. Now one question too few and you've had it. It has a tolerance of zero. There is no allowance for error on when it is flat. And most of your difficulties between now and the year two thousand will stem from what I have just outlined as possible errors.

Now when you're teaching this to people, when you're teaching this to people and somebody comes in and they say they are running Routine 3GA or whatever the routine is called, and the pc somehow or another isn't nulling well on the list and the meter isn't reading right and they say to you, "Please think up some unusual solution—some fabulously unusual solution." Let's see. You could dream up the fact that we do a yogi exercise every fourth command or something like that. That'd probably help the pc. I'm afraid your answer is something of this nature. They are ending their Model Session processes and the rudiments one question or more too early or they are carrying them on one question or more too long. Either one brings about catastrophe.

Now, if you end them too early the pc still has answers. And every answer that he has or would give you, now becomes a missed withhold. Which—I think that's marvelous, you know. We've just set up—you see, there's two things you could do about missed withholds: Is you could forget all about O/W—bury the whole thing—never have anything more to do with ever asking anybody for an overt, you see; or do it exactly right. Those are the Aristotelian elements involved. The black and white. We're into oddly enough some black and white things. There are no shades of gray in any of this, you see. And this Aristotelian— you either don't ever breathe at a pc that you ever want to know anything from the pc of any kind whatsoever or you do it perfectly. Any shade of gray is chaos. Disaster will strew the auditing room. This hyperbole is actually not hyperbolical but an understatement of fact.

Marriages, business careers, life itself could go by the boards if you don't believe that. I mean this is really wild. You either never ask the pc anything about what he ever did, to minimize the situation, or you do it perfectly.

Now, in view of the fact that you can't do the first one for this reason: any time you see the pc you're liable to miss a withhold. The mechanism is still there. Whether it's advertised, written up or not, it is still there, and explains all the vagaries and upsets that you've had in auditing It's still present. Wouldn't care if we abolished it; we held a big conclave and decided to eradicate it and so forth. I don't think it would do a bit of good.

In addition to that, there happens to be the case who thinks you should know everything they're thinking This is one case in twelve—as frequent as that. And you should know everything they're thinking And if you don't know everything they're thinking, of course, you will ask them questions. So any time you ask this pc any kind of a question like, "How are you?" you've missed a withhold. You say, "How do you do?" you've missed a withhold. They're furious with you. I don't exaggerate. That is the truth of the matter. There are people around who think you should know what they're thinking. And they think something is wrong with you if you don't. And the way they got into that state of mind, of course, was pretended knowingness on other people's parts and too much indulgence and this and that. Actually, overts against questions get a person into this state. But just did a bulletin on it. It's coming out Thursday, HCOB July 12, I guess it is.

Now the—if this type of person exists, and that type of person does, and if lots of people get into this state, and they do, and if man keeps being active while being secretive, which he will, it is inevitable that you miss a withhold. The person is sitting in the room; you walk in the room; you walk out of the room; you've missed a withhold. No conversation. Furious with you. You'll see it happen every once in a while. It becomes utterly inexplicable. You didn't do anything to the person. You didn't say anything to the person. Nothing. And they're mad at you. Well, you can't do number one then. So the only answer is to do number two perfectly. You can't do it, "fairly well." It's unfortunate that we have entered into a level of auditing sometime since where you couldn't do it fairly well. It's impossible to do auditing fairly well. Auditing must be done perfectly.

Now, you're very rich at this time whether you know it or not in having repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking because it is rather easy to do these things perfectly. There's no variation. You don't have to vary questions. You don't have to dream up something in passage. There aren't exceptions to the rule. These things all go on down the line. Now the only difficulty you will enter into is in a very, very severe case you will find that the Model Session withhold question has to be changed for that very severe case. You have to specifically state, "to another," or something like this in the question. You'll find that the person always answers it with a motivator. And he'll spin himself in.

You'll say, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding" If you know your pc and this pc falls into the one in twelve you'd better change that question. Like, "Done anything to another?" Or even "done anything bad to another." Because the pc will answer it this way, "Have you done anything you are withholding?" you see. And the pc will say, "Yes. I sympathized with myself for having such a lousy auditor."

And man, they will keep going this way, and you can just see the pc scrunching in the chair. And you let this be answered that way on and on and on and on. And the next thing you know the pc just spun himself in. It won't ever clear. That is the test. If you just sit there and you keep asking this question, "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?"

And the pc says, "Yes. I discussed with Gracie Ann what an ugly face you have." See. And so on and so on and so on. Your end rudiments are going out faster than you're putting in the beginning rudiments, don't you see?

And you could just go on like this endlessly. You can just go on and on and on and on like this, and this question doesn't clear. The needle gets sticky and then it gets dirty and you can't tell whether it's clear or not. So you have that vagary. And I would dare say sometime up in the near future I'll probably watch you operating along this line and will probably dream up an absolutely perfect question for that very one that's totally embracive. But just now I've been so busy I haven't done it. So you just have to put up with that.

Now, auditing is a pretty open and shut proposition now. And oddly enough, it is as successful as it is predictable by the pc. Now, auditors get spoiled by a success. A howling, singular success greeting an unusual solution can practically ruin an auditor. I know. I myself have sometimes smoked around for a month or so trying to recover from some fabulous victory. That's right. It was an unusual solution and I couldn't figure out why it worked or how it worked or exactly where it fitted into the jigsaw puzzle and so forth. Well, you saw more unusual solutions from two or three years ago and back than you have seen since. And you have seen many more unusual solutions from 1955 back to 1950 than there were from 1955 onward. You get the idea?

In other words the more we know about the mind, the less unusual solution we need. That is something to remember. See, the better your tools, the less the unusual solutions you need.

That is something to remember. It's also a way to measure up somebody, let us say, an HPA/HCA student. That person is smoking along one way or the other and one day they get

up very bright and they hit it rich, you see. And they hit some button on the pc, dream up this unu--- they're worrying about the pc, you see. Well, if they're worrying about the pc with the modern weapons which they're using, then you can really realize that they're not using the modern weapon. They're doing something odd or peculiar already. So they lie awake half the night trying to figure out what button it was, and they remember their Axioms or something of the sort, and they put it all together one way or the other, and they put their finger— because pcs—auditors are all so intuitive and they can put their finger exactly on the button that needs to be pushed, you see. The pc breaks down and cries and says, "Oh God, how did you know this?" you know, and feels wonderful and the warts all disappear off his face. Just like that, zzzp. The auditor goes guuulp.

You have to beat him after that. You have to beat him several times with losses before he starts to realize that he'd better audit along a standard line. The way he gets beaten is he does the same thing to the next case. Well, the more unusual was the solution, the less cases it's going to work on. So he might have to audit another hundred cases before he would get one to respond to this button.

So after that he gets nothing but losses, losses, losses, losses, losses. It works, unfortunately, sometimes. Sometimes they get so many losses they just stop auditing And they never really trace it back to the singular victory which departed from a standard procedure or action.

Now, the closer we approach in toward clearing—producing Releases easily and clearing— the closer we approach in toward this, the less unusual solutions appear or are required in the handling of cases. Naturally, if you have the answers that release and clear people, well, you aren't going to get it hunt and punch selectively, you see. You're not going to audit one one way and another the other way, don't you see? In order to release everybody and clear everybody, you've got to have how everybody's mind works. That's it. All right. Let me point out to you we're clearing people. We're releasing people rather easily and we're clearing them. So you see, we're getting in an—into an invariable type of procedure.

Now, the procedure which we're using, which did these tricks, gets modified to the degree that it is successful in the hands of all auditors—not a few, see. So we have two things monitoring the result and the ease of the result. Those are the two things that monitor our technology.

Now, I watch people auditing. And on the Saint Hill Course we're watching—as they come in brand new—the better auditors in the world. There's no doubt about that. I mean just as they walk in the front door they're the better auditors of the world. Instructors faint, you know. They just hold their heads, say, "Oh, my God! Don't tell me they really audited like this in Port Darwin. Oh, my God!" I have to cheer them up. I say, "Oh, my God! You should have seen what they were doing a few months ago in London. I mean, don't be so downhearted about this because it's been worse. It's been worse." "No, we doubt it."

All right. So our technology at the moment, because of observation and cooperation here, is monitored against what these auditors can do. Well, that makes a mighty rough hill to climb perhaps in this technology for somebody who is already having a very hard time of it. But I try to make a bit of an allowance for that. And when I find something that you can do standing on your head, I know it can be done elsewhere with sweat. If it doesn't get done elsewhere with sweat, if it gets done not at all, well, it will require further study.

Now I feel, however, that we're at a very happy state of the game. The problems were these. And you should know the problems about this before you start sailing off on unusual solutions or something or not grasping the solution which we're using. You should know what the problems were. I'll try to outline those to you rather rapidly. I won't tell you I'll tell you all of the problems, because some of the problems were you personally. But, I thought that'd wake you up.

Now, the problems are these. You got a GPM. A pc is built like a universe. First mention of this is Advanced Procedures and Axioms. Time postulate. What begun this 'ere thing called the MEST universe. It were a prime postulate. And it then accumulated thereunto, mass. That's the way the universe was built. Built on a prime postulate. And that's the way any mass connected with the pc was built: on the pc's own prime postulate.

A pc's reactive bank does not exist native to the corporeal self he is packing around as an identification card. They have other reasons for having bodies. I know. Sensations, storage, and that sort of thing Food absorbers— for polite drinking. There are various—various reasons to have bodies, you know.

Oh, you'd be surprised—wearing a doll body, somebody offers you a drink, and you can't follow a very mannerly procedure. I know. I got to be a drunk one time on a planet a long time ago. It was very embarrassing. And supposing you're sitting there with some human beings and somebody hands you a drink, you know. There you are in a doll body. Well, if you poured it down your gullet, for God's sakes, your condensers would short the capacitors now—and I do mean short out! Your crew chief would be collecting you and wanting to know what happened. He might add "Sir," but it'd be in sort of a surly fashion.

So the hostess offers you this drink, you know. You know what you have to do as a doll? Pour some on the tablecloth. That's right. So it'll evaporate. It's the only way you can get drunk. Oh, hadn't you remembered that? Goodness, you're foggy these days. Not remembering something like that. It's impolite. Ruined linen. Man dramatizes it. He takes these snifters—these balloons—brandy balloons. And he, you know... That's—that's how a doll gets drunk, you know.

Now, a human being is merely determined by having a human body. And the difference between a doll and a human body is just a difference of corporeal self. And you know a doll packs around the same kind of bank as a human being Thetan's got a bank. It's always the same kind of bank. This bank is constant and is all built the same way. It was built on a prime postulate. And oddly enough, so was the universe built the same way. Only we call that prime postulate the basic purpose of the individual in Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health, or his goal.

There can be a lot of these. There can be a lot of sections of the master— you might say the whole track GPM. The individual is dragging this stuff around.

It is the alteration on the prime postulate occurring in the course of putting it into effect. In other words, the individual says he wants to catch catfish and that's his prime postulate. That's his basic purpose. Of course, you might say there's a prime prime postulate and a prime postulate. The guy in the beginning of any cycle on the track or any life usually makes a prime postulate. I remember my prime postulate when I picked up this body. No, not this body. The one just before that. And that was, "I'll show them they can't put me out of the game," you know. No effect to amount to anything on this lifetime, monitored by a cycle prime postulate, don't you see. But that's a new prime prime postulate erected on a cycle prime postulate. And then you've got the prime prime postulate for the whole track. You're not going to get to that in one fair gulp. That's a few goals back, you see.

And the story of it all is alter-is. The individual's going to catch catfish, and by God, he finds himself studying law. Accumulates mass. He'll study law and try to go fishing It's the shift of attention; the shift of direction. And it inhibits his ability to as-is so he accumulates mass. Also, change of attention is change and energy is change, if you want to get more scientific about it. There's a lot to be understood about how mass evolves out of alteration.

Alter-isness. Alter-is a postulate and you get mass. Well, you got the idea. Lightning bolt goes from A to B. Boom! Nothing left of the lightning bolt. It all went over to B. All right. Let's have a lightning bolt determined to go from A to B and then let's put some huge capacitors and some impedances and put three vias on the line and let it flow. Something is

going to happen to mass. Something is going to occur here. Let it flow through just—just this much. Just let it flow through air and you'll get ozone being created. In other words, there's a—change is going to take place.

Change occurs the moment that you make something do otherwise than go from A to B. Something goes from A to B smoothly with no impedance of any kind if you can imagine that, and you get, of course, no change as far as that's concerned. Oh, you doubt that. Well, there's this little point. You see, if it goes from point A to point B with no change, then of course it can't—not travel across any distance, can it? You follow that? So point A has to be point B. and under those circumstances you get no-change situation.

Now, by introducing the arbitrary of space, you have introduced a via. It can't get from A to B without traveling through some space. You get one of the first things that happens to build a universe. That, by the way, looks so ordinary to you, but in actual fact is so peculiar that a universe will result from it—that A and B are different points. That's really a brain-cracker—distance. Now as we inspect all these various things, we see that alteration or shift of attention is what causes hang-up—motionlessness in time—you already have time. Now we get a shift of attention, we'll get a motionlessness in time. We get all kinds of variations. We get accumulation of mass. We get dissipation of masses. We get all kinds of weird things going on here. Interchanges of masses. Dislocation of points in space. We get all kinds of things. And because we're getting all these changes, we get an individual, who after a while, obsessively changes.

There are two things wrong with the human personality—if you can call them wrong—two basic errors. These are not the most basic errors. One is too great a constancy, and the other is too much inconstancy. Those are two crimes, you see. Two isnesses.

An exaggerated constancy is described in that thrilling poem, "The boy stood on the burning deck, The flames were about to kill him, And there came a thrilling rescue in the last three feet of film." That, of course, is an alteration of the poem. It almost murders you just to read the poem, you see. The temptation to alter-is it is so great, because its constancy is so fantastically stupid. He stands on the burning deck and burns up, see. This is supposed to be a great thing We're supposed to teach the kids, you know. If you're standing in the road and you are supposed to be waiting for your father, and the car is coming, it is very evil if you move. Don't move.

Doesn't sound educational, does it? Well, that is what you might call too great a constancy.

And the other is too great a variation. You never can find the kid. Unlocatable. As soon as you call up Jimmy's house to find him, why, he's gone over to Mary's house, and you call Mary's house, and he's back at Jimmy's house, and you keep this up for hours.

Auditors do these two things. Auditors do these two things: They resist change even when it is sensible; and they will obsessively introduce change when it is not required. Constancy without understanding, without reason, is simply a characteristic of MEST. One should understand why one is being constant before one starts being constant. I recommend it thoroughly.

And one should also understand what he is undertaking before he introduces alteration. This is also appalling. Now auditing, oddly enough, following the science of mind and life, does not necessarily bring about—and is not bound and determined to bring about its own track and its own mass because it's short track and it is singularly deprived of duress. Auditing today is not something to worry about unless it is done in such a knuckleheaded fashion that nobody would believe it. Then you could worry about auditing because it'll put the individual beyond the reach of help, which is the only actual overt.

Well, you could audit an individual so badly and so constantly and so consistently that nobody could ever tie him down again to get audited. That would be a crime, see, caused by

bad auditing. Because it would make auditing bring about an inaccessibility of the case, you see.

And you could audit somebody on the wrong goal knuckleheadedly enough, long enough and hard enough and knuckleheadedly enough, and viciously enough, and ARC breaky enough probably to kill him, see. Probably knock the body off before you got through. It would take some doing. An auditor would have to be singularly stupid to do this, but you must not, just because we are all tender little flowers that are likely to be shocked, we must not exclude that fact because it might alarm somebody.

I am a great believer in people doing what they're doing, knowing what they're doing I'll think that's a good thing, you know. I don't like to see troops told that they are going to go to heaven if they get killed on the battlefield fighting the Unguts or something, you see. I used to look at the whirling dervishes telling the Mohammedan troops and that sort of thing that this thing was going to happen, you know. Hang more dervishes. It made me feel spinny for a while, but I ran it out.

Anyhow . . . Cheer up, it's not that bad. Now I don't like to see you walking in against the pcs these days without realizing that you could use Routine 3GA in a completely knuckleheaded fashion; insist on—insist on the pc handling the wrong goal; insist on very ARC breaky and duressful sessions and so forth, and obtain a well, probably, possibly even a knock-off on the part of the pc, see. I don't like to see you blind to that fact because it could happen. It would have to be pretty—pretty wild, but it could happen. Ordinarily the pc becomes very sick and very dizzy and you realize something is going wrong, and if you know your business, then you'll find the pc's right goal. It now becomes a little bit harder to find, but it can still be done, you see.

Now, in Prepchecking—in Prepchecking we had a problem. First, there's this problem of alteration. There's a problem of too great a constancy. You know there are people still running engrams because the stuff I figured out later, that was no good; that, the early stuff, that was good, you know. I know this. There are people in the United States—there's some guys in the United States sitting in the back areas. They're still running engrams like mad. They probably never will get beyond this point in psychology classes in universities where they're using Dianetics. Because that was good, but any improvement on it, well, that was too much. And Hubbard shouldn't have started thinking about thetans or anything like that. That was a nasty thing for him to do in this materialistic society. That's what you might call too great a constancy.

The guy sacrifices his future in the—in the idea that constancy is that great a virtue. Well, it isn't that great a virtue. Constancy must always be accompanied by understanding Similarly, change should be accompanied by understanding If you fully understand the tools which exist at this moment, you will see minimal reasons to change them, and you'll get your maximal change from the auditors who know the least about these things or do them least well.

But that doesn't say when you're auditing a little kid who can hardly speak English, that—you see, this is too great a constancy—he's seven years old and you're—he can't speak English very good, you know. He's only been speaking it since—for the last five years, and you say, "In this session is there anything you have suppressed?"

And he says, "Suppressed?" He says, "What's that? What's that suppressed? What? What's suppressed? Suppressed? What's that?"

And you say, "Suppressed. I'll repeat the auditing question. In this session is there anything you have suppressed?" And you know, you're not going to get anyplace. You have to give it to him. He'll finally understand what you're talking about. Hid or squashed or put out of sight. You know, you'll say, "fail to reveal," he didn't get that. He didn't dig that. And you'll finally say, "hid from me." Hu-hu. Yeah, he digs that, see. You get the idea.

But this is—this is too great an alteration. Talking to somebody who understands all this and so forth. Pc says to us, "Well, every time we have a session you keep talking to me about difficulties, and I really don't like to have difficulties discussed because—and so forth, because it upsets me every time you mention difficulties, and difficulties are pretty bad, and nobody can ever get over their difficulties, see?" So you omit it from the Model Session. Never ask that. That's too great a change, man.

Or every time you say the criticism end rudiment, why the pc says, "Every time I—every time I hear that I—I get the idea that you're—you're just sitting there looking at me and thinking that I just sit here and criticize and criticize and criticize you all the time, and do nothing else but criticize you. I never criticize you. I never think any critical thoughts to myself at all. I never think any critical thoughts in the whole session. Yet you just keep asking this question and asking this question and so forth, and I . . ."

So you say, "Well, have you done anything in the session?" I'm afraid that's too great a change. Or let us say you can't clear the mid "rudiment," In this session, is there anything you have failed to reveal?" and you can't clear this mid rudiment. It just doesn't ever clear. So you say, "Are you concentrated on anything during this session that you aren't letting me in on in some fashion. And then develop seven or eight more middle rudiments. And then develop a hot button: "In this session are you refusing to win?" I can hear it now. This becomes the place where they raise kangaroos. It's up there in Southwest, New South, North Wales—place they raise kangaroos. I can hear it now. Right above one of those little lakes. Canberra. That's it. Canberra. Yeah, yeah. I can hear it now: "In this session are you refusing to win?" You know? Something like that. Gets to be very fashionable. Finally, we send out an expedition, make the archaeological discovery that that's why the civilization of Canberra disappeared, you see—because they squirreled all the time.

You get the idea? There's moderation in all things, even in constancy. And there's certainly moderation in alter-isness.

If you think you need four or five different new middle ruds to get your pc kicked along the line, you're going to be in more trouble than you're going to be in because this is one of the problems.

One of the problems is that an inconstancy of approach by the auditor causes more trouble than an unusual solution heals. Yes, these little buttons are wonderful; injected in the right place and all that sort of thing. But they inject an inconstancy and a failure to predict in the session, which overreaches the good they do. In other words, they actually might improve the pc's case and lower the pc's confidence; because he couldn't predict what the auditor's going to say next, see. And he gets down along the line and this auditor's always coming up with something different, you know, and the pc's always coming out of session with his attention on the auditor. You see, that can be an evil. And it finally results in violating the definition of in-sessionness.

You get a constancy that works so that your middle rudiments consist of suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal and been careful of. That takes an awful lot of edge off the case. Yes, we know there's more we could get off the case. Mary Sue and I were fooling around one night and I think we racked up I don't know, eight or twelve or fifteen, something like that, different new things that could be put into the end rudiments.

End rudiments would be about twenty questions long. You know, you start the session ten minutes before session time in order to get the end rudiments done by session end, you know. There's all kinds of them: "Is there anything in this session you've been responsible for?" The hottest of them, "Is there anything in this session that has shifted your attention?" or "Has there been a shift of attention in this session?" that sort of thing. That's a very hot button, but listen, there's about twenty of them.

And we were cleaning up a session which hadn't been noteworthy for its meanness or something of the sort, and she kept asking these questions. We were just—the session had just passed by, and she got a fall on every one of these. Little tiny things. Didn't amount to a hill of beans, you see. But nevertheless each one of them was slightly charged.

What you're trying to do with Model Session—and this is another problem—is you're trying to make the pc auditable and continue to be auditable. That's all you're doing with Model Session and its processes. Just trying to make the pc auditable and continue to be auditable. And oddly enough, if you run it, it's got therapeutic value. The repetitions are perfectly done with Havingness or something like that in the body of the session.

This is tremendously valuable, therapeutically. But honest, you could run it for a thousand sessions just as itself, and it wouldn't clear anybody. The virtue of Model Session then, is not its processing value, it's its predictable value. Pc knows what's going to happen, and additionally it takes the edge off the things most likely to distract the pc. Your Model Session doesn't try to heal all the pc's mari---- . Imagine your embarrassment. You're going to use the Model Session—the PTP question, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "Oh, I'm having terrible difficulty with my husband."

So you say, "All right now. Isn't that marvelous? We've finally gotten her to realize that she is—and so on."

And we take off at this point—see, we're not even in the session—and we take off at this point, and we use this. This is a repetitive question. No—we could, too. We do nothing but run this with one aim in view: to cure all of her marital difficulties. We're going to have all of their marital difficulties cured on the whole track.

Five or six sessions later, the pc's starting to look rather odd by this time. And we somehow or other never seem to get past this rudiment. We never bother just to clean the rudiment, you see. We're trying to audit the case with that rudiment. And imagine our embarrassment—either we or somebody . . . we finally get tired of it—we finally find the pc's goal: "To kill my husband." You're never going to run a R3GA with a rudiments process, I assure you.

Hidden in this case—here's another difficulty—hidden in any case is this basic purpose, a prime postulate. And earlier than that other prime postulates. These vary. And it would be very nice to say the basic prime postulate for all human beings every place is "to be." And all you have to do is list, "to be," and that will be marvelous and we'll just get the four way flow on "to be," and we just do that on any pc and we never have to do a Goals Assessment. And I wish that were true because you're knuckleheaded when it comes to Goals Assessments. But it doesn't happen to be true.

No, they have goals of various kinds. "To kill my husband." "To catch catfish." "To fall in love with golden haired goddesses." "To be a crapehanger." "To sit." Now, remember that any alteration of that goal is going to add mass, and it's actually a fantastic thing that we have processes such as these Model Session and Prepchecking today, which actually can do something with a case over the head of this without getting us into too much trouble. Remember that's the way it is. It doesn't get us into too much trouble. That's the way to look at Model Session and rudiments and processes and Prepchecking and so forth. It's just fine. It doesn't get us into too much trouble.

As far as improving the case is concerned, all we're trying to do with the case is smooth out the needle. That's basically all we're trying to do with the case so the case will sit there quietly and can have an assessment run. Now, that's the brutal truth of the matter.

Now, that people feel better is incredibly a fact, but it should be regarded as somewhat incredible by an auditor. How can the guy feel better when he has a goal, "to sit," and his job tells him he has to run all day. See, that is your senior aberration, and is so overwhelmingly

senior to any other button or aberration on the case that to be able to do anything for the case at all is absolutely miraculous.

But you can walk up to somebody, and put your finger on his forehead, have him look at your finger with his eyes shut, you know, and so forth, and cure his headache by spotting your finger around here, there; or that you can run "From where could you communicate to a leg," and "To what leg could you communicate," or something. That you could do anything for this guy at all—that you could take somebody who's lying in a sickbed with upper leukosis or something and run out what the nurse said yesterday or something and have the hemorrhaging cease. This is absolutely fantastic when you sound the well of human aberration and know that the prime postulate is going to interfere with anything you try to do. That you can get away with this is fantastic. Now, this is unusual enough without flying into the face of the gods.

Now, if you're trying to solve a case without recourse to the case's goal, I sympathize with you. I've had lots of experience. I can tell you that it can't be done. That case will not solve all the way. That case's recoveries will be quite often very spectacular, neighbors thrilled to pieces, everybody very happy. Little Izzekranz can see again, you know. Marvelous. Roscoe's right arm is not now shorter than the left. Yeah. This is gorgeous. It's fine. You'll find these pcs in due course of time, not necessarily getting that trouble back, but you'll find out they haven't found out they changed really. Very unsatisfactory over the whole thing. You're not going to change a pc short of his goal.

The way to change a pc is to clear him. That's one of the basic problems you're up against. The basic problem of clearing a pc is cleaning up his needle. The basic problem of cleaning up the needle is to have a sufficiently powerful process which is sufficiently constant in its application, that the pc gets very confident in being audited. Do you see how those problems add up?

Now, strangely enough, a pc is not going to let anything help him against which he has fantastic overts. He gets in a games condition with it, and you as the auditor or the subject you're using—he gets overts against you or overts against the subject, your missed withholds and it makes him misemotional or something like this, and he can't be helped as easily. In fact it is not only much harder but sometimes impossible to accomplish help in the face of those things so it requires a certain amount of preparatory action so as to keep the pc in-session.

Now, you were asking me one night whether or not you would do these things—you would set up a case like this after you left Saint Hill. Well, you're going to run into the same problems. You see, some case with a nice free needle, and you say, "Oh, well, that's fairly— all right. I mean—well, I'll just sail into this case. Aw, I'll just get the case's goal and . . ." And you'll be killed by your own good luck. So help me Pete, you found the pc's goal. So help me Pete, it was dead easy. Nulled it out, the needle went free, the pc felt marvelous. It's an absolute miracle. It didn't take anything like the number of hours that you thought. You think this is the most marvelous thing that ever happened to you, see. Oh, it's marvelous, see. Great. Great. Great.

And you get your next pc. And you say, "Well, I've got a fairly free needle . . . There's no dirty needle there or anything. I'll just go to work here." And then we hit the anxiety peak as we come up on the last quarter of the run in finding his goal, and suddenly discover belatedly that we have never had the pc under control ever. And the pc's anxiety throws him totally out of control. There isn't any way we can hold him in-session. He just blows, blooom! So we keep climbing uphill against this sort of thing, and we waste five times the number of hours on this pc that we would have had to spend in setting the pc up in the first place. And we become citizens, see. We can be spoiled by good luck. Don't think for a moment that you can't have good luck like this. Just please for my sake feel a little bit leery of it.

Little Johnny's schoolteacher understands you're a Scientologist, and she's heard something about this and she wants this and that. And we say all right. Well, make yourself out a list of goals, and we'll find a goal. And she does and you run down the list once and you find a goal sitting there. And that's the only thing it takes and it checks out perfectly. And you list it, and you list twenty-five items for each line and the needle goes free.

She tells you the next goal and the four items to free that and she becomes OT, you see. Look, I just hope it never happens to you. Yes, then every pc after that is going to look horrible. It's just disastrous in all directions. Life becomes gruesome.

Now, the other thing, the other main problem that stares us in the face with all this, is the fact that the E-Meter itself can be run into a hole with the pc. You can neglect reads on an E-Meter and make the E-Meter unworkable. An E-Meter does not ARC break from full reading to no read, one-two. That is not black and white. It's all shades of gray. An E-Meter fades out and becomes less and less readable the more you neglect. A very inexpert auditor, not seeing the tiny reads that occur on the meter in answer to rudiments questions, can very easily and very shortly get into—get the pc into a barely readable meter, which only reads on the greatest of greats, that just misses withholds from there on out. That is the problem.

That's ending the rudiments process too soon. We ask the question one more time. The needle was rising as we asked the question, and there was a microscopic, infinitesimal slow in the rise. It'd take hawkeye himself to have seen it. And the auditor lets it slide. Actually, he lets the next one slide. And he lets the next rudiment slide. By the time he gets into his third or fourth session doing this sort of thing, his meter isn't working The guy could have been found standing over the policeman with a smoking gun in his hand, and the meter on the question, "Did you kill that cop?" would not even wiggle on that auditor.

In other words, you can sort of educate the meter out of reading You see how you can do it? It's done on a gradient. Now, we know it can be done with a sharp and incredibly harsh ARC break from read well to no read at all. But this other one has not been suspected until recently. You can get a meter which gradually drifts out of read. The next thing you know you're ending all of your rudiments questions too early. All of them. The rudiments are never in. The whole list goes null on you every time you turn around in nulling the list. About every three questions, the list—every question goes null. Every read of every question on a goals assessment is null. There's—that needle is no longer ticking at all. That is the consequence of this earlier neglect. Now, you might have not—not have been the auditor who neglected it, but you must to some degree have aided and abetted it in the rudiments.

Now, the other problem is being too careful because you aggravate the pc every time you try to clean a clean rudiment. Just clean the clean rudiment. Now, I did some more tests on "Do you agree that that is clean?" and taking the read off of that. I found out that doesn't work because you're cleaning a clean rudiment. And it will ARC break a pc more often than it will salvage the case. If it was clean once, it was clean, man. You can say, "Do you agree that that is clean?" so as not to evaluate for him, or "Do you agree that that is null?"

Now, you've got an end of process type of solution. "Is there anything you care to ask or say before I leave this rudiment?" If your pc always adds something afterwards you could frankly get into the habit of asking him if he wanted to say anything, see. But it doesn't come under the heading of part of Model Session. What you must remember is what you forgot in the CCHs. Two-way comm still exists in a session.

Model Session run strictly, right on the button, word for word, still is not a muzzled session. Oddly enough, it would run today as a muzzled session. But a good auditor should have enough sense to maintain two-way comm with his pc. Too many auditors withdraw out of the session and just let the Model Session carry it. That's too great a constancy, you see. Never asks the pc how he is; never sounds cheerful about the thing. You know? Never does anything to let—you know, keep the pc thinking we're all alive after all. So you drop that out and you're also in trouble.

Now, we're also wealthy to the degree that repetitive rudiments use exactly the same pattern as Repetitive Prepchecking, and we need only one skill to cover both. And that is one of the problems—is teaching a number of technologies, a number of processes, a number of procedures. No, I would rather teach one procedure superlatively well than ten indifferently. So your two things the auditor was having the most trouble with—rudiments and Prepchecking or Sec Checking as it was called earlier—have been solved today. And we've brought this up to a constancy. Well, nobody is trying to change things just for the sake of changing things, but one is certainly—I'm trying, and I think I have succeeded in bringing it up within shooting distance for any auditor so that he gets results.

It's a great joy to see the pc sitting there chatting with you, talking to you interestedly about their own case, brightly, very happy to be sitting in the auditing chair.

You use this type of procedure and you use it well, why, the pc just sits there and they talk happily to you and describe everything and they're real sent, and things are blowing Things will blow, blow, blow, blow, because they're cheerful.

And sometimes when you've been grinding away on a pc who never spoke to you cheerfully but just answered the auditing command, you all of a sudden shift to repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking and have the pc sitting there cheerful, happy, glad to be audited, glad to talk to you—you will see that there's been a considerable advance just in the technology itself.

If your pc isn't doing that with you, and you use repetitive rudiments or Repetitive Prepchecking, well, you're probably doing something unusual.

Thank you very much.