

CHECKING RUDS AND WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on
14 July 1961

Thank you.

Okay, what is this? This is the . . .

Audience: 14th.

...14th of July, AD 11. Okay. I can at least remember the year. All right. It's a very difficult subject that I have to touch on. Very, very difficult subject: is you're dragging your heels. You've been out-passed. You've been out-passed. They just made three Clears in South Africa, on the course there. Clearing goes by contagion. It's contagious. You make a Clear, now look what happens. Went down to South Africa and on course made a Clear, see?

All right, a big reality was established right at that point. Promptly and immediately Peter Williams goes back over to Australia and makes two Clears. See? Boom. This Clear, now teaching a course down in South Africa, has cleared some fantastic percentage like . . I don't know what it is . . three out of four, three out of seven, or something like this, that was on this unit.

Interesting, isn't it? Who's going to be the first Clear here tomorrow? Tomorrow. All right. Let's get on the ball. You've got to create a new reality and set a good example and stop setting this aberrated example to people. Now, let's set a good example to people.

Now, you're doing all right. What we've been doing . . I'll tell you what the difference was, what the difference is. All these Clears have been made very close to assessment only. you understand? It's practically nothing but Routine 3 that is clearing them. Got it? But let me point out something very drastic here. A very small percentage is making it on Routine 3. Yeah, it's making it, but a small percentage is making it. Now why?

Rudiments are so far out on the vast majority of people that putting in the rudiments becomes a fantastically arduous proposition . . not necessarily difficult. But a whole activity has to be devoted to this thing called rudiments. Hence you have the first part of a session . . if you've ever cared to notice . . is getting the pc under control. You at least have to get him to set down in a chair before you can establish rudiments, you understand? Routine 1.

All right. Now, out and above that comes Routine 1A. That takes care of the alter-is characteristics of the pc and takes care of present time problems as a bugaboo from there on, because the only people she didn't clear were people who had screaming present time problems that nobody'd located. See that? It's a common denominator.

All right. So our next part of the program, of course, is to get these present time problems swept right straight off the slate . . just set this up and set up this wide percentage, you see? And get all of these withholds that are slowing it down to a walk, off. Hence your Routine 1 and your Routine 1A. These are preparatory.

We're not looking for an occasional Clear; we are looking for very broad clearing, you understand? Any time, for years, I could have made a Clear. Well, I did and have done it. So what? See? Where has this gone? Well, I could probably sit down and do nothing but audit twenty-eight hours a day and I could probably turn out a few dozen Clears in my lifetime, and that would be dandy. And then I go out and get mixed up in an altercation called life, or something like that, or the body decays, or something like that and nobody else makes any Clears. And then you've got Buddhism. That's pretty good. That would be nice. That's just what this planet needs . . just exactly what it needs. Just needs a bunch of brass idols. That's just what it needs. Because that's all anybody has ever understood out of Buddhism.

All right. So that obviously has been tried. And I wouldn't advocate that particular route. It has already been tried. And it's actually strewn with the whitened bones of busted psyches. That whole route looks like a chart of Death Valley.

There are so many routes been tried . . so many routes . . that one of the most difficult things is not getting curious when you cross some of their old ruts. And you know, you say, "Oh, isn't it interesting. Look at the Oregon pioneers and they went up that way. Well, all right. Let's walk through that woods. That was very interesting. And look at that water hole all surrounded by bones and busted wagon wheels and let's go a little bit further, maybe somebody found something out there. And there's a range of mountains over there. Yeah, well, maybe somebody can cross that." And the next thing you know, why, somebody's sitting and there is no way out, see? They can't even find the trail back, man!

So frankly, the piloting of Dianetics and Scientology is not so much through a wilderness or an untrodden desert waste, you see, that nobody has ever been in; the trouble with plotting Dianetics and Scientology is, it is nothing but solid trails. Something on the idea of tracking five hundred horses which have gone in all directions, you know, and you're trying to find . . you're trying to find a new trail in the middle of all these horse marks. And that's they are, too, horse marks.

Okay. Now, as we go forward here, we find that it'd be very easy to trip Up and to take some old cockeyed route that has never led anywhere and never will.

And this is pretty darn good that somebody else is clearing. This is pretty darn good. And we're clearing close-up and then they're clearing at a distance. And now they're clearing at a bit of a remote distance in time. This Looks very promising, see? Looks very good.

But the only flaw in all this is broad clearing. You want to be able to sake Joe Aloysius Q. Doakes . . that was not his father's name but we'll let it Pass . . and by getting . . without getting fancy and without having to become screamingly brilliant in all directions as an auditor and without having to sit up half of the night figuring out the star-plot of George Q. Aloysius Doakes, why, clear him.

All right. Now, we're on to that right now. We're on to that right now with Routine 1, Routine 1A. And I have not said very much about Routine 2. There's only one addition that has Routine 2. This has been hanging fire for some time.

I better give you the changes which have taken place in the Prehav Scale. Change number one is drop "No Motion." Drop the line "No Motion." Just leave it blank, leave the number blank. Now salt through the lot . . beginning up around one and so forth, salt through the lot of it . . which way they go and where they belong isn't very important . . every basic emotion you have ever seen on a Tone Scale, as part of your routine and ordinary assessment. You know, "serene," and all the rest of it on that line. In other words, put all those emotions into the Prehav Scale. There is several ways you could do it. you could put them all in their proper place on the scale (well, leave that up to me, I'll do that, sooner or later), or you could just take those emotions and just read them off every time, after you've read the Prehav Scale. See, there's not . . I don't think there's thirty of them. There are a very few number.

Now, people that get stuck in a chronic tone . . and you can get rid of that chronic tone. you can get rid of it. It's a good thing to do. And you'll find your pc will fall on that chronic tone. you just run it Routine 2, see? Or if it falls while you're running Routine 3, why, you run it on the terminal. You know, "Would a god be angry?" You know? "How would you make a god angry? Thank you. How would a god make you angry? Thank you. How would a god . . how would another make a god angry? Thank you." Or . . no, "How would a god make another angry? Thank you. How . . would another make a god angry? Thank you. How would a god make a god angry?" Or "How would a god make himself angry?" That would be your bracket, you see, if you ran across this Tone Scale.

Now, it would follow and fall right along with the Prehav Scale, you understand? It follows the same characteristic; it has no special activity, read, diagnosis, anything; it's just . . it's more levels of the scale. And you assess it by elimination, and so forth, and you just go over those things too, every time. Those things have been with us since the earliest days of Dianetics, and there is no sense in neglecting them now that we got it on the run. All right.

Now, we're looking for very broad clearing . . very, very broad clearing And we want to take somebody that's lying unconscious up in the hospital, non compos mentis, and haven't known anybody for eighteen years, and run them through to Clear. Get the idea? I mean that . . that is the reductio ad absurdum on the thing.

I wouldn't say, and I am not on the track of, some things that would work this way: You find a thetan after he's just dropped a body and you audit him through to Clear. See, now, we haven't got any summated data that leads on that track . . that's not an examined road. one of the requisites of Clear right now is the odd limitation that the thetan must be in a body. So that's as far south as we happen to be going at the present moment, see?

In the first place, you'd have to be something on the order of OT before you could pick up this character and audit him. See, so that requires a different skill and a different lineup and a different location of the pc and a different version of CCHs, and the lot, you see? "Give me that . . give me that beam. Thank you!"

But there is about where we are.

Now, we are doing this, and with your Sec Checks you're taking care of withholds, and with your various problem factors you're taking care of problems, and those are the primary hang-ups. I am perfectly prepared, as I have said before, to suddenly find out that ARC breaks might constitute some specialized activity. They basically, however, fall under O/W, do you see? And they are junior to withholds by considerable.

But you still might find some pc who did nothing but ARC break, and if he did nothing but ARC break, I imagine the oldest remedy we have on that is "Recall an ARC break." And that's quite a slippery one, man. That's quite a process. Any process ever calculated to turn on track and tie double carrick bends in the preclear that was it! "Recall an ARC break." They all do. Because, you see, they run themselves backwards on it all the time, you know? They call it motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator: George did this to me, and Bill did that to me, and Mamma did that to me, and somebody else did that to me, did that to me, did that to me, did that to me umm, boomm, boommmmm. They go down scale in a hurry.

But if you kept on pushing it, they eventually come up and find out they did something too. It's a workable process, the process is perfectly workable. I would say offhand, if I were auditing somebody who was consistently and continually ARC breaking and I just couldn't get them into session because they were ARC breaking and all that kind of thing, I'm afraid I would be more inclined to "Recall an ARC break" than I would be to go out on the CCHs. Person is perfectly capable of running a communication process, you know, of one kind or another. So we say communication process, "Recall an ARC break." He will do that. He is ARC breaking. You are paralleling what the mind is doing, and I'd say it was perfectly legitimate as an activity, if you ran into this factor of somebody did nothing but ARC break.

And then you've pretty well covered the rudiments, because you've got "Find . . " the Have process, you see, and that gives them the room. And you've got lots of rudiments processes, which are the best ones, to find the auditor. The best way to find an auditor is, of course, the CCHs, and the processes which already exist on Model Session. The old "Look at me. who am I?" is kind of a weird, lethal killer.

When columns A, B, C, D consistently and continually register as low on repetitive examination of profile . . that is profile, every intensive, and you find A, B, C, D that area in there low . . you can make an adjudication out of that. The pc has not found the auditor.

Now, there are two causes for this. The auditor is incapable of making an impingement on the pc, see? The auditor thinks he'd better audit, sort of in the back of his head, you know . . . And nobody ever quite finds out whether he's auditing or not. That could happen, you understand? That could happen. Or, the commoner cause of, the pc just cannot register an effect . . cannot stand or tolerate an effect of any kind, cannot stand or tolerate control of any kind. And on a pc whose profile continues consistently and forever low on A, B, C, D, and you are trying to run problems or you're trying to run some other remedy on this pc . . formulas, problems, something just anything to get him off the bottom there . . you're wasting time. You're just wasting time.

Now, let's say we audited somebody just fine on problems for twenty-five hours, and when we examine their profile the following Monday for their next twenty-five hours, we find out he didn't get off the register on A, B, C and D. See, they're all low, and they didn't move, and nothing happened. Well, don't come on down on the auditor with a thud, and so on. That's an entirely different activity, training auditors, and setting them right, and so on. The auditor probably was not effective in some fashion, or he didn't get the PTP, or he didn't get the withhold or he didn't get something.

But there's a very easy way to short-circuit this. you already must credit the fact that the auditor was undoubtedly trying to do something for those first twenty-five hours, you see? He was trying to do something, and you could go in and check it over and you'd find the PTP. You would, you'd find a PTP if you looked for it hard enough, and so forth. The easier thing to do, however, is just say "1A. Run 1A." That's a good, broad remedy for an HGC . . . a D of P. Assoc Sec. HCO Sec sort of remedy.

They just see this character is hanging up, and then without going and inquiring and running a congressional investigation . . . Oh, well I'd hardly say we'd ever run a congressional investigation. We're not trying for publicity. that's all a congressional investigation does. you should hear those guys, by the way. "Let's see, how can I get some publicity so I can be reelected? Well, I think I'll investigate Scientology. Yes, that's it. That's a good idea." You'll hear that someday. But remember that if you ever do hear it, to immediately convene an investigation of Congress! But the upshot of a hung profile at bevels A, B, C, D . . . those levels are down there about minus seventy or more . . . four standard remedy is Routine 1A.

All right. Now, if Routine 1A does not budge this in twenty-five hours . . . I'm getting . . . talking about awful difficult cases here. I'm giving you a good way out, see? You tried Routine 1A the first week, and the case didn't move. Let me . . . let me review this. Just scrub what I said.

Routine 1A didn't move the pc, see? When we assume, then, that while doing the Security Check and everything else, certainly there was every opportunity to find withholds, there was every opportunity to get the case started, and instead of just being critical and coming down on the auditor and batting our brains out and that sort of thing, shift them over to Routine 1, got it? Run Routine 1 for twenty-five hours.

Now, quite amazingly, it will now be possible for you to check over the case if it still didn't move much. you see, but that would be at the beginning of the third twenty-five hours. Now, what do you do at the beginning of the third twenty-five hours? This case didn't move for two consecutive intensives at columns A, B, C, D of the graph. What do you do? Well, certainly don't let it go any further than the beginning of the third twenty-five hours before you act, but don't much bother to act until then. That would be the rule you should follow when you're monitoring cases audited by other people.

You should saw in now with your E-Meter and get clever, with the sensitivity up to 32. Funny thing about it is, at twenty-five hours of problems, if they wouldn't show on the profile, has still done something. And twenty-five hours of the CCHs, although it didn't show on the profiles, have still done something. But all they have done is arm the firing mechanism. This is why it's really fruitless for you to have tried anything before this time, or have scolded auditors or jumped up and down, because all they've done is arm the firing mechanism.

Now, you're going to ask this case, you're going to talk to this case, you're going to talk to this person personally on a girl-to-girl basis or a man-to-man basis or a man-to-girl basis or versawise. And you're going to say, "Now, put all your hairpins on the table, because here we go." And just check those rudiments until they just about fry the atmosphere, see?

"Are you withholding anything from the auditor?" We've got the sensitivity all the way up; we can hardly read it, you see, because the thing is . . . the needle is so drifts. Sensitivity all the way up. And we say, "All right, are you withholding anything from your auditor?" See? And you don't get a reaction.

"Have you thought of withholding anything from your auditor! "Have you ever discussed it with yourself whether or not you should tell your auditor this?" "Have you ever decided that it was no good to have told

your auditor this?" "Have you ever decided that it wouldn't do your case any benefit," really, because 'a little thing like that' . . . which you haven't mentioned, and you don't know . . . 'a little thing like that, certainly, wouldn't hold up a case.' Have you ever thought that?" You get the idea? It's awfully, awfully, right-down-to-rock drilling, see?

And on questions of this character, which are all cross-leading and which are rather unsettling, you know what the person has done. Sometime during that period of time they have undoubtedly come up and said, "Well, I probably ought to confess to the fact that I did rob my piggy bank when I was three," you know? And have said, "Well, that couldn't possibly have suppressed my case." And so they have not-ised it. And for a moment, it was on registry, but immediately afterwards wasn't. Well, you've got to kick it back on a non registry . . . off of non registry and back onto registry.

The way you do this is run a not-is type of questioning. On all of your rudiments. Now, what do I mean by a not-is type of questioning? Well, I just gave you an example. "Have you ever thought that it really wouldn't hold up your case any if you didn't tell your auditor something? There it is. What was that?" And of course you're sitting right on it. What have you done? You've done the not-is, see? You've picked up these moments of not-is. Because you're going on the assumption that this case has been thinking about something, or this case has been stewing about something, or this case is reacting about one thing during that whole fifty hours of auditing, have you got it? The ease must have sooner or later come through something, and factually it'd be impossible if the case hasn't.

But remember that a case that hangs fire has this wrong with it: It has an automatic not-is. And when you've got an automatic not-is, it can wipe out the needle read. Thing comes up to reality, the person pushes it back. See? Not-is. For a split instant, when it came up to reality, it registered, and then the person said, "It doesn't exist." See, and the not-is machinery took over and said "Nu-unh." And it went right back out of sight again and didn't register on the needle after that.

In other words, there's just a fringe level. Now, this is a case that could go out and murder half a dozen babies and have an opportunity to shoot a policeman and didn't. This is a case that could have all sorts of oddball things in its background and tell them to you in just a steady stream on a Security Check without your ever getting a reaction. Got the idea? You just never get a reaction on the Security Check.

You say, "Why on earth isn't this reacting on the needle?" Well, it isn't reacting on the needle because it isn't real to him, he doesn't think it's bad, and he is actually running on about the second inversion of the not-is. See, he knows about it but it's all not-ised. You won't get any registry. You won't get any case advance either. Those cases are hang-fire cases.

So you get very expert in taking them apart. Don't, however, get into a state of outrage when you do this with the auditor who has done the auditing, or even with yourself if you've done the auditing, for that first fifty hours. Don't get in a state of outrage and say, "Well, he missed it! And I had to dig it up!" That is not a correct statement. "I had to dig it up" is a correct statement, but "he missed it" is incorrect, because it normally wasn't there. [In the first place, he was busy running "Give me that hand" when it came up. He didn't even have the person on an E-Meter. It registered for a moment; it got awfully real for a moment. And the person said, "Oh, my God, I . . . uhhzzzzzz" not-is. Out she went, you know?

Now, your line of questioning can actually dig it up out of the auditing. You're not trying to dig it up out of his life, you're trying to dig it up out of his auditing. The lock at the most is . . . even if they're being run fragmentarily, is only a few weeks old. Dig it up out of their auditing. And you talk about auditing all the time you're checking this person over who has had no gain for two consecutive intensives, see? Just dig it up out of his auditing. You'll find it's there. You'll find it's there. You'll find an amazing number of things that come up during the auditing they just had not mentioned to the auditor. You get the type of questioning this would amount to, you see? The type of questioning would be a very simple type of questioning which is about him and the auditor . . . him and his auditing.

"Now, at any time during your auditing have you felt that it was improper to audit in that particular auditing room?" All right, now you've put it on a via, so therefore it's safe. See, the question is on a wide via. If you say to him, "Is it all right if I Security Check you in this room?" or "If I run these rudiments,

or do a scout of rudiments on you in this room?" that's not real. Unreality is the common denominator of this case that doesn't make the advance, you see? That's unreal.

But asking him about being audited in another room that you are not now in . . . that's safe. See, that could be real. And all of a sudden comes up with this remarkable series of complaints. "Well, I just never mentioned it to the auditor, but there's a lavender picture on the wall, and I've always detested lavender ever since I broke a bottle of it over my grandmother's head, do you see? And I've always detested it, and . . ." They don't remark the idea that the smell of lavender and the picture . . . color lavender have nothing in common except some letters in the English alphabet. You pick things up that way . . . pick them up on a via.

That isn't the only trick in doing a research of this character on rudiments . . . that isn't the only trick. But it is a very good trick. You should ask any way you possibly can, "Is there any time in your life you ever felt that you were completely beyond help? Ah, what was that?"

"Oh, well, that was when I was eighteen, and, uh . . . goodness, I'd forgotten all about this, but this was when I was eighteen, and such-and-so happened, and I didn't dare tell my parents and uh . . ." Uh-huh-huh-huh-huh.

"Well, have you told your auditor?"

"Oh, well, no. you see that was a long time ago and that was when I was eighteen, see?"

You get the tricky way of going about this? In other words, you release the not-ises. "Have you ever felt that you were beyond help?" Well, obviously the guy had just done something and the person must have been withholding something even if it was just his body during such a period, don't you see?

So you can indulge in a tremendous amount of very tricky questioning. I could probably write down a series of thirty or forty rules or types of questions . . . they'd probably be very handy to have . . . but I haven't developed them. I've not ever seen any need to develop them. you usually look at the pc and you size him up and you find out about which way this thing is going. And you count on the fact, then, that during a period of CCHs, during 1A, something has come to the surface and has possibly disappeared. And it isn't registering now but it came to the surface during auditing and anything that happened during auditing, you can make it reregister on an E-Meter. So you get the registry of the registry. See, it's too direct to get a registry for this pc, but you can get a registry of a registry . . . get a via. you get how you might go about this type of questioning?

Well, you should study to get clever about this. you should study how to get clever about it. It's just cleverness, that's all. you sit there and the person says, "Now, have you failed to tell your auditor anything" and you don't even get a disturbed needle. It just sits there, calm. "No, no. I've told my auditor everything." Well, technically in a childlike way, this is true. But the reverse question is quite interesting, you see? "Have you ever thought of telling your auditor anything and then didn't do so?"

"Ohhh! Oh, well . . ." and you get a needle read. you see, this is an equivocation. The person really has told his auditor everything. "That he thought he should tell his auditor" is the qualifying statement which he doesn't add on to it. And the not-is machinery is, of course, why it's sitting there. And you could study to get very clever with this and it requires a bit of cleverness. The bit of cleverness will save you any quantity of auditing time. you get clever right about this point.

But I wouldn't bother to get clever at the beginning. In the first place, nothing's been plowed up. It's like trying to plant seeds or reap grain off of unplowed, unsowed ground. He's been going along like this all of his life and he knows it's all right. He knows it's all right to live like this, you know . . . constant migraine headache and sick stomach and hating everybody. He knows it's okay. That's normal, isn't it? That's what a psychologist would tell you. Normal state of man? Just read what his opinion of man is and, of course, you get what he thinks the normal state of man is. And it's pretty wild!

So this is all right, you see? Well, of course, people rob banks and rape billy goats, and so forth. So it's all right. See, everything is all right. And you get out a meter . . . well, of course, you're asking for a

disagreement. The only thing a meter ever registers on is disagreement. I pulled one right straight on the groove not very long ago and I just chucked all silly questioning and I said “Well, have there been any disagreements in the last few weeks with anything, anywhere?” You know? Of course, I got a registry. I got tired of talking into the blue, you know, and I just got a registry, bang! “All right, now what were you disagreeing with there?” See?

“Oh, well! At Holy . . .” You know, I mean a whole bunch of stuff comes off on this.

“Now, have you got any . . . have you had . . . ever had any disagreements with me about what’s going on here?” and so forth. Clang! You see? And immediately before this, “Do you have an ARC break? Do you have a present time problem? Have you got any withholds?” All blank, blank, blank, blank, blank. But now, a sudden dissertation on the subject of disagreements. “Do you have any disagreement with what’s been happening to you in the last couple of weeks?”

“Oh, well. Comes to that, that’s another proposition!” you see?

You say, “Well, have you had any unkind thoughts about your auditor?”

“Oh, no!” No registry, see?

“Do you have any disagreements with what’s been happening to you in the last couple of weeks?” Clang! “Well, now, what was that?” And we get this on a via-via-via. We have gotten . . . hit the jackpot. They sit there all the time thinking unkind thoughts about their auditor, see? Pocketa-pocketapocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa! Only, you see, this is ordinary. And it’s what everybody does.

I refer you to Dianetics: Evolution of a Science, the “everybody knows.”

Because what you’re running into is the “everybody knows” when you’re trying to cross-check rudiments. See, this is normal. You know, horses sleep in beds. Bang! Normal. Everything is normal! Everything is normal to this pc.

Of course, nothing is normal in actual fact. The pc has migrosis and his zorch is out of place. And all this is pretty goofy, see? And he really knows that it is not normal. The pc knows, but the valence that he is being considers it all normal. You sometimes, just for fun and just for exercise, should just lay aside your knowingness hat of you know what is going on and start asking somebody just right off the bat, “What is life really like?” You know, some raw meat someplace, and just ask this character, you know, “What is life really like? What are people really like? What are things really like?” and so forth. And just get treated to a ball. It’s pretty wild!

Now, you go to a jail and start asking this question and you get some of the wildest answers. Actually, it’s better than a comic book, practically. They just stagger you all over the jail aisles. You just ask prisoner after prisoner. Each one of them knows what normalcy is . . . each one of them. They know it perfectly. And they’re the wildest divergencies of anything you ever heard of And they have some of the wildest opinions on things you ever heard of They couldn’t possibly be further off of the line, you know? You could take a tractor or a tank, and drive all day and all night at right angles to any known highway and you still wouldn’t get as far off the line as they’ve managed! And then they say, “Well, life just doesn’t run right for me,” you see? Well, this universe in which they have gone up the pole, of course, hasn’t anything to do with it.

So you start asking anybody about the rightness or wrongness of their deeds or actions, or the rightness or wrongness of their opinions, or the differences of their conduct when all of their conduct is aberrated, and of course you get no falls on an E-Meter. See? I mean, that’s all usual. So there can’t be any disagreement because they’re in total agreement with themselves while being in total disagreement with everything, and you don’t get a fall on the E-Meters. Do you understand how this is?

We described this in various ways. We say, “Well, it’s below the fellow’s level of reality.” Well, what do we mean by that statement, exactly? Well, we mean something very precise by that. We mean that he has some specialized, compartmented values of existence which have nothing to do with existence. It’s below

his level of reality. Well, his level of reality is the clue. What is his level of reality? Well, it's up some fireman's pole someplace, that hasn't anything to do with the sun, moon or stars or another human being anyplace or anything, you see? It is a total unreality. But of course this is reality so, of course, it doesn't register when you ask him for a difference. You say, "Have you had an unkind thought about anybody lately?"

"No."

And it would even be too much insight for them to say, Not any more than usual!" But that's what they mean. "Have you had an unkind thought about anybody lately?" Well, they'll give you all kinds of qualifications about this sort of thing. But, of course, it doesn't register on the meter because it's totally rationalized.

You know, just going around nattering about everybody and how bad everybody is and how everybody ought to be shot. And somebody hands you a sandwich in a restaurant, and right away there is a long stream about how their thumb shouldn't have been on top of the plate and the plate should have

"Did the auditor ask what you were worried about?"

"Well, yes, as a matter of fact. The auditor said, 'What are you worried bout?' "

"What did you say you were worried about?"

"I said, 'life.'" And you go back in the auditing reports and you will actually find it. And you'll find there was a needle registry, and when they said "life" it cleared, and that was it. The not-is went bang, see, and there it all went.

You'll find people straining to get Clear, something on the order of submariners try to get out of a submarine that is immovably fixed on the bottom and will never come to the surface anymore. For God's sakes, find out what submarine, you know? What's her name, rank and serial number, you know? On the bottom of what sea? "Oh, well, I've told everybody about that! Everybody knows all about this submarine I'm trying to escape from. Yes, I'm being evicted next month."

You say, "From where?"

"Well, from my sister's."

"Oh? Well, what about this? What about this eviction? How come?" and 30 forth.

"Well, it's because of what the police did last month."

You say, "Whoa, boy! Where we goin' here?" see?

It's like taking a billiard ball and throwing it on a billiard table, you know, and it caroms off all sides and bounces and falls on the floor. Then- you don't even find a billiard ball there anymore, so you expect it's okay. Nevertheless, they become vaguely aware of a billiard ball during the auditing, you see, and you can track it back.

You get some goofy ones. Well, why are they goofy? Well, that's because life is totally identified with everything, so nothing makes any sense anyhow, 30 there's no sense in disagreeing with him. You're looking at some kind of a super apathy of one character or another. "This is life," you know, is kind of its motto. And you've got to do some smart checking back, that's all. And if you're smart enough, you can really start unveiling the statues, man. The place will look like an art gallery before you get through, you know?

"Well, have you ever consulted anything . . . during your last two weeks of auditing, have you ever consulted anything to find out whether or not you were improving" And you get a fall. That's the first

anybody ever heard of the hidden standard. See? "Have you ever asked anybody if you were getting better during the last two weeks of auditing" See, that kind of a dissertation.

"Oh, well, yes, of course. I asked my wife!"

"Well, what did she say?"

"She said she didn't think I'd ever get better."

And in that way, you can drift in sideways on something The pc is actually not being willfully mean, the pc is not trying to obscure anything, the pc is not trying to withhold or anything else. The pc's opinions of life are just sufficiently abstruse that they don't add up to a disagreement, you see, because "that is life." They've gone up some gully someplace and it's way off the mainstream, and there they are, you know? And they worried a little bit; they kind of know they're up a gully. And they'll tell you, "Well, I don't feel emotional anymore about things, you see? I don't get a kick out of life anymore. Just things don't seem good to me. And I just seem to be a little anxious all the time and so on." They make these general statements of some kind or another.

Well, all they are telling you is "the mainstream of life went that-a-way, and somewhere along the line I considered it was just too much, so I went up this little gully. And I've been lying here in the midst of the dead leaves ever since. And if you dig me out of here, of course, you'll put me back in the mainstream of life again. And that's no good, because that's too horrible, you see, and that's impossible. And if I just lie here and not feel anything and not see anything and not hear anything, I'll be all right. So just go away quietly and let the robins cover me one leaf at a time!" That is the super generalized solution that people take. They find the back bayous of the muddy river, you know? And they go in there and after that they don't even catch any catfish.

But they are worried about the fact that they know they shouldn't be there and they know they shouldn't be doing that. And they know that that's no good to do that.

Now, pcs who apparently have never had anything happen to them, have led perfectly calm, orderly lives, and yet still don't improve in any fashion whatsoever . . . Oh-oh! No. Their tale of the calm, orderly life and that sort of thing, you could sing a little song about "It may be so. But I really don't know. Your story sounds so queer." The truth of the matter is that you've got a case on the back bayous. You see, the case is up this little gully lying there in the black mud, and they hope they have no past. Their quite usual reaction is to say they don't have any . . . they hope they have no past.

Now, how would you get a person's past? How would you get a person back into the mainstream of things? The cruelest thing you can do is just ask this burning question: "Have you ever left any place?"

And they say thoughtfully, "Well, yes, when I was a small boy, I uh . . . well, as a matter of fact, no. In uh . . . uh . . . well, I left school. I left school."

Now, that isn't all of the meanness you're going to indulge in here. You're going to ask one more worse question. You're going to say, "Why?"

Now, you're asking for the points of departure from the main highway. "Did you ever leave any place?" "Why?"

He says, "Yes, oh yes. Well, of course, I left a place. People always leave places. As a matter of fact in 19 . . . 1948 . . . 1948 . . . I left San Francisco in 1948. Anybody is liable to leave San Francisco. If you can find your way out. Fog, you know?"

And you say, "Good! You left San Francisco. Why?"

"Hm-hm-hm!" You shouldn't have asked that, see. Because what have you done to him? At that precise and exact moment you have said, "What didn't you confront that you should have confronted? What did"

. . not necessarily should have confronted . . “you feel you should have confronted? What did you not confront that you feel you should have confronted?”

“Oh, well, that’s a different story.” And you’ve all of a sudden got an active meter. Now your meter gets active. Up to that time it was all okay, but this wasn’t okay. Now, that particular . . the not-is is what you run into as a more general mechanism. But if you want to connect somebody up with the mainstream of life, the exact mechanism I just gave you will just pick them up by the collar and throw them into the mad and raging torrent. It’s very easy to do; don’t think this requires very much cleverness.

It can be summed up this way: Did you ever have a little child want you to look at something? Put your attention on something? Did you ever have anybody . . ? All right, did you ever have anybody ever demand that you put your attention on something? Now, have you ever had anybody tell you you were wrong for not having had your attention on something? All right. That’s the basic trick. See, and you’ll run into that on problems. One of your basic tricks of life . . “making people confront” is the overt, and “having to confront” is the motivator.

All deaths and the whole mechanism of death derives from unwillingness to confront . . that is the mechanism of death. So when people leave and yet feel they shouldn’t have left, it is because there was something there which was too threatening And it keyed in death. And that’s why they went up the bud . . the bayou and covered themselves with the dead leaves. Because it’s just a straight Q and A on death. Departing from situations you feel you should have confronted is just the same as truck runs into body, pc goes out of head. If he was good enough at confronting probably the truck would have disappeared before it hit the body, but certainly he probably would not have been hurt. The fact that he knew he could be hurt caused him to bring about his hurtingness.

It’s interesting. You will notice that people have repetitive accidents to the same part of the body. Now, there’s a curious one, until you know that their motivator line must be that because their overt line is that. Well, similarly, they were running a no-confront on people. They were giving people things that couldn’t be confronted. Now, if you ran a bunch of no-confronts on people, then you get to the idea that you can’t confront. And after you get the idea that you can’t confront, you can only leave. And when you cannot even leave anymore, you can still go nuts. I’m speaking very factually; that is the cycle of sanity. All right.

So, the person . . you ask him this question. You say, “Well, have you ever left anyplace?”

And he’ll say, “No, no.” And “No,” rudiments all in, everything is all fine, no disturbance here, everything is going... Now, you’ve got evidence that there must be something wrong, because you have two powerful processes, here, run one after the other without any change of profile. You know something is here. That tells you something is here. That’s one of the most vivid tests that you can get is an unchanging profile, an unreality on the auditor. Case remains either very, very high or very, very low. No change. You got the idea? Just all floating along. Well, there are many ways to clear this up, and you can’t clear it up with ordinary cleverness, you can go back and actually trip the trigger on it. “Have you ever left anyplace?”

“Oh, well, one time, I . . yeah, yes, yes, yes.” Of course, when you’re part of the military services, you very often get answers like this, “Well, we were ordered out of Tobruk.” That’s not very fruitful ground. They say, “Well, yes, I left . . I left London. Left London in 1948. Yes, I left London in 1948. Hm-hm, hm-hm.” And if you were watching close, you got a disturbance right there.

“Oh,” you say. “You left London. Why?”

“Uuhp” Clang! Big withhold. It’s liable to fall right out of that hamper. And maybe if it wasn’t London, maybe you had to ask him for five places they left, and ask them why five times before the fifth one suddenly dropped it out in your lap. And all of a sudden you got a big withhold off the case.

Now, there’s another way to follow this down. And you say, “Well, has that sort of thing ever been a problem to you at any other time?” Cow!

“Well, yes, of course, right now!” There’s his present time problem. Got the idea? Get the withhold, work it to the present time problem, bring it down the line, you see?

Now, this works out this way: “Have you ever thought of blowing session?” is part of your technique. See? “Why?” You know he has no ARC break with the auditor. The pc has no AR(: break. He has no nothing; everything is all fine, and so forth. “Well, have you ever thought of leaving session?” “What had you just done?” “Good. Well, what had you said about your auditor?”

“Uhh!” Shouldn’t have asked that one. Falls off the pin!

And you see, what you’ve done is walk around using cleverly the actual buttons which you know in Scientology. You have actually walked around all the defenses, “If I keep it all not-ised and unreal, everybody will go away quietly and leave my decaying body here in the leaves.” You can just walk through this because you know the buttons to walk through it on, see?

Now, it’s a funny thing that a lot of the parts of the original Prehav Scale can be discussed in exactly the same way. you almost do a Prehav Assessment, only it’s in the line of rudiments. Do you see how that would be?

For instance, Prevent . . just taking one off the bat. Prevent is to a large degree an anatomy of problems. So you say to him, “Well, during your sessions have you been trying to prevent anything?”

“Uhhh!” You’re liable to get one fall off the pin there. “Well, no. I really haven’t been trying to prevent anything. I just don’t want to get any worse, you see? And the auditor is very unskilled, and . . .”

All of a sudden, “Well, have you told the auditor this?”

“Well, of course, no. But, uh . . It’d hurt his feelings.”

And you get a whole basket of stuff comes out, see? You can take almost any part of the Prehav Scale and go at it this way, see, and compare it to various parts of the rudiments. You don’t need any system.

Now, the funny part of it is, is surprise has a certain amount of element in this. So therefore, if you take a pat system, you see, which is everything, everything, everything, and then you put in the eggs, and then you whip them all up, you see, and then you put the frying pan on, and you put exactly one sixteenth of an ounce of butter in there, you know? Well, the recipe becomes familiar, and this too can become a not-is. See, then the person can not-is that. No, it’s got to be you . . it’s got to be you who does the questioning.

Now, there’s another part of the element, completely aside from a system . . a system defeats itself to this degree . . is the person realizes he’s being interrogated by an intelligence. And it’s necessary for the person to realize that. And the person says, “Ooooh, well, last fifteen hundred years been very comfortable in these here dead leaves.”

And part of his fall may actually be reaction against you . . some misemotional reaction against you . . for having actually disturbed the corpse. Dead bodies . . any good, clean, honest thinking auditor would know better than to disturb half-decayed bodies lying in piles of dead leaves.

But you can get to a pc from all corners and quarters. But to try to get to the pc before anything has happened to disturb the beautiful, smooth, not-ised complexion of the bank is quite a trick.

Therefore, things like Presession 37 run at the beginning of auditing turn up very little. The same technique run after ten hours of auditing turn up quite a bit. Now you take two tremendously powerful processes, like the CCHs or Problems, and look, if they’re not going to move this case . . . It has never happened yet. All it will do, however, is just shove the case far enough ;hat you can save the next five hundred hours of grind on “Give me that sand” by getting some withholds off and finding out what the present time problems is [are] and finding out why this case can’t get easily into session. You see how you could do that?

So right there, you could save an awful lot of auditing with a little bit of cleverness. Interrogation of this character is very, very valuable on a case . . . very valuable . . . criss-crossed questioning of one kind or other. Well, you ask the straight question at first. "Well, have you had any . . . during your auditing have you had any present time problems?"

"No." No registry on the meter. "Except one. I told the auditor about that, and the auditor handled it."

He had no other present time problems. Now, what's calling this pc a fibber? Two profiles. Now, man, that's not possible, see? It's just not possible to get no change of profile and be free of present time problems. That's not possible.

So you say, well, all right, and go in on it on some other quarter . . . some level of the Prehav Scale. Something . . . anything you want to do. But try to find this present time problem. It's probably there. It's not there because your meter says so, it's there because your graph says so. It's there because graph and unworkable auditing says it's there.

Now, somebody tells you, after they've had quite a bit of auditing, that they haven't gotten any results from the auditing, this once more is as good as the graphs. So you just wind up your E-Meter with the handy attached made-in-Britain spring on it and let it fly. And you start interrogation of one kind or another. You don't just run rudiments. You just shake this thing to pieces. You just go at it from every quarter.

Now, one of the things that restrains you from doing this is you think the pc is going to get ARC broke if they're this knocked around. I'll tell you what ARC breaks the pc about something like this. The ARC break that comes about is because of some dumb repetitive question that has no cleverness in it. And the pc gets ARC broken because he feels he is not being confronted by an intelligence. And that'll cause more ARC breaks than you can easily count. You see? You can only cause ARC breaks by auditing stupidly or just going on knuckleheadedly. Just completely off beam.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says to you, "No."

And you say, "Well, all right, do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc says, "No."

And then you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the pc picks up the chair and hits you over the head with it.

And I almost don't blame him, because this line of questioning is going to lead no place. In the first place, he's fairly well aware of the fact that you're not even getting a reaction on the meter, don't you see? That's the wrong way to go about this sort of thing "Do you have a present time problem?"

He says "No."

And you say, "Well, what would be a problem to you?"

"Oh, well, that's a different question. Let's see, what would be a problem to me? Well, like having my car parked outside like it is right now with the meter running . . . I . . . is . . . uh . . . na . . . heh-heh-heh! Yes, I have a present time problem." He'll say "Aha! You're a pretty clever auditor!" "You velly smart!" And he goes out and puts the nickel in the meter and goes into session like a rabbit disappearing in a burrow. Kabango! You got the difference?

Cleverness is very well associated with intelligence. Good reason, of course. It's also associated, for some reason or other, with control to such a degree that amongst working men who work all the time with their hands . . . you wonder what causes strikes and all this kind of thing, and upsets and so on.

By the way, I just read in the paper last night the first proof I have actually seen that psychiatrists do take their orders from Moscow. One of the great brain and nerve specialists of England, actually turns out to have been working under an assumed name as the head of an organization backed by the communists to knock out all management in England. He was the brains behind it all and he was working under an assumed name and he was known as something else, and so forth, and here he was.

This is the first one I've ever seen exposed. You know, they all go running down to Vienna every year to get their orders. You know? They all go down to get their orders, you know? And then they go spreading out and they say, "Well, the party line is 'Freud is no good' this year." you ought to hear them, man! And they get up there and they're always giving advice, that's super political advice, that's going to bust somebody's back sooner or later. It's quite interesting That was in the papers. That was headlines last night if you didn't see it. Did you see it last night? It was headlines. They got him! Rrrufff!

Anyway, labor-management situation is a suspicion of cleverness. And when people are very, very unclever, they are very easily overwhelmed by cleverness . . very easily. So much so, as I say, somebody who is plodding around all the time just learning that somebody is very intelligent or something, or something of the sort, they have one of two reactions: either they admire this, or they don't quite like this, or they immediately decide to strike. That is the basis of labor-management relations.

Now you often wonder . . I used to wonder, how in the name of common sense is a . . as an engineer walking around men building sluice ways and digging with their hands . . all of them with weapons in their hands, you might say, who would fight amongst each other. Every morning, why, they're dragging themselves to work with black eyes and split lips, you know? Violent boys! And why is it that they never turned on you? It used to be a little bit of a problem to me. you know? They'd fight amongst themselves, but they just wouldn't fight in the direction of somebody who was more intelligent than they were. That was what I finally boiled it down to.

It's curious, you know? Real curious! And yet you put somebody more intelligent than they are at their level, or below them, and boy, they eat him up like a terrier will eat meat! Slurp. Gulumm! Yeah, they will! They just go out of their road to make life hell for him. But the second that he has even a quasi-position which is slightly in charge of something, he's really in charge. Bang! You know? It's quite fantastic. You've seen this kind of thing or samples of it. I tried to understand it over a number of years exactly what this mechanism was all about.

The basic yap of labor is against an intelligent function called management. And management is never bright enough, however, as bright as it is, to turn around and use the same weapon on labor. And the weapon on labor is, of course, just a display of intelligence, not conservatism. You get a display of conservatism and that's a sort of a defensive action, you see, of one character or another. And you just ask him to get overwhelmed by the FCTU Communist Dedicated Anti people's Local Union Number 49. See, Kabango! It's not that I'm against unions; far from it. But they sure can be used! And you'll find that they have a revolt factor toward this other. And it's not management; it's intelligence. It's not so much control. The only way you can err in management is not control. And you can also err by being insufficiently intelligent.

But you get this intelligence factor. I'm only trying to say here that the intelligence factor is part of being looked up to. It's an altitude factor, let me put it more precisely that way. If you're clever, or if you show you're clever, or you are smart about something or other, you will have an immediate altitude with your pc. And going on and asking the pc stupid question after stupid question . . preferably repetitively . . all of which have been negated, is, of course, a prima facie demonstration of stupidity.

You ask this question: "Well, have you ever raped anyone?" it says on the Security Check. And the pc . . you get a small fall, and instead of saying, "What was that?" or something like that, you say "Good! Have you ever raped anyone?" And the pc says "No." And you say "Good. Have you ever raped anyone?" Actually, anything is better than that line of procedure, just anything is better than that line of proceeding when you're trying to find out one datum from the pc, because he hasn't answered the auditing question. And yet by repeating the auditing question you appear to have agreed that he has in some peculiar way answered the auditing question, don't you see? Because you're obviously asking

another one. Even though you say “I’ll repeat it,” or something, but the fact is it’s coming out again, you see?

And if you cease to demonstrate that you want that one question that you have asked, answered, and that you’re going to find some answer to it regardless of what he does, and going in on it from all sides . . you start doing that kind of thing, and he instantly feels sort of surrounded and he says, “There must be something here,” and he tries to look and all of a sudden he’s got it. And the whole thing rolls along with considerable speed if you do something like this. But you sit there and say, “Well, have you ever raped anyone?”

“No,” he says.

You say, “Well, have you ever raped anyone?”

“No.”

“Have you ever raped anyone?”

“No.”

“Well, have you ever raped anyone?”

“No.”

I’ll tell you, anything is better than that! Histrionics are better! If you . . if you even turned the E-Meter . . this is extreme, but if you even turned the E-Meter around facing him, and said “Now look! I’m going to say those words again, and you look what happens here! Have you ever raped anyone?” Bang! “You see that? Well, that’s what I want to know about! Now tell me.” Honest, that’s superior to a repetitive question. It sounds rough; it sounds rugged! But it’ll get results! It shows that you’re interested. It shows an reactive intelligence is confronting him, not a machine. See, he won’t obey a machine.

And intelligence is very often variety or versatility, or other factors mean intelligence to people. So you say, “Have you ever raped anyone?” And you get a fall. And you say, “Who was that?” Well, it at least tells him there was an Observer. You say, “Who was that?”

“Who?” He says, “Well, I’ve never raped anyone. It couldn’t be any ‘Who!’ “

“Well, ‘her’ then!”

“There couldn’t be any ‘her’ because I’ve never raped anyone, I tell you!”

“ ‘Him’ then!”

“Well, there can’t be a ‘him’ because...” and so on. “I’ve never raped anyone. I’m trying to tell you! I’m trying to tell you!”

“Well, I hear what you’re saying. But so does the meter . . look! All right. Animal, maybe? All right. Who could it be? Now, put your mind to it a little bit, this thing isn’t falling on the window shade . . now, come on! What is it? Rape, rape, rape, rape, rape.”

“Oh!” he says, “You’re talking about, uh, you’re talking about my sister Bet . . .”

“No, no, you!”

“Oh, I was just trying to tell you, you’re talking about my sister Bessie. She got raped and it was a great upset to the family, and that’s undoubtedly what the . . .”

“No, look. We’re talking about you. Have you . . . you . . . ever raped anyone? That was what the question was. And it’s still registering and I want to know what it is. That’s all. Let’s get it up very plain. Let’s get an understanding going here. I’m not trying to pick a fight with you or anything. I just want a piece of information that’s very easy for you to tell me, it’s very simple, and the second you tell me I will have heard it.”

And he says, “All-right-it-was-a-sixteen-year-old-girl-and-I-was-there-at-the-side-of-road! Uhpp uhp! There!”

You say, “That’s better. I knew you could do it!” “I knew you could do it! Good! Now, let’s just check here to make sure this thing is clean and clear. Have you ever raped anyone? Ah, that’s calm now, all right, fine. Let’s go to the next one.”

Well, I tell you, that’s Security Checking, see? Kabango-bango-bango! You’re getting right on down the line. That’s because the person feels he’s being confronted by an active intelligence. Somebody is interested. Somebody will understand. Something is happening here. Something is going on. The whole situation is under control. There’s something occurring. And that’s the way to do it. And just never go at it on the basis of set yourself up as a nice ritual, a nice machine. Like I’m telling you, check the rudiments on this character that isn’t advancing. You’re not satisfied this case’s advanced, check those rudiments.

But don’t check them, “Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. Any ARC breaks? Yeah. Yeah. Any withholds? See? You getting along all right with the auditor. Yeah. Well, your rudiments are okay. The rudiments aren’t out. Didn’t fall on any of those questions.”

If you add it all up to yourself this way, it’ll make much more sense: Only a dead body would fail to respond to the processes. There must be something else wrong. You got it? And that something else is contained in the rudiments. And as soon as you pick up a high level of certainty on this, then you go at this with a lot more willingness and a lot more verve, see? And that a dead body doesn’t talk well and doesn’t respond well . . . so that if you’re not getting instant and immediate responses, you’ve just got somebody who is lying up in that gully somewhere and it’s way out of the mainstream of life. And you’re going to have to get him back into it, that’s all.

In the first place, he’s never going to be happy up there. In the second place, he’s going to go on complaining because he’s living up there. Maybe if he’d just lay there quietly and never said anything anymore for the next two hundred trillion years, it would be all right. But he doesn’t. He thinks he’s lying there quietly, you know? And he’s firing off guns and throwing leaves into the river and putting this dreadful stench up through the trees, and so forth.

And you just got to show him somebody is alive around here. That’s all. And you do that by being clever. And you’ll be surprised, you’ll be surprised how much faster a Security Check goes, the second that the pc gets the idea that you might be smart. You know, that you just might have something on the ball; that you might be alive, and you might be smart. And all of a sudden he said to himself, “Oooh ohh, somebody has moved some leaves! Somebody has moved some leaves! And I never noticed it before! But there it is, there it is!”

Well, you can watch it, because you’re liable to be put on test right at that moment. Next one that’s hot, and you can say, “Well, did you ever spend any money that wasn’t yours?”

He knows of one. And he says nothing “No.”

You say “All-l-l-l right. When was it?”

“When was it? But I told you no.”

“But I want to know when!”

“Heh-heh! Well, yeah. I haven’t even told you that I did!”

“Yeah, but I know . . I want to know when!” “Why do you want to know when?”

“Well, I just think it might be a good thing if you told me. Peculiar idea of mine. When and how much? From whom?” Now, it’s getting tougher, see, and he gets the illusion, you see, that this is going to get horrible if he doesn’t burst forth with it.

“All right,” so he says, “Okay, it was seven dollars and nineteen cents, and I . . hunh-hunh. Twenty-one years old, and so forth, and it was from Uncle Sabuchi.”

“Very good. All right. Now, have you ever stolen any money from anyone? All right. That’s clear. Good.”

And you don’t get these hang-ups . . you just don’t get these hang-ups that way. They sort of become a thing of the past. And you’re over your primary hump of the guy wondering and hemming and hawing. Then you can go the other way too. you can get so helpful that he depends on you utterly to find them, and he never bothers to remember any. So that you can steer around that, too.

All right. Well, I didn’t mean to keep you so long today, but I thought you might be interested in this whole subject of criss-cross checking rudiments, and hang-up cases, and so forth. Thought you might be very interested in that. Okay?

All right. Have a good weekend, and don’t loaf because you probably have only got . . oh, you’ve only got a fraction of what you should have gotten filled out on your check sheets.

Thank you.

Female voice: Thank you.