RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
24 August 1961

All right, what's the date?

Audience: 24th.

Twenty-fourth of August, AD 11. And you better ask some questions. Come on, ask some questions. Nobody knows anything, huh? You haven't got a single question in your mind? Here you've had a whole rash of new data and there hasn't been a single question crossed your mind concerning any part of this. Yes, Kay?

Female voice: When you're running the Prehav level on the terminal, does the Confront and Have alone stabilize your person for Clear?

Mmm. When you run the Prehav on the terminal does the Confront and Prehav alone. . .

Female voice: No, the Confront and Havingness. Is that what stabilizes your Clear?

Yeah, but you've said the Confront and Havingness on the terminal stabilizes the Clear?

Female voice: No, when you're running the terminal.

Another female voice: When you're running the terminal on the Prehav Scale is it the Confront and Havingness Processes that stabilize the person?

Absolutely not. They have practically nothing to do with it. They just make it easier to run sessions. They just have nothing to do with it. The stabilization of a Clear consists one hundred percent of checking out goals, finding more goals, doing terminals lists (long terminals lists) for those goals, assessing the goal found . . the terminal found on the Prehav Scale and trying to find the command for that and getting a command for that and running that level of the Prehav Scale. And when you've got that terminal flat, why, go back and check the goal. And if you can't find anything left of that goal, make sure that your rudiments are in one hundred percent. And then check it over again and go back to the original goals lists. Find out if one of those goals are now alive, try to get some more goals. When you finally got a new Goals Assessment clearing all over again, you find a new terminal.

In other words, you just do that same operation of Routine 3 over and over and over. you assess for goal, assess for terminal and run on the Prehav. Assess for terminal, assess for goal. That's all. Once you've got a goal, well, let's get every terminal that applies to that goal flat, as long as the goal itself registers.

I mean you don't go back and find a new goal every time you flatten a terminal. You go back and check the goal. The goal is still alive, you find a new terminal for it, and run it on the Prehav, see? It's just a continuous cyclic process. And anything else you're doing, such as running rudiments, such as running problems of any kind, and anything to do with Security Checks, anything like that is simply aimed straight at keeping the preclear in-session. And if the pc gets out of session, if the rudiments go out, if your Security Checks are not kept up-to-date, and so forth on the case, the goal will disappear, the terminals disappear, and the person won't go Clear. Then you get endless runs to Clear. Endless runs to Clear. And they all add up to rudiments out, rudiments out, rudiments out. And in case you haven't noticed, there are broader processes now for the rudiments.

One of the broader processes is at the level of withhold . . the pc registers on withholds . . you've got the whole of Security Checking. That vast panorama of action all fits at that level of the rudiments. And you keep the rudiments in, in other words. You keep them in. you keep them in, you keep them in. The goal disappears, you find out if the rudiments are in. All right, now see if the goal still disappeared. All right, if the goal hasn't disappeared . . you flattened one terminal for this goal. Make sure those rudiments are

in, in, in, in. Make sure that terminal is, is, is flat, and then make sure the rudiments are in, in, in, in. And then check the goal again.

And with the goal: All right, is that goal still alive? Find another terminal for it. If that goal is now gone and your rudiments are in, in, in, why, you've got to go back to your original goals list and add whatever goals now occur to it and do a new Goals Assessment. And then do a new Terminals Assessment. And then do a new Prehav level for it. And then get your command and do the Prehav level run. And there you go, you see?

It's just . . the process of clearing somebody actually only consists of this and nothing more. It consists of getting a list of goals, and assessing that list to find one goal which is constant and continuous with the pc, which of course means that goal has to be run. So you take that goal, and you do a Terminal Assessment for the goal . . the cause and effect end of the line . . and then you'll find a terminal which stays in, in, in, in, in and doesn't go in and out and fluctuate around, but it's just in. And that is the terminal. And then you assess that on the Prehav Scale, and then you form up a command for that, and then you run it. And you run it until it produces no more tone arm action, all the while keeping the rudiments in, in, in, in, in. And you're all set.

Now that thing is finally flat. It doesn't respond anymore, you can't even get a fall when you mention it. It is all run off of the Prehav Scale and when that is finally accomplished then you'd better make a special activity of making sure the rudiments are in. But now, let's check that goal, find out if that original goal is still alive. If it is still alive and it still gets a fall then you had better do another Terminals Assessment, find another terminal for that goal, move the terminal found over onto the Prehav Scale. Assess on the Prehav Scale. Form up a command and run, run, run. Assess on the Prehav Scale, and run, run, run, and assess on the Prehav Scale and run, run, run. And then no more action for that terminal; now go back and make sure your rudiments are in, of course. Go back and find out whether or not the goal is still alive.

All right, you can't get a peep out of this goal now. Now make sure the rudiments are in. Now try and find out if you can get a peep out of that goal. No, you still can't. Okay. Now you've got to go through a whole cycle I've just said, once more. And you start in right there at the beginning and you find out whether or not the individual has a new goal that won't hang up. And he does have, he will have, and that moves over into the terminal list and you get your new terminal and then you move over into Prehav Scale, and it's just the same cycle over and over and over . . it's just exactly those steps.

Now, anything else, running Prehav . . running a Havingness Process on the pc, running a Confront Process on the pc, doing a Security Check, running problems, doing rudiments, other things to keep the case running, anything that you do to keep the case running and cleaned up and so forth, is totally and completely auxiliary to clearing. Clearing only consists of Routine 3 and nothing else. And nothing else will make a Clear known to man at this time except that exact process I just gave you. And that is really taped.

And the only thing that booby-traps that particular operation is, one, a bad command of technology on the part of the auditor. That's the only thing that booby-traps it. If the auditor knows his business, if he knows his TRs, if he can follow a Model Session, if he's willing to run a session, if he's willing to flatten the processes that he runs into, if he can read an E-Meter, keep these things going, so forth, the rest of this is just nothing.

Well, where the auditor has gaps and goofs, and where he's very, very poor on this, or very, very poor on something else or where he isn't quite sure whether you read the sensitivity knob or the trim button, you're not going to get Clears.

So all of these other things, such as learning how to do a Model Session, learning the TRs, learning the E-Meter, knowing that when you contact processes you flatten them, and on, on, on, on, on, on, everything that you learn about auditing . . even going back to Axioms, the behaviour of the pc, what are engrams, anything in Book One, anything in Scientology 8-8008 . . all these things are simply contributory things. And there aren't very many an auditor today really has to know. He has to know his TRs, bang! He has to know his E-Meter, boom! He really has to be able to make it talk Arabic, Greek,

anything, you see, or Marcabian. Only I notice that the Sullivan type individual tries to make it talk Marcabian, but it's actually just talking Sullivan.

When you get into this kind of action, knowing these various things, and so forth . . those things known . . now clearing works. And I can tell you right now that clearing works on every individual, every person, man, woman, child. And if you could talk to the flowers it'd work on that too.

It hasn't anything to do anymore with case level. Has nothing to do with case level. Not a thing! But it has everything to do with an auditor being able to run a session. And the degree that an auditor can run a session, the excellence with which he can run a session, totally monitors how fast and how many he will clear.

That's an extravagant statement but what proves it is this: I've been able to make Clears on offbeat processes. There's a process way back . . . You see, in vignette, doing the Dynamic Assessment, doing the old Dynamic Assessment, and finding the terminal and running Help on it, and so forth, it got Clear . . and as clear as Help would make anybody Clear . . those people who did have Help as a hot button on the Prehav Scale, see. That's how many it cleared. That was right there. But that still depended very exclusively on the ability of the auditor to audit.

But let's go back to the oldest clearing process there is, which is way back when, and that process is so esoteric, it can't be handled! Requires such insight, such sensitiveness and takes so damn long, and is so questionable and a whole bunch of things like this. It's like, well, building a watch in the dark blindfolded with a couple of elephant's feet for hands.

It wasn't even very reliable, you know. But it's taken something on the order of all these years, here, of about . . whee, it's getting something on the order of about thirteen years now, something like that, to develop technology which was handleable, which was predictable, which didn't require all these super-unknowns and this super-insight and all of that sort of thing, and to develop the auditing technology which we have today.

Now, the only thing that slows down clearing is the command of the auditor of that exact technology. And when I say that exact technology, I mean simply the ability to do the TRs, the ability to do a Model Session, the ability to handle an E-Meter and the incidental knowledge of doing a good Security Check, of running an assessment and that's it. you see, it just stacks up into that very small package . . your importances.

And you possibly still have some idea of this vast panorama of unending sea of data going out in all directions that you have to know. Get rid of it. It's a very finite little area. And frankly, when you look over E-Meter Essentials, there are only two data missing in E-Meter Essentials. There are two data missing in it. One data is instant read . . the difference between instant read and latent read, and which one you use (of course, you use instant read), and what it looks like and so forth. That's missing in there. And there's one more datum that is missing out of the E-Meter manual. What is it? It'd be fatal for me to say there was one missing and then not tell you what it was. It's something very incidental. Twenty minute rule? I don't think that's in.

Female voice: No, it isn't.

But otherwise it's a complete book. And we'll print up an errata sheet and paste that into the copies and so forth, and that'll be that. It'll be up-to-date.

All right, your TRs . . they're all up-to-date. You've got them right here. Model Session, you've got it right here. As far as rudiments are concerned, you've got an awful lot of rudiments processes, but because rudiments have mounted up to such importance, we're kind of throwing them away, using beefier processes, giving the rudiments more attention, giving it more umph. And, once more, you've got those right on these lectures: 1A and Unknown. And actually you've had this data consistently and continually now since bout the 10th of August . . the tape series going right straight on through bout this "unknown," use of, in Security Checks, and all that kind of thing.

But that's just beefing up the rudiments, beefing up the rudiments, beefing them up, beefing them up, making them stronger and stronger and tougher and tougher. And then finally we'll get down to this kind of a desperition, I can guarantee you, that after you've got the most powerful process of Scientology to bear on the pc on any given rudiment, and when that rudiment is totally vanquished, then you assess, or something like this.

Actually, this amount of rigor is not necessary at all. It's precautionary. From . . I am operating with you now in an unreality. That would be a withhold on my part to tell you otherwise, but I am in an unreality. I don't see how you an miss, you see. And therefore, I'm just making sure you don't. Only I am now something on the order . . it looks to me as though from an engineering standpoint that we're taking this bridge, you see, and it's built totally out of concrete by this time, and it's got girders which had nothing but sixteen-inchthick steel, you see. And it's totally weatherproof girders, and these things are hung together, you see, with huge clamps. They're not even drilled to weaken them, you know. And this is going across this little tiny brook. Isn't very wide, wouldn't hurt anybody to fall in it, but this huge, massive structure, you see, is going over there. And then the bed of this bridge, you know, is all fixed up with huge Roman-road-type construction, you know. Nine feet of ballast, you know, and then match stone and then match stone on top of that, and then we of course have put final, modern, hammered concrete in it, see.

And that's the kind of a bridge we've got, and I kind of feel like you're asking me to put up some staying rods to make sure the steel won't fall down, you see. And to repave this thing in some character with a thicker pavement, and so on. That's kind of the way it looks to me. I'm not running you down in any way, but this is the record that is being run up at the HGC from this unit and other classes and so forth. Apparently this is what it demands, don't you see.

Now, I'm trying to find these additional holes in the fence, where it looks to me like there aren't any, you know? I'm trying to find out where this bridge breaks down. It makes me feel as though you drove across a wide plain blindfolded, you'd run into this bridge; you just couldn't help it, you see. And then the bridge has got guide rods on the side of it that even though you hit at a slant you'd still go across it, you see. That's the kind of the way it looks.

All right, from this point on, we're superbuilding. Because I'll tell you this: Any one of you could run an assessment in two-and-a-half hours on a pc and find his goal and find his terminal and find his level on the Prehav Scale, see, right to start.

And we're running a real goofy one right now. We're going to make a Clear for you. We're going to make Tinny-Tin Clear, little Quentin. And Suzie's busy auditing him for a few minutes each day. And this little kid, he's got his full goals list, amounts to about thirty. One of them is "to run a candy store" and he's got the lot. And it's assessing right straight on out. And he's down . . I think he's got about six, seven of these.

Female voice: Eleven left in.

He's got eleven left in on this list. It's moving on down. He'll do a Terminals Assessment. When we get a Terminals Assessment, going to assess it on the Prehav Scale, and going to run it, you see. His needle's loose. It's getting looser. You know. Well, of course, there's good altitude at work here and the rudiments are in, but that's what's happening.

That isn't being done as a show-up or something like that; it's just his turn to be processed. So instead of running him on CCHs or something like this or trying to straighten up something . . nah! let's go for broke; let's clear him! Not take too many hours at it, either.

All right. Now, that's possible. That can be done. But, let me call this to your attention, it is . . this is the controverting fact. It is not being done. Now, you can't argue with that, can you? Now, I could get down and scream and howl and beat the floor, and Hitlerize the room. But let me tell you something, that isn't going to do any good. That isn't going to do any good at all. That's in the line of reason, or something like this mounts up.

If you looked at it very broadly you could say, "Well, nobody can audit." I mean, that's the first thing you'd say. "Nobody can run a session in the whole world, except just this little handful or maybe five," you know. Something like that. But that's an unacceptable datum that isn't true, see.

So it must be that there were some great big broad bugs on this, and the biggest bug . . and I finally located what it was, a very simple bug . . it's just the fact that the goal and the terminal easily disappear in the face of an out-rudiment. And I know what I have to convince you of, is what is an in-rudiment, see. you don't recognize a rudiment when it's out. And you think that this machine here is going to fall off the pins, and that there's going to be a neon light, which isn't in the machine, appear along this whole red band of the dial on an E-Meter. And it's going to appear on there, and it's going to blind you when a rudiment is out. Well, let me point something to you, there is no neon light back of that to do that, see. And you expect maybe a bell to ring in this thing or something, you know. But there's no bell in it, see. I've got to show you what is an in-rudiment. I know what my job is, you see.

Now, in addition to that, we've got to analyze why a pc doesn't stay in-session and why he isn't in-session. And what happens that he doesn't remain in-session long enough to be audited. All of this becomes a very important study. See, but it has to become one of these studies of adding the additional five coats of concrete to this already superpaved road, see. But it's got to be done, because there's obviously something awry here.

I know you can audit. I have no doubt about this whatsoever, and so forth. But I think what you don't do is recognize an out-rudiment. And then I think maybe you don't handle the out-rudiment. And then I look over our tools, and I find out the tools are rather inadequate, perhaps, for the handling of an out-rudiment.

All right, well, let's go for broke! Let's give you some tools that work, invariable, and that you have great confidence in. That seems to be a good solution, right? All right, so let's be able to set up a case at any given moment. And we at this moment do not care how long it takes you to clear somebody as long as you're progressing, see. We don't care how long it takes you to clear somebody, so long as you are clearing them. But we do care if you are auditing somebody and just wasting time. If the case is not advancing under your auditing, aw, that's just nowhere.

You see it could easily, profitably take fifteen hundred hours to clear somebody and you would clear somebody in fifteen hundred hours. Well, people would still work at it. They would actually still work at it and they would still go in that direction, if they were progressing all the time and all that fifteen hundred hours was useful auditing, don't you see, the case was making gains during that period of time. All right, that would be within man's finite limits of observation.

Well, it isn't anything like that. It is something on the order of about a hundred. See, we're dealing with about a hundred hours. If all the auditing is effective, you have a Clear in about a hundred hours.

All right, therefore, you can afford one hundred percent margin of error. You can have a hundred hours of wasted auditing and a hundred hours of effective auditing, and you're still going to wind up at the other end with a Clear. Well, now that's very well within your ability to deliver, don't you see. Only a couple of hundred hours.

All right, what we're chipping at now is trying to reduce off of the hundred wasted hours. That's what we're trying to do. Because the cases which you are auditing are making progress. But I can tell you now what is wasted. And perhaps you'd like to know that. What is wasted time?

Goals Assessments that go on and on and on are wasted time. you can just peg it down. Let's set an arbitrary figure, something on the order of six hours. If your goals, terminal, Prehav Assessment is requiring longer than six hours, then from the seventh hour on, including the seventh hour, is wasted. There's waste here. It's just being wasted. There's something wrong; your auditing was something wrong. It is not right. And the something wrong is, a rudiment is wildly out. So time from that moment thereon, that is just wasted time. It's just a waste of time.

I've got enough cases now and I've racked up enough cases and done enough observation and let enough people flounder long enough, studied enough graphs of the flounders, that we have proven conclusively

that it is a waste of time to go more than six hours with a Goals Assessment. Interesting, isn't it? Beyond that point it's not therapeutic. Doesn't damage a case but it doesn't help anybody. It isn't advancing the case and the case is not going toward Clear from that point on. Interesting, isn't it? It's just not going toward Clear from that point on. That is a stall.

So, number one of your waste is excessive time consumed in finding the goal. Time is wasted.

All right. Next item of wasted time is running a Prehav level on the found terminal with the rudiments out. That is wasted time. Running it and it's taking too long to flatten, it isn't smoothing out, it isn't changing. You're getting a tone arm action, and so forth, but the pc is not coming up out of it.

All right, you can apparently grind one of those things forever. And I've got records on that, too. Because you're running the pc with a rudiment out. Actually, the terminal has disappeared, and you are not running anything that is real to the pc. It's just like the goal disappeared and you couldn't find it. Well, during the Prehav run, if the rudiments are out, the terminal disappears, and you're running nothing.

So you can go on and say, well, "How far over the hill would a little girl go?" and so forth, or whatever the auditing command is, "To leave home," or something. And "little girl" . . "little girl" is the terminal, but the rudiments are out and this terminal is not real to the pc.

Just as it disappeared on the assessment, so, by out-rudiments, it can disappear during the run. Therefore, the Prehav run isn't biting on the pc because the rudiments are out.

There could be the biggest span of wasted time. Because that could go on forever, and the auditor is just hopefully going on auditing "little girl," "little girl," "little girl," "little girl." Great day! "Little girl" submerged back there in about the third hour of run. Auditor never sits there and says "little girl" to the pc and notices that there is no fall on the meter. What you're doing is running a Routine 2. You're running some kind of a Routine 2 with a wasted phrase in the auditing command now called "little girl." see how that would be?

Well, it's obvious . . this is just extrapolation, but it's very logical . . that if a terminal can disappear from the E-Meter read during an assessment because the rudiments are out, certainly rudiments out can make it disappear during a Prehav level run. That's obvious. If it can disappear one place, it certainly can disappear another place. And that's a good enough explanation to me, backed up by a bunch of evidence . . not as solid as the first, but acceptable.

This will account for an enormous period of run on a terminal. Terminal long since ceased to be real to the pc. Not because it disappeared or was flattened, but because the rudiments are out. And you're not really running this terminal. So therefore you're not running the case to Clear. And the answer to it is, keep the rudiments in.

That . . so those are the two biggest areas of wasted time in clearing. And they are both summed up to running with the rudiments out. So, when we keep saying rudiments out, rudiments out, rudiments out, well, we haven't described the reverse side of the coin. The reverse side of the coin is, of course, rudiments in.

What is an in-rudiment? Well, I saw an auditor not too long ago, had too much action on the needle at sensitivity 16, so turned it down to 8. And then asked several combinations of a phrase on withholds and thought this was all right. And was willing to leave withholds.

But the definition of in-session is this: interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor. And of course "can't" was the missing . . "can't talk to the auditor." This produced a very wild drop. But do you have a withhold from the auditor? No, pc didn't have a withhold from the auditor. Pc couldn't talk to the auditor. Why couldn't the pc talk to the auditor? The auditor wouldn't listen. This was a conviction and this added up to a "can't-talk-to-the-auditor," so obviously the pc was out of session.

So that's an out-rudiment, but a rather oddball out-rudiment, isn't it? Pc feels he can't talk to the auditor. Why? The auditor never receives a communication. So therefore it's a withhold. That's kind of a strange

one, isn't it? See? "I can't say anything to this auditor because it doesn't matter. It isn't that I can't speak. It's that the auditor can't hear." So if you have an "I-can't-speak," that would be a different kind of withhold, too. Well, "Do you have a withhold?" Well, that therefore, is not an adequate guarantee that the rudiment is in. Because that rudiment guarantees talking to the auditor. Doesn't even guarantee willing to talk to the auditor, but it has to do with the ability to talk to the auditor.

Well, I better go at this in a very orderly fashion. Let me tell you what an in-rudiment is. That's another . . that's branched off of your question. You got that answered.

Female Voice: Mm-hm.

Would you like to know what an in-rudiment is? All right.

In the first place you are processing a valence. Even though the valence is hidden and unknown, you are processing a valence. The valence does not well respond to conditions. So all rudiments are monitored exactly in this bracket: that any rudiment process, no matter how beefy and how strong is relatively ineffective. Just put it down in your book! By definition! You are processing a valence. See, this pc is in a valence. And therefore, the answers he is giving are valence answers. You cannot change the conditions of that valence short of Routine 3. That's the only thing that'll find and discharge this valence. So that all rudiments are monitored with this particular limitation: that to change the conditions of a valence is next to impossible. And yet your rudiments processes are addressed to changing the conditions of the valence in which the pc is sitting. "Faschinating," isn't it?

That puts you a hurdle that Epsom Downs steeplechasers up here would balk at. See, most of the horses would pile up right there. Unless we went just a little bit further. But you must recognize that as a fact, that no matter what process you run on a pc short of actually separating off valences . . spotting them with goals and running them as valences . . short of that, you are not going to get very sweeping results. We have been at it for years and we might just as well recognize the truth for what the truth is. If you run anything on a pc other than the location of his goals, the separation of the valence which is the solution of the goals, and knocking that out on the Prehav Scale, then you have this condition resulting, and this is going to be the condition which follows through, but the results are very limited. So anything that has to do with keeping rudiments in is monitored by this fact.

Now, let me give you an example. I'm just going to show you how rough it is to keep a rudiment in. I'm not going to paint any golden picture and say, "Well, if you weren't so stupid you'd be able to keep the rudiments in very easily. And it's just because you're stupid that you can't keep them in, and you're really doing a very bad Job of auditing You see, a fellow . . one could go off on this wild tear, if he didn't know this other point. It is next to impossible to keep them in. Because, by definition, conditional processes on a valence are trying to change the characteristics of the valence and those characteristics are not owned by the pc, and therefore are an other-being's characteristics. And you are changing an other-being's characteristics which are none of the postulates of the pc.

Do you see then why that is? And do you see then why no matter how many fancy processes were dreamed up over the years, if these processes did not immediately separate off the valences and orient and restore the person to himself, they, of course, had a limited workability.

Now, that series of conditions applies to all rudiments processes. So you handle rudiments processes with your eyes wide open that they are not easy to keep in. Because by definition they are going to be very limited.

So, how do you get around this? How can we get around this? Now, we've got Epsom Downs and tons of horses piled up all ready for the meat packer, see. Because I tell you frankly that it's an impossibility. Now, it's an impossibility only to this degree: Remember as part of this definition . . this is very tricky technical stuff I'm giving you here; you get it very straight. If you haven't got it, go over it again, because it's . . otherwise you're going to break your heart on it someday.

To change the characteristics of a valence without removing the valence from the pc is almost impossible. You got that? But you get the modification that is in that? "Change the characteristics without removing the valence."

Now, right in that, the booby trap, you see, there is a road out, right there. A rudiments process which does not tend to shift valences is nonfunctional. So the functional rudiments processes would be those processes which shifted or lightened valences. And rudiments will go in very easily if you pay attention to that particular rule. And that is probably the most important rule of keeping rudiments in: that the rudiments process that works must tend to shift valences, and the rudiments process that doesn't work is one which seeks to shift the conditions of a valence.

And the pc as he sits before you being audited, pre-Clear . . and this word takes on enormous significance right at that point . . is of course a valence. He's in a valence and he cannot shift the conditions of this valence or change the conditions of this valence, and it's been driving him to despair for eons! He cannot change himself. He doesn't know quite how he is going to act. He's an unpredictable being to himself. That's because once, long, long ago, he lost faith in himself as himself and so adopted other beingnesses and reposed his entire hopes of survival in these other beingnesses. And now these other beingnesses are unchangeable in their conditions.

All right, I'll give you an example: "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" Well, let's look it over! Has a very limited workability, doesn't it? Why? Because it seeks to change the condition of a valence. It seeks to get a valence to be responsible for the problem, but remember the valence had the problem and if the valence had been responsible in that zone or field he wouldn't have had the problem.

Now, that it works at all is absolutely a fantastic tribute to Hubbard and you! You see what I mean?

Now, let me give you an even more gruesome example. Goal of the pc, unknown and hidden to the auditor at this stage, see . . he's trying to get rudiments in. He doesn't know this goal, see. He doesn't know the terminal. He doesn't know anything. But let's say it was this: "To make problems." Let's just say it was that. All right, you've got Mr. Pc, Mr. Preclear, sitting there, and of course you're talking to a valence, and this valence will be something that carries out this goal. Now you're going to get problems straight?

Why, the person's going to have a problem every few minutes. They're going to have problems. They're going to start with the beginning of the session, and you're going to clear up the problems and you're going to go ten minutes deep in getting something you want done, and you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have another problem, you're going to have oh-nun-nnn. And pretty soon we just say "Whoa, it's impossible! You can't clear anybody! Because look, you can't get past the present time problem. So we'll just ignore the present time problem of this particular pc and we will just carry on anyhow." And eight thousand goals later you suddenly decide you can't find the pc's goal. Why? Because the rudiment is obsessively out. Because that's the goal of the pc. But that isn't known to you at the time you're trying to get that rudiment in. you see the example?

Hm?

All right, a person who creates problems all the time and the terminal is going to be "agitator." See, he's going to run "agitator." All right, you're talking to an agitator. Well, look, if the British government and the electricians union, and so forth, can't function in the basis of the agitator, why, how in the name of common sense do you think, in the auditing chair, you're going to function with an agitator? Well, you're just going to have to what? You're going to have to soften up this goal and soften up this valence before you handle it.

So therefore, this process would have a prayer. "What problem could you confront? What problem would you rather not confront?" Ah, ha! Why? Why does that have a prayer? It hasn't got much of a prayer, but it's got a prayer. It's a workable thing because of course all valences are accepted by the pc originally as a solution to some overwhelming problem . . by definition. That is how he got the valence. He himself

failed, so therefore he had too many problems. He had so many problems that he failed. So he adopted a solution called a valence.

Well now, the possibility is that two thousand hours later, 1A would run him to Clear if you took every single possible slightest cockeyed version of problems, you see. you just almost set them up on electronic computer to get enough versions of problems, you know, and you just flattened everything, just flattened everything about the problem.

Of course, because you're flattening them in the teeth of a machine that is making problems, see, all the time, you'd be going slowly! See, but you nevertheless would have a slight uphill grade all the way. You'd be making it as you went. Why? Because the valence is being separated.

So, therefore, every rudiments process which separates valence as its primary action will handle the rudiment. And every rudiments process which seeks to handle a condition will be of minor importance. Win a little bit, go flat, lose from there on. you can't keep the rudiments in. you see how that is?

All right. Let me give you an example of this. This fellow who has a thing "to make problems" . . that was his goal. An agitator is going to be his terminal but you don't know anything about this yet, because you couldn't get this goal and terminal, you see, because the rudiment of "problem" is out. Kind of an auditing problem that you stare in the face, you see.

All right, now you're going to run something on "What problem could you confront? What problem would you rather not confront?" You're going to win. But, if you ran this kind of a thing . . if you ran this sort of a thing . . and you said, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" of course, you're just asking the fellow to pick up his whole case and say, well, "responsible for the formation of it." But, of course, he isn't the person who is forming it. He is a valence and the valence is forming it. And, of course, he has no responsibility for the valence, it just goes on operating, so of course he can't do it. Follow this? So it would tend to knock something down momentarily and then this thing wouldn't be very successful and it would pop up again.

All right, but let's take a much worse problems process. Let's think of a much worse problems process. Let's say . . I'm set up so that I only think of good processes. I have to get in practice thinking of bad ones. Let's see. Well, let's take, "Now, what condition" . . this problem is about his wife . . "What condition of a wife would you be able to tolerate?" "What condition of a wife would you be unable to tolerate?"

Well now, of course, this is asking a valence called "an agitator" to run plus and minus toleration on a wife in order to handle a problem. And, of course, we are not going to get anyplace with it. Because, of course, he'll make another problem that has nothing to do with his wife the second that you come off of the other problem, you see? Even if you did manage to somehow or other ARC break the thing down to a point where it no longer fell . . which is not an accepted method of handling a rudiment, but which has been used . . that is addressed straight to the condition and is trying to alter the characteristics of a valence directly and so, of course, won't operate as a process. Okay?

All right. Now let's move on down the line. And let's take up the auditing room. Now, let's say the pc has a goal "to help mankind" and the terminal is a cow. you get the package of characteristics which would go along with this. And now we are auditing him with a meat chart on the wall. This takes a wild example of it, you see. "Is it all right to audit in this room?" you see. Hell, no! It isn't all right!

But you have . . the goal and the terminal of the pc is totally obscured, you cannot find it until you get the rudiment in. you cannot, of course, get the rudiment in because the goal and terminal of the pc are totally opposed to it. If you could find this out directly and immediately that he was opposed to that chart that was up on the wall, you see, you naturally could get it in, but then you would have had to have cleared the case before you could audit him in the room. you see?

All right. So the type of process that wouldn't work on that sort of thing or would have very, very minor workability would unfortunately be TR 10. Very minor. It'd run for a long time and it'd run with somatics, see? And the person would kind of get familiar with it and find out there wasn't anything really

going to bite. And the thing would cease to fall, but the rudiment wouldn't be well in. See, because you just kept . . every time he . . "Notice that hart." "Yes" . . of course, he couldn't confront any part of that meat chart. You get the idea? "Notice the fireplace. Notice the table" . . table-eat-food, you know? "Yes, yes." And just be more and more somatics.

Well, the fact that any familiarization with any piece of mest produces a gain in a case, come hell or high water, because it itself . . the common denominators of all valences is mass, energy, space and time. So the familiarizing with mass, energy, space and time on a very, very long look might possibly do it.

Therefore, TR 10 has had some workability. It has had some workability, as you know and I know. But that is the degree of workability and that is the length of time it would take to do anything for the case, because it's altering . . trying to alter the condition of a valence and of course you're not going to alter the condition of the valence until you clear the guy.

So, I'll give you a good valence process, and it would have to be a valence process in order to handle the auditing room. And you'd have to say something on the order of "who." Valences . . "who." The magic button back of all this is merely the "who/what." The list, the "who/what." You're doing some kind of a Terminals Assessment long before you should be doing a Terminals Assessment, don't you see.

You say, "Who couldn't be audited in this room? Who could be audited in this room?" You get the idea? Or you say, "What could be done in this room? Thank you. What couldn't be done in this room? Thank you." Some such approach as that, of course, is an effort to separate the terminal. And what you're doing is just keying the thing out, momentarily, so later on you can get a hold of it and key it in.

Now, some such approach . . I'm not giving you those as pat, perfect auditing commands but I'm just giving you the key of it. You'd have to handle it on a valence proposition. "Who would you have to be to be audited?" "Who would I have to be to give you a session?" See, that was an old one. And that was a nice working process. "Who would you have to be to be audited?" "Who shouldn't you be to be audited?" All of this starts listing terminals and to list people, you see, and beingnesses and objects and . . pcs can be objects, you know, valences can be objects.

By the way, in your assessments (just as a side comment) if you omit objects you're going to miss some pcs, do you realize that? You keep saying, 'Who, who, who, who, who," you turn yourself into an owl! And you better say once in a while, "What, what, what, what, what," see. Goal: "to go fast." 'Who would go fast?" "Who, who, who, who, who," just on and on and on, doesn't seem to be any sense to it, you know. It's, "What would go fast?" Pc's in the valence of a vehicle, see, and actually might slip the valence of the vehicle during the session and give you a "who." See, so it's "What, what, what," and "Who, who, who," and "What, what, what," and "Who, who, who," and that sort of thing, and you'll get more terminals that way on an assessment. All right, well, enough of that.

Let's get back to this other thing. Anything that you dream up, then, to shift valences on the subject of the room, or desensitize momentarily valences on the subject of the room, or let him have some more valences that could be audited in the room, or anything like this, that would have a better degree of workability and should work faster.

All right. Now, let's take up another one here. "Is it all right if I audit you?" Well, "I" is a valence, remember . . in the valence column, you know. As far as the pc's viewpoint is concerned, it's some kind of a pat beingness. Well, the same thing applies about the auditing room, you know. It'd be, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" and get him to make a list of terminals. 'Tell me who could audit you? Good. Who else could audit you? Thank you. Who else could audit you? Thank you. who else could audit you? Thank you. Oh, thank you very much. who else could audit you? Thank you very much." And you'll find yourself a screwdriver, an oil can. You're liable to find almost anything, you see. But nevertheless, you make some kind of a thing if you say, "What would I have to be to audit you?" see, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" You'll find a lot of people would be Perfectly willing to be audited by a tape recorder, but not by a being. You get this?

So once more the "who/what," and we've got a valence approach here and you will find that . . . I'm not telling you this will work in three minutes, you know, because you're working uphill, all the time you're

running valences, you're working up against the key valence of the case. And you haven't got it yet. All you're doing is shaking up valences or remedying his havingness on valences or doing something about valences and you'll move out the other end with some kind of a result.

But don't expect that this won't occasionally be spectacular. It'll be very spectacular. Sometimes quite painful, sometimes quite upsetting, because you're really kind of doing a Terminals Assessment on the guy, you see. And you just have to run it across the bumps and have to wear ship while you're running the thing. Keep your other rudiments in, don't make flubs. Run a very, very good technical approach to this thing Have an auditing environment that the person would have some confidence in. In other words, it's "Who/what would I have to be to audit you?" and that pretty well should take care of the stuff he is immediately and directly stuck in. He's liable to settle down. "Who am I?" is the earliest successful auditing command that solves that rudiment. You'll find that in the Model Session, by the way, present Model Session processes.

All right, let's take the next one. Withholds. Well now, actually, it's withholds that caused him to hold the valence, so withholds work. As you get withholds off you do shift valences. And you do have the answer to that in the Security Check. But you can whipsaw back and forth on questions as you ask in the rudiments, "Do you have . . are you withholding anything?" "Is there anything you should tell me?" "Is there anything that couldn't be said to me?" "Are you trying to communicate anything to me?" "Do you feel you can't talk to me?" Now, I'm talking about whipsawing all possible varieties with this, because we are trying to restore the ability of the pc to communicate with the auditor. Now, that is a brand-new statement in Scientology. It's a brand-new phrasing. We're trying to get the pc able to talk to the auditor, not willing and we're shifting a word there. Although willing and able are very close together and one depends on the other, we want ability to talk to the auditor. It's just a matter of more bluntly "Can you talk to me?"

Once more, you don't seem to be able to clear it up . . you don't seem to be able to clear it up . . you've got your "who" and you've got your "what." "Who could talk to me?" "What could talk to me?" You've got your whole routine of Security Checks which are right where they belong and as important as they are, you see. And you've got the lot of those and they're all devoted to getting this rudiment in, see. So in a session, as you pass it by, you nevertheless should get it squared away. you find out if there's anything he's withholding and all that sort of thing, just as you have been, but in addition to that, you can also find out if he feels able to talk to you and if there's been any part of any session that you've given the pc that he has felt or she has felt unable to talk to you and why. And you'll reestablish these old cut comm points. And if this doesn't seem to be producing too much results and you still can't get that thing clear, you'd better find out "Who would be able to talk to me?" "What would be able to communicate to me?" You'll be surprised sometimes: "What would be able to communicate with you?" "Well, a bullet." And you'll get a lot of the misemotional feeling of the pc off with that type of an approach. Have you got the various ways to handle that?

But remember you have a whole battery of processes devoted to this withhold, called a Security Check. You've got a big broad thing called a Security Check, and that is terribly important. So if the rudiments seem to be consistently out on this pc at the level of withhold, then, of course, you should be devoting the bulk of your time to Security Checking the pc with the various HCO WW forms. And until you've got him pretty doggoned well security checked one way or the other, even though it took fifty hours to get all these Security Checks straightened out. Voil‡! You nevertheless have won all the way and the pc's feeling better and better, and so forth. It's a winning process and a winning approach. You see how this would be?

All right. Now let's take havingness. There is no substitute for havingness except finding the Havingness Process of the pc. And we've got thirty-six Havingness Processes, and it's a very good thing to find the Havingness Process of the pc. And instead of randomly remedying havingness, find the one that does remedy havingness. Because it's quite a trick to remedy havingness on the pc.

Now, a common denominator of all valences is matter, energy, space and time, so that any approach to matter, energy, space and time has some slight . . as I was telling you about TR 10 . . has some slight power of shifting a valence. And in view of the fact that it does . . we have demonstrated it for a long time . . you go on and use havingness just the way you've always used havingness, but I would prefer that

you had the Havingness Process of the pc early in processing, okay? Now, that seem rather sensible as an approach? All right.

Now, the willingness of the pc to be assessed is great. The pc will be interested in his own case under assessment. But the pc gets terribly interested in his own case on these other things I have given you, too. They get very interested in their own case. It becomes very curious to them, some of the phenomena which occur. And if you think a person you're trying to security check successfully is disinterested, you're wrong. They're never disinterested. They're in a sort of a games condition, because it's a withhold sort of a basis, but nevertheless they're terribly interested in it, and they can become very upset if you fail. The only way they can get upset with you on a Security Check is if you fail to knock a question totally out. If you pass a question and they know they still have a withhold on that line, their respect for you as an auditor goes down, down, down! And that is the fastest way in the world to lose altitude with a pc, is pass a question in a Security Check where there is something still on it that you haven't got.

But now remember, a Security Check is done in Model Session. So a Security Check will most aptly function with the rudiments in. But the power of a Security Check is so great, and in view of the fact that it is one of the rudiments, that the particularities of keeping the rudiments in to do a Security Check are nowhere near as great as they are in an assessment and a goals terminal run on the Prehav Scale. You see it's just you haven't got the same value for rudiments in doing Security Checks as you have apparently in assessment and running. There's a lesser value. But still keep them in.

The way you can bust up a pc on a Security Check is just as I said. This is one that has not been well learned in HGCs. Somebody says, "Well, I'll just report this pc is terribly unwilling, and he ARC breaks very easily when I run a Security Check on him." That auditor has said in effect just this . . they've said one, two, three, four: They've said, "When I first started in the list of questions I Sound that it was hot and I went by it and I didn't buy . . strip it down and it didn't go null and the pc has been in a mess ever since." It might as well have been written in that terminology because that's what the auditor has said.

Now, it's a surprising thing, you wouldn't think how many people will sit down and take a Security Check right off the street, which just is a Security Check, not even a shakedown type of check. You just go down the list. And if they are left with the impression that they have passed the Security Check and you have found nothing, whereas they know very well a couple of the questions were hot, the odd part of it is that they're disgusted with you and consider that your whole operation is a fake.

So you must always at least tell the pc that the question is hot, broadly, whether you clear it or not. Always tell him it's hot. And that is the one restriction I'd put on you. Not necessarily, it isn't mandatory then in doing Security Checking for employment to clear every level. But it is mandatory to say "That one is hot." "Question is" . . well, you say to the fellow (you're on question thirteen) . . you say to him "still falling, still reacting," and so on. "We'll go on to the next question but that thirteen is still reacting. All right. Anything you care to tell me before I go on to the next question? No? All right, okay. Here's question fourteen." This guy says, "Wo-oh-oh-oh-oh." He knows! See?

And your altitude can suffer faster doing a Security Check than any other single operation in Scientology. You can lose altitude as though you had dropped in a bomb case. Just by failing to do that. And you yourself might have spotted it, you see. you might know very well the pc is withholding; you still might have a reaction, but the meter is facing you and you haven't informed the pc. And all of a sudden you find yourself in a bad ARC break situation of some kind or another. You can't quite find out how you got there.

Well, you got there very simply. You went by a question without informing the pc that it was hot and that you knew there was something on it.

So if you can't in one session strip down a particular question and get all of it, at the end of that . . now, I'm talking about a therapeutic Security Check . . at least say, "Well, we'll have to work on that one tomorrow because it is still hot." Don't leave him with any kind of a remote idea of any kind whatsoever that he has cleaned it if he hasn't. Otherwise, he's liable to go home and say, "Ah, well, I can get away with that." And next day he comes in and, by golly, you can't get anything off of him at all. He's ARC broken and he doesn't think you're so good and, you know, it's all messed up.

But although it's a games condition, apparently the individual is totally convinced that he loses if you lose. Now, isn't that odd? That holds good. That holds good with the men in the street and the cop in the park and it holds good to anybody. If you the auditor lose in failing to get one, why, they know they lose. The mind seems to know what the mind is doing. They know that it wasn't so good that they didn't give that up.

So that's the proviso I would give you on a withhold while handling them in the rudiments. If you want to have no altitude for the remainder of the session, go by your rudiments point of withhold and leave one warm, hot or undetected, or not searched out. If you really want to lose altitude for the remainder of the session, why, just flub on that.

So be very careful that you ask this question in a whipsaw fashion, and it just must go left, right, center. Any possibility of ability to talk to the auditor? Anything they're withholding? Anything they haven't communicated? Anything they've failed to communicate? Anything they've wanted to communicate and didn't communicate? Anything they felt they couldn't communicate? Any effort they have made to communicate which was not received by the auditor? You get the idea? Any type of questioning of that character. Now, when you get all of the fall out of that, your altitude goes up. And there is a primary altitude factor, you see.

All right. Now, in handling rudiments there is another thing: "Who should I be to audit you?" (let's go back to that one for a moment and take mother look at this thing) comes into the basis of "Who would you have to be to be audited?" . . this sort of approach. And you still consistently, here and there . . I say this advisedly . . have a pc who is doing something else. This is the old one. Now, it's not quite a part of the rudiments . . not quite . . but is apparently something that is slowing up things. And it comes in there "Is it all right if I audit you?"

Now, we had an earlier rudiment at some time or another that had to do, 'Who would you have to be to be audited?" or "Who are you?" or "What are you doing?" I think that was the original one, wasn't it? "What are you doing?" That was 1955. And to some degree that has dropped out of the lineup. And don't be too surprised if on the next release of rudiments you find that back in the lineup again, because we have just caught a case out. And we catch too many auditors out on running a pc who is doing something else. Not being a pc; they're doing something else during the session. And because it's personal I'll operate on that is a withhold. There's a couple of these are screamingly funny. And it's too bad I can't give them to you, but I won't be able to. They're doing something else. They're not being audited, see.

So "What are you doing?" . . some version of it . . belongs in a rudiment setup. And possibly its missingness is accounting for some of the difficulties. 'Is it all right if I audit you?" Somewhere in that vicinity, you would have to have this other question of "Are you willing to be audited?" or "What are you doing?" or something of this sort. But what you want to find out . . what you want to find out: is the pc willing to be a pc and willing to follow the auditing commands? That is what you are trying to find out. Or is the pc all set to do that and something else? That's what's the most amusing part of this. Is the pc going to do something else while he's following the auditing command, don't you see. And you want to know all about this.

And somewhere in a session if you notice any peculiarity about a pc, an in-rudiment makes it necessary that you enquire occasionally about that rudiment and we get middle rudiments, or running rudiments. And we get the same rudiments. If they look like they're going out, well then you're wasting session time. So you had better just break down, just right there at that point, and just interject a rudiment. Handle that rudiment as you're running.

So that would be an in-rudiment and that would be keeping the rudiments in. And something like this, you notice that this pc is sitting there obsessively crossing and uncrossing his feet, crossing and uncrossing his feet, crossing and uncrossing his feet, crossing and uncrossing his feet. Well, you'd run this rudiment about "What are you doing?" or "Are you willing to be audited?" you know, or that sort of thing. The pc's crossing and uncrossing his feet and you ask him what's he doing Well, he's going to be in a track race tomorrow and he's getting some exercise while he's being audited. You'll find some wild ones, man!

And of course, this is all in the package. This would all go back to the package. He's got a present time problem: he's spending his time here being audited when he ought to be out on the track. Only he didn't bother to tell you this in the beginning of session, and so on, and you better handle this right away, you see. And there's all kinds of oddities then. He obviously is not only not willing to be audited but he has a present time problem, and this is going to amount very shortly to an ARC break and here we go. We're going to have all the rudiments out here before we can say "scat." Why? Because we didn't observe something peculiar.

Now, a pc does not mind particularly being nagged. They don't mind it. It is all interest. It's all havingness. "What are you doing?" "How'd you do that?" and so on. This is one of the oldest wheezes that I use and one of my heavier failures in getting auditors to do it, is "What are you doing?" occasionally. "What is that all about?" "How are you answering the auditing question?" "What else are you doing?" "Now, tell me now, exactly what happens . . ?" You notice that this is getting pretty grindy. This is getting awfully grindy. You say, "Well now what are you doing with the auditing command?" something like that?

Well, he'll say, "Answering it, of course! What the hell are you talking about?"

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

"Yes, I sure do!"

"What is the present time problem?"

"Well, I . . I haven't been able to understand the auditing command since the beginning of session. What am I supposed to be do . . .?"

You'll find this session was going, you know, kind of grind, grind, grind, grind, apparently wasn't going anyplace, pc wasn't ARC breaky, he's just in a constancy, you see. You're getting some tone arm motion, because you practically can't stop an auditing process these days from working somewhat. And about that time you've all settled down for the long grind of some kind or another, you just apparently are not getting anyplace. Well, you shouldn't upset the session, you shouldn't suddenly depart from what you are doing wildly and never come back to it and leave pc in a big not-know about it, but you say, now, "How are you doing the auditing command?"

And the pc says "Well, I'm uh, hmmm . . well how the hell am I doing the auditing command?"

"Well, is there one of the legs of this bracket . . .?"

"What did you want to know?"

"Is there one of the legs of this bracket you're finding a little bit rough to do?"

"Well, yes, you can't do the third leg of the bracket at all."

"Well, have you done the third leg of the bracket since the beginning of the session?"

"No."

"What do you do?"

"Well, I just say, 'Yes.' "

"All right, can you recall the first time you did that? All right, that's fine. Next time you did that. Next. Ah, good, good, recall several times you did that. All right. Now, how do we phrase this third leg of the bracket so that it is answerable?"

And you rephrase the third leg of the bracket so that it is answerable and just carry right on, not stopping anything, starting anything. You haven't stopped anything, you see. And you just give the auditing commands you were on and get the thing answered and keep on going. You had to be pretty smooth to keep from upsetting a pc who is deeply interiorized into some fantastic problem.

Usually there's something going wrong, however, when a pc is not experiencing gains and it'll be a rudiment out. And the basic rudiment, we haven't paid enough attention to is "Are you being audited," see. Person isn't being audited; the person is sitting there figuring out the command.

All too often you'll get an old-time Scientologist sitting there auditing.

Happens every once in a while. He'll be putting a curve on the auditing command so it works. Because he can't answer the auditing command. So you better straighten that out, see, straightaway. Is it a feasible command?

Another thing you often run into and maybe don't handle is self-audit. And you say very coolly to somebody, "What self-auditing process have you been running that isn't flat?" Well, this is not the same thing as asking him "Have you been self-auditing?" He'd say "No," or something. You might or might not get much of a reaction. But "What self-auditing process have you been doing that isn't flat?" That's an awfully good way to start a session on an old-time Scientologist. "Which of these self-auditing processes now, haven't you flattened? Yeah, well, let's take a list of the things here. Now, that's good. You got several of them here. All right, and so on. Good enough. Well, when did you have a lose on self-auditing?" you know that kind of thing.

"Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Well now, all right."

See, this is just chatter. You're just asking for information and make a list of it one way or the other. You could ask him, "Well, have you ever been without an auditor when you needed one?"

"Oh, yes."

"Well, when was that?"

"So-and-so and so-and-so, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so."

"Oh, yeah, all those times. All right. Well, that's good." And, "Who would you have to be to audit you?" And, of course, you're right into the middle and could kick right straight out the self-audit crisscross valence.

These are the various problems you run into that'll slow down clearing. These are all handleable things. What is an in-rudiment? It's somebody interested in his own case and willing to talk to the auditor. That's by definition. But, of course, it is also somebody who is doing the process. And this, of course, is also somebody who is being audited, and that's up to the auditor. So all of these things count, all of these things list up, all of these things are important to an auditing session.

Now, if it's very difficult to keep the rudiments in, you shouldn't particularly become self-critical about it. But there's the old R-factor . . the old, old R-factor, way back in the Fourth London . . is you want to ask yourself if you're being real with this pc. Because the first thing a pc smells . . "Is it all right if [audit you?" This comes under rudiments, you see. one of the first things he smells is a missing R. The reality of the situation is not present. The auditor is not leveling with him. There is something else here. There's an ingredient in this auditing session that he knows nothing about. And it may be quite innocent, but nevertheless it had better be leveled with the pc.

An auditor who sits down, who hasn't had any lunch, who's had to rush back for the session and so forth and who doesn't say to the pc, "Well, I had to rush back to session so I didn't have any lunch. It's all right with me that [don't have any lunch," and so forth, "but nevertheless I haven't had any Lunch and

so on. So bear with me" . . and the pc's fine. That's all right. He's not really at a position where he wants to be guilty of the overt or anything Like that. you make it so that he doesn't feel he is guilty of the overt, but you rive him a reality.

You'll find a pc will ARC break, go out of session, have a present time problem. What is the present time problem? The present time problem he's groping for is the auditor doesn't seem real. This is up to the auditor. It isn't next time it comes up, that the pc suddenly looks up and he says, "What's wrong with you?" or "What's going on?" or "Did that shock you?" or "Are you nervous?" or "Are you upset?" or something like this. Any type of question of this character that concerns the identity of the auditor. This is what? This is a symptom of being out of session, isn't it?

All right. And your action right at that time should be, "Well, is there anything?" Think it over, you know. "Is there anything?" Take a moment out. "I don't know. Am I disturbed by all this? Have I got something on my mind?" And if you have, for God sakes, tell him! If you've been disturbed, for God sakes tell him. "Yeah." You say "Boy, about eight withholds ago I started to get absolutely dizzy. I must have one like it."

And the pc says "Oh, is that so?" you know, and he gives you the next withhold, just like a soldier. Perfectly all right.

And pc says "What's wrong?" and eight withholds ago you've started to feel very dizzy. You say "No, nothing is wrong. No, nothing's wrong," just go on and next auditing command, next auditing command, so-and-so. "We'll just carry on here." Watch all those rudiments go out, man. one by one, they will just go by the boards, because there isn't a person auditing the pc. Got it?

So these are what makes rudiments in . . what makes rudiments in. And they are actually very simple to keep in, they're very easy to keep in. But you'd better not, with the type of auditing you're doing today, except on a Security Check when you can be a little bit careless, except with a present time problem . . when you're doing sessions, boy, you'd better be thorough. You'd better be thorough as thorough as thorough as thorough as thorough. I don't care if you occupy three quarters of the session to get the rudiments in. End rudiments of course are nowhere near as important as beginning rudiments. But they have an importance too, because you're doing them for the next session. This pc is going to come back and be audited well and it all better be smooth, well, you better get the session out of the road.

End rudiments are normally devoted to getting the session out of the road. Beginning rudiments are normally devoted to getting the atmosphere and environment out of the road so that you can audit the pc, and middle rudiments are rudiments used one after another, inquiries about various rudiments during a session, of course, are used to keep the session progressing and keep the rudiments in. Okay?

Well, I want you to get your hand in about this, because you've got to get smart with this. You've got to get awful good with it. Okay? All right.

Thank you.