RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
31 October 1961

Thank you.

Okay. And this is . . .

Audience: October 31st.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, October 31st, 1961.

All right. Now, you have come to grips with clearing since I've talked to you last in a very definite and broad way and I want you to do this with your pc at the very next session before the session is started. Do a Dynamic Assessment just for the dynamic. Do a Dynamic Assessment for the dynamic before your next session. I simply want a Dynamic Assessment.

Now, if you don't know how to do a Dynamic Assessment, that is very simple. You just ask the pc how he feels about the various dynamics and you take the one that reacts the most or the change of needle pattern from the remaining dynamics and then you tell me which dynamic fell the most on your pc.

Now, there's a few bits and pieces of news with regard to processing And you are posing the problem in a very heavy way of broad, rapid clearing and we have been using some Class II types of technology in order to clean out circuits that interpose and so forth in clearing and so on.

Now, you know that it would be very difficult to audit anybody unless you had some Security Checks squared away on this person. I think you will agree with that, with the experience you have had here. Isn't that true? That'd be very – rather difficult, if you never did a Security Check on a pc to expect him to go anywhere.

Now, you see the goal will disappear rather easily. The terminal will disappear rather easily, so that assessment becomes rather difficult. But remember that you are running a goal and a terminal and in view of the fact that you are running a goal and a terminal on the pc, whether you're running it by Prehav Scale or some other process, no matter what you're doing with the goal or terminal, it can disappear. These two can disappear as easily during the run as they can disappear during the assessment. So you see, a goals-terminal run then must be handled with the rudiments in just as you have to have the rudiments in, in order to assess them. Does that make good sense to you?

All right. Now, those things which are closest to present time often have a greater influence upon the preclear than the whole track. Now, where is the boundary? This life is more important than other lives. In the pc's eyes only, not from the standpoint of his aberrations. His past lives have *far* greater aberrative value because of course, they're more hidden. But in the pc's eyes, this life of course has much greater importance than any past life. So you have at once a situation where the person who is sitting there being processed by you is completely convinced that anything that is wrong with him has happened to him in this lifetime. Well, this is one of the things that's wrong with him: that he considers that he could get this aberrated in just a half a century or less.

You see now, that's silly. There's really nothing happened to anybody in this lifetime compared to what has happened to them over thousands and thousands of lifetimes, you see. So you're processing somebody who believes that this lifetime is more important than past lifetimes, when in actual fact this lifetime is not at all important as far as auditing is concerned. As far as the basic seat of aberration, as far as his reactive bank is concerned, it *all* has its fundamentals in his past track before this lifetime ever began.

All right. Now, let's take that a little bit further. What has happened in the last twenty-four hours is more important to him than has happened in the last month. Let's just look at that again.

Now, of course, what has happened to him in the last twenty-four hours *is not* more important to him than has happened in the last month. But the *pc* thinks it is. Well, here we go again. You see, it's the same equation working out now in a little more finite piece of time.

All right. According to the pc's viewpoint, what has happened to him in the session is more important than what has happened to him in the day. Let's get it down – you know, not this lifetime-past lives, but let's move it down to now, to this day is more important than this month. Therefore, to the pc, what has happened in the vicinity – in the immediate vicinity of this auditing session or in it is more important than what has happened in this day. That's what the pc thinks.

So of course, you get a tremendous reaction on the part of the pc from an ARC break and he thinks this is *the thing* Right now this *is* what is wrong with him. It isn't what is wrong with him at all. It's probably those fifteen thousand prisoners he had executed way back when, you see. And he made them sit in a chair, you see – he made them sit in a chair and he executed them with electrodes which look remarkably like E-Meter cans. Something on this order, don't you see.

So he has an ARC break and he will tell you it is the ARC break which is holding up his auditing, when as a matter of fact it's the fifteen thousand prisoners. But because of this value, you cannot audit across the top of the ARC break easily. You can't do it because his

mind is fixated on the moment of time nearest to present time. He fixates on this superficially and analytically. So that has to be pulled before you can get to anything else.

And it's something on the order of a little tiny gate made out of strips of flimsy tin or bits of Dennison crepe paper and the pc says, "This huge, enormous, iron gate, which is spiked, counterbalanced and which weighs seventy-five million tons, called an ARC break, is the gate that is interposed between me and getting on in this session." See, that's what he says; that's what he thinks. All right. It isn't true. It isn't true.

This ARC break, actually, as far as his future life is concerned, is made out of Dennison crepe paper. But it looks awfully big. Now, as this ARC break floats back into the past, gradually drifts back into the past, it gets to be yesterday's session, it is not so important you see. It gets to be last month's session, no great value. It gets to be last year's session, well, you have to dig like mad to find it.

Well, why is this? Because of progression of time. The analytical mind fixes closest to all of the havingness. You've got all this havingness around here, you see. Present time has got all the havingness in it. Therefore, those things which are closest to the havingness are, of course more valid than those things which aren't close to the havingness. He no longer has Camelot, see. But he does have modern England.

So what happens close to modern England, of course, that's close to the havingness, so that's fine, you see. But Camelot, he never can get that back; that's gone. Of course, it really has no value as he looks at it. It has great aberrative value, but it has no analytical value.

So there is this basic disagreement always occurring in an auditing session. What is wrong with the pc is in the yesterlives and what the pc says is wrong with him is right here and now. Now, if you treat what is wrong with him right here and now with bulldozers and heavy axes and dynamite, as though the gate which is closed in your face *is* made out of iron, *is* of enormous tonnage, *is* a tremendous barrier – if you treat it in this fashion, if you slug away at it as though it *is* iron – the pc will think so, too.

You can validate the pc into out-rudiments. You can work on him and you very often will be right, but in the process of working on him too hard, you can actually blow rudiments out.

You start removing rudiments ineptly, you start slugging them around and you get the PT problem out and the ARC break in. And then you get the room out because it's the havingness around which the bad incident occurred, don't you see? And the room goes out and of course withhold goes in. But by this time you've cleaned up the PT problem and the ARC break, but now you have the room out and the withholds are out.

Now, if we were to go back over the rudiments again and check them, we would find this to be the case, but in order to get on with it and have an orderly progress of rudiments, we

run, of course, the rudiments consecutively and never cross them again. So we don't notice this other point. An auditor has to judge this way. He has to make a judgment. He has to say, "Is it going to do more damage to get the rudiments in than to audit with them out?" Now, that is sort of a – sort of a wild one because it's up against this perfection: is that the best auditing and the best gains always occur against rudiments in. And a goals run is very, very difficult to achieve with rudiments out.

All right. That's – that's the ideal, isn't it? The ideal is all rudiments in during the entirety of the run, right? Now, how about crudely putting the rudiments in? You can actually put the rudiments in with such ardor, you can attack this gate the pc has got closed against auditing in his bank with such ferocity, with such battering rams, with bulldozers and dynamite and so forth, that he becomes utterly convinced one way or the other that the rudiments are way out and that it's all a pretty hopeless proposition. And you throw the rudiments further out than you throw them in.

Can a condition exist whereby the handling of rudiments worsen the run? Can a condition so exist? Yes. And this is the discovery which we make here and it's an interesting discovery. There are two or three I will detail to you here.

And that is that any auditing of a terminal other than the goals terminal of the pc can increase the density of the bank and the resistance of the preclear. It doesn't happen a hundred percent, but it happens enough to make one very wary.

Any auditing of a terminal which is not the goals terminal of the preclear can result in difficulties. Tone arm rises; it gets sticky; it goes up; the pc gets very uncomfortable; the pc becomes very ARC breaky; the pc gets very, very upset; the rudiments are very, very hard to keep in. Why? Why? Because in not auditing his goal and his goals terminal, you are of course liable to be auditing other terminals and these increase the density of the bank. So that the pc becomes more ARC breaky by auditing certain rudiments than if you left them alone. See how this could be? It's one of these – one of these horrors. It's one of these superimpasses. It's one that requires judgment on the part of the auditor.

Well, I'll give you an idea. The pc's goals terminal is "a willow wand." Let's take something nobody has for sure and so the pc runs a willow wand and you can do all sorts of weird things with this willow wand. You can run concepts on it and brackets on it and you can run it backwards and upside down and nothing very grim happens on the willow wand, see? This can run, you see.

But in the rudiments, he has a present time problem with his boss. So we say, "Well, get an idea now of getting even with your boss; get an idea of your boss getting even with you. Thank you. That's fine. Get an idea of getting even with your boss, your boss getting even. . ." We're auditing the PT problem, you see. And we're going to clear up "boss." The boss is not a willow wand. And the harder we try to get it in, the less it goes in, because the

pc's attention is distracted off of his goals terminal every time we say the word *boss.* He goes *flink, boom.* "Boss, boss, boss. Wow! Boss. Well, us willow wands . . ." See? So off it goes and the bank gets stiffer, heavier.

All right. We're going to have an ARC break. We're going to run this ARC break in, see. This is going to be real good. Well, the person has an ARC break with the auditor and has had ARC breaks with past auditors and we're all set now. And we'll say well, "What has an auditor failed to do? And what have you not been able to say to an auditor?" And we go on this way, and we go on and we go on and we go on. And every time we say the word *auditor,* the pc's bank says, "Well, us willow wands. . ." No thank you. His attention is being pulled out of session, out of session, out of session, out of session. Don't you see? So the ARC break eventually disappears without the tone arm going down. You've stiffened the bank up, don't you see?

Now we had it stiffened up on the PTP. Now it gets stiffer on the ARC break. And now you say, "Do you have any withholds from me? Me over here, see. Me. Me. Me. You know? Me. Me. Me. You know? Withholds from me. Me. Me."

And all of a sudden – all of a sudden, "Us willow wands.. ." And the bank again doesn't go down. Nothing deflates here; nothing happens. So having "gotten the rudiments in" (quote) (unquote), in this particular instance, all we have succeeded in doing is getting a nonregistry of the meter by stiffening the bank up past registry. You see how this could happen?

Well, it's happened here lately to several cases. I've been steering you along the line, I've been steering you close to the edge in a few places and out of the last week-or-so's auditing, these facts have emerged: that some of the cases present in the last week or so being audited – a very few of them, only something on the order of about 20 percent, but that's good enough – would have done much better, thank you, if the auditor had never touched a rudiment. Because the auditor was getting them in by attracting the pc's attention violently off the goals terminal with a resultant rise of tone arm.

In other words, the rudiments weren't being put in; the meter was sudden – just being beaten into nonregistry. So finally all rudiments are out but not registering and rudiments can go out and not register if the tone arm is very high and the needle is very sticky. You should realize that as part of your auditing kit.

Try it sometime. Assess somebody very carefully and get a terminal. Let's say it's "a hyperbolid," see. And then very carefully for a very long time in auditing, avoid ever letting him put his attention on a hyperbolid and very carefully put his attention on everything else but a hyperbolid. And you'll wind up at the end of this particular run with about 20 percent or something like that of the cases so run with a high tone arm and a sticky needle. The rudiments have just all been violently driven out.

How have they been driven out? Well, the pc is actually experiencing a scarcity of auditing. That's one of the reasons. He feels he isn't being audited. So that would be one reason. And the other more important reason is the person's terminal is not getting the attention it thinks it deserves, which is total attention. You see how this could all add up then to a miserable sort of a situation?

So if, in the process of putting rudiments in, the tone arm starts up, it's a very good thing to look very pleased as though you've just gotten the rudiments all in beautifully, give two more questions, give the rest of the rudiments rapidly and look very pleased – needle falls off the pin on withholds, you get the idea – look very pleased about it all. Even heave a sigh of relief if you want to make a liar out of yourself, but the sigh of relief would actually amount to the fact that you've actually gotten him out of that particular embayed position without running him aground completely. He's just partially aground. And then run whatever you're running and for heaven's sakes make sure that what you're running has something to do with the goal or the terminal of the pc. And his bank will soften right up and it'll all come out all right.

But if you keep at it – if you keep at it, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound, pound – and that tone arm isn't coming down and the needle is getting too stiff to read, you're just heading for trouble. You can just park the case just like that.

Oh, I'm – can tell you all this because it has been subjected to considerable test and nobody here was being used as a guinea pig It just turned up as a gratuitous fact. It just turned up and took off its hat and said, "I am a sturgeon." And we said, "Well, how do you do?" That's the truth of it.

Now, terminals arrived at through a Dynamic Assessment, a full Dynamic Assessment, were apparently not too far off goals terminals, so old Dynamic Assessment runs were not too bad, but any vast concentration on the case where the auditor simply picks the terminal out of midair and makes the case concentrate on it, is liable to bring about in enough percentage of cases to make you worry about it on all cases – any time it gets up above 20 percent, well, it's liable to happen to you at any time, so just avoid it. We recognize clearly that the goal and terminal of the pc, properly run, will get the case further than any other single process.

Now – remember now, as we say this, that rudiments are just a process. They are four or five processes. That's what rudiments are. They are just processes.

Now, if those processes take the pc's attention off his goal or terminal to too great an extent, you suffer from this other liability. The rudiments will go out faster than they go in and that's what I've been talking about. On such a case, you will get further, actually, by auditing with the rudiments out rather than audit with the rudiments further out.

Now, it isn't true that a case makes no gain with the rudiments out. The gain is very tiny. There is *some* gain with the rudiments out. It is very slow. It's quite microscopic. But it is

a gain. It is a gain. And that little, tiny gain of course, is better than a negative gain, see. It'd be better to audit toward a tiny gain than to a thoroughly messed-up case, see. The better choice.

Now this is no invitation to assess people with the rudiments out. It is no invitation to run people with the rudiments out. I'm just pointing out to you that under these circumstances that when assessment is driving the tone arm up – pardon me, when rudiments for assessment just drive the tone arm up and make the needle sluggish, when rudiments for the original runs on the case just drive the tone arm up and make the needle sluggish, you're much better off saying, "Well, how do you feel about the room? Good. Is it all right if I audit you? Fine. Do we have any ARC break? Good. Do you have any withholds? Oh, fine. Good, so forth. Oh, yeah, present time problem. You haven't – you don't have any present time problem. Oh, that's good. That's fine. Fine. That's wonderful. All right. Now we're going to run this process, and it has to do with a willow wand."

Or in assessment – in assessment there is another dodge. You pick up the pc when the rudiments are most likely to be in and assess him at those times when the rudiments are likely to be in and don't assess him during times when they are likely to be out. Doesn't that sound weird? You say to the pc, "How do you feel?"

And the pc says, "Oh, I dunno. I'm not too good," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, we'll have a session tomorrow."

You see? You actually could do this. You recognize that you could do this.

You say, "Well, what time of the day do yau feel best?"

And the fellow says, "I feel pretty good around three o'clock, usually – afternoons." He thinks this over, "Well, yeah, usually, afternoons I feel pretty good. After lunch I feel pretty fine."

And you say, "Well, that's fine. That's good. Now, we're going to have our assessments here. We're going to assess for thirty-five minutes immediately after lunch."

That'd be a way to get the rudiments in, wouldn't it? So it wouldn't be impossible, even if the rudiments appeared to be out, you would get someplace this way by picking only times when the pc was in good shape.

Now, you're laughing about this now, but you actually will encounter this in your auditing and I can see that sooner or later you're going to use this on somebody.

Well, why all this? Why did they go out? Well, I should give you this very important datum, this extremely important datum. You understand the datum I just gave you as important was that taking the pc's attention off his goals terminal could result in a stiffening or

a massifying or solidifying of the bank as registered on the tone arm and needle of the pc. And, therefore, it is a liability to run any other terminal than his goals terminal.

All right. Here's the other one: The pc's goal, if run by itself on a two-way or more flow, *should* bring down the tone arm and that is a wonderful thing to know. That is a wonderful thing to know.

You've got the pc's goal and terminal. You can't get the rudiments in. Everything you're trying to run for some reason or other causes the tone arm just to go higher and causes the needle to be stickier and it goes along with an ARC breaky pc and you're trying to run the goals terminal, but you don't seem to be getting anyplace at all. You know, on a 5-way bracket or there's something messed up about the command or maybe the level isn't right or you've overrun a level. This was an old problem in clearing, was overrunning a level and getting the tone arm so high and getting the needle so stuck, you couldn't reassess.

Now, I can give you a method which should, under ordinary circumstances – since I haven't done it to enough people to tell you broadly that it'll do it to all cases – I myself believe at this time that it'll probably, will undoubtedly do it to all cases, but I can't tell you that from actual fact, I can only tell you my observation up to this moment – that running at least a two-way flow on the exact goal of the pc phrased in some action wording would cause the Prehav Scale – or stiffening of the bank or rudiments stiffening of the bank to come right off.

Quite marvelous. You see a high tone arm – you see a high tone arm, a stick needle, you don't know what's gone wrong. Your assessments might have been out on a Prehav Scale. You might have overrun something It might not have been a proper command. You might have been running with the rudiments too far out. There might have been a level which was left unflat, and then you went on to another level and this goofed it. There might be something wrong here and you can't quite find out what it is. You apparently have this to fall back on: You can phrase up the pc's goal. You – it's given. You have to have his goal already. You can phrase it up so that it can be run just as itself and that is all. You just run the goal.

It has to be action phrasing, however. You can't just chant. Let's say the pc's goal was "don't want to go home." You can't just say "Don't want to go home. Home don't want to go," you know. That would not be a proper command phrasing You would have to say how, or what, or something like that. "What would you have to do to go home," see, something like that, you see. "What would go – what would wanting to go home involve," some such phrase, but it's better to have it in a two-way flow and you'd say "What would make you want to go home? What would make another want to go home?" Now there's a very good one, see. "What would make you want to go home? What would make another one want to go home?"

"What would you have to do – ?" – any such phrasing – "How could you go – ?" "What would this involve – ?" Any such phrasing woven around, leaving the goal more or less exactly worded and intact will give you a brand-new lease on life.

Now, you can – you can discharge it all down. You get back to where you were and you've now got a needle that you can assess. You got a pc who isn't ARC breaky and you now feel happy about the thing and you can go on auditing and find out what is wrong. This is to get him back into the realm of the living So you see, that's a valuable thing to know.

If that fails you, well, you've always got suicide. You could propose that to the pc. That would solve his problems. "R2-45" by its various – various other techniques. So don't think that you just have this one technique to fall back on.

Now, that's a valuable thing to know, that you can probably desensitize the situation – that is to say, you can resensitize the meter by running the goal.

The goal run all by itself apparently produces some interesting – interesting phenomena. Apparently, a goal can be run all by itself. Now let me give you a further ramification on this.

We find the pc's goal and the pc has a goal of – well, let's say it was, "Under no circumstances to let the auditor have my terminal." Let's just corn it up, but let's say that that was the pc's goal: "Under no circumstances to let the auditor have my terminal." Now, of course, you'd recognize clearly in black and white letters of fire that under no God's quantity of expert terminal-finding over the next three weeks were you going to have much of a show because your pc is always going to have the rudiments out. The pC'8 always going to have it mucked up one way or the other – obviously, with a goal like that. You see that clearly? "To never let an auditor get anywhere near my terminal," or some such goal. That's his – the lifetime he's – I mean, it's a goal for the last trillion years, see. He knew he was leading up to this lifetime or something so he had his goal all set.

Well, you could turn around and run it and all you do is run the goal. That's all you've got. You haven't got a terminal. So you just run the goal until you can – got the goal kind of tamed down a little bit and you can find the terminal now. Cute, huh?

In fact, this is so good that I don't know that it wouldn't become standard procedure to run the goal before you looked for the terminal, because it'd be very fast assessment if you did. I don't know that it would become standard procedure, but I'm just giving you warning. Having made a discovery of this particular magnitude with what you can do with a goal, why, you can be prepared for anything

You can do something with a goal and if I find you can do something with a goal, why, I guarantee you that we will do something more with a goal, you see.

All right, so there is a method of short-circuiting it. Now, I've given you a very weird and corny type of goal: "To never under any circumstances, over my dead body, to let the auditor have my terminal." See? That's very corny, isn't it. How about a goal like this? How about a goal like this? "To remain totally undiscovered." Well, isn't that the same goal? Isn't that the identical goal? Now, how long are you going to sweat over that one before you get smart and remember this lecture?

I'm going to invite your attention to the pc's goal as indicative of his behavior in processing. You look at the pc's goal, I'll predict his behavior in processing and I won't be a hair off any time. I've been looking down your throats on this now for weeks. Matter of fact, I just – I once angled in toward a pc's goal because of his behavior in assessment. He was just laughing a minute ago there.

I did. I said, "Well, let's – let's sort that out from that angle because we couldn't get anything to stay in. Nothing ever would stay in on this goal and of course, the thing was practically "Nobody is ever to find anything on me," you see. That was the goal and it was very hard to find. And this pc, by the way, was being assessed, continually, with the rudiments wildly out. They were always out.

Well, look-a-here. It was after the fact. You've got the goal. So now you can understand why it was hard to get the assessment. But remember, you're doing – you're doing the assessment before you've got the goal. You – you don't have this datum yet, do you? Valuable as the datum would be, to know the person – the best way – the most easily – the easiest sessions you would ever run would be those sessions in which you were trying to find the goal that you already knew what it was. That'd be a very easy session to conduct.

The goal is "To hit the audit – hit an auditor over the head with an E-Meter," you see. And you know that, so every time he reaches over for the E-Meter and so forth, you put his arm back in the chair, and you – there's no surprise involved with it, don't you see. But we sweat along over this goal for a long time and we are considerably annoyed all during the assessment because at the least provocation, the pc picks up the E-Meter and hits us over the head with it and we think this is getting in the road of the assessment. You might say that the pc sitting there *is* the assessment. So if we knew it in advance, the pc would never give us any trouble. But we don't know it in advance.

But let's use this idea. We go down a long list of goals on the pc – Routine 3 is just done Routine 3, you understand. There isn't big changes occurring here. I'm just showing you some of the mechanics back of all this – and we do an assessment. We get our rudiments in. We get them in very well. We make sure that a Sec Check has been done on the pc. We make sure everything is grooved in and everything is very neat and everything is very nice. And we go down and we get the goals list and we get the thing all assessed out and we wind up with the pc's goal. All right, that's the way we should do it.

Is there any way to make it any easier on us? Well, that's for sure. There's ways to make it easier on us. As we look this thing over, we should do a goals list rather relaxedly. We shouldn't attack the pc and extract his goals list from him something on the order of a highwayman taking the gold off the night mail, see. This is kind of a wrong approach.

We can weight this thing up with importance, you see. We can make this so terribly important. We can make it under such strain. We can put so much attention on these Dennison crepe paper doors of the rudiments, you see, that he begins to think these things are castle high. "Oh, God, nobody could ever – . Oh, I hope I don't – I hope I don't have a present – I hope – I hope I don't have a present time problem before this session because, of course, I won't get any place in the session. And we'll have to spend the whole session on present time problem, and I hope I don't have a present time problem. And let's see, how can I keep from having an ARC break with the auditor. Let's see, if I get an ARC break with the auditor, then the auditor won't be able to find my goal and terminal and – and the session will be no good. So let's see. I guess no matter what the auditor does, I won't pay any attention. I think that would be a good idea. Now, let's see, room. Room. Well, that room always makes me nervous, so-so-so the best thing for me to do is just not look at it, the whole session."

See, the pc is helping you out, see. "Ah, now let's see. I have no present time problem and I'm not going to say anything much to the auditor or not going to hear anything very much that he says and then I'll get no ARC break and – and then I won't notice the room, so that'll stay in. And – withholds, withholds. Do I have any withholds? Do I have any withholds at all? Let's see, do I? Do I? Do I? Is there anything I haven't told anybody? Let's see. Let's see now. No, I guess I don't have any withholds, but – but on the other hand – on the other hand, he might find out the first third of my life. Somebody might get into that quarter of my life and maybe at the time of withholds, maybe if I just sort of clench the cans convulsively when he starts asking about withholds, weAl get across that one all right. "Now I've got the rudiments in, we will have a session."

You'd be surprised what goes on. The pc – pc tries to help you out all he can. I just ran an assist a little while ago, by the way, on Quentin. It had been carefully buried. Nanny had told him it was all better now and he was now well. And you know, I couldn't get a single somatic out of him? This little kid runs like a – like a baby carriage, you know. He'd fallen out of bed on his head. No somatics? This character? Impossible. Because usually all I have to do is say, *"Bing, bing, bang, thud.* Put your attention on this, that, *boom,"* and it blows. And that's about the end of that. But in this place, no somatic? No somatic? So I trace it back and I find out how he's been reassured while he's in a state of near concussion that "it doesn't hurt now." Somebody's installed a somatic shut-off. So I had to search this over, and – it took me a moment or two, and I said, "Well, has anybody said anything about this? You mentioned this to anybody?"

"No, nobody but so-and-so, and they said it didn't hurt now."

And I said, "All right. Well, do you recall when that was and where it was? All right. That's fine. Got that all straightened out. Okay, now let's go through this whole thing again." Somatics, you know, *bang!* Right in there, *thud!* And he was running.

So don't think that I'm saying you don't have to have rudiments in. Here was a somatic shut-off and here was somebody auditing before me. At the moment of the accident, he had another auditor and he was still – as far as the accident is concerned, you see – still totally fixated see, on a person that was supposed to be helping him out at that time. So as long as that person was standing there in the incident, the incident was shut off.

Well, of course, rudiments are in essence an effort to *be* the pc's auditor, and if you can become the pc's auditor through putting the rudiments in, of course the pc runs wonderfully. The somatics go on. All kinds of things happen; various phenomena occur. Pc goes rapidly through the bank. The rudiments are out; benefits occur less to the degree that the pc doesn't have an auditor, you see. I mean, it's a direct proportion proposition. The more he has an auditor, the more confidence he has in an auditor and so forth, why, the more will occur in the session beneficial to the pc. It's a direct proportion, so don't let me discount in your mind the importance of getting rudiments in. I've just told you that there are times when it's better to leave them slightly out than to drive them out with clubs.

I think we need a new phrase about there. Let's just call them muzzled rudiments. Muzzled rudiments, you know. You say, *"Rum-thum-thum-thumthum-thum.* All right. Now we're going to run this process." And bang, here goes your session. You see, you've gone through the form of Model Session and if one or two questions didn't release the needle, you leave it alone. You don't run any process on the pc. You would do that at times when the tone arm was high and the needle sluggish during the last session that you gave the pc.

Of course, the pc comes in – of course, any pc of mine comes in with a high tone arm and a sluggish needle and they left the last session with a low tone arm and a loose needle, I curl my long, nonextant black moustache and I say, "Well, I don't mean to inquire into your private life, but *what* have you been doing?" They usually tell me and the needle goes down thud, see. Needle goes loose. Tone arm goes down. They go into session. Now in essence, however, if they're not going to and if this phenomena is not going to occur by reason of everything being out, you – you're better off auditing them with rudiments out than trying to slug the rudiments in.

Do you see? That's the only point of judgment I'm trying to make with you. Muzzled rudiments. If you notice that every time you try to get the rudiments in the pc becomes more ARC breaky than before, you might decide that it's a marvelous idea to do. certainly one thing – to sort of muzzle down the rudiments. Toughen up security checking on the pc.

You see, that's not a rudiment. Security Checking is Security Checking, see. If he's going to be so chopped up and messed up and ARC breaky, he's probably got withholds like

crazy, so throw that over into the department of Security Checking and if his tone arm and needle are not responding to any process known to man or beast, *if* you're lucky enough to have his goal, run it. You just run it and the whole thing will soften up. It'll bypass everything else that's happening to the pc because this is the single, more important thing than present time.

You have something more important than present time. So, therefore, it overrides the top of rudiments and so forth. So is the terminal more important than present time, but *less so* than the goal. The terminal is not quite as important as the goal. And the goal is the softer road. See, there can be several terminals to one goal. You can run a terminal flat for that goal and then have to find another terminal for that goal. See and maybe have to find *another* terminal for that goal before you get rid of the goal. But goal? That's just one goal. Zoom! When it's out – when you've got it audited out, then it is out. And that is it.

These are all points of adjudication. What do you do in auditing? And a very finished auditor, an auditor who really knows his business, can handle a pc well, goes on the basis of fundamentals. He sees what is happening with the case. He knows what he wants to have happen with the case and he just throws aside all barriers which interpose on his having that happen with the case. I gave you a very crude example but a very easily understandable one.

Well, all right, I'm trying to give a little boy an assist. No somatics. Well, I don't try to sack into his past life and do this and do that and the other thing I just figure out "Well, what – *woo-woo.* This boy has no somatics and he should have somatics. And nobody has run this thing. And must have been something in the environment at the time." And sure, we find a somatic shut-off. Somatic shut-off. Knock it out. There goes the rest of it.

Would it have ever come out into the clear if I'd just run the process? Yes, yes. I could have run the thing and run the thing and run the thing and all of a sudden he would have remembered the person telling him this and it would have blown anyhow and I would have come out the other end. And it would have been the difference between about a two-hour session and a fifteen-minute session. The way I did it was a fifteen-minute session. You can always cut corners by knowing your business.

You understand that an auditor can almost always get there in some knuckleheaded fashion. Skill does just this: It makes a time difference in auditing It can make an *enormous* time difference in auditing. It can be something on the order of five hundred to one. See? It can be five-hundred hours for one hour. See, pc gets this session. Auditor really understands this. Gets a good grip on it. Has a little bit of luck. A couple of horseshoes in one pocket and a rabbit's foot in the other pocket and some shamrocks stuck in his lapel. Just hits it, you know. *Bing!* And he said, "Is it so-and-so?" And the pc says, "Yes, it's so-and-so." And he does so-and-so. And zoom and that's it. And that clears all that up and that's the end of that.

And somebody else runs the CCHs and then follows through CCHs and he runs a Present Time Problem Intensive one way or the other and gets that out of the road. He runs all existing Security Checks, fifteen Security Checks more that he himself has thought up and so on. And somewhere in this mass of stuff, why, he hits the exact thing that the pc was on. And it happens more or less at that point because the pc is softened up. You get the idea?

You could get there. You can always get there, you know, but riding what tortoise sometimes.

Now, it isn't just basically that you always have to get there faster. As a matter of fact, getting there swiftly is sometimes an economic liability and in a society of this particular character, getting there too fast and getting there too slow can be looked on alike as undesirable. They would have you strung up in short order, I'm afraid, if you went out on the roads and you saw somebody sick and you said, "God bless you, my son," and it – he instantly was well. And you looked around throwing these God-blesses in all directions and so on. Well, they'd say "That fellow down there in Judea. It's about time we hang somebody else, man." They'd hang you, that's for sure.

Furthermore, it'd be economically very difficult. Negotiations – economic negotiations before you said "God bless you," you see, would take more time than the cure and this would all be rather silly. And of course, I'm joking now about this, but the economics of the situation do influence the length of time in auditing I just don't want them to influence the length of time in auditing the way they did in psychoanalysis. Almost the total end product of psycho-analysis is "how long can you get somebody to be analyzed." Hasn't anything to do with what you do with the person in analysis. It's how long can you go. Because the longer it goes, the better your paycheck is and the more weeks you're sure of it. So there's an optimum that the society will accept in terms of speed, economically.

Now of course, I'm just joking on that point, but there is *another* point: it's how much change can a pc accept over what period of time and you just start talking to this pc you're having too hard a time with on the subject of Clear and you're liable to find out that it's just a totally unacceptable proposition because he looks on it as a rapid proposition. And you talk to him about rapid clearing, he's all set to tell you that he wants to be cleared this session.

Well, that's interesting because you'll see some pcs putting it down session after session after session that the session goal they put down is to be Clear. Well, that's dandy. We're awfully glad they put that down as a session goal. Nobody's criticizing it. Wouldn't say anything about it except for this: It should occur to you as the auditor once in a while not to *question* the goal, but to discuss the subject with the pc with your eye on the needle.

Now, you shouldn't take up the pc's goals too arduously as did he reach them or didn't he and his goals are his goals, and they are his goals for the session. And you take up the session's goals at session end and find out if he made them or didn't make them. But if all the

pc ever said was "to be Clear," "to be Clear," "to be Clear," "to be Clear," we wouldn't question the goal, but sooner or later we'd find out what was he talking about. What was he talking about?

And you'll find some tremendous variability. They – he doesn't really know what he's talking about. Now, not that you would do this in a session – very often he definitely does know what he's talking about – but, not that you would do this in a session but you could do this in a session: You could say, "All right. This session we are going to try to make this goal of yours 'to be Clear.' And we're going to make it in this session." And this, of course, to somebody that's reading at 6.5 and stuck up and so forth.

It won't necessarily violate his reality, but it'll violate his speed-of-progress factor. The idea of sitting down in this session in one condition and coming out at the other condition without any time allowed for adjustment, healing, feeling whether or not the water is cold, doing all of these things, you see – and you're liable to get – you're just liable to shake up the meter just – just horribly. I'm not saying you should do that. I'm just saying the consequence of doing it on some pcs who have this as a goal. Speed. Speed. The speed with which you clear the pc is sometimes unacceptable to the pc and you very often will find a pc planting his heels in. But *what* has got its heels in? And this is very important to you. His *goal* has got its heels in. That's what's got its heels in.

Examine a case from the aspect of its goal. Examine the goal from its aspect – from the aspect of what dynamic it is an overt against and you'll find out something about pcs. You'll find out how a pc got a goal in this solid. He had this goal. It was a perfectly honest goal – perhaps. And – it was – it was a perfectly good goal and he went along, but nobody wanted this goal because it didn't fit with certain dynamics. And they invalidated it and he reasserted it and they invalidated it and he reasserted it. And they invalidated it and he reasserted it, and they invalidated it and he didn't assert it very much. And then he reasserted it and then they *really* invalidated it. And after that, he skipped it and it kind of crops up now and then. He thinks about it, you know, sort of, "Well, sort of a fairy-tale thing. I mean, nobody really believes in it, you know. It doesn't amount to much – just something you . . ."

And when you first pick it up, you'll find out it behaves like an overt. A pc's goal, even though it is a goal – and it is a perfectly honest goal – nevertheless behaves like an overt. And you can run it as an overt. And that's why it works to run it two ways. It's running overts. It's the most remarkable thing you ever cared to run into.

All right. Let's take the goal "to climb a mountain." Highly unlikely goal on some pc, but we will take it that way. "To climb a mountain." All right. "To climb a mountain." Very good. And you say – you can't figure out that this would do anything to anything very much. And you say, "What would this do to a group?" And by golly, the pc will come out with a long chain of overts. It is an overt against a group to climb a mountain. You wouldn't think so

at first glance, but of course the goal wouldn't be *stuck* to this degree if it hadn't been invalidated, if it hadn't been an overt. See, it was treated as an overt, so it becomes one.

Naturally, it's been objected to so often that it's easily invalidated and this is how a goal or terminal goes out on the pc. Any goal that was not a mass goal of the race or line of the pc – but not – you know, just actually not an axiom; any goal that isn't an axiom – is out of agreement to some degree and therefore has been invalidated very often by other members of the groups with which the pc has been associated, has been invalidated on other dynamics and having been invalidated on other dynamics becomes a fruitful source of invalidation.

Now he's used it to invalidate eventually and people invalidate it, so you say to this pc – you're doing a goals assessment on the pc – and you say, "To climb a mountain. To climb a mountain. Climb a mountain. Did you ever go in for mountain climbing?"

And the pc says, "Oh, huh?"

And you say, "Well, your goal here 'to climb a mountain,' did you ever go in for any mountain climbing?"

And the pc says, "Well, no, not particularly. I thought it'd be very nice to climb a mountain sometimes."

And you say, "Well, don't you find mountain climbing awfully tiring? Ah, it's not being done much these days, you know. Did you know that – did you know that airplanes now fly much higher than Everest? Did you know that?" And you say, "Let's take up this goal now 'to climb a mountain.'" It doesn't register.

Now we get the rudiments in and get the ARC break off and the thing registers again. Now, what's – what's the phenomena connected with this? It's just that the goal has been invalidated very often and has been *used* for the purpose of invalidation of certain groups of people and so is a fruitful source of invalidation. And you just sort of breathe on this goal lightly, you see, and it apparently folds up.

Actually, this is a misnomer. It simply disappears from view and it disappears from consciousness, but it sure doesn't disappear from the reactive bank. It's in there plowing and chewing and mashing, going on like mad, you see, down underneath the cover, but you can actually – can get it off of the meter by invalidation.

And because the terminal is an outgrowth of the goal, it of course could be similarly invalidated. Well, these things are easily submerged. So the rudiments go out; there disappears the goal and terminal. You could go forever. Actually, we have. You can pull a thousand, fifteen-hundred goals or terminals off of a pc when the original ones are invalidated? Mm.

Oh, I'll tell you one. An HGC didn't take the pc's goals list. Pc laboriously writes out a goals list, so an HGC didn't take the pc's goals list, but wrote the pc a new goals list down for

the pc, taking it off by the meter. That was it; that was enough. I don't know how long they assessed and it wasn't length in that particular instance. They did a complete misassessment. The goal they found couldn't possibly have stayed in. The terminal they found couldn't possibly have stayed in. They ran it. They got nowhere. It was a complete mess.

Fortunately, we found the list. We found the list and found out about this and got this straight and so forth and it was just a matter of, I don't know, five, six hours. Just five or six hours. There it was. The pc's goal occurred on the original, handwritten, personally written list, but didn't occur on later lists. That any goal had been invalidated, you see – by not accepting just the pc's list of goals, the goal – the pc's goal disappeared. It disappeared because when the pc was asked to list the goals again, she didn't list it. She omitted her goal. Interesting, isn't it? *Ha-ha-ha,* boy, I'll tell you. Finding goals and terminals is walking a tightrope.

Now, are there any processes that you can run – well, I've given you one. There's this goals process. That's very good. Several brackets of the goals process; two brackets or something like that. It's marvelous. But there must be some other processes. Must be some other processes that you can run. Oh, yeah, well there's a hatful of them. I've just done a safety table which I think you already have. Should have been issued. It was last Thursday's bulletin. If it hasn't been issued to class, it should be. But it's a safety table. Safe processes. That's all.

Now, this particular problem is what can you audit and it lays down this rule. I have gotten enough information now so that I can write up a Problems Intensive and will talk and give a comprehensive lecture on the subject of everything about a Problems Intensive – all the form and so forth. I'm redoing the form and so on.

But it follows like this: that you can always ask a generalized Security Check question. Contains the word you and it contains the word *someone* or *anyone. You* can always ask that type of question. You, *someone, anyone. You* know? "Have you ever robbed a bank?" Well, fine. Not much of a terminal, a bank. "Have you ever – have you ever sunk any boats?" These are not as good a Security Check question as "Have you ever robbed anything? Have you ever sunk anything?" See?

The further you can get the question away from a particularized or even what we used to call a generalized terminal, why, the better off you are. You say, "Has there been any commotion before that problem? Was there any commotion before you had that problem? When did you have that problem? Well, what activity was going on then?" See?

You didn't name anybody. You don't direct the pc's attention directly onto past terminals if you can possibly help it. Now, understand you can get away with it. You can get away with quite a bit of this. I'm just showing you that it's a poor practice and you should realize that it has liabilities and it has limitations. So it is a better Security Check question – "Have you ever robbed?" What's the – where's the rest of it? Well, just leave that to the pc's

imagination. His mind will go over onto something, see? See, that – I'm just doing the *reduotio ad absurdum,* actually. This is being *too* careful, see.

"Have you ever robbed?"

The pc says, "Well, there's the next . . ." You know, his mind connects on the proper terminal or whatever he has robbed, you see.

All right. This – that – that's nearly perfect, but too extreme. "Have you ever robbed anything?" or "Have you ever robbed anyone?" Ahs that's good. See, yeah, that's all right. That's quite acceptable. You can play that around and do a lot with this.

"Have you ever robbed your father?" Oh, no, that is utterly and completely unacceptable as a Security Check question. I finally got all of the bars down now and got this thing shaken out and seen where it lives and I know all about this thing and that is just not acceptable, as a Security Check question. You understand what I mean?

What does this amount to? "Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you. Have you ever robbed your Father? Thank you."

Well, what's happening here? Attention on terminal, Father. Attention on terminal, Father. Attention on terminal, Father. Attention on terminal, Father. This would be a little bit safer but also a little bit corny: "Have you ever robbed any member of your family?" See? At least his attention can flick around without you crushing it down against Father. He'd be better off. That would be the better thing to do.

You understand that you've got wide latitude here and you can get away with an awful lot. I'm just giving you the perfections of it. That's all. I'm being pedantic, in the extreme. You can run through a Security Check question, you can actually assess lists of people and you can find out who drops the most and run practically a repetitive command on the person of what they've done to them. You can do all this sort of thing and you just get away with it left and right – as long as it's a Security Check because O/W is the only thing that'll run against a terminal. It's the O/W that excuses it.

You can always run Overt-Withhold as long as overts and withholds exist. Don't run Overt-Withhold where no overts or withholds exist. That sounds awfully mechanically something, but why – why do I add the additional provision? Well, this is strictly and entirely because if no overts and withholds exist, you're still putting the person's attention on another terminal, than the person's goals terminal. And you're going to get some kind of a repercussion.

Therefore, when a pc runs out of overts and withholds against a certain person in the past, he would get ARC breaky. Why? Did you ever have a pc do this? "Yeah, but they're – but I don't have any more. I didn't do anything more. I – I – mean I have no – I – uh . . ."

He's sensible now that his attention is being crowded *newly* over onto that terminal. You got it washed up before, but now *newly* you're crowding it onto that terminal. That's a bad show.

So Security Checking is the best way to run Overt-Withhold and a generalized sort of question is – having to do with the action, not the terminal – is much better than any other type question. And you get some sloppy, pronoun type of terminal – well, that's not, not perfect, but it's quite acceptable. "Have you ever robbed anyone?"

Now, you understand that you can throw questions in along the line, but you should realize, actually, that you are just to some degree getting away with something. It's a violation of this other, so you are – you're – you're just getting away with something

All right. You take prior confusion. We'll take up prior confusion in another lecture and beat it to death. But you take prior confusion: the person says, "Well, was there any excitement before – when was the first time you noticed you had that problem? Oh, yeah, well, that's good. Was there any excitement occurred just before that? That's fine. Now, oh, yes, well, you had a fight with your sister. All right now. What did you do to your sister there? All right. Did you have any withholds from her? Was there anybody else you had any withholds from? Oh, yes, you had a withhold from your sister. Good. Is there anybody else you had any withholds from then? Any more and so forth? Oh, all right. That's fine. That's good. Did you do anything else in that particular period? Did you do anything to anybody else? Was there anything of this a little earlier? Did you have any unkind thoughts any earlier about anything or anybody and so forth?" And you're just running unkind thoughts, criticalness, withholds, overts, you know, just – just reach around the basketful and just clean up the confusion, you see. Just plug away at it and so on. That's almost perfect.

You'll find out the present time problem will blow. The somatics will blow. The person's illness will blow. You'll find out the ARC breaks blow and so forth and it opens up the door to a brand-new type of rudiment. It's a Security Check type of rudiment. You clean up your rudiments by Security Check and find out you can get away with it much better.

You don't have those at this particular instant. They're still in development. It is based on this other lineup, see – the prior confusion to get rid of the out-rudiment. Well, it doesn't violate the goals terminal, and it doesn't leave the pc sitting out in the middle of nowhere.

But let me give you just this – this other fact. I've talked about it quite a bit and I've been asked here a question of "What exactly makes the bank stiffen up by taking its attention off the goals terminal? What *exactly?* Now, I've said that the terminal asserts itself. It's one of the built-in mechanisms of the terminal that if it is ignored, it gets apparent. This is one of the

mechanisms of the thing This is still, however, not answering this question because frankly I don't know, frankly. I can give you the generality and I can give you the basic law that makes it occur, but the exact mechanics of how this is done actually, practically – practically it just staggers you trying to figure these things out. Exactly how would the pc with his left hand make his bank go stiffer and heavier and more solid and so forth, so that he notices it on the right hand, you see.

It's always this mystery about "How does the pc do it with his left hand – in order to feel it with his right hand and just exactly what goes on here?" Well, the exact mechanics of the thing – electronically and so forth – I could not tell you at this time. I don't know.

But I can tell you this: that you needn't worry about hidden standards anymore, because all the basis of all circuitry are to be found on the goals list of the pc. The basis of the pc's circuits are in his goals and the type of circuit he will have of various kinds will be found on his goals list. So that you get his main goal, you'll find out one line of circuits and when you go down and assess another goal, you'll find another whole series of circuits. After you've gotten rid of the first goal, you'll find another whole series of circuits obeying this other goal. And we have the basis of circuits for any given individual. And isn't it interesting that it's different for every other individual, so don't – and there are a couple of billion of them alive at the present moment right here on this planet, so don't blame me too excessively for not having noticed they were all the same mechanism before, but I have just more or less scouted this out at the moment.

If a person has a hidden standard type of circuit that is immediately in action, running the goal bypasses it. And if he has several types of circuits, they will be found somewhere on his goals list, and you will get to those as you clear him. As you get rid of the terminals and the goals, why, the next layer will unpeel. And of course, those that are most active may come last, but they will surrender the most easily.

Well, what – what is the goal of the pc? Well, you'll find this – the first goal that you find on the pc – remember you're going to find other goals on the pc, too, after you've gotten rid of the first goal. It has to get out of the road. But the first goal of the pc will describe the most available series of circuits and one of the things you do for the pc when you first find his goal is you actually do blow up some of his circuits. So actually, the best way to get at hidden standards is to clear the pc. Interesting, isn't it?

But you clear him with his goal and if you bring his goal into the command, his circuits will clear up, which is what's new here. You're getting commands now that include the pc's goals as part of the command, which we will also talk about at some other time.

But it's quite amusing if you recognize that the center . . . This is a possibility, you see, that the pc has a goal "never to give the auditor a terminal." They actually will respond as a

circuit which goes into action in the presence of an auditor and then which blanks out the pc's memory of anything if the auditor asks for the terminal, see?

I'm just saying – supposing this were the main goal of the pc, just giving you a piece of idiocy. Which is – nobody ever had that goal. You get how that would be? He's got a circuit set up so that you say, "Now, what is your terminal?" and immediately this thing goes into an occlusion, makes him stupid and doesn't answer. And he says, "Huh?" You know?

All right. That's his goal. His goal expresses itself in a circuit form. So you get circuitry goals. "Never to make money anywhere." See? That's his goal. Let's say it's "never to make any money at any time, anywhere." Every time he sees himself in danger of making any money, a little voice talks to him and tells him that's the wrong thing to do. He just comes close to making some money and a little voice says, "Well, that's very bad. That's a very bad thing" You know? "Much more advantageous to sell it than buy it at this particular time," you see? And he gets caught in the stock market crash and he's always in financial disasters.

You ask this person who has a goal like that if he was in any financial disasters. "Oh, yes, yes. Lots of them."

"Well now, do you have any little voice that tells you what to do in order to make money?"

"Oh, well, it's funny you ask this, but I always have a hunch."

"Well, how does this hunch express itself?"

"Well, I get a burning in the – under my jaw here, you know. It sort of comes to life, you know? And I just know."

All right. You run the person's goal, you find the person's goal and run it a couple of ways and so forth and this somatic will go *ke-pshwt!* And there goes the circuit.

So we're down to – we're in reaching distance of straight ways to blow circuits, anyway. So we have made a considerable gain here in the past couple of weeks while you've been agonizing around. But I've decided to treat you all nicely. I've decided to be very good to you and so forth. And as far as possible at the moment, I have you running directly in the direction of Clear pointed and fired.

And it's some possibility that some of you in the next few hundred years – might, as you're auditing might accidentally slip, you know, and disconnect the E-Meter so the needle will float and something on that order. I'm not going to threaten you with being Clear. You don't have to be Clear if you don't want to be. Really. You can go on being aberrated if you want to be and so forth.

The only thing I will say is if you – if you insist utterly on remaining totally aberrated and so forth, you have approached a period when you've got to be very careful. You've got to

be very, very, very careful and try not to do any of the auditing commands because if you do just a few of them, it's liable to happen. And so I'm not threatening you and I don't want to beef up your banks and so forth or anything like that, but I'm very happy to – no, I'm very happy, by the way, with the general run of cases for the first time in many, many, many, many, many weeks. First time this year, actually. First happy – where I'm very happy with all the cases which are running. There's a couple of little question marks hanging over the left ear of a couple of cases present, but that's all working out and it's all going very smoothly. But I think you must somehow or another accidentally have applied some of the information you've been getting on the bulletins. For that – and for that I thank you. I thank you very much.

So I hope that – I hope you have a very successful run of it, and – I do. I want to see some Clears here in the very near future. So you, too, could sacrifice yourself toward this ambition or goal. Okay?

Thank you.