MORE ON MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
12 June 1962

All right, this is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. June 12, AD 12. All right, this is going to concern nothing but middle rudiments which you haven't had very much information on. I'll give you how to do mid rudiments plus a few comments on fish and fumble. It's getting to be one of my favorite activities and you use them in conjunction with middle rudiments. You can.

Now first a remark on Q and A. When you ask a second question or double question the pc, you of course are omitting your TR 2 gorgeously. That's one of the weakest points in the broad body of auditors. TR 2, you wouldn't think so. Two Central Orgs have recently asked me for a new TR 4. It isn't TR 4 that is at fault. It is TR 2. An adequate acknowledgment is worth a very great deal in auditing. Now one of the ways of not acknowledging is to ask again. And that of course is the stinkingest TR 2 there is. "Do you have a present time problem?" "I had a fight with my wife last night." "What about?"

Now, if you get one of those things going you're going to spend the rest of the session, as an auditor did today, cleaning up the PTP. Now, I don't claim that auditor particularly didn't throw the TR 2 in. But certainly there must have been something going on there that didn't have too much to do with the price of oysters in Australia. Something Otherwise this would have come off. Now frankly the auditor ran, "What part of that problem could you be responsible for" worded like that, not having isolated the problem the pc had. Which of course gave the rest of the session, as an auditing action.

Now, in trying to handle a Q and A, trying not to Q and A, you're liable to pull all sorts of oddball things, like not get the answer to the auditing question. You're liable to use the Q and A, you see. you mustn't Q and A so therefore you don't get the answer to the auditing question. "Do you have a present time problem?" "I feel all right."

Now of course it's not a double question, because the comm lag is the length of time between the auditor's asking of the question and the pc's reply to that exact question. There are fewer fundamentals missing today than you might think and that . . .

"Do you have a present time problem?" "I feel fine" is just part of the comm lag The pc has now begun a comm lag. That isn't an answer to the auditing question. So therefore you have to ask the question again. So you say, "Well, I'll repe- " You can say, "Uh-huh" or

something and say, "I'll repeat the auditing question: Do you have a present time problem?" Well, that's not a Q-and-A. But it requires that the auditor hear what the pc said. So frankly TR 2 should include understand and acknowledge.

Now, more auditors go out of ARC with pcs by pretending to understand, I think, than any other single reason.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" and the pc says, *"Wah fi fooel."* And you say, "Thank you." And at that moment a great black miasma settles down over all like Pittsburgh smoke. You know? There it is. You've now got a missed withhold. See? The auditor now has a withhold. He didn't understand what the pc said.

Now if you're so diffident about answering up and talking to your pc you of course can do this often. But if you have – didn't understand what the pc said, then for God's sakes say so. Not, "You mumbled" see, but "I didn't get it." you always put the onus on the auditor. You'll find the pc, after he's been questioned five or six times, answering perhaps with some asperity. But oddly enough he doesn't have an ARC break. He only gets the ARC break when the missed withhold accumulates in the auditor. "Do you have a present time problem?" *"Slaf wof whoove."* "Oh, thank you!" For what, man? See, there's nothing there. You say, "I didn't get that."

A lot of you don't make old TR 10 function because you don't know what the pc is pointing at. "Point out something, thank you. Point out something, thank you." you know. The pc says, *"Wwhm, hmm." you* don't know what he's pointing at. So of course you have to salt it down with two-way comm. If you're running such a general process that can't be usually understood, you have to say, "What'd you point at?" He says, "The wall." Well, just because he says it somewhat acidly is no reason he's got an ARC break. It's when he doesn't talk that he has ARC breaks. A pc who's screaming by the way is less ARC broken than a pc who won't talk.

Now, therefore all rudiments questions, not just the middle rud, have to obtain an answer, have to obtain an answer to the question asked. And if the question is answered, the auditor simply understands and acknowledges it. And that is all that happens. It is only when it becomes manifestly, gargantuanly impossible to clean it with single questions, repeated over and over, that you finally resort to a rudiments process.

Now, if a pc gets the auditor's question and answers the auditor's question and the meter is cleaned on that exact question, you'll find out, if your TRs are any good at all, that the number of rudiments processes you need are zero. The rudiments are now that good, if you're really putting it through and checking it on the meter and cleaning it up.

All right. Now, what happens in using a rudiment? You say – I'm using by the way an old rudiment so they won't get in your road here – "Do you have a present time problem?"

See? And the pc said, "I have – yes, I have a headache" or something like that. you say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That still reads. Do you have a present time problem?" The pc isn't talking

"Oh, yes, I have another, I've got an appointment right after the – right after the session."

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? That is clean. Thank you very much."

Now, doesn't matter how many times you go through that evolution, go through it forty times if you have to. It is more effective than a process.

What was peculiar about this auditing mistake today – just to not stress anything – was that frankly the one thing that will clean up on a repetitive request *is* a present time problem.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"I have a headache."

"Thank you. I will check it on the meter. Still reads. Do you have a present time problem?"

"Uh – see. *Ooooh-oo ah umm,* got an appointment right after the session."

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem? It still reads."

"Well I – uh – I'm sunburned. Uh – it's a little uncomfortable sitting in the chair."

"All right. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much. I will check it on the meter." See. "Do you have a present time problem? That still reads."

"Aaaa-hm."

"Well, do you have a present time problem?"

"Well, yes, I do. Actually I don't feel good being audited – uh – uh – uh – uh, here – it's so nice outside. Now the present time problem is being – ins – yeah, it's being inside when I should be outside."

"All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. I will check that on the meter. Do you *have* a present time problem? Thank you. That is clean."

There is an old process: Tell me a problem you have had or tell me a problem you have. you know. Pc's always different, always different, always different. It's practically running the same process. See?

So, each one of these things actually converts into a direct process. It's just like you're running a direct process so the rudiment in that wise is used as *the* process. So why do you need a process? See, that's the question. Why do you need a process? You've got one.

"Since the last session have you done anything you are withholding" Clank. "That reads. What was that? What was that you were thinking of? Yeah, that right there."

"Oh, well I – I – I kissed one of the fellow students last night. I – hmmm."

"All right, thank you. Good. Thank you very much. Since the last session have you done anything that you are withholding?" See? It's an auditing question, isn't it? So you're just checking the answer every time to find out if you should go on running the process, that's all you're doing. And if you look at an anti-Q-and-A activity of getting a rudiment in in this fashion it all of a sudden will make marvelous sense to you. you will be able to make it work. You won't be sitting there in a tremendous impatience to have this run out. All you want to do is have the pc answer it and have the meter not read then. See? That's the only thing. And every – actually every one of them is an auditing question. So you run the process till the meter doesn't read. On the needle of course. See there?

So there goes your – the – your session gets very smooth. You can understand that an old repetitive process would go something on the basis of, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you." See. Or whatever it is. And you know that sooner or later the guy is going to run out of steam. He's going to run out of answers. When he runs out of answers, you don't get no further reaction, that's the time you leave it.

So it's sort of-auditing something against the needle, not against the tone arm. If you look at it in that wise, why you will become very, very clever at getting your rudiments in.

Now, don't go asking a rudiment *after* a rudiment is clean. "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc says, "No." You say, "I'll check it on the meter, here." Now look, when you said do you have a present time problem, you got no read at all. What are you doing hanging around waiting for the pc to answer it? You answer for the pc. This doesn't leave an unanswered auditing question. I mean, that's another little trick you can do. you know you can sit back and repeat a phrase out of the pc's bank, you know. you can take a phrase and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and repeat it and it will eventually go null in the pc's mind. Did you know that?

You know the auditor can do that on his own responsibility. He can also answer for the pc to this degree. He finally says, "Do you have a present time problem? Oh, that's null. Thank you. That's clean. Ha, ha, good. All right." Pc hasn't said a word.

And he says, "Well, I don't have to worry about that."

It's not a trick, it's just a fact. why hang around waiting for the pc to dig one up? Let's take it while it's clean, man.

Now, this is – this is pure cruelty. "Do you have a present time problem?" No reaction at all on the meter, you see.

Pc says, "God, he's looking at me. It must be that I have a present time problem." So help me Pete he gets the problem of having to find a problem. Now, you ask it again and he's got a problem. So a double question goes about the meter as well as the pc. If you've asked the question and got it clear, get out of there, man. Don't ask it twice. The only time you ask it twice is when you get an equivocal read. Well, we don't have to use this high school word "equivocal" but I normally do. I couldn't tell. you know. Well, there's several ways that you can't tell, as a pc is coming on and being audited at sensitivity 16, you sometimes start your question with the needle on the dial and by the time you have gotten the question out of your mouth the needle is off the dial. And you sometimes have to run against the dodge of really throwing the needle with the tone arm down against the pin starting a long rudiments question and end it as the pc bounces back on the meter and shows that you have no read. Did you know you could do that? You have to be pretty sharp with a meter not to be wiggling it at the time the actual end of the question occurs. That requires very smart thumb action. But you sometimes have to do it, you get your needle so floppy. That's all in the tools of the trade, however. And there's nothing unusual about that.

But your needle's null, it's null. Don't leave anybody in suspense about it. You've watched me audit there. You ever see any pcs I've been auditing in these demonstrations complain about any of this? No. You've seen me do this in demonstrations.

"Do you have a present time problem?" "That's null. Thank you." We're out of there and away and gone into the next one, see. Now if it's equivocal, "Do you have a present time problem?" And at that moment it's off the pin and you say, "I didn't get that read. I'm going to have to ask it again" see. Jack it around. "Do you have a present time problem? All right. That's null." Merely looks to the pc as though you were being careful, which you are. But don't leave him in suspense. Sometimes on a goal or something like this you can get an equivocal read. you don't know whether it read after the "h" at the end of the sentence, see, " . . . to conquer Earth." Or whether it read at the "E" or something. You just weren't sharp enough at that moment to tell exactly where that thing read. See, the pc's got some bugs. Pc's doing a thinkthink about something else and there's an occasional tick-tick here and there occurring on the meter. Well, the tick might have occurred at that point and if it's important at all, you say, "Well it's an equivocal read." you know. And ask it again. Because that's the onus on you. you couldn't read the meter. You didn't read the meter, that's why you're asking again. And that's the only time when you check a clean read.

Don't – it – say, "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean. All right. Now I'm going to make sure. Do you have a present time problem? That's clean." Hell, you've weighted the rudiments now to a point where the pc will stagger under their burden. And the pc's case will stagger. Also, it seems kind of stupid. Can you read a meter or can't you? Is the meter reading or isn't it? See? You're questioning the meter, now. And that's a double question. This is as destructive to the use of rudiments as anything else.

So a rudiment is basically a process. Being a process it of course is run until it doesn't react on the needle. In view of the fact that we're not trying to run it flat on the case, we can only run it flat on the needle. The second it is flat we don't give the pc any chance to cognite or stretch or tell you that it's flat, we tell him it's flat and we get out of there.

That is not evaluative because the pc knew before you did.

He gets a feeling that it's all right.

Now, if you go reverse end to and call one clean that isn't clean, through some misguided expediency on your part, of course you've set up the session for an ARC break from Hell to Halifax.

You always call a meter right. Don't ever call a meter with expediency. If you have a meter that you can't call and you don't know, say so. And if you're going to leave something live without cleaning it, say so. *Be informative,* auditor, be informative. Otherwise your R-factor flies out the window. You have to be informative consistently and continuously. You have to tell the pc this is what is going on. Let's not have the pc sit there in the dark worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, worrying, see. you have to tell the pc what you're going to do and why you're doing it.

All right. The pc is going along the line and he's been – he says, "To catch catfish, to chase waterbucks, to kill tigers, uh – uh – to uh – to catch big catfish, *ummmm* – to catch big catfish – yah." What are you going to do? You going to sit there, wait for a holiday? This is something like painting a wall and leaving half of it unpainted, you know. It is the same thing. You're not going to sit there and let the pc go on and on and on, on auto in the first place. The way for calling for a goal or a list item is you call a stylized question. All right.

"What other goal have you had?" Something like that, see. "Tell me another goal you've had." And he gives you one and, "All right. You got another goal?" (it's a rather informal type of question) and he says, "Yes!" He says, "To catch catfish, to drown waterbuck, to shoot tigers, uh – to paint battleships, to go down chutes, to murder little children, ummm – uh . . ."

What are you going to do at that time? Are you going to sit there and wait? He's already given you about six answers beyond the answer you asked for – which is perfectly all right. Don't say to the pc, "No, now you've given me one. You've given me one. Now, just

wait for a moment till I ask the auditing question again, you see." Hell, you'll throw him out, if his interest is put on the auditor and that sort of thing. So he gave you six. All right. And you have a hell of a time writing them down. Well, calmly catch up with writing them and the time you are halfway through the last one that you're writing, why give him the question again. See?

Now, he says, *"Ahhuh."*

You say, "Yes, yes. Any other goal you've had."

"Aaahh-nm."

You say, "All right. Now we're going to do a few middle rudiments if that's all right with you." He looks at you kind of dumbly and says, "Why?"

"Well we just don't seem to be listing as easily as we can, maybe something has gone out here." Tell him anything you want to, see? "And we're just going to do them just to be sure. Just to be sure." And you rattle off your middle rudiments question.

"In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of" is the question, but of course it runs like this in actual use:

"In this session is there anything you have suppressed? Yes. What was that?"

"Oh . . ."

"Yeah, suppressed. That. That there."

"Oh, well that. I've just been trying not to tell you that uh – I find it very, very, very hard to – to confide in you these – these – these various goals about murdering children. I – I – actually had – had – had a couple more of them and I didn't tell you."

You say, "Thank you. All right, I will check that. In this session is there anything you have suppressed? That's clean."

Now we go: "In this session is there anything you have invalidated? Failed to reveal? Yes. What's that? Failed to reveal. What is it?"

"Oh! It's just, these two goals about the – killing children. Ha-ha, yeah."

Say, "Good. Thank you very much. I'll check that. In this session is there anything that you have failed to reveal? That's clean. All right. In this session is there anything you have been careful of? Thank you. That is clean. All right. Tell me another goal you've had."

See? That's the way you handle them. You'll find out you'll win every time if you handle them that particular way. In other words you cut in at it as though you're going to take care of it in the shortest possible fashion. And if you've got one clean you sure don't repeat it. See? You leave that one alone.

Now you go on and list goals again and oddly enough you will find that your person is perfectly willing now to list goals. Perfectly willing to list goals. Every time the listing slows down, *bloombo!*

Well, about every fifth session they've gotten enough residual out-of-session nonsense kicked around that had been – invalidating enough and monkeying around enough that it's worth a Prepcheck. But supposing the pc came into session – we're going to do it every fifth session anyhow – and supposing the pc came into session and you got the beginning rudiments in all right and then you said, "All right, now on this goal list...."

"Well, I don't know that I want to list any more today. Can't we do something else because I just *asssssar-bisar-hmm-berar-rrarrwow-rrorrowow."*

Well, you got your beginning rudiments in so it can't be them. See? It must be the middle rudiments. So just go ahead and prepcheck your Zeros. Because now you're going to catch it. All the invalidations of listing as a subject, invalidation of goals as a subject, you see. That would call for a Prepcheck rather than do something else weird. You'll pick it up. They've been invalidating listing That's the commonest source of stopping listing is they invalidate listing.

"I don't see how this is getting me any place." You know. Now the reasons they suppress and fail to reveal and all that sort of thing may be something odd but you will catch it in these four questions.

Now, you use this "suggest" and "failed to suggest" or anything of that character on a pc who is sort of on the verge of telling you what to do all the time. It's a critical pc that this is the most useful on because the pc is suppressing suggestions about your auditing continuously. So you can just run that into the lineup and certainly run it into the Prepcheck. I don't care whether you ask it as a middle rudiment or not. I wouldn't, but I would certainly fix it up as a Prepcheck. When Prepcheck time came around I would ask them if there was anything they had failed to suggest and we would get the *all* – all of the latent withholds on the subject of our auditing off and all kinds of things. You see. But the time to take that up is on a Prepcheck.

So in your middle ruds you're only interested in the immediate session. You're interested in the immediate session that you're running That is because we're going to prepcheck them and that's going to take in all the – all the middle areas on the whole subject. The accumulations. And the reason you're going to run the middle ruds is to keep their needle relatively clean, so it is readable – that's your best reason – keep them in-session and part of keeping the needle readable is of course making sure the needle is reading on the goal, not an invalidation of the goal or something of that sort.

So that's middle rudiments in their use on goals.

Now, they're used exactly the same way in – when you are listing a goal, the four lists of 3GA used in a goals list. Used exactly the same way except there's now a better pattern. Every time you stop listing on a line you get the middle rudiments in. And then go to your next line. So the middle rudiments all live between lines and they're just used as a bridge. You do line one, middle rudiments, line two, middle rudiments, line three, middle rudiments, line four, middle rudiments. See? Line one. Round and round and round but always the middle rudiments. Because he may have just run out of steam and that line might have been exhausted or he might have stopped listing on that thing because the middle rudiments were out.

So we don't question this or fool with it. It's too easy to get them back in again. So we just take it more or less that we better smooth it up and go on to the next line. And he'll accept this generally; after you've done it a few times he just accepts it as a matter of course and that's very easy and he never pays more – any more attention to it. It's not heavily weighted, in other words.

All right. Now in Prepchecking, in Prepchecking – now there's of course – prepchecking the middle rudiments is this – this thing I've been giving you here about goals and so on and mentioned in the first lecture this evening – but in Prepchecking you use middle rudiments. You use it after every What question is null. Whatever the What question is you use it after it is null. You've run the chain and come back and checked the What question and now you found it null. So, you do the middle ruds. "In this session have you . . . ?" or "Is there anything you have . . . ?" And get your middle rudiments in and then check the What question again. *Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh-heh.*

Now, you'll notice that this is being put in as a broader look at failed – on a – on a missed withhold. You see, before you were supposed to ask consistently for missed withholds. Well, this is just a fancier, broader way of asking for a missed withhold. So you don't also ask for missed withholds. You just do your middle ruds. And then you go back and check the What question again. If your pc is sort of running down on havingness, is consistently down, there'd be two ways you could go about it. you could get your middle ruds in, check the What question again, find it null, then do some Havingness and go on to your next question, or if this needle was so agitated that you couldn't read well and were suspicious of your reads on the What question you would do your middle ruds and run the Havingness and then check that What question. See?

I don't care which way it is because Havingness can be put in any place. It's not necessarily a tailor-made adjunct to the middle ruds but it is something that can be run with the middle rudiments if a pc's havingness tends to go out easily.

So there is always a middle rud between What questions. Always. And then you're not going to miss any withholds on this pc and you're not going to miss straightening out chains and so forth.

Now, what if you did the middle ruds, found them wildly out, straightened that up and went back and checked the What question and found it now as live as a pistol? You'd go on prepchecking it. And when you've reached a new fundamental on it and checked the What question as null you would again do the middle ruds and go through the same action again. You'd always complete the cycle in that same way.

Now supposing you were running down a pat list, a Form Three, 1, 2, 3, 4 and you were asking, "Have you ever stolen anything Have you ever raped anybody?" You're going on down the line, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark and you had about five or six of them and with one answer they have been cleaned up. I would also do the middle ruds. So that you would say any consecutive number of five or six What questions – I – five or six Zero Questions gone over and cleaned up with just one or less answers, do your middle ruds. Get them in. Because he may be suppressing something. And you, all of a sudden, find that the third one was *not* flat, it was simply gorgeously suppressed and you have to go back and clean that one up again and of course you'd follow through and ask the next one and do your middle ruds again. Same way.

If your middle ruds are found to be out you go back and do the thing you were doing except in listing of course and in that case you just go on to the next list. That's doing what you were doing anyhow.

All right. The use of middle rudiments can be extended. You can extend the use of middle rudiments to a specific subject, object or activity. This pc – we're checking out a goal, so we say, "Has the goal to catch catfish been suppressed? Invalidated? Is there anything about the goal to catch catfish that you have failed to reveal? Or been careful of? Thank you."

Now, there you can check – you can check, just bang, on the subject of a single goal, do you see and you can make sure that that's the goal that's reading, not an invalidation or something like that.

Now, there's another way to use a middle rudiment and that's just whatever you're doing Put it in there at – as the headline of the middle rudiment. But if you get this thing too broad you're going to go into a prepcheck activity before you get out of it. So there is a limited area between how far you could extend the middle rudiment and before it has to be prepchecked and that's not very far. you can ask almost anything "Auditor" is out. This would be a very unusual use of the middle rudiment. "Auditor" is out in some fashion, so we adapt the word "auditor" to the middle rudiments, see.

"In this session have I...." You see? "Is there – is there – in this session is there anything about me you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?" See? That is an odd use.

Now I'm not telling you to do this. I'm not advising you and I don't expect you ever will, but I'm just showing you as how far this could actually go. you could probably put in every other rudiment with the middle ruds. I'm just trying to give you a flexibility of thinkingness about the thing. Person says he has a present time problem, you ask him the second time he has a present time problem, he tells you the same present time problem. It's still reacting, so you say, "Well, is there anything about this problem, *blah, blah, blah"* – you announce the problem you see – "Is there anything about this problem *blah, blah, blah,* that you have suppressed?"

"Yes, what's that?" You know. And invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of, you know. Get those things cleaned up, each one in its time. Come back and you could ask about the problem, you'd probably find it null. I do not advise that use of the middle rud. That would be very freaky and that'd be very tricky auditing But, I'm just showing you that anything can be put in relating to this with the middle rud following it.

But sometimes your wording has to be shifted around, because of the peculiar phraseology of "failed to reveal" and "been careful of." You have to break it down into two questions because you can't have them both asked in the same line because you've put some oddball thing and you every once in a while will find yourself tripping into the fact – oh-oh. You can't ask "failed to reveal now," so you're sort of in mid-flight with your voice at the proper intone in the sentence and ask it some other way so that you can get "failed to reveal" and "been careful of" on there, see, because your grammar would be all upset. You'll get used to doing that.

Now, this is a marvelous thing, the middle rudiments because if you feel called upon to suggest a goal to the pc – God forbid – it'll be only because you're so anxious to have the pc find a goal. See? You're urging the pc, you see. You're trying to – you're pressing. You're pushing. That's because the pc isn't moving in some fashion, you see. You're anxious; you're impatient about the thing and so on. It'll only be because the pc doesn't appear to be getting anyplace. And he isn't getting anyplace because the middle rudiments are out. See? So if you've got this answer and you finally realize that the middle ruds will start the pc up again, you get very happy about middle ruds and you get very expert in their use because you say, "Looky-here, every time the pc slows down or stops, we get the middle ruds in and hell start going again."

So ideas of evaluation, ideas of chopping up the pc, getting the pc – withholding from the pc that we'd like to knock his block off if he sits there just ten more minutes without saying anything, you see, well, that disappears, because you'll find out consistently that the

reason he has stopped giving you answers lies in those four categories, not because there are no more answers.

You see that's the easiest one for you to say. There are no more answers. "Ho-ho, no more answers obviously. Obviously there are no more items on the list, he's already given me twelve hundred." Well, that he's given you twelve hundred does not mean there are no more answers. If he can't give you any more it's because his middle rudiments are out. And if you get a good reality on that you'll say, "Wow!" You talk about – you talk about the proper – the proper coin to drop into the electric piano, it's the middle rudiments. Slugs don't work. Middle rudiments: *Cling! Da-da da-di-da da-di-da* right away. It's marvelous.

I held off for a long time putting middle rudiments in because they were insufficiently formed. I wasn't sure that we had all these. But now I've been using these things, been working out fine. Now you wonder why we add on to the end of middle rudiments half-truths, untruths and meter and maybe command or question. Well actually, in middle rudiments you ordinarily wouldn't have to. you ordinarily wouldn't have to. And I would say offhand if your pc has gone so far adrift that he's telling you half-truths and is hanging up the meter madly and has gone on in some different direction and offbeat and oddball, I'd say the pc was in the kind of condition where he should be short-sessioned anyhow, so go on and get your middle ruds in and then end your session with the end rudiments. Start your session, give the pc a break, you'll have already gotten this thing straightened out, get a new crack at the beginning rudiments and carry on. See?

That's smarter than to use these things. But of course you have to – you have to use some of those end rudiments – and you can use as many as you please when doing a Prepcheck – you can. . . It all depends on your pc. You could weight this thing too heavily by asking everybody, "In listing have you damaged anyone?" – if you ask everybody, see, this. But you would know this pc – this is where you have to be a little clever, you know, you're in your Prepcheck, you know this pc and he's been saying, "Joe: *Groowrr." You* know? "Auditors: *Rowrrrrr!* Instructors: *Hrroarrrr."*   I think the next time you prepchecked him it might be a very good idea, if you didn't catch it on the end ruds, it might be a very good idea to ask him, "In listing have you tried to damage anyone?" you see and it falls off the pin. That's why he stopped listing. Listing was getting to be an overt act. See? He was considering listing critical or something.

But that would very definitely depend on your preclear and be a rather freak method of using it.

I don't want to introduce the idea now that there are a great many middle rudiments that you would or would not use or don't know anything about or something of this sort. I don't want to introduce that idea at all. Actually middle rudiments are simply, just and only, "suppressed, invalidate, failed to reveal and been careful of." That's middle rudiments. Now if

you want to ask a pc something else, why, that's fine. And you'll find in the ordinary run-of-the-mill auditing the less something elses you ask the pc, the happier you're going to be. But I can't say that a pc – well, a pc had a – had a cough and didn't consider it suppression and the auditor had to include in the middle rudiments, "In this session, have you tried not to cough?" to get the meter reading again. See, I mean – so all right. So all right. You notice something like that's going on, if you think you need it go ahead and do it. But the less dress-parade patness you do, the better off you are in these middle ruds, because those four will take care of almost anything

So he was trying to damage somebody in listing, the probability is that you're going to get it as you do the end rudiments, you see.

So there are a lot of – a lot of angles to this.

Those are your middle rudiments.

The – the best method of using them is simply a very straightforward method of using them and they make an excellent bridge from one type of activity to another similar activity or to a different activity. There are many ways to use them.

Now, a pc who has a rather dirty needle and who has to have medium – middle rudiments done three-minutes' worth for every minute of auditing:

There's something wrong with the middle ruds Prepcheck. See? Prepchecking the middle ruds is what's indicated there, you'll save time by doing so. And supposing prepchecking the middle ruds didn't do it, well then I'd say just general Prepcheck and the CCHs should have been done much more thoroughly. You understand you can often find a goal on a pc and so forth, in spite of the hedgehog character of the needle, but it's sometimes almost impossible and it can get so weird and so impossible and so forth that you have no other choice than do something else.

Actually getting a goal on a pc with a rather clean needle is a joy.

So, I have been specializing lately in fish and fumble. And I could be expected, if I was starting to have trouble that had developed since the beginning of the session – that is to say, you know or was evident in the beginning of the session, with a dirtied-up needle and I didn't hit it on the beginning rudiments and the needle was still dirtied up, I would very – be very likely to start my session with a fish and fumble. No matter what else I was doing. Because I found out it only takes me from three to nine minutes to clean up a needle. I'm not saying I'm so good and you're so bad. you 11 learn how. you should expect to clean up a dirty needle in three to nine minutes. Most of the time.

Now we're talking about the needle that goes *bzzzzt,* tick, tick, *bzzzzt,* tick. "Have you eaten any . . ." *Bzzzt. "...* cucum . . ." *Bzzzzt,* tick, tick, ". . . lately?" Clang. You're saying,

"What am I going to do? Sit here the rest of this session, watch this thing go *bzzzzt?"* and so forth. Let's find out what the hell it is. So before I do anything else, why, I'd do a little fish and fumble and do it rather rapidly and get out of there. I 11 put the beginning rudiments in and then say, "All right. Now I want you to carefully consider your auditing." Nothing happened, see. "And now carefully consider your life." *Heh-heh.* "What's that? Yeah, that." Needle's going *bzzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzt. you* say, "What's that? What did you think of just then? What are you thinking of now?"

"Oh, well, I was thinking of that disk on the top of the E-Meter. It's red."

"All right. Good enough. All right. What have you done to HCO?"

Bzzzt, bzzzt, chp-chp, dzzzt.

What do you know! "All right. When's the first time you did that?" See? I got a What question: What have you done to HCO? I hit it lucky. Funny part of it is, I've been hitting these things 100 percent lucky. One pc said, "I can't stand the electricity in the cans." And I said, I said something about, "Have you ever shocked anybody?" As a Zero. Sounded more like that, you know. And *bzzzt! bzzzt! bzzzzt.* And it ran right back and we found a bunch of double-entendres on the subject of shock. Shock means several things apparently. We got this all out and the needle suddenly went limp. I've been – I've been sorry ever since because the needle travels around so easily it's almost impossible to check anything at sensitivity 16. I shouldn't have done that one.

But been having very good luck doing things like this. Do a little tiny fish and fumble. Not making any profession out of it. you just get the person to think or consider or look things over. Say, "Well, I'm going to sit here and watch – watch this needle and see what you are doing." That's good enough, you know. There's no stylized question then *bz bzzzt!* Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, tick. What the hell! You know. What's that? And by the way, if you're doing fish and fumble, just as a little side comment, trace only one pattern down at a time. Don't try to trace four. Trace the *bzzzt! You* know, and then it goes tick, tick, tick, tick. Don't pay any attention to those tick, tick, ticks. Then it goes *bzzzt!* "What did you think of just then?"

Then it's going clang, tick, clang, tick. Don't pay any attention to that. *Bzzzt!* "What did you just think of just then?"

"Oh! I've been thinking about my baby."

"Oh? Good. Done anything to your baby lately? Something happen to your baby lately? What about your baby?" *Bzzzt!* "All right. What are you thinking of?"

"I was thinking about she doesn't have any shoes."

"What about your baby's shoes?" *Bzzzt! bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzt, bzz-bzz.* Now fish and fumble takes a brighter auditor. I will tell you that. you have to say, "What have you denied your baby lately?" *Bzzzt! bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt, bzzzt.* Ah-ha. That's it, right there. "What have you denied your baby lately?" That's the test What question.

"Well, I did. I took her milk away from her last night."

"Good. Anything earlier than that?" *Heh-heh-heh-heh.* "Took all her clothes out and burned them up because they smell bad." You know, I mean horrible things been going on here. We get the chain pulled *up. Bzzzt.* All of a sudden you just got these ticks left. So you say, "All right, now. Just think things over now." Person's very relieved. They think life's wonderful. Tick, tick – those ticks. That one peculiar tick. you say, "What're you thinking over there? Then. Then. Then."

"Oh, I just think all the time – I just keep wondering why you're so inquisitive."

"Oh? There. Yeah, that. Is that what you keep thinking about?" So on.

"Well, is there some question I sh – I should have asked you? Something like that?"

"Well . . ." Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick.

"What's that? What's that?"

". . . well, have I been critical of you outside of session. *Heh-heh hehheh."*

"Well, good. Good. All right. Well, (Let me see – see if this works here.) What have you said about me outside of session?" Tick, tick, tick, tick. "That's very good. That's fine. That's it. All right."

And you say, "Now what – what about criticizing an auditor? Have you done something like that, have you lied about me or done something I don't know about? What about criticizing me?" Tick, tick, tick, tick. "Oh, that's right." We'll just knock off the session here, "What about criticizing me? Excellent." Tick, tick, tick, tick, tick. "Now can you think of an actual incident?" Because if you can't get an actual incident, you haven't got a What question, you've just got a test What, see.

"Oh, well, yes, I said something at dinner the other night, critical of you." "Yeah? All right. That's good." A specific incident. Let's work it. Let's get it back. Let's pull up the chain. Three, four minutes later this needle is clean as a whistle. It's just going....

You say – you say, "All right. We're going to do some listing now" whatever it is, "going to do some Prepchecking" I don't care what it is. But you can frankly clean up a needle just as it is. And you know it doesn't get dirty again easily. You really have to goof to get a needle dirty after you've cleaned it up like that. In fact I haven't seen these needles I've cleaned up go dirty again. I think there must have to be something going on with a bunch of missed withholds and all kinds of wild things being stirred up and so forth for the needle to be

made dirty again. I don't quite understand how the needle is made dirty by poor auditing but it's basically on the mechanic that the auditor's TR 2 is so bad that when the pc says something it's automatically a missed withhold. Do you see how that could be? You don't see how that is?

Pc said, "I shot a dog" and the auditor said, *"Mowwwm."* And you get to the end of the session, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" *Clank!* "What's that?" "Oh, about shooting dogs."

You're bewildered. You say, "But I acknowledged it, you know." you say. He didn't hear you. So it's a missed withhold. It's an inadvertent withhold. See? He said it but nobody heard it. And I think then double questioning and oh, running pcs on the wrong things. You'd have to be busy to dirty up a needle but I've been having very good luck cleaning them up and I should mention at this time that little technique of fish and fumble.

Now, one of the virtues of fish and fumble, it could be overused, of course, I suppose, but I haven't seen much reason to use it on a pc more than a couple of times, two or three times on the same pc and it hasn't taken very long on that pc either. It's just a fast method of cleaning up the needle. The needle must be banging against something and every different pattern that the needle is reacting with is a different subject so you only follow one pattern at a time. Don't get clumsy and follow a – a double tick and a single tick and a stick and make the mistake of, "What was that? What was that? What was that?" Calling off the double tick, the single tick and a stick. No, man, because he's thought of three different things in a row. No, you've got to just abandon all the ticks and sticks. Take the most vital of them first, which is the double tick. If you can get that you're best off because it's always the missed withhold. There's something wrong with it. The double tick you would choose up. you can actually clean that thing off the needle without too much worry or upset or take much time about it. That's why I'm quite surprised that a pc's needle stayed dirty during Prepchecking It must be that they're going on a stylized basis of approach and it isn't the pc in front of them. See?

And you certainly are taking up the pc in front of you if you're picking up just that tick. The tick that goes, *"loollk, loollk."* *You* say, "That's the one. That's the one. I'm going to find out what he thinks about." You'll find out it's something very innocent in present time like this: "Well, the windows of this room are always big. you know, every time I think of the windows or look at the windows or something like that I get this."

Well, did it clean up? That's the test.

And it didn't clean up, all right, so you've got to do something more about the thing And then you find out that it's a – he was a professional window breaker when he was a little boy, he used to haul off and break windows in all directions and you just pick this up and get the disentanglement off the thing and you won't get that tick any more.

Cleaning up a needle appears to me, at least in my recent activities in auditing, as a relatively easy action if approached with a fish and fumble, without any more intention than just to clean up the needle. And you will make one slick and floppy in practically no time. I'm beginning to believe that there's no excuse for a dirty needle now. It's getting that bad. Because they're very hard to read, dirty needles are. And you certainly can't do Goals Assessment with a needle that's dirty. Drive you mad. you don't know whether it's reading on the goal you are reading or what the pc is at that moment noticing *or – or –* if the rudiments have gone out *or – or – or . . .*

Well, you see it's a dead giveaway. You've missed this one. If you haven't cleaned up a needle and you're doing a Goals Assessment, why, you haven't any clue as to whether the middle ruds are out, because you only started going tick and flop and so forth and *bap-bap,* when the middle ruds are out.

So you know, you just stop right then, put them in. Well, if your needle was just sporadically *always* operating in this particular fashion, why, how would you know?

So I recommend fish and fumble to you. I recommend you setting up a little project for yourself just simply cleaning up somebody's needle. Not to do anything for the case but just to clean the needle and clean one pattern off at a time and see how good you are. It requires a faster auditor. He's got to be faster on his feet than routine Prepchecking because he has to do a lot of guessing. Because he's got to guess the overt ordinarily. It goes tick. And finally the pc says, "Well, I'm thinking of hollyhocks." Where does that leave you, man? It leaves you up the garden walk someplace.

You can always say, "Well, what about hollyhocks?" or something, you know. And he'll say, "Well, hollyhocks, they're beautiful." Man, you're still up the garden walk and it's still ticking. Hollyhocks are . . . Actually it's foxglove that he's thinking of and it contains digitalis and he poisoned his grandmother but otherwise.... You've got to short-circuit that line of thought. Well, the pc will help you out if you'll help him out. But it's something like, "Well, the current going through these cans worries me." See? "Did you ever shock anybody?"

Well, that's a one-two. Of course the pc must have an overt with electricity if the pc minds electricity now. That's the kind of think pattern that you have to develop. See? And you do that think pattern and you usually come out with, what the hell has he ever done with hollyhocks? You know? Must be an overt that connects with hollyhocks. It's either to or with. See?

Then you can stir it around a little bit and all of a sudden it will fall out.

But that's fish and fumble and it's a mile – it's a marvelous way of cleaning up needles and I don't know any faster way than to shape it all up, polish it all off, dust it all off beautifully and carry on with what you're doing. I don't think you'd have to do it very often.

And if you're doing Prepchecking on a pc you of course have the horizon wide open. This is the time to clean up the pc's needle.

But it's a rather easy thing to do and I should think you'd learn how to do it. And I don't know how well it will work in your hands or not work in your hands. It's not as well worked out of course as Prepchecking, to which it is a crude barbaric cousin. It is done exactly the same way as Prepchecking plus infinite intuition on the part of the auditor. You furnish the intuition. I've already furnished the stylized line of Prepchecking, it will do a lot of things all by itself. It takes – it's not that this supplants Prepchecking, this is to clean up a needle so you can Prepcheck.

See? It's pretty good. So try it. Try it. Next time you see this haunting tick that always goes off, get curious about it. What is that tick? It is something It's related to present time. It will run back on a direct chain. It will clean up in from three to nine minutes if you're smart and fast on your feet. So I recommend it to your doing it.

All right. Well, that's middle ruds and the way they're used and that's actually how you can clean up a needle thrown into the bargain, so if you master that, why you're all set.

Thank you very much.