

# REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS AND REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING, PART II

A lecture given on  
10 July 1962

Okay, and this is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. What did you say the date was?

*Audience: The 10th.*

The 10th?

*Male voice: Yeah.*

How did it get to be the 10th? Terrible.

All right, we're still covering the subject of repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking. And we're now going to go ahead and extend this into Repetitive Prepchecking.

Repetitive process is simply a process that is run over and over with the same question of the pc. The pc answers the thing and the auditor gives him an acknowledgment, gives him TR 4 on his origins and it is run until it is flat.

And when we say repetitive these days and apply it to rudiments and applying it to Prepchecking, we are talking about a very precise flatness. There are no more – there – in this use of it, you do not say – oh, this is really corny, I mean, to add this – “I will ask you this question two more times and then end this process.” Now, you don't ever say that, see. The procedure is very precise.

There's two ways of handling these things: one is repetitive, the other is fast. See, you can include these as technical terms: repetitive rudiments, fast rudiments.

Now, there are no, and you would never run any, beginning rudiments as a fast check. Beginning rudiments would always be repetitive.

Early on when you are doing basic types of sessioning, particularly in training, you do your middle rudiments repetitive and your end rudiments repetitive. At that moment your end rudiments become single questions, each one, and it takes forever to get them in.

And that is not how they are written in Model Session. It is almost identical, except that you take the packaged question and subdivide it so that your un – your half-truth, you ask a whole question repetitively about a half-truth, and then a whole question is only about an untruth and so forth. You break that down so it becomes a *fabulous* number of rudiments.

But that's all right. That's all good training and that's all fine and it's kind of a Prepcheck in disguise. But that would simply be a training mechanism.

It would be more usual to run your middle rudiments repetitive than end rudiments. End rudiments thereafter, would normally be handled as fast rudiments. And normally mid rudiments, particularly as a case advanced, would be handled as fast rudiments.

The random rudiment – asking for a missed withhold randomly, any part of a session – would usually be handled as a fast rudiment. In the first place the pc hasn't – you haven't missed that many withholds on the pc during that session. The pc starts to look a little bit tense so you ask him the random thing and you ask him the random rudiment. You're just asking for a missed withhold, that's all. And check it on the meter, guide his attention into it and he tells you this and he's fairly cheerful.

Sometimes you have to wrastle around for this one. I mean, be accustomed to getting that question answered. Never ask for a withhold unless you get the question answered: That's a maxim. And never ask for a missed withhold unless you are fully prepared to sit there all night to get it answered. So a little bit of random rudiment goes a very long way.

Now, the repetitive aspect is very precise in its delivery. At one time we were sec checking this way. Everybody could do it very easily. And we found that it was very well handled normally. And it was known as the “Impasse system,” – its earliest action, sometime around the first of the year. And it was quite successful. And I got Prepchecking – developed Prepchecking after that, asking for chains, and developed the withhold system and so on.

And if you are very expert and your pc is well, well in-session and you dig chains and basics and a lot of other “if's,” prepchecking by the withhold system is undoubtedly very fast and it's very good and very able, and percentagewise it is unteachable. There are not too many auditors can use it successfully. They get all fouled up. Their feet get all tangled up in the E-Meter and it gets pretty grim.

Quite in addition to this, used as itself on an ARC breaky or poorly reading pc on the meter, is not as successful as the Repetitive Prepcheck.

In other words if you are very good and your TR 1 is excellent and your pc is well in-session, prepchecking with the withhold system can be pretty marvelous, pretty rapid, and you can do some things with it which look absolutely miraculous. But in the general course of human events, your pc is happier; you will get more done – the average auditor will get more done with Repetitive Prepchecking than he will get done with Prepchecking with the withhold

system. So, Repetitive Prepchecking becomes very valuable. The pc goes better into session with Repetitive Prepchecking than they do on Prepchecking with the withhold system.

We are not doing, and I do not advocate your doing or learning, Prepchecking by the withhold system. I don't advocate that now. If you were fortunate enough to have learned it, and to have learned how to do it, you will occasionally find yourself facing some pc that you are trying to straighten out – straighten out a needle on, or something of this sort, and you take Repetitive Prepchecking combined with a fish and fumble, or either one of them, and you can chase that needle down and clean it up, scat. And it's a good skill. If you haven't learned it, don't bother. Okay?

The Repetitive Prepcheck follows exactly the same pattern as a repetitive rudiment. And this is a wild virtue because the individual is then not having to learn two skills; he only has to learn one skill to perform two functions. They are both identical. There is nothing – no difference at all between the way these two things are used, except of course, the repetitive rudiment stems from the rudiment question of the session as given in Model Session and no other way, except of course, as you might have to modify it for a very motivatorish case or as you have to modify it, perhaps for a child – something of that sort.

You don't use more rudiments than you'll find in the modified Model Session. Don't use more rudiments than that. If you find yourself having to run more rudiments than that you still have the solution. The ARC breaky pc, of course, comes to pieces on O/W. And see, you've still got a process sitting there.

The process O/W – general O/W, is added, by the way, to Prepchecking, Model Session, and can go prior to any Prepcheck, Havingness or Routine 3 session. It isn't not – doesn't matter what type of session you are in – the rule is the same.

We've never before had a specific allowance for one fact: that occasionally a pc comes to a session – not comes into session – but comes *to* a session so misemotional, so ARC broke, so wrapped up in a PTP of great magnitude that they hardly even hear you say, “Start of session.” They are just involved. And this new Model Session allows for you to put in general O/W ahead of any other rudiment, because the pc can't pay any attention at all to the rest of it and you are just going to get soup and mush. you – just going to find yourself terribly messed up, because the pc's attention is so fixated that any change of the pc's attention on exactly what the pc's attention is on is going to lend to ARC breaks, apathy and upset on the part of the pc and is actually a cruelty.

The other one is a seriously ill pc or a pc who feels too ill to be audited. Now, those two pcs we have never specifically taken care of. They are unusual circumstances, but the general O/W at the beginning of session – just after you say, “Start of session,” is “What have you done? What have you withheld?” Or the motivatorish one which will be out with the 12th

July bulletin, 62. The motivatorish question is “What have you done to another? What have you withheld from another?” You have to get around this tendency, “What have you done?” “Well, I’ve punished myself terribly by sitting down in this auditing session and having to look at you.” you see? I mean, the pc will rapidly plow himself in on this.

That, right there at the start of a session, is *not* run against the meter. It’s *not* run against the tone arm. you should understand that it isn’t run against the *meter*; it’s run against the *pc*.

Now, when it first came out, that was when I first released it, I showed you how you could run it against the meter. But I found out on a little more experimentation that it really wasn’t necessary to run it against the meter. You are going to find out if you missed a withhold on the pc in the next two questions anyhow. See? So you needn’t even bother to check it if you don’t want to, you just, “What have you done?” you see, “What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld?” Oh, his tone arm is moving madly, you know. Well, maybe you’ve got some kind of a situation where you’ve never seen the pc’s tone arm move before, *ho-ho*. You know? Great. It’s true, too!

Some pcs with a superautomatic bank – you know these pcs are rare, but when you meet them, you’ve had it. The superautomatic bank: Did you ever hear about this? Well, it is just like somebody shuffling through a Niagara Falls of lantern slides – if you can just imagine it. They are all over the time track. Everything is grouped, everything is in motion, everything is automatic. You say, “Did you ever drink any coffee?” And they get rapidly five hundred pictures of drinking coffee. See? You say, “What did you say to the fellow?” And just on the mention of “fellow,” you get *brrrrrrrrr* of “fellows.” See?

It’s almost impossible to hold this pc on the time track anyplace. The pc is not very frequent. But I have seen a pc with an automatic bank fail to respond to any processing known to man or beast because you couldn’t control him enough in session – except O/W. Now, I’ve seen them – I’ve seen them run on anything else – no tone arm action, no answers, can’t spot it on the time track, always in trouble. The mere fact that you have asked them a question practically slaughters them – upsets them.

The pc generally starts in and says, “Well, I’ve been audited an awful lot of times, been audited in an HGC, and several, several auditors and I’ve had no less than twenty-nine Saint Hill graduates” – this is very peculiar you see, because there aren’t twenty-nine of them in Canada – “and all of this and so on, and never had any results, and all of this sort of thing, and it’s all very terrible and I wish I had some reality on the situation, because I always have this kidney backache or I always have this – this knife through my chest or I always have this bad foot. See? And it doesn’t do any good. There’s just no reason to audit me and I don’t ever get any results from auditing”

You hear something like that, ask the pc what happens when you ask a question or ask the pc what they are looking at, and you are liable to find you are auditing an automatic bank. Quite interesting because the case, of course, is in so many engrams so often they never have an opportunity to suffer from just one. yet they will respond to O/W. You can ask them “What have you done? What have you withheld?” or the motivatorish version of it, see. “What have you done to another? What have you withheld from another?” And actually get a wild lot of tone arm action.

So the only thing you would do with tone arm action – the only thing you would do – if you did see tone arm action while you were running O/W because the pc was sick at his stomach that day, and you hadn't seen that much tone arm action on this pc, and you were prepchecking this pc, *ho-hohoo*. Well good, just move it into the body of the session.

In other words, you run the thing until the pc feels much better and you can get in your first rudiment. Then get in your second rudiment, get in your third rudiment, go into the body of the session and resume O/W. Get the idea?

So if you were getting tone arm action on a pc with O/W and you hadn't seen it before, no matter what you were prepchecking on, why, that would be about the only time you ever paid much attention to the tone arm action of O/W. Don't you see? That would be a time to pay attention to the tone arm action of O/W.

But you don't run the tone arm action out of it because you can't. And you don't run the ticks out of it because you can't. Would you please look at the breadth of the question? Have you even said, “In this lifetime is there anything you've . . .?” No! Well, let's just jump at the whole track! “Now, have you done anything in two-hundred trillion years?” See? “Well, that's not flat yet.” So just forget about – forget about that, except where the pc's concerned.

Now, we used to have an ARC break-type process that we ran without the meter. Do you remember that? You know we ran it – we spotted the fact the pc didn't feel good with our eyes, you see – we didn't pay any attention to the meter. And we ran something on the pc till they felt better and they looked better to us, and then we went ahead with the session. Do you remember that? That was because the meter was unoperative on ARC breaks, so you could never quite take that chance.

Well, O/W comes under the same category. The pc says – sits down. He says, “Oh, I'm not going to be audited by you. I don't want to be audited by you because the last time you audited me you put both of your feet in my lap and kept kicking me throughout the whole session.” And the thing to do at that particular time is not say, “You're lying.” That is not the right thing for an auditor to say. It's just – not that there's anything wrong with it – it's just that it isn't done and Ron frowns on it. Now, the thing . . . And the pc will do worse than frown.

The thing – the thing to do at that particular time is realize that if you asked the pc, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” you are going to get a howling, screaming, “No, goddamn it and I never will.” Don't you see? We are now going to just stack up a whole bunch of new overts.

See? If we run, “What have you done to *me*? What have you withheld from *me*?” – we are running a terminal and maybe we're allergic on the pc's terminal track. See, maybe it – maybe we are the wrong terminal to be used as a terminal on the track, you see. Sometimes you know, you can audit the wrong terminal and beef up the pc's bank in about five commands. But as the auditor, if your attention isn't being yanked off onto the – I mean pc's attention isn't yanked off onto you all the time you could audit him hundreds of hours without messing him up, see. So you can say to this pc, “What have you done? What have you withheld?” That's all.

Now, if the pc seems to be withholding things and having a very hard time, you could ask the random rudiment in the middle of that particular process. It's an opportunity to use the random rudiment. It's called random . . . You see, mid ruds are used only in the body of the session. This random rudiment which pulls the missed withhold can be used during any rudiment or at the end of any rudiment or any time.

So you could run O/W and you'd find this pc would eventually settle down. The pc would find you as an auditor and so forth. The pc's finally sitting there, looks pretty well all right, looks better, sounds calmer, doesn't look even apathetic. We say, “Well, the pc looks vaguely like they could be audited.” So then we go into the first rudiment which is, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” And the pc says, “I guess so.” you see? That's a way of handling that situation.

Supposing the pc blew and you went and got the pc and tried to get the pc back into session. That's in the middle of the session isn't it? What are you going to do then? Oh, I don't know – I don't think if you let a pc blow you deserve a solution. Let's go on to something else.

No, you could use that. By introducing the random rudiment or getting the random rudiment flat you would also accomplish the same ends. And probably you couldn't use O/W on such a case without using the random rudiment also. Now, how would you do that? Well, you'd use the random rudiment every once in a while. Just check a rudiment while running O/W, in other words.

Now, the random rudiment is always checked against the meter, but O/W is the exception to the line. you don't run the O/W questions to a flat meter. You don't because you can't. And it is not safe to leave that without adding the random – without being very, very – I won't say that you always have to use the random rudiment by reason of running O/W, but I would say you would be safer if you did, rather than to wait till just the question after the

difficulty question. That might be one question too many, particularly if the pc was misemotional. At the beginning of session you are liable to spin the pc in again. Do you follow this?

So you can use the random rudiment anyplace. Let your conscience be your guide. Of course, the more rudiments you use, and the more you use middle rudiments unnecessarily, why, the more time you are going to waste in a session. That's your main penalty. And the less auditing the pc will feel he is getting.

Now, just how does this – how does a real rudiment sound? How does a real rudiment, repetitive, sound? What is it?

Well, the auditor ignores his meter and he says to the pc, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” – not watching the meter.

And the pc, let us say, says, “No.”

And you say, “What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?” And get it answered. And then you say to the pc – no meter see – “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

And the pc says, “No.”

And you say, “What difficulty aren't you willing to talk to me about?” And the pc answers it – you still don't have a meter, see.

“What – are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

And the pc says, “Yes.”

You say, “Good. I will check that on the meter.” And for the first time, bring the meter into it.

And then looking at the meter, you say, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” Now, if it was clear you say to the pc, “Do you agree that that is null?” or “Do you agree that that is clean?” And you – if you've got a null read – didn't react to your question – you leave it whether the pc says anything else or not or whether the “agree” has a fall on it or not, because the rule is: is once you get a clean read, you never ask it another time. you shut up right now.

If you've gotten a clean read on, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties,” the only way you can ask it again – and the only reason you would ask it again – is because you couldn't read the meter, and to keep in the reality factor you say so. Rather than use clear technical words, rather than to use words which might be slightly engramic or something, use something that is offbeat like, “That was an equivocal read.” The pc learns pretty soon that when you say “equivocal,” you probably mean that it wasn't quite

understandable to you and that you are going to say it again. That's the least the pc will get out of it and you haven't introduced the idea "the meter isn't reading," or "that was wrong," or "I couldn't tell," you know.

You old Dianeticists would know the folly of saying to a pc when he's half-anaten, "I couldn't tell that time." That is lovely, you know, you just get that piece of the time track in the session – just get lost right there, you see. So use something like, "that was an equivocal read," see. use something besides... That is not a – there is no standardization on that particular wording because you are going to run into trouble on any standardization. Because sometimes you weren't able to see it, or something of that sort. And your R-factor to be put in very solidly, simply should be that. you can even say, "It hit the pin. I'm sorry." And ask it again. Get the idea? It's what breaks through to the pc without interrupting the whole session and throwing it all in a cocked hat.

The truth of the matter is, the R-factor is, is you *missed it*. you couldn't tell. you missed what it said. And that's fairly easy to do.

Don't feel too upset because it has very, very little to do with the auditor. Given a trained auditor, all variations and numbers of equivocal reads depend on the pc he is auditing. Audit one pc and my gosh, every fifth – every fifth read on the meter is equivocal. See, you've got a dirty needle that's going tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick, tickety-tick tickety – and it never ceases. Boy, how you can read – how you can get a read through that is pretty fantastic, and yet you have to do it.

So, rather than make a liar out of yourself and . . . Never pretend on a meter read, because somewhere down deep the pc knows. See? Never pretend. Say what it is. Don't ever try to make yourself look good at the expense of the meter or something like that. Boy, that's dynamite!

So, about every so often on a pc, and sometimes on the same pc, you'll get patches of clean and patches of dirty and you'll just spend a couple of sessions when all the reads are – about every third or fourth read is equivocal. And then you're into the same trouble when the pc is coming up toward . . . You got the needle all loosened up with prepchecking gorgeously. And at sensitivity 16, if a breath of air passes through the room, why, the needle kicks over against one pin and comes back hard enough to hit the other pin and bounce. You see? And it does it so rapidly – and by the way, I probably should mention this: You ride the thing with your thumb. You ride the tone arm with your thumb. See, you should always be able to ride a tone arm with your thumb. See? You don't keep reaching over here adjusting it. You see me do it on the TV because the meter is left-handed, see, for me. See, I have to work the meter with my right hand which I ordinarily wouldn't do at all. But that's just so you can see it on TV – it has nothing with the proper way of setup. And took a little doing for me to get used to that too, when I first started to run that.



But, it's very funny, in order to do this, this is the way you'd – see – you'd have – it can't even be done. This is the equivalent position of the meter. See, really – you can't do it, so I have to adjust it with this finger. And it's very hard to do. So you don't – you never have seen how I do this, but when I'm auditing the pc, I put my thumb over here on the tone arm and throw – this is with too loose a needle, see – and I throw the thing as I start to say the sentence. If I've got too loose a needle, throw it so it will hit the pin and bounce back and idle as I say the last word. It takes nice timing, but you know you can actually train yourself to do this to such an extent that your needle is never under the impulse of being thrown at the time you are saying the last word.

If you are absolutely perfect, the needle will be sitting right straight up in the middle of the dial completely motionless and unaffected at just – at the instant you finish the last word, and you'll get any action that is on it. you never find yourself trying to read on a fast rise. I always distrust fast rises. Particularly, do you know a goal – an actually reading goal – doesn't have enough impulse to read down against a fast rise. Did you know that? It won't tick against the fast rise. It will show up as a tiny slow, if you can detect it at all.

You'll see some goals – they'll go tick, tick, and then by that time the pc is now suddenly getting a fast rise, you see, because they've got a very floaty needle or something like that, and you will have said the goal the third time as it gave that fast rise. And you won't get any read, and then it will drift over toward the middle again and you'll say the goal the next time and you will get the tick, the tick, and then the fast rise and it won't read. That's about the only time. An impulse against a speeding needle is always to be distrusted. Don't get too trusting about that.

That needle was flying around. Remember that needle has weight and the little tiny missed withhold that is going to shoot your session full of holes does not have enough energy to overcome all that inertia. So the needle that is really flying around on the dial – ah, you'd better call equivocal reads more often than you do, until you really get used to it, any time that needle was going too darn fast.

Oh, never go in for this: never wait for the needle to sit down before you start reading it. Don't make that mistake because you will find yourself spending one and two and three minutes dead silent as the auditor in the session, waiting for the needle to be still enough to ask the question. But of course, now that you have started to ask the question the pc is not yet in the condition where the pc is not disturbed by the sound of your voice, so of course the needle then starts moving and is off the dial by the time you have said the last word. Then you have to wait two or three minutes, don't you see, in order for the needle to quiet down. And that's not what we're – that isn't the way you ought to be doing it.

No, the way to – the way to handle one of these things is: If your sentence finishes against a fast flying needle that is flying very, very fast and so forth, and the pc's reads are

usually against that direction, see. It's up, and the pc's needle – there's a slight fall you've been getting lately. And you didn't detect a slow. See, that will read as a slow. Don't take a chance. Just say, “That was equivocal,” and say it again. See? Don't be in all that hurry. But when you announce that it is or infer that it is by saying, “Do you agree that that is clean?” – you be awful sure that it is clean, you understand?

Say “equivocal” all you want to, you understand, but be sure. Because this other factor enters in. This other horrible factor enters in: Miss a little tick here and a little tick there and the pc will cease to read on the meter at all. They've gotten away with it this time, and they've gotten away with it that time and the next thing you know they know the meter isn't functioning on them; and the meter will read less and less and less and less and all of a sudden the meter doesn't read for you as the pc – as the pc's auditor.

Interesting, isn't it? And then you have to trace way back in your auditing and you have to take the Zero Questions that you hoped were clear; and then you have to study down the line; and you really scrunch up your eyes; and you really watch the meter; and finally you'll see that one of those questions goes *pfffft*, you know. And you say, “Did it or didn't it?” And you say – ask it again and you watch it very closely. “No, it was a null that time.”

Oh, you've had it. See, you've compounded the felony. Of course, it will be unreadable the next time because the needle has already ceased to read, to all intents and purposes, because the pc – you just missed too much on the pc, don't you see? The needle isn't reading now to amount to anything, and you did get one little tiny twitch, and just that extra question to make sure will be enough to cause it to be another missed withhold. See?

So that one has – that track back has to be done with the greatest of care. And you get back to something and get it to twitch, and then call the twitch and get it answered. And you gradually will build the case back to a good, solid reading needle. That's how to build them back when they've faded out on you.

All right. So, with all that explanation – you check whatever question it was that you were asking the pc, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” You've gotten no reaction, so you say to the pc, “Do you agree that that is clean?”

And the pc says, “No. Yes. The sky is green. The moon is made of green cheese.”

From there on it's a TR 4 situation. You got it? That's just a TR 4 situation. You don't do anything else, in spite of the liabilities of missing withholds. Once you have declared something clean don't reverse your tracks, because this upsets the pc more than the tiny missed withholds. See?

You'll get all upset about this thing. See, I mean the pc – “Oh, what the hell? God almighty we got the thing clean. We had a present time problem and now here we've got another present time problem,” and so on, so you never check it twice. Once you have issued

the papal bull – once the proclamation is posted in the village square it is never pulled down, till next session, or the next time you run mid ruds or something. See? You've pronounced it.

Now, the pc says, “No, that was not clean. In actual fact there are several difficulties I'm perfectly unwilling to talk to you about and they have to do with cats, fishhooks and catfish and various things of that character.” You just TR 4 him, TR 4 him, TR 4 him. “Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thanks. Good. Well, all right.” And we get on with the next rudiment. You got it?

All right. So what's your exact action here? The exact action is without the meter, you say, “Question.” The pc answers it yes or no. you ask him for the more information if he hasn't given you the information. Ordinarily a pc will generally get so that he is making a session out of it. That's neither really bad or good in the rudiments. He won't give you the yes or no anymore because he finds out it won't do him any good, you'll just ask the additional question, so he answers the additional question at the time you ask him the rudiment. Quite common, let it go by. It's not perfect, but then neither are rudiments.

So the setup in this particular case is: You ask the pc the question and you – the pc answers it – has an answer for it, has an answer for it, has an answer for it, has an answer for it, has an answer for it. you always ask the same question. You never vary the question. You never ask another question. You can engage in two-way comm at any time with the pc of course. But you don't go and pester him; you don't Q-and-A on this; you don't question his answer – nothing like this. you take whatever he tells you. you even take what he tells you if he gave you a motivator when you asked him for an overt, you know, unless it flagrantly is not an answer to the auditing question. Flagrantly – it has to be pretty flagrantly not an answer to the auditing question. “Since the last time I audited you have you done anything that you are withholding” “I am mad at you.” Well, when you finally get it amplified, the pc has answered the question, only he's shorthanded it. So you didn't buy that? Cut your throat man, you are going to have an ARC break. Now he is going to be mad at you. you get the idea?

You say, “Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding” And the pc says, “Well, I've become unwilling to talk to you about my difficulties.” Of course an auditor at that time practically goes up the pole. He doesn't know whether to go back and ask the first rudiment question which is apparently clean. He doesn't know. But the truth of the matter is, an auditor is only puzzled when he feels he has to do something every time the pc says something That is the only auditor that ever really makes a mistake.

The guy who can sit there and fiddle while Rome burns, and fiddle cheerfully with all his TRs 0, 1, 2, 3 and 4 right on the front burner – that's the auditor. But the guy who has to go and call the fire department every few minutes – he's a lousy auditor. See?

So you say, “Since the last time I audited you have you done anything you are withholding?” “Yes, I've become unwilling to talk to you about my difficulties.” And my God, you just went over the rudiment and it was clean. Well, don't be so concerned; don't be so involved. The pc, in actual fact, is simply telling you that there was a point during the wee small hours of the morning, when he became unwilling to talk to you about his difficulties. And he decided this, see. And he doesn't also tell you that at breakfast he decided he could, see. And you ask him the first rudiments question, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” And he says, “yes.” And of course this is clean and perfectly factual. And then you ask him if he was withholding something. He tells you – if he amplified it, he'd say, “Well, in the wee small hours of the morning, yak-yak-yak-yak, why then – so on, I became unwilling to talk to you.”

Buy it, see. Don't be too critical of the pc's answer. The only time you want the pc to say more is when you honestly didn't understand what he said. When you can't make sense out of something, you are a fool to go on. why leave yourself in a mystery-sandwich session? The beginning and end of the session are totally clustered around the mystery in the middle of the pc's comment.

Why did the pc say, “Roses are piccadillied never.” What reminded him of what that caused him to say which? You put yourself on a missed withhold with regard to the pc. He doesn't know that you didn't know. See, always fill that missed withhold in, for this reason: The most serious button that you can disturb on a case, of course, is the knowingness button. You throw the pc into a situation that has to do with know or not-know, and of course you are going to get into an involved situation. So, that's the only time when you ask a pc to say something else or amplify it.

The funny part of it is, let's say that you've had a horrible time in the last few days and you've become totally knuckleheaded and half-deaf, so that *every* time the pc says something you have to tell the pc to speak up and you didn't understand it. you didn't hear it, you didn't understand it, you didn't dig it. Do you know that the only way to really mess up the session is to fail to do that – when you didn't understand it, not to say so. Then you can mess up a session. Next thing you know you find yourself furiously angry with the pc.

Why are you angry at the pc? Well, he's missed a hell of a lot of withholds on you, hasn't he? You didn't understand a thing he was saying. On his Havingness Process, you didn't know whether he was pointing at the ceiling or the rose garden. See?

Now, therefore with those amplifications and that sort of thing, you simply ask the rudiments question and you get the pc's answer *until* the pc has no further answer. It's the pc who decides he has no further answer – nobody else. He's got to say, “No, I ain't got no more answer.”

Now, as long as the pc was willing to sit there and answer the auditing question, you have no recourse to the meter. He just goes on and on and on. I don't care if it's the whole session. But remember, there must be answers to the auditing question.

You can't say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And he says, "I want a drink of water." That's not an answer to the auditing question.

You, in that particular case say, "I will re – well, thank you. you want a drink of water, all right, well, we'll take care of that in due course. Thank you very much. Now, I'll repeat the question – 'Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?'"

He said, "But I really do want a drink of water."

You say, "Good. Thank you." Just treat it as a brand-new origin. You aren't going to get in an argument. I don't care if the pc originates the word "peanuts" thirty times every half hour, see – once a minute. Always give him an ack on it. It'll wear out before I do. I don't get upset because he is repeating himself.

Now, you'll sometimes get a repetitive rudiment sung back at you. Now, we can talk about your, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" An auditor become quite upset by this. "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"No, I am not willing to talk to you about dogs – the trouble I have with dogs."

"All right. Thank you very much. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"No, I'm not willing to talk to you about my trouble with dogs."

"Thank you very much. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

"No, I am not willing to talk to you about my trouble with dogs."

Well, you can go on like that forever, can't you? The very funny part of it is, you can always go on like that much longer than the pc can.

I usually start increasing my acknowledgments – the only thing I ever do to meet a situation like that. Of course, there is a limit on increasing your acknowledgments because if you gave the pc a tone one-thousand, "Okay," you know, he'd disappear.

Sometimes I assume – I assume that I haven't understood it when I haven't. I'll make the pc tell me. See? I figure out, well, yeah, he – I haven't got it, you know. I just – and I won't have. It suddenly dawns on me that I'm not digging what the pc is saying See. He's talking about fire dogs. I get this little additional datum, you know. "I'm not sure that I dug you. I'm not sure that I understood what you were saying"

And he says, “Dogs, dogs. I'm not willing to talk to you about dogs. I have trouble with dogs. Every time I light a fire in the fireplace the dogs fall over.” “Oh,” you say, “Oh, oh yes.” Funny thing, his repetition will cease at that moment.

The onus of understanding is on the auditor, and also the onus of making it understandable is on the auditor. That's where your TR 4 goes to pieces. You get into more trouble with TR 4 because you confuse Qing and Aing in making something understandable. You could actually make a pc sit for a half an hour and explain this thing to you that you couldn't dig and you would have a better session than by, in any way, pretending that you understood it when you didn't.

This happened last year sometime. Somebody was running old 3D and the pc – the pc all of a sudden ran into a spacecraft and was talking about oogly-boogly rotor bug drives, you see, and how mescus these things were. And his auditor was a girl, and fashionably all these rocket jockeys that now have girl bodies, you know, aren't supposed to understand anything about this in this lifetime. They keep pretending this all the time till you finally get them back on the track. Anyway, the auditor sat there just so long in a big stupidity about the thing and finally said to the pc, “I don't know what you are talking about with this oogly-boogly-bug-rug ooger-drive, or whatever it is.”

And the pc who had been only moderately in-session, sat up, got very alert and explained a spaceship – this particular Mark 61 space vessel or something of this sort – in complete detail to his auditor with sufficient explanation so that the auditor actually did understand it! And the auditor came out of session saying, “And I would have bought one if I had had the money.” One of the most pleased pcs you'd ever want to meet.

Anyway, that isn't a Q and A. That is not a Q and A. But to keep it from being a Q and A you've got to preface such a thing with the actual fact that you didn't dig it.

You never say to the pc that he didn't express himself well or that he is daring to talk about something you care not what of. So don't put the onus on the pc. say to – say yourself the actual truth of the matter – you didn't dig it, see. “I didn't understand what you said. I don't grasp what you are talking about. Dogs, dogs. What – what kind of dog? I don't understand what you are talking about.” And the pc elucidates and goes off the machine at that point. Why? Because a complete comprehension takes place and with a comprehension you get an as-isness.

Your pc gets hung up all the time because you never give him the comprehension necessary to an as-isness. You can practically blow the bank up like it's full of atom bombs if you give him enough comprehension.

You can overdo this, but oddly enough I never have. I never really have been able to overdo this. I only been sorry in sessions when I haven't – when I haven't really understood what that was all about.

Now, we get down to that drill. We have a variation when we check it and it does read. We say, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” And finally the pc says, “Yes, I'm willing to talk to you about my difficulties.” And you say, “Oh, good. I will check that on the meter.” This is the first time you've paid any attention to the meter and by golly, you get a read. Well, you stay with the pc on that read because factually the pc won't know what it is. He'll go darn near bats if you just leave him completely unguided. So every time it goes with the same tick as you got the first time, you have to recognize that the tick you got is the tick that will clear it and not a different one.

So you say to him, “That. That. That one. What were you looking at right that minute?”

“*Oh-oh-oh-oh-oh*, well – *that's oh-who-oh* – that was last night, midnight – I'd forgotten all about that, but I suddenly woke up and said, 'I'll never say another word to that auditor about my sex life,' you know, and went back to sleep again.”

And you say, “Thank you.”

Well now, that didn't clear did it? So the whole cockeyed action has to be done again without a meter. Don't now stick on a meter. That is a serious mistake. Don't keep checking it and getting a read and clearing it and checking it and getting a read and clearing it. Why? Because that hidden one you just pulled – the pc actually is leveling with you – 99.4% 100 percent of the time he's pure. He's leveling with you. He's telling you all the answers he knows. And when you release one that he didn't know you are going to get a whole bunch of locks. So why stick with it? See, it's just good technical sense. Why stick with it, because now he's going to give you all the locks.

So you just put the meter aside and you say, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” And he answers it.

And, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” and he answers it.

And, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

And he says, “Yes.”

And you say, “Good. I will check that on the meter.” And you do so. And that time it reads.

So you say, “That. What were you looking at right – right then? Yeah, that. That. That.” You get that located, he gives it to you. you don't even bother to find out if that was it

or not. you go off the meter. “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

Finally, “Yes.”

“Good. Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Do you agree that that is clean?”

Now, whatever else happens after that point, you never do anything more about it. Do you understand? It's all TR 4 from there on. But you don't ask him two consecutive times against a read, see – ever.

Now, that's the exact procedure. Now, you go at it just like a one, two, three. Always do it just exactly that way. That is a repetitive rudiment. And you'll find out that has been worked out within an inch of its life and it just worked like a dream.

The few little difficulties you get into will only be gotten into early on in auditing the pc. The pc will very soon come uptone as far as you're concerned, to a point where they audit very well by this. They never tell you any lies. you very seldom – less and less do you find your end rudiments out and more and more do actual overts by the pc read.

Now, you do that every time just exactly that way. And you clean up your rudiments that way. That's a repetitive check.

Now, oddly enough, that is the *whole* drill also of Prepchecking. You do *exactly* the same thing. There is not one  *tiniest* variation in Prepchecking. You just treat every Prepcheck Zero as a rudiments question and depend on the automaticity of cycling to pick up your basic on the chain. It's going to take longer, but it's going to be more thorough, and your pc's going to stay cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily, cheerily in-session. The pc will be very happy with you – very cheerful.

You do this right – and with any given pc you never make a mistake on a meter read – and very soon you are going to have a pc going into session and being so cheerful and chatty and happy to be audited that you won't believe it.

And you start making little tiny mistakes or you pick up a pc on which little mistakes have been made and not play that pc back into a readable condition again, and your pc is going to be nattery and upset and miserable because you're all missed withholds, missed withholds, missed withholds – are all over the place.

There's a difference between night and day in the results you can get with exactly the same procedure. Do the procedure carelessly – horrible. Do the procedure very nicely, very neatly, very expertly, and the results are fabulous.



Prepcheck Zeros: Don't ever do anything extreme, extraordinary, unusual – nothing  
You've just got a Prepcheck Zero is: “Have you ever stolen anything?” And that's all there is  
to it. And you ask the pc if he's ever stolen anything and, “Have you ever stolen anything?  
You ever stolen anything You ever stolen anything? You ever stolen anything” – as long as  
he'll answer the question.

And you finally hear, “No, nothing else,” or “That's all.”

Then you say, “Thank you very much. I will check that on the meter.” Look very  
fixedly at the meter at sensitivity 16. Say, “Have you ever stolen anything” And it goes *clank*  
and you say, “That reads.” Well, don't think the pc is holding out on you. You've actually  
found one that he's buried himself down into and he hasn't got that one. See?

So, you've got now, “That. That. That. That. That. That.”

He says, “Oh, ho-ho-ho-ho-ha-ha-ha-ha. I forgot about that thing – Bank of England.”  
See?

And you say, “Thank you very much.” – Off the meter now – “Have you ever stolen  
anything? Have you ever stolen anything Have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever  
stolen anything Have you ever stolen anything”

And he finally says, “No, that's all.”

And you say, “Good. Thank you. I will check that on the meter. Have you ever stolen  
anything?” Clank! And just expect that cycle to go on and on and on, you see. But only clear  
it once and then go back off the meter again.

Finally, it's clean. Get out of there. Drive away from that while you are still alive. You  
ask, “Have you ever stolen anything,” after you've got a clean read on the meter and hell hath  
no ARC breaks like the ones you've just started to set up.

Because, you know why that ARC break is so rough? A thetan is closest to nothing  
You've set up a nothingness withhold. That's very upsetting to a thetan. You've given him a  
withholding of nothingness, and of course he can't spot the nothing. See? And of course he's  
closest to a nothing and he thinks he himself has been missed. And he goes buggy when you  
try to clean a read that is not there. He's – you already – he's already told you all, you see. And  
you say, “Have you ever stolen anything?” One more question, see. He doesn't know what's  
happened to him. He thinks you are asking for him. And of course, he can't spot the  
nothingness that he is now withholding. He is withholding just one word, “nothing,” see. you  
didn't buy “nothing,” so now “nothing” is unacknowledged. So therefore he is  
unacknowledged, so it upsets him far more than missing an actual read. see the mechanism?

Now, that is all you do. Believe me that is all you do. And anything more you do than  
that – beyond getting your question answered, beyond understanding what the pc said,

engaging in what little two-way comm passes by – anything you do beyond that, you get into trouble. And that applies to both rudiments and Prepchecking. The only difference now between a rudiment and a Prepcheck repetitive question is just that they are – one is in Model Session and the other is in forms or you've written up a flock of Zeros you want to knock out on the pc.

Now, Prepchecking comes into its own and the less – the least you goof around – the less you goof around in handling rudiments questions and trying to audit the whole case with rudiments, the happier you're going to be. And the smarter you are about Prepchecking and the more inventive you are about Prepchecking, the better off you are going to be.

An auditor should be able to take a plain form or an auditor should be able to write up a form based on the mechanics of auditing, based on the mechanics of the mind, based on his own intuition. So they are flat. All right, so they are flat. So what. So they didn't have any response to them at all. All right, good – he at least knows they didn't have any response to them. Or they might be hotter than a pistol.

No, you save your inventiveness and your intuition for the perspicuity of your Prepcheck Zeros. And you can be as inventive as you please. But once you've written down a Zero to ask the pc, then ask that Zero. Don't go varying it around. You don't vary it any. you just ask that Zero and get it cleaned with the repetitive rudiment form, you see. Same – same thing.

You suddenly woke up in the middle of the night and realized that this pc is craving – this constant constant craving – for ham sandwiches smothered in chocolate milk sodas and so forth, has a great deal to do with somebody who has been with that food fixation. Because you can't get anything on food and must be a person in some way or another. And lightning strikes and you realize that the pc must have had some member of their family who liked that sort of thing. You see?

So you just ask the pc this question, “Who do you know that likes strange foods?” You see? “Have you ever known anybody that likes strange foods?” You know? Well now, don't go getting goofy. If that's the question you dreamed up to ask the pc, that is the question you ask. you got it? And that is the question you flatten. No matter what you now go and find out, you've now made up material for a new Zero. See? Don't go wishy-washing around with the question you're asking until it is flat. When you've got that flat, now if you want to invent another question, why great – invent another question, you see. But don't halfway flatten something and then vary the question – not with this system, because this system is too powerful.

Now, what you should know about this system is it has a liability. Now, the liability is that it pulls the pc deeply into session. It builds up a fantastically high ARC between the

auditor and the pc. And your sudden goofs or perhaps a tendency to speak your mind on automatic three-quarters of the way through the session, or something like this. Whereas they never might have hurt pcs before – of course, you never had a pc in-session so they didn't bite. This time they'll bite. And you see the pc's ears fly off, man.

You say, “What the hell, what's so important about ARC breaks these days? By golly, I've done these things before and the pc's never ARC broken. Well, what's happening now? Good heavens.” Well, it's just the pc's in-session. The pc was never in-session before. So the auditor's command value over the pc is fantastic – very high. So the disparity of the ARC break – just fantastic!

Now, let's say the auditor is sitting there not giving a damn what happens to the pc and somehow or another the session is carrying – the Model Session and the system – is carrying the pc deeper into session and all of a sudden the auditor expresses his actual opinion of the pc. *Oh-ho-ho!* It's a betrayal that was never suffered between the Union and the South. The Civil War is going to result. Your meter just stops reading. Everything goes to hell.

Well now, this whole activity was invented for just one reason: is auditors were having trouble getting pcs to read on meters. You cannot improve this type of meter any further than this sensitivity or it will become unreadable. It just gets unreadable. It is adequate to find a goal. It is adequate to find this and that, but the pc has to be in-session. No electronic device is going to operate in the absence of a command value in TR 1 to activate the pc's bank.

Now, if the pc's bank is activated, any electronic instrument of high sensitivity is going to react. But in the absence of a high-level TR 1, in an absence of an in-sessionness on the part of the person being asked, you get no internal reactive bank reaction.

Well, that would be usual. People walk up and down the streets and they hear all sorts of things and people say all kinds of things to them socially and that sort of thing And they are not affected by these things particularly. They wouldn't read on a meter either.

And you meet an old friend and he says, “Well how're ya, you old horse?” you know. Your meter wouldn't operate, see. you don't have now an engram about horses. So the common social aspect is that commonly and socially a meter is inoperative.

A person has to have some tiny degree of in-sessionness before a meter operates at all. That would be the most sensitive meter in the world. It isn't more sensitive meters, it's the degree the bank reacts, see. So there's got to be some tiny amount of in-sessionness. That the meter reacts to the degree that it does is fabulous. Even a – even a Keeler meter – these eighteenthousand-dollar monstrosities that they make up around Chicago – those confounded things, they'll even react on people in the hands of a police detective.

You think about ARC and you really don't – aren't immediately led inextricably into a course of thought which arrives at a police detective. I think you'll agree these are not

associative thoughts. And even then you get some kind of operation on the meter, mostly because – at – but it's usually at that level of response that you find a detective, which is terror or something of this sort, you see. The guy is terrified. If he's really afraid of the detective you really get a reaction. You get how the thing operates? So it operates at that tone level. You would really get a pounding reaction if a fellow had just committed the crime and blood was all over the floor, you see, and the guy is trying to hide it, see. you get this terrific . . . And, of course, it even reads so that a detective can read it. And that's fantastic, you see.

I mean this guy is sitting there in the police station and shuffling guys through, and if he gets a single person to answer it somebody goes to jail. Look at the level of overt. What do you think that's going to do with this cop's ARC with the people he's asking, you see. Every win is an overt. Oh, my God. See, so we're not going to get very much action here.

So let's go a little bit further with this thing Let's say the fellow was just afraid of police and has engrams on the subject. You'd get the same reaction on the meter.

A lie detector does not detect lies. Therefore – and actually they are quite dangerous in the hands of justice. Very dangerous in the hands of justice because in the first place you are not going to . . . There are many fine men in police work and that sort of thing, but very often their work is undone by the terrific injustices of the fellows on the other side of them, don't you see? And cops are always swearing they could clean up all the crime in the city, you see, if the judge would only let them.

New York City – the way the bulls in New York City used to put it, they'll bring anybody in you want. Well, whether the magistrates will keep the fellows there or let them go because of influence is another thing.

But anyway, you get meters even operating at that level. But they would not operate at tiny levels of sensitivity in the presence of ARC. Your pc knows he's not – you're not – doesn't matter what overt he gets off, you are not going to turn him in, see. There is no liability connected with this thing so you're reading, actually, at a very high level of ARC. You are not reading in the same zone or area of the lie detector. And these impulses are very slight, man.

So you have to make up for ARC, what the situation lacks in terror and brutality. See, you are either going to – the pc is either scared to death of you and the meter reads because of high-degree terror, you see. Or you are either in good ARC with him, he wants to talk to you and therefore you have an influence on him and the meter reads. You get the idea? It's one thing or the other. So the meter – the better ARC you have with the pc, why, the better your meter reads.

Now, you start missing reads and you run into missed withhold phenomena. So, if you run into the missed withhold phenomena consistently and continually then it fades out and you cease to get the pc operating on the meter. Do you follow that?

All right. This repetitive system is so that you will get the pc *in-session* before you meter him. And just by the trick of, "He talks to you about his own case," gets him in-session so the meter reads. So you prepare a meter read before you read the meter. Then you prepare a meter read before you read the meter. So you prepare a meter read before the meter. You got the idea? And that's why repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking will work where nothing else does. Do you follow that? That's – and you will find that will hold up.

If you want to re – fix up a pc who has gotten so he won't read on the meter, you better backtrack against questions that have been left unflat on the pc at sometime or another. Develop those questions, get everything out – you know, get repetitive answers from the pc in this same system, get all that stuff off. Then ask him on the meter. Pull the hidden one. Get some more stuff off he wants to g Pull the hidden one. All of a sudden your meter is reading again beautifully.

So, if a pc's meter stopped reading while you were doing Goals Assessment you would assume that he'd been badly prepchecked, not that your mid rudiments were out. Oh, your mid rudiments, you see, can be put back in and they're a patch-up and you'd better use them. Yes. But, to totally not read any place – goal after goal after goal after goal – not for one tick to occur. It's never happened to me. And it means there is bad Prepchecking somewhere. Go back. you have to develop the guy back onto it. you also must have missed a few little rudiments reads, or something You've got to get the pc operating again. And don't just keep bulling on with the Goals Assessment; take him back, check over Prepchecking, figure it all out, get him straightened out, get him functioning again on the meter. Get him in-session with you as the auditor and now you will be able to continue on and get his goal. you see how it's done?

But that's how this whole thing is designed. That's how it will operate. And it will operate to the degree that you don't do something unusual at the middle of thing that breaks the ARC up before you find – before you've found the thing.

You build a confidence, you'll get the reads, everything will straighten out. Do you see how that system is designed?

Okay. Well, thank you very much. I kept you overtime. Thank you for being patient.