

LEVEL 2

HUBBARD CERTIFIED AUDITOR

Black/White Version (suitable for print) (BW, Black/White)

Compiled 23. June 2023

a) Table of Contents, in Checksheet order:

1.	70-06-15	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
2.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
3.	67-11-22	OUT TECH.....	11
4.	80-10-23	CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER LEVELS AND EXPANDED GRADES.....	13
5.	68-10-14	THE AUDITOR'S CODE.....	17
6.	54-11-26	THE CODE OF HONOUR.....	19
7.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED.....	21
8.	59-11-12	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING.....	29
9.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR.....	31
10.	73-11-21	THE CURE OF Q AND A MAN'S DEADLIEST DISEASE.....	33
11.	73-11-20	ANTI-Q AND A TR.....	37
12.	62-05-25	E-METER INSTANT READS.....	39
13.	62-07-21	INSTANT READS.....	43
14.	78-08-05	INSTANT READS.....	45
15.	74-03-18	SENSITIVITY ERRORS.....	47
16.	17-01-04	CORRECT SENSITIVITY SETTING.....	49
17.	61-06-12	THE RISING NEEDLE: SKIP IT!.....	53
18.	69-05-17	TRS AND DIRTY NEEDLES.....	55
19.	78-09-03	DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM.....	57
20.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	59
21.	73-11-20	F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM.....	65
22.	70-05-27	UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS.....	67
23.	71-02-28	METERING READING ITEMS.....	69
24.	01-08-01	CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADE PROCESSES.....	73
25.	78-08-11	RUDIMENTS DEFINITIONS AND PATTERN.....	79
26.	71-05-23	METERING.....	85
27.	15-04-02	FLYING RUDIMENTS.....	87
28.	64-08-24	SESSION MUST-NOTS.....	91
29.	74-02-17	MUTUAL OUT RUDS.....	95
30.	66-02-21	DEFINITION PROCESSES.....	97
31.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING.....	103
32.	60-05-30	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP.....	111
33.	60-01-28	THE KEY TO ALL CASES – RESPONSIBILITY.....	115
34.	59-12-31	BLOW-OFFS.....	119
35.	64-09-08	OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?.....	123
36.	62-01-16	NATURE OF WITHHOLDS.....	125
37.	62-02-20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?.....	151
38.	68-05-20	OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE.....	167
39.	62-04-03	THE OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE.....	171

40.	64-07-10	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	193
41.	64-07-12	MORE ON OWS	197
42.	62-02-08	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	199
43.	62-05-22	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	203
44.	62-11-01	THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD	221
45.	62-02-12	HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS	235
46.	62-02-22	WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL	239
47.	62-05-03	ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	241
48.	70-01-31	WITHHOLDS, OTHER PEOPLE'S.....	247
49.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	249
50.	64-07-02	O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED	253
51.	77-04-17	RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND OVERTS.....	277
52.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM.....	279
53.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION	285
54.	61-10-04	MORAL CODES: WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?	289
55.	61-10-05	SEC-CHECKING: TYPES OF WITHHOLDS	313
56.	61-11-02	HOW TO SECURITY CHECK.....	335
57.	61-10-19	SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED.....	359
58.	61-11-16	SEC CHECKING GENERALITIES WON'T DO.....	361
59.	65-03-29	ARC BREAKS.....	363
60.	62-01-11	SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY.....	367
61.	61-10-26	SECURITY CHECKING: AUDITING ERRORS.....	371
62.	74-11-01	ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS.....	395
63.	77-03-01	CONFESSIONAL FORMS.....	399
64.	77-05-07	LONG DURATION SEC CHECKING	401
65.	76-12-07	LEAVING AND LEAVES	403
66.	62-05-03	CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS	405
67.	78-09-06	FOLLOWING UP ON DIRTY NEEDLES.....	419
68.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH AND FUMBLE - CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	421
69.	63-03-27	TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH.....	453
70.	_____	DEFINITIONS	473
71.	70-11-15	CONFESSIONALS.....	475
72.	62-08-30	MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING.....	477
73.	62-07-03	REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	481
74.	62-01-04	CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS.....	487
75.	63-03-29	SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING.....	493
76.	63-07-23	AUDITING RUNDOWN MISSED WITHHOLDS TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT	495
77.	78-11-10	PROCLAMATION POWER TO FORGIVE.....	497
78.	78-11-10	PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE ADDITION.....	499
79.	76-11-15	0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES – QUADS PART D GRADE 2 PROCESSES	501

b) Table of Contents, in chronological order:

1.	_____	DEFINITIONS	473
2.	01-08-01	CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADE PROCESSES.....	73
3.	15-04-02	FLYING RUDIMENTS.....	87
4.	17-01-04	CORRECT SENSITIVITY SETTING.....	49
5.	54-11-26	THE CODE OF HONOUR.....	19
6.	59-11-12	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING.....	29
7.	59-12-31	BLOW-OFFS.....	119
8.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION	285
9.	60-01-28	THE KEY TO ALL CASES – RESPONSIBILITY.....	115
10.	60-05-30	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP	111
11.	61-06-12	THE RISING NEEDLE: SKIP IT!.....	53
12.	61-10-04	MORAL CODES: WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?	289
13.	61-10-05	SEC-CHECKING: TYPES OF WITHHOLDS	313
14.	61-10-19	SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED.....	359
15.	61-10-26	SECURITY CHECKING: AUDITING ERRORS.....	371
16.	61-11-02	HOW TO SECURITY CHECK.....	335
17.	61-11-16	SEC CHECKING GENERALITIES WON'T DO.....	361
18.	62-01-04	CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS.....	487
19.	62-01-11	SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY.....	367
20.	62-01-16	NATURE OF WITHHOLDS.....	125
21.	62-02-08	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	199
22.	62-02-12	HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS	235
23.	62-02-20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?.....	151
24.	62-02-22	WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL	239
25.	62-04-03	THE OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE.....	171
26.	62-05-03	ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	241
27.	62-05-03	CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS	405
28.	62-05-22	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	203
29.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH AND FUMBLE - CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES	421
30.	62-05-25	E-METER INSTANT READS	39
31.	62-07-03	REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	481
32.	62-07-21	INSTANT READS	43
33.	62-08-30	MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING.....	477
34.	62-11-01	THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD	221
35.	63-03-27	TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH.....	453
36.	63-03-29	SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING.....	493
37.	63-07-23	AUDITING RUNDOWN MISSED WITHHOLDS TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT	495
38.	64-07-02	O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED	253
39.	64-07-10	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	193

40.	64-07-12	MORE ON O/WS	197
41.	64-08-24	SESSION MUST-NOTS	91
42.	64-09-08	OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?	123
43.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING	103
44.	65-03-29	ARC BREAKS	363
45.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT	249
46.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	31
47.	66-02-21	DEFINITION PROCESSES	97
48.	67-11-22	OUT TECH.....	11
49.	68-05-20	OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE	167
50.	68-10-14	THE AUDITOR'S CODE	17
51.	69-05-17	TRS AND DIRTY NEEDLES	55
52.	70-01-31	WITHHOLDS, OTHER PEOPLE'S.....	247
53.	70-05-27	UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS	67
54.	70-06-15	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
55.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
56.	70-11-15	CONFESSIONALS.....	475
57.	71-02-28	METERING READING ITEMS.....	69
58.	71-05-23	METERING	85
59.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED	21
60.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM.....	279
61.	73-11-20	ANTI-Q AND A TR	37
62.	73-11-20	F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM	65
63.	73-11-21	THE CURE OF Q AND A MAN'S DEADLIEST DISEASE.....	33
64.	74-02-17	MUTUAL OUT RUDS.....	95
65.	74-03-18	SENSITIVITY ERRORS	47
66.	74-11-01	ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS.....	395
67.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN	59
68.	76-11-15	0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES – QUADS PART D GRADE 2 PROCESSES	501
69.	76-12-07	LEAVING AND LEAVES	403
70.	77-03-01	CONFESSIONAL FORMS.....	399
71.	77-04-17	RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND OVERTS.....	277
72.	77-05-07	LONG DURATION SEC CHECKING	401
73.	78-08-05	INSTANT READS	45
74.	78-08-11	RUDIMENTS DEFINITIONS AND PATTERN	79
75.	78-09-03	DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM	57
76.	78-09-06	FOLLOWING UP ON DIRTY NEEDLES.....	419
77.	78-11-10	PROCLAMATION POWER TO FORGIVE.....	497
78.	78-11-10	PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE ADDITION.....	499
79.	80-10-23	CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER LEVELS AND EXPANDED GRADES	13

c) Table of Contents, in alphabetical order:

1.	76-11-15	0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES – QUADS PART D GRADE 2 PROCESSES	501
2.	59-11-12	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING.....	29
3.	73-11-20	ANTI-Q AND A TR.....	37
4.	62-05-03	ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	241
5.	65-03-29	ARC BREAKS.....	363
6.	63-07-23	AUDITING RUNDOWN MISSED WITHHOLDS TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT	495
7.	59-12-31	BLOW-OFFS.....	119
8.	80-10-23	CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER LEVELS AND EXPANDED GRADES	13
9.	01-08-01	CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADE PROCESSES.....	73
10.	77-03-01	CONFESSIONAL FORMS.....	399
11.	62-01-04	CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS.....	487
12.	70-11-15	CONFESSIONALS.....	475
13.	17-01-04	CORRECT SENSITIVITY SETTING.....	49
14.	62-05-03	CRAFTSMANSHIP, FUNDAMENTALS	405
15.	78-09-03	DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM	57
16.	66-02-21	DEFINITION PROCESSES	97
17.	_____	DEFINITIONS	473
18.	60-05-30	DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP	111
19.	62-05-25	E-METER INSTANT READS	39
20.	73-11-20	F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM.....	65
21.	15-04-02	FLYING RUDIMENTS.....	87
22.	78-09-06	FOLLOWING UP ON DIRTY NEEDLES.....	419
23.	62-02-12	HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS	235
24.	61-11-02	HOW TO SECURITY CHECK.....	335
25.	62-07-21	INSTANT READS	43
26.	78-08-05	INSTANT READS	45
27.	60-01-21	JUSTIFICATION	285
28.	70-06-15	KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING.....	1
29.	76-12-07	LEAVING AND LEAVES	403
30.	77-05-07	LONG DURATION SEC CHECKING	401
31.	71-02-28	METERING READING ITEMS.....	69
32.	71-05-23	METERING	85
33.	62-08-30	MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING.....	477
34.	62-02-08	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	199
35.	62-05-22	MISSED WITHHOLDS.....	203
36.	61-10-04	MORAL CODES: WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?	289
37.	64-07-12	MORE ON OWS	197
38.	65-10-01	MUTTER TR	31
39.	74-02-17	MUTUAL OUT RUDS.....	95

40.	62-01-16	NATURE OF WITHHOLDS.....	125
41.	64-07-02	O/W MODERNIZED AND REVIEWED.....	253
42.	67-11-22	OUT TECH.....	11
43.	68-05-20	OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE.....	167
44.	64-07-10	OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING.....	193
45.	64-09-08	OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?.....	123
46.	78-11-10	PROCLAMATION POWER TO FORGIVE.....	497
47.	78-11-10	PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE ADDITION.....	499
48.	76-08-10	R/SES, WHAT THEY MEAN.....	59
49.	77-04-17	RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND OVERTS.....	277
50.	62-07-03	REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.....	481
51.	72-05-10	ROBOTISM.....	279
52.	74-11-01	ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS.....	395
53.	78-08-11	RUDIMENTS DEFINITIONS AND PATTERN.....	79
54.	61-11-16	SEC CHECKING GENERALITIES WON'T DO.....	361
55.	61-10-05	SEC-CHECKING: TYPES OF WITHHOLDS.....	313
56.	62-01-11	SECURITY CHECKING TWENTY-TEN THEORY.....	367
57.	61-10-26	SECURITY CHECKING: AUDITING ERRORS.....	371
58.	61-10-19	SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED.....	359
59.	74-03-18	SENSITIVITY ERRORS.....	47
60.	64-08-24	SESSION MUST-NOTS.....	91
61.	64-11-06	STYLES OF AUDITING.....	103
62.	63-03-29	SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING.....	493
63.	70-06-17	TECHNICAL DEGRADES.....	9
64.	68-10-14	THE AUDITOR'S CODE.....	17
65.	54-11-26	THE CODE OF HONOUR.....	19
66.	65-09-29	THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT.....	249
67.	73-11-21	THE CURE OF Q AND A MAN'S DEADLIEST DISEASE.....	33
68.	60-01-28	THE KEY TO ALL CASES – RESPONSIBILITY.....	115
69.	62-11-01	THE MISSED MISSED WITHHOLD.....	221
70.	62-04-03	THE OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE.....	171
71.	61-06-12	THE RISING NEEDLE: SKIP IT!.....	53
72.	71-08-16	TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED.....	21
73.	69-05-17	TRS AND DIRTY NEEDLES.....	55
74.	62-05-23	TV DEMO: FISH AND FUMBLE - CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES.....	421
75.	63-03-27	TV DEMO: SEC CHECKING WITH COMMENTS BY LRH.....	453
76.	70-05-27	UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS.....	67
77.	62-02-20	WHAT IS A WITHHOLD?.....	151
78.	62-02-22	WITHHOLDS, MISSED AND PARTIAL.....	239
79.	70-01-31	WITHHOLDS, OTHER PEOPLE'S.....	247

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 FEBRUARY 1965
Reissued 15 June 1970

Remimeo
Sthil Students
Assn/Org Sec Hat
Case Sup Hat
Ds of P Hat
Ds of T Hat
Staff Member Hat
Franchise
(issued May 1965)

Note. Neglect of this Pol Ltr has caused great hardship on staffs, has cost countless millions and made it necessary in 1970 to engage in an all out International effort to restore basic Scientology over the world. Within 5 years after the issue of this PL with me off the lines, violation had almost destroyed orgs. "Quickie grades" entered in and denied gain to tens of thousands of cases. Therefore actions which neglect or violate this Policy Letter are **High Crimes** resulting in Comm Evs on **administrators** and **executives**. It is not "entirely a tech matter" as its neglect destroys orgs and caused a two-year slump. **It is the business of every staff member** to enforce it.

ALL LEVELS

KEEPING SCIENTOLOGY WORKING

HCO Sec or Communicator Hat Check on all
personnel and new personnel as taken on.

We have some time since passed the point of achieving uniformly workable technology.

The only thing now is getting the technology applied.

If you can't get the technology applied then you can't deliver what's promised. It's as simple as that. If you can get the technology applied, you can deliver what's promised.

The only thing you can be upbraided for by students or pcs is "no results". Trouble spots occur only where there are "no results". Attacks from governments or monopolies occur only where there are "no results" or "bad results".

Therefore the road before Scientology is clear and its ultimate success is assured if the technology is applied.

So it is the task of the Assn or Org Sec, the HCO Sec, the Case Supervisor, the D of P, the D of T and all staff members to get the correct technology applied.

Getting the correct technology applied consists of:

- One: Having the correct technology.
- Two: Knowing the technology.
- Three: Knowing it is correct.
- Four: Teaching correctly the correct technology.
- Five: Applying the technology.
- Six: Seeing that the technology is correctly applied.
- Seven: Hammering out of existence incorrect technology.
- Eight: Knocking out incorrect applications.
- Nine: Closing the door on any possibility of incorrect technology.
- Ten: Closing the door on incorrect application.

One above has been done.

Two has been achieved by many.

Three is achieved by the individual applying the correct technology in a proper manner and observing that it works that way.

Four is being done daily successfully in most parts of the world.

Five is consistently accomplished daily.

Six is achieved by instructors and supervisors consistently.

Seven is done by a few but is a weak point.

Eight is not worked on hard enough.

Nine is impeded by the “reasonable” attitude of the not quite bright.

Ten is seldom done with enough ferocity.

Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are the only places Scientology can bog down in any area.

The reasons for this are not hard to find. (a) A weak certainty that it works in Three above can lead to weakness in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. (b) Further, the not-too-bright have a bad point on the button Self-Importance. (c) The lower the IQ, the more the individual is shut off from the fruits of observation. (d) The service faces of people make them defend themselves against anything they confront, good or bad, and seek to make it wrong. (e) The bank seeks to knock out the good and perpetuate the bad.

Thus, we as Scientologists and as an organization must be very alert to Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

In all the years I have been engaged in research I have kept my comm lines wide open for research data. I once had the idea that a group could evolve truth. A third of a century has thoroughly disabused me of that idea. Willing as I was to accept suggestions and data, only a handful of suggestions (less than twenty) had long-run value and none were major or basic; and when I did accept major or basic suggestions and used them, we went astray and I repented and eventually had to “eat crow”.

On the other hand there have been thousands and thousands of suggestions and writings which, if accepted and acted upon, would have resulted in the complete destruction of all our work as well as the sanity of pcs. So I know what a group of people will do and how insane they will go in accepting unworkable “technology”. By actual record the percentages are about twenty to 100,000 that a group of human beings will dream up bad technology to destroy good technology. As we could have gotten along without suggestions, then, we had better steel ourselves to continue to do so now that we have made it. This point will, of course, be attacked as “unpopular”, “egotistical” and “undemocratic”. It very well may be. But it is also a survival point. And I don’t see that popular measures, self-abnegation and democracy have done anything for Man but push him further into the mud. Currently, popularity endorses degraded novels, self-abnegation has filled the South East Asian jungles with stone idols and corpses, and democracy has given us inflation and income tax.

Our technology has not been discovered by a group. True, if the group had not supported me in many ways I could not have discovered it either. But it remains that if in its formative stages it was not discovered by a group, then group efforts, one can safely assume, will not add to it or successfully alter it in the future. I can only say this now that it is done. There remains, of course, group tabulation or co-ordination of what has been done, which will be valuable – only so long as it does not seek to alter basic principles and successful applications.

The contributions that were worthwhile in this period of forming the technology were help in the form of friendship, of defence, of organization, of dissemination, of application, of advices on results and of finance. These were great contributions and were, and are, appreciated. Many thousands contributed in this way and made us what we are. Discovery contribution was not however part of the broad picture.

We will not speculate here on why this was so or how I came to rise above the bank. We are dealing only in facts and the above is a fact – the group left to its own devices would not have evolved Scientology but with wild dramatization of the bank called “new ideas” would have wiped it out. Supporting this is the fact that Man has never before evolved workable mental technology and emphasizing it is the vicious technology he did evolve – psychiatry, psychology, surgery, shock treatment, whips, duress, punishment, etc, ad infinitum.

So realize that we have climbed out of the mud by whatever good luck and good sense, and refuse to sink back into it again. See that Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten above are ruthlessly followed and we will never be stopped. Relax them, get reasonable about it and we will perish.

So far, while keeping myself in complete communication with all suggestions, I have not failed on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten in areas I could supervise closely. But it's not good enough for just myself and a few others to work at this.

Whenever this control as per Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten has been relaxed the whole organizational area has failed. Witness Elizabeth, N.J., Wichita, the early organizations and groups. They crashed only because I no longer did Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. Then, when they were all messed up, you saw the obvious "reasons" for failure. But ahead of that they ceased to deliver and that involved them in other reasons.

The common denominator of a group is the reactive bank. Thetans without banks have different responses. They only have their banks in common. They agree then only on bank principles. Person to person the bank is identical. So constructive ideas are individual and seldom get broad agreement in a human group. An individual must rise above an avid craving for agreement from a humanoid group to get anything decent done. The bank-agreement has been what has made Earth a Hell – and if you were looking for Hell and found Earth, it would certainly serve. War, famine, agony and disease has been the lot of Man. Right now the great governments of Earth have developed the means of frying every Man, Woman and Child on the planet. That is Bank. That is the result of Collective Thought Agreement. The decent, pleasant things on this planet come from individual actions and ideas that have somehow gotten by the Group Idea. For that matter, look how we ourselves are attacked by "public opinion" media. Yet there is no more ethical group on this planet than ourselves.

Thus each one of us can rise above the domination of the bank and then, as a group of freed beings, achieve freedom and reason. It is only the aberrated group, the mob, that is destructive.

When you don't do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten actively, you are working for the Bank dominated mob. For it will surely, surely (a) introduce incorrect technology and swear by it, (b) apply technology as incorrectly as possible, (c) open the door to any destructive idea, and (d) encourage incorrect application. It's the Bank that says the group is all and the individual nothing. It's the Bank that says we must fail.

So just don't play that game. Do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten and you will knock out of your road all the future thorns.

Here's an actual example in which a senior executive had to interfere because of a pc spin: A Case Supervisor told Instructor A to have Auditor B run Process X on Preclear C. Auditor B afterwards told Instructor A that "It didn't work." Instructor A was weak on Three above and didn't really believe in Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. So Instructor A told the Case Supervisor "Process X didn't work on Preclear C." Now this strikes directly at each of One to Six above in Preclear C, Auditor B, Instructor A and the Case Supervisor. It opens the door to the introduction of "new technology" and to failure.

What happened here? Instructor A didn't jump down Auditor B's throat, that's all that happened. This is what he should have done: grabbed the auditor's report and looked it over. When a higher executive on this case did so she found what the Case Supervisor and the rest missed: that Process X increased Preclear C's TA to 25 TA divisions for the session but that near session end Auditor B Qed and Aed with a cognition and abandoned Process X while it

still gave high TA and went off running one of Auditor B's own manufacture, which nearly spun Preclear C. Auditor B's IQ on examination turned out to be about 75. Instructor A was found to have huge ideas of how you must never invalidate anyone, even a lunatic. The Case Supervisor was found to be "too busy with admin to have any time for actual cases".

All right, there's an all too typical example. The Instructor should have done Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten. This would have begun this way. Auditor B: "That Process X didn't work." Instructor A: "What exactly did you do wrong?" Instant attack. "Where's your auditor's report for the session? Good. Look here, you were getting a lot of TA when you stopped Process X. What did you do?" Then the Pc wouldn't have come close to a spin and all four of these would have retained certainty.

In a year, I had four instances in one small group where the correct process recommended was reported not to have worked. But on review found that each one (a) had increased the TA, (b) had been abandoned, and (c) had been falsely reported as unworkable. Also, despite this abuse, in each of these four cases the recommended, correct process cracked the case. Yet they were reported as not having worked!

Similar examples exist in instruction and these are all the more deadly as every time instruction in correct technology is flubbed, then the resulting error, uncorrected in the auditor, is perpetuated on every pc that auditor audits thereafter. So Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten are even more important in a course than in supervision of cases.

Here's an example: A rave recommendation is given a graduating student "because he gets more TA on pcs than any other student on the course!" Figures of 435 TA divisions a session are reported. "Of course his model session is poor but it's just a knack he has" is also included in the recommendation. A careful review is undertaken because nobody at Levels 0 to IV is going to get that much TA on pcs. It is found that this student was never taught to read an E-Meter TA dial! And no instructor observed his handling of a meter and it was not discovered that he "overcompensated" nervously, swinging the TA 2 or 3 divisions beyond where it needed to go to place the needle at "set". So everyone was about to throw away standard processes and model session because this one student "got such remarkable TA". They only read the reports and listened to the brags and never looked at this student. The pcs in actual fact were making slightly less than average gain, impeded by a rough model session and misworded processes. Thus, what was making the pcs win (actual Scientology) was hidden under a lot of departures and errors.

I recall one student who was squirreling on an Academy course and running a lot of off-beat whole track on other students after course hours. The Academy students were in a state of electrification on all these new experiences and weren't quickly brought under control and the student himself never was given the works on Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten so they stuck. Subsequently, this student prevented another squirrel from being straightened out and his wife died of cancer resulting from physical abuse. A hard, tough Instructor at that moment could have salvaged two squirrels and saved the life of a girl. But no, students had a right to do whatever they pleased.

Squirreling (going off into weird practices or altering Scientology) only comes about from non-comprehension. Usually the non-comprehension is not of Scientology but some earlier contact with an off-beat humanoid practice which in its turn was not understood.

When people can't get results from what they think is standard practice, they can be counted upon to squirrel to some degree. The most trouble in the past two years came from orgs where an executive in each could not assimilate straight Scientology. Under instruction in Scientology they were unable to define terms or demonstrate examples of principles. And the orgs where they were got into plenty of trouble. And worse, it could not be straightened out easily because neither one of these people could or would duplicate instructions. Hence, a debacle resulted in two places, directly traced to failures of instruction earlier. So proper instruction is vital. The D of T and his Instructors and all Scientology Instructors must be merciless in getting Four, Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten into effective action. That one student, dumb and impossible though he may seem and of no use to anyone, may yet some day be the cause of untold upset because nobody was interested enough to make sure Scientology got home to him.

With what we know now, there is no student we enroll who cannot be properly trained. As an Instructor, one should be very alert to slow progress and should turn the sluggards inside out personally. No system will do it, only you or me with our sleeves rolled up can crack the back of bad studenting and we can only do it on an individual student, never on a whole class only. He's slow = something is awful wrong. Take fast action to correct it. Don't wait until next week. By then he's got other messes stuck to him. If you can't graduate them with their good sense appealed to and wisdom shining, graduate them in such a state of shock they'll have nightmares if they contemplate squirreling. Then experience will gradually bring about Three in them and they'll know better than to chase butterflies when they should be auditing.

When somebody enrolls, consider he or she has joined up for the duration of the universe – never permit an “open-minded” approach. If they're going to quit let them quit fast. If they enrolled, they're aboard, and if they're aboard, they're here on the same terms as the rest of us – win or die in the attempt. Never let them be half-minded about being Scientologists. The finest organizations in history have been tough, dedicated organizations. Not one namby-pamby bunch of panty-waist dilettantes have ever made anything. It's a tough universe. The social veneer makes it seem mild. But only the tigers survive – and even they have a hard time. We'll survive because we are tough and are dedicated. When we do instruct somebody properly he becomes more and more tiger. When we instruct half-mindedly and are afraid to offend, scared to enforce, we don't make students into good Scientologists and that lets everybody down. When Mrs. Pattycake comes to us to be taught, turn that wandering doubt in her eye into a fixed, dedicated glare and she'll win and we'll all win. Humour her and we all die a little. The proper instruction attitude is, “You're here so you're a Scientologist. Now we're going to make you into an expert auditor no matter what happens. We'd rather have you dead than incapable.”

Fit that into the economics of the situation and lack of adequate time and you see the cross we have to bear.

But we won't have to bear it forever. The bigger we get the more economics and time we will have to do our job. And the only things which can prevent us from getting that big fast are areas in from One to Ten. Keep those in mind and we'll be able to grow. Fast. And as we grow our shackles will be less and less. Failing to keep One to Ten, will make us grow less.

So the ogre which might eat us up is not the government or the High Priests. It's our possible failure to retain and practise our technology.

An Instructor or Supervisor or Executive must challenge with ferocity instances of "unworkability". They must uncover what did happen, what was run and what was done or not done.

If you have One and Two, you can only acquire Three for all by making sure of all the rest.

We're not playing some minor game in Scientology. It isn't cute or something to do for lack of something better.

The whole agonized future of this planet, every Man, Woman and Child on it, and your own destiny for the next endless trillions of years depend on what you do here and now with and in Scientology.

This is a deadly serious activity. And if we miss getting out of the trap now, we may never again have another chance.

Remember, this is our first chance to do so in all the endless trillions of years of the past. Don't muff it now because it seems unpleasant or unsocial to do Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

Do them and we'll win.

L. RON HUBBARD

Founder

LRH:jw.rr.nt.ka.mes.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 17 JUNE 1970R
Revised 9 April 1977

(Revision in this type style)

Remimeo
Applies to all SHs and
Academies
HGCs
Franchises

URGENT AND IMPORTANT

TECHNICAL DEGRADES

(This PL and HCO PL Feb 7, 1965 must be made part of every study pack as the first items and must be listed on checksheets.)

Any checksheet in use or in stock which carries on it any degrading statement must be destroyed and issued without qualifying statements.

Example: Level 0 to IV Checksheets SH carry "A. Background Material – This section is included as an historical background, but has much interest and value to the student. Most of the processes are no longer used, having been replaced by more modern technology. The student is only required to read this material and ensure he leaves no misunderstood." This heading covers such vital things as TRs, Op Pro by Dup! The statement is a falsehood.

These checksheets were not approved by myself, all the material of the academy and SH courses **is** in use.

Such actions as this gave us "Quickie Grades", ARC broke the field and downgraded the academy and SH courses.

A condition of **Treason** or cancellation of certificates or dismissal and a full investigation of the background of any person found guilty, will be activated in the case of anyone committing the following **High Crimes**.

1. Abbreviating an official course in Dianetics and Scientology so as to lose the full theory, processes and effectiveness of the subjects.
2. Adding comments to checksheets or instructions labeling any material "background" or "not used now" or "old" or any similar action which will result in the student not knowing, using, and applying the data in which he is being trained.
3. Employing after 1 Sept 1970 any checksheet for any course not authorized by myself and the SO Organizing Bureau Flag.
4. Failing to strike from any checksheet remaining in use meanwhile any such comments as "historical", "background", "not used", "old", etc. or **verbally stating it to students**.

5. Permitting a pc to attest to more than one grade at a time on the pc's own determinism without hint or evaluation.
6. Running only one process for a lower grade between 0 to IV, where the grade EP has not been attained.
7. Failing to use all processes for a level where the EP has not been attained.
8. Boasting as to speed of delivery in a session, such as "I put in grade zero in three minutes." etc.
9. Shortening time of application of auditing for financial or laborsaving considerations.
10. Acting in any way calculated to lose the technology of Dianetics and Scientology to use or impede its use or shorten its materials or its application.

Reason: The effort to get students through courses and get pcs processed in orgs was considered best handled by reducing materials or deleting processes from grades. The pressure exerted to speed up student completions and auditing completions was mistakenly answered by just not delivering.

The correct way to speed up a student's progress is by using two way comm and applying the study materials to students.

The best way to really handle pcs is to ensure they make each level fully before going on to the next and repairing them when they do not.

The puzzle of the decline of the entire Scientology network in the late 60s is entirely answered by the actions taken to shorten time in study and in processing by deleting materials and actions.

Reinstituting full use and delivery of Dianetics and Scientology is the answer to any recovery.

The product of an org is well taught students and thoroughly audited pcs. When the product vanishes, so does the org. The orgs must survive for the sake of this planet.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd.lf.jg

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 22 NOVEMBER 1967R
(Revised and Reissued 18 July 1970)

Student Hat
Remimeo

All Students

All Courses

OUT TECH

If at any time a supervisor or other person in an org gives you interpretations of HCOBs, policy letters or tells you, “That’s old. Read it but disregard it, that’s just background data”, or gives you a chit for following HCOBs or tapes or alters tech on you or personally cancels HCOBs or policy letters without being able to show you an HCOB or policy letter that cancels it, **you must report the matter complete with names and any witnesses on direct lines to the international ethics officer at worldwide. If this is not immediately handled, report in the same way to your nearest Sea Org MAA.**

The only ways you can fail to get results on a pc are:

1. Not study your HCOBs and my books and tapes.
2. Not apply what you studied.
3. Follow “advice” contrary to what you find on HCOBs and tapes.
4. Fail to obtain the HCOBs, books and tapes needed.

There is no hidden data line.

All of Dianetics and Scientology works. Some of it works faster.

The only real error auditors made over the years was to fail to stop a process the moment they saw a floating needle.

Recently the felony has been compounded by disclosure of the facts that data and tapes have been deleted from checksheets, data has been “relegated to background” and grades have not been in use fully to complete end phenomena as per the process column on the classification and gradation chart. This caused an almost complete unmock of the subject and its use. I am counting on you to see it is not allowed to happen **ever again**.

Any supervisor or executive who interprets, alters or cancels tech is liable to the assignment of a condition of enemy. All the data is in HCOBs or policy letters or on tape.

Failure to make this mimeo known to every student carries a \$10 fine for every student from which it is withheld.

LRH:sb.rd

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 23 OCTOBER 1980

ISSUE II

Remimeo
Tech
Qual
Execs
C/Ses
KOTs
Auditors
Reges
Examiners
Qual Secs
HCO
C & A

CANCELS BPL 25 June 70RB rev.
27.4.75 EXPANDED LOWER GRADES,
CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED

(Also issued as HCO Bulletin
same title, same date)

**CHART OF ABILITIES GAINED FOR LOWER
LEVELS AND EXPANDED GRADES**

Ref: Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart
HCOB 11 Nov 73 Preclear Declare? Procedure

BPL 25 June 1970RB, rev. 27 April 75, Expanded Lower Grades, Chart of Abilities Gained is hereby **cancelled** as it failed to state the ability gained for all flows of the Expanded Lower Grades.

Expanded Grades are attested to by the pc declaring the full statement of the ability gained for all four flows.

The chart given below lists the ability gained for each of the Lower Levels plus the four flows of the Expanded Grades.

It is used by the Examiner when a pc is sent to „Declare?“. The Examiner has the pc read the entire statement for the ability gained for that Grade (including all four flows) or Level and must accept only the pc declaring the full statement for the ability gained.

Declare procedure is done exactly as stated in HCOB 11 November 1973 Preclear Declare? Procedure.

LEVEL

ABILITY GAINED

GROUP PROCESSING Completion (Not a mandatory level) Awareness that change is available.

DIVISION 6 CO-AUDIT PROCESSES (Not a mandatory level) Personal case improvement in oneself and the ability to help others with co-auditing.

REPAIR OF ONE'S LIFE (Not a mandatory level) Awareness of truth and the way to personal integrity.

Note: At C/S discretion, where a pc needs Two Way Comm or rudiments or other repair put in on his life and livingness previous to his doing a major beginning action such as the Purification Rundown, such repair can be done initially. This is not a mandatory action and would only be done as directed by the C/S.)

PURIFICATION RUNDOWN Freedom from the restimulative effects of drug residuals and other toxins.

SURVIVAL RUNDOWN Feeling in present time and able to control and put order into the environment. Greatly increased survival potential.

NED DRUG RUNDOWN Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, alcohol and medicine and free from the need to take them.

DIANETICS CASE COMPLETION A well and happy pc.

SCIENTOLOGY DRUG RUNDOWN Freedom from harmful effects of drugs, medicine or alcohol and free from the need to take them.

EXPANDED ARC STRAIGHTWIRE Knows he/she won't get any worse.

EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 1 Willing for others to communicate to him on any subject; no longer resisting communication from others on unpleasant or unwanted subjects.

EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 2 Ability to communicate freely with anyone on any subject; free from, or no longer bothered by, communication difficulties; no longer withdrawn or reticent; likes to outflow.

EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 3 Willing for others to communicate freely to others about anything.

EXPANDED GRADE 0 COMMUNICATION RELEASE, FLOW 0 Willingness to permit one's self to communicate freely about anything.

EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 1 Ability to recognize the source of problems and make them vanish; has no problems.

EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 2 No longer worried about problems he has been to others; feels free about any problems others may have with him and can recognize source of them.

EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 3 Free from worry about others' problems with or about others, and can recognize source of them.

EXPANDED GRADE 1 PROBLEM RELEASE, FLOW 0 Free from worry about problems with self and can recognize the source of them.

EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 1	Freedom from things others have done to one in the past. Willing for others to be cause over him.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 2	Relief from the hostilities and sufferings of life; ability to be at cause without fear of hurting others.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 3	Willing to have others be cause over others without feeling the need to intervene for fears of their doing harm.
EXPANDED GRADE 2 RELIEF RELEASE, FLOW 0	Relief from hostilities and suffering imposed by self upon self.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 1	Freedom from upsets of the past; ability to face future; ability to experience sudden change without becoming upset.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 2	Can grant others the beingness to be the way they are and choose their own reality; no longer feels need to change people to make them more acceptable to self; able to cause changes in another's life without ill effects.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 3	Freedom from need to prevent or become involved in the change and interchange occurring amongst others.
EXPANDED GRADE 3 FREEDOM RELEASE, FLOW 0	Freedom from upsets of the past one has imposed upon oneself and ability to cause changes in one's own life without ill effects.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 1	Ability to tolerate, and freedom from others' fixed ideas, justifications and make-guilty of self; free of need to respond in like kind.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 2	Moving out of fixed conditions into ability to do new things; ability to face life without need to justify own actions or defend self from others; loss of make-guilty mechanisms and demand for sympathy; can be right or wrong.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 3	Can tolerate fixed conditions of others in regard to others; freedom from involvement in others' effort to justify, make guilty, dominate, or be defensive about their actions against others.
EXPANDED GRADE 4 ABILITY RELEASE, FLOW 0	Ability to face life without need to make self wrong; loss of make-self-guilty mechanisms, and self-invalidation.

L. RON HUBBARD

FOUNDER

Approved and accepted by the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:bk

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 14 OCTOBER 1968R
Revised 1 January 1976

Remimeo
Auditor 43
Class VIII
All Auditors

THE AUDITOR'S CODE

In celebration of the 100% gains attainable by Standard Tech.

I hereby promise as an Auditor to follow the Auditor's Code.

1. I promise not to evaluate for the preclear or tell him what he should think about his case in session.
2. I promise not to invalidate the preclear's case or gains in or out of session.
3. I promise to administer only Standard Tech to a preclear in the standard way.
4. I promise to keep all auditing appointments once made.
5. I promise not to process a preclear who has not had sufficient rest and who is physically tired.
6. I promise not to process a preclear who is improperly fed or hungry.
7. I promise not to permit a frequent change of Auditors.
8. I promise not to sympathize with a preclear but to be effective.
9. I promise not to let the preclear end session on his own determinism but to finish off those cycles I have begun.
10. I promise never to walk off from a preclear in session.
11. I promise never to get angry with a preclear in session.
12. I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle.
13. I promise never to run any one action beyond its floating needle.
14. I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session.
15. I promise not to mix the processes of Scientology with other practices except when the preclear is physically ill and only medical means will serve.
16. I promise to maintain communication with the preclear and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session.
17. I promise not to enter comments, expressions or enturbulence into a session that distract a preclear from his case.

18. I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed in the session.
19. I promise not to let a preclear run a wrongly understood command.
20. I promise not to explain, justify or make excuses in session for any Auditor mistakes whether real or imagined.
21. I promise to estimate the current case state of a preclear only by Standard Case Supervision data and not to diverge because of some imagined difference in the case.
22. I promise never to use the secrets of a preclear divulged in session for punishment or personal gain.
23. I promise to see that any fee received for processing is refunded following the policies of the Claims Verification Board, if the preclear is dissatisfied and demands it within three months after the processing, the only condition being that he may not again be processed or trained.
24. I promise not to advocate Scientology only to cure illness or only to treat the insane, knowing well it was intended for spiritual gain.
25. I promise to cooperate fully with the legal organizations of Dianetics and Scientology as developed by L. Ron Hubbard in safeguarding the ethical use and practice of the subject according to the basics of Standard Tech.
26. I promise to refuse to permit any being to be physically injured, violently damaged, operated on or killed in the name of "mental treatment".
27. I promise not to permit sexual liberties or violation of the mentally unsound.
28. I promise to refuse to admit to the ranks of practitioners any being who is insane.

Auditor: _____

Date: _____

Witness: _____

Place: _____

L. RON HUBBARD
 Founder

LRH:nt.rd

P.A.B. No. 40
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN
From L. RON HUBBARD
Via Hubbard Communications Office
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

26 November 1954

THE CODE OF HONOUR

A Basic Course in Scientology – Part 6

1. Never desert a comrade in need, in danger or in trouble.
2. Never withdraw allegiance once granted.
3. Never desert a group to which you owe your support.
4. Never disparage yourself or minimize your strength or power.
5. Never need praise, approval or sympathy.
6. Never compromise with your own reality.
7. Never permit your affinity to be alloyed.
8. Do not give or receive communication unless you yourself desire it.
9. Your self-determinism and your honour are more important than your immediate life.
10. Your integrity to yourself is more important than your body.
11. Never regret yesterday. Life is in you today, and you make your tomorrow.
12. Never fear to hurt another in a just cause.
13. Don't desire to be liked or admired.
14. Be your own adviser, keep your own counsel and select your own decisions.
15. Be true to your own goals.

Scientology is itself the microcosm of a civilization. It contains two moral codes: one is the moral code of practice which is the Auditor's Code of 1954, the other is the Code of a Scientologist, which will be given at greater length in the next PAB. It also contains an ethical code, and that is its Code of Honour.

The difference between ethics and morals is very clearly known in Scientology, if not in a modern dictionary. This mergence of morals and ethics has occurred in recent times, and is symptomatic of a general decline. An ethic is practiced on an entirely self-determined basis. An ethical code is not enforceable, is not to be enforced, but is a luxury of conduct. A person conducts himself according to an ethical code because he wants to or because he feels he is proud enough or decent enough, or civilized enough to so conduct himself. An ethical code,

of course, is a code of certain restrictions indulged in to better the manner of conduct of life. If one Scientologist started to punish or berate some other Scientologist and called for an enforcement on the grounds that the Code of Honour had been disregarded, the punitive act itself would involve and violate the Code of Honour. The Code of Honour is a Code of Honour as long as it is not enforced. If a person is big enough, or strong enough or sane enough, then he can indulge himself in the luxury of holding upon himself freely and of his own decision the Code of Honour. When such an ethical code begins to be enforced it becomes then a moral code.

A moral code is enforceable. Mores are those things which make a society possible. They are the heavily agreed-upon, policed codes of conduct of the society. If an auditor were to flagrantly and continually violate the Auditor's Code or the Code of a Scientologist, then other auditors would have a perfect right to demand, and through the HASI effect, the suspension or revocation of certificates or memberships, or both. However, no such action is possible with the Code of Honour. A person could continually and flagrantly flaunt the Code of Honour and experience no more than perhaps the slight contempt or pity of his fellows.

The Code of Honour clearly states conditions of acceptable comradeship amongst those fighting on one side against something which they conceive should be remedied. While anyone practicing "the only one" believes that it is possible to have a fight or contest only so long as one remains "the only one" and confronts as that single identity all of existence, it is not very workable to live without friends or comrades in arms. Amongst those friends and comrades in arms one's acceptability and measure is established fairly well by his adherence to such a thing as the Code of Honour. Anyone practicing the Code of Honour would maintain a good opinion of his fellows, a much more important thing than having one's fellows maintain a good opinion of one.

If you believed Man was worthy enough to be granted by you sufficient stature so as to permit you to exercise gladly the Code of Honour, I can guarantee that you would be a happy person. And if you found an occasional miscreant falling away from the best standards you have developed, you yet did not turn away from the rest of Man, and if you discovered yourself betrayed by those you were seeking to defend and yet did not then experience a complete reversal of opinion about all your fellow men, there would be no dwindling spiral for you.

Indicative of this is a process which is rather easy to work and which has some workability. Sit down in a public place where many people are passing by and simply postulate into them, above them, around them, Perfection – no matter what you see. Do this person after person as they walk by you or around you, doing it quietly and to yourself. It may or may not occur that you would bring changes in their lives, but it would certainly occur that you would bring about a change in yourself. This is not an advised process – it is simply a demonstration of a fact that he who lives believing wrong of all his fellow men lives, himself, in Hell. The only difference between Paradise on earth and Hell on earth is whether or not you believe your fellow man worthy of receiving from you the friendship and devotion called for in this Code of Honour.

L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 AUGUST 1971R
Issue II
Revised 5 July 1978

Remimeo
Courses
Checksheets

(Revisions in this type style)

TRAINING DRILLS REMODERNIZED

(Revises 17 April 1961.
This HCOB cancels the following:

Original	HCOB 17 April 1961	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 5 Jan 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED
Revised	HCOB 21 June 71	TRAINING DRILLS MODERNIZED Issue III
	HCOB 25 May 71	THE TR COURSE

This HCOB is to replace all other issues
of TRs 0-4 in all packs and checksheets.)

Due to the following factors, I have modernized TRs 0 to 4.

1. The auditing skill of any student remains only as good as he can do his TRs.
2. Flubs in TRs are the basis of all confusion in subsequent efforts to audit.
3. If the TRs are not well learned early in Scientology training courses, **the balance of the course will fail and supervisors at Upper Levels will be teaching not their subjects but TRs.**
4. Almost all confusions on meter, Model Sessions and Scientology or Dianetic processes stem directly from inability to do the TRs.
5. A student who has not mastered his TRs will not master anything further.
6. Scientology or Dianetic processes will not function in the presence of bad TRs. The preclear is already being overwhelmed by process velocity and cannot bear up to TR flubs without ARC breaks.

Academies were tough on TRs up to 1958 and have since tended to soften. Comm Courses are not a tea party.

These TRs given here should be put in use at once in all auditor training, in Academy and HGC and in the future should never be relaxed.

Public courses on TRs are **not** "softened" because they are for the public. Absolutely no standards are lowered. **The public are given real TRs – rough, tough and hard.** To do otherwise is to lose 90% of the results. There is nothing pale and patty-cake about TRs.

This HCOB means what it says. It does not mean something else. It does not imply another meaning. It is not open to interpretation from another source.

These TRs are done exactly per this HCOB without added actions or change.

NUMBER: OT TR 0 1971

NAME: Operating Thetan Confronting.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed, a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to be there comfortably and confront another person. The idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of another person, to **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Student and coach sit facing each other with eyes closed. There is no conversation. This is a silent drill. There is **no** twitching, moving, confronting with a body part, "system" or vias used to confront or anything else added to **be** there. One will usually see blackness or an area of the room when one's eyes are closed. **Be there, comfortably and confront.**

When a student can **be** there comfortably and confront and has reached a *major stable win*, the drill is passed.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in June 71 to give an additional gradient to confronting and eliminate students confronting with their eyes, blinking, etc. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 CONFRONTING REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Preclear.

COMMANDS: None.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing only or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to be there comfortably in a position three feet in front of a preclear. To **be** there and not do anything else but **be** there.

TRAINING STRESS: Have student and coach sit facing each other, neither making any conversation or effort to be interesting. Have them sit and look at each other and say and do nothing for some hours. Student must not speak, blink, fidget, giggle or be embarrassed or anaten.

It will be found the student tends to confront **with** a body part, rather than just confront, or to use a system of confronting rather than just **be** there. The drill is misnamed if confronting means to **do** something to the pc. The whole action is to accustom an auditor to **being there** three feet in front of a preclear without apologizing or moving or being startled or embarrassed or defending self. Confronting with a body part can cause somatics in that body part being used to confront. The solution is just to confront and **be** there. Student passes when he can just **be** there and confront and he has reached a *major stable win*.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 0 BULLBAIT REVISED 1961

NAME: Confronting Bullbaited.

COMMANDS: Coach: "Start" "That's it" "Flunk."

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart – about three feet.

PURPOSE: To train student to confront a preclear with auditing or with nothing. The whole idea is to get the student able to **be** there comfortably in a position three feet in front of the preclear without being thrown off, distracted or reacting in any way to what the preclear says or does.

TRAINING STRESS: After the student has passed TR 0 and he can just **be** there comfortably, "Bullbaiting" can begin. Anything added to **being there** is sharply flunked by the coach. Twitches, blinks, sighs, fidgets, anything except just being there is promptly flunked, with the reason why.

PATTER: Student coughs. Coach: "Flunk! You coughed. Start." This is the whole of the coach's patter as a coach.

PATTER AS A CONFRONTED SUBJECT: The coach may say anything or do anything except leave the chair. The student's "buttons" can be found and tromped on hard.

Any words not coaching words may receive *no* response from the student.

If the student responds, the coach is instantly a coach (see patter above). Student passes when he can **be** there comfortably without being thrown off or distracted or react in any way to anything the coach says or does and has reached a *major stable win*.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in Washington in March 1957 to train students to confront preclears in the absence of social tricks or conversation and to overcome obsessive compulsions to be "interesting." Revised by L. Ron Hubbard April 1961 on finding that SOP Goals required for its success a much higher level of technical skill than earlier processes. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in August 1971 after research discoveries on TRs.

NUMBER: TR 1 REVISED 1961

NAME: Dear Alice.

PURPOSE: To train the student to deliver a command newly and in a new unit of time to a preclear without flinching or trying to overwhelm or using a via.

COMMANDS: A phrase (with the "he said" omitted) is picked out of the book ALICE IN WONDERLAND and read to the coach. It is repeated until the coach is satisfied it arrived where he is.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The command goes from the book to the student and, as his own, to the coach. It must not go from book to coach. It must sound natural not artificial. Diction and elocution have no part in it. Loudness may have.

The coach must have received the command (or question) clearly and have understood it before he says "Good."

PATTER: The coach says "Start," says "Good" without a new start if the command is received or says "Flunk" if the command is not received. "Start" is not used again. "That's it" is used to terminate for a discussion or to end the activity. If session is terminated for a discussion, coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

This drill is passed only when the student can put across a command naturally, without strain or artificiality or elocutionary bobs and gestures, and when the student can do it easily and relaxedly.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London, April 1956, to teach the communication formula to new students. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard 1961 to increase auditing ability.

NUMBER: TR 2 REVISED 1978

NAME: Acknowledgments.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that an acknowledgement is a method of controlling preclear communication and that an acknowledgement is a full stop. The student must **understand** and **appropriately** acknowledge the comm and in such a way that it does not continue the comm.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from Alice in Wonderland omitting the "he said" and the student thoroughly acknowledges them. The student says "Good," "Fine," "Okay," "I heard that," **anything** only so long as it is appropriate to the pc's comm – in such a way as actually to convince the person who is sitting there as the preclear that he has heard it. The coach repeats any line he feels was not truly acknowledged.

POSITION: Student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student to acknowledge exactly what was said so preclear knows it was heard. Ask student from time to time what *was* said. Curb over and under acknowledgement. Let student do anything at first to get acknowledgement across, then even him out.

Teach him that an acknowledgement is a stop, not beginning of a new cycle of communication or an encouragement to the preclear to go on and that an acknowledgement must be appropriate for the pc's comm. The student must be broken of the habit of robotically using "Good," "Thank you" as the only acks.

To teach further that one can fail to get an acknowledgement across or can fail to stop a pc with an acknowledgement or can take a pc's head off with an acknowledgement.

PATTER: The coach says "Start," reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper acknowledgement. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk." "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. "Start" must be used to begin a new coaching after a "That's it."

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956 to teach new students that an acknowledgement ends a communication cycle and a period of time, that a new command begins a new period of time. Revised 1961 and again in 1978 by L. Ron Hubbard.

NUMBER: TR 2½ 1978

NAME: Half Acks.

PURPOSE: To teach the student that a half acknowledgement is a method of encouraging a pc to communicate.

COMMANDS: The coach reads lines from "Alice in Wonderland" omitting "he said" and the student half acks the coach. The coach repeats any line he feels was not half acked.

POSITION: The student and coach are seated facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: Teach student that a half acknowledgement is an encouragement to the pc to **continue** talking. Curb over-acknowledgement that stops a pc from talking. Teach him further that a half ack is a way of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling that he is being heard.

PATTER: The coach says "Start," reads a line and says "Flunk" every time the coach feels there has been an improper half ack. The coach repeats the same line each time the coach says "Flunk." "That's it" may be used to terminate for discussion or terminate the session. If the session is terminated for discussion, the coach must say "Start" again before it resumes.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in July 1978 to train auditors in how to get a pc to continue talking as in R3RA.

NUMBER: TR 3 REVISED 1961

NAME: Duplicative Question.

PURPOSE: To teach a student to duplicate without variation an auditing question, each time newly, in its own unit of time, not as a blur with other questions, and to acknowledge it. To teach that one never asks a second question until he has received an answer to the one asked.

COMMANDS: "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?"

POSITION: Student and coach seated a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: One question and student acknowledgement of its answer in one unit of time which is then finished. To keep student from straying into variations of command. Even though the same question is asked, it is asked as though it had never occurred to anyone before.

The student must learn to give a command and receive an answer and to acknowledge it in one unit of time.

The student is flunked if he or she fails to get an answer to the question asked, if he or she fails to repeat the exact questions, if he or she Q and As with excursions taken by the coach.

PATTER: The coach uses "Start" and "That's it," as in earlier TRs. The coach is not bound after starting to answer the student's question but may comm lag or give a commenting type answer to throw the student off. Often the coach should answer. Somewhat less often the coach attempts to pull the student into a Q and A or upset the student. Example:

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Yes"

Student: "Good"

Student: "Do fish swim?"

Coach: "Aren't you hungry?"

Student: "Yes"

Coach: "Flunk."

When the question is not answered, the student must say, gently, "I'll repeat the auditing question," and do so until he gets an answer. Anything except commands, acknowledgement and as needed, the repeat statement is flunked. Unnecessary use of the repeat statement is flunked. A poor command is flunked. A poor acknowledgement is flunked. A Q and A is flunked (as in example). Student misemotion or confusion is flunked. Student failure to utter the next command without a long comm lag is flunked. A choppy or premature acknowledgement is flunked. Lack of an acknowledgement (or with a distinct comm lag) is flunked. Any words from the coach except an answer to the question, "Start," "Flunk," "Good" or "That's it" should have no influence on the student except to get him to give a repeat statement and the command again. By repeat statement is meant, "I'll repeat the auditing command."

"Start," "Flunk," "Good" and "That's it" may not be used to fluster or trap the student. Any other statement under the sun may be. The coach may try to leave his chair in this TR. If he succeeds it is a flunk. The coach should not use introverted statements such as "I just had a cognition." 'Coach divertive' statements should all concern the student, and should be designed to throw the student off and cause the student to lose session control or track of what the student is doing. The student's job is to keep a session going in spite of anything, using only command, the repeat statement or the acknowledgement. The student may use his or her hands to prevent a 'blow' (leaving) of the coach. If the student does anything else than the above, it is a flunk and the coach must say so.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to overcome variations and sudden changes in sessions. Revised 1961 by L. Ron Hubbard. The old TR has a comm bridge as part of its training but this is now part of and is taught in Model Session and is no longer needed at this level. Auditors have been frail in getting their questions answered. This TR was redesigned to improve that frailty.

NUMBER: TR 4 REVISED 1961

NAME: Preclear Originations.

PURPOSE: To teach the student not to be tongue-tied or startled or thrown off session by originations of preclear and to maintain ARC with preclear throughout an origination.

COMMANDS: The student runs "Do fish swim?" or "Do birds fly?" on coach. Coach answers but now and then makes startling comments from a prepared list given by supervisor. Student must handle originations to satisfaction of coach.

POSITION: Student and coach sit facing each other at a comfortable distance apart.

TRAINING STRESS: The student is taught to hear origination and do three things. 1. Understand it; 2. Acknowledge it; and 3. Return preclear to session. If the coach feels abruptness or too much time consumed or lack of comprehension, he corrects the student into better handling.

PATTER: All originations concern the coach, his ideas, reactions or difficulties, none concern the auditor. Otherwise the patter is the same as in earlier TRs. The student's patter is governed by: 1. Clarifying and understanding the origin. 2. Acknowledging the origin. 3. Giving the repeat statement "I'll repeat the auditing command," and then giving it. Anything else is a flunk.

The auditor must be taught to prevent ARC breaks and differentiate between a vital problem that concerns the pc and a mere effort to blow session. (TR 3 Revised.) Flunks are given if the student does more than 1. Understand; 2. Acknowledge; 3. Return pc to session.

Coach may throw in remarks personal to student as on TR 3. Student's failure to differentiate between these (by trying to handle them) and coach's remarks about self as "pc" is a flunk.

Student's failure to persist is always a flunk in any TR but here more so. Coach should not always read from list to originate, and not always look at student when about to comment. By originate is meant a statement or remark referring to the state of the coach or fancied case. By comment is meant a statement or remark aimed only at student or room. Originations are handled, comments are disregarded by the student.

HISTORY: Developed by L. Ron Hubbard in London in April 1956, to teach auditors to stay in session when preclear dives out. Revised by L. Ron Hubbard in 1961 to teach an auditor more about handling origins and preventing ARC breaks.

As TR 5 is also part of the CCHs it can be disregarded in the Comm Course TRs despite its appearance on earlier lists for students and staff auditors.

TRAINING NOTE

It is better to go through these TRs several times getting tougher each time than to hang on one TR forever or to be so tough at start student goes into a decline.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jw:JR:JS:nt.pe.rd.lfg

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 NOVEMBER 1959

Fran Hldrs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS IN AUDITING

Avoidance of Double Acknowledgement is vital if you ever hope to keep the preclear in session.

Double Acknowledgement occurs when the pc answers up, the auditor then acknowledges, and the pc then finishes his answer, leaving the auditor with another acknowledgement to do (and also leaving the auditor with no session).

Wrong:

Command: "What could you say to your father?"

Pc: "I could say, 'Hello'."

Auditor: "Fine."

Pc: "... Father, how are you?" I could say that."

Auditor: (weakly) "Good. What could you say to your father?"

Pc: "I could say, 'Are you feeling well?' "

Auditor: (desperate by now) "Good!"

Pc: "... enough to go fishing?" "

Auditor: "Well okay all right. Now "

A pc is not always sure he has answered the question so he often changes his mind. If the auditor gives him Tone 40 or any acknowledgement at all in between a pc's reply the *auditor is wrong*.

You just don't "encourage" a pc with a lot of agreement OK's and Yes's in the middle of answers. The pc answers, the pc is *sure he has answered* and the auditor then acknowledges. After all, it is the pc that must be satisfied.

There are many ways to mis-acknowledge a pc. But any mis-acknowledgement is only and always a failure to end the cycle of a command – auditor asks, pc replies and knows he has answered, auditor acknowledges. Pc knows auditor has acknowledged. That is a full auditing command cycle. Don't forget it and expect a process to work, it won't. The roughest spot in most auditors is TR 2, not so much *how* to acknowledge but *when*.

An auditor running into this with a pc should handle it this way.

Auditor: "What could you say to your father?"

- Pc: "I could say, 'Are you feeling well?' "
- Auditor: "Did that answer the question?"
- Pc: "Well, no. I could say, 'Are you feeling well enough to go fishing?' "
- Auditor: "Did that answer the question?"
- Pc: "Yes, I guess it did. He always liked fishing and sympathy."
- Auditor: (sure pc is through) "Good! What could you say to your father?"

And there's the way of it. If the pc is not sure he has answered and that the auditor has accepted the answer, the *pc will get no benefit from the auditing*. And that's how important that is.

Mood can be expressed by an acknowledgement. Evaluation can also be accomplished by acknowledgement, depending on the tone of voice with which it is uttered.

There is nothing bad about expressing mood by acknowledgement, except when the acknowledgement expresses criticalness, ridicule, or humour.

You can always spot a bad auditor. He does two things: he talks too much to the pc and he stops the pc from properly answering.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 OCTOBER 1965R
Revised 24 February 1975

Remimeo
All Students

MUTTER TR

Name: Mutter TR.

Purpose: To perfect muzzled auditing comm cycle.

Commands: “Do fish swim?” “Do birds fly?”

Position: Student and coach sit facing each other a comfortable distance apart.

Training Stress:

1. Coach has student give command.
2. Coach mutters an unintelligible answer at different times.
3. Student acknowledges.
4. Coach flunks if student does *anything* else but acknowledge.

(*Note.* This is the *entirety* of this Drill. It is not to be confused with any other Training Drill.)

Note. The whole trick in TR 2 and TR 4 is that it means one understands that the pc has said something or has answered. There is no demand the auditor understand the *meaning* in the pc’s answer in muzzled auditing. In the above drill the coach just mutters or nods and looks wise instead of saying anything comprehensible. The only kind of auditing where you *must* grab the actual sense of the answer is in listing or in looking for something that will blowdown or trying to find out what the pc thinks is wrong. If the pc *has* said something he wants the auditor to really grasp, let him explain and of course, if the pc insists, grasp it. But this is rare and happens only when the pc is already ARC Broken. Otherwise the above is the right way to do it.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:rs.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 NOVEMBER 1973

Remimeo
All Auditors
All Levels
Flag Internes
LRH Comms

THE CURE OF Q AND A MAN'S DEADLIEST DISEASE

Q and A is a dreadful malady which has to be cured before an Auditor (or an Administrator) can get results.

THE DISEASE OF Q AND A

Auditor: Spot that wall. Pc: My neck hurts. Auditor: Has it been hurting long? Pc: Ever since I was in the Army. Auditor: Are you in the Army now? Pc: No but my father is. Auditor: Have you been in comm with your father lately? Pc: I miss him. Auditor: That F/Ned, end of process. The Auditor has failed to note that he *never* got the pc to spot the wall or that he has run the pc all over the track flattening nothing, restimulating the pc.

A DEADLY BACTERIA

When an Auditor asks a Question and F/Ns something else he can mess a pc up badly.

Auditor: Do you have a withhold? That reads. Pc: It's just a 2D perversion. What I was really thinking about was my raise I got today. Auditor: That F/Ns. Pc (later in session): You run a lousy org here. Charge too much... Auditor in mystery, caves in. **That is simply Q and A in another coat.**

ADMINISTRATIVE DELIRIUM

When an Administrator Qs and As it puts him straight down the org board and into a spin.

LRH Comm: You have a target here to move the file cases. Staff Member: I didn't understand some of the words. LRH Comm: Here's a word clearing order for Qual. (Next day.) LRH Comm: Did you go to the word clearer? Staff Member: I'm on Medical Lines now. LRH Comm: How long have you been ill? Staff Member: Since the Ethics Officer was mean to me. LRH Comm: I'll go see about your ethics folder...

And there goes the old soccer game. **No target done because the executive could not handle Q and A.**

C/S Q AND A

Case Supervisors (blush for the thought) are often guilty of Q and A and infect their area with its bacteria.

Pc to Examiner: I have a cold. C/S: Run spot spots to cure his cold. Pc to Auditor: It's really I'm PTS to my Aunt. C/S: Do PTS RD on Aunt. Pc to Examiner: It's really my foot. C/S: Do touch assist on foot...

What C/S ever got a pc's program done that way?

Where you find undone programs in folders you find goofing Auditors and Q and A type Case Supervisors.

FUMIGATION

There are definite cures for this dreadful and disgraceful malady. It must be handled as it results in a breaking out of bogged cases and blows, high and low TAs and very red faces when the Paid Completions Stat is counted.

The Cure is pretty violent and very few have courage enough to go through with it as their confront at the beginning is too low, what with their no-interest items left in restim on their drug rundowns or no TRs to begin with or no Supervisor when they took the Course.

The direct result of all this is a symptom known as "patty-cake". This is a child game of clapping hands and putting palms together and has meant since 1950 Dianetics **not handling cases**. The signs of patty-cake are a weak slouching posture, bags under the eyes, a bowed spine and hangdog pathetic eyes. The respiration is quick and panicky, the palms sweat and. one starts at pins dropping in the next room.

However for those sturdy souls who want to Clear a planet and who really want to handle things they can prop themselves up in bed and somehow get through this program:

1. This HCOB starrate. _____
2. HCOB 24 May 62 "Q and A" starrate. _____
3. HCOB 13 Dec 61 "Varying Sec Check Questions". _____
4. HCOB 22 Feb 62 "Withholds, Missed and Partial". _____
5. HCOB 29 Mar 63 "Summary of Security Checking". _____
6. HCOB 7 Apr 64 "All Levels – Q and A". _____
7. TRs the Hard Way. _____
8. Upper Indoc a Rough Way. _____

- 9. Handling the Auditor's, C/S's or Administrator's Not Done or No Interest item Drug RD. _____
- 10. 35 hours Op Pro by Dup in Co-Audit receiving and giving. _____
- 11. HCOB 29 July 63 "Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Training Drills", Section "Q and A Drill". _____
- 12. HCOB 20 Nov 73 Issue I Anti-Q and A Drill. _____
- 13. HCOB 20 Nov 73 Issue II "F/N What You Ask or Program". _____
- 14. A final end result demonstrated that the person **can see situations and handle them.** _____

For, of course, the reason the person Qs and As is that he can't confront or see the existing scene and so can't handle it.

Q and A is the **disease of dodging life.**

When such a person tries to get a question or program done and the other person says or does something else, the Q and Aer goes into a sort of overwhelm or cave-in and just rides along at effect.

People who get things done are at cause. When they are not, they Q and A.

Thus it **is** a kind of illness. Chronic Overwhelm. It is **not** cured by drugs or electric shocks or brain operations.

It is cured by making oneself strong enough in confront and handle to live!

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt,jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 NOVEMBER 1973
Issue I

Remimeo
All Levels
Flag Internes
LRH Comms

Reissued from
21st Advanced Clinical Course Training Drills

ANTI-Q AND A TR

Name: Anti-Q and A TR.

Commands: Basically, “Put that (object) on my knee.” (A book, piece of paper, ashtray, etc can be used for object.)

Position: Student and Coach sitting facing each other at a comfortable distance and one at which the Coach can reach the Student’s knee with ease.

Purpose:

- (a) To train Student in getting a Pc to carry out a command using formal communication **not** Tone 40.
- (b) To enable the Student to maintain his TRs while giving commands.
- (c) To train the Student to not get upset with a Pc under formal auditing.

Mechanics: Coach selects small object (book, ashtray, etc) and holds it in his hand.

Training Stress: Student is to get the Coach to place the object that he has in his hand on the knee of the Student. The Student may vary his commands as long as he maintains the Basic Intention (not Tone 40) to get the Coach to place the object on the Student’s knee. The Student is not allowed to use any physical enforcement, only verbal commands. The Coach should try and get the Student to Q and A. He may say anything he wishes to try and get him off the track of getting the command executed. The Student may say what he wishes in order to get the command done, as long as it *directly* applies in getting the Coach to place the object on the Student’s knee.

The Coach flunks for:

- (a) Any communication not directly concerned with getting the command executed.
- (b) Previous TR.
- (c) Any upsetness demonstrated by Student.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 25 MAY 1962

Central Orgs
Franchise

E-METER INSTANT READS

An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.

The reaction of the needle may be any reaction except "nul". An instant read may be any change of characteristic providing it occurs instantly. The absence of a read at the end of the major thought shows it to be nul.

All *prior* reads and *latent* reads are ignored. These are the result of minor thoughts which may or may not be restimulated by the question.

Only the instant read is used by the auditor. Only the instant read is cleared on rudiments, What questions, etc.

The instant read may consist of any needle reaction, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action so long as it occurs at the exact end of the major thought being expressed by the auditor. If no reaction occurs at exactly that place (the end of the major thought) the question is nul.

By "*major thought*" is meant the complete thought being expressed in words by the auditor. Reads which occur prior to the completion of the major thought are "prior reads". Reads which occur later than its completion are "latent reads".

By "*minor thought*" is meant subsidiary thoughts expressed by words within the major thought. They are caused by the reactivity of individual words within the full words. They are ignored.

Example: "Have you ever injured dirty pigs?"

To the pc the words "you", "injured" and "dirty" are all reactive. Therefore, the minor thoughts expressed by these words also read on the meter.

The major thought here is the whole sentence. Within this thought are the minor thoughts "you", "injured" and "dirty".

Therefore the E-Meter needle may respond this way: "Have you (fall) ever injured (speeded fall) dirty (fall) pigs (***Fall***)?"

Only the major thought gives the instant read and only the last *fall* (bold-italic type in the sentence above) indicates anything. If that last reaction was absent, the whole sentence is nul despite the prior falls.

You can release the reactions (but ordinarily would not) on each of these minor thoughts. Exploring these prior reads is called "compartmenting the question".

Paying attention to minor thought reads gives us laughable situations as in the case, written in 1960, of "getting P.D.H.ed by the cat". By accepting these prior reads one can prove anything. Why? Because *Pain* and *Drug* and *Hypnosis* are minor thoughts within the major thought: "Have you ever been P.D.H.ed by a cat?" The inexpert auditor would believe such a silly thing had happened. But notice that if each minor thought is cleaned out of the major thought it no longer reacts as a whole fact. If the person on the meter *had* been P.D.H.ed by a cat, then only the discovery of the origin of the whole thought would clean up the whole thought.

Pcs also think about other things while being asked questions and these random personal restimulations also read before and after an instant read and are ignored. Very rarely, a pc's thinks react exactly at the end of a major thought and so confuse the issue, but this is rare.

We want the read that occurs instantly after the last syllable of the major thought without lag. That is the only read we regard in finding a rudiment in or out, to find if a goal reacts, etc. That is what is called an "instant read".

There is a package rudiment question in the half truth, etc. We are doing four rudiments in one and therefore have four major thoughts in one sentence. This packaging is the only apparent exception but is actually no exception. It's just a fast way of doing four rudiments in one sentence.

A clumsy question which puts "in this session" at the end of the major thought can serve the auditor badly. Such modifiers should come before the sentence, "In this session have you.....?"

You are giving the major thought directly to the reactive mind. Therefore any analytical thought will not react instantly.

The reactive mind is composed of:

1. Timelessness.
2. Unknownness.
3. Survival.

The meter reacts on the reactive mind, never on the analytical mind. The meter reacts instantly on any thought restimulated in the reactive mind.

If the meter reacts on anything, that datum is partly or wholly unknown to the preclear. An auditor's questions restimulate the reactive mind. This reacts on the meter.

Only reactive thoughts react instantly.

You can "groove in" a major thought by saying it twice. On the second time (or third time if it is longer) you will see only the instant read at the exact end. If you do this the prior reads drop out leaving only the whole thought.

If you go stumbling around in rudiments or goals trying to clean up the minor thoughts you will get lost. In sec checking you can uncover material by "compartmenting the question" but this is rarely done today. In rudiments, What questions, et al, you want the instant read

only. It occurs exactly at the end of the whole thought. This is your whole interest in cleaning a rudiment or a What question. You ignore all prior and latent reactions of the needle.

The exceptions to this rule are:

1. "Compartmenting the question", in which you use the prior reads occurring at the exact end of the minor thoughts (as above in the pigs sentence) to dig up different data not related to the whole thought.
2. "Steering the pc" is the only use of latent or random reads. You see a read the same as the instant read occurring again when you are not speaking but after you have found a whole thought reacting. You say "there" or "that" and the pc, seeing what he or she is looking at as you say it, recovers the knowledge from the reactive bank and gives the data and the whole thought clears or has to be further worked and cleared.

You can easily figure-figure yourself half to death trying to grapple with meter reads unless you get a good reality on the instant read which occurs at the end of the whole expressed thought and neglect all prior and latent reads except for steering the pc while he gropes for the answer to the question you asked.

That's the whole of reading an E-Meter needle.

(Two Saint Hill lectures of 24 May 1962 cover this in full.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

[HCO B 21 July 1962, Instant Reads, adds to this HCO B.]

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JULY 1962

Franchise
Sthil Students

Urgent

INSTANT READS

(Adds to HCO Bulletin of 25 May 1962)

On Rudiments, repetitive or fast, the instant read can occur anywhere within the last word of the question or when the thought major has been anticipated by the preclear, and must be taken up by the auditor. This is not a prior read. Preclears poorly in session, being handled by auditors with indifferent TR One, anticipate the instant read reactively as they are under their own control. Such a read occurs into the body of the last meaningful word in the question. It never occurs latent.

In other words all reads occurring when the major thought has been received by the preclear must be taken up and cleaned. This does not mean all needle reactions occurring while question is being asked must be cleaned, but it does mean that the instant read is often to be found before the last meaningful word is spoken fully, and it is catastrophic not to take it up and clean it.

Goals and items are however read only when the read occurs exactly at the end of the last word.

This will give you cleaner sessions and smoother needles.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.pm:rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 5 AUGUST 1978

Remimeo

Ref: HCOB 28 Feb 71 C/S Series 24 METERING READING ITEMS
HCOB 8 Apr 78 AN F/N IS A READ
E-Meter Essentials, page 17 (ROCK SLAM)
HCOB 18 Jun 78 NED Series 4 ASSESSMENT AND HOW TO GET THE ITEM

INSTANT READS

The correct definition of **instant read is that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.**

All definitions which state it is fractions of seconds after the question is asked, are cancelled.

Thus an instant read which occurs when the auditor assesses an item or calls a question is valid and would be taken up and latent reads, which occur fractions of seconds after the major thought, are ignored.

Additionally, when looking for reads while clearing commands or when the preclear is originating items, the auditor must note only those reads which occur at the exact moment the pc ends his statement of the item or command.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 18 MARCH 1974

Remimeo

E-METERS

SENSITIVITY ERRORS

An auditor must set the Sensitivity of an E-Meter exactly right for each pc.
The setting is different for almost every pc.

TOO LOW

Too low a Sensitivity on some pcs (like Sens 5-32) will obscure reads and make them look like ticks. It will obscure an F/N. Whereas a Sens 16-128 will show reads and F/Ns.

A pc can be hindered by the auditor not setting the Sensitivity high enough to show reads and F/Ns. Items are missed as well as F/Ns.

TOO HIGH

When auditing a flying pc or a Clear or OT the auditor who sets the Sensitivity too high gets weird impressions of the case.

"Latent reads" on such a case are common. They aren't latent at all. What happens is that the F/N is more than a dial wide at high Sensitivity and a started F/N looks like a read as its sweep is stopped by the pin on the right of the dial.

In this way uncharged items are taken up, the case is slowed, overrun and general up-sets requiring repairs occur.

On one hand electrode an OT VII sometimes has a $\frac{3}{4}$ dial wide F/N at Sens 5-32.

This would mean a $\frac{3}{4}$ dial F/N at Sens 2-32 with two cans.

A Clear sometimes has a floating TA at Sens 32-32 instead of an F/N. He would have to be run at Sens 3-32 two cans to keep him on a dial or detect F/Ns.

This is a very important matter as the auditor will miss F/Ns, think beginning F/Ns are reads and as the Pre-OT is off the dial, miss reads.

Thus uncharged areas are run and charged ones are missed.

The result is very chaotic to repair.

Some lower level pcs also have a need for lower Sensitivity settings.

SUMMARY

Sometimes an easy pc looks very difficult just because of wrong Sensitivity settings.

Set the Sensitivity for the pc for a half dial F/N maximum or minimum.

Don't get repairs.

Get wins.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ntm.rd

RON'S ORG COMMITTEE
QUAL BOARD RECOMMENDATION BULLETIN
4 JANUARY 2017

Remimeo
Class II Auditors and above
Level II checksheet
E-Meter Courses
Academy Supervisors

CORRECT SENSITIVITY SETTING

In February 1979, the E-meter drill 5 got revised twice and became EMD 5RA. Up to that time, the stated purpose of that drill was merely “to train a student auditor how to get an accurate can squeeze which correctly indicates the preclear’s current state of Havingness and state of case”. After the revision, the purpose became, amongst other purposes, “to train a student auditor how to determine the sensitivity setting to get $\frac{1}{3}$ of a dial drop of the needle on the can squeeze, for use in setting the correct sensitivity for each preclear in an auditing session”. Only at that point of time it became a general rule to have the sensitivity in a session at all times set as established by the can squeeze to give a $\frac{1}{3}$ of a dial drop. Before, there were several other, in part conflicting technical data as to the correct sensitivity setting.

Because of the late date it is doubtful that the above revision was really written by L. Ron Hubbard. Additionally it gave no reasons why earlier conflicting statements in various bulletins and tapes would no longer be accurate. Thus the Qual Board decided to inspect the matter and its findings are now issued in this Qual Board Recommendation Bulletin.

HISTORY AND REFERENCES

The first mention of the problem of correct sensitivity setting in the Red Volumes comes with HCOB 10 Feb 1960 *BRITISH E-METER OPERATION* (which in fact was a user manual for the Mark IV E-meter). It states that you should set the sensitivity to a $\frac{1}{3}$ of a dial drop on a can squeeze at the beginning of a session. However it continues and says, “Keep the sensitivity low so that you only get significant readings (not breath or heart beat). Most pcs run around 1 on sensitivity on this meter which is very live. Sticky pcs have to have a higher sensitivity setting”.

In later materials the third of a dial drop is frequently referred to as a stable datum, but as often it is mentioned that on rudiments, withholds or sec checks you need to use a higher sensitivity setting. Finally HCOB 16 Nov 1965 *E-METER SENSITIVITY SETTING* (which also later was revised in February 1979) made the following sensitivity settings mandatory:

“Rudiments are run at Sensitivity 16.

Lower level processes are run at Sensitivity 16.

Above Grade V sensitivity is run at 5.”

HCO PL 10 Feb 1966 II TECH RECOVERY mentions that “a Mark V Meter run with too high a sensitivity does not give a marked change when a needle floats. Thus sensitivity must be reduced in ordinary running and increased only to get in rudiments. Then a free needle becomes more visible. A Mark V cranked up to 128 sensitivity looks like a floating needle all the time at a casual glance on most pcs. Sensitivity 5 is ample.”

HCOB 3 July 1971 AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED states that on assessing correction lists the sensitivity should be set so “that it is easy to keep the needle at set” and that “5 is usual for upper grade cases. 16 is usual for lower grade or Dianetic cases.”

Finally HCOB 18 Mar 1974 E-METERS, SENSITIVITY ERRORS warns the auditor that the sensitivity must neither be too low so it is hiding reads and F/Ns, nor – especially on Pre-OTs and “flying pcs” – too high, thus leading the auditor to mis-reading F/Ns and having the needle often off the dial. It concludes with the stable datum, “Set the Sensitivity for the pc for a half dial F/N maximum or minimum.”

By statement of a Class VIII trained in the early 1970s, the way it was applied then was to run the pc on the sensitivity set by a 1/3 of a dial drop on can squeeze, but on rudiments and related activities on sensitivity 16.

References:

HCOB 10 FEB 1960 BRITISH E-METER OPERATION

HCOB 19 MAY 1961 ASSESSMENT DATA

HCOB 1 MAR 1964 METER READS, SIZE OF

BOOK OF E-METER DRILLS (UNREVISED EDITION)

HCOB 16 NOV 1965 E-METER SENSITIVITY SETTING

HCO PL 10 FEB 1966 II TECH RECOVERY

HCOB 11 FEB 1966 FREE NEEDLES, HOW TO GET THEM ON A PC

HCOB 3 JULY 1971 AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED

HCOB 18 MAR 1974 E-METERS, SENSITIVITY ERRORS

HOW TO SET THE SENSITIVITY

By the data given above it can be concluded that

- a) Basically for the processes to be run, the major action, the sensitivity is set by the can squeeze, as given in E-Meter Drill 5RA.
- b) For rudiments and the assessment of correction lists the sensitivity should be increased markedly, to get significant instant reads.

- c) If the sensitivity according to the above rules a) and b) is leading to the trouble described in the HCOB 18 Mar 74 E-METERS, SENSITIVITY ERRORS, the auditor is justified to adjust the sensitivity so that he can reasonably work with the meter and an F/N would be “half dial maximum or minimum”. This applies particularly to Clears and OTs and other pcs with a very live needle and, in the case of the other extreme, pcs who have a very sticky needle that only shows very small movements.
- d) It should not be ignored that several EM drills give specific instructions as to the sensitivity setting for this drill. In these cases the sensitivity for the drill should not be set to 1/3 of a dial drop but according to the drill description.

MARK V SETTINGS IN RELATION TO OTHER METERS

The Mark V E-Meter is no longer in use. Newer Meters from the Church of Scientology have approximately the same sensitivity (but only in the middle range of the Tone Arm) but are not recommended for use for various reasons, especially the needle behavior.

On the Ability Meter (2, 2a, 3 and 3a) the sensitivity is not equal to the Mark V. By actual test, the sensitivity settings roughly compare as follows:

Sens 5 on the Mark V - ca. Sens 4 on the Ability Meter

Sens 16 on the Mark V - ca. Sens 12 on the Ability Meter

Other meters must be tested if the information how the sensitivity compares to a Mark V or Ability Meter cannot be gotten from the manufacturer. The following data can help with this.

On a Mark V, a BD of the needle, i.e. a meter read from set to exactly the end of the dial, means the following TA change¹:

on Sens 5: 0.25 TAA

on Sens 8: 0.125 TAA

on Sens 16: 0.1 TAA

on Sens 32: 0.05 TAA

USE OF REFERENCES AND STUDY MATERIALS

According with the data given above, it is recommended that students are trained to set the sensitivity before the start of session as given in E-Meter Drill 5RA. HCOB 16 Nov 1965 E-METER SENSITIVITY SETTING can be used for imparting the datum that sensitivity is cranked up when running rudiments. In the case of HCOB 3 JULY 71 AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED the issue revised in February 1979 would be fine except for the change of the above

¹ Future e-meters should be designed so that they are in accordance with the Mark V specifications for sensitivity. In this way auditors can easily relate to the HCOBs.

given quote; so it is recommended to use the unrevised version in training of auditors. The remaining changes in the revised issue are not very significant and are covered elsewhere so that the revised version can be used as reference but should not be included in training. The unrevised version of HCOB 18 Mar 74 E-METERS, SENSITIVITY ERRORS must be studied by an Academy student on Level II because it is expected at that level that the auditor is aware that on some pcs he needs to adjust the sensitivity according to the needs of the specific pc sometimes.²

QUAL BOARD of the
RON'S ORG COMMITTEE

As assisted by the

TECH EXAMINATION BOARD

I/C: Max Hauri

2nd: Otfried Krumpholz

Erica Hauri

ROC QB:TEB:MH:ok

² As an advice for academy supervisors and case supervisors it should be added that the combination of too low a sensitivity and a modern meter that automatically puts the needle on set whenever it leaves the scale can lead to a mistakenly low tone arm action recorded: the auditor switches his meter on auto and is too lazy to return the needle to set when it moves out of the set area – he rather continues to audit and waits until the needle is so far off set that the automatic meter does the work for him. When the sensitivity is rather low, the needle might do a lot of motion back and forth that under normal circumstances (higher sensitivity setting, auditor correctly adjusting the needle whenever it moves away from the set area) would produce quite a bit of tone arm action that is recorded, but as the auditor does not push the set button often enough and the needle only rarely leaves the scale, the tone arm action recorded is close to zero. Additionally the auditor will not (and on most meter models cannot) write down the actually changing TA position and thus the C/S cannot even suspect the mistake. Academy supervisors should watch this point in training and stress that the needle is brought back to set whenever necessary, no matter whether the meter is set to “auto” or not.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JUNE 1961

Central Orgs
Franchise

THE RISING NEEDLE: SKIP IT!

Former ACC students will well remember the E-Meter drill in which, among other “reactions”, they were to produce a rising needle on their coach. The time has come to change nomenclature on this one! For practical auditing purposes – such as deciding if a Sec Check question has been cleared, or whether a particular level of the Pre-Hav Scale should be run – **a Rising Needle is not classified as a “reaction”**.

Of the 10 needle actions described in Ron’s new book, *E-Meter Essentials*, let’s call the following “*reactions*”, in as much as they are of value to an auditor in deciding what needs to be run on a case, or what needs further work:

- **Rock Slam**
- **Fall**
- **Theta Bop**
- **Stuck**
- **Change of Needle Characteristic**

The following might be called, simply, needle actions, or motions – in that you don’t use them in deciding to *do* something with a pc:

- **Free Needle**
- **No Reaction (nul)**
- **Stage Four**
- **Rise**
- **Body Reaction**

About all a rising needle tells you is that the pc can’t confront, therefore has exceedingly low reality, responsibility, and knowingness on whatever significance it’s rising on. So, skip it! Treat a rising needle, for practical purposes like a Security Check or Assessment, like a nul needle. You needn’t pursue this particular subject any further at this point in the case, because the pc’s knowingness and responsibility on this subject is practically nil. There may very well be further material available on this particular subject *after* the pc has had some more auditing – but *not now*. So, let go of it. Skip it! So, it’s putting the Tone Arm up, this rise. All right. That’s why E-Meters are built with Tone Arms that rotate; sometimes they go

up! Fine. You don't need to do a blessed *thing* about it, and shouldn't try. Just keep on with your check, assessment, or whatever it is you're doing. Let your auditing guides be the rock slam, fall, theta bop, chiefly, plus stick and change of pattern.

If it's a rise with sticks in it, you do find out what's putting the *stick* into it. If it were a rising needle with rock slam in it you'd investigate the *rock slam*. But the rise itself, or a needle that is simply rising, you ignore.

In this way you will save hours and hours of auditing time. Trying to kill a rise by finding out what it's rising on is attacking the case at its least approachable point – the point responsibility, reality, confrontingness and knowingness are at their lowest, the point when the pc (and the meter!) is least capable of helping you, or himself. Why try to scale a wall where it's 20 feet high when you can walk through the breaches in it? So gear him in instead where the needle is reacting with rock slam, falls, theta bop, or sticks, where he has some reality and responsibility, where he knows something about it, and can confront it a little. That way he'll move, and you'll both win.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:im.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 MAY 1969

Remimeo
Dn Checksheets

TRs AND DIRTY NEEDLES

When a student's pc develops a dirty needle (dn) it is caused by one of three things.

1. The student's TRs are bad.
2. The student is breaking the Auditor's Code.
3. The pc has withholds (w/hs) he does not wish known.

The remedy for TRs is to have the student do them in clay, showing the lines and actions of each TR. And to do more TRs with a fellow student.

The remedy for Code Breaks is to have the student define and do Invalidation and Evaluation in clay. And to list examples of possible upsets caused by each line of the Code.

The remedy for the pc with withholds is to send to a Scientology Review Auditor as Scientology can handle outnesses which occur in Dianetic sessions.

It is a safe rule in any event when a "dirty needle" occurs to send the preclear to a Scientology Review Auditor.

It is also a safe rule to assume that the student whose pcs get dirty needles is deficient on TRs and the Auditor's Code.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:an.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 SEPTEMBER 1978

Remimeo
HCOs
Tech Staff
Qual Staff
Confessional Courses
All Auditors, C/Ses,
Supervisors

(Cancels HCOB 5 Dec AD12 “2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21
and Routine 2-10 Modern Assessment.”)
(Cancels HCOB 13 Aug AD12)
(Cancels HCOB 1 Aug AD12)

URGENT – URGENT – URGENT

DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM

The following is the only valid definition of an R/S:

Rock Slam: The crazy, irregular, left-right slashing motion of the needle on the E-Meter dial. R/Ses repeat left and right slashes unevenly and savagely, faster than the eye easily follows. The needle is frantic. The width of an R/S depends largely on sensitivity setting. It goes from one-fourth inch to whole dial. But it slams back and forth.

A rock slam (R/S) means a hidden evil intention on the subject or question under auditing or discussion.

Valid R/Ses are not always instant reads. An R/S can read prior or latently.

HCOB 5 DECEMBER AD12, “2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 AND ROUTINE 2-10 MODERN ASSESSMENT” is an HCOB composited by others incorrectly and is **cancelled** as it misdefines an R/S as a single slash left or right. It contains the statements: “One or two slashes make an R/S... If it slashed up or down once call it an R/S.” The data is utterly false. By this wrong definition a rocket read could be mistaken for an R/S, or any sudden rise could be mistaken for an R/S. **One slash doesn’t begin to be an R/S. Nor two or three for that matter. The correct definition of an r/s includes that it slashes savagely left and right.**

DEFINITION OF A DIRTY NEEDLE

The following is the only valid definition of a dirty needle:

Dirty Needle: An erratic agitation of the needle which is ragged, jerky, ticking, not sweeping, and tends to be persistent. It is not limited in size.

A Dirty Needle is caused by one of three things:

1. **The auditor's TRs are bad.**
2. **The auditor is breaking the auditor's code.**
3. **The pc has withholds he does not wish known.**

The definitions of a dirty needle as "a small Rock Slam" and "a smaller edition of the rock slam" in HCOB 13 AUGUST AD12, "ROCK SLAMS AND DIRTY NEEDLES," are **cancelled**. The definition of a dirty needle as "a minute rock slam" in HCOB 1 AUGUST AD12, "ROUTINE 3GA, GOALS, NULLING BY MID RUDS," is **cancelled**.

All definitions which limit the size of a dirty needle to "one quarter of an inch" or "less than one quarter of an inch" are **cancelled**.

A dirty needle is **not to be confused** with an R/S. They are distinctly different reads. You never mistake an R/S if you have ever seen one. A dirty needle is far less frantic.

The difference between a Rock Slam and a dirty needle is in the character of the read. Not the size.

Persistent use of "fish and fumble" can sometimes turn a dirty needle into a rock slam. However until it does it is simply a dirty needle.

Auditors, C/Ses, supervisors must must must know the difference between these two types of reads cold.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 AUGUST 1976

Remimeo
All Sec Checkers
All HCO Personnel
All Meter Operators

R/Ses, WHAT THEY MEAN

(Integrity Processing Checksheets)
(PTS Processing Checksheets)
(Expanded Dianetics Checksheets)
(Meter Operation Checksheets)
(Various Rundown Checksheets)

The violent left right ragged motion of the needle which sometimes occurs on a pc's meter is called "A Rockslam" or "R/S." The term was taken from a process in the 50s which sought to locate "A rock" on the pc's early timetrack; the "slam" is a description of the needle violence, meaning it "slams" back and forth. For a time all left right motions of the needle were considered and called "Rockslams" until it was found that a *smooth* left right flow was a symptom of release or key out and this became the "Floating Needle." There is yet another left right motion of the needle called the "Theta Bop." This occurs when the person has or is trying to exteriorize. "Theta" is the symbol for the person as a spirit or goodness; "bop" is an electronic term for a slight hitch in the sweep of a needle. A "Theta Bop" hitches evenly at each end of the sweep left and right and is very even in the middle of the sweep.

Neither the "Floating Needle" nor the "Theta Bop" can be confused with a "Rockslam." The difference of the Rockslam is uneven, ragged agitation left and right; even the distances traveled left and right are likely to be different in each swing from the last.

A "Rockslam" can be caused sometimes by leaving rings on the pc's fingers or by a short circuit in the meter or by the cans (electrodes) touching something like a dress. These are the mechanical considerations and must be ruled out before the pc can be considered to have "Rockslammed." If the pc is not wearing rings and if the meter needle is calm with the lead unplugged, if the lead is okay, and if the pc is not jiggling the ends of the cans against his clothes, then the pc's Rockslam is caused by the pc's bank.

One has to be very careful about the correctness of the pc actually having Rockslammed while on the meter that it was actually observed, that it was not mechanically caused as above. One puts the R/S down on the worksheet and also gives exactly what was asked. And also that the mechanical points were checked without distracting the pc.

One must always report a Rockslam in the auditing report, note it with session date and page inside the left cover of the pc's folder and report it to ethics including the question or subject which rockslammed, phrased exactly.

Why? Because the Rockslam is the most important needle manifestation! It gives the clue to the pc's case.

In 1970 I began a full-scale research project into the subject of insanity and its relationship to cases and case gains and suppression. It was only then that the full significance of the Rockslam was unearthed. This research developed into what is now called **Expanded Dianetics**, a series of special processes and actions with their drills and training which permits the auditor to handle a specific case type. This was, by the way, Man's first system of positive detection and handling of psychosis and the first full understanding of what psychosis is.

While this bulletin is not in any way a two minute course in or a substitute for full training in Expanded Dianetics, any auditor who audits, sec checks, or handles people on a meter has to know what a Rockslam is and how it behaves and what he should do about it.

The first thing is to be able to recognize one and to quickly with the scan of the eye and unplug of the meter cord (without any distraction of or notice by the pc) make the checks for a mechanical Rockslam as given above.

You can make a meter "Rockslam" with no pc or cord connected to it by (a) turning it on; (b) put the sensitivity at perhaps 2; (c) put the needle at "set"; (d) rapidly, very rapidly, move the TA back and forth maybe a quarter of an inch and do it unevenly. *That*, if you did it very fast and unevenly, would be something that resembled a Rockslam. But no matter how fast you made your fingers move, a real R/S is a trifle faster. If you do that you will see what an R/S looks like. The needle in this experiment is not made to hit the sides of the meter.

Now if you take the same setup and smoothly slowly move the tone arm back and forth about 2 times a second without any roughness and the same distance right and left, you will have a Floating Needle. Note it very well as this comes at a time of release and is the thing a good auditor hopes to see and gives him the end-off signal for a process. It has to be well known as you **never** bypass one in a session and to do so makes an uncomfortable pc. (The pc will often cognite – and get a realization about himself or life at this point and one does not stop him from doing this.) This is the thing you indicate to the pc. You don't ever indicate Rockslams or Theta Bops. When you see it and, without stopping or interrupting the pc's cognition, you always say, "Your needle is floating."

Now the Theta Bop can also be shown to yourself by you. Set up the meter as above. Only this time, you smoothly swing it to the right and give it a tiny twitch in the same direction. Then you smoothly, at once, swing it to the left and give it a tiny twitch in the same direction. Then do it to the right. And so on. This is a Theta Bop. It is different than a Floating Needle only in that it hitches at each end of the swing. So learn to recognize it.

There is a vicious smooth right direction slash that occurs when a pc hits a certain area of the bank that is called a "Rocket Read" and there is of course the small fall, long fall (which both go to the right and indicate a charged question or reaction) and there is the grad-

ual rise to the left. But these do not repeat back and forth which is the characteristic of the Rockslam, Floating Needle and Theta Bop.

All right, so we know exactly what it looks like when we talk about a **Rockslam** as a read of the meter. We know how it can be mechanically caused. And we know what we have to record and report when it is seen.

But exactly *what* does a Rockslam mean with regards to the pc?

If you don't know this you can miss on the pc, on the case, on the org and humanity.

A Rockslam means a hidden evil intention on the subject or question under discussion or auditing.

Two things underlie insanity, or to be more specific, there are two causes and conditions both of which have been lumped together by man and called insanity. He could not of course define it as he didn't know what caused it.

The first of these two things does not concern us overly much here and is the subject of a separate checksheet training and is called PTS or Potential Trouble Source handling. A "PTS" is a person who has been or is connected with somebody who has evil intentions. A PTS can feel uncomfortable in life or be neurotic or go insane because of the actions upon him of a person with evil intentions. Most of the people in institutions are probable PTSes.

The second of these two things is insanity caused to the individual himself (let alone others) by hidden evil intentions.

The extent of these intentions and what the person will do (and hide) in order to carry them out is quite shocking. These people are covert or overt criminals and many of them are insane – meaning beyond all rationality in their acts. Because their evil intentions are hidden and because they are often very plausible such individuals are what make "behavior so mysterious" and "man looks so evil when you see what mankind does" and all sorts of fallacies.

It is this last type, the chronic, heavy Rockslammer, which Expanded Dianetics handles.

One Rockslam doesn't make a psychotic. Or a total menace to everyone. But it does mean there could be more and it might in rare cases mean you have, seeing enough of these R/Ses, a very dangerous person on your hands and in your vicinity. And that person must be handled by Expanded Dianetics.

You won't see a great many Rockslams in auditing people so you could be totally thrown off by surprise when you see one. And mess it all up because you are surprised. So know what it is and don't get all quivery and make mistakes and blow your confront. Just carry on.

If you don't note the **exact** question that was asked and the **exactly** worded statement the pc made when the R/S was seen, you can muck it up for the Expanded Dianetics guys. They won't be able to get it turned back on again easily and will lose a lot of time. So you have to be sure your auditing report is accurate, that the R/S is written BIG on the column and circled and, no matter what else you do in the session, you have to get it recorded in the left front cover of the folder giving the date and page of the session and you have to report it to

Ethics. And also you don't third party the pc and give him a bad time in the session because of it.

Now R/Ses most easily turn on during Sec Checks or Integrity Processing or when pulling withholds or trying to investigate something. So the people who see these most often are those engaged in that activity and not routine auditing (when they can also but more rarely turn on). Further the most likely person to collide with "needing to be sec checked" is an R/Ser, which again increases the numbers of R/Ses seen in these activities compared to routine auditing. But a very heavy R/Ser will also turn them on in routine auditing.

It is the exact *point* of the R/S in the session, the exact question that was asked and the exact subject or phrase where the R/S turned on that are important. And these are very important as then the person can be fully handled with a full Expanded Dianetics rundown by a qualified Expanded Dianetics Specialist. When, of course, the person gets to that point on his grade chart. (The grade chart points are after Dianetics (like Drug RDs etc.) but before Grades, after Grades but before Power, after Power but before Solo, and after OT III or after any single grade above OT III. These are the only points where Expanded Dianetics can be delivered and the R/S fully and completely handled.)

Now here is how you can turn off an R/S and mistakenly think it is handled:

1. The overt-motivator sequence has two sides. One is what the person has done (overt) and what is done to the person (motivator). You can ask, when the person R/Ses on something, if anyone has ever **invalidated** him on that subject or action. He will find some and the R/S will turn off **and won't even be faintly handled but only submerged**. One can believe he had "handled" the R/S. Not true. He has just turned it off and maybe made it harder to find next time. One can ask what the person has done TO the subject mentioned and while this may unburden the case and make the person a bit better, the R/S is **not** handled, only turned off or submerged. It's almost as if there are so many overts and motivators on this subject or in this area that the push-pull of it makes the needle go wild (R/S). And indeed, this may be the energy cause, in the bank, of the needle reaction.

But neither overt nor motivator handles an R/S finally because the **cause** of the R/S is an **intention** to harm and it isn't all that likely the basic intention will be reached.

2. Another apparent way the R/S can get "handled" and isn't is to take the R/Ser earlier-similar on the subject of the R/S. The R/S will probably cease, go "clean." But in actual fact it is still there, hidden.
3. The third way an R/S can be falsely "handled" is to direct the person's attention to something else. If, when this is done, the exact subject of the R/S is not noted by the auditor, it will be difficult to find it again when the person goes into Expanded Dianetic auditing.
4. Yet another, and probably the last way to falsely "handle" an R/S is to abuse the person about his conduct or behavior or the R/S, or to "educate" him to do better, or to "modify" his behavior with shocks or surgery or other tortures like the psychiatrists do. In other words one can seek to suppress the R/S in numerous ways. Maybe the R/S

won't occur (being too overburdened now) but it is still there, buried very deep and possibly beyond reach now.

So if you understand the above four points you will see that although you can ease off the R/S, you have not handled it. It has merely gone out of sight.

All right, what then **does handle** an R/S?

I warned you that this isn't a two minute course on Expanded Dianetics and it isn't. An R/S is **handled** by a fully qualified Expanded Dianetics auditor delivering full Expanded Dianetics to the person at that point on the grade chart where Expanded Dianetics is supposed to be delivered. If anyone thinks it can be done effectively any other way or if he C/Ses it to be done and the auditor is stupid enough to try to do that C/S, then it's Committees of Evidence and Suspended Certificates all around.

With that warning, and only with that warning, I can briefly state what has to be done with the case. This is not what **you** do if you are not delivering full Expanded Dianetics at the right point on the grade chart. It is a brief statement so that you can understand what lies under that R/S.

The pc with an R/S on any given subject and who R/Ses while discussing that or related subjects **has an evil intention toward the subject discussed or some closely related subject**. The pc intends that subject or area of life nothing but calculating, covert, underhanded **harm** which will be at all times carefully hidden from that subject.

Thus, the Expanded Dianetics Specialist, in handling that case (at the proper point on the grade chart) has to be able to locate each and every subject and question and R/S in that person's folder as noted by Sec Checkers and previous auditors or cramming officers or why finders. He has to have the complete list of R/S subjects. If they are noted as to session date and page and if all sec checking papers and cramming papers are in that person's folder, then the Expanded Dianetics Specialist can do a full and complete job. Otherwise he has to do a lot of other time wasting actions to get the R/Ses found and turned on again.

What the Expanded Dianetics Specialist actually does is locate **exactly** the actual evil intention for every R/S on the case and handle each one to total conclusion. When he is finished, if he has done his job well, the person's behavior will be magically improved and as to his social presence, menace and conduct, well that will be toward survival.

When you see an R/S, if you are not an Expanded Dianetic Specialist doing Expanded Dianetics at the correct point on the grade chart, you don't say, "Hey, you've got an evil intention!" and you don't ask "Say, what's that evil intention?" or do corny things like that because you'll get the pc self listing, you may get a wrong item, you won't know what to do with it and you're just likely to get the auditing room wrapped around your neck right there.

No, you quietly note it, make sure it isn't a mechanical fault, write it big on the worksheet, write down everything the pc is saying swiftly, note what question you were asking and let the pc talk and ack him and go on with what you are doing with the pc at the time. And after session you note it in the left-hand cover of the folder and send a report to Ethics.

And some day, when he's done his Drug Rundown or gotten to one of the points on the grade chart where a full XDn can be done, why then it will be handled. And a good C/S will program or tip the case for that to be done.

So that's the know-how you have to know about R/Ses to really help the guy and the society and your group.

We're not in the business of curing psychos. The governments at this writing pay the psychiatrists billions a year to torture and kill because of R/Ses they don't know anything about. The crime in the society out there is caused by people who R/S. Stalin, Hitler, Napoleon and Caesar were probably the most loaded R/Sers of all time unless it was Jack the Ripper or your local friendly psychiatrist.

So know what you are seeing when you see it and know what to do about it. And don't kid yourself. Or vilify or mow down people who R/S; we're not in that business.

And the Expanded Dianetic Specialist *and* the pc someday will love you dearly for knowing your job and doing it right.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 NOVEMBER 1973
Issue II

Remimeo
All Levels
Flag Internes

C/S Series 89

F/N WHAT YOU ASK OR PROGRAM

Ref: HCO B 23 Dec 72 Integrity Processing Series 20
HCO B 21 Nov 73 The Cure of Q and A

When an Auditor asks one question but F/Ns something else it is simply a version of Q and A.

Example:

Auditor: Do you have a problem?

Pc: (ramble-ramble) I was thinking of last night's dinner.

Auditor: That F/Ns.

Every few folders you pick up, if you can find examples of this:

The Auditor is not trained not to Q and A.

He is **not** getting answers to his questions.

When the Auditor starts something (such as a question or process) he **must** F/N what he started **even though he did something else during it and got an F/N on something else. He must F/N the original action.**

The result can be:

- (a) Missed W/H phenomena.
- (b) High or low TA an hour after the pc "F/Ned at Examiner".
- (c) A stalled case.
- (d) An undone program.
- (e) An unhandled pc.
- (f) Continual need for repair programs.

To get this disease out of an HGC requires that Auditors go through an Anti-Q and A handling.

C/S Q AND A

C/Ses can also Q and A. They simply handle whatever the pc originates to the Examiner or Auditor, over and over and on and on.

The result is:

- A. Incomplete Programs.
- B. Tripled or quadrupled C/S effort as the case never seems to get solved.
- C. Loads of repair programs.

Yet a C/S who does it will never look for it as **the** primary error being committed.

The remedy is to have the C/S do an Anti-Q and A program.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt,jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 27 MAY 1970

Remimeo

UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS

(With particular reference to doing
a Group Engram Intensive)

Never list a listing question that doesn't read.

Never prepcheck an item that doesn't read.

These rules hold good for all lists, all items, even **Dianetics**.

A "tick" or a "stop" is not a read. Reads are small falls or falls or long falls or long fall blowdown (of TA).

A preclear's case can be gotten into serious trouble by listing a list that doesn't read or prepchecking or running an item that doesn't read.

On a list, this is the sort of thing that happens:

The List is "Who or what would fly kites?" The C/S has said to "List this to a BD F/N Item". So the auditor *does* list it without checking the read at all. The list can go on 99 pages with the pc protesting, getting upset. This is called a "Dead horse list" because it gave no item. The reason it didn't was that the list question itself didn't read. One does an L4 on the pc to correct the situation and gets "Unnecessary action".

On a list that is getting no item you don't *extend*. You correctly use L4 or any subsequent issue of it. If you extend a "dead horse list" you just make things worse. Use an L4 and it will set it right.

This weird thing can also happen. C/S says to list "Who or what would kill buffaloes?" The auditor does, gets a BD F/N Item "A Hunter". The C/S *also* says to list as a second action "Who or what would feel tough?" The auditor fails to test the Question for read and lists it. Had he tested it, the list would not have read. But the list comes up with an item, "A mean hunter". It has stirred up charge from the first question and the item "A mean hunter" is a *wrong* item as it is a misworded variation of the first list's item! Now we have an unnecessary action *and* a wrong item. We do an L4 and the pc is still upset as maybe only one or the other of the *two* errors read.

In a Dianetic "list" one is not doing a listing action. One is only trying to find a somatic or sensation, etc. that will run. The item must read well. Or it won't produce a chain to run. In actual fact the Dn list Q does usually read but one doesn't bother to test it.

But an item that doesn't read will produce no chain, no basic and the pc will jump around the track trying but just jamming up his bank.

The moral of this story is:

Always *test* a Listing Question before letting the pc list.

Always *mark* the read it gave (SF, F, LF, LFBD) on the worksheet.

Always test an item for read before prepchecking or running recall or engrams.

Always mark the read an item gave (SF, F, LF, LFBD) on the worksheet.

CHARGE

The whole subject of "charge" is based on this. "Charge" is the electrical impulse on the case that activates the meter.

"Charge" shows not only that an area has something in it. It also shows that the pc has possible *reality* on it.

A pc can have a broken leg, yet it might not read on a meter. It would be *charged* but below the pc's reality. So it won't read.

THINGS THAT DON'T READ WON'T RUN.

The Case Supervisor always counts on the **Auditor** to test Questions and Items for read before running them.

The auditor, when a Question or Item doesn't read, can and should always put in "Suppress" and "Invalidate". "On this (Question) (Item), has anything been Suppressed?" "On this (Question) (Item), has anything been Invalidated?" If either one read, the question or item will also read. The Case Supervisor also counts on the **Auditor** to use Suppress and Invalidate on a Question or Item. If after this there is still no read on the Question or Item, that's it. Don't use it, don't list it. Go to the next action on the C/S or end off.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dz.ka.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 FEBRUARY 1971

Remimeo
HGC Auditor Check-
sheet
Academy Level 0
Checksheet
Dn Crs Checksheet
**For LRH Comm
Compliance**

C/S Series 24

IMPORTANT

METERING READING ITEMS

(**Note:** Observation I have recently done while handling a C/S line has resulted in a necessary clarification of the subject of "a reading item or question" which improves older definitions and saves some cases.)

It can occasionally happen that an auditor misses a read on an item or question and does not run it as it "has not read". This can hang up a pc badly if the item was in fact a reading item or question. It does not get handled and exists in records as "No read" when in fact it **did** read.

Therefore all Dianetic auditors whose items occasionally "don't read" and all Scientology auditors who get list questions that don't read must be checked out on this HCOB in Qual or by the C/S or Supervisor.

These errors come under the heading of Gross Auditing Errors as they affect metering.

1. An Item or Question is said to "Read" when the needle falls. Not when it stops or slows on a rise. A tick is always noted and in some cases becomes a wide read.
2. The read is taken when the pc first says it or when the question is cleared. **This** is the valid time of read. It is duly marked (plus any blow down). **This** reading defines *what* is a *reading item or question*. **Calling it back to see if it read is not a valid test** as the surface charge may be gone but the item or question will still run or list.
3. Regardless of any earlier statements or material on **Reading Items**, an item does not have to read when the auditor calls it to be a valid item for running engrams or listing. The test is did it read when the pc first said it on originating it or in Clearing it?
4. That an item or question is marked as having read is sufficient reason to run it or use it or list it. Pc Interest, in Dianetics, is also necessary to run it, but that it did not read *again* is no reason to not use it.

5. When listing items the auditor must have an eye on the meter **not** necessarily the pc and must note on the list he is making the extent of read and any BD and how much. **This** is enough to make it a "reading item" or "reading question".
6. In Clearing a listing Question the auditor watches the meter, **not** necessarily the pc and notes any read while clearing the question.
7. An additional calling of the item or question to see if it read is unnecessary and not a valid action if the item or question read on origination or Clearing.
8. That an item is marked as having read on an earlier Dianetic list is enough (also checking interest) to run it with no further read test.
9. To miss seeing a read on an origin or clearing is a Gross Auditing Error.
10. Failing to mark on the list or worksheet the read and any BD seen during pc origination or clearing the question is a Gross Auditing Error.

EYESIGHT

Auditors who miss reads or have poor eyesight should be tested and should wear the proper glasses while auditing.

GLASSES

The rims of some glasses could obstruct seeing the meter while the auditor is looking at the worksheet or pc.

If this is the case the glasses should be changed to another type with broader vision.

WIDE VISION

A good auditor is expected to see his meter, pc and worksheet all at one time. No matter what he is doing he should always notice any meter movement if the meter needle moves.

If he cannot do this he should use an Azimuth Meter and *not* put paper over its glass but should do his worksheet looking through the glass at his pen and the paper—the original design purpose of the Azimuth Meter. Then even while writing he sees the meter needle move as it is in his line of vision.

CONFUSIONS

Any and all confusions as to what is a "reading item" or "reading question" should be fully cleaned up on any auditor as such omissions or confusions can be responsible for case hang-ups and needless repairs.

NO READ

Any comment that an item or question "did not read" should be at once suspected by a C/S and checked with this HCO B on the auditor.

Actually non-Reads, a non-reading item or question means one that did *not* read when originated or cleared and also did not read when called.

One can still call an item or question to get a read. That it now reads is fine. But if it has never read at all, the item will not run and such a list will produce no item on it.

It is not forbidden to call an item or question to test it for read. But it is a useless action if the item or question read on origination by the pc or clearing it with him.

IMPORTANT

The data in this HCOB, if not known, can cost case failures. Thus it must be checked out on auditors.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:nt.rd

CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADE PROCESSES
UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS
MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING
INSTANT READS

By Max Hauri

1. August 2001

Added to 12 May 05

Added to 14 May 09 (Addition in this type face)

R-Fac and Observation: around 1978 the Church of Scientology started some attempts to make the tech standardized (to release all as HCOBs and HCO PLs instead of having BTBs and BPLs) and easily understandable. The Church wrote quite an amount of new "HCOBs" which were based on true LRH tech but in fact have not been directly written by him. And by that some fatal errors – most probably intentionally – sneaked in.

HCOB 23 June 1980 CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADES PROCESSES (especially the revisions R and RA) is most probably not from LRH and only an interpretation of his tech. There is no issue or lecture of LRH that an auditor has to check a normal grade process for read. As basic to that HCOB served probably HCOB 27 May 1970 UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS (revised and unrevised) which states that a question must read before you can run it. But this applies to LISTING AND NULLING QUESTIONS, not to grade commands. No auditor known to me who did the Academy and/or SHSBC before 1978 did ever check any grade process for read.

Actually the HCOB 23 June 1980R CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADES PROCESSES started a fatal wave of quickie what was followed by the "solution" of "Golden Age of Technology".

The HCOB 23 June 1980R CHECKING QUESTIONS ON GRADES PROCESSES and the practice of checking normal grade commands for interest and read is no more to be used and taught on any course or checksheet. Please don't use it anymore. The first release, HCOB 23 June 1980 actually contained the correct datum that a general grade process doesn't need to be checked for read, only specific items have to.

HCOB 27 May 1970R UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS (*only the Revision!*) is also not to be used anymore as it says every flow has to read, which applies to Dianetics and not to Scientology Grades. So this issue is misleading and the subject is actually covered in HCOB 3 Dec 1978 UNREADING FLOWS.

HCOB 7 Sept 1978 MODERN REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING is a summary of how to do a Repetitive Prepcheck and it would be fine – but it contains that you have to check the buttons for read which is an arbitrary. The subject an auditor is going to prepcheck must read, not the buttons. All else in this HCOB is fine. Please use instead of it BTB 10 Apr 1972RA PREPCHECKS and HCOB 14 Aug 1964 PREPCHECK BUTTONS.

READS

The HCOB 27 May 1970 UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS was misinterpreted to the effect that a Tick or Change of Characteristic is not a Read, that a Read is only a Small Fall or bigger. The sentence '*A "tick" or a "stop" is not a read. Reads are small falls or falls or long falls or long fall blowdown (of TA)*' was put out of sequence into the Tech Dict and became general valid data. That you need a Small Fall or a bigger Read is applicable to **ITEMS** and Listing and Nulling **QUESTIONS**, not to a Rudiment question, nor a Correction List question nor Sec Check question. See also Reference HCOB 3 July 1971R, AUDITING BY LIST. The following write-up explains the matter in detail.

INSTANT READS, HISTORY

In 1960 and 1961, more and more auditing techniques come about that necessitate that something (an item, a question) needs to give a read. In SHSBC Lecture 12, E-METER ACTIONS, ERRORS IN AUDITING, LRH discusses instant reads and mentions in an example about handling reads in Security Checks:

"And you ask him, "Have you ever illicitly diamond-bought?" you say, and the needle stops. Ah, but that's a change of characteristic. It didn't fall, it didn't theta bop, it didn't rock slam. But if you've got an instant read on "Did you ever illicit-diamonds-bought?" you press it. You see, the instant read is, instantly it stops – if just for a second, see? It's going up very nicely and all of a sudden you say, "Did you ever illicitly diamond-bought?" Man, that's a change of characteristic. Get your jackrabbit ears flapping. That means he has illicitly diamonds-bought at some time or another. Probably in this lifetime. Probably got them in his pocket right now."

1. HCOB 10 July 1961, METERING RUDIMENTS

In this HCOB Ron clarifies a question asked by a staff member and states that even if it sometimes said that only falls should be taken into consideration when doing rudiments, the word "fall" is mistakenly or colloquially used for "change of needle pattern". Every rudiment which gives a change of characteristic with a sensitivity properly set to a third of a dial drop is explored and cleared.

2. HCOB 23 May 1962, E-METER READS, PREPCHECKING, HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED

It says it is "fatal" to pass an instant reaction on a pc and may cancel further reads.

3. HCOB 25 May 1962, E-METER INSTANT READS

"The reaction of the needle may be any reaction except null. An instant read may be any change of characteristic, providing it occurs instantly." This HCOB further says: "The instant read may consist of any needle reaction, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action so long as it occurs at the exact end of the major thought being expressed by the auditor."

So far, with these 3 points, we know something should be done with those instant stops, rise, ticks...

4. HCO PL 26 May 1962, TRAINING DRILLS MUST BE CORRECT

That one is very important and seems incorrectly interpreted in IGN³ Bulletin 25, where that HCO PL was interpreted as meaning you could not take a stop or a tick, but only falls. This is not what this HCO PL says! It says that you should only take instant reads, and even refer to the HCOB 25 May 1962 (point 3 above).

Here is an extract: "This came from needle-reading TRs where instructors had students calling off every activity of the needle as a read, whereas only the needle action at the exact end of the question was used by the auditor. Auditor have thought all needle actions were reads and tried to clean off all needle actions except, in some cases, the end actions." Ron says here that a needle action occurring prior is not a read, and that you should only take instant reactions.

So far, we have nowhere a difference between "instant read" and a "read occurring instantly".

Here, a valid read is any instant reaction of the needle. And so far, in rudiments, one should take up any instant reaction on rudiments, or the meter might go null and mask further out ruds.

5. HCOB 2 July 1962, REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS, HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN

A meter can become null if an instant reaction is missed on a rudiment, and obscure further out ruds. Instant reads are defined in HCOB 25 May 1962 above.

So, if you get a stop, but no falls even with buttons, and ignore that rudiment, you are in trouble.

The HCOB further states: "If it reads, the auditor uses the meter to steer the pc to the answer [...]", and refer to the 25 may HCOB for the definition of instant read.

So far, in rudiments, one should take up any instant reaction on rudiments, or the meter might go null and mask further out ruds.

6. HCO PL 14 July 1962, AUDITING ALLOWED

One instant read missed out of 200 can deprive pc from all gains. Usually, any session trouble started with an error in reading an instant read.

³ IGN Bulletin: These are now issues of the Church of Scientology. IGN stands for „Inspector General Network“. The IGN is a division of the RTC that deals with investigation of the tech, keeping the tech clean etc.

7. HCOB 25 April 1963, METER READING TRs

The above HCOBs of 1962 are still indicated as valid.

8. HCOB 8 June 1963R, THE TIME TRACK AND ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS, BULLETIN 2

This explains how to date on the track (like EM25). So far, the instant read has not been redefined yet.

This implies that when dating, you must take any instant reaction (rise, tick, theta bop, ...).

9. EM 22 (from the E-Meter drills book)

That exercise is from 1963 also. At that time, the definition of instant read is the one from 25 May 1962. So, you should take any instant reaction, like a tick or a stop. If you ignore it because it was not a fall, the pc might go ARCX gradually and will react even less on the meter! If this worked in 1963, it will still work in 2001 of course. In 1963, dating was done using any instant reaction and this worked, so there is no reason why you could not use any instant reads today in dating.

10. HCOB 25 June AD13, ROUTINE 2H, ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT

"Look only for tiny ticks or falls or a small left to right slash of the needle. Do not expect large reactions." Here the greatest read is to be taken from the assessment, but a tick would still be ok.

11. HCOB 1 March 1964, METER READS, SIZE OF

On lower levels, size of read is usually 1/8" to 1/4" (ticks or SF) at sensitivity 16. On upper levels, reads are huge. But even there, ticks and tiny falls would be ok in rudiments: the HCOB does not revise that. In checking a goal, getting only a tick, you would put in buttons to see if it develops into a big read.

But this is for a goal, to run something! For a rudiment, reads are not often so big and you must accept ticks.

Here is an extract: "in class V and VI, tiny reads are used only for mid ruds as they were in lower levels".

So this is just another reference allowing to take ticks in rudiments. If it worked in 64, it would still work this way today.

12. HCOB 7 October 1968, ASSESSMENT

There is an example of nulling to one item. Items giving instant reaction but not a fall are noted as "/". Falls are noted SF, F, LF or LFBD.

In the example, he has two "/" and one "F", the rest is null ("X"). After the first nulling, he reassesses those 3 items, including the 2 "/" items. This shows they were considered as reading items.

There is also an example of L&N, and on first nulling, there is one "/" and one "F". The list is extended, because it has more than one reading item (thus, the "/" is counted as reading item).

This is in 1968.

13. HCOB 15 August 1969, FLYING RUDS

So far, instant read is still the 1962 definition.

So, if you check ARCX? And you get any instant reaction, you take it! A Fall is not needed. There is so far no HCOB yet stating that.

If it is null, you put suppress in.

14. HCOB 27 May 1970, UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS.

"A tick or a stop is not a read. Reads are SF, F, LF or LFBD".

THIS IS THE FIRST TIME WHERE IT IS STATED THAT STOPS AND TICKS ARE NOT READS!

But... Let's look at the full HCOB to see in which context, because all earlier HCOBs have not been cancelled.

This applies to listing (includes also listing for Running Item, HCOB 14 Sep 71, DIANETIC LIST ERRORS) items to prepcheck. An item with just a tick, stop or "/" would not give a proper Dianetic chain.

But this says nothing about ruds, dating, or assessments like EM-24, or correction lists.

This HCOB says that in order to RUN something (run = audit a process), it must read well (not with a tick only, but with falls). But rudiments and correction lists are to locate a BPC, not to audit the case. So, if in a rud or prepared list, you get only a "/", you take it. (see HCOB 3 July 1971R, AUDITING BY LIST, which, although coming later in time, explicitly allows tick as valid read on a correction list).

15. HCOB 3 July 1971R (revised 22 Feb 79) AUDITING BY LIST

"Mark the read at once (tick, SF, F, LF, LFBD, R/S), [...] and look expectantly at the pc".

So, a tick is a valid read when you are assessing a prepared list. This confirms that the redefinition of read as being falls (point 14 above) applies on things that you want to RUN (items for Dianetic chain or L&N question,), but it does not apply to ruds, ARCU /CDEINR assessments or prepared lists.

16. HCOB 5 August 1978, INSTANT READS

The only thing changed or clarified here is that all definitions which state it is fractions of seconds after the question is asked are cancelled. There is nothing new regarding what is a read, in regards to the definition from 1962.

Summary

In 1962, an instant read was defined as any reaction of the needle occurring instantly, and it was clear that rudiment and sec check questions that give a change of characteristic have to be taken up.

This was never cancelled, however, many data were added, stating that when you want to run something, you need to have at least falls. But for rudiments or prepared lists, or dating (EM 22), any instant reaction is valid, even though not a fall. EM 19, EM 22 and EM 24 all are to be done with that 1962 definition, since they are from that period! And it worked like that at that time, so it will work the same way today.

There is no contradictions in HCOBs, just various contexts and aspects of the same subject. And there is no strange confusion between "instant read" and a read (that is instant).

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 AUGUST 1978
Issue I

Remimeo
All Auditors

RUDIMENTS DEFINITIONS AND PATTERN

(Ref: HCOB 15 Aug 69, FLYING RUDS)

(Note: This Bulletin in no way summarizes all the data there is to be known about ARC breaks, PTPs and missed withholds, or handling rudiments.

There is a wealth of technology and data on these subjects contained throughout the Technical Volumes and in Scientology books which the student auditor will need as he progresses up the levels.)

A rudiment is that which is used to get the pc in shape to be audited in that session.

For auditing to take place at all the pc must be in session which means:

1. Willing to talk to the auditor
2. Interested in own case.

That is all you want to accomplish with rudiments. You want to set up the case to run by getting the rudiments in, not use the rudiments to run the case.

ARC breaks, present time problems and withholds all keep a session from occurring. It is elementary auditing knowledge that auditing over the top of an ARC break can reduce a graph, hang the pc up in sessions or worsen his case, and that in the presence of PTPs, overts and missed withholds (a restimulated undisclosed overt) no gains can occur. Thus these are the rudiments we are most concerned with getting in at the beginning of a session so that auditing with gains can occur.

GETTING THE F/N

If you know bank structure you know it is necessary to find an earlier item if something does not release.

If a rud doesn't F/N then there is an earlier (or an earlier or an earlier) lock which is preventing it from F/Ning.

Thus we have the procedure and the rule:

If a rud reads you always take it earlier similar until it F/Ns.

The question used is:

“Is there an earlier similar (ARC break) or (problem) or (missed withhold)?”

If at the beginning of a session the rudiments are in (the needle is floating and the pc is VGIs), the auditor goes directly into the major actions of the session. If not, the auditor must fly a rud or ruds, as ordered by the C/S.

ARC BREAKS

ARC: A word from the initial letters of Affinity, Reality and Communication which together equate to Understanding.

ARC Break: A sudden drop or cutting of one’s affinity, reality or communication with someone or something. Upsets with people or things come about because of a lessening or sundering of affinity, reality, communication or understanding.

While the earlier similar rule fully applies to ARC breaks, there is an additional action taken in handling ARC breaks that enables the pc to spot precisely what happened that resulted in the upset.

An ARC break is called that – an “A-R-C break” – instead of an upset because, if one discovers which of the three points of understanding have been cut, one can bring about a rapid recovery in the person’s state of mind.

You never audit over the top of an ARC break, and you never audit an ARC break itself; they cannot be audited. But they can be assessed to locate which of the basic elements of ARC the charge is on.

Thus to handle an ARC break you assess affinity, reality, communication and understanding to find which of these points the break occurred on.

Having determined that, you assess the item found (A or R or C or U) against the Expanded CDEI Scale (curious, desired, enforced, inhibited, no and refused). Ref: HCOB 13 OCT 59, DEI EXPANDED SCALE, SCIENTOLOGY 0-8. THE BOOK OF BASICS, and HCOB 18 SEP 67, CORRECTED 4.4.74, SCALES.

With this assessment the actual bypassed charge can be located and indicated even more accurately, thus enabling the pc to blow it.

The assessment is done on every ARC break as you go earlier similar until the rudiment is in with F/N and VGIs.

The first rudiment question is:

1. “Do you have an ARC break?”
2. If there is an ARC break, get the data on it briefly.
3. Find out by assessment which point the ARC break occurred on: “Was that a break in Affinity? Reality? Communication? Understanding?”

You assess it once and get the read (or the largest read) on, say, communication.

4. Check it with the pc: “Was that a break in (communication)? If he says no, rehandle. If yes, let him tell you about it if he wishes. Then give it to him by indicating it, i.e. “I’d like to indicate that was a break in communication.”

Provided the right item has been gotten, the pc will brighten up, even if ever so slightly, on the very first assessment.

Note: On Step 4 the pc may originate: “Yes, I guess it was communication but to me it’s really more like a break in reality,” for example. The wise auditor then acknowledges and indicates it was a break in “reality.”

5. Taking the item found in Step 4 above, assess it against the CDEI Scale: “Was it:

Curious about (communication)?

Desired (communication)?

Enforced (communication)?

Inhibited (communication)?

No (communication)?

Refused (communication)?”

6. As in Steps 3 and 4 above, assess it once, get the item and check it with the pc: “Was it (desired) communication?”

If no, rehandle. If yes, indicate it.

7. If no F/N at this point you follow it earlier with the question:

“Is there an earlier similar ARC break?”

8. Get the earlier similar ARC break, get in ARCU, CDEINR, indicate. If no F/N, repeat Step 7, continuing to go earlier, always using ARCU, CDEINR until you get an F/N.

When you get the F/N and VGIs you have it.

PRESENT TIME PROBLEM

Problem: A conflict arising from two opposing intentions. It’s one thing versus another thing; an intention-counter-intention that worries the preclear.

Present Time Problem: . . . A special problem that exists in the physical universe now, on which the pc has his attention fixed.

. . . Any set of circumstances that so engages the attention of the preclear that he feels he should be doing something about it instead of being audited.

A violation of “in session-ness” occurs when the pc’s attention is fixed on some concern that is “right now” in the physical universe. The pc’s attention is “over there” not on his

case. If the auditor overlooks and doesn't handle the PTP then the pc is never in session, grows agitated, ARC breaks. And no gains are made because he is not in session.

The second rudiment question is:

1. "Do you have a present time problem?"
2. If there is a PTP, have the pc tell you about it.
3. If no F/N take it earlier with the question:
"Is there an earlier similar problem?"
4. Get the earlier problem and if no F/N, follow it earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar to F/N.

MISSED WITHHOLDS

Overt Act: An intentionally committed harmful act committed in an effort to solve a problem.

. . . an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics.

That thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you.

Withhold: An undisclosed harmful (contra-survival) act. Something the pc did that he isn't talking about.

Missed Withhold: An undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed. This is a withhold which another person nearly found out about, leaving the person with the withhold in a state of wondering whether his hidden deed is known or not.

The pc with a missed withhold will not be honestly "willing to talk to the auditor" and, therefore, not in session until the missed withhold is pulled.

Missing a withhold or not getting all of it is the sole source of an ARC break. A missed withhold is observable by any of the following: pc not making progress, pc critical of, nattery or angry at the auditor, refusing to talk to the auditor, not desirous of being audited, boiling off, exhausted, foggy at session end, dropped havingness, telling others the auditor is no good, demanding redress of wrongs, critical of Scientology or organizations or people of Scientology, lack of auditing results, dissemination failures. (Ref: HCOB 3 MAY 62, ARC BREAKS, MISSED WITHHOLDS.) The auditor must not overlook any manifestations of a missed withhold.

Thus, if the pc has a missed withhold you get it, get all of it using the system described below, and use the same system on each earlier similar missed withhold until you get the F/N.

The third rudiment question is:

1. "Has a withhold been missed?"
2. If you get a missed withhold, find out:

- (a) What was it?
- (b) When was it?
- (c) Is that all of the withhold?
- (d) **Who** missed it?
- (e) What did (he/she) do to make you wonder whether or not (he/she) knew?
- (f) Who else missed it? (Repeat (e) above).

Get another and another who missed it, using the Suppress button as necessary, and repeating (e) above.

3. Clean it to F/N, or if no F/N take it earlier similar with the question:
“Is there an earlier similar missed withhold?”
4. Handle each earlier similar missed withhold you get per Step 2 above, until you get an F/N.

SUPPRESS

If a rudiment doesn't read and is not F/Ning, put in the Suppress button, using: “On the question ‘Do you have an ARC break?’ has anything been suppressed?”

If it reads, take it and ask ARCU, CDEINR, earlier similar, etc.

Use Suppress in the same way for non-reading PTP and missed withhold rudiments.

FALSE

If the pc protests, comments, or seems bewildered put in the False button. The question used is:

“Has anyone said you had a ... when you didn't have one?” Get who, what, when and take it earlier, if necessary, to F/N.

END PHENOMENA

In ruds when you've got your F/N and that charge has moved off, indicate it. Don't push the pc on for some other “EP.”

When the pc F/Ns with VGIs, you've got it.

HIGH OR LOW TA

Never try to fly ruds on a high or low TA.

Seeing a high or low TA at session start, the Dianetic or Scientology auditor up to Class II does not start the session but sends the folder back to the C/S for a higher classed auditor to handle. The C/S will order the required correction list to be done by an auditor Class III or above.

REFERENCES: HCOB 15 Aug 69	FLYING RUDS
HCOB 13 Oct 59	DEI EXPANDED SCALE
HCOB 18 Sep 67	SCALES
HCOB 7 Sep 64 II	ALL LEVELS, PTPs, OVERTS AND ARC BREAKS
HCOB 12 Feb 62	HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS & MISSED WITHHOLDS
HCOB 31 Mar 60	THE PRESENT TIME PROBLEM
HCOB 14 Mar 71R	F/N EVERYTHING
HCOB 23 Aug 71	C/S SERIES 1 AUDITOR'S RIGHTS
HCOB 21 Mar 74	END PHENOMENA
HCOB 22 Feb 62	WITHHOLDS, MISSED & PARTIAL
HCOB 3 May 62	ARC BREAKS, MISSED WITHHOLDS

The above issues give further data on rudiments, ARC breaks, PTPs and missed withholds. Note, however, that this is not a complete list of references on the subject. There is much additional data to be found in the Technical Volumes.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 MAY 1971
Issue IX

Remimeo
Auditors
Supervisors
Students
Tech and Qual Staff
Checksheets of all courses
teaching metering

Basic Auditing Series 11

METERING

One does **not** tell the pc anything about the meter or its reads ever, except to indicate an F/N.

Steering a pc with "That – That – That" on something reading is allowable. But that isn't putting attention on the meter but on his bank.

Definition of "In Session" is "Pc interested in own case and willing to talk to the auditor".

Saying "That reads", "That didn't read", "That blew down" is illegal. It is no substitute for TR 2. It violates the In Session definition by putting pc's attention on the meter and can make him very unwilling to talk to the auditor!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:act.rd

RON'S ORG COMMITTEE
QUAL BOARD RECOMMENDATION BULLETIN
2 APRIL 2015R
Revised 29 Apr 2015

Remimeo
Class II Auditors and above
Academy Supervisors
Case Supervisors
Qual Hats

(Revised to include the last two paragraphs under "Ask-
ing vs. Checking" and a typo in "Earlier Similar")

FLYING RUDIMENTS

How to get rudiments in is a subject often bothering not only the beginning auditor. Frequently enough, the attempt to apply a rote procedure and "get rid of the ruds" has gotten into the way of establishing real communication with the pc and getting him into the shape to get audited, which is "willing to communicate with the auditor and interested in his own case".

To give an orientation and establish some stable data as to how rudiments are handled (and how they should not be handled), the Qual Board has drafted this bulletin, taking up some of the misunderstands that have haunted academy training here and there.

This issue does not cover alternative procedures the C/S can order for getting in the session rudiments, especially on pcs at the beginning of the bridge, like Lower Level Ruds (or plain 2WC as in "How are you?"), L1C, R2H or Big Mid Ruds. It focuses on flying "3 Ruds" or "6 Ruds" as the standard approach to get in out ruds.

3 Ruds or 6 Ruds are taught on Level 2. A HSDC/NED Auditor, Class 0 or Class 1 Auditor learns Lower Level Ruds, and these are what is usually applied on a beginning pc.

It is essential that the auditor first studies and understands the following reference materials on the subject of the procedure:

HCOB 11 Aug 78 I RUDIMENTS, DEFINITION AND PATTERN

HCOB 16 December 1972 HELP THE PC

HCOB 29 January 1970, NULL LISTS IN DIANETICS

And also – with regards to the subject matter of rudiments themselves as case manifestation – the various references given on the Academy checksheets. It goes without saying that the basics of auditing as covered in the Basic Auditing Series must be very well understood and completely in on an auditor who attempts to bring out rudiments in on a pc.

ASKING VS. CHECKING

It should be well noted that nowhere in the relevant reference bulletins it says that rudiments should be checked. However there is a common misunderstood that the rudiments are checked on the meter, much like the assessment on a prepared list. To do so can cut the pc's comm line and disregards the technical fact that a meter can cease to react in the presence of out rudiments, especially of an ARC break (ref. HCOB 2 July 1962 REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS).

Thus the auditor asks the rudiment question of the pc, and if the pc volunteers an answer that is an answer to the rudiment question, the auditor takes it up and handles it as given in the HCOB RUDIMENTS, DEFINITION AND PATTERN.

The auditor then simply asks the rudiment question once more. The pc might have another answer which is taken up in the same way.

However, if the pc says no (or says so when the rud is asked for the first time), now the auditor can consult the meter. He checks the question and if no read and no F/N GIs he gets in the suppress button.

If there is a read, the auditor inquires further, if needed helping the pc with the meter, and, when he gets an answer, now – having a reading rudiment at hand – takes it earlier similar to F/N.

If the read does not disappear but the pc has no answers and/or protests or invalidates the matter, seems ARC broken by the read or seems resigned or starts to explain how things have been run before, the auditor checks for false read.

“Has anyone said you had a ... when you didn't have one?” Get who, what, when and take it earlier, if necessary, to F/N.

If the auditor does not get a read when he checks the question after a “no” answer by the pc, even after using the suppress button, there is nothing that can be taken up and the auditor goes to the next rudiment question.

It is an invalidation when a pc answers a rudiment question by saying he has an out rud of this type and the auditor does not accept the answer because “the question has not read”. In HCOB 13 April 1964 TONE ARM ACTION it says,

“In a conflict between pc and meter, take the pc's data. Why? Because Protest and Assert and Mistake will also read on a meter. You can get these off, but why create them? Your data comes from the pc and the meter always for anything. And if the pc's data is invalidated you won't get a meter's data. If the pc says he has a PTP and the meter says he doesn't, you take the pc's data that he does.”

EARLIER SIMILAR

Very rarely it is necessary to go past life in handling a rud. When an auditor realizes that he bogs down in an E/S chain he should abandon it without taking it to F/N GIs and take up the original out rud the pc has given and try to handle it in PT without going E/S, using

Lower Level Ruds procedure. If he cannot get this to an EP, he sends the folder to the C/S for new instructions.

USE OF THE SUPPRESS BUTTON

The materials say that the button must be put in by the auditor. How does one get a button in on the pc? You simply let the pc say what has been suppressed (as given in HCOB 29 January 1970, NULL LISTS IN DIANETICS – of course you wouldn't say “that reads” today.) And there might be more than one answer. This is very much like the use of the button in Big Mid Ruds: You repeat the question for a suppressed until there is no further answer. Now the button is “in” and you can recheck or re-ask the rudiment question. If it still does not read and the pc has no answer that is now available, that's it.

FLY ONE RUD VS. FLYING 3 RUDS

If your last session was only a few days ago the C/S usually will be “Fly a Rud if no F/N”. If there was a break of some weeks, it is more probably “Fly 3 Ruds”, or in specific cases the C/S might order to fly “6 Ruds” or “all ruds”, including overts, invalidation and evaluation.

If it is just “Fly a Rud”, you go until the first F/N accompanied by VGIs and that's it. You can now bridge over to the major action you are expected to run in this session.

Of course in the case of Fly 3 Ruds it is different. First of all, each rud must be gotten to an F/N. But there is more to it: As mentioned above, the pc might very well have more than one ARC break which he experienced and which was not relieved by auditing since. The same goes for the other rudiments. This is especially true if a longer time has elapsed since your last session.

Because of this, it is advisable that after you got an F/N you once more ask for an ARC break (or whatever rud you are at). The pc might bring up another one, and another one. Only when the pc indicates that there are no more out ruds of this type and you have an F/N along with it (or get no read on checking the question even with the use of the suppress button), that's it, and you go on with the next rudiment question.

When your pc is not accustomed to this type of rudiment running, he might need a suitable R-factor so he does not feel invalidated or misunderstood when you ask the same rudiment question again and again.

The auditor has to be familiar with the references mentioned at the beginning of this bulletin and should drill the procedure until he has it down pat.

QUAL BOARD of the
RON'S ORG COMMITTEE

As assisted by the

TECH EXAMINATION BOARD

I/C: Max Hauri

2nd: Otfried Krumpholz

Erica Hauri

ROC QB:TEB:MH:ok

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 24 AUGUST 1964

Sthil Students
Franchise

Scientology I to VI

SESSION MUST-NOTS

Not that you would do such a thing – you undoubtedly already know better. But just as a matter of record, the following session must-nots should be taught in letters of fire to any new auditor.

I

Never tell a pc what his present time problem is.

The pc's PTP is exactly and only what the pc thinks or says it is.

To tell a pc what his PTP is and then audit what the auditor said it was will inevitably ARC Break the pc.

This of course is under the heading of Evaluation in the Auditor's Code and is one way of evaluating, a very serious way too.

II

Never set a goal for a pc.

Don't set a session goal, a life or livingness goal or any other kind of a goal.

Auditors get tangled up on this because everybody has the same R6 goals and when you call out the next goal from the list it appears you are giving the pc a goal. But an R6 educated pc knows that and it isn't evaluation.

Other goals are highly variable. The pc's life and livingness goals and session goals are especially variable pc to pc and even within one session on the same pc.

To tell a pc what goals to set for a session or for life is to upset the pc.

If you don't believe it, trace some pc's upsets with their parents and you will find these usually trace back to the parents' setting life and livingness goals for the child or youth.

The pc's session and life and livingness goals are the pc's and for an auditor to deny, refute, criticize or try to change them gives ARC Breaks; and for an auditor to dream up a brand new one for the pc is especially evaluative.

III

Never tell a pc what's wrong with him physically or assume that you know.

What's wrong with the pc is whatever the pc says or thinks is wrong physically.

This applies of course only to processing, for if you *weren't* auditing the person, and if the person had a sore foot and you found a splinter in it and told him so, it would be all right. But even in this case the person would have had to tell you he had a sore foot.

The main reason society has such a distaste for medical doctors is the MDs' continuous "diagnosis" of things the person has *not* complained of. The violence of surgery, the destruction of lives by medical treatment rather educates people not to mention certain things. Instinctively the patient knows that the treatment may leave him or her in much worse condition and so sometimes hides things. For the medical doctor to cry "Aha" and tell the person he or she has some undefinable ill is to drive many into deep apathy *and accounts for the high frequency of operational shock* wherein the person just doesn't recover.

So **never** tell a pc what is physically wrong with him. If you suspect something is physically wrong that some known physical treatment might cure send the pc for a physical check-up just to be safe.

In the field of healing by mental or spiritual means, the pc is sick because he or she has had a series of considerations about being sick. Deformity or illness, according to the tenets of mental healing, traces back to mentally created or re-created masses, engrams or ideas which can be either de-stimulated or erased completely. Destimulation results in a temporary recovery for an indefinite period (which is nonetheless a recovery). Erasure results in permanent recovery. (De-stimulation is the most certain, feasible and most rewarding action below Level VI; erasure below Level VI is too prone to error in unskilled hands as experience has taught us.)

The reality of the auditor is often violated by a pc's statement of what ails him. The pc is stone blind – but the pc says he has "foot trouble". Obviously, from the auditor's viewpoint, it is blindness that troubles this pc. **But if the auditor tried to audit the ailment the pc has *not* offered, an arc break will occur.**

The pc is ailing from what the pc is ailing from, not from what the auditor selects.

For it is the statement of the pc that is the first available lock on a chain of incidents and to refuse it is to cut the pc's communication and to refuse the lock. After that you won't be able to help this pc and that's that.

PERMITTED AUDITOR STATEMENTS

There are, however, two areas where the auditor must make a statement to the pc and assume the initiative.

These are in the **Overt – Motivator Sequence** and in the **ARC Break**.

A

When the pc is critical of the auditor, the organization or any of many things in life, this is *always* a symptom of *overts* priorly committed by the pc.

The pc is looking for motivators. These criticisms are simply justifications *and nothing more*.

This is a sweeping fully embracive statement – and a true one. There are *no* criticisms in the absence of overts committed earlier by the pc.

It is quite permissible for the auditor to start looking for the overt, providing the auditor finds it and gets it stated by the pc and therefore relieved.

But even here the auditor only states there is an overt. The auditor **never** says what the overt is for that's evaluation.

You will be amazed at what the pc considered was the overt. It is almost never what we would think it should be.

But also, an auditor whose pc is critical of him or her in session who does not say, “It sounds like you have an overt there. Let's find it,” is being neglectful of his job.

The real test of a professional auditor, the test that separates the unskilled from the skilled is: **Can you get an overt off the pc's case without ARC breaking the pc and yet get it off.**

The nice balance between demanding the pc get off an overt and getting it off and demanding the pc get off an overt and failing to get it off but ARC Breaking the pc is the border line between the unskilled and the professional.

If you demand it and don't do it you'll ARC Break the pc thoroughly. If you fail to demand it for fear of an ARC Break you'll have a lowered graph on the pc. The pro demands the overt be gotten off only when necessary and plows on until it's gotten off and the pc brightens up like a lighthouse. The amateur soul-searches himself and struggles and fails in numerous ways – by demanding the wrong overt, by accepting a critical comment as an overt, by not asking at all for fear of an ARC Break, by believing the pc's criticism is deserved – all sorts of ways. And the amateur lowers the pc's graph.

Demanding an overt is not confined to just running O/W or some similar process. It's a backbone auditing tool that is used when it has to be used. And not used when it doesn't have to be.

The auditor must have understood the whole of the overt-motivator theory to use this intelligently.

B

Indicating by-passed charge is a necessary auditor action which at first glance may seem evaluative.

However, the by-passed charge is *never* what the pc says it was if the pc is still ARC Broken.

By-Passed Charge is, however, found by the meter and the pc has actually got it or it wouldn't register. So the pc has really volunteered it in a round-about way – first by acting like he or she has by-passed charge and then by bank reaction on the meter.

Always indicate to the pc the by-passed charge you *find on the meter*.

Never tell a pc what the by-passed charge is if you don't know.

A Class VI auditor knows all goals but *the* goals are wrong and often sloppily just tells people at random they have “a wrong goal” knowing this to be probable. But it's very risky.

If you find it on the meter, telling the pc what the by-passed charge is is not evaluation. Telling the pc “what it is” without having found it is evaluation of the worst sort.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 FEBRUARY 1974

Remimeo

C/S Series 91

MUTUAL OUT RUDS

It has been known for many many years that the phenomenon of “Mutual Out Ruds” existed.

This means **two or more people who mutually have ruds out on the wider group or other dynamics and do not get them in.**

Example: A husband-wife co-audit team never run O/Ws on the rest of the family because both of them have similar overts and so consider it usual.

Example: Prisoners engaged in co-auditing (as in Narconon) may have similar overts, withholds, ARC Brks and/or problems with the rest of society and so do not think of handling them as out-ruds.

Example: Two top class auditors co-auditing, have similar overts on the junior auditors and the org and so never think to get them in.

This can stall cases!

A C/S has to take this factor into account wherever he has a possibility of its occurring.

In one instance mutual out ruds went so far as four auditors, co-auditing, agreeing never to put their overts down on W/Ses “so they would not lose reputation”. Needless to say all four eventually blew.

If the C/S had done a *routine* check for mutual out ruds, this whole scene would have been prevented and four beings would not have ruined each other.

In any situation where a small portion of a larger group is engaged in co-audit the C/S must check routinely for mutual out ruds.

This could even apply to an org or vessel which was separate from the rest of society around it: its members could develop mutual out ruds from the rest of society and cases could fail on this point.

Be alert to **mutual out rud situations and handle by getting them in on the rest of the surrounding people or society.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:ams.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 FEBRUARY 1966
(Amends HCO B of 12 November 1964)

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil students

Scientology II

PC Level 0 – IV

DEFINITION PROCESSES

The first thing to know about **Definition Processes** is that they are separate and distinct and stand by themselves as processes.

In THE BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES we find on page 25 **Remedy A** and **Remedy B**.

These two remedies *are* A and B because they handle a primary source of worry to supervisors *and* auditors.

AUDITING STYLE

Each level has its own basic auditing style.

The Auditing Style of Level II is Guiding Style. The Secondary Style is **Guiding Secondary Style** or Guiding S Style.

ASSISTS

An assist is different from auditing as such in that it lacks any model session. Assists are normally short periods of auditing but not always. I have seen a touch assist go on for months at the rate of 15 minutes a day, two or three days a week. And it may take hours to do a touch assist on an accident victim. What characterizes an assist is that it is done rapidly and informally and anywhere.

“Coffee Shop Auditing” isn’t really an assist as it is usually done over coffee too casually to be dignified by the name of auditing. The pc is never informed at all of the existence of a session.

The pc, in an assist, is however informed of the fact and the assist is begun by “This is the Assist” and ended by a “That’s it”, so an assist, like a session, has a beginning and an end.

The Auditor’s Code is observed in giving an Assist and the Auditing Comm Cycle is used.

As an Auditor one sets out in an Assist to accomplish a specific thing for the pc like relieve the snivels or make the ache in the leg better. So an Assist also has a very finite purpose.

SECONDARY STYLES

Every level has a different primary **Style of Auditing**. But sometimes in actual sessions or particularly in Assists this Style is altered slightly for special purposes. The Style altered for assists is called a **Secondary Style**. It doesn't mean that the primary style of the level is merely loosely done. It means that it is done a precise but different way to accomplish assists. This variation is called the **Secondary Style** of that level.

REMEDIES

A Remedy is not necessarily an Assist and is often done in regular session. It is the Remedy itself which determines what auditing style is used to administer it. Some Remedies, as well as being used in regular sessions, can also be used as Assists.

In short, that a process exists as a Remedy has no bearing on whether it is used in an Assist or a Model Session.

GUIDING STYLE

The essence of Guiding Style is:

1. Locate what's awry with the pc.
2. Run a Repetitive Process to handle what's found in 1.

In essence – steer the pc into disclosing something that needs auditing and then audit it.

GUIDING SECONDARY STYLE

Guiding Secondary Style differs from proper Guiding Style and is done by:

1. Steering the pc toward revealing something or something revealed;
2. Handling it with Itsa.

Guiding Secondary Style differs from Guiding Style only in that Guiding Secondary Style handles the matter by Steer + Itsa. Guiding Style Proper handles the matter with Steer + Repetitive Process.

DEFINITIONS PROCESSING

Definitions Processes, when used as Remedies, are normally processed by Guiding Secondary Style.

Both Remedies of *The Book of Case Remedies A* and B are Guiding Secondary Style in their normal application.

One would expect them to be used by a Class II Auditor.

One would expect the Assist to last 10 or 15 minutes, perhaps more, but less than a regular session would take.

One would expect that any case in a PE class, any student that was getting nowhere, would be handled by the Instructor with Guiding Secondary Style using Remedies A and B as precision processes.

REMEDY A PATTERN

One would *not* expect the person or student in trouble to be turned over to another student for handling. It's too fast, sharp and easy to handle that trouble oneself if one is Class II or above and far more certain. You can do it while you'd be finding another student to do the auditing. It would be uneconomical in terms of time not to just do it right then – no meter – leaning up against a desk.

The auditor's pattern would be something like what follows. The pc's responses and Itsa are omitted in this example.

"I am going to give you a short assist." "All right, what word haven't you understood in Scientology?" "Okay, it's pre-clear. Explain what it means." "Okay, I see you are having trouble, so what does *pre* mean?" "Fine. Now what does *clear* mean?" "Good. I'm glad you realize you had it mixed up with *patient* and see that they're different." "Thank you. That's it."

In between the above total of auditing pattern, the student may have hemmed and hawed and argued and cognited. But one just steered the pc straight along the subject selected and got it audited and cleaned up. *If* the student gave a glib text book definition after challenging the word preclear, we wouldn't buy it, but would give the student a piece of paper or a rubber band and say "Demonstrate that." And then carry on as it developed.

And that would be Remedy A.

You see it is precision auditing and is a process and does have an Auditing Style. *And* it works like a dream.

You see this is Steer + Itsa as to its style. And that it addressed the *immediate subject*.

What makes A Remedy A is not that it handles Scientology definitions, but that it handles the immediate subject under discussion or study.

REMEDY B

What makes Remedy B Remedy B is that it seeks out and handles a *former* subject, conceived to be similar to the immediate subject, in order to clear up misunderstandings in the immediate subject or condition.

Remedy B, run on some person or student, would simply be a bit more complex than Remedy A as it looks into the past.

A person has a *continuous* confusion with policy or auditors, etc. So one runs B like this (the following is auditor patter only):

“I’m going to give you an Assist. Okay?” “All right. What subject were you mixed up with before Scientology?” “I’m sure there is one.” “Okay. Spiritualism. Fine. What word in Spiritualism didn’t you understand?” “You can think of it.” “Good. Ectoplasm. Fine. What was the definition of that?” “All right, there’s a dictionary over there, look it up.” “I’m sorry it doesn’t give the spiritualist definition. But you say it says *Ecto* means *outside*. What’s plasm?” “Well, look it up.” “All right. I see, *Ecto* means *outside* and *plasm* means *mould* or *covering*.” (Note: You don’t always break up words into parts for definition in A & B Remedies.) “Yes, I’ve got that. Now what do you think spiritualists meant by it?” “All right, I’m glad you realize that sheets over people make ghosts ghosts.” “Fine, glad you recalled being scared as a child.” “All right, what did the spiritualist mean then?” “Okay. Glad you see thetans don’t need to be cased in goo.” “All right. Fine. Good. You had Ectoplasm mixed up with engrams and you now realize thetans don’t have to have a bank and can be naked. Fine. That’s it.” (Note: You don’t always repeat after him what the pc said, but sometimes it helps.)

Student departs still cogning. Enters Scientology now having left Spiritualism on the back track. Doesn’t keep on trying to make every HCO Bulletin studied solve “Ectoplasm”, the buried misunderstood word that kept him stuck in Spiritualism.

DEFINITIONS PURPOSE

The purpose of definitions processing is fast clearing of “held down fives” (jammed thinking because of a misunderstood or misapplied datum) *preventing someone getting on with auditing or Scientology*.

Remedies A and B are not always used as Assists. They are also used in regular sessions. But when so used they are always used with Guiding Secondary Style – Steer + Itsa.

As a comment, people who seek to liken Scientology to something, “Oh, like Christian Science,” are stuck in Christian Science. Don’t say, “Oh no! It isn’t like Christian Science!” Just nod and mark them for a fast assist or a session the moment the chance offers *if they seem very disinterested or aloof* when asked to a PE Course.

There’s weapons in that arsenal, auditor. Use them.

As Remedies A and B stand as the first and second given in THE BOOK OF CASE REMEDIES, so before a large number of *potential* Scientologists stands the confusion of definitions.

We have made Scientology definitions easy for them by compiling a dictionary, using words new to people only when useful.

But those that don't come along at all, are so wound up in some past subject they can't hear or think when that earlier subject is restimulated. And that earlier subject is held down *only* by some word or phrase they didn't grasp.

Some poor pawn howling for the blood of Scientologists isn't mad at Scientology at all. But at some earlier practice he got stuck in with mis-definition of *its* terms.

You see, we inherit some of the effects of the whole dullness of Man when we seek to open the prison door and say, "Look. Sunshine in the fields. Walk out." Some, who need Remedy B say: "Oh no! The last time somebody scratched the wall that way I got stupider." Why say, "Hey. I'm not scratching the wall. I'm opening the gate"? Why bother. He can't *hear you*. But he can hear Remedy B as an assist. *That's* the channel to his comprehension.

UNDERSTANDING

When a person can't understand something and yet goes on facing up to it, he gets into a "problems situation" with it. There it is over there, yet he can't make it out.

Infrequently (fortunately for us) the being halts time right there. Anything he conceives to be similar presented to his view is *the* puzzle itself (A=A=A). And he goes stupid. This happens rarely in the life of one being, but it happens to *many* people.

Thus there aren't many such messes in one person in one lifetime that have to be cleaned up. But there are a few in many people.

The cycle of Mis-definition is:

1. didn't grasp a word, then
2. didn't understand a principle or theory, then
3. became different from it, commits and committed overts against it, then
4. restrained himself or was restrained from committing those overts, then
5. being on a withhold (inflow) pulled in a motivator.

Not every word somebody didn't grasp was followed by a principle or theory. An overt was not committed every time this happened. Not every overt committed was restrained. So no motivator was pulled in.

But when it *did* happen, it raised havoc with the mentality of the being when trying to think about what seem to be *similar subjects*.

You see, you are looking at the basic incident + its locks as in a chain of incidents. The charge that is apparently on the lock in present time is actually only in the basic incident. The locks borrow the charge of the basic incident and are not themselves causing anything. So you have a basic misunderstood word which then charges up the whole subject as a lock; then a subject charging up similar subjects as locks.

Every nattery or non-progressing student or pc is hung up in the above 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 cycle. And *every* such student or pc has a misdefined word at the bottom of that pile. If the condition is new and temporary it's a Scientology word that's awry. If natter, no progress, etc, is *continuous* and doesn't cease when all is explained in Scientology or when attempts to straighten up Scientology words fail, then it's an earlier subject at fault. Hence, Remedies A and B. Hence Guiding Secondary Style. Hence, the fact that Definitions Processes *are* processes. And **vital** processes they are if one wants a smooth organization, a smooth PE, a smooth record of wins on all pcs. And if one wants to bring people into Scientology who seem to want to stay out.

Of course these Remedies A and B are early-on processes, to be audited by a Class II or above on a Level 0 or I pc or student. However, some in Scientology, as of this date, are studying slowly or progressing poorly because A and B haven't been applied.

One expects that very soon, now that auditors have this data, there will be nobody at upper levels with his definitions dangling.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.ml.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 NOVEMBER AD14

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

STYLES OF AUDITING

Note 1: Most old-time auditors, particularly Saint Hill Graduates, have been trained at one time or another in these auditing styles. Here they are given names and assigned to Levels so that they can be taught more easily and so that general auditing can be improved.

(Note 2: These have not been written before because I had not determined the results vital to each Level.)

There is a Style of auditing for each class. By Style is meant a method or custom of performing actions.

A Style is not really determined by the process being run so much. A Style is how the auditor addresses his task.

Different processes carry different style requirements perhaps, but that is not the point. Clay Table Healing at Level III can be run with Level I style and still have some gains. But an auditor trained up to the style required at Level III would do a better job not only of CT Healing but of any repetitive process.

Style is how the auditor audits. The real expert can do them all, but only after he can do each one. Style is a mark of Class. It is not individual. In our meaning, it is a distinct way to handle the tools of auditing.

LEVEL ZERO

LISTEN STYLE

At *Level 0* the Style is Listen Style Auditing. Here the auditor is expected to listen to the pc. The only skill necessary is listening to another. As soon as it is ascertained that the auditor is listening (not just confronting or ignoring) the auditor can be checked out. The length of time an auditor can listen without tension or strain showing could be a factor. What the pc does is not a factor considered in judging this style. Pcs, however, talk to an auditor who is really listening.

Here we have the highest point that old-time mental therapies reached (when they did reach it), such as psychoanalysis, when they helped anyone. Mostly they were well below this, evaluating, invalidating, interrupting. These three things are what the instructor in this style should try to put across to the HAS student.

Listen Style should not be complicated by expecting more of the auditor than just this: Listen to the pc without evaluating, invalidating or interrupting.

Adding on higher skills like “Is the pc talking interestingly?” or even “Is the pc talking?” is no part of this style. When this auditor gets in trouble and the pc won’t talk or isn’t interested, a higher classed auditor is called in, a new question given by the supervisor, etc.

It really isn’t “Itsa” to be *very* technical. Itsa is the action of the pc saying, “It’s a this” or “It’s a that.” *Getting* the pc to Itsa is quite beyond Listen Style auditors where the pc won’t. It’s the supervisor or the question on the blackboard that gets the pc to Itsa.

The *ability* to listen, learned well, stays with the auditor up through the grades. One doesn’t cease to use it even at Level VI. But one has to learn it somewhere and that’s at Level Zero. So Listen Style Auditing is just listening. It *thereafter* adds into the other styles.

LEVEL ONE MUZZLED AUDITING

This could also be called rote style auditing.

Muzzled Auditing has been with us many years. It is the stark total of TRs 0 to 4 and not anything else added.

It is called so because auditors too often added in comments, Qed and Aed, deviated, discussed and otherwise messed up a session. Muzzle meant a “muzzle was put on them”, figuratively speaking, so they would *only* state the auditing command and ack.

Repetitive Command Auditing, using TRs 0 to 4, at Level One is done completely muzzled.

This could be called Muzzled Repetitive Auditing Style but will be called “Muzzled Style” for the sake of brevity.

It has been a matter of long experience that pcs who didn’t make gains with the partially trained auditor permitted to two-way comm, did make gains the instant the auditor was muzzled: to wit, not permitted to do a thing but run the process, permitted to say nothing but the commands and acknowledge them and handle pc originations by simple acknowledgment without any other question or comment.

At Level One we don’t expect the auditor to do anything but state the command (or ask the question) with no variation, acknowledge the pc’s answer and handle the pc origins by understanding and acknowledging what the pc said.

Those processes used at Level One actually respond best to muzzled auditing and worst to misguided efforts to “Two-Way Comm”.

Listen Style combines with Muzzled Style easily. But watch out that Level One sessions don’t disintegrate to Level Zero.

Crisp, clean repetitive commands, muzzled, given and answered *often*, are the road out – not pc wanderings.

A pc at this Level is instructed in exactly what is expected of him, exactly what the auditor will do. The pc is even put through a few “do birds fly?” cycles until the pc gets the idea. Then the processing works.

An auditor trying to do Muzzled Repetitive Auditing on a pc who, through past “therapy experience”, is rambling on and on is a sad sight. It means that control is out (or that the pc never got above Level Zero).

It’s the number of commands given and answered in a unit of auditing time that gets gains. To that add the correctly chosen repetitive process and you have a release in short order, using the processes of this Level.

To follow limp Listen Style with crisp, controlled Muzzled Style may be a shock. But they are each the lowest of the two families of auditing styles – Totally Permissive and Totally Controlled. And they are so different each is easy to learn with no confusion. It’s been the lack of difference amongst styles that confuses the student into slopping about. Well, these two are different enough – Listen Style and Muzzled Style – to set anybody straight.

LEVEL TWO

GUIDING STYLE AUDITING

An old-time auditor would have recognized this style under two separate names: (a) Two-Way Comm and (b) Formal Auditing.

We condense these two old styles under one new name: Guiding Style Auditing.

One first *guides* the pc by “two-way comm” into some subject that has to be handled or into revealing what should be handled and then the auditor handles it with formal repetitive commands.

Guiding Style Auditing becomes feasible only when a student can do Listen Style and Muzzled Style Auditing well.

Formerly the student who couldn’t confront or duplicate a command took refuge in sloppy discussions with the pc and called it auditing or “Two-Way Comm”.

The first thing to know about Guiding Style is that one lets the pc talk and Itsa without chop, but also gets the pc steered into the proper subject and gets the job done with repetitive commands.

We presuppose the auditor at this Level has had enough case gain to be able to occupy the viewpoint of the auditor and therefore to be able to observe the pc. We also presuppose at this Level that the auditor, being able to occupy a viewpoint, is therefore more self-determined, the two things being related. (One can only be self-determined when one can observe the actual situation before one: otherwise a being is delusion-determined or other-determined.)

Thus in Guiding Style Auditing, the auditor is there to find out what’s what from the pc and then apply the needful remedy.

Most of the processes in the Book of Remedies are included in this Level (II). To use those, one has to observe the pc, discover what the pc is doing, and remedy the pc’s case accordingly.

The result for the pc is a far-reaching re-orientation in Life.

Thus the essentials of Guiding Style Auditing consist of Two-Way Comm that steers the pc into revealing a difficulty followed by a repetitive process to handle what has been revealed.

One does expert TRs but one may discuss things with the pc, let the pc talk and in general one audits the pc before one, establishing what *that* pc needs and then doing it with crisp repetitive auditing, but all the while alert to changes in the pc.

One runs at this Level against Tone Arm Action, paying little or no heed to the needle except as a centering device for TA position. One even establishes what's to be done by the action of the Tone Arm. (The process of storing up things to run on the pc by seeing what fell when he was running what's being run, now belongs at this Level (II) and will be re-numbered accordingly.)

At II one expects to handle a lot of chronic PTPs, overts, ARC Breaks with Life (but not session ARC Breaks, that being a needle action, session ARC Breaks being sorted out by a higher classed auditor if they occur).

To get such things done (PTPs, overts and other remedies) in the session the auditor must have a pc "willing to talk to the auditor about his difficulties". That presupposes we have an auditor at this Level who can ask questions, not repetitive, that guide the pc into talking about the difficulty that needs to be handled.

Great command of TR 4 is the primary difference in TRs from Level I. One understands, when one doesn't, by asking more questions, and by really acknowledging only when one has really understood it.

Guided comm is the clue to control at this Level. One should *easily* guide the pc's comm in and out and around without chopping the pc or wasting session time. As soon as an auditor gets the idea of *finite result* or, that is to say, a specific and definite result expected, all this is easy. Pc has a PTP. Example: Auditor has to have the idea he is to locate and destimulate the PTP so pc is not bothered about it (and isn't being driven to do something about it) as the finite result.

The auditor at II is trained to audit the pc before him, get the pc into comm, guide the pc toward data needful to choose a process and then to run the process necessary to resolve that thing found, usually by repetitive command and always by TA.

The Book of Remedies is the key to this Level and this auditing style.

One listens but only to what one has guided the pc into. One runs repetitive commands with good TR 4. *And* one may search around for quite a while before one is satisfied he has the answer from the pc needful to resolve a certain aspect of the pc's case.

O/W can be run at Level I. But at Level II one may *guide* the pc into divulging what the pc considers a real overt act and, having that, then guide the pc through all the reasons it wasn't an overt and so eventually blow it.

Half-acknowledgment is also taught at Level II – the ways of keeping a pc talking by giving the pc the feeling he is being heard and yet not chopping with overdone TR 2.

Big or multiple acknowledgment is also taught to shut the pc off when the pc is going off the subject.

LEVEL III

ABRIDGED STYLE AUDITING

By Abridged is meant “abbreviated”, shorn of extras. Any not actually needful auditing command is deleted.

For instance, at Level I the auditor *always* says, when the pc wanders off the subject, “I will repeat the auditing command” and does so. In Abridged Style the auditor omits this when it isn’t necessary and just asks the command again if the pc has forgotten it.

In this style we have shifted from pure rote to a sensible use or omission as needful. We still use repetitive commands expertly, but we don’t use rote that is unnecessary to the situation.

Two-Way Comm comes into its own at Level III. But with heavy use of repetitive commands.

At this Level we have as the primary process, Clay Table Healing. In this an auditor must *make sure* the commands are followed exactly. No auditing command is *ever* let go of until that actual command is answered by the pc.

But at the same time, one doesn’t necessarily give every auditing command the process has in its rundown.

In Clay Table Healing one is supposed to make sure the pc is satisfied each time. This is done more often by observation than command. Yet it is done.

We suppose at III that we have an auditor who is in pretty fine shape and can observe. Thus we *see* the pc is satisfied and don’t mention it. Thus we see when the pc is not certain and so we get something the pc is certain of in answering the question.

On the other hand, one gives *all* the necessary commands crisply and definitely and gets them executed.

Prepchecking and needle usage is taught at Level III as well as Clay Table Healing. Auditing by List is also taught. In Abridged Style Auditing one may find the pc (being cleaned up on a list question) giving half a dozen answers in a rush. One doesn’t stop the pc from doing so, one half acknowledges, and lets the pc go on. One is in actual fact handling a bigger auditing comm cycle, that is all. The question elicits more than one answer which is really only one answer. And when that answer is given, it is acknowledged.

One sees when a needle is clean without some formula set of questions that invalidate all the pc’s relief. And one sees it *isn’t* clean by the continued puzzle on the pc’s face.

There are tricks involved here. One asks a question of the pc with the key word in it and notes that the needle doesn’t tremble, and so concludes the question about the word is flat. And so doesn’t check it again. Example: “Has anything else been suppressed?” One eye on pc, one on needle, needle didn’t quiver. Pc looks noncommittal. Auditor says, “All right, on “ and goes on to next question, eliminating a pc’s possible protest read that can be mistaken for another “suppress”.

In Abridged Style Auditing one sticks to the essentials and drops rote where it impedes case advance. But that doesn't mean one wanders about. One is even more crisp and thorough with Abridged Style Auditing than in rote.

One is watching what happens and doing exactly enough to achieve the expected result.

By "Abridged" is meant getting the exact job done – the shortest way between two points – with no waste questions.

By now the student should know that he runs a process to achieve an exact result and he gets the process run in a way to achieve that result in the smallest amount of time.

The student is taught to guide rapidly, to have no time for wide excursions.

The processes at this Level are all rat-a-tat-tat processes – CT Healing, Prepchecking, Auditing by List.

Again it's the number of times the question is answered per unit of auditing time that makes for speed of result.

LEVEL IV DIRECT STYLE AUDITING

By direct we mean straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner.

We do not mean direct in the sense of to direct somebody or to guide. We mean it is direct.

By direct, we don't mean frank or choppy. On the contrary, we put the pc's attention on his bank and anything we do is calculated only to make that attention more direct.

It could also mean that we are not auditing by vias. We are auditing straight at the things that need to be reached to make somebody clear.

Other than this the auditing attitude is *very* easy and relaxed.

At Level IV we have Clay Table Clearing and we have Assessment type processes.

These two types of process are both astonishingly *direct*. They are aimed directly at the Reactive Mind. They are done in a direct manner.

In CT Clearing we have almost total work and Itsa from pcs. From one end of a session to another, we may have only a few auditing commands. For a pc on CT Clearing does almost all the work if he is in session at all.

Thus we have another implication in the word "direct". The pc is talking directly to the auditor about what he is making and why in CT Clearing. The auditor hardly ever talks at all.

In assessment the auditor is aiming directly at the pc's bank and wants no pc in front of it thinking, speculating, mauling or Itsaing. Thus this assessment is a very *direct* action.

All this requires easy, smooth, steel-hand-in-a-velvet-glove control of the pc. It *looks* easy and relaxed as a style, it is straight as a Toledo blade.

The trick is to be direct in what's wanted and not deviate. The auditor settles what's to be done, gives the command and then the pc may work for a long time, the auditor alert, attentive, completely relaxed.

In assessment the auditor often pays no attention to the pc at all, as in ARC Breaks or assessing lists. Indeed, a pc at this level is trained to be quiet during the assessment of a list.

And in CT Clearing an auditor may be quiet for an hour at a stretch.

The tests are: Can the auditor keep the pc quiet while assessing without ARC Breaking the pc? Can the auditor order the pc to do something and then, the pc working on it, can the auditor remain quiet and attentive for an hour, understanding everything and interrupt alertly only when he doesn't understand and get the pc to make it clearer to him? Again without ARC Breaking the pc.

You could confuse this Direct Style with Listen Style if you merely glanced at a session of CT Clearing. But what a difference. In Listen Style the pc is blundering on and on and on. In Direct Style the pc wanders off the line an inch and starts to Itsa, let us say, with no clay work and after it was obvious to the auditor that this pc had forgotten the clay, you'd see the auditor, quick as a foil, look at the pc, very interestedly and say, "Let's see that in Clay." Or the pc doesn't really give an ability he wants to improve and you'd hear a quiet persuasive auditor voice, "Are you quite certain you want to improve that? Sounds like a goal to me. Just something, some ability you know, you'd like to improve."

You could call this style One-Way Auditing. When the pc is given his orders, after that it's all from the pc to the auditor, and all involved with carrying out that auditing instruction. When the auditor is assessing it is all from the auditor to the pc. Only when the assessment action hits a snag like a PTP is there any other auditing style used.

This is a very extreme auditing style. It is straightforward – direct.

But when needful, as in any Level, the styles learned below it are often also employed, but never in the actual actions of getting CT Clearing and Assessment done.

(Note: Level V would be the same style as VI below.)

LEVEL VI

ALL STYLE

So far, we have dealt with simple actions.

Now we have an auditor handling a meter and a pc who Itsa's and Cognites and gets PTPs and ARC Breaks and Line Charges and Cognites and who finds Items and lists and who must be handled, handled, handled all the way.

As auditing TA for a 2½ hour session can go to 79 or 125 divisions (compared to 10 or 15 for the lowest level), the pace of the session is greater. It is this pace that makes perfect ability at each lower level vital when they combine into All Style. For each is now faster.

So, we learn All Style by learning each of the lower styles well, and then observe and apply the style needed every time it is needed, shifting styles as often as once every minute!

The best way to learn All Style is to become expert at each lower style so that one does the style correct for the situation each time the situation requiring that style occurs.

It is less rough than it looks. But it is also very demanding.

Use the wrong style on a situation and you've had it. ARC Break! No progress!

Example: Right in the middle of an assessment the needle gets dirty. The auditor can't continue – or shouldn't. The auditor, in Direct Style, looks up to see a puzzled frown. The auditor has to shift to Guiding Style to find out what ails the pc (who probably doesn't really know), then to Listen Style while the pc cognites on a chronic PTP that just emerged and bothered the pc, then to Direct Style to finish the Assessment that was in progress.

The only way an auditor can get confused by All Style is by not being good at one of the lower level styles.

Careful inspection will show where the student using All Style is slipping. One then gets the student to review that style that was not well learned and practice it a bit.

So All Style, when poorly done, is very easy to remedy for it will be in error on one or more of the lower level styles. And as all these can be independently taught, the whole can be co-ordinated. All Style is hard to do only when one hasn't mastered one of the lower level styles.

SUMMARY

These are the important Styles of Auditing. There have been others but they are only variations of those given in this HCO Bulletin. Tone 40 Style is the most notable one missing. It remains as a practice style at Level One to teach fearless body handling and to teach one to get his command obeyed. It is no longer used in practice.

As it was necessary to have every result and every process for each Level to finalize Styles of Auditing, I left this until last and here it is.

Please note that none of these Styles violate the auditing comm cycle or the TRs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN

30 MAY 1960

Reissued 23 July 1974 as BTB

All Auditors

Cancels

HCO Bulletin of 30 May 1960

Same Title

(Was also released with the date
2 June 1960 – PAB 173)

DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT ON HELP

Marilynn Routsong has written the following on how to do a dynamic assessment on help after observing a demonstration by Ron:

Once you have a preclear well pre-sessioned you are going to enter into a model session and run help and run help and run help. Now there are lots of ways of running help. One extremely valuable way is to clear help on the dynamics. Recalling the rule on running terminals not conditions, you are going to run help on terminals which he can't help that have gone out of kilter on the dynamics. In other words, the preclear conceived at some time that he was unable to help a certain terminal and he has misaligned it on the dynamics. He probably misplaced it to the dynamic on which he felt there was some sort of help or some such – the misplacement will shake out in cognitions as it is being run.

To discover what terminal to run you do a dynamic assessment as follows:

In doing a dynamic assessment you are not actually auditing, but looking for a terminal to audit. However, you will be doing two-way communication and you will find things blowing off with two-way communication, so some auditing will occur. If it does, fine! What you can resolve with two-way communication, by all means do so. You are looking for the terminal that (1) doesn't resolve with two-way communication, (2) the preclear can conceive no way of helping the terminal, and (3) the terminal is misplaced on the dynamics. Example: you've assessed and ended up with a fish (an actual fifth dynamic terminal) which the preclear cannot conceive of being able to help and which the preclear, you discover on careful questioning, really thinks of as a sort of spiritual thing (7th dynamic). Sounds odd? It is! You will stop being surprised after running a few of your own.

To do a dynamic assessment you are going to use an E-meter. The lead in per the E-meter is to ask the preclear about help on the various dynamics. In other words, you put the preclear on the E-meter (model session) and ask him what he thinks about help on the first dynamic (or self, or whatever terminology is necessary to get the idea of the first dynamic across to the preclear) – then you ask what he thinks about help on the second dynamic (appropriate terminology), then the third, fourth, and so on across the dynamics. As you are asking, observe the E-meter. You are looking for a change in needle or Tone Arm pattern, as a clue to the misplaced terminal that he cannot help. Now note this - **a rising needle means**

you have tripped the terminal you are looking for and have missed it (gone past it) and are now asking the wrong question. To find the terminal again, continue to go through the dynamics as above until you get the one that stops the rise. Question closely on terminals on this dynamic pertaining to help. Two-way communication may clear it off – if so, fine! Or it may be a lock on the one you are looking for – in which case it would not quite fit the conditions of no help conceivable and dynamically misplaced but there would be charge on it – i.e. on a preclear the rising needle stopped on fourth dynamic. Preclear was questioned on what he thought of a fourth dynamic – preclear said people – all races of people – preclear was asked about help on these people – preclear was then thinking about brown people and was thinking that help to brown people always turned out wrong (betray). However, note – in spite of change action on E-meter and the fact that it stopped a rise preclear could conceive of trying to help brown people and it was on the right dynamic – so you blow off on this what you can with two-way communication, make a mental note that it is probably a lock on the terminal you are looking for.

Now, once you have assessed the dynamic and in your questioning you have found a “no help” terminal that is dynamically misplaced you are going to run some form of help on the terminal – in spite of the fact that the preclear can’t conceive of helping it. Example: preclear assessed and discovered to have “sun” on the eighth dynamic and he couldn’t conceive of helping a sun. Preclear was run on “Think of helping a sun” alternated with “Think of not helping a sun” (light form of Help O/W – the usual form of “How have you helped a sun?” “How have you not helped a sun?” would have taxed him heavily to answer).

You may expect communication lags, of course, and also a sense of relief when the preclear gets an answer, to say the least. You will also find the preclear being very curious and interested in the terminal. You can expect somatics and the preclear will run through bands of forgetfulness, propitiation, destroy, etc., all the way up to free (not compulsive) help on these terminals. At this time you will find he has a nul needle on help on the terminal and the terminal will be on the correct dynamic. If you are running a very specific terminal (i.e. preclear’s mother, not *a* mother) the preclear may run out of answers. If so, you assess per the E-meter what the general terminal is for this specific one and run help on the general one until the needle is nul for that general terminal. At any rate, on any specific terminal you run, you also run the general terminal.

Now you may find several terminals that fit the category you are looking for; a bad off case will be hung up on many or all dynamics. Then it becomes a matter of auditor judgment which one to run. It would probably be best to run the one that shows the greatest action on the E-meter.

Let’s say now that you’ve found a terminal, and run it on help until it is nul (by the way, at this point you will find it on the correct dynamics). The next thing you do is reassess the dynamics all over again as before. You will find they all assess differently than before as you will have shifted the preclear’s bank in running the former terminal. You find another terminal and run help on it.

In the event you found more than one terminal in the first assessment, you do NOT go to a second terminal without reassessment. After running help flat (nul) on a terminal you always do a complete reassessment.

In doing an assessment you do not question the preclear on the dynamics with an auditing type question as you are not at this time trying to put the preclear in session. Example: you would not ask “How could you help yourself?” This is an auditing question. You could say “How about help on the first dynamic?” (or other terminology denoting it), or, “What do you think about help on the first dynamic?” You just want the preclear to be considering help on these dynamics. Got the idea? (Of course, once you have assessed the terminal you use an auditing command to run the terminal.)

You assess, find a terminal he can't conceive of helping that is dynamically misplaced, run it nul on help, assess again, find it is nul, reassess, and so on until the preclear is nul on help across the dynamics and you can't get a blip on the E-meter on any sort of discussion of help on any dynamic, or any terminal on any dynamic.

You would only do a dynamic assessment on help once the preclear has been well pre-sessioned and the dynamic assessment and running help on the terminals so assessed would be run only in a model session. You are in effect running out failure to help. Failure to help is the basic of aberration. Out of failure to help stems compulsive help, overt acts, help = betray, betrayals, criminality. So you see where you are taking your preclear when you run out his failures to help. Yes, you are going to clear him.

Marilynn Routsong
Org Sec Washington D.C.

Revised & Reissued
as BTB by Flag Mission 1234

Approved by the Board of Issues
for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

of the

CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:SW:AL:MH:MR:mh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JANUARY 1960

HCO Secs
Assn Secs
Fran Hldrs

THE KEY TO ALL CASES – RESPONSIBILITY

During the past three months I have made several important discoveries in the field of the human mind which iron out the bits and pieces that were getting in our road in making broad clearing programmes possible.

First of these was the discovery that the *tone arm* of the E-Meter rather than the needle was foremost in analysing the case. When the tone arm reads at three for males and two for females on the modern meter a process can be considered flat. Aside from various special states such as valence shifts, this will hold true. When the tone arm reads at clear for the person's sex no matter what one attempts to restimulate on the case you have a *clear*. Additionally the hot areas of the time track are located because they throw the tone arm to higher or lower readings. Good auditing today cannot be done without an E-Meter of good reliable quality as distributed by HCO WW in the UK and by Wingate Enterprises in the United States. It could be said that the E-Meter has just now become an absolute necessity in auditing and general analysis – using the E-Meter **right** we can achieve clears.

Next, but not next in importance was the discovery of the anatomy of **Responsibility**. Although Responsibility has been known as a case factor since 1951 (just as the overt-motivator sequence has been) it has not been until now that I have been able to get it to run well on cases.

Responsibility is a significance. Pcs define it in various ways. And all rather tend to run from it. Pcs in general pretend they would much rather be victims than causative sources – which is what is wrong with their cases. In order to get responsibility to run I had to find out a lot more about it and not until the very end of 1959 was I able to define it in any way that made it run and come into being on a case.

Now I mentioned the E-Meter first in this because it is **Responsibility – Level Of** which causes the tone arm of the E-Meter to fluctuate. Place the pc in an area which has a very high tone arm reading or a very low one and you find the pc in an area in time when he was being very irresponsible.

It is not always true that a pc picked up as reading at the clear reading of his sex is high on responsibility. There is an inversion of the matter where the pc is so very low on responsibility that he just gets a body reading for his sex and that is that. The test of this is the running of responsibility, as given in this bulletin. If the pc, run on responsibility, changes the position of the tone arm from the clear reading then that pc has a very long way to go perhaps

before he can achieve any responsibility. If a pc is run on responsibility as given herein, if his track is explored, and if the tone arm reads and continues to read at clear then he is very responsible and very clear. But you would have to run the pc a bit not just read him on the meter in order to get an accurate view of the matter. In other words, don't look for overts to check out on a case. Look for tone arm fluctuations when responsibility is run. *It takes at least a certain level of responsibility to show up overt acts on E-Meter.*

What exactly does the E-Meter read? It reads the degree of mental mass surrounding the thetan in a body.

A thetan accumulates mental mass, pictures, ridges, circuits, etc, to the degree that he misassigns responsibility. If he does something and then says that it was done by something or someone else then he has failed to assign cause rightly and, doing so, he is of course left with an apparently uncaused mental mass. This to us is the "bank". To Freud it was the "unconscious". To the psychiatrist it is lunacy.

He therefore has as much bank as he has denied cause. As he is the only cause that could hang himself with a mass, the only misassigned cause therefore is self cause. Other people's causation is not aberrative and does not hang up except to the degree that the pc is provoked to misassigning cause. Other people's cause is therefore never audited.

Here then we have the anatomy of the reactive mind. The common denominator of all these unwanted ridges, masses, pictures, engrams, etc, is **Responsibility**.

The discovery of the direct anatomy of **Responsibility** is as follows:

Able to admit causation.

Able to withhold from.

This you will recognize as old reach and withdraw and as the fundamental of every successful process. But now we can refine this into the exact process that accomplishes a removal of the reactive mind and re-establishment of causation and responsibility.

A thetan will not restore his own ability until he is certain he can withhold from things. When he finds he cannot then he reduces his own power. He will not let himself be more powerful than he believes he can use power. When he gets mad he of course can control nothing, neither can he really direct anything. When he causes something that he thinks is bad, he next seeks to withhold. If he cannot withhold then he begins to compulsively cause things that are bad and you have overt acts happening.

What we call responsibility is restored on any subject or in any case by selecting a terminal (not a significance) and running on it:

What could you admit causing a (terminal)? Think of something you could withhold from a (terminal).

Overt acts proceed from *irresponsibility*. Therefore when responsibility declines, overt acts can occur. When responsibility declines to zero then a person doing overt acts no longer conceives them to be overt acts and **you do not even get a wiggle on the e-meter needle** when looking for overts and withholds on such a case. Thus some criminals would not register on overts at all even though they had the loot in their pockets! And it is often necessary on

any case to run cause/withhold on present life terminals as given above before the person can conceive of having committed any overts against those terminals.

This is very important: No case will run well and many cases will not run at all with present life overts and withholds undisclosed and unflattened. These overts and withholds may not even come into view **until the version of Responsibility given herein is liberally run on the case.** Choose any area where the pc conceives himself to be a victim. Select a terminal to represent that area that falls on an E-Meter. Run cause/withhold as given herein on that terminal and watch the overts pop into view. It is not necessary to handle these overts when they come up with any other process than cause/withhold since cause/withhold given here is responsibility.

There are other factors on cases that need handling but these are all handled with responsibility processes. If all the factors involved in a case are well handled as given herein you will have a theta clear who will be able to do a lot of things humans can't do. And if you handled a case totally with this material and its specialized skills then you would have an Operating Thetan. Fortunately for this universe no thetan will let himself go free unless he can operate without danger to others and the responsibility factor is way up on all dynamics.

This material is covered in tape lectures from the Washington January Congress 1960 (nine hours) and in the HCS Course lectures, Washington, January 1960 (nine hours). The Congress, which was very warmly received in Washington, is being replayed in many areas by public demand and the HCS Course is being given as the HCS/BScn Course in all Central Organizations.

This is the major breakthrough we are starting the 1960s with. We are counting on HGCs turning out theta clears at regular intervals and we are working to get all staffs of Central Organizations through to theta clear on Staff Clearing Courses.

This material is also being used on PE Courses which now should run as follows: One week PE Course with TR demonstrations, this free. People pass from this course directly into Co-Audit (no Comm Course) at a fee, on the following process: "What could you admit causing a person?" "What could you withhold from a person?" Terminals other than "person" may be selected by the Co-Audit Instructor. A full intensive given by HGCs on the basis of OT-3 Procedure is sufficiently in advance of this to make individual auditing necessary in most cases. OT-3 has been released to all Central Orgs who have the Washington HCS tapes. The CCHs are used on cases incapable of defining terms.

In view of this material and what is now known of responsibility and overts and what they do to case level, a new kind of justice comes into being, making it completely unnecessary to punish. You can know a person by his case level. Does it advance or doesn't it? Does he elect others ogres when he himself has been doing things or does he show Scientology in himself?

This is a brand new look and it can be made a brand new earth. We started the 1960s the right way as I think you will discover.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 DECEMBER AD 9

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
HASI
Dept Heads

BLOW-OFFS

Scientology Technology recently has been extended to include the factual explanation of departures, sudden and relatively unexplained, from sessions, posts, jobs, locations and areas.

This is one of the things man thought he knew all about and therefore never bothered to investigate, yet, this amongst all other things gave him the most trouble. Man had it all explained to his own satisfaction and yet his explanation did not cut down the amount of trouble which came from the feeling of “having to leave”.

For instance man has been frantic about the high divorce rate, about the high job turnover in plants, about labour unrest and many other items all stemming from the same source – sudden departures or gradual departures.

We have the view of a person who has a good job, who probably won't get a better one, suddenly deciding to leave and going. We have the view of a wife with a perfectly good husband and family up and leaving it all. We see a husband with a pretty and attractive wife breaking up the affinity and departing.

In Scientology we have the phenomenon of preclears in session or students on courses deciding to leave and never coming back. And that gives us more trouble than most other things all combined.

Man explained this to himself by saying that things were done to him which he would not tolerate and therefore he had to leave. But if this were the explanation all man would have to do would be to make working conditions, marital relationships, jobs, courses and sessions all very excellent and the problem would be solved. But on the contrary, a close examination of working conditions and marital relationships demonstrates that improvement of conditions often worsens the amount of blow-off, as one could call this phenomenon. Probably the finest working conditions in the world were achieved by Mr. Hershey of Chocolate Bar fame for his plant workers. Yet they revolted and even shot at him. This in its turn led to an industrial philosophy that the worse workers were treated the more willing they were to stay which in itself is as untrue as the better they are treated the faster they blow off.

One can treat people so well that they grow ashamed of themselves, knowing they don't deserve it, that a blow-off is precipitated, and certainly one can treat people so badly that they have no choice but to leave, but these are extreme conditions and in between these we have the majority of departures: the auditor is doing his best for the preclear and yet the preclear gets meaner and meaner and blows the session. The wife is doing her best to make a marriage and the husband wanders off on the trail of a tart. The manager is trying to keep things going and the worker leaves. These, the unexplained, disrupt organizations and lives and it's time we understood them.

People leave because of their own overts and withholds. That is the factual fact and the hardbound rule. A man with a clean heart can't be hurt. The man or woman who must must become a victim and depart is departing because of his or her own overts and withholds. It doesn't matter whether the person is departing from a town or a job or a session. The cause is the same.

Almost anyone, no matter his position, can remedy a situation no matter what's wrong if he or she really wants to. When the person no longer wants to remedy it his own overt acts and withholds against the others involved in the situation have lowered his own ability to be responsible for it. Therefore he or she does not remedy the situation. Departure is the only answer. To justify the departure the person blowing off dreams up things done to him, in an effort to minimize the overt by degrading those it was done to. The mechanics involved are quite simple.

It is amazing what trivial overts will cause a person to blow. I caught a staff member one time just before he blew and traced down the original overt act against the Organization to his failure to defend the Organization when a criminal was speaking viciously about it. This failure to defend accumulated to itself more and more overts and withholds such as failing to relay messages, failure to complete an assignment, until it finally utterly degraded the person into stealing something of no value. This theft caused the person to believe he had better leave.

It is a rather noble commentary on man that *when a person finds himself, as he believes, incapable of restraining himself from injuring a benefactor he will defend the benefactor by leaving.* This is the real source of the blow-off. If we were to better a person's working conditions in this light we would see that we have simply magnified his overt acts and made it a certain fact that he would leave. If we punish we can bring the value of the benefactor down a bit and thus lessen the value of the overt. But improvement and punishment are neither one answers. The answer lies in Scientology and processing the person up to a high enough responsibility to take a job or a position and carry it out without all this weird hocus-pocus of "I've got to say you are doing things to me so I can leave and protect you from all the bad things I am doing to you." That's the way it is and it doesn't make sense not to do something about it now that we know.

A recent Secretarial Executive Director to all Central Organizations states that before a person may draw his last pay cheque from an Organization he is leaving of his own volition he must write down all his overts and withholds against the Organization and its related personnel and have these checked out by the HCO Secretary on an E-Meter.

To do less than this is cruelty itself. The person is blowing himself off with his own overts and withholds. If these are not removed then anything the Organization or its people does to him goes in like a javelin and leaves him with a dark area in his life and a rotten taste in his mouth. Further he goes around spouting lies about the Organization and its related personnel and every lie he utters makes him just that much sicker. By permitting a blow-off without clearing it we are degrading people, for I assure you, and with some sorrow, people have not often recovered from overts against Scientology, its Organizations and related persons. They don't recover because they know in their hearts even while they lie that they are wronging people who have done and are doing enormous amounts of good in the world and who definitely do not deserve libel and slander. Literally, it kills them and if you don't believe it I can show you the long death list.

The only evil thing we are doing is to be good, if that makes sense to you. For by being good, things done to us out of carelessness or viciousness are all out of proportion to the evil done to others. This often applies to people who are not Scientologists. Just this year I had an electrician who robbed HCO of money with false bills and bad workmanship. One day he woke up to the fact that the Organization he was robbing was helping people everywhere far beyond his ability to ever help anyone. Within a few weeks he contracted TB and is now dying in a London hospital. Nobody took off the overts and withholds when he left. And it's actually killing him – a fact which is no fancy on my part. There is something a little terrifying in this sometimes. I once told a bill collector what and who we were and that he had wronged a good person and a half hour later he threw a hundred grains of Veronal down his throat and was lugged off to hospital, a suicide.

This campaign is aimed straightly at cases and getting people cleared. It is aimed at preserving staffs and the lives of persons who believe they have failed us.

Uneasy lies the head that has a bad conscience. Clean it up and run responsibility on it and you have another better person, and if anybody feels like leaving just examine the record and sit down and list everything done to and withheld from me; and the Organization and send it along. We'll save a lot of people that way.

And on our parts we'll go along being as good a manager, as good an Organization and as good a field as we can be and we'll get rid of all our overts and withholds too.

Think it will make an interesting new view?

Well, Scientology specializes in those.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 SEPTEMBER 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

Levels II to IV

OVERTS, WHAT LIES BEHIND THEM?

I recently made a very basic discovery on the subject of overts and would like to rapidly make a note of it for the record.

You can call this the "Cycle of an Overt".

4. A being appears to have a motivator.
3. This is because of an overt the being has done.
2. The being committed an overt because he didn't understand something.
1. The being didn't understand something because a word or symbol was not understood.

Thus all caved-in conditions, illness, etc, can be traced back to a misunderstood symbol, strange as that may seem.

It goes like this:

1. A being doesn't get the meaning of a word or symbol.
2. This causes the being to misunderstand the area of the symbol or word (who used it whatever it applied to);
3. This causes the being to feel different from or antagonize toward the user or whatever of the symbol and so makes it all right to commit an overt;
4. Having committed the overt, the being now feels he has to have a motivator and so feels caved in.

This is the stuff of which Hades is made. This is the trap. This is why people get sick. This is stupidity and lack of ability.

This is why Clay Table Auditing works.

Clearing a pc then consists only of locating the area of the motivator, finding what was misunderstood and getting the word made into clay and explained. The overts blow. Pure magic.

The trick is locating the area where the pc has one of these.

This is discussed further in Saint Hill lecture of 3 Sept 1964, but is too important a discovery to leave only in tape form.

The cycle is Misunderstood word or symbol – separation from ARC with the things associated with the word or symbol – overt committed – motivator felt necessary to justify the overt – decline of freedom, activeness, intelligence, well being and health.

Knowing this and the technology of auditing one can then handle and clear these symbols and words and produce the gains we have described as being clear, for the things causing the decline are cleared out of the being.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

Nature of Withholds

A lecture given on 16 January 1962

Well, we have some new students. Some new students. We have Bernie Pesco, from HASI Melbourne. Stand up. (Applause). Glad you are here! And Liam Bosworth, HASI Joburg. (Applause).

And we have two old students. (laughter), Wing and Smokey Angels. Stand up. (Applause).

All right.

Okay. What's the date?

Audience voices: 16th.

All right. 16th Jan. 62, AD 12.

Oh, they've changed the acoustics around here.

Now, it's a moot question whether I lecture you today about 3D or 3D Criss Cross or Security Checking Twenty-Ten. It's a moot question because the difficulties of both are exceeding you enormously.

In fact, it's almost, "Have you ever heard of them?" [laughs] I don't mean to be sarcastic and I never lay it into people. I gave you a low-toned lecture the last time I gave you a lecture, remember? Last week – gave you a low-tone lecture; told you there was enormous gap between what you ought to be doing and what you are doing – as great as the gap between what you are doing and what is being done in the field. And that's a pretty wide gap. See, there's a big, a big lot of stuff that you could be getting in there and pitching on.

Now, we have various things that would assist this. And these things are normally summed up in a subject of technology. Now, technology is what you ought to be studying.

Technology is divided into two parts. And these two parts are *how* you do it, what motions you go through, and *what* you do. How you do it and what you do. Don't try to wrap up technology under one heading of "Well, it's technical."

How do you run a session? And what do you run in the session? And these are two different subjects and they are very broadly different subjects.

Now, actually, I'm torn in several different directions in giving you a lecture today because I've got so much data to give you on Security Checking and on 3D Criss Cross and other things like this, and the anatomy of the Goals Problem Mass, which we have a lot more data on that you'll be very interested in, and so forth. But it's very difficult for me to keep this in a very orderly groove, because there is just – how'd you get this stupid? I mean, you know,

you must have worked on it, you know? You must have worked on it. Somewhere or another on the track, you must have said to yourself, "They shouldn't know, and that includes me." [laughs] Somewhere here. But I wish you just hadn't done it so often. If you'd just done it less frequently.

Now, of course, it's a good thing that you do have withholds, some of you. That's a good thing. That's a good thing. Think of the cities that would be destroyed, the planets burst into pieces if you hadn't withheld here and there. We're not trying to teach you to not have withholds – that if you have an impulse, just do it; we're not trying to teach you to do that. We're trying to get you out of the tangle you got yourself into. What do you mean doing – having such terrible impulses? *That's* the tangle we're trying to solve in a pc. How come the pc has these impulses that he then has to withhold? See, now *that's* the problem. It isn't the problem of withholding.

Now, if you took all the withholds off of a born killer, see, and you didn't remedy the case in any other way at all – ha-ha-ha-ha. I could look at a few of you right now – I'm not mentioning any names; [laughter, laughs] I don't want to be personal – but just supposing you didn't withhold some of the things you think of. Just supposing.

Immediately we get a cough here. [laughs]

All right. The withhold is, of course, that area of motionlessness which follows that area of doingness which you "shouldn't ought to have." And the whole study of withholds comes about from "shouldn't ought to have done it," you see? If you shouldn't ought to have done it, you then begin to withhold it, which, of course, classifies action under the headings of "things you should have done" and "things you shouldn't have done."

But what do you know? There's a whole bunch of things called "laudable withholds." Now, it was very laudable of you not to sink the battleship. This was very laudable. It's very laudable of you not to have gotten angry at the waitress. Yeah, it's laudable. But a laudable withhold, of course, is always something that society expects of you, providing you've got these other impulses which society has classified (whatever society you happen to belong to), has classified as shouldn't-ought-to-have-done-it actions.

Now, it all depends on where you was brung up (some people were brought up and some people were brung up) and exactly what you shouldn't ought to be done-ing. Now, the whole subject of that is not the subject of philosophy, it's a subject of mores. It's what is moral. To whom and where and what group, under what circumstances, is a laudable action and an action that ought to be withheld?

Now, you have, then, all withholds divided, and all actions divided into "laudable actions" and "laudable withholds." And the laudable withhold goes along with the undesirable action, and the laudable action goes along with an undesirable withhold. Well, figure it out. That's true, isn't it?

So you is always horsed between two horses. See? Is it laudable to went and done it? All right. Well, then it's not laudable to withhold it. All right. If it's laudable to withhold it, then it must be coupled with of – "You shouldn't ought to have done it. It shouldn't be done." You see?

So one of the pair of the overt or the withhold is always laudable and always desirable. And the other one is, it is undesirable. See, if you got a laudable withhold, you must have had a desirable action. In other words, a laudable withhold is an undesirable action – get it straight: laudable withhold, undesirable action. Desirable action, on the other hand, of course: you have a bad withhold.

For instance, it is laudable in some societies to hand out money indiscriminately. See, that's very laudable. That means you're generous, you believe in Allah, all kinds of other actions. You must hand out money in all directions. And if you withhold it, if you withhold any money, you're of course a miser. See, you're a cheapskate. You're a miser, you see? Now, that is the punishment they assign in order to – you see, that's a derogatory withhold because the action is considered by the group to be desirable.

Take any given action – let's take kissing a girl – just take that as an action. I don't know whether you're familiar with this action or not, but – [laughter] Kissing a girl. All right. Now, let's take a look at the various societies and their various regards of it. And you find out it'd be very interesting. The Marriage Counselors Society of Los Angeles. Of course, this is a very laudable action and therefore you are a very evil man if you don't kiss a girl. If you're not the type of man who kisses girls, then you're an evil man. That's according to the mores of the marriage counselors. Because of course the more girls that get kissed, the more business they have. [laughter] Elementary. Elementary.

All right. Now, let's take the Sex Is Evil Society of New York City. The Sex Is Evil Society. All right. Every time you kiss a girl, you see, you are evil. So you're an evil man because you kiss a girl.

Now, you go down to Hollywood, for instance, and kiss a girl, they think you're crazy. I didn't mean to – it as a crack, and so forth. I didn't mean it as a crack – a derogatory. In the first place, it couldn't be derogatory because you can always explain cracks about Hollywood on the same basis, "It isn't critical – it isn't a critical thought because it's true!" You hear that? [laughter] How do they say?

Now, there's just one action. And the fellow who does it in one group is evil and the fellow who doesn't do it in another group is evil. It's a case of "you can't win." But there's another side to this game, too, you see? The one action of withholding kissing girls in New York – then you're a *good* man, you see? And in California, you see, why, you're a – Marriage Counselors Association – why, you're a *good* man if you kiss girls. In New York – Anti-Sex Society, you see – you're a *good* man if you withhold kissing girls. Now, between these two things you get confused.

In a war there's nothing quite as upsetting to a company officer as a soldier who won't shoot enemy troops. This is very upsetting, very upsetting. The War Department in the United States, and I am sure in England, has often sat up all night long compiling statistics as the number of unfired weapons or weapons fired in the air at no target during actions of World War II. And it is a terrible worry to them, particularly when the figure gets above 50. When the figure gets above 50 percent, you see. Why, look at – the taxpayer has devoted his blood and treasure to manufacturing bullets, and there is this chuckleheaded soldier sitting on the front line who won't even pull the trigger, you see? So this is a bad withhold. Very bad busi-

ness, you see? This is a rough thing here. A fellow shouldn't do it, you see? He shouldn't withhold that bullet.

All right. Now let's say he's even a member of the police force and he goes down the middle of Main Street, and he fires this – fires off a gun – somebody fires off a gun. The same officer at a different period of time may then be sentencing him for having *shot* a gun, arresting and sentencing him for having done this action. So the *time* it is done has something to do with it. Not only the society, but the *time* this is done. The timing of the action tells you whether or not the desi- the withhold is desirable or the action is desirable. So it's no wonder you get confused.

You get it all straightened out, you see, that certain society, called the United States population, considers it laudable if you fire a gun at a man in time of war, and considers it evil if you *refuse* to fire a gun at a man at time of war, see? That's in time of war.

Now, in time of peace, the same society, the same people, consider it laudable to *withhold* firing the gun and evil to *fire* the gun. See? So you get confused. So your pc gets confused.

Your pc after a while doesn't know whether it is laudable to act or to withhold. And if you were to ask a pc bluntly, "Now, is it best to reach or to withhold yourself from reaching? Which is best? Which of these two actions would be the best action? Is it better to reach or better to restrain yourself from reaching? Now, what is the answer to that question?" Then if you – the person asked it, if he were really forced to solve it, would go around the bend – because it all has to do with the mores and the time and place. What group would consider it, you see? When? That's the anatomy of the situation.

In other words, you've got a situation going here where you cannot say that at all times one certain action... Let's take one action. There *is* no action that at all times is good in all places. And there *is* no withhold that at all times should be in action or withheld, see? There is no one certain withhold that at all times must be withheld everywhere.

So you cannot say that there is a bad withhold or a good action, or a 100-percent-bad action or a 100-percent-bad withhold, see? It all depends on from what viewpoint do you view this?

Now, that's all viewed with a worm's-eye view of the wog. And if you ask a wog these questions, you've had it. Because he can never answer this question. He will never answer it from one end of the world to the other if you say, "Tell me an action that is at all times good in all places. Tell me something that should be withheld in all places at all times by everything and everyone. Tell me such a withhold."

You can't, from a wog's-eye view.

Therefore, we must be dealing – and when we're security checking – with another factor. We must be dealing with something else. We can't, then, say, "He has withholds," and feel cheerful about it or feel depressed about it, either way. Because good men probably have more withholds than bad men, which therefore makes everybody very puzzled. And they don't want to become good because they know that all good men never communicate. And by this definition, the goodest men they are, are out in the cemetery.

You see, so everybody gets in a, in a ball-up about this. So we must be doing something else than pulling all withholds from all people at all times – all withholds. See, we must be doing something different. And we are.

We are remedying the compulsion or obsession to commit actions which have to be withheld. In other words, we're remedying unreasonable action. And that's all we're doing. And that covers Security Checking like a blanket. You see, you're remedying unreasonable action. That's all.

Now, if we were fixing somebody up so that he would fit very well into the society of the Calakahoochie Indians, we would have to study up the Calakahoochie Indians and find out what they considered to be undesirable actions, remedy these in the pc, and he would be considered a very good man indeed amongst the Calakahoochie Indians. The only trouble is we cannot guarantee that our pc is going to pick up a body with the Calakahoochie Indians. This we cannot guarantee. They probably, by the time they get around to it, will have been totally wiped out by the United Nations.

The United Nations hears about it these days, they exterminate it. This is the – it's the modus. That's – the word is out these days. I don't mean to say anything bitter against the United Nations. Nobody is fonder of cooperative, coordinated action than I am, and – of course, I don't see any of it in the United Nations so I don't like them much, but that's all right. Let's just pass over that silently with a moment of bowed heads.

The – we can't guarantee that the United Nations will not have gotten there first, you see, or somebody else will have gotten there. We can make no guarantee where this pc is going to go next. There he sits in the pc's chair or there he sits in the Academy for that matter, and well, times are uncertain, and the generals they got on this planet aren't up to my standards. And they're liable to blow the whole top off the place at any minute, and – or some auditor from Burbank, or something like that, is liable to get hold of this person next, and the person does a bunk and passes Arcturus and thinks one of its planets would be a good place to stop.

In other words, we cannot predict, we cannot predict where our pc is going to land within the next century. Well, he has two hundred trillion years behind him, the probabilities that he will land in different places in the next hundred years are rather certain. He's been landing in different places for two hundred trillion years and to say that he is now never going to land in another place is idiocy.

He for sure is going to land in different places elsewhere. He's going to be in different societies than he is in now. Therefore, there is only one thing that you can rehabilitate in the pc. There's just one thing that you can rehabilitate in the pc, and that is his ability to determine his own actions. And that's all you can rehabilitate. You can rehabilitate nothing else. Do you follow that?

All you can do is make him governor of his own deeds. And if he can be made to be governor of his own deeds, we have then done the job for all societies in all places. And we have also rehabilitated totally, 100 percent, communication for this person. Because communication isn't, as some people would like to think, one constant long blah, which was started several thousand years ago and is still going on, you see? Most people – a lot of people have

that; about 50 percent of the people have that. Or on the other hand, one total silence that began a long time ago and will be silent for a long time to come.

You see, communication is neither one of these things. Communication is the ability to control an outflow or stop it. It is to run start, change and stop on outflowing and inflowing actions: control of communication.

Now, control of communication, of course, downgrades into heavier MEST as control of reach, so that you have the ability to start, change and stop outflowing and inflowing reach. And the ability to do this is, of course, the thing that you are rehabilitating.

What your pc is afraid of is that one fine day he will be in Piccadilly Circus or Times Square and take off all his clothes. Now, you recognize that it's perfectly all right to take off all one's clothes in one's bedroom or even some other bedrooms; [laughter] that is perfectly all right. But it is not all right to take off all one's clothes in the middle of Piccadilly Circus.

Now, one of the reverse mechanisms of the human mind is that a person can be so worried about doing this that he will begin to think about nothing but withholding this. So he goes around twenty-four hours a day, except when he's asleep – and he doesn't sleep much either because he might walk in his sleep; you could even take care of that, you see? And he is afraid that one of these days he's going to go down in the underground, or the subway, take a train and go to the exact center of the city, stand on the sidewalk and take off all his clothes. He's pretty sure that sooner or later he's liable to do this and he becomes totally concentrated on doing all he can to *not* do it. And you could devote a wh- a person's whole life to not performing that one action. You could actually train a person to a point – you could get him so worried, you could get him so obsessed, you could get him so upset, you could get him so concentrated on this one point – that he would never think about anything else.

Of course at that moment you would classify him as insane because he couldn't even remember to eat, he couldn't remember to go to bed. He would walk around all the time thinking to himself about "I must not go down to Times Square and take off all of my clothes." Do you see that?

Well now, what he is doing, then, is practicing a consistent withhold of an undesirable action and most of his attention is wrapped up in restraining himself from performing this undesirable action. And it's an attention trap to end all attention traps.

All right. The reverse of it is true, too. He must remember to *do* a desirable action. Now, you could get somebody and you could train him completely that he must never pass a beggar without putting a coin in the beggar's cup, and that terrible bad luck will ensue if he fails to put a coin in a beggar's cup.

All right. That's fine. That's fine. That's a very laudable outflow, isn't it? Only a cheap-skate would not do that. Only a miser would fail to perform this very desirable action, you see?

All right. Now, let's multiply it. Let's multiply it. Let's make it so that he begins to believe that if he doesn't do this action at least once every day, that he will be ostracized and cauterized. He must do this in order to live. He must outflow this action. He must give to charity.

If you think I am being a little bit archaic here, just to this degree, that this particular obsession is most resident in the Middle East and was most prevalent about fifteen hundred years ago. Boy, they and – well, fourteen hundred years ago, thirteen hundred years ago, twelve hundred years ago. They were really working on this hard, you see? "Alms for Allah," you know, and so on. And the *Koran* was all written around how thou must give in order to be lucky, you know?

But anyway, it still exists today to some degree. But let's supposing that we trained this guy on an obsessive, compulsion basis, rickracked him up one way or the other, gave him electronic implants and made him implant others to do it – in other words, got him real set; and gave him a bunch of failures implanting others – so that he must put a coin in a beggar's cup every day.

Now, let's speed it up. He must put a coin in a beggar's cup every hour. Now let's really fix it up so that it must be a different beggar every hour and he has to keep a map, then, and a roster of all the beggars in the city in order to perform this action. Otherwise, the sky will cave in or the muezzin will not hold up the minaret or something.

Well, you see, that's an obsessive action. That's an obsessive action.

Now, what would happen to most of the citizens of Western society today if they failed to come to work in the morning? That's a desirable outflow, isn't it? They have to outflow a body from home and put it down at work, right? Correct? Hm? And on this we have accompanying economic disaster, social disgrace, denial of all things that go along with having a position and a salary in the society, you see?

All right. If we enforce that to that degree and then we withheld it in that degree, we'd probably have the fellow – he wouldn't have any clothes, so he'd be in the middle of Piccadilly Circus without any on whether he liked it or not.

Now, if we educated the same man to never outflow any money and never to give any money – we've educated him both ways now, a hundred percent – and we got this exactly and equally balanced, we'd have an insane ridge. And he'd have the glee of money or something.

Now, if we had this fellow totally educated to believe that he must never go away from home because he might go down to Piccadilly Circus and take off all his clothes, but that he must go away from home in order to have money to buy clothes, every time he went across the lintel he would not know whether he was heading for Piccadilly Circus or work. Which way was he going? Was he going to Piccadilly Circus to – ? Oh, no. He'd better not go to Piccadilly Circus. And after a while he forgets why he is leaving home. And he just doesn't leave home anymore.

And you find a tremendous number of people who cannot leave their houses. Well, you can run houses in vain on them without curing this phobia. You can remedy the havingness of houses and everything else. Why? Because it – the trouble with them is not the house, it's Piccadilly Circus. They don't know why they mustn't leave home because they've now forgotten that they might go down to Piccadilly Circus, you see, and take off all their clothes. And because they might do that, then they'd better not go out of the house. But they've forgot-

ten why, what they're liable to do, and therefore you have a covered overt with a covered withhold, and you've got the present time action of a motionless person.

See? There he sits; he's motionless. In some sphere he is not free to communicate. Why isn't he free to communicate? Because he cannot find out what is the desirable action and what is the desirable withhold, and what's the undesirable action and what is the undesirable withhold?

See, he doesn't know what these things are now. He cannot any longer differentiate amongst good actions and good withholds and bad actions and bad withholds, and he is no longer master of his own communication or his own reach, so therefore he has to be very careful to not reach and he has to be very careful to reach while he is being very careful not to reach; he must not reach, you see, because he might reach, but if he doesn't reach then he wouldn't reach. And you get your average wog. Average person. This is not an insane person I'm talking about. This is just the average bank. That's what it's composed of.

The fellow doesn't know what he mustn't reach and he doesn't know what he must withhold, and he's forgotten that he must reach and he's forgotten that he must withhold. But the habit pattern stays with it as caution. And it's interesting that all that psychoanalysis ever trained anybody to be was cautious. The more – longer they were psychoanalyzed, the more cautious they got. That's the difficulty.

Now, this other fellow who was trained obsessively to reach, he's trained obsessively to reach – he's got to reach, he's got to reach, he's got to reach, he's got to reach – he never has a chance to do anything else but reach, and he must never withhold on this subject, he must never stay home from work, see? *Never* stay home from work. Never, never, never.

And now he hasn't got a job. And not having a job, what does he now have? He has compulsion to go, but he doesn't know what he's supposed to go to. He doesn't know where he's supposed to go or why he's supposed to go or what he's supposed to arrive at or anything else. He just knows that he must go, you see? He's got to leave home.

And you'll find that these leaving-homenesses and things like that are cyclic. For instance, insane person is only insane sometimes between two and four o'clock in the afternoon. A person who has insomnia very often cannot sleep between one and four in the morning, see? Well, one and four in the morning, someplace along the line – one and four in the morning is a wakeful period of something or other. And they must – might have been a one – a night watchman sometime or another, you know, and they always had to be there at one o'clock. There is no telling why they had to be there but it was necessary that they reach at that particular time. So they feel agitated because they don't know where they're supposed to go, and they feel nervous. *Heh. Wzzzzzzz!*

Well, you – there isn't anybody you know that doesn't have a nervous period in the day sometime. If you sorted it out carefully, you would find that some period of the day they became very active, and another period of the day, at least one, they became very quiet. You don't know anybody who doesn't do this.

They get up in the morning, they have to get active. In the evening they go to bed and become inactive. Why? I don't know.

But a lot of people have a lot of trouble with sleep, because they're accustomed to sleep, or their sleeping hours compare with some other part of the planet, or some other time area somewhere on some other planet. And they're trying to go to sleep and wake up in the period that they're most accustomed to going to sleep and wake up because their training pattern of going to sleep and waking up is that training pattern of, let us say, Los Angeles. And they're now living in London. There's eight hours difference, you see? Eight hours difference.

So actually, in Los Angeles you ought to be getting up around seven or eight o'clock in the morning, but you see, there's an entirely different time in London for seven or eight o'clock in the morning, so one just about goes to bed and becomes very wakeful. The second they go to bed, they become wakeful. Well, it may be coinciding with some period when they should be getting up. You see how dizzy all this can be, see?

Well, what is all that? Let's characterize that with what it is. This is strictly, totally and only a confusion of a reach and a withhold, according to the time and place and action. They don't know whether to reach or withdraw, and why or when or something. In other words, they have lost knowingness over the action.

Now, in order to restore control over one's communication or not-communication, receiving communication or not receiving communication, control over one's reach or not-reach, be reached or not be reached, one must get these unknowingnesses out of the road or the person will appear nervous sometimes to a point of total apathy and collapse.

When you ask them to do something or other, suddenly you'd – they're not able. They just – they just feel very nervous about this. They're not quite sure why they feel nervous about this. Matter of fact, they don't go into it so deeply as saying, "I feel nervous about this." See, they're not that analytical.

They're supposed to go down to the grocery store and they sit down on the porch and they stay there for two hours. But yet that's never happened to them before. But the next time they go down to the grocery store, they go down to the grocery store all right. They haven't any idea of lingering. It never occurred to them, you see, they were going down to the grocery store at the time they should have been going to bed in some other part of the world. You see how confused all this gets? How confused a person could be.

Now, in order to aberrate somebody on this subject, you establish compulsion to reach or a compulsion to withdraw or withhold – you establish this as an absolute necessity – and then shift them in time and place so as to bring about no necessity for this of any kind whatsoever, so that they forget it and so that they don't remember what they are supposed to do. In other words, make an unknowingness out of the whole thing. Bury it.

Somehow or another cloud the thing over, and after that, why, they've, to some degree, had it. But doing this once wouldn't aberrate anybody very much. After it had been done several hundred thousand times, though, it would begin to tell – begin to tell. The person would begin to get the idea that they didn't quite know what they were doing. That would become rather apparent, even to them.

Have you ever seen anybody that knew exactly what he should have been doing, knew exactly what he ought to be doing, gets all geared up to do it, get out all the equipment to do it, and then doesn't touch anything? Did you ever see anybody do that?

Audience voice: Yes.

Well, his "Now I'm supposed to" worked right up to the point where it restimulated the hidden withhold. See? He goes right straight up. He's going into action. Now he's supposed to withhold it.

Did you see – ever see anybody sit down, decide to relax – decide to relax, sit down, take it easy, have a good rest – turn around and they're tearing all over the house, you know, and the walls are caving in practically from the amount of running and fussing and scattering and changing the furniture and so forth. You ever notice anybody do anything like that?

Well, they've just hit the wrong side of things, see? Their compulsions to withhold or to reach are not in agreement, so that they sit down to withhold – in other words, they're going to withhold themselves from action, they're going to rest now – and they've hit so close to a borderline, some kind of a restimulator causes them to go into action: having decided to withhold causes them to go into action.

Now, when a person gets very bad off, any decision to act causes them to withhold. They have no differentiation at all. Any decision to act causes them to withhold. You've seen them. They get elected to office all the time.

Government program: That's a very, very good one, a government program. They're going to "do" this, and then the letter sits in the out-basket, you see, for six weeks and then it goes into another in-basket and sits there for seven months, and then it goes over to appropriations, and appropriations dawdles with it for a year or two, and that's just from the fact that the government is guilty, collectively, of overt acts.

You never have an effective government where you have tremendous numbers of overt acts mixed up in the government that are being withheld.

All right. Do you see, then, that the whole subject of withholds and Security Checking is intimately wound up with the action and inaction of people, and the determinism and the – of people and their failure to be self-determined, and so forth.

You take some bird, he's in a total hypnotic trance. He comes in and you say, "Well, close the door," and the door is closed. And you tell him, "Close the door." And they go over and they pick up an imaginary door knob and shut the imaginary door so that they will comply with what you've said.

You've set them down in a chair and they're in a chair. If you stood them up, they'll stand up.

In insane asylums they stretch them out, they lie down, they lie down there fine. You pick up one arm, put it in the air; it'll just stay there – catatonic schizophrenia. It's marvelous. They're just like tallow or clay or something. It's – anything you can do to them, you know?

Any – you know, you got – you'll get pcs like this. You want to watch it. They have eye flutter and various things. And you, if you were to suggest anything – it – this isn't why

we suggest things to people on assessing – but if you were to suggest to this person that a battleship was his terminal, a battleship, yeah, boy, you're going to get a battleship registering. Because you shoved a battleship right into his skull, and he's got the battleship registering, and that's it and that's all that's there. You said it, so therefore it's it.

I have trouble with that. I sometimes assess people's terminals and so forth, and you can't get them away from them with shotguns – sometimes, sometimes. That doesn't mean those people are hypnotic. They know it was probably right. Oddly enough, it usually is right.

Good thing to do, good thing to do is take all eva- invalidations and evaluations and all overts off it, and strip it down to where nothing registers with regard to it and still see if it's it. That's the only way you would recover that. But this gives trouble every once in a while, where an auditor has suggested a terminal or where an auditor with altitude has found a terminal the pc isn't about to give it up.

Now, you're not in that range right now with 3D Criss Cross. It isn't as hard as that. Somewhat amusing to me to see some of the terminals I have assessed coming up again on 3D Criss Cross. There they are. They were there all the time, of course.

But here's your action. This person is totally susceptible to any restimulation. Now, get off the idea the person is totally susceptible to suggestion and how nice that is, because that's for the birds. The person is totally susceptible to any inflowing action of any kind – the person is totally susceptible.

In other words, they restimulate – *bang!* Their bank is so rigged that they see a spotted wall, they get measles, see? And anything that happens to them in society, they are instantly – reaction is to have that with them. They restimulate at once. And they are very, very bad off.

Now, a gradient scale of that is the average person. He sees a few things and they restimulate him where he's on a total effect basis.

Now, what's the matter with that total effect basis? There's only one thing wrong with that basis, only one thing. And that is a person has no command over his reach and withdraw. He has lost this. He cannot, then, be master of his own actions. He of course, then, is never governor of his own fate and of course he cannot be sensible about what he does.

IQ is the degree that a person can observe, understand actions, that's all – then withholding of actions, a person's grip of this situation.

You say, "Well, it could have a lot more ramifications, a lot more prettinesses about it, and so forth, and it'd be very much more complicated than that," but it isn't, really. It's one's government of one's environment.

Now, we are strange, as – if we considered Scientology a philosophy, which it is not, we would find ourselves almost alone in this one idea: that man should have any self-determinism. Because others, falling short of this, have looked on this point – and it's an important point – they've fallen short of it. They have seen that a criminal has a compulsion to commit crimes. And then being unable to pick up any part of the overt act of committing crimes or doing anything for the criminal, they say there is only one further answer, and that is to make the criminal withhold his crimes harder.

Now, that is peculiar as a philosophy because it doesn't work and that philosophy hasn't worked on this planet since I don't know how long.

You can compel a fellow to not go down to Times Square and take his clothes off to a point where he *can't do anything else!* Every time we see him, why, he's on his way to Times Square.

"Well, hello, Joe. Where are you going?"

"Well, I'm going down to Times Square – take my clothes off."

And you say, "Well, all right. I'll be down at four o'clock at the police station, bail you out."

And he'll say, "Well, thank you very much." Much relieved now, he goes down to Times Square and takes his clothes off. It's because he's withheld it so far that the withhold has failed. And it becomes a compulsion.

So, the action which is severely withheld very often reverses and becomes a compulsive action. A person knows he cannot withhold the action and therefore has to do it. And that is the danger of this philosophy that the more good, total withholds we have around, the better off we all are.

If you don't know this mechanism of overts and withholds, and you don't know why people act this way, of course you're liable to fall into this other philosophy as the only possible remedy. It's not a very good remedy.

Now, there's your basis of action. There's your basis of action and human beings. One, he does not know what his compulsive actions are or his "must dos" are – he doesn't know what these things are therefore he doesn't know what he is withholding. And not-knowingness is the common denominator of all withholds and overts which are operative on the individual.

Those things which are operative on the individual are *always unknown* to the individual. I might even teach you that someday. I keep telling you, and so forth. You're still always willing to look in a known area.

I know of some pcs that have been audited on their mother-in-law for years and years and years and years and are still having trouble with the mother-in-law, and it's never occurred to any auditor that the trouble couldn't *possibly* be the mother-in-law if the pc knew all about it. See? Pc knows about it – can't be the trouble.

Now, that gets in your road in Security Checking, that fact. Because the pc can know about it without you knowing about it. But that's half a know. And that isn't a good enough know, see? That's just half a know. So you don't know about it, but he knows about it. And he'll get upset if you don't let yourself in on it.

And you get the missed withhold phenomena, which is the most serious phenomena that stands in the road of Security Checking. Might teach you that someday, too.

I taught FCDC recently. Man, I got a despatch this morning. Boy. Wild, man. Absolutely wild. They've been going around tearing people's missed withholds. They have – that's all they've been doing. They haven't getting – been getting people's withholds off, they've

been taking people's *missed* withholds off. Takes them one or two sessions per staff member. It's going gorgeously. All of a sudden, people are going back and straightening up their departments and fur is flying in all directions, and so forth.

They're even getting cocky, you know? They don't say they don't care whether you people are coming back from Saint Hill or not, but they say, well, even if you don't, they might make it. You've been gone too long. They've forgotten you. Well, anyhow, have to go home pretty quick and reestablish your altitude.

The difficulties we have are that a missed withhold is a half a know. And evidently there's nothing more painful to somebody who has got to withhold something he no longer has to withhold. You don't know about it, so he has to withhold it, but now he knows he has to withhold it because you don't know about it.

You see, the mechanics of this are very logical. They actually are very logical. You see, he has to go on withholding it because you don't know about it yet, and it's very arduous to have to go on withholding it because it's – that's a half a know, see?

See, you don't know yet, and you didn't find out, and he found out, only he wasn't able to communicate it, so now you've got a knowing withhold, and the individual just practically goes to pieces on this basis, see, on a half a know.

You know, he's got to walk around, knowingly withhold this now. Nobody to tell it to, nobody else can be let in on it, so therefore there is no other know to compare. So it won't duplicate, so obviously won't blow. It's a single terminal at that moment, so there is no duplication of it in any other terminal. So as there is no duplication in any other terminal – of course, he knows by perfect duplication, that nothing will blow unless it is duplicated and other mechanisms which thetans have been very, very clever, very, very clever in working out. So you got a missed withhold is upsetting to the pc.

And a missed withhold, a pc will just come down on your neck with a crash. "*Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah.*" That's the Tone Scale of a pc on which there's been a missed withhold. Or...[laughter] Tone Scale of a missed withhold.

Now, when you're operating with a bad meter throughout an organization, everybody is at everybody else's throats. Everybody's missed withholds on everybody, so the tone of the organization is "*Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah.*" Or... [laughter] and that's all there is, see? And I say I might teach you that someday.

Up to the moment, however, if you yourself don't run into it, you won't know it. One day you'll be sitting there as the auditor, and the pc will be going, "*Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah,* and you've done this and you've done that." You will get smart enough to look for the missed withhold. And then all of a sudden the pc gets that off and, "Well, what were you mad about? What was I mad about? What was it all about? There isn't anything here. Nothing disturbing."

You feel, "You idiot."

Of course, the thing you feel most idiotic about is the caliber of the withhold you miss. You're still looking for quality. The missed withhold might be that the pc thought the E-Meter

was shiny and didn't tell you and the rudiments went out. And that's a missed withhold. And the next thing you know, you've got an ARC break.

Remember I told you long, long, long ago that it took about an hour and a half for an ARC break to build up to magnitude in a session. Well, we find out why that is now, is usually the missed withholds, the first missed withholds are at the beginning of the session – not in withhold rudiment at the beginning of a session, but the pc sits down and says, "Well, I hope this will be all right," and doesn't tell the auditor.

See, he has a misgiving about the session and doesn't mention it to the auditor and the auditor doesn't pick it up. And then an hour – a half an hour, an hour, or an hour and a half later, you have a pc who is in a blowing, screaming mess, because that withhold, you see, adds to a next withhold, and they don't have to be serious withholds. The pc sat there and said, "Well, I wish I had a cigarette," and he doesn't tell the auditor. That is a withhold. Pc knows he's supposed to be in communication with the auditor and he's not in communication with the auditor on that point.

And the next point is, he wonders how late it is and he doesn't tell the auditor. He wonders what the next command is and he doesn't tell the auditor. And all these little grains of sand add up to a Sahara Desert with the pc on one side of it and the auditor on the other and cannon going in both directions.

You see how this multiplies? It isn't the quality of the withhold, it's the fact that it exists.

Now, the pc, oddly enough, doesn't know about these withholds when he thinks them. You have to make him think for a moment to remember them. In other words, they've drifted by and they're relatively unknown to him. If you keep those picked up, just those alone while you're assessing a list, the rudiments will stay in.

Now, an invalidation usually betokens a withhold. So you can ask for invalidations and then ask for withholds as a very fruitful method of getting both sides of the thing.

If you want to keep a session clean and the needle reading throughout a Security Check activity, you're in just a constant look over of this one point: Has the pc invalidated anything and is the pc withholding anything? And those are the Gemini twins of Security Checking and assessing and nulling. Invalidation and withholding. These are the two things which go glove in hand, hand in glove. Invalidation, withhold.

Now, the common denominator of every out-rudiment is withhold. That is the common denominator of every rudiment out.

Present time problem? All right. Well, he has withholds from somebody or he wouldn't be having a problem with them. You can ask, "Well, what withholds do you have from your wife?" and watch the present time problem evaporate in smoke, see?

All right. The pc has an ARC break with you; well, the pc must be withholding something from you, no matter how tiny it is. So therefore that's the common denominator of all these rudiments. No matter what rudiment is out, a withhold is the basis of it, including, of

course, the rudiments about withholds. That is more seriously concerned with withholds. But it's still the missed withhold that causes you the trouble in a session.

The missed withhold is back of the ARC break. The missed withhold is back of all auditor upsets, save one – which I should mention to you – save one: where you are running the session for form's sake and not for the pc. You're not auditing the pc who is in front of you, and you are running a session just for form's sake, you have disobeyed the Auditor's Code to not being in communication with the pc and have set up an unintentional withhold for the pc throughout the whole session.

Do you remember I classified withholds from you – the unintentional and the intentional, and so forth? Well, you see, the pc who cannot talk to the auditor is on an unintentional withhold, but it is nevertheless a withhold and causes an ARC break with the auditor. And that is why difficulties in talking to the auditor cause ARC breaks. Because it makes an unintentional withhold on the part of the pc.

There sits the pc. He is trying to tell the auditor something. And in trying to tell the auditor something, he finds he's unable to tell the auditor something, because the auditor will not listen, will not acknowledge, will not stop doing what he is doing obsessively, whatever it is, will not listen to anything the pc has to say, and the pc suddenly, dimly – well, he doesn't really knowingly ever counter this point – nevertheless recognizes reactively and goes into reaction because of a withhold, because the pc is unintentionally withholding.

You – well, I'll give you an idea of an unintentional withhold. Have any of you ever unintentionally withheld anything? See? It's unintentional. You couldn't be there. Well, just think of not being home for Christmas because you had to work. Well, you had to work or something like that. Therefore, it was unintentional.

Now, when somebody will not listen to what you are telling them, you of course are put on an unintentional withhold.

Little kids ARC break and become teenagers along one curve of unintentional withholds. My little kids do pretty well on the basis that I'll knock anybody's head off that won't acknowledge them. See, let's not put the kids on an unintentional withhold. As a matter of fact, I think you've seen them around. They're very outspoken and quite polite, usually. And they're not ARC broke with people, that's for sure.

Well, get this idea. (I'm not setting them up as paragons of virtue, but I will say, I will say that my children are superior in one respect. I will say that my two little boys can dig more worms than any other.) [laughter, laughs]

A little kid comes up and he says, "Mama, Mama, can I go outside? Mama, can I go outside?"

And Mama just goes on knitting the dishes or whatever she's doing [laughter] and doesn't say a blessed word to the kid, you know? And pretty soon the kid gets the sensation of being mad at his mother and breaks her favorite teapot in the middle of the floor.

Almost all breakage by children is totally occasioned by the fact they've been put on an unintentional withhold. That's your ARC break mechanism amongst children. I imagine the Steiner schools and some other things would be very happy to know that.

You got this, you got this point, then, where the pc is on an unintentional withhold and then does react as an ARC break. See, the basis of an ARC break is a noncommunication.

Well, it's more serious than just a noncommunication because you can sit and ignore a tree for hours and have a tree sit and ignore you for hours without getting mad at it.

The intention to communicate must be present for a withhold to occur, which is another thing you must recognize about all withholds: an intention to reach before the person has to restrain it. In other words, an intention to communicate must exist before an ARC break can result.

All right. If that is the case, if that is the case, then a pc who is being audited by somebody who is out of communication with the pc is on a perpetual unintentional withhold, but is nevertheless a withhold and will ARC break.

Now, it isn't that an auditor has to turn himself wrongside out just for the pc, but I want to call something to your attention. This is also under the head of Security Checking and withholding, and so forth. And that is: Every session you run is *for* the pc *by* the auditor. The session you run is *for that pc* and for nobody else in the whole world. It is not for the Instructors, not for the persons who are going to read this auditor's reports or the D of P or anybody else. The session is not for anybody else in the whole world than the pc who is sitting in that chair. It is *his* session.

And some of you training auditors over in DC and down in South Africa and in Australia can clobber them with just exactly that remark, because you will find *every* time you're having a *lot* of trouble, every time you're having lots of trouble with some pc in the shop, the pc doesn't have any idea that the session is for him, and you may have an auditor who isn't running any kind of a session *for* that pc.

The auditor is running it for some other reason. He is running it to run a ritual. He was running it to please the D of P. He is running it because he was told to. He was running it because he was taught at the Academy to do this.

Oh, you could just list – one of the things you could do in training auditors is just ask them to make a long list of all of the things, *why* they were running a session, see?

Now, why are you doing that session? They're liable to give you some fabulous long list, and it never occurs anyplace in it, that, you see, that they're running the session for the pc and because the pc is there to be audited, you see? That is liable not to occur to them. The auditors that are having trouble will always miss that point, see? They always will.

And actually, if an auditor masters just that one point, that one point, he can be an awful crock with his technology, and pcs will get well and think he's wonderful, and send telegrams to the organization to reserve that auditor. And you say, "Oh, no. You know, we were just about to send him back to the Academy." But this person does run a session for the pc. See? It is the pc's session, nobody else's. It is run by the auditor, a session is, but it's run *for*

the pc. And the ownership of the session is the pc's. It is not the auditor's session. It is the pc's session.

If you can just master that point as oddly peculiar, as simple as the point may seem, you will master most of your difficulties in auditing, and also, by the way, most of your distaste for auditing, whenever that occurs. There is nothing more satisfactory than running a session for the pc you are auditing at that moment. And that is, its – it keeps you from getting very strained up. Oh, your attention is on the pc. Pc is usually very happy and pc is puttin' right along, *pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa*. And you're making hay in all directions, and so forth. And you say, "Boy, that was a good session, you know?"

And you check it over: You missed three of the end rudiments, you see, and you goofed up. You didn't even find an item. It's been three sessions and you haven't found the item yet.

You couldn't find any good reason at all, if you were to examine it technologically, why this is such a satisfactory session. Well, you see there, you could just set all technology and form aside and keep that one point, and you'd find it was very fascinating how well that one point would operate.

Now if you move in on that – good technology, you see, and good form – wow! See? You just – Wham! Pcs go up the line like startled gazelles, you know? They just right on up the Tone Scale.

But there is the anatomy of a session. If you want to make it smooth technically is you just keep those withholds off and then you don't give the pc a restimulation of all the undesirable actions.

Now here's what happens: The pc feels he is withholding something. It doesn't matter whether it's an unintentional or an intentional withhold. That he is *withholding* something now restimulates the fact that he is withholding something, you see? It's not withhold – it's not the withhold he's doing, it is the withhold back of the withhold he's doing that gets restimulated. And that withhold, of course, is a withhold of undesirable action. So, the fact that he is withholding anything causes a withhold to go into restimulation.

That withhold, being in restimulation, may be a failed withhold, which is so close to the borderline that it brings about obsessive action at once. And the pc finds himself in this god-awful position of engaging in actions he knows are reprehensible and is incapable of stopping himself from acting. And he wonders how in the hell he got in this condition.

There he is saying to this perfectly nice auditor, he's saying, "Well, you rat, you – you – you – you bum, when did you ever learn to audit? You ought to be shot. You ought to be hanged. You ought to be stood up against the wall and electrocuted." He gets confused, you see? And – . See? And he hears himself saying these things and he is unable to stop saying them.

Well, how did he ever get into this position where he's doing these things? Because he feels very bad that he is doing these things while he is doing them, you see?

Now, he's in the position – you've hit on something which is very hot on the bank – and he's in the position of having to go down to Times Square and take all his clothes off, see? And he doesn't want to do that. But you have inadvertently restimulated the fact that he must *withhold* going down to Times Square and taking all of his clothes off, so that means he *must* go down to Times Square and take all of his clothes off, see?

He doesn't want to do that. So his power of choice is overwhelmed. And you, by letting him have a withhold in the session, or by missing a withhold on him – I'm talking about a session withhold now, not a life withhold, you see – by letting him have a session withhold and not keeping those cleaned up, you're liable to kick back into this other channel. And you get into this, and he's got to go down to Times Square and take his clothes off. He just can't stop himself from doing it, you see? And he's amazed at himself.

You know, it's a very funny thing. People who do things like that are the most amazed people around, you know? They're much more amazed than anybody else. You know, they're saying, "What am I doing?" as they go right on and do it.

It's fantastic.

So you see, the fact that you put a pc on an unintentional withhold of being unable to communicate to you as the auditor – . See, it isn't his session, he's just an outsider. He just dropped in while you were running a session. See, he's just an outsider to the whole thing. He is probably there to make a report to Inland Revenue or something. Or he's holding down the chair so gravity won't make it skid. But he hasn't anything to do with the session, see? Nothing to do with him. Whatever the auditor is saying has nothing to do with the pc, you see? And the pc finds himself quite startled occasionally, he suddenly wakes up and he says something to the auditor. He doesn't recognize this condition exists till he tries to say something to the auditor. And he's saying something to the auditor like, "It's warm in here," he tries to say, you know. "It's awfully warm in here, you know?"

And the auditor is nulling a list, you know, and says, "A category analyzer. A category analyzer. A category analyzer," you know?

And the pc says, "It's awfully warm in here."

And the auditor goes on and he says, "A mica shifter. A mica shifter. A mica shifter."

And the pc says, "It's warm in here, you know? It's warm in here."

And the auditor goes on and says, "All right. Waterbuck. Waterbuck. Waterbuck."
[laughter]

And what happens is, the mechanic is that the pc becomes aware of the fact that he can't communicate to the auditor. And this equates to this fact that he must then be withholding from the auditor. See how silly this is? But it nevertheless equates to that. Because remember, you're dealing with a whole reactive bank that is totally constructed on the obsessive action and the withhold, see?

So the fact that he isn't communicating says he must be withholding, which rekindles a withhold in the reactive bank, and God help the auditor if that withhold in the reactive bank triggers the undesirable action. Because the pc is liable to do anything, just anything.

And there's how you get blows, there's how you get scolds, there's how you get upsets, there's how you get pcs saying remarkable things to you. See? That's how you get the lot, see? Unintentional withhold.

So you see, you avoid the whole mechanism if it never enters the pc's mind that he is withholding anything. See? Now, if that's thoroughly enough established, actually, he could withhold a little bit, you see, without rekindling anything. Because it's *his* session, see, and he *is* in communication with the auditor. He realizes if he said it, the auditor would hear it.

TR 4 from a standpoint of holding somebody in session is, of course, the most important of the TRs. TR 0 is the most important from the auditor's viewpoint, and TR 4 is most important from the pc's viewpoint. You can't run a session at all without TR 0, but a pc sees TR 4 out like rockets, barrels of tar being burned and Parliament exploding, see? TR 4 – "Oh, this auditor can't handle TR 4."

Well, the way to handle TR 4 is handle it in advance and just give the pc the session, see? Because it's his session. It's his session. This is peculiarly for the pc.

All right. Now, in the field of Security Checking, in the field of Security Checking, what you're trying to do, fundamentally, is release or discover both the undesirable actions considered undesirable by the pc and the withholds which restrain them. So you get off the withhold by blowing the prior confusion. And when you're doing Security Checking, you're on the business of the prior confusion, you see, and the motionless point: the problem.

But the problem in this case is only half there. It's the withhold, so it blows very easily. So the prior confusion and the withhold, you see? And all you got to do is reach underneath the withhold to get the prior confusion to it. "What did you *do*?" you say. "What did you *do*?" It must be some impulse from the pc because the pc is the only one there. Some people who listen to what the college did to the pc, or what the pc is told, have not noticed something: The college is not present in the auditing room. It really isn't there, so therefore it can't be audited. It's what the pc is doing, you see, that you're auditing.

So the pc, what the pc's – outflowed that he didn't want to outflow, and what the pc withheld that he didn't want to withhold, these things are your main points of action and interest.

And "What have you *done*?" you see, releases the not-do.

But the anatomy of a withhold is the: *done* undesirable action, *stop* the undesirable action, *natter*, see? So you – the fellow says, "Oh, I am upset. I mustn't say anything to anybody. I mustn't talk about it, and so on. Those bastards are dogs. I mustn't say anything to them. They're a bunch of hound dogs and so forth. They're really no good, and I mustn't say anything about it because I might have some undesirable actions. Because if they found something where I was wrong – because if I said anything it would be terrible, and then it would screw everything up. So I'd better be very careful not to say anything, and so forth. And I'm not saying anything."

And you – most, most, most people, when they're giving you gossip, are always prefacing it with, "I don't mean to be critical" or "I don't wish to say anything bad," or "I don't want to get John in trouble," or something like this. They're always being preface about the

thing, and then "Natter, natter, natter, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak." And you get a generation, actually, you get a generation of the outflow undesirable, which underlies it all, pinned against this other, just operates something like a motor battery. And floating off the top of it you get all this entheta.

Guy can't reach and he can't withhold, but he can natter. So you find what is the critica– good formula, see?

You had a bulletin the other day which has a correction in it. It says, "Ignore all unkind thoughts." That's not actually accurate. There is one little point about it: You *use* the unkind thought, the critical statement, and so forth, to find the overt. They're a sure indicator.

You say, "Well," you say to this person, "Well, what, what's your unkind thought?" They give you the unkind thought. "Have you ever had any unkind thoughts about Joe?"

"Oh, all right. I got unkind thoughts about Joe."

"All right. What have you done to Joe?"

Bang! They got it. See?

It's a leader. It'll go right straight down the line. So you don't *pull* them. Don't spend five hours pulling unkind thoughts, you idiot – that's usually the phrase that goes through an Instructor's mind when he sees somebody doing something like that. Person's spent five hours working and sweating and so forth to get all the unkind thoughts off about their wife, you see? Instructor kind of obsessively thinks "You unkind – you idiot!" on the end line, because that's four hours and fifty-nine minutes completely wasted.

One minute of natter about the wife, see, is all you want. That is a whole fish basket full. You have no more room on the truck. What you do after that one minute is conclude that the pc has *done* something. If the natter is there, then the underlying done must have been present, which is being withheld. Otherwise, you don't get this motor action going.

And so you just say – the person says, "And, and actually, actually ..." – it doesn't have to be motivatorish – "... actually, my wife, my wife actually uses false, false hair all the time. Just uses false hair all the time and I just go into the house, I'm always falling over this false hair, you know. Ge- have a drink of beer – false hair. Eat dinner – all through my teeth, you know? It's a hell of a thing. And false hair – ."

Beca- he'll kind of state it as a motivatorish, but it could be overt and it could be motivatorish; the natter, you see, is not necessarily motivatorish. It's just either way, see? It's that it's natter, that it's critical, is all you want, and so forth.

And you say, "False hair. Well, good. Thank you. All right. Now, what have you done to your wife?" And the needle falls off the pin.

And he tells you something or other. And then he says, "Well, it's the false hair that really worries me, though. It gets into the – it's – I had a wedding cake. I remember it goes clear far back to the wedding. She baked the wedding cake, you know? And we couldn't even eat the stuff, it was all full of false hair. And so – ."

So you figure that it must have something, then, to do with the exact thing he's complaining about.

So you say, "Well, what have you done to your wife's hair?"

"Well, I haven't done anything to my wife's hair. I held her down on the bed one day and cut it all off with the scissors."

"Well, have you done it since?"

"No! Ha-ha."

And you'll see him brighten up at once. Blow the withhold off the overt, see?

Actually, if you're a master of the anatomy of this kind of thing, you can do some of the trickiest things for the pc you ever heard of. You'll leave the pc just gasping, you see? "How did you know?"

"Oh, a little bird told me."

It's just a matter of, if there's a natter, then there must have been an overt. And if there's an overt, there must have been a withhold, see?

So you could always follow – you got a big, juicy *done* off the line, see? And just ask the pc, "Well, have you ever done that since?"

The pc has to recognize that he's withholding the action – is liable to give you the rest of the overt. There might be more overt there after you release that much withhold off the thing.

In other words, it's a – an action followed by a withhold. Well, of course, mostly you're counting on the fact that they both blow by his telling you, and this is usually true. And this is safe enough, and you don't have to know all the facts of life, you see? And – but the other point is that if you ask, "Have you done it since?" or "Did you ever do that again?" he'll think you're looking for another overt, see?

And he'll look it over very carefully, and you blow the withhold. And you'll suddenly see the pc look very relieved. See, he's been, he's been holding back with ten-ton-truck motor, see? It's going perpetually, keeping him from holding his wife down on the bed and cutting all her hair off again, see? *Zzzuh! Zzuh-uh!* And he hasn't noticed that there's no reason to have the truck motor.

So he tells you he did it. Now, this should explain to you the mystery of why you sometimes see a withhold blow and sometimes not see one blow, and sometimes see a pc very relieved and sometimes not see the pc relieved.

All right. The anatomy is this: You find a withhold in the pc, see? The pc is withholding and you find out that the pc is withholding, see? You find out he hasn't told anybody about something or other, see? He hasn't told anybody about that sex in college, or something, you see? He hasn't told anybody. You've just triggered the withhold, see?

And the pc at that moment could feel uneasy. He sometimes will feel relieved at having told you but he also could feel very uneasy at that moment. Because you've sort of taken

some of the straps off, and he's liable to do it again. And he knows it's an undesirable action, so he's not happy about having given up that withhold. Do you see that?

He's not happy about giving it up at all, because you've taken away some of the means by which he's keeping himself compressed as a jack-in-a-box, see, and somebody is liable to press the catch on the lid at any moment, see? And he's liable to do *that* again, you see? You see what he's worried about.

So you triggered some of the ways he was restraining himself without finding out what it was. And you'll see an unhappy pc. He doesn't get the session very well and it doesn't finish up too good.

"Well, he was security checked for two hours," see?

You read the auditor's report. "Did you make any goals for the session?"

"No," or "Partly." These are all very sad remarks.

Well, you can just count on some of this mechanism having gone on this way. You triggered the withhold, got the withhold slightly off, he didn't dare let it come all the way off because if he let it come all the way off, then he might do it again.

There he is down there at Times Square taking off his clothes, see? Hmhm-huh-huh-hhuh! He's almost conquered that, you see? He's withheld it, and he knows he can withhold it if he keeps his head in this exact position and goes to his psychoanalyst regularly. See, he-he-he-he-he knows he can live with that. Only he doesn't really know about it, you know, but he knows he might do something and *oooouuoo*. And you take the withhold off and you got the restraint.

So if you made it a rule, an operating rule, that every time you got a withhold off, "Well, I've never told anybody or they don't know this about me," or something of the sort, that you try to find the overt under it. And then you'll blow the rest of it. And that every time, including that time, that you have blown a heavy overt that the person has done, you ask him if he's done it again, or did he ever do it another time – he'll tell you another time and another time, and then so on.

And if you ask him, also, when he'd not done it, the rest of the thing would go *phooft!* and all of a sudden the pc would look very relieved.

So if you pulled just purely a withhold without the fellow telling you what the overt was, you've actually goofed a little bit by not asking him, well, what did he *do*. See, "What have you done, done, done?"

"Well, I've just never told anybody about my conduct in college."

"All right. Fine. Good. We'll go to the next question."

Male voice: Huh-huh-huh-ho!

Now you see why the guy is upset with you. You've released some of the straps by which he holds himself down without permitting him to let go of it. So you've – he thinks maybe you've damaged him somehow.

No, you've got that far, you must go on from there and you must say, "Well, what did you *do* in college?" See? "What did you *do*?"

"Uh, well, I *woo-woom-mm*. I'd forgotten all about the – *ooo-mm-a-huh*. Well, actually it wasn't very much. There was just some of us boys, and it wasn't very much. It was just kind of a joke. We laughed it all off."

"Well," you say. "Well, you laughed it all off, what is the needle doing falling off of the pin here? What's that? What's the part you didn't laugh off?" (Only you wouldn't talk that way to a pc.) And if – he all of a sudden comes clean and your needle clears up.

And then having told you all that dirt, and he's got all the overts off, remember there may be some residual withholds. And the residual withholds, of course, come off best if you ask for them.

You say, "Well, did you ever do it again?" Heh-heh.

"*Ooo*, well, no, except that, uh-oo-well, there, *hoom-mm* Miami Beach Hotel, I mean the *mmm-hm*. Yeah. Well, no, we didn't. Ha! Yeah, I didn't do it at the Miami Beach Hotel. I *m-rr-r-raw* and didn't do it in Los Angeles, and didn't do it up there when I was at Canada, and then *b-rrroo*. What do you know? Didn't do it during the whole war. Life is wonderful. Isn't that great? Except after the war."

"Well, what about that one?" "All right. Well, did you ever do that one again?"

Y-ng-ngt and *zoom-zoom*, and so forth. All of a sudden the guy feels like fresh air has been ventilated through the reactive carcass.

But if you know this as the anatomy of a withhold, and you know that the person, after you've gotten the overt off, may still be *withholding* obsessively, and it may not all be gone, and you know that if you get some of the withhold off, the person may be – without getting the overt – why, you know the person will get nervous. If you know that where there is a critical thought, there is a withhold *and* an overt underlying it, and if you know all of these things and keep the pc from going on little session withholds – keep those little session withholds and invalidations cleaned up as you go – and don't run the pc for the wall, run a session for the pc.

You see, there's various things that you could get confused on. It's the pc's session and it's his session exclusively, and run it for that pc. And the auditor runs it, but it's for the pc. Don't let your control go down particularly, but also, man, don't let the pc get the idea it's for somebody else.

And if you follow through, on the two-way comm – your TR 4 is good – you never have any trouble, and, boy, you can just blow somebody up through the roof. Oh yeah, they can just go up, up, up, up. Terrific. *Bangity-bangity-bangity-bang*.

But the point which is general – the points which are generally missed is sessions are not for the pc – that's missed. See, sessions are run for the piece of paper or the E-Meter, or something. I'm not being sarcastic. I mean, people treat a pc sometimes like a piece of driftwood. The pc doesn't exist in the session. If the pc thinks something, why, you don't have anything to do with it. He doesn't know what's going on. It's true, he doesn't know what's go-

ing on in his bank. True, you know better than he does, but at the same time – ha-ha-ha-ha – at the same time, you're there to straighten this out. And if you don't pay attention to what the pc is saying, you of course go out of communication with the pc, the pc goes on an unintentional withhold and so forth and there you've had it.

Also you could let the pc talk too much and not shut the pc off, but the way to shut a pc off, of course, the best way to shut the pc off is just shift his attention on to what you're doing.

Not, "Well, let's stop talking about *that* now, and start doing something else." That might appear a little bit crude. But just refer the pc's attention over onto some other part of the session and carry on with it. You can do those things very smoothly.

If you can learn to do those things, my God, how you will carry somebody up through the – through the Tone Scale. I mean, *zooooom!*

Now – this is on just Security Checking, Twenty-Ten. And every time you run twenty minutes' worth of this stuff, why, run ten minutes of Havingness, and residual impulses to withhold blow in the Havingness, of course, and other things happen, and up they go.

But there is something else that you should know about Security Checking and running Security Check sessions, something that you should know very well. And that's another one of these – of "run it for the pc" in the mechanics of the withholds. And that's this – that's this: You try to null rudiments. You takes them as you finds them and youse tries to null them without shoving the pc around in any other zone or area than he is in. You don't go looking for withholds and present time problems and ARC breaks and down havingness while you're running rudiments – end rudiments or beginning rudiments.

In other words, you try to null the needle. Just overtly and directly try to null the needle. You takes the pc as you finds him and you tries to null the needle. That's what you does. And that's all you does. That's rudiments.

But you're the world's worst – maybe not the world's worst, but – close candidate – let me put it that way: you're a candidate for the world's worst if you carry this action of the rudiments over into the session body. Now if you carry the spirit of taking the pc as you find him and try to null the needle on things you ask the pc, and *only* try to null the needle on things you ask the pc, the way you handle rudiments, you are not going to get any gain on that pc to worth a nickel. Because nothing is going to happen in the session, and he – sometimes you accidentally find something. And if you null the needle real good, why, you'll end up the session, the pc feels a little bit better, he makes his goals partly or no. And it's all about here.

Now, there's a vast difference between running rudiments – a vast, vast, *vast* difference between running rudiments and the body of a session. You're trying to null the needle on rudiments but in the body of the session you are trying to find data and clean it up, and it's an entirely different activity.

In other words, you find the data, and then you null the needle on the data. And you find the data, and you null the needle on the data. And you – one of the reasons some of you very well might have rudiments out so often is because you put them out.

Rudiments are simply there to be nulled. The pc is accidentally sitting in something, you null it. See, if he's accidentally sitting in something, you null it. Good. That's it. Bang!

You might be looking around and have these two things reversed. You might be trying to run the rudiments so as to find things and then null them, at which time you would do nothing but run rudiments, and in the body of the session just trying to be nulling the needle – see, these things here could be completely reversed – and you'd get no reaction at all from the pc. You'd get no real gain on the part of the pc from any auditing.

Now, the body of a session is devoted to finding data and nulling the needle on it. And it's another action, it's the additional action. And that action must be done. And if it is not done by the auditor, what has he got? He has got a pc who is sitting there in the chair. He is calm, cool and collected. He is getting a session. He is happy. He is in a room. He is *miles* away from any trouble. Isn't it sweet? He doesn't have a present time problem, he doesn't have an ARC break, he doesn't have anything. And so he has nothing in restimulation of any kind whatsoever and now you're simply going to read him some questions, one after the other, and null the needle on them.

You have an unrestimulated pc. Now, listen. You have to restimulate the pc in order to clean it up, because it won't come to the surface of the bank unless you pull it up to the surface of the bank, I assure you.

See, your rudiments smoothed him all out, didn't they? Now, supposing you ran the body of the session just to null the needle. Well, of course, you're not going to get anything done at all.

How do you get the pc restimulated so as to run something off? Well, I've given you other systems of doing that and that's not part of the lecture. That is very pertinent to the lecture, however, that you *null* the needle in the rudiments. And in the body of a session looking for withholds or auditing the pc on anything else, you've got to find what you are looking for and you've got to persuade the pc to look for it. You've got to get the pc in there digging. And you've got to dig. And the body of the session is done with a pick and a shovel and dynamite, and all kinds of digging tools, oil-well drilling rigs, anything you can think of. And you keep stirring this stuff up and clearing it off the top of the mound, and – and you're *busy*, man! *Busy!* Get *busy* in the session. Don't just sit there and say, "*Dadadadadadadadadadad-poooh! Dudududududududududu-poooh. Dadadadadadadadadu-poooh. Dadadadadada* – well, I had a good session today. Pc didn't have an ARC break the whole session." Nothing happened either.

No, you gotta dig it up to clear it away. Otherwise, it's just there, see? And you look at sessions from that point of view – that you've got to dig them up before you find anything and then you've got to clear it up, having dug it up – you all of a sudden will see what a session is all about and why you've got to have rudiments nicely. Because you don't want the pc digging things up accidentally. You only want the pc to dig up what you want the pc to dig up.

And if the rudiments are out, of course he's digging things up accidentally all the time and he's sitting over there, a busy little beaver. Dig, dig, dig, dig, dig, dig, dig. Chop down trees. Dig, dig, dig. Make a dam. Grout up the dam. *Dadaroom-dadeedada-dadadaroom. Boom. Boom. Boom. Boom.* There he is. Dig, dig, dig, dig, so on.

And you're sitting over there mining coal, and he's sit- . Hasn't anything to do with him; he's drilling for oil. [laughter] And that's the secret of it all.

Of course, if you know the anatomy of the reactive bank, that it consists of overts and withholds, and that you're trying to restore his knowingness first, and then his self-determinism over these actions, and so forth, and if you know those things you could almost audit by definition. Just audit by definition. Say, "Well, the pc isn't there. Why did he blow?"

Just ask the pc, "Well, has he blown from anyplace lately?"

Guy will say, "Yes, I left a cafe before I finished dinner last night."

You say, "Good. Now, what are you withholding about that?"

"Oh, well, I didn't realize I was withholding anything about it, but as a matter of fact I am."

"All right. Good. Thank you. What is it?"

"Well, it's so-and-so."

"All right. What overt did you pull just before that?"

"Oh, well, we don't want to go into that, do we?"

"Yes, we do. We're going into it right now. All right. Good enough. There it is. Well, then, you going to do that again, and so forth?"

"Well, I decided I wouldn't. Ha-ha!"

And you say, "Well, that's good. Now, where else have you blown from in the last two hundred trillion years, son?"

And you will see the depth and distance to which a Security Check can reach. Do you see?

All right.

[end of lecture]

What is a Withhold?

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 20 February 1962

Okay. You have, by the way, seen an example of Sec Checking on rudiments as opposed to Prepchecking. And you had three or four rudiments live on the other session, the first session you saw, do you remember that? The earlier session, same pc. And the auditor just swept these by grandly. Do you remember?

Audience: Yes. Hm-mm.

Hm-hm. And you gasped with horror? You remember gasping slightly with horror? And you didn't use any sound. And today you saw me handling them with Sec Checking and going in and straightening up every rudiment, or trying to, and bypassing Prepchecking. We never got to Prepchecking, did we? Never got to our business at all.

If it's all right with you, Fred, we will now ask the pc. You understand this is not pre-ordained particularly. This isn't taped as to – so as to give you an example of which is which. It just turns out that you now have an example of which is which.

All right. Which session gave you the most gain, Fred?

Male voice: First one.

The first one? Mm. We handled the whole ruddy lot with Prepchecking, didn't we? Hm? And on the other one we never got any auditing done to amount to anything, and go ahead and tell them what you told me at the end of the session about having the areas confused.

Male voice: Well, he was asking me about a withhold on something. Had to do with money. And I had three different areas, if you noticed: the Center Theater, the American Theater Association, a big area there, and this area here. And I wasn't sure about which area the withhold was in. And on Thursday, in Prepchecking, coming around to "What about such and such," the number one question⁴ – you see, every time he came around to the number one question, I knew where I was. I could locate myself, kind of, on the track or what are we working on together here? You see, how you're working? I knew where I was every time the number one question came around. And we got a new number one question, we kind of narrowed down to one area and cleaned that up before it went on to something else. This time I

⁴ The number one question: One uses the whole subject to be cleared as the *zero* question. Sub zero questions are marked 0A. Each 0A has a Number One question which is taken from a withhold given on asking the 0A question. (HCOB 01.03.62 PREPCHECKING) Editor's note.

wasn't sure, and so I kept saying, "Well, gee – where, you know? What?" or something like this.

Okay. All right.

Male voice: I'll keep prepchecking.

Good enough. Okay. You see this? You see this? Well, we learn what we learn. That was not scheduled, to teach you these two things. But you get out – you understand, these are live sessions, they are not demonstrations. And you learn what you learn out of something like that. Of course, I feel silly when I don't get a pc pressed on forward. I didn't intend, actually, to run onto this much crash on this. And frankly, an hour, an hour-and-fifteen-minute session is a very short session for me. I normally will audit three to five hours in a session. And I'm having to scale my sessioning down, see, to match the demonstration.

But frankly, it is my opinion after this session – it's my opinion after this session – that the more you monkey around with rudiments, except for Havingness, why, the less auditing you're going to get done. That's just what we sort of mean.

That does not apply to 3D Criss Cross. But, we've got Prepchecking now and it is a highly precise activity. And I don't think that Sec Checking even vaguely compares to it. That's my opinion.

I couldn't get it off the launching pad, see? If we'd gone on auditing, I would have given him a break. And I'd have said, "Well, none of this is clear, none of these things are null." I would have given him a break, and we'd had a cigarette and I would have brought him back into it and started a new session. See, I would have ended that session and started a new session instantly and I would have swung right into the rudiments. "All right. This one's live and this one's live." I would have told him, see?

And then I would have come down on Prepchecking, and I would have said, "Well, what about money?" See? Or "What about taking money?" or "What about this subject?" because this seemed to be the subject we were on. And then I would have gone ahead and cleaned it up by area and type of withhold, and so forth, and I would have cleaned it up properly. But I was trying to clean that up with the who and the when, if you will notice – just the who and the when – and, man, it didn't spring, did it? So scrub it. It didn't spring. If I can't do it, I can't expect you to. Okay?

There's no substitute, apparently, for just full dress parade, clean zone, troop the colors, Prepchecking. Get a 0, proceed from the 0, go to your 1, proceed from your 1 to your 11,⁵ you know? Whatever it is. There is no substitute for it. I've run a couple of sessions since I was – that, well, I ran another session particularly, I was just standing on my head. I could have been sitting there knitting like the children's tutor does. She teaches them school while knitting.

⁵ Editor's note: Spoken "One sub-one", term for a What question evolved from the first What question; One sub-two is the next one evolved from that and so on. Explained in the preceding lecture of 15 Feb 62, SHSBC-118, "Prepchecking". From the following lecture on changed to "One-A", "One-B" etc., see also in Tech Dic under "Zero-A".

It requires no strain on the auditor. This was quite a strain on the auditor; wondering where the hell you were going, see? And this other, I ran a three-and-a-half hour Prepcheck session; terrific numbers of withholds falling off the line. And it was just dead easy. There was nothing to it. Sunday night. I woke up, you know, “Well, let’s go to a dance,” you know? There wasn’t anything to this on the auditor.

Euh, do we have Peter, is that... It’s allright.

Masculine voice: (inaudible)

We didn’t have... we didn’t put a demonstration on it, did we?

Masculine voice: Ok. We made that as well.

Ha, you did. Well, three cheers. That’s a good experience. It’s a good experiment. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Okay? All right. This is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. What’s the date?

Audience: Twentieth.

Thank you. What’s the month?

Audience: February.

Oh, thank you. What’s the year?

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. All right. All right. We will let you away with that. Thank you very much. Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

We have some new students in our midst. We have some new students in our midst and I think you that actually you should (I set that up for me) we shouldn’t introduce some of these. [laughter] Here is the one we can introduce: Hazel Booker, stand up. [Applause] And Heisi Sheppard, stand up. [Applause] And somebody we are glad to see, we haven’t seen for a long time: Jim Skellen, stand up. [Applause] And here two students [laughter], two students that, I must empathize, that I’m very glad to see here. We are going to get them on, we left them on in spite of their HPA/HDA [laughter] [inaudible] and so on and we did let them on course so you’ll be kind to them, hum? and that Jan and Dick Halpern and [Applause] [laughter] OK.

Now, I’m going to talk to you about withholds. And this is all about withholds, so a rather – relatively brief lecture. But I have now found the common denominator of withholds. You didn’t get an opportunity to see it in today’s demonstration but that doesn’t make any difference to that.

What is a withhold? A withhold is something that a person believes that if – if it is revealed, it will endanger their self-preservation. In other words, a withhold is something that endangers the self-preservation of the pc. Now, that is a very important definition. It’s taken me a very long time to get that definition. It gives us a new line for 3D Criss Cross, although this is not about 3D Criss Cross.

And it, worked back and forth, is an absolute killer because this is the reason whole track is occluded. This is where your whole track memory went. And this is the button on which it is sitting.

So this is a very important discovery. Therefore, we would consider that that person who had very little whole track recall would consider themselves in a very dangerous position.

In other words, you've got a gradient here. The less whole track recall, the more the person considers they are in danger, and the less likely you are to get a withhold off of them. The more fantastic the whole track recall, the same thing we are dodging here, somehow or another, with that.

Now, that's quite important to you, because it gives you and gives me – ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha – the exact reason... Did you get me that list of withholds, Suzy? Did you? It's alright, I can call somebody else – this is why you get off such as I am now going to say, and call them withholds. These are actual student withholds:

“I went outside and looked at the sky and felt strange.” And an auditor bought it as a withhold and worked it over.

“I had a picture of my mother's bedroom and I don't know why.” That is a withhold.

“I spoke crossly to an Instructor.”

“George and Bill told me that they had heard that Agnes...” And that is a withhold. Why is that a withhold?

All right. Let's start with the first one first. Of course it's safest to get off other people's withholds. These are all safe withholds. They are so safe. And that is all students tend to get off on each other, is safe withholds. I'm sorry to send that arrow so deeply. They get off safe withholds. If they reveal these things, they – it'd be perfectly all right to reveal them, because it's perfectly safe to reveal.

Now, why do we get into a tacit consent of this particular kind? Very interesting why we do: overts on other people's withholds. We take somebody's withhold and we yap-yap at them and we trip them up with it and we make them guilty with it and we sort of punish them a little bit for having gotten off a withhold. We yip-yap on the subject. And after that, we are a little bit afraid to get off a withhold of ourself because we have an overt against the other person's withhold, so therefore, we don't consider it safe to get off a withhold. Do you see what the – what the rationale of the overt is? We have an overt on other people getting off withholds, so we don't get off withholds, you see? Because it isn't safe to get off a withhold.

Now, of course, the more unsafe you make it to get off a withhold, the battier it all becomes until you get a civilization like this one.

Now, the one thing by which the communist profits in [in very broad Australian accent:] Australia and Suid-Afrika⁶ are the laws against perversion. The state, of all means, is regulating how you are going to perform the sexual act. I think that's very interesting. I've

seldom seen any police officers in my bedroom. And I'm afraid if I did they'd have short shrift. [laughter]

Of course, I have – I have had the people the police officers are supposed to restrain trying to crawl into my bedroom windows and a few things like that, you know, but that, of course, they wouldn't be interested in.

Now, what are they doing? They're just trying to invent some new withholds, aren't they? I think that's fascinating, because the communist uses blackmail of this particular kind as a means of controlling heads of state.

In other words, if the state itself lends its weight to punishment of withholds, see, it has just laid itself out to be crazy. Because now, anybody in the state can be blackmailed so as to overthrow the state, because the state will punish the overthrow of the withhold. Do you understand this, or any part of this?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, there it is on the third dynamic. The state makes it unsafe for anybody to confess to anything. So everybody is withholding from the state. What happens if you withhold from the state or the state misses withholds on you? Of course, you begin to hate the state, and that is the downfall of nationalism.

Of course, this may be very fortunate. But nevertheless, they have sown the seeds of their own destruction by the number of great laws which they – arise on how a person shouldn't get off withholds.

Let's apply that to an auditing session. The auditor upsets the pc or tries to make the pc guilty every time the pc gets off a withhold. Therefore, the auditor is making it unsafe for the pc to get off a withhold. All right. Then therefore the auditor trains the pc not to get off unsafe withholds. The auditor then trains the pc to get off only safe withholds. And we read on an auditor's report, "I went out at night and looked at the sky and felt strange." And that is a withhold. Great day in the morning! That's a safe withhold, isn't it?

Well, of course, the funny part of it is, there it is. It's not a withhold. It's not a withhold at all.

So you can actually get into a games condition with your pc by punishing the pc for his withholds. You can actually get into a games condition where the pc will only try to get off safe withholds. And there you go.

Now, if a pc isn't giving me withholds, I'm afraid that I would become persuasive. A withhold is something that, if revealed, would be prejudicial to his survival.

Now, naturally, his individuation comes from his withholds. This hyper-individuation of the pc, this only-oneness, this withdrawal into only self – all of that – and withdrawal out of groups and withdrawal here and there and so forth, all of these things stem exclusively and only and entirely from, of course, withholds which, if gotten off, the person *believes* would injure their survival.

⁶ Suid-Africa: the name for South Africa, as it is said in Afrikaans, an official language of South Africa which

Now, the funny part of it is, is these – is this is not true. The person gets an aberrated idea of what would injure his survival if he got it off, don't you see? And it's this aberrated idea of what they dare get off that brings about the condition of aberration. I think that possibly you've got one, two, or three apiece – some kind of an average like that – that if you revealed it in the wrong quarter, your – it's factual that somebody would be likely to take action. See, if the state of New South Guinea, or something of this sort, found out about this, well, huh, might be a poor show.

You've all got some that were factual. There are some factual ones, see? Some real ones. And you get those real buried and they get very encysted. And the other aberrated idea builds up on those and we get a build-up of that.

Now, the punishment of our parents, of course, we feel offhand that – this comes from past life; 3D Criss Cross gets these areas cleaned up – but when we started this life, we already had the idea that if we disclosed certain things to our parents or we did certain things or we were – didn't withhold mean words and so forth from our father, or something like that, we'd find ourselves suddenly without food, clothing and shelter. In other words, we get this exaggerated idea. Well, it's built on our past life structure. But that's a bad enough basis.

Now, we take off from there and we move into areas and then do commit something which, if revealed, would be very upsetting, or would have been very upsetting. And then other little things start piling up on the top of that, and so on. And we get up to a point where we become quite aberrated, quite individuated, and we get so we can't even communicate with parts of our body.

And the result of all this, naturally, is a feeling of high antisocialness.

And somebody comes close to these withholds and we believe implicitly, you see, that if we got off this withhold, naturally we could just see the police running in, my God, the sirens going in all directions, you see, and police by the squad coming bursting in the front door, probably with battering rams, you know? And they got handcuffs and they're all ready to put them on you, you know, and drag you off. And naturally the cell they're going to drag you to is not any of the modern jails, you know, which just dramatize withholds; it's probably one of the old-time dungeons, you know, where they bury you up to the neck in water and leave you there for forty years or something like this, you see? You get an aberrated idea of the punishment in a jail. And this all of a sudden rekindles, you know? The auditor gets close to one of these things, and this idea, *oooooh!* you know. *Oooo-ooooooo-oooo-ooo*, you know? At any minute this horrible series of circumstances are going to occur, and naturally we consider the auditor dangerous.

No, listen, the auditor is only dangerous if he doesn't pull the withhold. And that is a recurring phrase that is starting to happen here in this school. There are certain auditors that we designate as dangerous auditors.

Why are they dangerous? Because they will only tick and not pull a withhold. And we call those people dangerous auditors. Why? Their pcs are all going to be mad at them, they are themselves going to goof up and get lots of loses one way or the other and they're going

developed from seventeenth-century Dutch.

to always be involved in ARC breaks of some kind or another and they're going to have people going around gossiping about how bad Central Organizations are and how bad they are and how bad everything else is and so forth. And they are dangerous.

But from the pc's viewpoint, the person becomes dangerous the moment they might find out whatever this thing is, you see? And the auditor appears for a moment dangerous. The auditor might find out. And the pc gets ARC breaky, however, only when the auditor fails to find out. The auditor has to go the whole way. And an auditor who won't go the whole way, an auditor who will only get off safe withholds off of a pc is dangerous. And that is today's adjudication on whether a person can audit or not: Are they a safe auditor or a dangerous auditor?

Oddly enough, it's a complete reversal. The auditor who gets off safe withholds is dangerous. And the auditor who will get off unsafe withholds is safe. You understand that?

Now, you've got to – you've got to bust through any feeling you have on this and look at this square in the teeth and follow it through, because your – actually – all of your activities as an auditor are totally, 100 percent, based on this *one little fact*. It all cones down to this: An auditor who will not pull dangerous withholds from the pc is a dangerous auditor.

You're going to have an ARC breaky pc, your pc is going to be upset with you. There are only two or three ways you could possibly mess it up, but how could you fail to do this?

One, you could fail to use an E-Meter. You could fail to make an E-Meter play any tune that was ever written by Bach, Beethoven and Brahms, you see? You could just fail to make an E-Meter talk. In other words, you look at the thing and the needle falls off the pin, and so forth, and there it is, and the parts are all collapsing and so forth, and we say, "Well, that needle, that's null. Ha-ha. That's a null needle. Ha-ha."

Hm. God, man. Well, you don't have to clean it up in one session, but you have to make sure that you've got another session. You notice I had about two or three rudiments banging there in that demonstration today, and even missed a withhold as banging. And the pc didn't spit at me because the pc knows I know that they're missed. See, and the pc knows I know where we're going on this sort of thing. Pc has confidence in this.

All right. But you go a whole intensive and you never pull any of these things and you never ask for missed withholds and you never try to inquire any deeper into any of these things and that pc blows up in your face.

Every ARC break you *ever* got off of a pc *was* due to missed withholds. Although missed withholds is brand-new as a principle, it's been functioning this whole time. And every time you failed to get off a withhold – you missed a withhold on the pc, you ticked it – you had an ARC break. That accounts for every ARC break you have ever had with a pc. That accounts for every pc who never wanted to be audited again by you. That accounts for all of your own difficulties with pcs; right there in one fell swoop.

Now, you could accomplish it by not operating with an E-Meter. You could accomplish it by a very unreal or nasty auditing approach. Every time the pc said something, you say, "Nyaaaaa." You know, something like this. You could accomplish it by just having your technology all backwards and shuffled into another deck. You could accomplish it by

just poor auditing. But in the final analysis, poor auditing only exists if a person is determined that they're never going to hurt a pc by getting off any *nasty* withholds. They're going to be *nice* to pcs and they're only going to get off *safe* withholds. *Uuuuhhrrr!*

You almost have to use sjamboks⁷ and clubs on some auditors. I'm not kidding you. My method on the thing is just to stampede the auditor on the subject and there's more than one here who's already been stampeded by me straight at the subject. You know?

What – the only thing you want to worry about, the only thing you should really worry about, is when I give up on you. I've done that, too; just quit, you know? And then you get very nice auditor reports. You get an initial or something like that. I just won't do anything more about it. Why? I know you won't. But that doesn't include very many, and the other ones is you start missing withholds...

Pc goals and gains: "Well, I didn't make any goals and I didn't make any gains," and so forth. Well, it might as well have been printed in letters of fire! "Auditor has missed withholds on this pc. Auditor did not clean up things on this pc. Auditor read the E-Meter upside down." Something wild went on here. That's all. I mean, because frankly I have to tell you this. But I've got you in a box right now with Prepchecking. You're taped and targeted.

The auditor who cannot get a result with Prepchecking will not audit. *Uuuuhhrrr!* It's been weaving closer and closer to this point, see? We've been converging on this point. Technology has been getting better and better and better and better, and here we sit looking at Prepchecking. Well, Prepchecking gets a little better. There was a little change the other day in 3D Criss Cross.

As soon as I found out that this applied to 3D Criss Cross, I realized that you can't let a pc cross out anything on a list. Because – that's you, not me – because the pc says, "That's pretty dangerous. Let's see, that's pretty dangerous. Let's see, that's pretty dangerous. And I think this – this item, I think that's awfully dangerous. I think we ought to have that off the list and that off the list and that off the list," and we just cross the whole list off. It's all too dangerous. And then you have missed an item which actually amounts to a missed withhold and so the person gets upset with 3D Criss Cross.

So we can't allow the pc, once he has put it on the list, after we've blackjacked him, tricked and hoodwinked him into getting it onto the list, we can't let the pc take it off, even though that makes more work on differentiations. I found this is the case. I find pcs will take live items off the list if you don't watch them. So, there it is.

So some of your lists are disappearing into smoke, and some of your items are being crossed off because your pc has misgivings upon the safety with which they can be revealed since *all* of these items went out of sight to some degree or another because it was very unsafe at some time or another to reveal them.

I'm looking at somebody right now that was going around with a very, very hot terminal tucked under her arm in a family who believed *implicitly* that the exact *reverse* of this terminal was a way of life and how to be closer to God.

⁷ Sjambok: A strong, heavy whip made from thick, tough hide, such as that of the rhinoceros or hippopotamus, used in South Africa for driving cattle. (World Book Dictionary)

And this pc just had to withhold this one like mad. And of course the whole – more the pc withheld it and so forth, why, the hotter it got. See, the whole family – this would have been heresy. It's like the son of a priest, you know; he wouldn't believe in God. (Nobody gets that joke. Boy, you're slow today. You're very slow today. Wake up.) The son of a priest and he has a terminal called "atheist." See? That would be very upsetting, very upsetting. He'd have withholds. So would the priest.

But anyway, as you get this straight across the boards, we find that a hundred trillion years ago, why, well, let's take an example. We had one mentioned in the session today, something like, well, let's just call it out of thin air "embezzler," or something like that, you see? And this fellow was born in a banking family where *integrity* is all, you see? And he hears from his father and he hears from his mother and he hears from his brothers and sisters in the business and he – and so forth, and he's got a hot terminal. He's been one of the best embezzlers that the country has ever had, don't you see? Something like that.

And here he has to live in this atmosphere with this terminal. *Hot*, you know! So all the time he's pulling this terminal back. (I'm not saying that's the terminal but...) You get the idea? That's a withhold! Man, would it be unsafe to be that embezzler. Right? And he might dramatize it at any moment. And so he fights it and he fights it and he fights it and then one night he goes into the bank vault and he cleans out the whole thing and goes over the hill. [laughter] See, the wrong time, wrong place, wrong terminal, see, for his environment.

And when these things get badly restimulated and so forth, why, they've had it.

All right. Now some auditor is auditing him, see, and we get down to this terminal. And, "Who or what would enforce an outflow from others?" See?

And he puts down "An embezzler."

And he goes down the line, and the auditor goes down, and they – he had a little ARC break with the auditor, something of this sort. The auditor looked at him crosswise or didn't acknowledge him just right – and it's not really an ARC break; it was just that. And he clicks on that other one, you see? "You know this – I don't," auditor has already missed a withhold on him, and so forth, and he's a – he says, "I – I don't know."

We're differentiating the list, and we get down to "embezzler," and we – he thinks we better cross that off so he says, "Well, it – it really wouldn't enforce an outflow. Cross – cross that off the list."

Gives him a second thought, and we mustn't let the pc have that second thought. So there's that little change in 3D Criss Cross. You see why it is?

All right. Now you see that the pc – now let's take up Prepchecking. These two things, you see, suddenly go hand in glove. In other words, we have one straight line. We have Prepchecking as a basic for this lifetime that keeps the pc in-session and then we have its extension, 3D Criss Cross, and both of them are devoted to the same thing of letting the guy stand in the sun. They're both devoted to the same thing, you see? Getting him over all of his oddball notions about how dangerous it would be to reveal the fact that he had a crooked left ear. Nothing to it. I mean, he looks at this after a while and laughs. But he isn't laughing at the time you start auditing him.

You say, “All right, now. Okay. Now, what about that activity there that was going on in Tacoma?”

And, [sighs] “Now, let’s see. If I think of something else or if I can get the auditor thinking or talking about something else...” you know, this is all reactive, you know? “So let’s – let’s – let’s move it all over onto some other perimeter.” Then he says, “Well, it has to do actually with Mexico City.” In other words, he’s trying to throw red herrings. He can get into a point of reactively regretting having mentioned it. And you’ll see him pass through that little band of regretting he brought it up in the first place.

Now, if the auditing is bad, he does this often. If the auditing is good, he only does it once in a while. It is always present, no matter how good the auditing is.

“I’m kind of sorry I brought this up. Now what is going to happen to me?” Of course, all the time he’s being sorry he brought it up, you’re just crossing into the actual zone and area. You actually have tremendous unknowns left on the whole subject. And the pc does not know much and a great deal about this. That’s what the difficulty is. In other words, he still has tremendous unknowns.

Now, in Prepchecking – in Prepchecking, also, there’s been a little discovery here about when the pc – Prepchecking – when the pc equivocates, you know you’re looking at the package; when he starts to explain. Watch when the pc starts to explain. At that moment add a What 13, or whatever it’s coming up this time. And let’s find out what this little hot subject is he’s going over right this minute. He’s explaining.

Now, there’s a rule. There’s a rule about this, about asking What questions. And this isn’t really about What questions but I’ll just show you what this is.

The first rule is: When the pc gives you a motivator, you *know* you’re on hot ground and so you always ask a What question that’s rather overt. Says, “Well, my mother beat me every day.”

My What question, I’m afraid, at the moment is “What have you done to your mother?” I would not even monkey with this motivator, see? I wouldn’t fool with it at all.

The next gradient up – that would be – that’d be the most certain ground to mine. Motivator, motivator, motivator – man, that just takes the What question and practically writes it in legible script in front of your face, you see?

Your next one up the line from that is the person is critical. The person is being critical of somebody. Well, the criticalness – you can go on and pull criticism forever without getting anyplace. You want to know what he did, did, did, did, did, done, done, done, done, action, action, action. There must be action back of that criticism. Otherwise, we wouldn’t have it, see? So, criticism is a sure indicator of an overt.

Now let’s take the milder form of it which is explaining why it happened. The pc starts explaining – I don’t let the pc explain very long without giving him a new 1 sub-something or other on the What question. I give him a new What question to clean up.

Pc starts explaining and says, “Well, actually, the truth of the matter was that I was on the ferryboat. I hadn’t – I hadn’t actually meant to be on the ferryboat, you understand, but I was coming down from the taxi rank, and I just saw the ferryboat there.”

I’m liable to cut him off at that moment, on whatever we were talking about, and ask a little more pinched-in-close What. “What were you doing?” you know? Something like this.

And he says, “Well, oh-oh. Oh, that!” And it alerts him.

So you have these various indicators. They make a gradient. Pc gives you a motivator; oh well, that’s an absolute certain indicator and you must pull the overt straightaway, just convert the thing into an overt without any slightest...

Person says, “Well, my – just my mother beat me every day, just on and on and on. And beat me every day and so forth.”

It’s just a lead-pipe cinch. “What have you done to your mother?” I mean, it just might as well appear – be printed on the auditor form, you know? I mean, it’d be that inevitable.

Your next one is criticism, criticism, criticism. Well, there’s a real overt back of this, and so forth.

Now, we’re not going to dignify getting off other people’s withholds by even classifying it. An auditor who would do that, oh, man. That’s very safe, but it’s so safe that they’re not withholds. They’re not his withholds. What are you doing – what are you doing monkeying with somebody else’s withholds? They’re not this pc’s actions. Perfectly safe to reveal other people’s withholds, isn’t it? Or it might be, unless they find out about it.

But – then your area of explanation. And then there is the actual withhold. Now, of course, the actual withhold: the person says, “Well, I – I used to stand down on the Battery and bung paving stones through the windshields of cars,” see? And you’ve got your tailor-made What question standing right in front of your face, because it’s not “What about bunning paving stones through windshields of car on the Battery on July 1st, 1962?” or something like this, you see? That’s not the question. The question is, “What about damaging cars?” or something. But there’s your What question. It’s tailor-made because it’s the withhold.

Now let’s drop downstairs a little bit and we find the pc is explaining something so we get the What question out of the bulk of his explanation.

He’s saying, “Well, I actually – I actually would never – never really liked – liked – liked my wife, and I really never liked her, and so forth. And this was easy to understand. I, of course, was – came home late and all that sort of thing, but she never kept herself up and she never really did anything for me around the house. And she never really paid much atten – .”

That’s – actually, he hasn’t given a motivator, you know, he hasn’t given an overt. It’s just an explanation of how it was all messy. And you could just cut him short on his explanation, get your new What.

Now, I’ll give you an example out of your session today: we had two or three periods of explanation, when I wasn’t doing Prepchecking. In view of the fact that I wasn’t doing Prepchecking, I of course could never get to the bottom of it. It was just crippled, you see,

because I couldn't slide in the What. See? Because in clearing rudiments, I was avoiding Whats, and I certainly wasn't Prepchecking, you see, I was sec checking. Doesn't work.

All right. So next indicator is the pc is being very critical about something or other. He's being very critical of you, the auditor. That's a very special case. If he's being critical of you, the auditor, you have missed a withhold and you better find out what it is. "What should you have found out about?" "When did you think I was a fool?" Anything that you could possibly mention that would throw a missed withhold into view – that would be the stage at which you pulled this particular one. But it's the criticism. You want to find out what has been *done*. The missed withhold, underlies all of these things, by the way. But you can find an actual *doingness* at the point of criticism. He's saying, "Well, I," natter, natter, natter, "and actually I always thought, always thought that he wore the wrong color ties. And that was why I didn't like him," or something of the sort, and so on. Well, he's done something to that person or done something to a person like that. So your What question is tailor-made out of that.

And then there is your fundamental fundamental – is motivator. Man, red flag! Let's just find out what he's done to the source of that motivator or the type of beingness of that motivator. Just overtly find out what he's done. In other words, you're getting off overts and so on.

Now, if you look at this as a scale, you will find out that the withhold is measured by the degree of danger – the only reason I'm giving you this scale; I'm not talking about how you ask What questions – the degree of danger the pc conceives to be present on the subject of getting off the withhold.

All right. If the pc doesn't think it's very dangerous, they give it to you directly and straight. If the pc thinks it's a little bit dangerous, they explain around the fringes of where it might lie. If the pc thinks it's rather confoundedly dangerous, it's getting just a little bit grim, maybe on the jail borderline on that chain, the pc will criticize. See, criticism enters.

And if it is so dangerous that the pc believes – you understand I'm saying pc "believes"; I'm not saying it's factual – the pc is right up to the point where, with a jingle jangle the patrol wagon arrives, the officers pick up the battering ram, they knock down the front door, they come crashing in with the handcuffs and leg irons, you see, and drag him screaming off, towed back of the Black Maria, you see? Something like this. And they can see *this* is going to happen if that withhold is missing; they give you the motivator. They always give you a motivator. Flat, flat, total motivator – a hundred percent.

Now, what – how do you use this? Well, it gives you the gradient scale and indexes of all cases. A case is *not* as bad off as he is crazy. A case is *not* as bad off as he is aberrated. A case is *not* as bad off as anything, except how dangerous he considers it would be if he revealed himself.

And so you have from the top to the bottom, all cases on that gradient. Just like you have the What questions and the degree of the withhold and the safety on those – that gradient, so you have all cases on that gradient. And the person who will die before he will reveal himself is also on that scale.

So you have them from the case that you could audit to Clear in twenty-five hours. See, bang! You sneeze, the person is Clear. Well, this person has not had any great idea that it'd be dangerous to tell people things. That's the index of that case.

All right. Now, the person who went 150 hours to a Routine 3 kind of Clear. Well, that person doesn't have very much he considers his – be all right. Pretty easy.

Now we have the case that we went 200 hours on without finding – only finding a goal and terminal. Well, ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, that case has got quite a little hatful. There is a nice little hatful of stuff that if the individual revealed any part of that, he thinks, he believes, that *hmmm*, it would be, well, it'd be rough. It would be pretty rough. He'd probably lose his family and he'd lose this and that, you see?

And now you take the person who went 500 hours with no goal and no terminal and no gain, and that sort of thing. Now, we know darn well this person has moving up into the perimeter of the police breaking in the front door, if it were learned about this person, see?

And now we take the case – the case that actually goes to the spinbin rather than reveal things. Well, man, that's *in extremis*. Because insanity is the last protest against punishment. See, "I cannot feel your punishment. I do not even know about it. I'm not even a rational being. You've driven me out of my mind." You see, that's a total motivator on the subject of punishment.

So, where we go. Then you've got your whole – your whole thing. It's just length of time in auditing. Your length of time in auditing is indexed by the danger the individual believes would be present if he revealed certain things. And danger to reveal is the direct index of length of time in auditing. There it is. Want to know how long it takes to clear somebody? Well, how dangerous does this person consider it would be to reveal certain things.

Now, how could you cut down this length of time in auditing? Well, I've given you the answer. Don't pull safe withholds. Just move in and pull actual withholds. Don't fool around with it. And use Prepchecking. And you've got that, all right. Now, that gets this lifetime's danger out of the way.

And I've even given you a new type of line and a slight change in 3D Criss Cross that does not permit the person to escape once you've got the item on the list. And the type of line is – the line for 3D Criss Cross, of course – is "What identity would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" or some such wording. See? And they will blow into view. And, "What identity would it be safe for you to reveal?" of course, could be a relief line, which would just be nonsense. But it would sort of balance the thing off and throw the other one into view; in other words, just be a trick line.

In other words, you could drag these things out, and you could – you know now what the pc is doing, so it becomes relatively simple. That is what the pc is doing. While he is there sitting in front of you, he would like to reveal himself. He would like to reveal this and he would like to get out of it, but he does not know how to get out of it. And the person is always hoping that somebody will come along and give him a shot in the gluteus maximus with some magic fluid by which he will not have to reveal a thing and become totally Clear.

And anytime anybody has *ever* proposed that to me, why, I've had an instinct on the subject. [laughter] Now I know why! I should go back through the files and find out who's proposed it because we would have an index of some of our roughest cases. It'd be the person who wants to be cleared without revealing anything.

Now, the people who get spinnny in processing, you must be tripping right over – you must be falling right over something.

Well now, Prepchecking will get it for you. There is no contest about it. This is a very easy, easy activity, because a person moves right up into it. But the basic Prepcheck question that would get them all would of course be one of these “unsafe to reveal” questions.

Your Zero: “Have you ever – have you ever done anything that might have been unsafe to mention?” See, that would be your Zero. “Is there anything you've ever done that would be unsafe to you if you told about it?” “If you reveal certain things about yourself, would it be unsafe to you?” Some such Zero, don't you see? Doesn't matter how it expresses to the pc. Then you get your What off of what the pc said. Then you'd mine that down; you'd strip the whole bank. Interesting

“Safe to reveal.” This is the index on it.

Now, you must figure it's awful safe to show up with a mest body, a meat body, you see; and then you get the idea that it's unsafe so you begin to take it down. That must be what old age is. That must be the only thing old age is. So take heart, girls. [laughter]

Now, you just look at this as the idea of apparence – apparency, appearances, disappearances, being there, not being there, well, it all passes over into the field of fact. Offering the fact is dangerous. Withholding the fact is apparently not dangerous. All it does is pull the person to pieces. That's the trick of the Body Builder. That is the basic trick of this universe. And the basic trick of this universe is, if you withhold it, it won't hurt you any. And of course, that is a stinking lie.

So they get everybody to withhold things. They invent codes of law and that sort of thing, and these things are all supposed to get everybody to withhold the thing, and then the thing – thetan gets to packing up mass and occupying less space. And he occupies less space and less space, and he can permeate less and less things, and here he goes. He's got it made. Yeah. But who's got it made?

Of course, that is a game nobody wins. Scientology is the only game where everybody wins.

Now, there's your – there is your index of withholds. There is your – what they're about. That is why your pc won't talk to you. That is why your pc reveals what he reveals. That's why you sometimes look very silly writing down, “Well, the pc has a withhold that the pc has a bent toe,” and why, after you've prepchecked a bent toe for five or six sessions, there has been no gain on the part of the pc.

You see? You see how this might work? Does this straighten out anything for you?

Audience: Hm-mm.

Now, you could use this principle, but if I give it to you, you'll work it to death, instead of using it as a Zero, you can flip over, and you mustn't work this to death.

“Who would have been dangerous to have revealed that to?” could be a version of the Who question. But you get on some hot line and the person is talking about having robbed every restaurant in the entirety of New York – and he's robbed every restaurant in New York practically, and so forth, and he just keeps going on and on; you don't seem to clean this up. The Who that will clean it up is “Who wouldn't it have been safe to have told about that,” and “Who didn't find out about it?”

And of course, he'd say, “Well, the restaurateurs.” And he's been saying “The restaurateurs” all this time, and all of a sudden he looks at you and he says, “Well, all right. The police.”

“All right. When did they fail to find out about it?” And we get the rest of the chain and it blows. Do you see that?

Now, there is – there is your gradient of the value of the withhold to the pc. I call very strictly to your attention that I have said the pc *believes* it would be unsafe. And that is what is most interesting: “believes” it would be unsafe.

And of course, these things – I think, I think the crime you committed – I think they probably run out of witnesses. I think the – I don't think the government would spend a cent trying to dig up enough witnesses, or even find the records, in order to prosecute you and so forth, particularly if it was a real crime. The government is much more interested in minor crimes than real crimes.

And the essence of the situation, however, is one little thing like that gets stacked up on other little things and something else gets stacked up on that and the next thing you know a person believes it's very dangerous to put his nose out of doors. Can't! Can't go outside. And there's your “can't go outside” thing. God-awful things are liable to happen to this person if they go outside; liable to be recognized as the person who committed the murder, only they kind of vaguely think maybe they have committed a murder, which is quite interesting.

You have very few backtrack things on this that are hot, but every case must have a few on it. You suddenly say, “Oh man, I bet they're still waiting for me. I bet they're still looking for me someplace or another,” and the pc is liable to have his hair almost stand on end for a moment when he hits one of these things. And then he suddenly, “Well, that's nonsense. Been a long time ago. Long, long ti... I wonder if they are.”

But this equally applies to 3D Criss Cross and to Prepchecking but is most salient in your use of Prepchecking. And there is where you should use it. And I won't get nasty or mean with you, or anything. I will just forbid anybody to get off your withholds if I hear any more session being spent on “I went out in the evening and looked at the sky and felt strange.” I wouldn't even try to make anything out of it except that some pc had a hot area someplace and had just thrown me a great big floppy, squishy red herring. And I don't like red herring, so I would let that one drop.

There are certain withholds you let go by. You just let them go by. You don't do a thing with them. And there are certain withholds that you hang to till grim death, until they

are all revealed, and you'll just have to learn which ones. And the index of it is what is it – the pc consider it safe to reveal; what does the pc consider it unsafe to reveal. And that unravels the whole problem for you.

Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 20 MAY 1968
Corrected & Reissued March 1974

Remimeo

(Only change is in this type style)

OVERT-MOTIVATOR SEQUENCE

Dianetics Courses – Level Two

Solo Audit – OT Sections

There was an important discovery made in 1952 on the subject of engrams which did not get included in “Book One”, *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*.

This was the “Overt-Motivator sequence of **Engrams**”.

An **Overt**, in Dianetics and Scientology, is an aggressive or destructive **act** by the individual against one or another of the 8 dynamics (self, family, group, Mankind, animals or plants, MEST, Life or the Infinite).

A **Motivator** is an aggressive or destructive act received by the person or one of the dynamics.

The viewpoint from which the act is viewed resolves whether the act is an overt or a motivator.

The reason it is called a “Motivator” is because it tends to prompt that one pays it back – it “motivates” a new overt.

When one has done something bad to someone or something one tends to believe it must have been “motivated”.

When one has received something bad, he also may tend to feel *he* must have done something to deserve it.

The above points are true. The actions and reactions of people on the subject are often very falsified.

People go about believing they were in an auto accident when in actual fact they caused one.

Also people may believe they caused an accident when they were only *in* one.

Some people, on hearing of a death, at once believe they must have killed the person even though they were far away.

Police in large cities have people turn up and confess to almost every murder as a routine.

One doesn't have to be crazy to be subject to the Overt-Motivator sequence. It is not only used on him continually by others, it also is a basic part of his own "case".

There are two extreme stages of Overt-Motivator phenomena. One is a person who gives up only motivators (always done to him) and the other is the person who "has done only overts" (done to others).

In running engrams you will find

1. All overt engrams that hang up (won't audit easily) have *also* a motivator engram as the same or different incident.
2. All motivator engrams that hang up have an overt engram in the same or different incident.

The two *types* of engrams then are **Overt** Engrams and **Motivator** Engrams.

Example of Overt Engram – **shooting a dog**.

Example of Motivator Engram – **being bitten by a dog**.

The rule is that the **subject matter must be similar**.

They can be in different points in time.

When you can't run out (erase) a dog bite engram, why then you find the "shoot dog" engram.

Psychosomatic ills or aberrations that do not resolve by running one side, usually resolve by finding and running the other.

When you can't erase an engram about shooting a dog, why then there's a bitten by dog.

It's all very simple really. There are always two sides to the coin. If one won't run, you try the other.

BASICS

Finding the basic engram on a chain also applies to finding the basic overt or basic motivator engram.

Engrams then hang up (won't run out) when

- (a) The other type needs to be run and
- (b) The one found has earlier engrams on it.

NONEXTANT ENGRAMS

An "engram" sometimes didn't exist. A pc can be trying to run being run over by a car when he never was. What needs to be done, when the incident won't run, is get the pc's incident of running over somebody. It also works in reverse. A pc can be trying to run an engram

of running over somebody when he was in fact only run over himself and never did run over anyone.

So **both** engrams can exist and be run or only one side exists and can be run or with a heavy foul-up on overts and motivators, one side can be non-factual and won't run because only the *other* side exists.

It is easy to visualize this as a matter of flows. An overt of course is an Outflow and a motivator is an Inflow.

SECONDARIES

It may never have been said that secondaries always sit squarely on incidents of actual pain and unconsciousness.

Also secondaries can exist on the overt-motivator sequence pattern just as in engrams.

This is the cause of frozen emotions or “unemotional” people. Also some people complain they can't feel anymore.

This works out by overt-motivator sequence. A person in grief over loss (grief is always loss) who then can't run it has *caused* grief and that overt-secondary can be run.

Also a person misemotional over causing grief has been caused grief. It works both ways with **all points on the tone scale**.

The last is a newer discovery and wasn't known to early Dianeticists.

The Overt-Motivator Engram phenomena did not receive adequate dissemination. The principle applied to secondaries has not before been released. It is basically Dianetic Engram running that resolves all cases in the end so one had better be pretty good at auditing Engrams and Secondaries, Motivator and Overt both.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jp.nt.cden:jh

The Overt-Motivator Sequence

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 3 April 1962

Thank you.

What is this?

Audience: April the 3rd. The 3rd of April.

3 April? By golly, you're right. One lecture, Saint Hill Briefing Course, 3 April A.D. 12, and I haven't got anything to lecture you about because I got a withhold.

Female voice: What is it?

Male voice: Tell us. Well?

Yeah, I got a withhold.

Male voice: What's it about?

Are you interested?

Audience: Yes!

Well, I haven't prepared it or revved it up, but I've been taping a Class IV.

Audience: A-a-hhhh.

And I finally just tipped it over – just tipped it over on Class IV, and so forth, and now I got it taped. I've been fooling with this for some time – what do you do with 3D Criss Cross items and that sort of thing?

And what do you know? (This is all I'm going to tell you. This isn't a lecture on the subject.) The only thing I was withholding is that the solution to what you do with 3D Criss Cross items, of course, is the resolution of what makes the overt-motivator sequence; and I've suspected this for some time. And I just got some processes and so forth, here, which undo the overt-motivator sequence. I think it's absolutely fascinating. And the withhold in this lecture would be the fact that I, out of my own interest and so forth, would normally talk to you garrulously about this particular action, because I'm terrifically interested in it – the overt-motivator sequence. How the hell did it ever get that way, you know? And can it be undone? I've been asking that question for ages. Instead of having to run it, can't you undo it? Because I know it'd be a junior phenomenon, see? And sure enough, apparently you can undo it. And so that's a good piece of news.

So anyhow, I'm not going to give you any more about that in particular right now. End of withhold. I'm delighted, you see, because if you think of running out all the things which you have done and from which you are suffering at the present time, you see, when you run these out one by one, and selectively on the whole track, it becomes one of these things like running out every engram on the whole track. It's just an impossible action, it's so long and arduous.

You take Jim over there, for instance, or you take Dick or somebody like this, and you get all of these overts – you get the idea? We won't even mention Peter. [laughter] You get these fantastic numbers of overts. And if you're going to suffer from every overt you have ever committed – see, that's impossible. I mean, mathematically, on one lifetime, you'd be dead a dozen lives over, don't you see? And if you got a motivator for every overt, for instance, and so forth, how could you live?

So I've been fooling around with a lot of combinations that have to do with energy and MEST-universe ideas, and ideas and that sort of thing, and it's – comes out rather well. And apparently it's a very junior idea to prevent people from attacking.

And I have now told you about all there is to know about it, even though I would love to go on discussing it for a long time. It's just a mechanism to do just that one thing – nothing else. That's it. Well, end of withhold.

I'm terrifically interested in the Class IV. You have no idea. This has practically laid me in my grave trying to get this thing done, because you start going over the top of the whole Goals Problem Mass, and just not-is the lot, and sit around and look it square in the teeth, and reserve aplomb in one way or the other, it's something like living in the middle of the living lightning, don't you know? And like to got my head kicked off on this one. But that's about all it amounts to. It's fascinating, isn't it?

And it's just a mechanism. It is not even an axiom. See, it's nothing. Because every way you look at it, it can't be. It'd be impossible. And there wouldn't be any way by which this could be.

You see, if the only thing that ever affected anybody was you, in the final analysis – you get this now – then you would have a perfect alibi for everything you had ever done to anybody. Don't you see that at once you have never done anything to anybody? You see? So therefore, looking at that, that makes it look pretty specious, you know? You say, "Well, that's – that's kind of a gag."

And now, if nobody ever was affected by anything except what they themselves did, do you realize you have never talked to anybody anyplace?

Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah.

See? So from all these sides... You know, I've told you for years, the overt act-motivator sequence was limited. You know, I knew it was limited, but I couldn't find the entrance point of how the hell you ran it out. And I imagine I must have tried at least, oh, I don't know, fifteen hundred, two thousand combinations trying to blow this thing down just as itself, so – that is, that would run, that would run on a case. Just nothing would, except itself.

You look at it from numerous other angles, and it becomes impossible. If only you have ever affected you and nobody else has ever affected you, numerous things then apply. And amongst those things, you wouldn't even be able to keep the same time track. See, there's a lot of things wrong with the overt-motivator sequence. I've known that these things weren't reasonable. But I knew at the same time that everybody had fallen for this malarkey and that everybody responded to it.

Well, if everybody responds to it and everybody has fallen for it and it processes – you ask a fellow what he's done, and this immediately relieves things. And his withholds and all that sort of thing – these things are all pertinent to this. And they all relieve, don't you see? I mean, you can work with this; you can operate with this.

So it doesn't wipe out all processes which do things with it. Doesn't wipe out Prep-checking. You can sit down and prepcheck somebody, you know. And that's fine. But how about just knocking the whole ruddy computation in the 'ead? And now I have just opened up a nice, wide-open, twelve-pass express highway that does. It is just a mechanism to prevent people from attacking. That's all.

And handled in that fashion in processing, why, it all becomes very explicable – runs, in other words. Like to kill you, running it.

But I don't wish to leave you in mystery. I'll give you a specific process: “What shouldn't A attack?” “What shouldn't you attack?” That should carry you well enough. Of course, to keep in communication with the subject, why, you have to add attack, you know? And then because that won't be explicit to some people, you will have to get synonyms for attack. These are the usual complications which arise when you release a process.

So if you do an overt assessment of the Overt Secondary Scale⁸, it'll probably give you a better word for your one particular pc. But it would be on the basis of “should” and “shouldn't.” But this, of course, could be expected to be modified to “could” and “couldn't” and “have” and “haven't.” You see the variations – these are the normal variations through which a process goes.

But if you just got somebody to list, who was sitting in a whole bunch of motivators and overts and so forth – just list what they shouldn't attack, just as easy as that... That, you should remember, was the lead-in. It might not be the final process that you run, but that was the lead-in on the research level which gave the result and made, all of a sudden, the overt-motivator phenomena look, of course, as corny as Christmas tinsel. It's just a mechanism by which people have dreamed up ways and means to prevent other people from attacking. That is all.

Of course, you don't want people attacking you, so of course you tell them that you shouldn't be attacked. And you tell them how you shouldn't be attacked, and then you tell them what they shouldn't attack, don't you see? And what you overlook is, at the same time, they're teaching you what you shouldn't attack – the same time you're doing this. So eventually it looks like you have an overt-motivator sequence.

8 HCOB 23 May 1961 PRE-HAV SCALE REVISED

See, the most sensible thing in the world is, is there's certain things which you, in a human body, shouldn't attack. And the lesson which you learn from the physical universe: that if you attack these things you get hurt. And that is the basic mechanism and the learning-ness which underlies all the overt-motivator phenomena. See?

Well, then, if you don't believe me, take your fist sometime and start a buzz saw up, and – oh and let's not be quite that violent, lawn mower will do – and hit the lawn mower in the blades while it is running. Well, as far as that's concerned, just find a nice, rough stone wall and haul off and hit it, and you are immediately taught this lesson: that you shouldn't attack it. Because it reduces your havingness, of course.

So you teach yourself the lesson that you shouldn't attack, and then this goes into a philosophic wingding. And the philosophic wingding comes after this fact. You see, after you've learned that you shouldn't stick your paws into lawn mowers and shouldn't kick paving blocks, and various things – when you've learned all these things – why, of course you've learned the remainder: that is, what you do unto others will happen to you.

That's not true at all. That's a philosophic extrapolation from the fact of what you do you get recoils from. And it comes back to the basic law of inertia – Newton's law of inertia. It's a physical universe law: says what you hit hits back. It's as simple as that.

Now, you can build this up philosophically, that if you say something critical of Joe, Joe is going to say something critical of you. And if you say something critical of Joe, why, then you can be hurt by Joe's criticism.

But a withhold is basically nothing more than your unwillingness to attack or your unwillingness to be attacked. And that's all a withhold is.

You can take any withhold a person has got: if he gives you this withhold, you could ask him, "Well, what shouldn't attack you about that?" and run that off. And then, "What shouldn't you attack in this particular way?" – any phraseology you care to use. Your withhold is going to evaporate.

See, your withhold system also takes care of it, but there it is. It's quite fascinating.

I'm sure you will excuse my absorption with this particular scene, in view of the fact that it is the single complication that makes your case awfully complicated. You get so that you won't bawl out cops and you go around being good, and all kinds of wild things accumulate as a reason for this.

Personally, I've never learned this too well. It's not that I've been particularly bad in that particular thing, but nobody has ever really taught me I shouldn't attack. I mean, it's been rather hard to grapple with the thing. People have tried. People have tried.

But I'll give you a little hyster – historical note – a little hysterical note here, which you might find amusing. Hasn't anything to do with the price of fish.

One of the points where this broke down was, I was examining what on the track I felt worst about. I wasn't getting audited; I was trying to find out what I felt worst about, see – you know, that I had done. I was trying to bracket this thing, this overt-motivator sequence, you see? And it was necessary that I do this and get studying it, and I've been very reticent

about this recently for this reason: is it looked for a while that doing anything to anybody's mind was the most destructive thing you could possibly do. That's quite interesting. I was studying that, you know, and I got the bad auditor, and so forth. And I went on and looked at this even further, and taking responsibility for somebody else's mind, and that sort of thing, it looked like it was a pretty bad show, see? So that looked awfully bad for auditors.

Well, I wasn't trying to disprove this, and you can get quite a jolt out of this by running it on somebody – “Whose mind have you helped?” or something like that, you know. And you would think offhand that this would be what tangled up your wits, you see – would be helping somebody or doing something with their mind.

And I went through a little period there of looking this thing over, and it had a limited workability, and it did make some sense one way or the other, and fortunately proved to be not true at all.

It is the energy involved. It's the attack on the energy involved. It's the attacking of energy. And it's not even bad to attack energy. It's just that you have tried to convince people, and people have tried to convince you, that it was very bad to attack energy. So you become allergic to energy.

The definition of being good – as long as I find myself talking about this – the definition of being good is the definition of being overwhelmed, you see? A person who is good is overwhelmed.

I first began this study nautically in this life. It was a naval study with me. There's one thing: I'll hold something that bugs me, that I don't understand and I'll put it in a bull pen. And I'll put it over on the side. And I'll say, “This green puzzle doesn't fit with these pink pieces, you know? What is this thing, you know?”

Well, one of those things was the fact that every fighting man I ever had under me was always in bad with other people at a time when they needed fighting men. And the only people that were getting any pats on the back with the shore patrols and so forth were people who weren't worth a damn. I mean that – just weren't worth a damn. There was definitely something wrong here.

I'd have six or seven sailors out of a couple of hundred, you know, and they'd – man, action be engaged, one of those fellows (I don't think the period could have been longer than about a minute or thirty seconds, or something like that), he was at the wheel correcting the course, he was up on the gunnery platform correcting the training of the guns, he was down studying the chemical recorder, and he was handling the engine room telegraphs; and while he was doing all this, he was carrying on a conversation with me.

And on almost any ship I ever had in action, there'd not be more than four or five people on the ship that would help me fight her.

And you had this enormous supernumerary, you see, out there. That always bugged me, because these boys were the boys who were always in trouble. The people didn't like these fellows. They were always in bad. They weren't particularly bad people, but they were just always in trouble.

I've seen it now, you know? Some fellow – God, he'd have hash marks, and he'd have gold chevrons and eagles, you know, clear up to his shoulder, and he'd come aboard, you know, reading Horace or something, you know? He'd walk aboard with his package of laundry or something or other, and check himself in at the gangway and go below and put away his book and his nice, clean uniform. And his record would be beautiful and he'd always say "Yes, sir," and everything would be so nice. And he was a very pleasant fellow and not very obtrusive. Nice man, you know, and so forth. And he'd have all of the bonuses, you know? And he'd have all of the stuff that anybody ever awarded anybody. Service records, you know: "laudable," "terrific," "marvelous," you know, and just rave notices in this damn thing.

And in action you would just have to knock him out of your road. That was all. Always be in your damn road. "Go on up forward someplace and you know – stand down there with the damage control party. Don't get in the road." You know, some totally ineffective function. Get him out of the road. Ammunition passer – maybe you'd get the ammunition there and maybe you wouldn't, you see? But there'd just – oh! There'd just be dozens of these guys, see, just dozens of these birds, drawing all the pay, getting all the pats on the back.

And then here would be these madmen: always in trouble, always upset. When the ship was engaged, it would have sunk without them. Well, there's something here, see?

These weren't necessarily bad men. Looking them over, they weren't criminals, nothing like that, but just nobody liked them. This fact used to stick in my craw. I used to study this. I did an awful lot of studying of men and life and things like this, and it's something I didn't quite understand. But the shore patrol just loved these other fellows. I never knew what to do with them – use them for spare anchors or something like that? It wasn't that I didn't have their loyalty and affection; I did. But action would be engaged, they would be just as calm as they always were.

And you study men under stress and men in various guises and men under various actions of this particular character, and you find out that the world has built up a series of superstitions about people. And they're not facts – they're superstitions. They hardly even are dignified as findings.

Your animal psychologist has categorized the whole lousy lot. I mean, he's got them all. His textbooks are nothing else but the mirage of ought-to-be, see? There's no facts in there. It's just a bunch of ought-to-be.

He tells everybody, "Beware of anybody who is active." Isn't that interesting? "Beware of anybody who is active." You will find in the civil-defense manuals of the United States government, in that area delegated to (ha!) psychology, that the whole provision that they have made is for anybody who gets active: and if a citizen were to start flying around and talking about what should be done or what shouldn't be done or blaming the government or saying anything like this, he is the one you have the butterfly nets for. And this is why you have psychological units in civil-defense teams. They're the butterfly-net people, and they're supposed to pick up these guys who get active. And that's exactly what it says.

I'm not minimizing this or I'm not stretching it or – I don't have to. I mean, it's a marvelous example of "be good." You see, the whole U.S. civil defense system is based on the idea that there is a thing called the government which is composed of people (which already

is silly), and they're going to take over the country at the moment of an attack, see? They aren't there now. They're not part of the people, and they're not human, you see? And they're parked up someplace in Canada along the DEW line or down in Mexico or out on some island – and they don't exist there now. And at the moment of an attack, nobody is supposed to do anything but be taken over by the government. That's what you're supposed to do in an attack.

Consider it absolutely fascinating! It's just as bad as Eisenhower's design for the Normandy landing. I mean, there was nothing worse than that. I didn't know this until the other day. I'm going to write a book on it. I'm going to call it "The Great Myth." You see, I was a Pacific amphibious warfare officer before these Normandy landings occurred. And there are certain ways you're supposed to make landings. Well, they didn't make them that way at Normandy ha-ha! They killed men instead.

So anyhow, I didn't know it was that bad. But this is some more of your the-government-knows-all sort of a situation and "no individual is going to do anything." You got that? No individual – we're not going to count on any individuals. The government is going to do these things. You get the idea? The government is going to. Somehow or another, totally disassociated from anything that is made out of skin and blood, see, this is all going to be attended to.

So the government teams are going to take over in certain zones of the city, and so on. And it's all worked out. And the only thing they've overlooked is these people are people. And apparently, looking over the Normandy beachhead landing schedule, there weren't going to be any people involved and there was going to be no war involved. I think this was interesting – those two oversights that they made.

As early as 1941 I noticed something that probably nobody has noticed, that I might comment on, and – that war is the antithesis of organization. And if you organize in some dim hope that when battle is joined that organization is going to prevail, you're going to lose your war, because then it breaks down to the being, the person, the man on the job. And the other schedules never go off right. They just never, never go off right.

The fellow who is supposed to be there at 5:61, well, I can tell you from experience that he is never there till 5:00 and 61, if he appears at all. And if the whole intricate machinery depends utterly upon this man pushing a button at 5:61, man, you've had it. Because this – look, this fellow is flesh and blood. This fellow is die-able. And war is the antithesis of organization. War is chaos. And the only thing that you can organize for is chaos. And if you're going to organize it, organize for chaos; and that's the only way you can organize.

And if you're going to organize for chaos, there's one thing that you must count on utterly: the individual. There can be no great third-dynamic shadow which suddenly spreads out across the land and makes everything all right. Who are these beings that are going to take over the middle of these huge cities and set it all to rights after the bombs have landed? See? Who are they? Well, they're human beings. Well, by that very fact, you can count on the fact that some of them are going to be missing.

Now, in space opera we very often tape this better than they do on planets. Very often – very often – they have relatively indestructible dolls, relatively indestructible robots. But

they're forced into building these things by this other factor: the extreme destructibility of individuals and beings in areas of disaster. And even in space opera these fellows disappear. Oh, I love one of these. It's like the – I don't know what battle that was; I don't know what the Union called it. It was one of the first battles that Grant fought. The Confederate general was Johnston – very early, out in the West someplace or another.

But the only thing the poor Confederates did wrong was draw up a wonderful plan of battle; the most marvelous, intricate plan of battle you ever saw. At these times these regiments were going to be there, and this was going to be there, and everything was going to be there, and it was all going to be marked out this way.

And of course, they do all this for a battlefield nobody has been on yet, don't you see? They lost. We got clobbered.

This Normandy beachhead: Demolition teams had twenty minutes to knock out all the underwater obstacles on the whole of the Normandy beach. Pfft!

In the Pacific we used to spend three days and use certain tools, but they didn't do it over there. They had a schedule, and it ran off – bzzzzzt! And for seven minutes this happened and then seven minutes this happened. No part of this schedule is pinned to an actual event, don't you see? No part of this schedule is pinned to anything having happened. It's only pinned to the clock. Do you see that?

You get how mad this will get after a while, see? Unless you pin something to an event and say "Seven minutes after this happens or has occurred, then you start the next event" – well, you can do that. But you for sure can't say "At 6:00 this happens, and then at seven minutes after six this happens, and at fifteen minutes after six this happens, and at 6:30 this happens." Well, you can count, you see, on whatever is happening at 6:15 has probably not quite arrived and is probably taking place at 6:35. So the team that is enroute to do this thing at 6:30 runs into the team that hasn't done what it was supposed to do at 6:35, and – ooooooh!

Don't you see what happens? A confusion is an untimed, uncontrolled area. Well, you've only got one guy. You've only got one guy. I don't care how many textbooks you write or how many psychologists you give degrees to, you've, in the final analysis, only got one thing. And that is a being, an individual being. That's the only thing you've got.

Now, he may have responsibilities, and he may have dynamics and he may have a lot of other things, but that's all you've got and don't forget it.

You know, I can see some South American reformer, some Simon Bolivar. A great guy, Simon Bolivar. No doubt about it whatsoever. And this is not what he did, but I can see some lofty, ivory-towered character, and he says, "Now, let's see. Our people should do this. And our people should do that. And the government should do this. And the government should do that. And then all will work out to a marvelous utopia. Yes. So here is the schedule."

Well, man, I'd let that poor fellow in on something: He is working with the individuals he is working with, and he is working with nobody else.

Now, every once in a while somebody runs an ought-to-be on me on organizations. And I noticed from an essay Peter wrote one day over a telex spontaneously – oh, it’s a snide piece of thing. You can’t mock up a thetan. But they run it on other people besides me.

And people are always saying to me, “Well, why don’t you get some ‘good people’ in central organizations?” That’s a hell of a slam, isn’t it? People on the outside, “Why don’t you get some ‘good people’ in Scientology?” you see?

Where’s this fantastic reservoir called “good people”? [laughter] Where is it?

Well, I can tell you the last one to have a monopoly on it is the United States government or any other government. They don’t even know that it might exist.

But all of their actions are based on the fact that in some mysterious way “good people” are suddenly going to occur without anybody doing anything about it, you know. Just from somewhere, “good people.” It’s as pathetic as the Greeks sitting down at a battle one time, as it talks about in Plutarch’s Lives, sacrificing and making auguries until the right moment to repel the attack, you know? Greeks are just falling in windrows on all sides of this dumb bunny, and he’s busy slitting the guts of birds to find out if it’s all right to make the attack, you see? “No, that liver isn’t all right. Give me another bird.” Slit him up. “No, that liver isn’t all right.” Man.

It’s what’s known as being auguried to death. Even a private commented on it and went down into history.

No, there isn’t any such reservoir. There isn’t any such reservoir, and that’s basically what everybody has got on automatic at this particular time. They’ve basically got it all on automatic. “Good people.” That’s what they got on automatic. All the systems are geared for “good people.”

Government selection. Military selections. School teachers. Everything else. Any body that you can think of, it’s all geared to the fact that from some mysterious reservoir someplace, some “good people” are going to come along and pass some examinations, and it’ll all be all right.

Brother, one of these fine days, St. Louis or Chicago, or somebody... The rest of their atomic plan, by the way, depends utterly on the fire engines coming from Chicago to take care of St. Louis, and the fire engines from St. Louis going to Chicago to take care of Chicago.

It never occurred to these dumb – ah, that... [laughter] never occurred to them that any elementary atomic planning would cause the bombing of St. Louis and Chicago simultaneously.

So anyway, they got it all figured out that from some mysterious reservoir, why, these minutemen of steel, impervious to all excitement, are going to show up. And what are they going to do? What’s their first instruction with regard to people? That to take anybody who is doing anything – see, any private citizen that isn’t duly authorized, you know, isn’t wearing the magic badge, Fifth Fire Brigade or something, or the Royal Atomic Defenders of the Gasworks, or something – if he hasn’t got the right badge and he’s trying to say to people, “Go down that street there because it’s still open,” if he’s standing there at the corner doing

this, then the butterfly squad has orders to pick him up. He's the man they want – in the nearest hoosegow, quick.

And that is what the psychologist in an atomic war is being trained to do: to pick up the active person. I consider this fabulous, you know? I studied civil defense in the United States, and then my stomach gave out. Actually, there are probably only about five thousand people in the United States that know anything about disaster relief, and not one of those people has ever been called to the civil-defense department, which I consider very, very interesting. They were the people who handled civil defense in the various war theaters under chaos, and so forth.

But these beautiful organizations, man: “Yeah, George, Bill and Pete will go in Joe's car three and a half minutes after the first alarm, from the south entrance of the building.” Oh, no, you know? You can see it now: They never get out of the car park. Just one of the things that happened: Bill didn't bring his car to work that morning. See?

You're dealing with beings, you're not dealing with punched-tape card systems and that sort of thing. You're dealing with individuals. And I don't care whether you're trying to make a perfect government or if you're trying to make a perfect civilization or a more livable world or anything else, the basic building block with which you build is an individual, and there is no other building block. God isn't a building block; government isn't a building block; the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Uniformed Cats isn't a building block. None of these things are building blocks. It all comes down to the individual.

Is he any good or isn't he? And that's the other question. Is he competent or incompetent? United States today – not roasting the United States, particularly – recently passed a rule that no officer could be promoted until his wife had been passed on by the admiral.

Well, I suppose I've been an admiral a few times in my past lives, but I never went that far to make... [laughter] Honest. I never had to go that far. I didn't. I never had to go that far. You just look around: There's this pretty girl; it's a pretty girl. All right. And you used to say “Whhst!” you know, like that. You never had to pass a law under Congress that part of an officer's fitness report was the availability – I mean, excuse me – [laughter] the niceness of his wife.

I can just see that wife now, out there on the bridge of the destroyer, steering like mad during the battle, can't you? I can see it now.

Oh, man, how decadent can you get? What's that got to do with it? And yet I've seen officers and officials and organizational people promoted simply because they could slap better on the back and hold more liquor more asininely than anybody else around. So of course they get promoted.

No, it's competence. If you want to get something done, you depend on the competence of an individual, not his socialness or whether he's a good fellow. It's “Can he do his job?” That is all. Can he do his job?

Now, yes, it is true that an individual can be so mean and so vicious and so something or other that he gets in the road of doing his own job. Never met one myself, but I'm sure that can exist.

No, an individual is either competent or incompetent.

Now, when an individual ceases to be able to run his own life, you always can have communism. You can always have these group idiocies which take responsibility for conduct out of the hands of the individual and place it in the hands of some God-awful, God-help-us monster whereby everybody decides this. Everybody decides what he's supposed to do and what he isn't supposed to do, and whether he can spit, and whether he can breathe, and so forth.

But let me ask the burning question: Who's going to tell him? See? You get the point. This is the idea they never think. They never think this one other step. After you've destroyed all the individuals, who's going to tell them? They never think of that one.

It's a fascinating point. It's the automaticity of competence, the automaticity of this vast reservoir of competence, which somehow or another is always going to rise up someplace.

One of the ways they meet this is they've got everything all geneticized. You know, you raise good horses? You know, if you breed the right mares with the right stallions, why, you get an intelligent horse. I don't think anybody has ever been able to make animal husbandry work, but it's still a popular superstition. If you make being a horse so uncomfortable that no thetan – no self-respecting thetan – will have anything to do with it, you'll have a bunch of creep horses. [laughter] You will, too! You can see them at the horse show now, misbehaving.

All right. Now, the basis of the individual is his ability to observe and make decisions and to act. And that is ability: his ability to observe, to make decisions, and to act. He has to be able to inspect and know what he is looking at – what he is looking at. He has to be able to make a sensible summary of what he is looking at, and he has to be able to act in accordance to what he's inspected.

Now, I don't care if you go into the field of study. This is true of a student, this is true of a soldier, this is true of anybody: If he can't observe and can't make decisions about what he observes, why, he's in bad shape. He's in a bad way, very promptly.

Well, he couldn't help but be. I mean, if you knock out any one of those points... All right. He can observe and he can make a decision, but he can't act – in any way, shape or form cannot act on his data: You've got a fool.

Now you take somebody who can observe all right and see what he's looking at, but is unable to make a decision before he acts. He's a nut.

Now you've got somebody that's perfectly competent to make a decision – perfectly competent to make a decision – and perfectly competent to act, but always does so without observing anything. You've got a catastrophe, man! That's a catastrophe.

You got Congress. Congress is always building a man-of-war. You know, in 1896 they were building a square-rigged, line-of-battle, wooden man-of-war. They actually appropriated money enough to build that thing. They couldn't observe where they were. They kind of slipped on the time track. So anyhow, you got these various things.

Now, the only way you could have a good country, from my point of view... Well, you can have all kinds of systems. Doesn't matter how many systems you have. The world is system-happy right now. My God, the one thing we don't need is one more governmental system. They haven't got a good one, and they probably could use one, but actually they haven't got the fundamental on which you would build a system.

And the fundamental you'd build a system on would be an individual. I don't care how many communisms or "Engelsisms," or something, that you dream up, you're never going to have a utopia. You can Plato-ize day and night for years and never come up with a utopia that would work unless you have individuals who are able to observe, to decide and to act.

I'm sure that Mussolini, taking people who were – they had been pretty badly knocked around over a long period of time. He was making his way, but they were still having to make all the decisions in Rome. All the decisions had to be made in Rome. And the only trouble with a fascist government in a small town was they could maybe observe and they could maybe act, but they had to telephone Rome for the decision.

Well, the funny part of it is, you see, Rome wasn't there to observe and Rome wasn't there to act. So this got looking pretty weird, and their – a government like that gets pretty unwieldy. Nevertheless, they were making their way forward until they finally got knocked in the head. They got knocked in the head because individually they hadn't come up along the line into enough determinism yet to actually stand on their own two feet.

The main thing I'm trying to say is, here, that just if you haven't got the individual, you have nothing! And if you go in the direction of a system, if that system isn't designed to eventually make individuals, then it's a system which will fail. And it's the only kind of a system that you dare embark upon.

You embark upon any other system that ends up in slavery or ends up in the total subjugation of individual ability to observe, ability to decide and ability to act – if you impede any one of those three things – you're going to find yourself with a slave society on your hands. I don't care how many labels the thing has. So the only system that is justified is any stopgap system which pushes people forward in this direction.

I know I myself am rather proud of the fact that the dispatch traffic to me from any Central Organization of five years ago consisted easily of five hundred pieces of paper for every one I get today. Isn't that interesting?

The volume used to be fantastic! You know, "Ron, can I spit?" Man, it'd just be about that bad. And that has just cut down and cut down and cut down and cut down, because all the time we're working in the direction – we have this tremendous advantage. Of course, individuals are becoming more independent and more capable of observation, and so forth. I don't go on the basis that it's all right for them to make terrible blunders and knock everybody in the head before they learn how to walk. But I would incline slightly in that direction, that it was better for them to make a few mistakes than to be guided every minute of the time.

Their cases are coming up the line, everything is coming up. From where I sit, we're making it just this way. We're getting more and more autonomy. Our communication lines are longer and longer. We are acting, oddly enough, more and more in concert, which is rather

fantastic, you know? I mean, the further apart we seem to be moving, the more in concert we are seen to be acting; and the more we get good individuals, the more coordination and agreement we have. Isn't that peculiar?

The reason you have an organizational form and the reason I lay down organizational forms is basically (1) on experience, and (2) to get agreement amongst organization members so that they can move forward.

But I myself, in the early days, was the first one to scoff at any need of organizational form, as any old-time staff member can tell you. I used to say, "Oh, for Christ sakes, you're not going to make me define that!"

Well, yeah. So there's an interim in which a system can exist, but that system gradually goes out of the way to the degree that individuals are brought up to being able to observe, to decide and to act. And it's the only way you can make any progress, from my point of view.

Now I daresay, if I were to talk to some professor of "learnedology" in Spinbin U., who had a socialist penchant about it all, I imagine that I wouldn't talk this way. I would probably talk to make my point with him, because I amuse myself with those jokers. And he would be selling me the great value of the system, and I possibly would never even dare tell him what I thought or the truth, because his realm is in the never-never land of nowhere.

I well remember one debate that I had with such a character. He was one of the leading socialists of New York. And before the evening was over, in front of a bunch of intellectuals, he had admitted and declared, and had now begun to stand up for this one interesting fact; he had progressed from "socialism is wonderful" down to this interesting fact: that the only way that you could make socialism work was to kill every man, woman and child in the world. I finally got him to agree to this and was all set to go on forward on a program to put it into effect, when he suddenly found the garden path down which he had been led. But he still had agreed that this was correct.

How he got there was, of course, just by total specious spuriousness; you know, making him agree by shades, to agree by this, to agree by that. But it was all on this basis, that you couldn't have an individual. See?

Obviously, you see, you have a socialism, why, then obviously you couldn't have an individual. If you had to have the socialism, socialism must exist because you couldn't have an individual. And then, of course, I led him on, on this gradient scale, and then finally he realized that the only way it would really work was to kill every man, woman and child in the world. And then it would really work. You might really have a socialism. And he was quite sold on the program. That's known as brainwashing by gradients.

But you see whereof I speak here.

Now, if we have systems which depend utterly on making people good, we can never get out of the soup. But we can't have systems which make everybody good if we mean, by this, blind acceptance of a now-I'm-supposed-to without inspection, without decision, but only by action. If we totally concentrate on an action, an automatic action, and if we call that automatic action "being good" – see, you see an old lady crossing the street, so you're being

good, you must help the old lady cross the street. “So now I’m supposed to help the old lady across the street.” You get the idea?

She just got through shooting her daughter-in-law in the guts, you know, and she’s carrying the .45 in the bag. But that’s beside the point. “Now I’m supposed to,” you see? Without observation, you’re supposed to act in certain set patterns. That is what they call being good.

And the only way that is achieved is by overwhelming a person with energy. You overwhelm a person. You show him that he will get into too much action – more action than he can stand – if he does not concur with this action. In other words, he chooses to have this minor act or actingness, see; he chooses this minor actingness in lieu of all of this *rwoooooooooowrwooooowr*, see, of *krwow*, see?

You know, the way to make little Johnny eat his peas is to take a whip, don’t you see, and to whirl it around in the air a few times and hit him across in the behind and scream at him real loud. Well, that is action he cannot confront, isn’t it? So you get him to not confront this action in order to do the action of eating his peas. See how that works?

There are other ways you go about this, of total loss, total ostracism: “You’re going to be expelled from school if you don’t study... if you don’t study...” Oh, I don’t know what they study in a school. I’ve never been able to find out, but, “If you don’t study it, why, you’re going to be expelled, and your father and mother will never speak to you again and they won’t feed you, and you’ll be thrown into the gutter, and socially you will be totally ostracized.” And that’s what an E, F or G grade would mean when you’re in the fourth or fifth grade, see? You’re ostracized.

As a matter of fact, this even works on you, see? I use it simply on the basis of you better get a rush on, or something of the sort. You don’t take it that way. You take it on ostracism – “Ron is mad at me,” and so on. I never feel that way at all.

No, it’s the out-create of action which brings about the fixed actingness that we know as “being good.” See, “We can create more action and energy than you can, so therefore your only choice is to fit into this small actingness and energyness pattern.” You got the idea? Well, you get into this on the basis of coordination. You coordinate the actions of quite a few people. Yeah, you can snarl them into line and so forth; it has a certain workability. But it only works up to the basis where they know it works or where they know it should work that way, or something.

In other words, it’ll only work in the direction of consulting their observation of things. If they can now observe that this is workable, or that they would do it anyhow, and they would have decided to have done it anyhow, and got on this actingness, then perhaps you would be justified for a while in saying, “Ra-ra-ra-ra-ra-ra, and I’m going to out-create you until you do so-and-so, and so forth.” You get the idea? “I can shout louder than you can, so therefore you’re going to do this actingness.” You get that?

Ah, but that is not the road the world follows. The world follows a total different one. It’s “Regardless of whether this is reasonable or unreasonable or anything else, man, you’re

going to do it and you're going to be blind to everything else from there on." We call it "faith." We call it "discipline."

They used to take a soldier who deserted from his post and stand him out in front of the rest of the troops and shoot him down, or spreadeagle him on a wheel and beat him to death, or hang a sailor over the gangway and slash him to death, or just, you know, something like this. A Sunday – you'd never go to church on Sunday three hundred years ago but what you didn't pass some guy in the stocks who had been doing something or other, been drinking beer or something like that on a Saturday night, or some other criminal action.

In other words, there were various actions by which more energy was thrown at the individual than he thought he could confront. This is the idea of making people good, do you see?

So therefore, he fixed in this pattern of action because it was a choice of either fixing in this pattern of action or trying to face all of this unfaceable and unfrontable energy. Do you follow me?

That's being good.

Now, when you have a totally disciplined nation, you have a total failure. A nation which would make everybody good and sacrifice every individual characteristic in it, sacrifice everybody's observingness, everybody's decidingness – you got a complete end product: complete failure. That's what you'd wind up with – a complete flop. And there's where every old civilization goes, and that is why they become *old* civilizations. That is why they decay, that is why they become decadent. Because people just become gooder and gooder and gooder, by which we mean they observe less and less and they decide less and less.

You have this fellow walking down the middle of the street taking a certain mincing gait and so forth, not because he thinks it's anything, but because he's supposed to do it because his ancestors did it.

Oh, you can think of thousands of examples of this sort of thing. And when you finally get a totally decadent, totally gone society, it gets licked up by any chaos that hits it. It can be overwhelmed. By what?

Well, if everybody in it was trained to be good by being trained that they couldn't confront certain energy masses, then of course any hostile energy mass that shows up can conquer it.

So an old civilization is set up by its own premises to become conquered, and you have the cycle of civilizations. And that is how they age and that is how they die.

Now, the way an individual ages, the way he dies, is to give up his power of observation and his power of decision, and acts on the basis that he cannot do as much as he used to be able to do, he can't stand as much as he used to be able to stand. And he attributes this to advancing age. He never attributes it to being able to stand less. The source of advancing age is being able to stand less. Advancing age is not the cause of being able to stand less.

In other words, aging is caused by a lessening ability to confront action. That is all. It's not because the person can't, but he merely ages because he believes that he can't. Do you see how that goes?

See, it's a reverse, look. Well, if the way age is regarded at the present time doesn't solve old age, which is that an individual gets less and less active the older he gets (do you see that one, the less active, you know, the older he gets, the less active he is) – if they follow that through uniformly, let me point out to you that this does not result in a knock-out of old age. So it couldn't possibly be true. See, if everybody believes this implicitly, it couldn't be true. Because, boy, they really believe that one. The medicos and everybody else believes that one.

The reverse is true: that a person gets as old as he is incapable of confronting energy, whether it's a civilization or an individual or anything else.

You hear of somebody coming off the beaches at Dunkirk with his hair turned white as snow. Yes, well, he aged. Well, why did he age? Well, he looked at a lot of fury and ran away from it. See why? See how that is?*

By the way it's now past – its about four minutes past your leavingness time. Do you want me to let you go on schedule? Cause we had the (line?)

Audience: No.

Are you being polite?

Audience: No.

Okay.

Well now, the age of the individual is established by his ability to regard action.

The concern of an individual with action is coaction or attack of action. You can act with or you can attack an action, or you can avoid the attack of an action.

In other words, you either have a lot of energy which you are merely utilizing, or you're attacking energy or being attacked by energy. See, I mean, turning the band saw on and off and sawing up some lumber probably never made anybody insane yet. But attacking everybody because they saw up lumber with band saws and going on a considerable vendetta on the subject, and then shooting all those people, or something like that, or being shot at in return – that will cause an aberration, because it singles one out from his natural ownership and responsibility of the universe.

An individual is first as big as the universe, and then he selects out half of it to fight, and so becomes half the size of the universe; and then selects out half of the remaining universe to fight, and so becomes one quarter the size of the universe; and then selects out half of the remainder to fight, and so becomes one eighth the size of the universe. And I could go on and enumerate these steps, but why should I when here you are?

* Editor's note: the following 6 lines are missing in the Golden Era audio version.

Your size in relationship to the universe is directly determined by only one thing: is the amount of randomness you care to confront in the universe, or the amount of attack you think you're subjected to or care to subject the universe to. That determines your thetan size. That's how big you are as a thetan. It's how much you feel you can take on, or how much you feel may take you on.

Now, let's look at the mathematics of a civilization. We have 100,000 people in this particular civilized strata – let's take some ancient civilization of no great size – 100,000 people in this civilization. And at first we say to these 99,999 people, other than self – we say to these fellows, “Well, I am as good as any of you and can take any one of you on. And maybe even take on two or three of you, or six or eight or twelve or fourteen. Who knows? In fact, I'm liable to take on anybody who messes me up.” And they think this way equally, see? And they're liable to take it out on you, too, you see? But – so on.

And then one day somebody breaks his neck or breaks his brain or something – some other vital part – and he can't fight. So he invents justice. And then he gets some other fellows that are pretty weak, and they band together, and they invent this thing called “justice.” And that is, justice consists only of this: that when the one individual, when the one individual errs, all other individuals in the society are banded together against him. And in the final analysis, that is justice.

You go out here and you lay your hand on a man's shoulder: that's an assault. So you have every member of the entire British Isles, collectively called the government, issuing a summons for your arrest. That makes you versus the government. Right?

Now, look. You were willing to take on one or two or three or four, or five or six, or when you were feeling good one morning, maybe ten or twelve. But now you're opposed with the idea of some tens of millions.

I love this gimmick: “The people versus John Jones.” Where the hell are these people? Well, they're a collective nonsense that was dreamed up by a bunch of birds who couldn't fight. That's about the only thing you can say about it.

Now, we expect in a group of men you will get a leading order of hens. I'm sorry to mix the metaphor, but... We expect this. We expect this.

You turn a bunch of knights loose in a tourney, and they're all going to wind up with a champion and a bird who disgraced himself, and between the rest of them, the rest are going to be stretched out on a gradient scale of who can lick who. But they very, very seldom form a council to go against all the knights of the realm this way, until they get into an order of knighthood or something like that. And they only get into orders of knighthood when a lot of them have been licked. And then you get orders of knighthood. Up to that time, nobody bothers, see? Do you see how this works?

But think over this proposition called civilization. It's rigged so that the individual, if he commits a fault, finds himself pitted against every other being in that whole realm.

And that, he conceives – I don't know really why he conceives this, by the way – but he conceives this a too-manyness. So he is overwhelmed and he is good and he obeys the law

of the realm – not because he thinks it’s a good law, not because he observes that it is right or not because he’s decided upon it; but he just obeys the law of the realm.

I used to always be able to put this into effect. You race out down the highways and you’re trying to bring law and order to an area; you hang a bunch of guys to the nearest trees. See, you just catch some birds that have been cutting purses or burning farms, or something like that or – it doesn’t matter much where you get the bodies. But hang them up on some scaffolds and trees, very visibly, you see? And law and order spreads in all direction.

That’s because you and maybe four or five men-at-arms are more than any robber band. And you are law and order. You get the idea? And it’s just simply the matter – it’s this equation: “You rob somebody, without any reason, we will hang you as soon as we can catch you.” You see, this simple, simple equation, simple arithmetic. So they stop robbing people. See, people who would rob people tend not to rob people because they figure that guy, and so forth, will overwhump us. You get the idea?

Now, when you get old and you get creaky, and the climate of France and England has at last entered your bones to the point of arthritis, you of course subscribe to justice, and you invent this thing. Instead of you there with a strong right arm, you see, you say, “Well, look, ‘the people’ will get after you.” See, a considerable police force. But it’s “the people” who will get after you, and you’re being hung by “the people.”

I never really bought that sort of justice. Any justice that I ever brought to an area was exactly this other type of justice, as crude as that may be.

“All right, you robbed the coach, we’re hanging you.”

And guy would say, “Well, my laws and my rights, and the Magna Carta, and so forth,” and he’d go right on talking right up to the time when you pulled the rope check.

But I’d always let them know that it hasn’t anything to do – “This is a peculiarity of mine. We have peace in this area. And we’re going to have peace in this area. And we’re going to have lots of peace in the area, not because you want it and not because the people want it, but just because I say so.” And in that way may have escaped a lot of motivators and overts, because it was honest.

I’d always hated this other idea. I knew there was something wrong with this other idea. I couldn’t quite figure out what was wrong with the other idea.

But isn’t it a masterly gimmick? Look it over as a mechanism. You do wrong, and instantly you are going to have as your enemy several tens of millions of people. Isn’t that a muchness? Huh?

Well, all “goodness” is brought about by force, whether individually delivered or delivered collectively. And goodness is never brought about by philosophic persuasion.

Three guys observe that they get a lot of planting and hunting done as long as they don’t knock each other’s heads off. They observe that one day they knock each other’s around, and they don’t get so much hunting done the next day, and they say, “That’s a stupid idea. Let’s have some peace and declare war on somebody else.”

Well, all right. That’s an incipient and a quite proper civilization, because it’s based upon the fact that they have observed, they have decided, and that is the way they act.

“Ah, but, you see, law and order and justice actually are the best things, and they’re the best principles, and you should be a very lawful person, and – or your father and I will hate you. And uh... we uh... And you see that policeman down the street. Well, he’ll arrest you. And there are thousands of them.” And I wouldn’t say any duress had ever been brought against you to be good.

Now, and one of the oddities of it is that man is basically good. This is the oddity. But that he gets a synthetic bad valence. He gets a synthetic valence. He gets a mocked-up “baddy,” see? And then he can get into this valence of being bad, and after that you have bad men. It’s quite amazing.

If you don’t believe this, process somebody someday on the basis of bad valences. And you’ll find out these are the wildest synthetic valences you ever saw in your life. They’re described to him, they are borrowed from him, they’re his concept. You realize every 3D Criss Cross item is either some life that you yourself have lived, or its oppterm is merely your ideas of somebody else. There isn’t a somebody-else in the whole bank. Do you see? There’s never a somebody-else. It’s only you and your ideas of. No oppterm of any kind whatsoever.

Now, what does this all add up to? Well, it adds up to the fact that if man is basically good the only thing wrong with him is his imprisonment in evil. But the evil is false. This is quite interesting. If the evil is false, what would happen if you set him free? He becomes good.

Ah, then what witchcraft has been worked here? We tell a fellow he is evil, and we convince him one way or the other that he shouldn’t attack, because other things are good and he is evil.

And we just have another civilization mechanism.

And one of the ways of phrasing it is that everything done by you will be revisited [visited] upon you. That’s karma.

“You will pay for everything you have ever done”: that’s karma. And a lot of people get the overt-motivator sequence mixed up with karma. They are not the same thing.

The overt-motivator sequence means that you have to lay yourself open to feeling bad about something – to a motivator – with an overt. That’s true, too. But do you know how it’s true? It says there’s an area you mustn’t attack. And that becomes the keynote and the whole swan song of a people: There are things you mustn’t attack.

The only reason that wall is stably there for you and can trap you is because somewhere down deep you consider it sacred. Did you know you considered the wall sacred? But you do. You have certain sacred valences; they mustn’t be attacked. You’ve convinced everybody they mustn’t be attacked.

The priestess: She walks up the temple steps and turns around to the multitude, and she says, “Peace,” and they serve her up for stew. She’s a religious figure. She shouldn’t be attacked.

The toughest valences you are holding on to in 3D Criss Cross are the same wool and warp of this civilize structure. They are merely mechanisms to prevent you from being attacked.

And that's why you have withholds. The reason you withhold something is to prevent yourself from being attacked. You've all done something at some time or another, anyone has done something at some time or another, in a civilization, where this civilization mechanism goes into effect. You would be attacked if it were known, see? You'd be attacked if it were known. You know that.

I can think of dozens of police forces, not only in this galaxy, that would love to have my name and address right now. As a matter of fact, they have it. Well, come to think about it, the shoe is slightly on the other foot.

But we've got a matter here of the sacredness of beingness. You got the idea? A good, nonattackable beingness. Hoohoo! That's the thing, see?

Only trouble is, we fall for the other unattackable beingnesses around us. People are horrified when they hear me giving the Christian church what-not. Every once in a while we get fantastic comments on this subject. I don't see it myself, although I've had ample reason to believe that people get upset about this. See? I believe people get upset about this; I don't believe you shouldn't attack it. I think all mechanisms of slavery should be attacked.

Now, the basic mechanism by which people are persuaded not to attack is to show them that attacking will hurt them. And that is the whole lesson they try to teach in war. You go over a parapet and across an open field up against machine guns, and if you're damn fool enough to have a meat body with you, you're liable to get some holes in it, you know? The air is liable to start going through where the bullets went. You see that? That's a bum thing you're doing, you know? You get punished for attacking.

But you kick a stone and you'll get punished for attacking. But why does a stone hurt you? Well, you must consider that it shouldn't be attacked. You must consider that the MEST universe should not be attacked. Well, look-a-here, it's here. Nobody has as-ised it. So obviously it's under the curse of no attack. See, you mustn't attack. It attacks you though, doesn't it? I think that's fascinating. Every once in a while a cliff falls on your head, something like that, but you mustn't attack it. Sounds to me like a wonderful mechanism for keeping a universe going.

But now we move into the overt-motivator sequence, having observed that if you attack into the teeth of spitting machine guns, you get your guts full of lead. Having observed this, it is very easy, you see, that any evil act you do to others will be visited on you. See, after a guy has had the first lesson – you know, he kicks the stone, the stone hurts him; he's charged the machine gun, and the machine gun has shot him – then that he will harm himself for knocking somebody's block off.

And the next thing you know, there he is with a withered arm. Didn't even hurt him actually. This bird was a totally defenseless goof, and he walked along and he went pow! you know? And the other guy's head fell right straight off, you know? The next thing you know, the guy has got a withered arm. You want to cure it as an auditor, you run out the knocking

off the other fellow's head. Well, I'll be a son of a gun, his arm all of a sudden works! Because you've created a miracle.

There's a further miracle that you could create. How come it got withered just by knocking off somebody's head? Now, it didn't even hurt his hand! Where did that mechanism come from? And that's the overt-motivator sequence. Where did it come from?

It comes from this one mechanism of "You attack things, you will be hurt." And if you can teach enough people that, you have a civilization. But they will all be enslaved, they will all be trapped; and none of them will be able to clearly observe, to clearly decide or to decisively act. And they will all sooner or later go crazy.

Now, when I have said these few choice words, I've described everything there is really wrong with the human mind. There isn't anything else. There's no other outstanding phenomena, in the final analysis. Once you know the basic phenomena of Scientology – that is, the as-ising and energy and pictures and what the universe is composed of, and the Axioms and things of this particular character – you get down to that as far as processing is concerned, the only thing that you've got in your thetan bank at the particular moment that is giving you an awful lot of trouble is something you know you had better not attack.

The consequences of attack overweigh you so heavily that you will not attack it. Otherwise it will disappear. If you attack it, it will disappear. That's one penalty, but it is the only penalty. There are no other penalties. All other penalties are totally imaginary, and at this stage of development of Scientology can be considered so, wholly and completely.

I'm not now giving you processes to run on this. I'm trying to get you to understand this philosophically – understand it, on the head end, that there is no liability for attacking anything, but there is tremendous liability for not attacking. There's tremendous liability.

That sounds like we're going to make a lot of vicious people. [laughter] Well, if they all become vicious before they come good again on the other end, I'll just have to live through it, and so will you, because that's the way it is.

But there is obsessive attack – people could no longer control their ability to attack; there's all kinds of species of wildness and gyratingness and upsettedness and so forth. They're all misemotional and none of it under control. Overt attack never got anybody in trouble. Never – really never did.

The only thing that you ever lose when you do that is some havingness or something like that. It's about the only thing. But if it's a havingness you don't want, what's the difference?

Well, that doesn't erase the fact that the overt-motivator sequence, you understand – that doesn't erase the fact that it works. You can take it apart, you can get withholds, you can do all these things which you know how to do. I have just been busily trying to get to the root of the structure and find out exactly how it stood, and so forth, to find out if it could be swept away when we reach into Class IV with 3D Criss Cross items. And I find out that it can be swept away, and the residuals and so forth of the bank have as their common denominator things that must not be attacked, reasons why one shouldn't attack, reasons why one shouldn't

be attacked, reasons why one shouldn't attack others, ways and means of restraining oneself from attacking others, etc., etc., etc., ad nauseam. You understand?

And out of this you get all kinds of minor things like criticism, and you get all this kind of thing. And you also get overt-motivator sequence. But it's just one phenomena amongst many. Okay?

Thank you very much for staying over. Good night.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 JULY 1964

Remimeo
Sthil Students
Franchise

OVERTS – ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING

(STAR RATED except for Forbidden Words List)

It will be found in processing the various case levels that running overts is very effective in raising the cause level of a pc.

The scale, on actual tests of running various levels of pc response, is seen to go something like this:

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------|---|
| I | ITSA – | Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about self with little or no auditor direction. |
| I | ITSA – | Letting a pc discuss his or her guilt feelings about others, with little or no auditor direction. |
| II | REPETITIVE O/W – | Using merely “In this lifetime what have you done?” “What haven’t you done?” Alternate. |
| III | ASSESSMENT BY LIST – | Using existing or specially prepared lists of possible overts, cleaning the meter each time it reads on a question and using the question only so long as it reads. |
| IV | JUSTIFICATIONS – | Asking the pc what he or she has done and then using that one instance (if applicable) finding out why “that” was <i>not</i> an overt. |

Advice enters into this under the heading of instruction: “You’re upset about that person because you’ve done something to that person.”

Dynamics also permissively enter into this above Level I but the pc wanders around amongst them. In Level III one can also direct attention to the various dynamics by first assessing them and then using or preparing a list for the dynamic found.

RESPONSIBILITY

There is no reason to expect any great pc responsibility for his or her own overts below Level IV and the auditor seeking to make the pc feel or take responsibility for overts is just pushing the pc down. The pc will resent being made feel guilty. Indeed the auditor may only achieve that, not case gain. And the pc will ARC break.

At Level IV one begins on this subject of responsibility but again it is indirectly the target. There is no need now to run Responsibility in doing O/Ws.

The realization that one has *really* done something is a return of responsibility and this gain is best obtained only by indirect approach as in the above processes.

ARC BREAKS

The commonest cause of failure in running overt acts is “cleaning cleans” whether or not one is using a meter. The pc who really has more to tell doesn’t ARC Break when the Auditor continues to ask for one but may snarl and eventually give it up.

On the other hand leaving an overt touched on the case and calling it clean *will* cause a *future* ARC Break with the auditor.

“Have you told all?” prevents cleaning a clean. On the unmetered pc one can see the pc brighten up. On the meter you get a nice fall if it’s true that all is told.

“Have I not found out about something?” prevents leaving an overt undisclosed. On the unmetered pc the reaction is a sly flinch. On a metered pc it gives a read.

A pc’s *protest* against a question will also be visible in an unmetered pc in a reeling sort of exasperation which eventually becomes a howl of pure bafflement at why the auditor won’t accept the answer that that’s all. On a meter protest of a question falls on being asked for: “Is this question being protested?”

There is no real excuse for ARC Breaking a pc by

1. Demanding more than is there or
2. Leaving an overt undisclosed that will later make the pc upset with the auditor.

FORBIDDEN WORDS

Do not use the following words in auditing commands. While they can be used in discussion or nomenclature, for various good reasons they should be avoided now in an auditing command:

- Responsibility (ies)
- Justification (s)
- Withhold (s)
- Failed (ures)
- Difficulty (ies)
- Desire (s)
- Here
- There
- Compulsion (s) (ively)
- Obsession (s) (ively)

No unusual restraint should be given these words. Just don't frame a command that includes them. Use something else.

WHY OVERTS WORK

Overts give the highest gain in raising cause level because they are the biggest reason why a person restrains himself and withholds self from action.

Man is basically good. But the reactive mind tends to force him into evil actions. These evil actions are instinctively regretted and the individual tries to refrain from doing *anything* at all. The "best" remedy, the individual thinks, is to withhold. "If I commit evil actions, then my best guarantee for not committing is to do *nothing* whatever." Thus we have the "lazy", inactive person.

Others who try to make an individual guilty for committing evil actions only increase this tendency to laziness.

Punishment is supposed to bring about inaction. And it does. In some unexpected ways.

However, there is also an inversion (a turn about) where the individual sinks *below* recognition of *any* action. The individual in such a state cannot conceive of *any* action and therefore cannot withhold action. And thus we have the criminal who can't act really but can only re-act and is without any self direction. This is why punishment does not cure criminality but in actual fact creates it; the individual is driven below withholding or any recognition of any action. A thief's hands stole the jewel, the thief was merely an innocent spectator to the action of his own hands. Criminals are very sick people physically.

So there is a level below withholding that an auditor should be alert to in some pcs, for these "have no withholds" and "have done nothing". All of which, seen through *their* eyes is true. They are merely saying "I cannot restrain myself" and "I have not willed myself to do what I have done."

The road out for such a case is the same as that for any other case. It is just longer. The processes for levels above hold also for such cases. But don't be anxious to see a *sudden* return of responsibility, for the first owned "done" that this person *knows* he or she has done may be "ate breakfast". Don't disdain such answers in Level II particularly. Rather, in such people, seek such answers.

There is another type of case in all this, just one more to end the list. This is the case who never runs O/W but "seeks the explanation of what I did that made it all happen to me".

This person easily goes into past lives for answers. Their reaction to a question about what they've done is to try to find out what they did that earned all those motivators. That, of course, isn't running the process and the auditor should be alert for it and stop it when it is happening.

This type of case goes into its extreme on guilt. It dreams up overts to explain why. After most big murders the police routinely have a dozen or two people come around and confess. You see, if they had done the murder, this would explain why they feel guilty. As a ter-

ror stomach is pretty awful grim to live with, one is apt to seek any explanation for it if it will only explain it.

On such cases the same approach as given works, but one should be *very* careful not to let the pc get off overts the pc didn't commit.

Such a pc (recognizable by the ease they dive into the extreme past) when being audited off a meter gets more and more frantic and wilder and wilder in overts reported. They should get calmer under processing, of course, but the false overts make them frantic and hectic in a session. On a meter one simply checks for "Have you told me anything beyond what really has occurred?" Or "Have you told me any untruths?"

The observation and meter guides given in this section are used during a session when they apply but not systematically such as after every pc answer. These observations and meter guides are used always at the end of every session on the pcs to whom they apply.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nb.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 JULY 1964

Remimeo
Franchise
Sthil Students

Scientology I to IV

MORE ON O/WS

The Itsa processes for O/W are almost unlimited.

There is, however, the distinct *must not* at Level I, as at upper Levels, **don't run a process that makes the pc feel accused.**

A pc *will* feel accused if he is run above his or her level. And remember that temporary sags in level can occur such as during ARC Breaks with the auditor or life.

A process can be accusative because it is worded too strongly. It can be accusative to the pc because the pc feels guilty or defensive anyway.

At Level I proper O/W processes can take up the troubles that are described as peculiar to some pcs without getting too personal about it.

Here are some varied Level I Processes:

- "Tell me some things you think you should not have done."
- "Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble."
- "What wouldn't you do over again?"
- "What are some things a person shouldn't say?"
- "What gets a person into trouble?"
- "What have you done that you regret?"
- "What have you said you wish you hadn't?"
- "What have you advised others to do?"

There are many more.

These at Level II all convert to repetitive processes.

At Level III such processes convert to lists.

At Level IV such processes convert to how they weren't overts or weren't really done or justifications of one kind or another.

Care should be taken not to heavily run an out-of-ARC type process. This is the command which asks for out-of-Affinity moments, out-of-Reality moments and out of-Communication incidents.

All *after* charge is based on prior ARC. Therefore for a withhold to exist there must have been communication earlier. ARC incidents are basic on all chains. Out of ARC are later on the chain. One has to get a basic to blow a chain. Otherwise one gets recurring answers. (Pc brings up same incident over and over as you don't have the basic on the chain.)

You can alternate an ARC command with an out-of-ARC command. "What have you done?" (means one had to reach for and contact) can be alternated with "What haven't you done?" (means not reached for and not contacted).

But if one runs the out-of-ARC (not reached for and not contacted) process *only* the pc will soon bog.

On the other hand an ARC process runs on and on with no bad side effects, i.e. "What have you done?"

"What *bad* thing have you done?" is a mixture of ARC and out-of-ARC. *Done* reached and contacted. *Bad* wished one hadn't.

So solely accusative commands upset the pc not because of social status or insult but because a pc, particularly at lower levels of case, wishes so hard he hadn't done it that a real bad done is really a withhold and the pc not only withholds it from the auditor but himself as well.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 8 FEBRUARY 1962

Franchise

URGENT

MISSED WITHHOLDS

The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is **Missed Withholds** and the upsets they cause.

Every upset with Central Orgs, Field Auditors, pcs, the lot, is traceable to one or more **Missed Withholds**.

Every ARC Breaky pc is ARC Breaky because of a Missed Withhold. Every dissatisfied pc is dissatisfied because of **Missed Withholds**.

We've got to get a flaming reality on this.

What is a Missed Withhold?

A missed withhold is not just a withhold. Please burn that into the stone walls. A Missed Withhold is a withhold that existed, *could have been picked up* and was **missed**.

The mechanics of this are given in the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lecture of 1 February 1962.

The fact of it is stated in the Congress Lectures of the D.C. Congress of December 30-31, Jan. 1, 1962.

Since that Congress even more data has accumulated. That data is large, voluminous and overwhelming.

The person with complaints has **Missed Withholds**. The person with entheta has **Missed Withholds**. You don't need policies and diplomacy to handle these people. Policy and diplomacy will fail. You need expert auditing skill and a British Mark IV meter and the person on the cans and that person's **Missed Withholds**.

A **Missed Withhold** is a withhold that existed, was tapped and was not pulled. Hell hath no screams like a withhold scorned.

A **Missed Withhold** programme would not be one where an auditor pulls a pc's withholds. A **Missed Withhold** programme would be where the auditor searched for and found when and where withholds had been available but had been **missed**.

The withhold need not have been asked for. It merely need have been available. And if it was not pulled, thereafter you have a nattery, combative, ARC Breaky or entheta inclined person.

This is the only dangerous point in auditing. This is the only thing which makes an occasional error in the phrase, “Any auditing is better than no auditing.” That line is true with one exception. If a withhold were available but was missed, thereafter you have a bashed-up case.

HOW TO AUDIT IT

In picking up *Missed Withholds* you don’t ask for withholds, you ask for missed withholds.

Sample question:

“What withhold was missed on you?”

The auditor then proceeds to find out what it was and who missed it. And the Mark IV needle is cleaned of reaction at Sensitivity 16 on every such question.

Gone is the excuse “She doesn’t register on the meter.” That’s true of old meters, not the British Mark IV.

And if the pc considers it no overt, and can’t conceive of overts, you still have “didn’t know”. Example: “What didn’t an auditor know in an auditing session?”

SAMPLE MISSED WITHHOLD SESSION

Ask pc if anyone has ever missed a withhold on him (her) in an auditing session. Clean it. Get all reactions off the needle at Sensitivity 16.

Then locate first auditing session pc had. Flatten “What didn’t that auditor know?” “What didn’t that auditor know about you?”

For good measure get the ruds in for that first session. In auditing an auditor, also do the same thing for his or her first pc.

Then pick up any stuck session. Treat it exactly the same way. (If you scan the pc through all his auditing ever from the cleaned first session to present time, the pc will stick in a session somewhere. Treat that session the same as the first session. You can scan again and again, finding the stuck sessions and get the withholds off in that session and the ruds in as above.)

Clean up all sessions you can find. And get what the auditor didn’t know, what the auditor didn’t know about the pc, and for good measure, get in the other ruds.

Cleaning up an old session will suddenly give you all the latent gain in that session. It’s worth having!

This can be extended to “What didn’t the org know about you?” for those who’ve had trouble with it.

And it can be extended to any life area where the pc has had trouble.

SUMMARY

If you clean up as above withholds that have been missed on any pc or person, you will have any case flying.

This then is not just emergency data for use on flubbed intensives. It is vital technology that can do wonders for cases.

On any case that has been audited a part of an intensive, before going on the auditor should spend some time locating withholds he or she might have missed on that pc.

Any pc that is ending a week’s auditing should be carefully checked over for withholds that might have been missed.

Any pc that is ending his or her intensives should be most carefully checked out for missed withholds. This makes sudden auditing gains.

Any case not up to recognizing overts will respond to “didn’t know about you” when the case doesn’t respond to “withhold”.

Any student should be checked weekly for missed withholds.

Any person who is giving an auditor, the field, the Organization, a course or Scientology any trouble should be gotten hold of and checked for missed withholds.

It is provenly true on five continents that *any* other meter reaches only occasionally below the level of consciousness and the British Mark IV reaches deeply and well. It is dangerous to audit without a meter because then you really miss withholds. It is dangerous to audit without knowing how to really use a meter because of missing withholds. It is dangerous to audit with any other meter than a British Mark IV. It is **safe** to audit if you can run a meter and if you use a British Mark IV and if you pull all the withholds and missed withholds.

Every blow-up you ever had with a pc was due **entirely** to having missed a withhold whether you were using a meter or not, whether you were asking for withholds or not.

Just try it out the next time a pc gets upset and you’ll see that I speak the usual sooth.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.rd

Missed Withholds

A lecture given on 22 May 1962

I'm gonna make this one short. 15 minute lecture. 10 minute lecture. On the subject of missed withholds – pick them up. Well that's it folks, good evening. (laughter)

Fast lecture.

Lecture two. Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Is that going?

Voice: Yes.

(noises)

I'll be darned, it's got a strobe effect against the light and it was absolutely stopped in it's rotation. Now I've seen it all. Lecture two.

Lecture two, May the – what did you say it was?

Audience: Twenty-second.

Twenty-second. I get so mixed up on this planet's time. I don't know this planet's time at all. AD 12, English weather. [laughter]

This is a lecture on the subject of missed withholds.

Now, there's a long and involved bulletin on the subject which I haven't got in my hand, but some of you may have.

(noises)

That's it, I've got em. Thank you.

And this has to do with several bulletins, amongst them HCO Bulletin of May the 24th, also HCO Bulletin of May the 21st, and HCO Bulletin of May the 22nd – last two are relatively unimportant.

Now, you are going round and round about this proposition of TRs and how you ask for this and that and exactly how you do this. And this bulletin of May the 24th talks about Q and A and there has been a great deal of misunderstanding about Q and A because there wasn't a real hot communication on what Q and A was. See, there has been a lot of talk about Q and A, but a real hot thing ...

Now it sounds like, when you read this bulletin, that I knew what Q and A was all the time. You see? And I'm talking to you as – it doesn't sound this way, but you could take it that – I was talking to you as, "You dullard, why didn't you know this?"

Well, the truth of the matter is, there is at least a third of this data – probably the most important third – was unknown. And I just recently discovered this thing. And the term Q and A fits in gorgeously if you interpret it as: questioning the pc's answer. So it really ought to be Q an A, no "d" on the "and." Question an answer.

Well, if you apply that principle "question an answer" throughout here, you get all three types. You get double questioning. Well, that's the pc says something and he gives you a reply to your question and then you question his answer. See? Well, of course, that is no acknowledgment and that is just a setup for an ARC break.

And Q and A also would be changing because the pc changes. In other words, you run a process on the pc and then the pc answers up this process – nicely and neatly – by changing, you see? And right in the middle of the change, because he's changed, you change.

In other words, you give the pc what he's giving you, you see? But you again are questioning the fact that he's changing. His response to the process is being questioned.

And then the next thing is, following the pc's instructions comes under this. Now, you've got a total reversal of the whole thing, and because the pc – obviously knows far more about his case than we do, or something of the sort, don't you see – why, therefore, it's always best, you see, to do what he says.

In other words, that Q and A hardly is the questioning of the pc. That is a Q and A of me. See? That's questioning my answers to his case. That's kind of stringing a longbow – an amusing way to put it. We've got the answers. If you know them and you can apply them, why, you'll get there. And if you keep finding holes in the line, why, we'll find some more that we didn't even know existed, but basically, an auditor must stay in control of the auditing session. There is *no* doubt about this.

Well, the way an auditor stays in control of the auditing session is to stay at cause over the session and put the pc at cause over his case. And if we don't stay at cause over the session, the pc cannot stay at cause over his case. He goes to effect. Because you see, we're raising the pc's causativeness by making the pc confront. And if we don't make the pc confront, the pc will just obey his bank and his bank says "don't confront."

Now, a full cycle of action must exist with an auditing command – a full cycle of action. And you can't have a muddy cycle of action.

Well, this puts a tremendous responsibility on the auditor to ask the right auditing question. You say, "What should I be running on you today?" You have asked a wrong question. You can't [can] ask wrong auditing questions. You can say, "Have you had a motivator lately?" [laughter] And that is a wrong auditing question.

So there are two conditions which can exist here: is a wrong auditing question and a failure to let a cycle complete itself. You can do these two things, both of them quite deadly.

Wrong auditing question: "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Now, we didn't know this was wrong a short time ago, but it is quite wrong because the pc can answer it with a motivator response. You've managed to dig that up for me. Pcs were never ambitious enough to do that for me. They just took the easy route and did what I want, but – most have found by experience that it was easier to do that.

But answering with a motivator has happened in many cases. So you mustn't ask a middle rudiments or a rudiment-type question which permits the pc to give a motivator response, because the pc is then throwing the end rudiments out.

Now, you mustn't throw your end rudiments out. This is the wrong auditing question. This is also part of the wrong auditing question. You mustn't permit the pc to throw his end rudiments out. You've got to keep his end rudiments in.

And if you look over the end rudiments, you will see there are several that can go out and if any of those end rudiments go out, the pc will go out of session. So if you ask an auditing question which permits the pc to let his end rudiments go out, you've cut your throat. Now, let's get the middle rudiments in by throwing the end rudiments out, and then we've got a nice dog's breakfast.

Let's say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. My pc – I've been sitting here thinking how mean my pc has been to me in the last few sessions."

Oh man, you've had it because, unless – you're in for a Q and A. Now if you keep the end rudiment from going out – this is the problem you've posed yourself – to keep the end rudiment from going out, you've got to Q-and-A. You can't permit the cycle to be finished. He just got through damaging his own pc.

Now these two things have to be held in balance, don't you see? This is a real crazy one. By asking a wrong auditing question you will inevitably throw yourself into a Q and A, because you've got to question the pc's answer.

You say, "Has anybody been mean to you lately?"

And the pc says, "Oh, yes. Yes, yes. Herbie's been mean to me and Reg has been mean to me. All my fellow students have been mean to me." I'm not talking about any particular student. [laughs]

All right. You've just thrown the end rudiments wildly out. Now, suppose you correct this. Supposing you ask some equivocal thing like, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

"Yes. I was sitting here realizing that Mike has a deep, sadistic tendency."

Ooh, you've had it here. Now what have you done, you see? You asked a question which was equivocal. The pc gives you an answer which throws the end rudiments out. Now the only way you can correct this is with a Q and A. You can't buy this answer. This is the auditor's dilemma that I am giving you here. You can't buy this answer because you've thrown the end rudiment out.

You would question the answer in any event, even if you said promptly, "In this session have you damaged anyone?"

The pc would still realize that his answer had been questioned. That's – see, the auditor's dilemma. You ask a wrong question, you will Q-and-A every time.

So you've got to ask the type of question – I'm not giving you now words – I'll give you the principle back of such wording. You must ask a type of question which makes a Q and A very unlikely. I will not use the word "impossible." [laughter]

Now, you can judge whether or not the wording of a middle rudiment or a Prepcheck question or anything else – you could judge whether or not a question you're asking the pc is right just on that formula alone. Is it one which will lead to a possibility of having to question the pc's answer? And if it is, then it is to greater or lesser degree a wrong question, because he's going to give you a response which you then must question.

You're going to have to question his answer, and then he's going to feel like he's not acknowledged, and then he's going to feel like he can't talk to you, and then he's going to go out of session. And there goes all of your beginning ruds and all the end ruds.

Now, that's where you should direct your consideration of what you are doing with the pc. You must not Q-and-A. To prevent Q and A, you must ask the right auditing question. What is a right auditing question? One that will produce an answer you do not have to challenge.

That is the perfect auditing question: a question that will produce an answer from the pc that does not have to be challenged or qualified in any way by the auditor. You mustn't question an answer.

Now, here's a perfect Q and A – in case somebody came in late and doesn't have a copy of the bulletin – here's a perfect Q and A:

We run into Joe. We say to Joe, "How are you, Joe?"

And Joe says, "Awful."

And we say, "What's wrong?"

Well that's very socially acceptable. You'll hear it up and down the highroads and by-ways in every language, including the Chinese and Scandinavian. Everybody does it. It's social machinery. It would be unsympathetic of us not to do it.

We ask a question. We say, "Well, have you had a good day, Bill?"

We meet Bill, you know? And Bill says, "No." Inevitably, we have to amplify the thing, see? So we say, "Well, what happened?"

That's a Q and A: That questions the pc's answer.

Correct. This is correct:

"How are you?"

"Awful."

"Good." [laughter]

When you get an answer like that, it is much more polite to say, "Thank you."

Do you know, the funny part of it is even in social concourse, the fellow will feel better if you handled it that way. He told you how he felt, so give him the cheery ack, man – the cheery ack.

All right. Now let's take the auditing question. Now here's where auditors tie themselves, not just into knots, but double carrick bends, bowlines on a bight and other unlikely cask hitches, and so forth.

We're doing rudiments. We say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Well, what is it?"

Flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk! He answered our question. So therefore there's something a little bit phony with the question. See, that question is not the perfect auditing question. Because it isn't perfect, it leads us into a Q and A.

Now the best question, of course, would [be] one which would require him to tell us. So you would have to add to it, "and if so, tell me what it is." [laughter, laughs]

You don't always run into this problem, but the proper non Q-and-A response is "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc says, "Yes."

You say, "Thank you. I will check it on the meter."

So, therefore, the slightly offbeat question leads us into an inevitability of a Q and A because we would be prompted to say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

And the auditor would be prompted to say, "Yeah, well, what is it?"

Hey! Wait a minute. The guy did answer your auditing question. Your answer – I mean, question – is "Do you have a present time problem?"

You cut his comm, it'll throw him out of session; you've thrown the remaining rudiments out, don't you see?

The trick of keeping rudiments in is not throwing the others out while you're getting one in. And in view of the fact that there are more you are not working than the one you are working, [laughter] the probability of your doing this is great if you don't know this rule about the perfect auditing question and what a Q and A is.

You can throw these things out wildly if you don't. Now, auditing is of course, is what you get away with and you don't run into this *in extremis*. Most times it goes off just fine.

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

And the fellow says, "Yes. I had a fight last night with my auditor."

Your proper response to that is, "Good," or "Thank you." The Q-and-A response would be "What about?"

And that just throws the comm straight out the window, you see, because it's an incomplete cycle; you have not bought the pc's communication; the pc will go out of session and rudiments start shedding out of the session like a white dog when you're wearing a blue suit.

There you are. You've had it, don't you see?

Now, auditors do these others such as changing because the pc changes. An auditor who does this constantly, after it's been called to his attention, just should be shot. I mean there is no other cure for it. I see them keep it up, you know? Actually, it tokens tremendous impatience. That is all.

This auditor is so anxious to do something for this pc that he's got to do it all in the next ten seconds. And therefore, he won't even run the full bracket. See, he'll do something like this. Actually, he's trying to help the pc like mad, usually. "Think of a problem you could confront. Think of a problem you could confront. Think – how are you getting along on that process? Think of a problem you could confront. Think of a prob--- how are you getting along? Do you have problems now? You Clear yet?" [laughter] "Oh, well, we'll have to do something else. Let's see. Invent a problem. Invent a problem. That's best. How you doing? You Clear yet? Well, maybe we shouldn't be running Problems at all. Uh – let's – let's get down to something more fundamental. You used to talk about your mother an awful lot – uh – let's see. Now – uh, what has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. What has your mother done to you? Thank you. We don't seem to be getting anyplace here. What has your mother done to you? Ah, well, let's skip that."

Do you know auditors actually have done this? I'm not just joking on something that has never existed. You see it less commonly that way. More commonly, they will change from session to session. They won't flatten what they did in the last session because it's much better what they thought of today, you see?

So that type of thing – the auditor just simply needs training, but basically needs some confidence.

This auditor will also go off into extraordinary solutions very easily because he doesn't have any confidence in the ordinary doing anything because he's never done it.

And as far as following the pc's instructions again, you get a pc who is blasty, who is upset, who is misemotional, and so forth, and a lot of auditors just back out of it. And then they will do what the pc wants them to do. And it just about kills the pc. That's the usual source of that.

We're not worrying about that right now, however, we're worrying about this most basic and fundamental Q and A for which we do have an immediate and direct cure.

The first cure is always ask the right auditing question. The right auditing question is one which prohibits a Q and A.

There is no perfect right auditing question. You actually can get along with relatively sloppy ones like, "Do you have a present time problem?" Nobody has ever run into this so seriously on the present time problems.

"Yes," the pc says.

But it's a bad auditing question because it can be replied to so that you have to say, "Well, what is it? Heh-heh." Of course, that's a Q and A. The pc answered it, and now you pretend that the pc hasn't answered it. But the pc did answer it. Well, the pc gets the idea that he hasn't answered it, so there, if he hasn't answered it – you don't think he's answered it – then he knows what position he's in. He knows he's not in-session because the auditor didn't hear him. So therefore he must be withholding, so therefore he must be a missed withhold.

And if he's a missed withhold, then the thing for him to be is mad at the auditor. Very logical. But you'll find out that that is one hundred percent just like that. The exact mental response of one hundred percent of your pcs, no matter whether they look nice about it or look happy about it or anything else, that is the response of every pc who sits in front of you.

If you want to drive ... Take the mildest, best, goodest, most educated pc you ever had anything to do with; pc's never really been in-session; he just – sort of socially answers, responses, you see, and tries to be nice about the whole thing; and you never really get a bite on his case; and he's always sitting there in a very quiet, charming, nice – never makes any changes. You ever see this pc? Pc exists.

Take this perfect pc who never has any changes and just start this racket on this pc.

"Do you have a present time problem? Have you ever had a present time problem in your whole life? Yes, I know, but yes," you say, "Yes, I know, but have you ever had a problem in your whole life?"

The pc answers something. You say, "Well but – now look, look, look, look, listen now. In your whole life have you ever had a problem?" See?

And the pc says, "Well, yes, I – I – I had appendicitis and – and uh – and – so – so forth."

And you say, "Uh – now look, I'm talking to you. Do you have – you, see? Have – have *you*, you – right there, you know? Have you ever had a problem in your whole life? I – I want – I want you to tell me now."

And the pc, "If – I – yeah, my back's out and they gave me something."

"When are you going to tell me? Now just own up to it. A problem?" And listen, you keep up some kind of a racket like that – you could make it more flagrant than that – and do you know, you think a pc is peculiar who screams. You think this is a certain type of pc. Well, I assure you that that is not a type of pc – that's a type of auditor. Because you can drive that good pc, that perfectly educated pc, you can drive them absolutely into a screaming funk that you have just never heard the like of. You would just never dream that a human being can be that upset. And you can do it to every pc you audit.

And when this is done too much to a pc; when it's done at the wrong moments; when processes are also changed on the pc too often and when the pc is also giving auditing direc-

tions which have been accepted, and let's composite the whole thing, you see? We get somebody – all you have to do is look like you haven't received the question and thereafter the guy will start screaming – just look like you haven't heard him. You know? Be looking at the window when he speaks. You were going to come in right afterwards and say, "Yeah. All right. Thank you." you were going to do that, but you just paused for just a split second, and he saw that you were looking at the window and he'll start screaming.

"God damn you. You ought to go back to the Academy and, Jesus Christ, whoever the hell told you you were an auditor? For Christ's sake!" That's it.

In other words, you the auditor, can create that state of mind. You can create that situation much more easily than baking a birthday cake.

Now, I'm not talking now – because I myself a few times have been driven into "Christ almighty!" you know? I think poor Philip one day – I only did once – he missed fifteen or twenty. And the next thing you know, he – going like this because I had said a couple of very mean things – which of course I didn't mean – but the guy had just ... I'm not always a good pc or a bad pc, but just all of a sudden the no acknowledgment, the no acknowledgment, the no acceptance of the answer, something like that, and you sit there in amazement.

You sit back here – I've got a good reality on it and you say, "What the hell?" You know? You're saying, "For Christ's sakes, why don't you get your mind on it?" You know? And you sit back and look at yourself, "Did I say that? Huh? Was that me? Who was that? Did I hear some noise in here?" Because you're in the irresponsibility, of course, of being a pc, and you just react.

I did it to a pc, almost with malice, one time, but actually not on purpose. And that was when I learned exactly what the mechanism of it was. I had to look at exactly what had been going on. And I analyzed it and then I turned around and I did it again and brought the same response.

Now, I've taken other pcs and I can start up the same response. And then I analyze any situation where that is occurring and I find the same response. *That is it*, man.

Of course, the pc will go into apathy, go into a complete funk.

Now, there is an extreme action of questioning the pc's answer. That is the extreme response on the part of the pc to not receiving the pc's answer, because of course the pc thinks he's withholding.

And that's the whole mechanism – his replies have been missed. So therefore, he is a missed withhold. And he gets upset! Just as you'll find missed withholds works on everybody, so this mechanism will upset any pc.

But now look, look. Now listen to me very carefully. Do we have to produce the extreme state of screaming, of apathy, of making the pc ill, to have it in effect? I mean is there anything short of the extreme state? Oh, yes, yes. There is a twilight zone of in-session and out of session caused by the almost not-responded-to answer, the occasionally not-acknowledged reply by the pc. This sort of thing causes a borderline of not being out of ses-

sion totally and not being in-session, but just being in a condition where all the rest of the rudiments keep going out all the time.

Everything is sort of flying out, and you're sort of keeping the pc in session, you know, just – just by gripping the table edge with your fingernails, you know? It's just barely keeping the pc in-session.

What's the answer to it? Don't Q-and-A. The pc says something – acknowledge it. Well, how can you keep from Q-and-Aing? Always ask the right auditing question. Of course, that is impossible to bat one thousand on the right auditing question, so therefore, make up your mind whether you're occasionally going to accept some nonsense from the pc, or drive the pc into an ARC break. And, actually, if you ask the wrong auditing question, you are honor bound to buy the nonsense.

But what if the nonsense throws out the end rudiments? Then you've worsened the case. Then you have to get the end rudiments in. Now, we've got some kind of a chain reaction going.

You ask the wrong auditing question; you cannot directly acknowledge the question because it isn't the kind of answer that you want or is a damaging answer to the pc, so this throws out the end rudiments. Therefore, you have to get the end rudiments in in order to get this other rudiment in, and so forth. And then you ask this same question again, but of course, the pc gives you the wrong response which throws it – look at the chain reaction here. And that pc will not be in-session.

That is the only thing you can say about that – pc won't be in-session.

The pc will be half, three-quarters out of session all the time, all the time, all the time. Tone arm action is out and so forth. And then you have to become an absolute expert at putting middle rudiments in. Oh, you even develop systems sometimes to keep your middle rudiments in and you get very arduous. And it all stems back to the wrong auditing question in the first place, which forces you into a Q and A. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "Yes."

You say, "Well, what about?"

What's this? You know? So you've already driven it a little bit up the wall, see? The exact right response is, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Thank you. I will check it on the meter."

Now, for Christ's sakes, if you will pardon my French, don't ask him this again. See, if this is where we are going to get with this particular question, we had better ask a question which is far more intelligent, because there is an old, old datum that comes forward from 1950. And that is you can ask an auditing question once or twice without restimulating the pc.

You can always ask any process once or twice – even three times. But when you get up to three times, you're on the border of – now, you've got to flatten it from there on, see? Do you see what I mean?

So you can always ask a question, take the answer – it laid an egg. Well, let's sort out what would be the proper question here, now, and ask that question, get the answer to that and acknowledge it. But we'll do the pc far less damage if we do it that way. Far, far less damage if we do it that way than if we shift in midflight and Q-and-A.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Yes."

"Well, what is it about?" Oh, God, we've had it now. We've done a Q and A. Pc will go just that far out of session. Inevitably, although he looks – he still looks the same – you don't see it, it doesn't get written on his forehead in letters of fire – he has still done it. An invariable rule because it busts up the comm formula and does a lot of other things.

All right. So how do we approach this problem? We ask a question and if it obviously is the wrong question to ask and doesn't produce the answer, we back out of the same door we went in, gracefully, by completing the cycle of action always. You're always safer to complete the cycle of action.

Now, there's several other things you could do. You could do an interim: "I am not asking you questions. I am trying to find out what the responses are on this meter," like you have to do in Prepchecking. You say, "All right now. You don't have to answer any of these, but I'm going to ask you several little What questions about this thing and see what the best reaction we get now."

"Now, well, what about stealing vehicles? What about killing girlfriends? What about – whatever it is – yeah, well, what about stealing vehicles? Thank you. I got the What question now. All right. Now let's go back to this incident which you just had there. Good."

And we just prepcheck it. You see, there's a fumble period. I suppose you couldn't dignify it any more than call it a fumble period.

You ask a middle rudiment. Here's an example.

"In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" Cheerily, cheerily, cheerily. See, very happy – perfectly legitimate. You get away with it eighty-nine percent of the time. Oh, more than that – you'll probably get away with it ninety-five and a half percent of the time, you see? And it's those other few percent there and you run into that one head-on, see?

"Yes, I've been sitting here thinking what a rotten auditor you are. And how mean all the Instructors are to me."

And now, of course, you say, "Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" *Clank! Whew!* Now you see, right there you've had it, see? You know you're walking through the valley of death. You're walking down the street at sunset – let me put it that way – with Black Bart in town.

This is a deadly activity in which you are involved. So you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Now have I missed a withhold on you in this session?"

"Yes. I think you're giving me a bunch of no auditing. You know, I've had twenty auditors since I've been here, and you're the rottenest of the lot." [laughter]

Damage, half-truths, untruths. See, we're just compounding this felony, see, madly. So you say, "Good. Thank you. Have I missed a withhold – in this session have I missed a withhold on you?" How far can it go?

Well, you can not only take in all the end rudiments, you can also take in all the beginning rudiments. You can get them all out. See, that's the auditor's dilemma. Well, you're asking the wrong auditing question. So it is much safer to do it this way.

Oh, yeah, inevitably you will use something like: "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" for the excellent reason it lets him tell you the "thinks" and the other things. And you don't want to prepcheck this guy and go back and find all the things he has *done* to you because he hasn't done anything really in the session.

He did something this morning that you missed in the beginning rudiments, and so forth and et cetera, *ad nauseam*. Yeah, all those things are true. But you'll ask something like this, you see? And most of the time you get away with it. So you say, "In this session have I missed a withhold on you?"

"No." *Clank!*

"Thank you. I will check that on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?" *Clank!* And what are we going to do? Well, you just enter a fishing or fumble period. That is what you do. I've been trying to work out this data to a something-or-other and I have a package question which serves as a middle rudiments. "In this session..." I won't give you this package question. You'll start writing it down. But it'd be something like this: "In this session have you withheld, invalidated or suppressed any datum about listing, or anything about listing?" Do you understand?

I'm talking about just giving you an example of a package question. And you can name each one of these things as you go by, and you'll get the *fall*, you see? And you watch for the one that falls. That's very smooth. Otherwise, you're left in a fish and fumble period.

But, I don't care how perfect you make auditing, you'll still have fish and fumble periods. You say, "Well, just – just a minute. Let me check this over on the meter. Withhold, invalidation, suppression, untruth, half-truth, impression, impress, damage, command and a wrong command – haven't answered a command – meter. Meter. In this session, have I failed to find out something you were doing about a meter?" *Clang!*

And he says, "Eh – well, yes. Ha-ha – thanks. Ha-ha, ha-ha. Yeah, haha – I'm sitting here fiddling the cans so that you – so you'd get the goal 'to have more women' because I always get such a bang out of running heh-ha – that kind of a stuff, you know?" [laughter]

And you say, "Well, thank you. Thank you very much. I'll check that on the meter. Good. In this session have you tried to influence the meter?" whatever it is. "That's clean."

In other words, there's the fish and fumble period. You actually sort of run a little assessment so you could have a package question in the middle rudiments which would run a nice assessment for you. But if it were too long, you'd get lost.

Now if you're going to have such a package question, remember you're going to have to repeat it, so it had better be fairly standardized.

I'm telling you in this lecture how you figure these things out rather than giving you a bunch of pat data, you understand?

Now, there will always be a fish and fumble period in Prepchecking as far as I can figure it out. Otherwise, for the sake of smoothness and gallantry, you're throwing away efficiency. You're just discarding the possibility of getting the right What question.

You sit there and look at Mr. Meter and you say, "All right, let me test out a few questions here. Now what about throwing baseball bats at cops? What about throwing things at cops? What about doing things to cops? That's it. That's it. What about doing things to cops?"

"Now, you were just telling me about throwing a baseball bat at a cop. All right. When was that?" See, that's a fish and fumble period.

Well frankly, doing a list and nulling it is a fish and fumble period, isn't it? Well, there is always these areas in auditing when you're trying to find something out. And the mark of a good auditor is that he goes ahead and finds these things out without throwing the rudiments wildly out.

See, now you could go at this in such a way as to throw them wildly out. I'll give you an idea: "Well, this listing isn't going very well here, because I don't think you've given it very many right items for this particular list. They don't seem to really be the kind of item that I would expect on this list. So this is sort of – of crude here, and although we've listed 1285 items on this particular list and we only have two items on these other three lists, I – I think – I think what I'd better do is figure out some better wording for the goal we found. And see whether or not we can't get this thing more adequately worded, because this thing doesn't show a sign of blowing and we have twelve hundred and fifty items, you see, all on this one list, you see, and it shows no signs of anything happening. So I think we ought to go about it that way. And if that's all right with you, why, we'll go back to the Goals Assessment. Now, What have I done to you in this session that you are upset about? Good. Good. What was that? Yeah. Oh, I didn't do that, you know, at the beginning of the session."

Well, I think by the time you had done all that, you would have the pc ready for his – to be measured for his straightjacket. Particularly, is that type of auditing would have gradually led up with 825 withholds to the cubic withhold. That'd be very corny, wouldn't it. But the funny part of it is you can do some mighty wild, offbeat things in an auditing session if you do them very smoothly, particularly if they are in the guise of letting you find out where you're going, without giving the pc a bunch of missed withholds or making the pc withhold madly.

And the only thing you've got to avoid is committing yourself to a cycle of action you can't complete. And if you commit yourself to a cycle of action you can't complete, of course, you've had it. I'll give you the crudest, oldest example: "What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? Thank you. What has your boss done to you? What's the matter with you?"

See, that has committed you to a cycle you dare not complete. I'll give you another old-time process: "Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconscious-

ness. Thank you. We'll get you over being unconscious all the time. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. Mock up some unconsciousness. Thank you. What's the matter with you?"

In other words, that's committing yourself to a line of action you can't complete. Well, recognize that a question which lets the pc answer as a motivator in the middle rudiment is something you actually can't satisfactorily complete. It's all going to be astray. Something like this:

You're going to say, "In this session have I missed a withhold, on you?"

"Yes."

See, you sit there like an idiot, man.

Now, the wrong way to weight the thing is to throw it over onto a Q and A. That is always wrong, no matter what you do – it is always wrong. Let that be your guiding principle.

So you say, "Good. Thank you. I will check this on the meter. In this session have I missed a withhold on you? That's dirty as a dishrag. Thank you very much."

"Now, in this session have you been up to something I didn't latch onto?"

He says, "Yes." [laughter]

"All right. Good. Thank you. I will check the meter on that. In this session have you been up to something I didn't latch onto? That's dirty. Thank you." Let's see now.

All right. "Ah, what have you been up to that I didn't find out about?" [laughter] "Ooooooh! All right. Good. I will check that on the meter. What have you been up to that I didn't find out about? Thank you. That's clean."

See, the mistake you make is always beginning a cycle which you feel would be very unsatisfactory to complete. But the big mistake – the big mistake would be failing to complete a cycle you started.

Don't kid yourself. You're going to find yourself in an old bunch of Western tales by old Charlie Russell, the Western painter. He had an old plainsman named Bab, and Bab was talking about the time he was being chased by the Sioux Indians and he got into a canyon. And there was 10,000 Sioux came boiling in through the front of the canyon, you know filling it up to wall to wall. He kept backing up further and further into the canyon. He finally looks around over his shoulder and it's a box canyon; it's totally cleaned off. And old Bab sits back and relaxes and doesn't go on with the story until somebody prompts him and says, "Well, Bab, what the hell happened?"

"Oh," he said, "they killed me." That's where you're going to find yourself someday – back up that box canyon. There's no way out of it.

Well let me tell you. The way you never get out of it is with a Q and A. You just never get out of it with a Q and A. Ask the right auditing question, is the way to prevent Q and A.

And it's all right for you to sit there and tell me, "All right Ron, go on, invent the exact, perfect wording that always keeps us from never getting into a Q-and-A situation." I don't

know. I don't speak Chinese. I couldn't invent it in Chinese, so why do you demand I invent it in English.

Now, the joke of the thing is that I can give you a good approximation; I can give you a good code situation; I can give you something that is probably completely embracive about the thing.

Well let me tell you. Someday or another, you're going to run into somebody who is doing something weird, because pcs can invent them faster than you can cure them up, man. And you had better know the principles back of the auditing command – "the perfect auditing command," (quote) (unquote) – as well as the command itself, because you'll find yourself in a situation where the perfect auditing command doesn't pull the withhold.

And you say, where am I at? Well, you're at a position where you have to develop an auditing command which does get the pc to give you whatever the pc is doing, and which gives you at once the only real mistake that you can make – which is to fail to complete the cycle of action and to do a Q and A. If you Q-and-A at that point, why, you've lost that much of the pc in the session.

Now, you don't always notice that a pc has gone out of session because they sometimes drift out of session little by little, tiny by tiny by tiny. And the total aggregate of it is, is the guy is miles out of session, but he's gone on such a gradient scale, hardly anybody noticed.

It's like the prisoner that escaped from the jail. Just everyday they were supposed to be sitting on their bunks at the last inspection. And every night when the guard came by – this was an actual escape, by the way, from Alcatraz of all places – the prisoner was an inch closer to the door. And he gradually built it up so that the guard got so used to that, that he had a prisoner actually standing at the door at the time when the last inspection was made, do you see?

And finally, the prisoner was able to stand at the door and keep the automatic lock from going shut, opened the door and walked out and swam to San Francisco. I think they elected him mayor. Anyway ... [laughter]

A pc can drift out of session; you should know what he's drifting on. He's drifting on his feeling he cannot communicate to the auditor. That is what he's drifting out of session on. And the way to throw somebody wildly and almost permanently out of session is just lower the bars on him to prove to him conclusively and forever and aye, from there on out, that he will never be able to communicate to the auditor or he will never be able to tell any of his withholds.

You start punishing somebody for getting off their withholds and you produce this immediate and direct result. The fellow feels then he can never be audited. Why? That is – you see, you're dealing with the actual machinery of a mind. You're dealing with the actual responses of the mind. We're not playing with kid's stuff here, you see? We're not playing with psychology or psychiatry or other dirty words, you see? We're actually functioning right straight on the middle buttons of the mind. And that is communication, withholds, missing withholds, that sort of thing. And the person will stay in there and pitch, and do almost any-

thing under the sun, moon and stars, for an auditor that he can communicate to. He'll almost take anything off of an auditor he can communicate to.

You see me run a session someday that looks awful rough to you and you wonder, "How in the name of God is that pc still in-session?" If you thought emotion, misemotion, argument, things of this character, if you thought these threw people out of session and if you thought that being kind and sweet and good as an auditor keeps somebody in-session, you should watch a good, knockdown-drag-out session, by somebody who knows better than to miss a withhold. And that is a pretty fantastic session.

I've done this, you see? I've asked an auditing question. The pc doesn't speak Chinese, the pc speaks English. I've asked an auditing question and I demand that that auditing question be answered – and go on and on demanding it be answered.

See, the pc's trying to answer some other question, and just never permit the cycle to shift in any other direction than to a perfect completion of the answer of that auditing question.

Cheer the pc up. Say, "Yes, yes, you can talk to me about any of those things. That's fine. I'm glad to hear about that. Fine." And so forth. "But I asked you if you'd ever seen a rat. And you keep talking to me about hats."

The pc will even come up scale on something like that. He'll say, "What the hell do you know? This guy listens to me. You know, he listens. That's true. I did talk to him about hats. He asked me if I'd ever seen a rat and I said – I said girls in their teens wear thick hats. I did – I said that, and he heard it. But I heard him and therefore I ought to tell him whether or not I've seen a rat. And I can tell him that because he'll listen. Proves it because he knows that I didn't answer the question."

"Yeah, I've seen a rat!"

There, that pc would be in-session, come out the other end smiling. My God, you would have thought for half an hour there was nothing but a confounded dogfight going on in the room. That was because the perfect communication cycle was always insisted upon, that the answer to the auditing question was given. But you have to be very, very smart, and hear your own questions because the pc very often answers your auditing question.

And when you don't hear that exact answer and don't realize it's an exact answer and you refute it, well, you've had it.

But by permitting him to answer something else beside the question asked, you also throw the rudiments out. And that's not a Q and A. "I'll repeat the auditing question. What have you done, done, done, done? Not what have you thought about doing. I asked you something you've done."

"Oh, oh, oh, oh yeah. You did, didn't you?" Guy listens. Good auditor.

Funny part of it is that the cycle, the completed cycle of action, must take place. The cycle of communication must occur. It must go all the way through, but only on the subject which the auditor has introduced, otherwise, it's a complete miscontrol and it isn't a response to what was asked.

So if you think you can sit there and be kind, and you say, "Well, have you ever seen any rats?"

And the pc says, "Yes, I've seen – a lot of girls wear thick hats." And you say, "Well, good." Because Ron always said that you mustn't Q-and-A and you have to accept the pc's response.

Don't be surprised if at the end of a half an hour of doing this kind of thing your pc is not in-session, because the withhold in this case you have created and the withhold is the right answer to your auditing question. Here is – this thing falls on both sides of the fence.

So therefore, there is a thing called control, there is a thing called the right answer, and so forth. So you must ask a question – this is the rest of it – you must ask a question that can be answered and then complete that cycle of action of getting that question that you asked answered. And don't buy any other answers.

And if you do that smoothly, man, pcs will just do almost anything for you, including go Clear. But you see where the tightrope walk is, is how do you keep the pc in-session while not permitting the pc to give you the wrong answer to the auditing question. Well, you have to be smart enough to know when he has given you the right answer; and when he has given you the right answer that you buy it and you don't challenge him.

And I'll say this at least once. You're going to find yourself sitting there gaping. The pc is absolutely right. He has answered the auditing question and you have developed the whole thing into a dogfight.

And you said, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And the pc said, "Yes."

You know, that kind of a situation, but it'll be in some other guise.

You'll be prepchecking somebody and you'll say, "Well, did you ever really know your mother?" Why you asked that, God knows, you see?

And the pc says, "Well, I – actually, actually, I don't know."

Well the question is, did the pc answer the cycle? Is it part of the cycle? Is that a right answer? And you go up in smoke and then you finally look back at your question and you realize that he's given you the only possible answer he could give you under the circumstances. And that is the answer to the auditing question and you're the one who has thrown him out of session.

There is two ways, now, he can go out of session: One, is you "complete the cycle of action," (quote) (unquote), or the cycle of communication on a wrong answer, because the right answer is now a missed withhold. Or you failed to complete the cycle of action on a right answer and, of course, now the right answer is a missed withhold. Now, that is the tightrope walk which you walk, and you should know exactly what you're doing with an auditing question.

Now, when you see a session running off the rails, when you see a session doing peculiar and odd and strange things and the pc doesn't look right with your auditing, don't look at

the pc as a peculiar ape. Don't develop that. And neither develop a good communistic self-criticism. Don't develop that either.

Just look at the questions which you're asking in a session and ask it to yourself if they are answerable by this pc and if you are accepting the right answers that the pc gives you here. Just look at the whole thing on a cycle of action on a communication line. See, a cycle of communication. Is it complete? Have you asked a question? Has the pc answered the question? Have you then responded in such a way as the pc knew you answered the question? And have you straightened out what you were trying to straighten out? Well, if you've done all those things and so forth right, and the pc is getting worse, then I'll let you in on something – something very, very tremendous. It must be his environment that is caving him in.

Now, the way – the way it goes – the way it goes... What you've got to reconcile yourself to is your pc drifts out of session, something is going wrong. Yes, you're doing something that is failing to complete that communication cycle. You're doing something that appears to – a Q and A – doing something like this.

Could be in your earliest sessions the pc – that you've inherited a pc, of course, that has been mucked up with this kind of thing. And you have to straighten out the pc's communication cycle and that sort of thing. But if you have to go on straightening out a pc's communication cycle, if you have to go on patching the pc up, if you have to go on crowding him in-session, session after session, and if you have to go on sweating blood over this pc, look at your own wording and your auditing and this lecture and you will have the answer. You'll be able to analyze it.

It's a very ordinary thing to analyze. I mean it's a very easy thing to analyze. The funny part of it is, it'll be as crazy when you finally see what you are doing as this business of "Since the last time I audited you, have I missed a withhold on you?" And it isn't quite a question, don't you see?

So that has been followed by this, that and the other thing and lifted out, and then one day, all of a sudden, you get the right question. And the right question is "Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding?"

And the pc says, "*Brrrrrrrrrrrrrrzzzzzzzzzz*," and so on and so on.

And you say, "My God, my God, my God."

Well, remember something, there is every period between session has been missed. You've walked into a lousy auditing situation then, you see? My God. Ghastly things staring you in the face. It's always going to be coming back up and should be prepchecked. So you have to prepcheck some rudiments. You see that?

Mark my words, it'll be something like that. It'll be something the auditor is doing that the pc cannot respond on and the auditor isn't finishing the cycle with or can't finish the cycle with.

And if you get that down pat, you'll be able to analyze your own auditing, you'll be able to analyze auditing in general, you'll be able to tell why pcs are improving or not improving.

Only thing TRs do is get you to improve your skill in handling these things so you're not taken by sudden surprise and so forth. So that these responses are very usual and natural. But I always think it's best to know the principles underlying these natural responses, and there are some very solid ones.

Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Thank you for staying over.

The Missed Missed Withhold

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 1 November 1962

Thank you.

When you were building this country, why didn't you fix up the weather? You know, really, I have my opinion of planet builders that go around designing weather like this, and that sort of thing. There's a great deal to be said for rain, but it quickly becomes hyperbolic.

Well, now tonight, I've made notes for lectures, so I probably won't talk about that. And this is the 1st of November, isn't it? What year is it?

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. All right. Lecture number one.

This is a brand-new subject to you. It's an entirely new subject to you. You have never heard of this subject before. In fact, you have never run it or handled it or had it done. I want to recommend, then, this lecture to you very, very seriously. There have been several bulletins out on it, but you apparently haven't read those. Now, therefore, this is new material here. And I want you to take to heart what I tell you in this lecture.

And the subject of the lecture is missed withholds. Now, it may surprise you that the first bulletin out on this particular subject of missed withholds is February the 8th, HCOB February 8, 1962, and it's marked, as a bulletin, "Urgent." And it says, "The one item Scientists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is missed withholds and the upsets they cause." That's the first paragraph of this. It says, "Every upset with Central Orgs, field auditors, pcs, the lot, is traceable to one or more missed withholds." That's what it says. Well, anyhow, on February the 12th, because nobody got it then, I issued another one – rote formulas for missed withholds, and so forth. That's HCOB February 12th. It's *How to Clear Withholds and Missed Withholds*.

Well, they didn't get it then, so we issued another one on February 22nd. And on February 22nd, 1962, we had *Withholds, Missed and Partial*, see? And it has a lot to say on that particular subject. And it says, "I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge. I don't appeal to reason, only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But at the moment, it may not seem reasonable, so just try it and do it well and day will dawn at last." Well, day didn't dawn. Well... [laughter]

So, on May the 3rd, 1962, you have the HCOB *ARC Breaks and Missed Withholds*, and it says, “How to use this bulletin: When an auditor or student has trouble with an ‘ARC breaky pc’ or no gain, or when an auditor is found to be using freak control methods or processes to ‘keep a pc in-session,’ the HCO Sec, D of T or D of P should just hand a copy of this bulletin to the auditor and make him or her study it and take an HCO Exam on it.

“After some months of careful observation and test, I can state conclusively that: All ARC breaks stem from missed withholds.

“This is vital technology,” and so forth.

It says also, “There are no ARC breaks when missed withholds have been cleared up.” And it goes on, technically.

Well, on May the 21st, we have one: *Missed Withholds, Asking About*, and so forth, but that’s just a little more data.

And on June the 28th, 1962, we have *Dirty Needles, How to Smooth Out Needles*. There it is, and it talks all about missed withholds and so forth. It’s not obviously and directly on the point, but it does mention withholds, missed withholds, overts and secrets and so forth.

And on July the 4th we have *Bulletin Changes* which include missed withholds, and then on July the 12th, 1962, we have *Motivatorish Cases* and so forth, and that goes on talking about how to get missed withholds out of people.

And then on August the 13th we talk about *Rock Slams and Dirty Needles*. And there’s some more about missed withholds then.

And then on August the 30th, while I was stateside, why, Mary Sue got desperate and issued some bulletins. And of course the first subject that she picked up was missed withhold handling. Well now, that is a lot of bulletins. Let me call to your attention, there’s weight here, man. There’s weight. There’s been a lot said on this subject, see?

And it’s just about the most important subject in an auditing session and keeping the show on the road, short of actually clearing and helping people, you see, it’s just about the most important subject there is. And there isn’t one here got it. None of you. You haven’t got it. So I’m going to give you a lecture on it.

And I might as well start this lecture with, “The one item Scientologists everywhere must get an even greater reality on is missed withholds and the upsets they cause.” Do you see? That’s out of the February 8th bulletin. And “I don’t know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge,” on February the 22nd.

Listen. All you’re doing and all you go on doing and all you keep on doing and all you do, endlessly, every time you’re told to pick up a missed withhold, all you do is pick up a withhold. Honest. You’re picking up withholds. I don’t think you have ever picked up a missed withhold off of a pc in any session you’ve ever run. You’ve only picked up withholds.

You ask the auditor to pick up the missed withholds and the auditor promptly picks up all the *withholds*. You got the idea? Everybody says this, and I guess it’s because of the semantics of the word *missed*. It says they’re missed withholds, and by God, they are! Everybody misses them! See?

You see, it is so pat and it's so plain to the naked eye that this is what happens: Pc has a withhold, and you haven't picked it up. So therefore it's a missed withhold. *No!* That is wrong.

So, when I tell you to pick up the missed withholds, all you're doing is picking up withholds. You say, "Well, he wants us to pick up the missed withholds, so therefore I better pick up the withholds I've missed. So therefore, 'Do you have a withhold?'" When sometimes you even say, "Have I ever missed a withhold on you?" "Has anybody missed a withhold on you?" and the pc gratuitously gives you withholds; gives you more withholds and more withholds and more withholds.

No pc has ever given you a missed withhold. I'll bet you you've never picked one up. Now, I may be very harsh on this line, but let's get down to tacks here, man! Brass, iron and otherwise.

A missed withhold is a withhold that people nearly found out about but didn't. And you're only looking for the *nearly found outs*. You don't give a *damn* what the guy did. You don't care what the person did. You only want to know what people *almost found out!!*

Honest! I've been talking since February, you know? I'm getting hoarse.

You see, a withhold is something the pc did. That is something the pc did – do you understand? – that he isn't talking about. See? He did it and he isn't talking about it. Now that is a withhold and that is all a withhold is. And please don't keep saying also it is a missed withhold just because you didn't get it in a session.

You see, it's all very neat. You got it all figured out that if you didn't get the withhold in a session, why, therefore, it's a missed withhold. And that's not what a missed withhold is! A missed withhold has nothing to do with what the pc said. *Nothing!* Not anything to do with what the pc did and then withheld. It actually hasn't a *damn* thing to do with what the pc is withholding.

The missed withhold is something people *nearly found out*. *It's an other-person action!* Look. It's not the pc's action! It's nothing the pc did or is doing! You keep trying to pick up missed withholds by asking the pc what he's withholding, you never get anything but withholds and then you miss some more of these and you've got a pc even further upset!

Look, here are – here are absolute *pearls* on a silver platter. They're actually beyond price. And I've never got it across to you. A missed withhold has *nothing* to do with the pc. But nothing! It is an other-person action and the pc's wonder about it. I just know right now I'm not making any sense to you even this minute. I'll betcha I'm not making any sense to you.

It hasn't a *thing* to do with what the pc is withholding. Let's just sever the end off of the "missed." Let's forget that it is even a withhold.

You're looking for exact moments in the lifetime or lifetimes of this pc when somebody *almost found out*, and he's never been sure since whether they did or they didn't. And we don't care *what* they almost found out! We only care that they almost found out something!

And that is the address to a missed withhold. It's an other-person-than-the-pc's action. It's an other person's action.

I really didn't realize that I hadn't gotten it across to you in bulk and in gross form till not too long ago in a catch-as-catch-can session I said to a pc – this pc was going natter, natter, natter, natter, yak, yak, yak, yak, yak, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, yap, yap, yap. So I just routinely was running a little bit of – I said, “Well, what have you done?” “What have you withheld?” “What have you done?” “What have you withheld?” “What have you done?” “What have you withheld?” “What have you withheld?” “What have you done?” “What have you withheld?” you know, that sort of thing. And got stuck in this area of the track and started saying natter, natter, natter, and natter, natter, natter, and natter, natter, natter, and started giving me withholds and withholds and withholds and withholds out of that area of the track, and withholds and overts and withholds out of that area of the track, and they would have been going yet if I hadn't – that's one of the dangerous things is Instructors are actually going to stop you sometimes practically running it. Because once you shove this down the pc's throat, it looks just like a Q and A. It's almost in the teeth of the laws about Q and A. You understand?

But the pc isn't clearing this. You've got this thing called a recurring withhold. You understand? You run into these things all the time. You were auditing a pc, so they're going to run some withholds, and they run the time that they locked their husband out. And you say, “Ha, ha. Thank you very much.”

And you note down this fact, and a few sessions later, they tell you they locked their husband out, see, and they didn't tell him that they were the person that had locked him out, you know? Never confessed to it since, and he got pneumonia, and it was all pretty rough.

And so, a few sessions after this, you know, why, you're running down the track and they tell you they locked their husband out. And a little while later some other auditor is auditing this same pc, and they tell him they locked their husband out.

Look. Sometime or another, won't you get tired of hearing the same withhold? Isn't it boring? It's like watching a “C” movie that wasn't very good in the first place for the tenth time. That is a *missed* withhold.

Look. It has a very *special* anatomy: It isn't the moment they locked the husband out; it isn't when they withheld it from the husband; it isn't when they withheld it from you. These things have nothing to do with the reason this is charged up! That it is an overt, that it is a withhold – ahhh, yes. But there's this special thing called a *missed withhold*, and it hasn't got anything to do with either one of them. It merely uses them for fodder to feed on. And the overt and the withhold won't blow if a missed withhold occurs.

Now, what is the missed withhold? The only thing you have to ask this recurring-withhold pc is “When did your husband *nearly* find out about it?” Not “When did he find out?” – see, that would have blown – but “When – when did your husband *nearly* find out about it?”

Now, here's the actual mechanics of it. A few days later while he was lying there suffering with a fever of 118, why, his eyes opened slittedly and suspiciously and looked at her

and glanced toward the lock on the door. Now, that was his action, not hers, see? That was his action. And ever afterwards she hasn't known whether he knew or didn't know. Ever afterward! She doesn't know! And that's why the recurring withhold hangs up.

Now, I lowered the boom on this pc, and I said, "All right. Fine. Thank you. Thank you. Good. Now, tell me the exact moment you suspected somebody knew what you are telling me."

"Ohhhh." And that was dead easy. It was right there. The whole package blew, and that was that.

Somebody had made a comment which might or might not have been interpreted as the fact that they knew about it. And the pc goes off in this fantastic confusion. Now, how can it be a confusion? Well, it's a confusion because there is an overt and there is a withhold. And these are the primary mechanisms which sit back of all this. But they actually aren't very serious until they get a mystery on top of them.

Now, you take an overt, a withhold, plus a mystery, and you've got a missed withhold. It's a mystery! Now, did her husband know about it or didn't he? "Did-did-did he find out – did he re – and – and is he withholding? And is he – did he – as he was lying there in a fever and so forth, did he – he really mean that look toward her and toward the lock of the door as an accusation for having accidentally locked him out in the snow storm? Or did he – did he ever know, or-or-or wasn't that? Or did it or didn't it? Did he fi... No. He couldn't have known about it. Oh, he – he did – no. No. He couldn't have. He-he did, but still he looked straight at the lock of the door and he looked at me. He must, I-I-I-I don't know."

Do you understand this? Now, that is a missed withhold, see? Had nothing whatsoever to do – you can say, "Now, what have you done?"

And she says, "I locked my husband out in the snow and he got sick with pneumonia and he was sick for seventeen months and eighteen days. Lost his pension."

A few sessions later, you say, "All right, rata-ta-tatta-ta-tatta. What have you done?"

"Well, I locked my husband out in the snow, and – and he – he got – he got sick, and – and he was sick for eighteen months and eighteen days and he lost his pension."

You say, "Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good. (Maybe if I acknowledge it this time, maybe the pc will find out that I heard it, see?) Good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you. Good, good. Good. Tha... thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Now, I got that. I heard exactly what you said there. I heard exactly what you said. Thank you."

Next morning in session you're running some General O/W, see? "I locked my husband out in..." [laughter]

Now, of course, that isn't as comprehensible as some offbeat – because this society is a bit offbeat on the subject of the second dynamic – you get some juicy second dynamic withhold of some kind or another. Get this girl, and she's making love to a dog, you know? You get this, you know? And then you, the auditor, get pulled right in on this. You say, "Well, of course this is heavily charged! Of course the pc is having trouble getting this off. Of course, of course, of course!"

Don't be so damn reasonable. There isn't any reason why the magnitude of the overt has anything to do with the readiness of its blowing. The magnitude of the overt has nothing to do with the speed of its evaporation. I don't care if you've blown up a husband or a planet. It's an overt. And it – one doesn't blow any harder than another.

Well, therefore, we have to ask this question. "How come this doesn't blow?" Don't sit there and say, "Well, because the society is rigged the way it is and because so forth, and it's on her terminal chain, and it's probably something that rock slams. It's on the oppterm side, dogs are oppterm, and – and so forth, and I'll fix that. Actually she is stuck on the se... and that's why that overt won't blow, see?" Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, see? That's why you get this second dynamic overt ten minutes deep in every session, or every third session. Or every Prepcheck, it comes up.

Wouldn't you be a little bit curious why this thing keeps recurring? Well, don't be so reasonable. It is not recurring because it is badder than other overts, see? It's not recurring because it weighs heavily on the pc's conscience. I don't know where people keep their consciences – lunch boxes or something like that. Obviously, it's very dangerous to squash a conscience because things are – shouldn't be kept on the conscience, and so forth. It's all a very interesting mechanical problem to me, this whole problem of consciousness. Because you see, everything that is on a conscience is unconscious. It's all confusing. And you can just figure yourself into a grave with this if you don't know this mechanism.

One day they had this elderly man and he came to the house for dinner. And he had a rather false smile. He had false teeth, see? And he had – [laughter] and he had a false smile, and he looked straight at this girl, and he says, "You like dogs, don't you?" [laughter] And that's the missed withhold, see? The pc that you're auditing didn't do it. And ever since then: "Did he know? Did he really know? No, he couldn't have known. Yes, he..." [laughter]

Now, you getting hold of the corner of this thing's tail, huh?

All right. I – maybe I haven't been as articulate as I could be.

Actually, I figured and I figured and I figured and I thought and I looked at it and so forth. And on this demonstration the other night, I actually couldn't believe it when the pc said, "I never thought you had to remember a specific moment in time to get off a withhold." Even the pc had missed it, but the thing had evaporated. There was no more natter in that area. There were a whole bunch of overts and a whole bunch of withholds. But this was just pursuant with natter until the exact moment when somebody was standing there – see, this is the moment we had to find – and I said, "All right. Let's look for it. This is the exact moment I want, see?" Pc is just going off answering questions, answering questions, getting no place, see? I say, "This is the exact moment I want. Who almost found out you were doing that?"

"Oh, well."

And we picked up this exact split instant in time and it was just somebody making a casual remark that it indicated that they might know about these overts. You get the idea? They might know. But they didn't. But did they? See, there's the mystery sandwich.

If you want to see what is sticking a pc to something, always look for the mystery sandwich. Mystery is the glue which sticks thetans to things. Mystery is the glue. Even overts

wind up in mystery. You shoot somebody. Now you don't know whether you shot him or you didn't shoot him or if it was a lucky shot or you should have shot him or if he was a bad man, or if, if, if, if, if, if, if, if, or if you should have done it. So it's the "if you should have done it" which causes you to pull back the withhold and sort of withhold a further action like that.

All things boil down to right conduct. Here is the crux of this situation. If you go on asking the pc, who doesn't understand what you're asking for, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or "Have we missed a withhold on you?" and the pc is glibly giving you withholds, you ain't gettin' noplacé. You is on the *Arkansas Special* with its wheels locked, its brakes on and the rails torn up. You're not going down any track anyplace.

Now, you can take the edge off of a case. I salute the fantastic workability of General O/W, you see? See, it is – it's the woof and warp of the GPM itself. And it's right on down the line. That's why it's totally unlimited in the amount of run it can have. But I don't think you'd like to run out a GPM with General O/W. You're perfectly welcome to try if you've got a few centuries. Numerically, to count up the number of withholds that the person has, pursuant to the number of overts which they have committed, gives us some figure that if we were to write it up on the wall behind me in very tiny figures, starting at that corner and then just keep on writing across the whole top of the wall with groups of three zeros, you see, and then without ending the number, come just down below it and start right straight across the wall again, and then come down another quarter of an inch and start writing zeros there, you'd get some kind of an idea of what this guy has done and withheld.

Well, that many answers is not necessary to clear somebody. So although the overt is very powerful in its ability to aberrate the individual – the withhold which follows it is locked up by the overt itself, of course – and although this mechanism is the mechanism underlying the gathering up of energies which results in solid-mass terminals and gives you the game in the first place (see, the whole anatomy of a game is O/W).

In spite of all that, why, you don't have time and the pc doesn't have enough body years to run out all those overts, even if you could keep him in-session that long, even if he could spot them all that long. And you don't even have time to run them out for one lifetime. How do you like that? And you haven't got time to sit around watching a pc's dirty needle go *bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz*, and try to settle it with General O/W. Recurring withholds will result.

General O/W, of course, is enough to straighten out the thing and get the session running, and all that sort of thing – a very valuable process; don't think I'm running it down. I'm just going to say it's too lengthy for that sort of thing.

And when I tell you to pick up somebody's missed withholds, I want you to pick up another person's action and not the pc's action. And it's best characterized as "nearly found out." Don't ask the pc for a missed withhold because he obviously, I have learned lately, he doesn't know any more of what I've been talking about than you have. See, you'd have to explain the whole anatomy to him. So there's got to be a better thing, see?

It – "What did we almost find out about you?" It's got to be that "almost." It's got to be "might have." It's got to be some conditional word. And then you will see a case suddenly go *spoing! nyyow!* and pick up the – a funniest, funniest series of disrelated incidents that that

case had never looked at before, never had anything to do with it before. You'll see the tone arm do peculiar things and the needle do peculiar things that you've never seen it do on O/W because you're running a different track. You're running the "almost discovered" track.

Now let me give you an example. Once upon a time I was up in the wilderness and wilds of Montana, and for some reason or other, a wolf, gray timber wolf, showed up and I shot a bullet over his head. I don't know just exactly why I shot at him because I never have any trouble with animals. I was very young at the time. And he heard this bullet go by over his head and he reached up and he snapped at the place where the bullet had been. And he decided to come my way. It upset him to be missed.

Honest, you never quite see anybody quite so upset as somebody who has been just barely missed. Look at a pedestrian who was not hit. [laughter] The examinations flunks which you're most upset about were those which you passed all except for the last half of the last question. See? That's the nearness of the miss. In other words, missing things upsets things. It's a misestimation of effort or thought or something of the sort.

Now, a thetan's main attention is on estimation of effort, estimation of thought, estimation of look. He wants to know how much look is a look and so forth, and his certainties are all based on proper estimation of how much look is a look and all that sort of thing. See, just look at your Know to Mystery Scale, you see? How much knowledge is knowingness, see? That's an estimation. University is very simple. University hands you an old school tie, and you now know that you have the knowledge necessary, see? You can wave a pennant with your right hand so many motions to the left under the sis-boom-bah, and you're all set in life. That's how much knowledge, you see, is necessary to be knowledge. So that's an estimation of knowledge.

Now, you can go right on down the scale and how much emotion does it take to be emotional? How much emotion is emotional? Well, you get lots of answers to that: enough to create an effect on somebody. If you're a TV actress, it's very simple: enough to please the sponsor. You can go on down and take another one at random. What is a proper symbol? How proper is a symbol when it is a symbol, see?

Well, you can estimate everything, except "How much mystery is a mystery?" And of course that's a mystery. You're into the no-estimation-of-effort band. No estimation of the think, no estimation of anything; it's all mysterious. You don't know. The not-knowingness of it all is what is upsetting.

But now you take a not-knowingness which is probably known and play it both ways. Now, they knew but they didn't or couldn't have known, and you knew that they knew but you know they didn't know.

Now let's just get the four-way flows on a not-know and you've got a missed withhold. And it's very painful to a thetan. So I really don't blame you for avoiding it like a plague.

See, the fellow walks up to the girl and he smiles and he looks at her in a sort of a false smile and he says, "Well, little girl, I understand you like dogs." Well, right away, her concept of him is – is "Did he know? Didn't he know? He couldn't have known," she thinks to

herself. “He must know.” But then complicated into this is the fact that he looks like he knows but he hasn’t said enough to indicate that he did know, so he doesn’t know. It’s strictly ding, ding, ding, here comes the wagon, you know? Strictly. This is the stuff out of which insanity gets made, see?

It’s a can’t reach, not reach, must reach situation, and so forth, in the effort band. When you get insanity in the mystery band, it’s a “did know, but didn’t know, but mustn’t know,” you see? But he must know, but he mustn’t know, you see, and it’s the sort of reach and withdraw, only it’s not a mechanical thing. And there it is and it’s just pure mystery mutilage. And a thetan will stick right to it, man. Now, in trying to pull off the overt and the withhold in the presence of something that has a missed withhold on it does not accomplish an as-iness of the section of track in which the pc is stuck. Because the pc is not stuck with the overt and is not stuck with the withhold; the pc is stuck with the “almost found out.” So, of course, nothing as-ises and you get a recurring withhold, see, because he isn’t looking at that section of track where he did it or where he’s withholding it. He’s only looking at that section of track where it was almost found out. And you ask him for what he did and what he withheld, you don’t as-is the section of track he’s stuck in. So therefore, it just perpetuates itself and goes on forever.

And if you want to see something very remarkable in a pc, just very remarkable in a pc, just sit down in apropos of nothing, after you’ve got the pc in-session and so forth, just start running in any command sequence, “Well, just get the idea of nearly being found out.” See, it has to be nearly being found out, see? “Get the idea of somebody nearly finding out about you.” “Get the idea of you nearly finding out about another” – that’s an unnecessary leg to the thing, but you could make it up – and the next thing, more track would be going by that this person had never heard of before. Didn’t matter what else you’d run. That’s got a brand-new track area. They’ve never seen this track before and it’s been with them all the time. It’s what’s stuck out in front of their noses. Directly in front of their noses.

I could just ask you at this exact instant to “Recall a time you were nearly found out.” Now go ahead, think of a time you were nearly found out. ... Having any trouble finding this time you were nearly found out?

Well, I shouldn’t think so because that’s the bulk of the stuff in front of your schnozzola. Most people can’t even find an engram, merely because there are so many missed withholds in front of their faces. They can’t get any clear view of anything, because they got missed withholds in front of their faces.

“Did they really know or didn’t they? Was I actually discovered at that time or wasn’t I?” See, that is the question.

“Who has nearly known about you?” Think that over for a while, you’ll come up with people you have been leery of or felt nervous around.

And when I tell you to pick up somebody’s missed withholds on Scientology, I don’t want you to pick up the overts that they have been withholding. See? I couldn’t care less about these overts, don’t you see, that they have been withholding. That they have been withholding them, oh, all right, so they have been withholding them. You can get TA action by finding all the things the fellow has been withholding. That’s good. That’s fine. But this is

a junior action. That would be asking you to run General O/W on a pc. That'd have nothing to do with missed withholds.

Now, when I ask you to find out something about missed withholds, get this pc's missed withholds. Don't you *dare* come up with any withholds. Just don't you *dare!* I want the name, rank and serial number of the person who missed it. God, I couldn't care less what was missed. You understand? I don't want the pc's actions, I want the pc's guesses about the other guy, see? That's what I'm asking you to find out.

Now, this is very arduous to run, because sometimes you actually have to bear down on it if your command has not been sufficiently explicit. You have to direct the pc's attention rather heavily. Let's say you've run a lot of O/W and so forth. Well now, you think you've got this all licked, you see? This person has been taking things from their company, you see? And you've run this – and they're taking things from their company and stealing them, actually, and you think you got it all licked. You've got the number of fountain pens and the number of stenographers, and all these things they've stolen from their company, you see? And you think you've got a tabulated list now and you say, "Well, that cured it" and so forth, and next week, why, they take a typewriter.

There's something missing here, something – something went wrong. You got all of the overts, and you got the fact they were withholding it. They're not now withholding because they told you – see, there's the rationale. And so therefore it's now all hunky-dory, and so they go back and steal a typewriter and the week after steal the boss's secretary, see? They're still nervous about the company. The person is not in a forgive-or-forget mood about the company. See, that's because they've gotten off these overts, why, you have a feeling, and your feeling is quite right by the way – you're not totally stupid – your feeling is quite right when you suppose that after they've gotten this straightened out in their mind they'll feel all right about the company. And they very often don't. They feel propitiative or they feel sort of guilty, or they feel some other weird misemotional way about the target of these overts and withholds, and you don't feel this is right. And so you keep plunging and asking for something else they did. And if there's anything guaranteed to drive the pc round the bend, it's after he has told you everything he has did, you insist there must be something else the pc has did-did. You're in essence cleaning a clean, see?

Now, actually, because you sense that this pc is still a little bit "*mnyah*" about the company, why, then you assume there must have been some other overt. Well, he can always dig up another one or two, or something like this, and the basic on the chain, and... And the trouble is you so often have a near win on this that you really never get your win. You sort of quit eating just before dessert.

And there was a lot of people that were with us in 50, 51, that sort of thing, are starting to write me now and they're starting to get in contact again and that sort of thing.

I just sort of laugh rather raucously, by the way. The last one that did, I said he quit before dessert, you know? I'd realized after I had mailed the letter that I had missed a wonderful sort of an epigrammatic sort of thing that he deserted before the dessert, you know, but it's – that's what you're denying yourself. You're denying yourself a forkful of strawberries

and cream, see? You quit with the gravy and mashed potatoes, you know? There's still one more course.

So, he stole a typewriter, and he stole an eraser, and he did this, and he withheld it from this person, he withheld it from that person, and he stole the boss's secretary, and he goes so, and yes, all fine. Yes. And he's withheld it all these years, and now you know about it, and that's fine.

And he's sort of still kind of blowy and sort of nattery about the company a little bit. A week or so later, you see him; he really doesn't feel good about the company, and so forth. Well, you just quit before the dessert was served, that's all. You've got to find out *who nearly discovered this*, when and how often? And he'll give you exact split instants. Now. Now. Now. Now. All of a sudden he goes "*Uu-huugh-coooo*. I should say so. *Ohhhh!*"

See, the idea is you've gotten off all the overts, you've gotten off all the withholds, and he still doesn't like the Materiel Executive. Got the idea? He still feels a little peculiar in some parts of the organization. You see, you really didn't clean it up. Because the key-in – the bullet that passed almost into his ear but not quite, you know, just fanned air – was one day the Materiel Executive stepped out of the back door putting an inventory sheet in his pocket and looked at him rather frowningly and went on by into his office. Like somebody who has been in a hotel that has thin rooms and floors, you know, and the guy upstairs drops one shoe, you see? Five o'clock in the morning, he's still waiting there for the other shoe, you see?

Next action, you see, never proceeds from this point. We have started a piece of time track here which doesn't go anyplace. Next action is he's – you see, he's doing all this quite reactively, and it's down underneath the surface of analysis, you know? I mean, at the surface of his analytical processes. And he saw the fellow do this, and he knew it made him nervous, and he goes back in, and he doesn't want to have the phone ring. Because he knows what's now going to happen, you see? If the fellow did know, this is what's going to happen: You see, the phone is going to ring, and he's going to be sent for by one of the directors of the company, and then one of two things will happen. They will either hand him the pink slip, or there will be a policeman standing there, see? And then there's two choices that come out of that, and if it's the policeman, that's got one choice, you see? And you get a big dramatic sequence about the trial, you see, and he has to have all of the bad things the company did to him, and how it's actually one of the junior directors trying to cover up. See, he's got to have all the whole story manufactured for this, but is there any reason to manufacture the story? Did the Materiel Executive really know? See?

Here we've got the track that goes nowhere, don't you see? And it could develop into track, but is it going to develop into track or isn't it going to develop into track? Here's where this thing – just as far as time is concerned, it becomes a mystery sandwich and there's no time in it because those events don't take place. So therefore, there is no time track for it so the – which hangs it. It's not spotted in time. It doesn't fire off right, don't you see? There's nothing goes right about it at all because this isn't any estimation of it. You can't figure out what you would do because it didn't happen. You can't figure out what you would have said because nobody said it. You can't figure out what explanation was the right explanation be-

cause you never had to explain it. You see? But you should have explained it, but you didn't. So there's just nothing known and you just get this terrific area of just total – it's not even hardly a positive-negative. It's just *thaah*. And that's a missed withhold.

And the missed withhold depends on the other guy – the accidental action of another person.

Sometimes it'll be a piece of paper, or something like that. He's sitting there. He's sitting there in conference and he suddenly notices that just showing in the boss's in-basket is a memorandum with his own name just showing above the covering pieces of paper. That conference is ruined for him. You see, he never has another thing to say during the whole conference. He sort of sits there and sweats, you know? But he really doesn't quite realize what he's sweating about. You see, there's his name on a memorandum. He doesn't know what the memorandum is about except that it concerns him in some way and he can't see what the subject of it is, do you see?

Now actually, three people are standing together in the hall, you come by and they shut up. There's a very good missed withhold situation. If that was preceded by an overt which the person wasn't telling anybody about, if that was the morning after the high-school girl's first raw escapade – see, the truth of the matter is that they probably had their mouths full of candy and couldn't talk when they went by. [laughter] But then one never really knows what the truth is, you see? No, there's no truth contained in any of it. It's just one huge glob of mystery. And that is a missed withhold.

It's a “should have known” as it has been described, but you will pick it up and be able to relay it much more ably if you call it a “nearly found out.” It's a nearly known, see? Nearly found out.

Now, if you wished to clear up somebody's missed withholds on Scientology and you said, “What have we failed to find out about you?” he would give you a whole string of withholds. And this would then go no place, see? No. You want another word, and this will clarify it to you and this will clarify it to the pc and everybody will be as happy as clambakes. Now, “What have we nearly found out about you and when did we nearly find it out?” comes much closer in to what you want, see?

See, you want to know what. Well, he's not likely to give you the rest of it until he has identified, to some degree, what. See, “Well, my escapades with young boys,” see, or something like this, see, or “wild women or something,” see? “That's what you failed to find out about me,” you see? That's what he kind of answers. “What did we nearly find out about you?” “My escapades with wild women,” see? Oddly enough, that doesn't clarify the situation at all. That doesn't make him like you any better, or anybody else. That doesn't keep him from getting ARC breaks. You've got to follow it up with a second question. Now you've got the missed withhold, see? You've merely identified what the missed withhold was about. You haven't got the missed withhold. Takes some additional step. All right.

“When did we nearly find out about it?” Now you could follow that through a little bit further if it wasn't blowing well with “who?” you see? “Who nearly found out about it?” “When was that?” You get the concatenation of questions – the series of questions – that would deliver all of this data into your hands. You're looking for moments in the HGC's, D

of T's office. You're looking for the instant when the PE Instructor all of a sudden paused. Fellow realized that he'd better cut this short because actually, he's gonna miss his ride home, see? This thought suddenly strikes the PE Instructor, you see? He's liable to miss his ride home, you know? So he'd better cut this short. So he's looking over the class and he fixes his beady eye on one person. Seems to lose track of what he was saying, don't you see?

Said, "Well, all right. Now you understand ARC and we're going to have to conclude the talk this evening. And so, good night," and hurriedly walks out the door. Now, the person his eye accidentally lit on in those pauses goes, "*Eeenk*," see? Nearly found out. "Did he know? Didn't he know?" See? "Wa-wa-wa-was he on the *ri-ri-ri-uh-uohhhh*. What did he guess at that moment? What did he recognize about me at that moment? Which one of my various crimes?" You see, here's something else, see? Now he doesn't even know which one of his crimes have been identified. Maybe the Instructor has been talking about the fact that people with big heads have more brains than people with little heads or something, you know? And this person gets some kind of a rationale about this thing.

He couldn't make up his mind whether he had lots of brains or little brains because he's always realized that he had a medium-sized head. See? Now, that's already got a little mystery connected with it, which is just nothing. Then all of a sudden the Instructor seems to completely look down, seems to completely change pace, and then abruptly leaves. And you know there'll be some people leave that PE class very, very nervous, because they realize when they go out the front door that the police are going to be waiting for them?

What did we nearly find out? Well, it isn't good enough to find out just *what* was nearly found out. We've got to find *when* it was nearly found out or might have been found out, but doesn't know if it was found out, don't you see? When and by *whom*? We got to spot these points. And all of a sudden, why, this person, *tah!* Everything is marvelous. Everything goes off beautifully, smoothly, and there it is.

Now, you can give me a gold star tonight, at least, for trying.

Audience: Yeah!

Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 12 FEBRUARY 1962

Sthil
CenOCon

HOW TO CLEAR WITHHOLDS AND MISSED WITHHOLDS

I have finally reduced clearing withholds to a rote formula which contains all the basic elements necessary to obtain a high case gain without missing any withholds.

These steps now become **the** way to clear a withhold or missed withhold.

AUDITOR OBJECTIVE

The auditor's object is to get the pc to look so that the pc can tell the auditor.

The auditor's objective is *not* to get the pc to tell the auditor. If the pc is *in session* the pc will talk to the auditor. If the pc is not in session, the pc won't tell the auditor a withhold. I *never* have any trouble getting the pc to tell me a withhold. I sometimes have trouble getting the pc to *find out* about a withhold so the pc can tell it to me. If the pc will not tell the auditor a withhold (and the pc knows it) the remedy is rudiments. I always assume, and correctly, that if the pc knows about it the pc will tell me. My job is to get the pc to find out so the pc has something to tell me. The chief auditor blunder in pulling withholds stems from the auditor assuming the pc already knows when the pc does not.

If used exactly, this system will let the pc find out and let the pc get all the charge off of a withhold as well as tell the auditor all about it.

Missing a withhold or not getting all of it is the *sole source* of ARC break.

Get a reality on this now. All trouble you have or have ever had or will ever have with ARC breaky pcs stems only and wholly from having restimulated a withhold and yet having failed to pull it. The pc never forgives this. This system steers you around the rock of missed withholds and their bombastic consequences.

WITHHOLD SYSTEM

This system has five parts:

0. The Difficulty being handled.

1. What the withhold is.
2. When the withhold occurred.
3. All of the withhold.
4. Who should have known about it.

Numbers (2) (3) and (4) are repeated over and over, each time testing (1) until (1) no longer reacts.

(2) (3) and (4) clear (1). (1) straightens out *in part (0)*.

(0) is cleaned up by finding many (1)'s and (1) is straightened up by running (2) (3) and (4) many times.

These steps are called (0) Difficulty, (1) What (2) When (3) All (4) Who. The auditor must memorize these as What, When, All and Who. The order is never varied. The questions are asked one after the other. None of them are repetitive questions.

USE A MARK IV

The whole operation is done on a Mark IV. Use no other meter as other meters may read right electronically without reading *mental* reactions well enough.

Do this whole system and all questions at sensitivity 16.

THE QUESTIONS

0. The suitable question concerning the Difficulty the pc is having. Meter reads.
1. What. "What are you withholding about.....?" (the Difficulty) (or as given in future issues).
Meter reads. Pc answers with a w/h, large or small.
2. When. "When did that occur?" or "When did that happen?" or "What was the time of that?"
Meter reads. Auditor can date in a generality or precisely on meter. A generality is best at first, a precise dating on the meter is used later in this sequence on the same w/h.
3. All. "Is that all of that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.
4. Who. "Who should have known about that?" or "Who didn't find out about that?" Meter reads. Pc answers.

Now test (1) with the same question that got a read the first time. (The question for (1) is never varied on the same w/h.)

If needle still reads ask (2) again, then (3), then (4), getting as much data as possible on each. Then test (1) again. (1) is only *tested*, never worked over except by using (2), (3) and (4).

Continue this rotation until (1) clears on needle and thus no longer reacts on a test.

Treat every withhold you find (or have found) in this fashion always.

SUMMARY

You are looking at a preview of **preparatory to clearing**. “Prepclearing” for short. Abandon all further reference to security checking or sec checking. The task of the auditor in Prepclearing is to prepare a pc’s rudiments so that they *can’t* go out during 3D Criss Cross.

The value of Prepclearing in case gain, is greater than any previous Class I or Class II auditing.

We have just risen well above Security Checking in ease of auditing and in case gains.

You will shortly have the ten Prepclearing lists which give you the (0) and (1) questions. Meanwhile, treat every withhold you find in the above fashion for the sake of the pre-clear, for your sake as an auditor and for the sake of the good name of Scientology.

(Note: To practise with this system, take a withhold a pc has given several times to you or you and other auditors. Treat the question that originally got it as (1) and clean it as above in this system. You will be amazed.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 22 FEBRUARY 1962

Franchise
CenOCon

**WITHHOLDS, MISSED
AND PARTIAL**

I don't know exactly how to get this across to you except to ask you to be brave, squint up your eyes and plunge.

I don't appeal to reason. Only to faith at the moment. When you have a reality on this, nothing will shake it and you'll no longer fail cases or fail in life. But, at the moment, it may not seem reasonable. So just try it, do it well and day will dawn at last.

What are these natterings, upsets, ARC breaks, critical tirades, lost PE members, ineffective motions? *They are restimulated but missed or partially missed withholds*. If I could just teach you that and get you to get a good reality on that in your own auditing, your activities would become smooth beyond belief.

It is true that ARC breaks, present time problems and withholds all keep a session from occurring. And we must watch them and clear them.

But behind all these is another button, applicable to each, which resolves each one. And that button is the restimulated but missed or partially missed withhold.

Life itself has imposed this button on us. It did not come into being with security checking.

If you know about people or are supposed to know about people, *then* these people expect, unreasonably, that you know *them* through and through.

Real knowledge to the average person is only this: a knowledge of his or her withholds! That, horribly enough, is the high tide of knowledge for the man in the street. If you know his withholds, if you know his crimes and acts, then you are *smart*. If you know his future you are moderately wise. And so we are persuaded towards mind reading and fortune telling.

All wisdom has this trap for those who would be wise.

Egocentric man believes all wisdom is wound up in knowing his misdemeanors.

If any wise man represents himself as wise and fails to discover what a person has done, that person goes into an antagonism or other misemotion toward the wise man. So they hang those who restimulate and yet who do not find out about their withholds.

This is an incredible piece of craziness. But it is observably true.

This is the **wild animal reaction** that makes Man a cousin to the beasts.

A good auditor can understand this. A bad one will stay afraid of it and won't use it.

The end rudiment for withholds for any session should be worded, "Have I missed a withhold on you?"

Any ARC broke pc should be asked, "What withhold have I missed on you?" Or, "What have I failed to find out about you?" Or, "What should I have known about you?"

An auditor who sec checks but cannot read a meter is dangerous because he or she will miss withholds and the pc may become very upset.

Use this as a stable datum: If the person is upset, somebody failed to find out what that person was sure they would find out.

A missed withhold is a should have known.

The only reason anyone has ever left Scientology is because people failed to find out about them.

This is valuable data. Get a reality on it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:sf.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 MAY 1962

Franchise

ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS

(How to use this bulletin.

When an auditor or student has trouble with an “ARC breaky pc” or no gain, or when an auditor is found to be using freak control methods or processes to “keep a pc in session”, the HCO Sec, DofT or DofP should just hand a copy of this bulletin to the auditor and make him or her study it and take an HCO exam on it.)

After some months of careful observation and tests, I can state conclusively that:

All ARC Breaks stem from Missed Withholds.

This is vital technology, vital to the auditor and to anyone who wants to live.

Conversely:

There are no ARC Breaks when Missed Withholds have been cleaned up.

By **Withhold** is meant **an undisclosed contra-survival act.**

By **Missed Withhold** is meant **an undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed.**

This is **far** more important in an auditing session than most auditors have yet realized. Even when some auditors are told about this and shown it they still seem to miss its importance and fail to use it. Instead they continue to use strange methods of controlling the pc and oddball processes on ARC Breaks.

This is so bad that one auditor let a pc die rather than pick up the missed withholds! So allergy to picking up missed withholds can be so great that an auditor has been known to fail utterly rather than do so. Only constant hammering can drive this point home. When it is driven home, only then can auditing begin to happen across the world; the datum is that important.

An auditing session is 50% technology and 50% application. I am responsible for the technology. The auditor is wholly responsible for the application. Only when an auditor realizes this can he or she begin to obtain uniformly marvellous results everywhere.

No auditor now needs “something else”, some odd mechanism to keep pcs in session.

Picking up Missed Withholds keeps pcs in session.

There is *no* need for a rough, angry ARC Breaky session. If there is one it is *not* the fault of the pc. It is the fault of the auditor. The auditor has failed to pick up missed withholds.

As of now it is not the pc that sets the tone of the session. It is the auditor. And the auditor who has a difficult session (providing he or she has used standard technology, model session, and can run an E-Meter), has one only because he or she failed to ask for missed withholds.

What is called a “dirty needle” (a pc’s needle pattern) is caused by missed withholds, not withholds.

Technology today is so powerful that it must be flawlessly applied. One does his CCHs in excellent 2 way comm with the pc. One has his TRs, Model Session and E-Meter operation completely perfect. And one follows exact technology. And one keeps the missed withholds picked up.

There is an exact and precise auditor action and response for every auditing situation, and for every case. We are not today beset by variable approaches. The less variable the auditor’s actions and responses, the greater gain in the pc. It is terribly precise. There is no room for flubs.

Further, every pc action has an exact auditor response. And each of these has its own drill by which it can be learned.

Auditing today is not an art, either in technology or procedure. It is an exact science. This removes Scientology from every one of the past practices of the mind.

Medicine advanced only to the degree that its responses by the practitioner were standardized and the practitioner had a professional attitude toward the public.

Scientology is far ahead of that today.

What a joy it is to a preclear to receive a completely standard session. To receive a text book session. And what gains the pc makes! And how easy it is on the auditor!

It isn't how interesting or clever the auditor is that makes the session. It's how standard the auditor is. Therein lies pc confidence.

Part of that standard technology is asking for missed withholds *any* time the pc starts to give any trouble. This is, to a pc, a totally acceptable control factor. And it totally smooths the session.

You have *no* need for and must not use any ARC Break process. Just ask for missed withholds.

Here are some of the manifestations cured by asking for missed withholds.

1. Pc failing to make progress.
2. Pc critical of or angry at auditor.
3. Pc refusing to talk to auditor.
4. Pc attempting to leave session.
5. Pc not desirous of being audited (or anybody not desirous of being audited).
6. Pc boiling off.
7. Pc exhausted.
8. Pc feeling foggy at session end.
9. Dropped havingness.
10. Pc telling others the auditor is no good.
11. Pc demanding redress of wrongs.
12. Pc critical of organizations or people of Scientology.
13. People critical of Scientology.
14. Lack of auditing results.
15. Dissemination failures.

Now I think you will agree that in the above list we have every ill we suffer from in the activities of auditing.

Now **please** believe me when I tell you there is **one cure** for the lot and **only** that one. There are no other cures.

The cure is contained in the simple question or its variations "*Have I missed a withhold on you?*"

THE COMMANDS

In case of any of the conditions 1. to 15. above ask the pc one of the following commands and **clean the needle of all instant read**. Ask the exact question you asked the first time as a final test. The needle must be clean of all instant reaction before you can go on to anything else. It helps the pc if each time the needle twitches, the auditor says, “That” or “There” quietly but only to help the pc see what is twitching. One doesn’t interrupt the pc if he or she is already giving it. This prompting is the *only* use of latent reads in Scientology – to *help* the pc spot what reacted in the first place.

The commonest questions:

- “In this session, have I missed a withhold on you?”
- “In this session have I failed to find out something?”
- “In this session is there something I don’t know about you?”

The best beginning rudiments withhold question:

- “Since the last session is there something you have done that I don’t know about?”

Prepcheck Zero Questions follow:

- “Has somebody failed to find out about you who should have?”
- “Has anyone ever failed to find out something about you?”
- “Is there something I failed to find out about you?”
- “Have you ever successfully hidden something from an auditor?”
- “Have you ever done something somebody failed to discover?”
- “Have you ever evaded discovery in this lifetime?”
- “Have you ever hidden successfully?”
- “Has anyone ever failed to locate you?”

(These Zeroes do not produce “What” questions until the auditor has located a specific overt.)

When Prepchecking, when running any process but the CCHs, if any one of the auditing circumstances in 1 to 15 above occurs, ask for missed withholds. Before leaving any chain of overts in Prepchecking, or during Prepchecking, ask frequently for missed withholds, “Have I missed any withhold on you?” or as above.

Do not conclude intensives on any process without cleaning up missed withholds.

Asking for missed withholds does not upset the dictum of using no O/W processes in rudiments.

Most missed withholds clean up at once on two way comm *providing* the auditor doesn't ask leading questions about what the pc is saying. Two way comm consists of asking for what the meter showed, acknowledging what the pc said and checking the meter again with the missed withhold question. If pc says, "I was mad at my wife," as an answer, just ack and check the meter with the missed withhold question. Don't say, "What was she doing?"

In cleaning missed withholds do not use the Prepcheck system unless you are Prepchecking. And even in Prepchecking, if the zero is not a missed withhold question and you are only checking for missed withholds amid other activities, do it simply as above, by two way comm, not by the Prepcheck system.

To get auditing into a state of perfection, to get clearing general, all we have to do is:

1. Know our basics (Axioms, Scales, Codes, the fundamental theory about the thetan and the mind);
2. Know our practical (TRs, Model Session, E-Meter, CCHs, Prepchecking and clearing routines).

In actual fact this is not much to ask. For the return is smooth results and a far, far better world. An HPA/HCA can learn the data in 1 above and all but clearing routines in the material in 2. An HPA/HCA should know these things to perfection. They are not hard to learn. Additives and interpretations are hard to get around. Not the actual data and performance.

Knowing these things, one also needs to know that all one has to do is clean the E-Meter of missed withholds to make any pc sit up and get audited smoothly, and all is as happy as a summer dream.

We are making all our own trouble. Our trouble is lack of precise application of Scientology. We fail to apply it in our lives or sessions and try something bizarre and then we fail too. And with our TRs, Model Session and meters we are most of all failing to pick up and clean up **Missed Withholds**.

We don't have to clean up all the withholds if we keep the Missed Withholds cleaned up.

Give a new auditor the order to clean up “Missed Withholds” and he or she invariably will start asking the pc for withholds. *That’s* a mistake. You ask the pc for *Missed Withholds*. Why stir up new ones to be missed when you haven’t cleaned up those *already missed*? Instead of putting out the fire we pour on gunpowder. Why find more you can *then* miss when you haven’t found those that *have been* missed.

Don’t be so confounded *reasonable* about the pc’s complaints. Sure, they may all be true **but** he’s complaining only because *withholds* have been *missed*. Only then does the pc complain bitterly.

Whatever else you learn, learn and understand this please. Your auditing future hangs on it. The fate of Scientology hangs on it. Ask for missed withholds when sessions go wrong. Get the missed withholds when life goes wrong. Pick up the missed withholds when staffs go wrong. Only then can we win and grow. We’re waiting for you to become technically perfect with TRs, Model Session and the E-Meter, to be able to do CCHs and Prepchecking and clearing techniques, *and* to learn to spot and pick up missed withholds.

If pcs, organizations and even Scientology vanish from Man’s view it will be because you did not learn and use these things.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 31 JANUARY 1970

Remimeo
SHSBC Checksheet
Academy Checksheet
Level II

WITHHOLDS, OTHER PEOPLE'S

Now and then, quite rarely, you find an auditor who in being audited "gets off" other people's withholds.

Example: "Yes, I have a withhold from you. Charley said you were insane."

Example: "Yes, I have a withhold. Mary Agnes has been in prison."

One also finds public pcs trying to do this occasionally.

The facts of the case are that it doesn't do anybody any good casewise to "get off" other people's withholds.

Essentially, a withhold by definition is something the *pc* did that was an overt act, which the *pc* is withholding and thus keeping secret.

Thus, getting off things that somebody else did is not helpful to a case as such things aren't aberrative to the *pc*.

But now let's look at this more closely.

If a *pc* is "getting off" other people's withholds **he himself must have a chain of similar overts and withholds that are his own**. Getting off other people's withholds is then seen as a symptom of the *pc* withholding similar actions of his own.

Let us then complete the two examples above.

Auditor: "Do you have a withhold?"

Pc: "Charley said you were insane."

Auditor, correctly: "Do you have a similar withhold of your own?"

Pc: "Er-uh – well actually I told the class you were crazy last month."

Auditor: "Do you have a withhold?"

Pc: "Mary Agnes has been in prison."

Auditor: "Ok. Do you have a similar withhold of your own?"

Pc: "Er-uh – well – I spent two years in a reform school and I've never told anybody. "

You can assume that any pc who is trying to get off withholds someone else had is making a sort of out-of-valence effort to avoid giving his own withholds.

This applies, of course, to all overts as well. Somebody giving other people's overts (which aren't aberrative to him) is actually failing to give overts of his own which are aberrative to him.

This is the mechanism behind the fact that if a pc is nattering about somebody the pc has overts on that somebody. The natter is "other people's overts". Getting these off does not help the pc. Getting the pc's off does. Never be misled by a nattering pc. Never be hooked into letting him get off other people's overts and withholds.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:js.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 SEPTEMBER 1965
Issue II

Remimeo
Franchise
Students
BPI

All Levels

THE CONTINUING OVERT ACT

Pity the poor fellow who commits daily harmful acts.

He'll never make it.

A criminal pilfering the cash box once a week has himself stopped cold as far as case gains are concerned.

In 1954 I counted some noses. I checked up on 21 cases who had never had any gains since 1950. 17 turned out to be criminals! The other 4 were beyond the reach of investigation.

That gave me my first clue.

For some years then, I watched for no-gain cases and carefully followed up those that I could. They had major or minor criminal backgrounds.

This gave the 1959 breakthrough on the meter checks (Sec Checking).

Following it further since 1959 I have finally amassed enough histories to state:

The person who is not getting case gains is committing continuing overts.

While this sounds like a very good "out" for us, we assume that the auditor at least tried *something* sensible.

Today – the running of a pc by grades is a saving grace for merely "tough cases". Directors of Processing are doing well with the modern graded process approach, level by level, and the DofP Washington has just told me they were cracking cases with the lowest grade processes DC had never been able to handle well before.

So, given processing by Grades (the best case approach we've ever had), we crack the rough ones.

But will that be *all* cases?

There's still one. The case who continually commits overts before, during and after processing.

He won't make it.

One thing helps this, however.

You have seen the Ethics Codes appear.

By putting a bit of control in the Scientology environment we have enough threat to restrain dramatization.

The phenomena is this: The reactive bank can exert stress on the pc if it is not obeyed. Discipline must exert just a shade more stress *against* dramatization than the bank does. This checks the performance of the continual overt long enough to let processing bite.

Not everyone is a continuous overt committer by a thousand to one. But this phenomenon is not confined to the no-gain case.

The *slow* gain case is also committing overts the auditor doesn't see.

Therefore a little discipline in the environment speeds the *slow* gain case, the one we're more interested in.

The no-gain case, frankly, is one I am not panting to solve. If a fellow wants to sell his next hundred trillion for the sake of the broken toy he stole, I'm afraid I can't be bothered. I have no contract with any Big Thetan to save the world complete.

It is enough for me to know:

1. Where bottom is, and
2. How to help speed slow gain cases.

Bottom is the chap who eats your lunch apple and says the children did it. Bottom is the fellow who sows the environment with secret suppressive acts and vicious generalities.

The slow gain case responds to a bit of "keep your nose clean, please, while I apply the thetan-booster."

The fast gain case does his job and doesn't give a hoot about threatened discipline if it's fair. And the fast gain case helps out and the fast gain case can be helped by a more orderly environment. The good worker works more happily when bad workers see the pitfalls and desist from distracting him.

So we all win.

The no-gain case? Well, he sure doesn't deserve any gain. One pc in a thousand. And he yaps and groans and says "Prove it works" and blames us and raises hell. He makes us think we fail.

Look down in our Sthil files. There are actually thousands upon thousands of Scientologists there who each one comment on how wonderful it is and how good they feel. There are a few dozen or so who howl they haven't been helped! What a ratio! Yet I believe some on staff think we have a *lot* of dissatisfied people. These no-gain characters strew so much en-theta around that we think we fail. Look in the Saint Hill files sometime! Those many thousands of reports continue to pour in from around the world with hurrah! Only the few dozen groan.

But long ago I closed my book on the no-gain case. Each of those few dozen no-gains tell frightening lies to little children, pour ink on shoes, say how abused they are while tearing the guts out of those unlucky enough to be around them. They are suppressive persons, every one. I know. I've seen them all the way down to the little clinker they call their soul. And I don't like what I saw.

The people who come to you with wild discreditable rumours, who seek to tear people's attention off Scientology, who chew up orgs, are suppressive persons.

Well, give them a good rock and let them suppress it!

I can't end this HCO B without a confession. I know how to cure them rather easily.

Maybe I'll never let it be done.

For had they had their way we would have lost our chance. It's too near to think about.

After all, we have to earn our freedom. I don't care much for those who didn't help.

The rest of us had to sweat a lot harder than was necessary to make it come true.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ml.rd

O/W Modernized and Reviewed

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 2 July 1964

Thank you.

All right. What have we got here? Have we got a date?

Audience: Second of July.

Second of July. There is a date. All right.

And... you... Actually, you know, there are 2 new students came in and I was not ap-
prised of them a week before.

...

The 2 students.

I want the 2 students.

Voice: I don't know. [laughter]

Voice: Alright.

We get this list straight yet.

Here we go.

I'd like to introduce 2 new students. Stand up and take a bow: Liam Steinberg
[Applause] and John Wuitton. [Applause]

Allright. There's various methods of discipline. [laughter]

Now, I haven't committed an overt. I'm going to talk to you today about overts.
[laughter]

And this is the subject of O/W Modernized and Reviewed.

Now this lecture is given into the teeth of the fact that it is notorious that very few Sci-
entologists would ever inquire very deeply as to just exactly "what was did." This is given
into the teeth of that knowledge. And there's a good reason for that: In order to do something
for somebody, you have to have a communication line to that person.

Communication lines depend upon reality and communication and affinity. And where
an individual is too demanding, the affinity tends to break down slightly. And the Scientolo-
gist is very afraid of breaking that affinity line with his pc and so he doesn't want to break
that affinity line with his pc so he never, then, gets to the second stage of processing.

Processing goes in two stages: One is to get into communication with that or which you are trying to process. That's number one. And number two is do something for them. And there's many – many a pc will go around raving about his auditor, whose auditor has not done anything for the pc. All that has happened is a tremendous communication line has been established with the pc. And this is so new and so novel and so strange to the pc that he then considers that something miraculous has occurred. Well, yes, something miraculous has occurred, but in this particular instance the auditor has totally neglected *why* he formed that communication line in the first place.

He formed the communication line in the first place to do something for the pc. And he very often mistakes the fact that he has formed a communication line and the reaction on the pc for having formed one with having done something for the pc.

There are two stages here – is

- 1) form a communication line and
- 2) do something for the pc.

Those are two distinct stages. That is something like walking up to the bus and driving off. Do you see? There's two stages: You walk up to the bus and then you drive off. If you don't drive off, you never go anyplace.

So many an auditor bogs down at this one point of walking up to the bus which is putting in a communication line with the pc, and then they never go anyplace. Do you see that? And where auditing broadly breaks down, and you say, "Well, Mamie Glutz had lumbosis and" – we're going to have to make a list of Scientology diseases; that's one of them – "Mamie Glutz has lumbosis and she loves her auditor but she's still got lumbosis."

Now, exactly, what has happened is the auditor has formed his communication line to the pc – has actually done this heroic thing of getting in communication with the pc – and that is very tricky and that is no small shakes. That's something: to be able to communicate to a human being who has never been communicated to before. This is quite remarkable. And that is such a remarkable feat that it appears to be the end-all of Scientology to some. But you see, that's just walking up to the bus. Now we've got to go someplace.

Now, how do we go someplace? Well, actually, any upset that the individual has is so poised; it is so delicately balanced; it is so difficult to maintain. You know, you look at this fellow. He's in a wheelchair, you know? And you say to yourself, "How is he keeping himself in a wheelchair?" And you think, "Well, it'd be very difficult to get him out of that wheelchair." Oh, no, no! It's very difficult to stay in that wheelchair. That is what's difficult. Unless you learn this reverse look, you'll have trouble with psychosomatics and things like this, particularly battinesses more than psychosomatics. Psychosomatics are not a good example. A battiness of some kind or another is a much better example because they surrender so easily.

This individual is very sure that "horses sleep in beds." Now, you don't look at what it takes to maintain that. That is based on such slippery logic that the least little cogwheel goes adrift in it, it'll collapse. In other words, it's very hard to remain batty. It's not difficult to get well but it's hard to remain batty. A fellow has to work at it. You'll see an odd look coming into somebody's eyes, sometime or another, when you're getting right close to, and you'll see

a pc suddenly start veering sideways from you when you start approaching too closely to a piece of battiness.

Let's supposing that having formed a communication line, we merely and only did this – we just did this and we didn't worry about these vast complications and this terrific sea of aberration. We didn't do anything like that. We just said, "Now, what are you doing that's sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?" And you know, a guy's case will just fall to pieces right in front of your eyes. This is a zone to which I invite your attention because it's untrodden. It's virgin. It's native. It's the bush in a completely unspoiled condition.

You see, this communication line is only valuable to the degree that you can walk around in your big muddy feet in the midst of all this morass. And if your communication line is very good and very smooth, and if your auditing discipline is perfect so that – you see, your auditing discipline is perfect so you don't upset this communication line – then you can walk around in this wild jungle that he calls his ideas.

And if you just made a foray of no more importance and no more breadth than "What are you doing that's sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?" and kept your communication line up the while and kept your affinity up with the pc the while – did it with perfect discipline – you would see more aberration fall to pieces per square inch than you ever thought could exist. See? Now, that's what I mean when I'm saying to you *do something for the pc*.

See, I tell you, "Audit well. Get perfect discipline. Get your comm cycle in. Don't ARC break the pc. Let the cycles of action complete." Don't you see? All of that. Well, that is simply an entrance to the... You see, the discipline of Scientology makes it possible to do this. And one of the reasons why other fields of the mind never got anyplace and never could get near anybody because they couldn't communicate to anybody, see?

So that discipline is important. That is the ladder which goes up to the door. And if you can't get to the door, you can't do anything. You see? So there's two stages here, two stages. And you're busy completing communication cycles and so forth. And I will admit sometimes I get impatient with you, you see, because I'm merely trying to teach you how to communicate to somebody so that you can do something for him, you see? And I sometimes believe that your whole attention gets tremendously absorbed in merely communicating with somebody – see, that – and use that as an end-all. See, and I get a little upset.

Because it's something on the order of – well, let's say you're trying to make an actor, you see? It's something like this, and you get him all set on the subject of makeup, you know, but he keeps standing in the wings made-up and thinks he's acting and he isn't. He's standing in the wings, see?

So this perfect discipline of which we speak: The perfect communication cycle; the perfect auditor presence; perfect meter reading; all of these various things are just to get you in a state where you can do something for somebody. And because this is so new, strange and novel, and is so unheard of in this universe, it looks so startling that you can say, "Well, that's auditing, that's processing, that's it. That's the end product."

Man, that's no more the end product than a can of dog food, see? I mean, it's still there in the can. It's supposed to be eaten, you know? It's the difference between reading a recipe book and dining.

So when you're real slow picking up the discipline, when you're – when you're real slow picking up keeping in a communication cycle, when you're poky on this subject and so forth, you see, you just – still nine miles from the ball, you know? You're not even attending yet. See?

So what you want to be able to do is audit perfectly. By that we mean keep in a communication cycle: be able to approach the pc; be able to talk to the pc; be able to maintain the ARC; get the pc to give you answers to your questions; be able to read a meter; get the reactions; be able to do this; be able to do that; all of those little things, you see? They've all got to be awfully good because it's very difficult to get a communication line in to somebody anyway. And they all have to be present and they all have to be perfect. But if they're all present and they're all perfect, *then we can start to process somebody. Then we can start to process somebody.* And all of that looks so beneficial that you could mistake it for processing.

Now, I'm giving you some kind of an entrance point here of – if all of your cycles were perfect, if you were able to sit there and confront that pc and meter that pc and keep your auditing reports and do all these other multiple various things and keep a pleasant smile on your face and not chop his communication and – if you can do those various things, now let's find out what do you do. Because there is something you do with those things.

Well, at Level VI this is very easy. You run GPMs. But that's doing something for somebody. And try to run GPMs sometimes without all these other factors near perfect. It's not possible. But let's take it down to a lower level. What could you do for somebody if you were a perfect auditor from the basis of your auditing technique and presence and handling somebody? Now, what could you do? That's the burning question: What could you do?

Now, we used to have this all on backwards. We used to try to teach people what they could do for somebody but they could never get in communication with him to do it. See, so therefore you had failures in processing.

Well, the most elementary procedure – the most elementary procedure, "What are you doing that you think is sensible?" and "Why is it sensible?" That's a perfectly elementary procedure and the guy would all of a sudden gawp at you.

And he'd say, "Oh, no!" you know? Because these things are very difficult to maintain as an insensibility. You have to work hard to have something in crosswise. "Horses sleep in beds."

All right, you say, "Well, what are you doing – what do you think is sensible?" or "What are you doing that's sensible?" or anything of this sort.

And the fellow says, "Well, I think horses sleep in beds. That's sensible."

"All right, now why is that sensible?"

"Well... that's nuts!" See?

You actually wouldn't have to do anything more than that, see? See? Now, one of the things that's horrible about all this is it's so easy to do but you keep looking for some magic. Well, your magic was getting into communication with the person. The rest of it is very easy to do. All you had to do is remain in communication with the person while you're doing this and realize that these huge boulders that he's got in his skull are poised with the most fantastically delicate balance on little pinheads, see, little pinpoint balance. And all you have to do is go *phooh*, like that, and this thing goes *Brrooomm*, crash! Now, if you're not in communication with this person, he takes it as an accusative action; he tries to justify thinking that way; he tries to make himself look good to you; he tries to put on a public front of some kind or another sitting in the pc's chair; he tries to hold up his status. And any time I see a bunch of pcs around jumping happily to something else because it's "Only sane people can run on that," you see, "and crazy ones run on something else."

Well, everybody immediately will have the same computation, so they never have to be run on the crazy one. I right away know their auditors are not in communication with them and that auditing discipline itself has broken down because the pc is trying to justify himself and trying to hold – uphold his own status. So he must be defending himself against the auditor. So the auditor couldn't possibly be in communication with him, could he?

So right back – we're right back to the fundamental of, "Why didn't the auditor get into communication with the pc in the first place?" Well, you get into communication with the pc in the first place by doing the proper Scientology discipline. That is not any trick. It is – goes off one, two, three, four. You sit down and you start the session and you start talking to somebody and you start handling the pc and you start handling his problems, and that sort of thing; and you do it by completing your communication cycles and not cutting his communication and by this and by that – the very things you're taught in the TRs. And you'll find you're in communication with the person. And where you fail and why he maintains his status is you've gotten into communication with the person and then you've never done anything for the person.

Unless having gotten into communication you now do something for the person, you lose, of course, your communication line, because the R-factor breaks down. He doesn't think you're so good and you go out of communication with the person. Do you understand? You can get into communication with the person, then not do anything for the person; the R-factor of why you are in communication with the person can break down and break down with you. You say, "Well, here I am in communication with the person. What am I supposed to do now?" You'll go out of communication with the person and you've somehow taken a little circular trip which was in toward the person and then away from the person, see?

All right, that having happened, now the person will be in sort of defensive and status and wonder why he's being processed and – you see, he could wonder all these questions.

It takes a process now. Now you've got to do something for the person and it takes a process. But it takes an understanding of what a process is. And a process is simply a combination of mental mechanisms which by – which when inspected will pass away. All auditing is negative gain, you never add anything to the case. All auditing is subtractive, you're as-

ising things on the case and that's all you're doing. So you say, "All right, what do you think is sensible?"

The guy says, "Horses sleep in beds. Ah – ! Hey, that isn't sensible." Cognition. Total duration of process, see, was that.

You actually will get a – probably get a big blowdown or something like that on your E-meter – be a huge blowdown on your E-meter. Now, you try to get more tone arm action out of the fact that "horses sleep in beds." You don't get there. You flattened the process.

So it requires a sensitivity to know when the process is flat. You can over-audit and under-audit. You can try to run that tone arm action out of things which have no tone arm action left in them and you can walk off and leave things which have a ton of tone arm action left in them. You can do one or the other of these things. But this requires observation of the pc, and it only answers this question: Have you done anything for the pc? Once more, you only have to answer that question: Have you done something for the pc?

Well, if you've done something for the pc, you are not likely to get any more tone arm action out of it. Now, this is – becomes elementary, you see? We're breaking this down into 1) and 2). So, 1) there's the auditing discipline, and 2) there's doing something for the pc. If you've done something for the pc, you've gotten the tone arm action out of it. It isn't that you really even do anything for the pc by having the tone... getting the tone arm action out of it, you see? That's simply an indicator of whether you're doing anything or not. This becomes – I'm beating a dead horse to death, now, don't you see, because this is not – it's not that complicated. That's – it's less complicated than anybody imagines.

You say to the pc, "What's sensible?"

"Well," he says, "Oh, well, so – well, yes psychiatry and psychoanalysis and congressmen and elections and governments. They're all sensible and something is sensible, and something else is sensible, and so on and so on, and they're all sensible." Well, let's observe the pc. Have you done anything for the pc yet? Well, the funny part of it is that your tone arm is going to be moving during this period. See, we haven't done anything, really, for the pc yet. And he goes on and he says, "Well, my old teacher was sensible. My old teacher used to tell me, well, I'd never succeed in the world, and he was right. And he was sensible."

And you're still getting tone arm action, see? "And he was – I don't know."

"Was he sensible or wasn't he sensible?"

"I don't know. You know, I have done some things in life. You don't suppose I could be failing all the time because he was so sure I would? *Uhghh*, this doesn't make any sense. You know, I think that man was a blithering ass! I think he was a complete fool. How would he know that I would never succeed in life? He's silly. I don't think he was sensible. No, we'll forget about that being sensible. Well, that – that wasn't sensible. That – you know, that's why I failed in life! Because he was so sure I would. And I always thought he was so sensi... Well, I'll be a son of a gun!"

Right about that moment your TA action goes *bzzp, bzzp, zzp, thup-bup* there's no more TA action, see?

Now you, knucklehead, not having noticed... I should be polite, I laid down a maxim "Always be polite to somebody who is trying to learn something," you see? You don't notice this one answer has come your way. You have done something for him. So now you start beating up the brush to do something for him. This is very bad timing, don't you see?

Now, you could go on with the process in some other way and some other field or some other channel, but you've handled something and you've done something. And if you keep him working on that one thing that he has now – you've now done something for him on, your TA action will disappear and your pc will get resentful. And not only will your TA action disappear, but you'll lose your comm line.

Now, let's try to press him. "What about this old teacher?" see? He's already had the cognition, see? Wow! See, "What about this old teacher? When did you know him? Did you have any overts against him?" and so forth. Notice your TA. TA is not moving. You're now restimulating the pc. You've gotten your key-out – destimulation factor has occurred right before your eyes. You've done something for the pc.

Now, hear me now, it's just a matter of. "Have you done anything for the pc or not?" And on any given subject, when you have done something for the pc, your TA action in that zone and area will cease. If there's any TA action to be gained in that area while you are doing something for the pc, you will get tone arm action. But sooner or later it is going to run up to having done something for the pc, see? Your TA action is about to do something for the pc, you see? That tells you that something there that can be done for the pc, and your TA action will go on toward the point where you have done something for the pc, and now this is past tense. Now, you're going to get more TA action on his dear, old teacher. In a pig's eye you are! That is a went proposition, now. So! It requires of the auditor discipline to keep in his communication line. He's got to stay in communication with his pc. Those cycles have got to be perfect. He can't be distracting the pc's attention onto the TA. "I'm not getting any tone arm action now." That's not staying in communication with the pc, see? Has nothing much to do with it. You're distracting the pc from his own zones and areas. So don't keep his attention out of session, you know? Keep him going on this; keep that communication line in. And the next requirement is do something for the pc: do something productive; use the communication line. Now that you've got the telephone in your hands, for God sakes, talk! See? There's nothing quite as silly as receiving a transatlantic telephone call where the other person then doesn't talk.

They phoned you – I got one not – not a month or two ago, and the person actually at the other end of the line stood there with the live phone in their hand with nothing to say. Undoubtedly, they had something to say but they just couldn't think of it at the time it finally got through.

And many an auditor who isn't getting a result with a pc is sitting there with the telephone in his hand not saying anything, see? He's got all the lines in, "Hello, hello. Are you there?"

"Oh, yes, I'm here," bright and cheerful.

"Oh – oh." See? Now, too much astonishment to say anything to the pc, see? So we go back to putting a communication line in, see? Best thing to do is to call back central and find

out if we really do have a call to the pc, see? Find out if it was the correct number after all. Call up the rate operator and find out how much it's costing.

Do you see? You see, you can walk right up – you can walk right up to this crucial point and then die on the vine. You can start getting tone arm action on the pc and then never press it home. This thing all of a sudden there's – big drop. He says something about – you said – well, just – let's take this weird little process: "What's sensible?" see?

And he says, "Well, the most sensible person I ever knew was my old instructor."

Wiff. You know, you've got some tone arm. You make a note over here. "Instructor," it gave a tone arm action, and so on and so on. And "What's the question again? Sensible. Sensible. What does sensible mean? Is *sensible* a sensible word?" And so forth. No tone arm action there, you see?

And you say, "(Well, look, there was a bit of a tone arm motion there when he said 'the old instructor.')" You said something about this old instructor being sensible."

"Oh, yeah! Oh, terrifically sensible man." More TA, see?

"Well, have you adopted any of his views or anything like that?"

"Oh, yes, my whole life has been monitoring by the views," you see? See, big TA going on. And we'll go on this way and all of a sudden he's – he knew the pc was going to fail. Pc suddenly gets that in crosswise, you see? You'll see a big reaction and then the more reaction, more reaction and then all of a sudden the pc suddenly cognites, "Maybe that's why I'm failing all the time. I am *blaug-ow-ow-oh*," see? "Yeah! That guy is a fool. I didn't – he wasn't sensible at all. Ha! What do you know about that!" See? Big TA action occurs right before that moment. And if you're riding right up on your toes, you won't expect another whisper to come out of that old man. You won't ask for another whisper to come out of it, nothing. That's gone. That is dead. That's as dead as yesterday's newspaper.

You see, that's where the tone arm leads you into this. And if I was trying to teach you, totally mechanically, I'd say you go ahead and make sure there is nothing flat in there, but actually your communication line is at risk all the time you're trying to find out if anything else is in that. Your communication line is at risk. You're liable to get – unplug the whole switchboard.

"Well, hell, I told you! I had the cognition, you know? I told you already! I have – how many times do I have to...?"

See, there goes your communication line, you see? And after awhile, you'll get the point. You'll say, "Look, we're pulling switches out of the switchboard here. We're messing things up." And come off of it.

Actually, if you're very, very clever, you'll run a process that cyclically produces this sort of thing by a general question so that you don't make that particular goof. You don't have to make the piece of judgment, which I just gave you, all the time, see?

It took me a long time – and really, it took me as an auditor a long time – to learn when to give up on somebody. You know, learn when to give up on a subject. And I finally got clever and tuned my antenna up on a Martian wavelength and got it up to a point where

that thing was flat. I could see that was flat, see? And where, if I pursued it any further, I would now get into trouble: Where I had done something for the pc and, in trying to do anything further along that particular line, would put my communication line at risk. And I got to a point where I could judge that just like that, you know? Pc happy, tone arm increasing every session, everything going along swingingly.

But let me tell you that it is a very interesting point. It'd be something I would be very happy to be able to teach you. But I'm afraid it's something that you learn on the basis of observation. Now, in Level VI you're learning that; there is nothing deader than a dead item. When it has give up its ghost, there is no more tone arm action there. If there is any more cognition in it, any more read in it, yes, yes, you could get it out. But you develop a sensitivity after a while as an auditor. You know when it has given up its ghost. And you know that just mentioning it or referring to it one more time is practically fatal. Your pc just feels like he's being ground into the dirt. See, just one more mention of that item and you've had it, see?

And you'll start to get a tick-tocky needle, and other undesirable phenomena sets in, and if you keep it up – "Yeah, well, I'm not sure whether the item has read or not. I didn't have my eye on the meter at the time." (Calling pc's attention to the meter, always, if you want ARC breaks.) "I didn't have my eye on the meter and I don't really know whether it read or not. And, of course, I must – I must have seen it read before I can go on, but maybe I missed it." That's the – one of the most marvelous ARC breaky situations that I could possibly set up, and yet it's one of the commonest ones.

Now let's take this same situation. There was only so much charge, see, on this old instructor or something like that. See, there is only that much charge on it. You've got it! He wasn't an item. He was a lock of some kind or another. But boy, you blew it. You've seen it blow; you've seen the pc change before your very eyes. Now that's the time to unload; that's the time to swing off that freight train and hit the gravel and grab another one. Not necessarily change the process but certainly don't press that guy any further in the direction of what has just given TA.

You could now ask him – but there's ways of asking auditing questions that are part of a communication line. There is a way of dismissing everything you have been talking about while asking the same question as you did before. You know? Sort of like, "Well all right, we've taken care of that. You've gotten all of that. Good. Good, I'm glad we've got – we've finished off with that. All right, now let's get back to the original process now. What's sensible?"

You get an idea? There is a thing an auditor can do. He doesn't have to say all those things I just said, but that is the way he is building the atmosphere. You know, he acknowledges on the idea, "Oh, that old tutor you had. Yeah. All right, well, we got that, good. We got that. Let's..." so on. You even do a little business here about crossing it all off, you know? And, "All right, now we're getting back in the original process. Okay."

Here, you see? Now, we say same auditing question, we say, "What's sensible?" But he obviously knows that it's now being addressed to some entirely different zone of the mind and as such you shift that. You're still doing something for the pc. You follow this?

So there's getting up to the bus and then there's getting in it and going someplace. And you could become a past master at auditing discipline and motions and so forth – and actually have to be a past master at it anyhow before you can carry on the rest of it – never carry it another sixteenth of an inch, have a lot of pcs that absolutely loved you and swore by you who went right on having lumbosis. And you would say, "What in the name of heaven has happened to me? What terrible catastrophe am I looking at here?"

Well, everything is fine, except you're not doing anything for the pc. You got right up to there and got on the bus but you never drove off anyplace and you never did anything. That's the whole secret of auditing. It's in two sections.

Of course, Level VI, you do it so fast that you hardly get a chance to you call this, and boom it goes, and that's the end of it. And of course, there it's predicted where the charge is going to be, and you know what's going to fire and all that sort of thing. So you say, "Well, this is something different." No, it isn't any different at all. Cleverer auditing is below – is below IV. See, you've got to be clever. There's ways of asking auditing questions, which is the same question, which could make the pc believe implicitly that his answer had not been accepted.

I'm sure we've all had at one time or another this trouble. We've repeated the auditing question and the pc thinks his cognition has been invalidated. So then, to prove to him that his cognition has not been invalidated, we preserve our communication line by wildly changing a process that is not flat as a general process. And that is one of the most flagrant examples and that is the most general reason why auditors run lots of processes. They haven't mastered the trick of convincing the pc that his cognition has been accepted and that they're all done with that particular zone or area of the process and that the process that is being run is now expected to go into some other zone or area. Direction of attention this comes under.

You can do some pretty wild things with direction of attention. You can exaggerate this up like mad. Pc says, "Oh, oh, yes! Yes. Yes, yes, yes. See, you're asking me sensible. Oh, yeah. Textbooks. Yeah. Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho!" Big blowdown, see?

And you say, "What's with textbooks?"

"Oh, well, good God, you know, they pretend they're sensible and nobody can make any sense out of them at all. Ha-ha!"

Gone, that TA now is gone. You understand it, that's as far as you're permitted to pursue it. You've now done something for the pc. It isn't manifested in any degree that you will notice right there at that moment. But how do you now convince the pc that your next same auditing question is not actually going to be addressed to textbooks? Well, there are crude mechanisms for doing it.

"All right. We've taken care of textbooks. Now, in some other zone or area, what's sensible?" That's doing it with an axe. "We got your communication. We consider that that particular zone or area is complete and we're not asking you to do anything more in that zone or area because you've already gotten the tone arm action out of *that*. Now, asking exactly the same auditing question, but addressing it to some *other* zone or area of the mind, what's sen-

sible?" See, this is the message which you're putting across in the middle of your communication line.

Now, you can make – you could do some weird, weird, weird things with cases. You – it's quite, quite unbelievable what you can do with a case, steering him around in this particular zone on some general process. Now, this is not running an alternate process; this is really not running itsa. This is merely a finished method of handing a process to a pc: Is run him to cognition; run him to cognition. And that's actually not new. It's running the pc to cognition, but it's on the same thing.

And nearly everybody has understood "running to cognition" – change the process when the pc has cognited. Well, that is very far from true. You change the sub-subject of the process on the cognition. You don't change the process.

Your process can be far too specific. It can be a sub-process. "Right around the vicinity of this rug, you see, have you ever made a footprint?" See? Well, it's so circumscribed as an auditing question that it's really a subquestion anyhow. So what you really want to run on a pc is a broad question which you've already established, and running to cognition is knocking off these sub-cognitions on it. Now, you take something as broad as "What's sensible?" Ooooh, that's broad.

Now, of course, "Putting footprints on this rug, see, that's sensible. I don't know why it's sensible," he suddenly says, "but it doesn't seem to be any reason at all why I should put footprints... Do you know, I see a rug of this particular type and I always have to put a footprint on it. That's real crazy. That's real crazy. I think that's Wadsworth, or somebody, 'Footprints on the sands of time,' yeah. It already – yeah. Yes, I learned the poem when I had scarlet fever. Yeah. Yeah, there was a rug in the room the same as the rug in this room. Oh, that's what that's all about."

"All right, good." You've had your blowdown. "All right, that – that's fine. Now, aside from that and footprints and that sort of thing, which we've got, and so forth. What's sensible?"

See, that's just parking it. That's how to really, smartly run by cognition. You can be smarter than a tack if you pursue this particular course. But I'm warning you that that particular approach requires some sensitivity on the part of the auditor. He has to ask himself this question continually: "What have I done for the pc?"

I used to run an auditing session until I had done something for the pc. You take a short-attention pc, particularly. The session was exactly as long as it took me to do something for the pc. And horribly enough, some of those sessions would go four or five hours, and I had thought they would run as long as fifteen minutes. But that's because we never got into the communication cycle necessary to do something for the pc. And it'd take maybe that long to establish a communication line before we could start to ask the pc what's cooking. See?

You'll sometimes start asking an alternate question of a pc, back and forth, and notice that the answers are dodgy. These are dodgy answers. Well, merely and completely recognize out of that dodginess just one thing: that your communication line to the pc has failed in some particular way.

I'll give you an example. You start to process a child – you start to process a child on the idea of "What problems do you have?" You're going to you're going to process this child, you see? And the child is sitting there very dodgily answering this question. And they appear to be very reluctant to answer the question. You realize that this reluctance isn't really any withhold or anything, it's just that the child cannot talk to you. Then you suddenly realize that the process you should have started in on was "What could you say to me?"

You maybe process the child on something very fundamental, like "What problems do you have?" and get no place because you aren't doing anything for the pc; so therefore, you get minimum tone arm action and so forth. Well, you haven't established a communication line to the pc. You shift your gears and ask something that has nothing to do – well, the child has been sick, let us say, and the child feels badly and there's a lot of things wrong with this child. And you shift off onto a process such as "What could you say to me?" and "What would you rather not say to me?" And the – you say, "Well, there's lots of mechanisms in this such as withholds coming off and all that sort of thing." But the surprising thing about it is you now have tone arm action, you now have a session running because you're getting in your communication line. At the same time, you're incidentally getting off a few withholds, which is doing something for the pc, too, at the same time you're getting in a communication line.

A process like that tends to confuse you. You see why it'd be confusing? Because it's putting in the communication line and it's doing something for the pc at the same time.

Well, there are a great many of these processes in Scientology which get in the communication line and do something for the pc at the same time. So, therefore, this breakdown of getting into communication with the pc and then doing something for the pc becomes obscured because you're doing them both at once. And then you begin to become confirmed in the idea that getting in the communication line is what's doing something for the pc. See, so the whole subject now gets lost all over again. Even though you do, then, use a combination that accomplishes both at once, don't lose sight of the fact that there are two actions and you won't make very many mistakes along this line.

Now, all of this is really a prelude to O/W because O/W is just about the greatest, handy-jim-dandy little communication wrecker that an auditor ever had very much to do with. And an auditor loses the ARC he has with the pc a time or two and he becomes very timid. And he starts asking, "Do you have any overts? Have you committed any overts?"

And the pc says, "Yes. Well, I thought people were mean to me, and it was really an overt to think that against myself."

And the auditor says, "Well, he got off a big overt," and so forth. And they will go on this way and on this way and on this way and on this way, a sort of a motivatorish, critical think, you know? And the auditor never tags it and never nails it and never does anything about it and never corrects it; and nothing happens with the pc and the communication line doesn't improve because the pc is actually running a falsity. And it just winds up in a pile of garbage. You see, we really never get anyplace. So we're really adventuring on something that is very, very intricate when we're adventuring on O/W.

It's not a simple mechanism, because although handled rightly, it would put in the communication line at the same time it was doing something for the pc. The auditor protects his communication line to the pc – he protects his communication line to the pc by not asking anything embarrassing. And he permits his pc to sit there with withholds in the session half-ARC broke with the communication line flying out the window. And he never presses home to find one of these things out. He can even get a read on the meter that exists and never really ask for it because he doesn't want to risk his communication line. So this makes O/W dicey.

Now, another thing that made it dicey in the old days is the fact that *withhold* occurs in the bank. And you should not use the word *withhold*.

Of course, withhold is an out of ARC condition and it's an out of ARC process and, actually, cannot be run solo. You can take an out of ARC process and run it in combinations with an ARC process. You can say, "What have you done? What have you not done?" You could say, "What have you said? What have you not said?" You could say, "What have you thought? What have you not thought?" or something like that. But again, *thought* is a risky one because that also occurs in the bank. But done, fortunately, really doesn't occur in the bank.

Now, I've told you that O/W is senior to the bank. Now, this might lead you to believe that once you'd got the bank gone you'd still have O/W. No, this is not the case. It is senior in that it will key out the bank.

Now, let's look at this a little more intimately and find why it keys out the bank: Because the whole common denominator of the bank would be "done." That's the common denominator of the whole reactive bank. In other words, a high order of lock. And anybody who knows the constituency of the bank could look those things over and he'd certainly say, "Heh-heh! Yeah, that's true." It's just a high order of lock, don't you see?

So it's a lock on all parts of reactivity. Now, when we specify what things have been done to, we err, because we might run into another piece of the bank, you see? So the generalized statement, or a common or the proper name of somebody, is quite allowable.

We find our pc has a present time problem with Oswald. Perfectly proper to say "What have you done to Oswald?" We're not running into any bank because he hasn't got Oswald as part of the basic reactive mind. "Men," that might be different. That might be too close in. But this guy, Oswald; what have we done to Oswald?

Now, we'd find, weirdly enough, that the communication line to Oswald will have been interrupted because of an overt to Oswald, so therefore, one couldn't communicate to Oswald.

A present time problem is also produced by failing to complete a communication. There is really one for the book. That's something I don't think I've told you. I've known it for a long time but I just think I've omitted mentioning it. I might have, I might have mentioned it, but I doubt it. A present time problem can be created by a failure to complete a communication cycle. This is so much the case that if your pc, coming into session, were asked – you were to ask your pc coming into session, "Is there any communication you ha-

ven't completed?" the pc would rattle off several and the pc would not register on present time problem. This is another method of handling PTPs. They tend to vanish under this.

Now, you're not trying to erase the PTPs anyway. All you're trying to do with these PTPs is get them out of the road so that you can audit somebody. You never erase, in rudiments, anyway. Actually, you never erase in anything below Level VI, now. So your action here is a destimulative action and that question all by itself will adequately destimulate the pc so the pc can be audited. You'll find it very seldom that you will fail to get around a present time problem with that question. Of course, the problem can still be there but the pressure is gone on it.

Now, "I got PTPs," the pc says.

You say, "Well, what communication have you failed to complete or haven't you completed with regard to these?"

And the pc says, "*Brrow, brrow, brrrow, brrow, brrrow, brrow,*" and that's the end, and you don't get none that will register on PTP. That would be a common experience.

Now, the reason he has PTPs with these people and hasn't completed the communication is because he's got overts. So we get the secondary consideration on PTPs. You never have a PTP with anything you don't have an overt on. Of course that's primary, really. Your PTPs stem from overts. If you have an overt against a telephone pole, you will have a PTP with a telephone pole, see, something like this. Psychosomatics go back to PTPs which go back to overts. So you can actually run out psychosomatics on this but it's a rather adventurous undertaking. You're liable to get the pc into more than you can easily get him out of. But you can, in *extremis*, handle a psychosomatic illness on the basis that it must be a present time problem. See? The guy has got lumbosis. All right. There, then, you immediately – you have two approaches.

The least adventurous of these approaches, and the swiftest one to handle, is the guy has got lumbosis of the – of the blumjum. And you say, "Well, what communication haven't you completed to or about the blumjum?"

"Oh, well, that's simple. I had an appointment at the hospital, and *waf-waf-saf-saf-naf*, and I had an appointment there. And I was supposed to go to the drugstore and then get some stuff, and so forth. And I actually, I was telling my Aunt Maisy the other day about the blumjum was a very obstructive mechanism as far as I was concerned. And I didn't finish the letter and – what? The somatic is gone. What happened?" The pc is liable to be very startled at this point because they are apparently not talking about anything that had anything to do with doing something for the blumjum. That's what I mean by it's very, very difficult to keep lumbosis around. It is. It takes a lot of doing.

So we have these two approaches, not just one. The unfinished cycle of communication to or about the "it"; the unfinished cycle of communication to or about the object that you're trying to handle, which is a PTP. Guy has a present time problem with Internal Revenue. Well, we don't much care about wondering and settling this problem but we certainly want him less obsessively concerned with it. So let's do something to get rid of this problem.

All right, the easiest pitch is an unfinished cycle of communication, and the second one is a done.

And let me call to your attention, you have now followed out the exact one-two that I gave you for the auditor to a pc. See, this is the way the mind stacks up.

Now, it's quite sensational just getting a communication line straightened out to something. This is quite sensational. It doesn't really finish off everything there is to finish off. It is merely sensational. So the best thing to ask a pc who has a PTP – the best thing to ask this pc to get rid of his PTP is "What cycle of communication have you failed to complete with regard to this?" "To it" or "about it?"

See, he's given you a present time problem. "Present time problem with my wife."

"All right. What cycle of communication have you failed to complete or have you not completed (better wording) to your wife or about your wife? Hm?" And it all sort of goes *bzz-bzz-bzz*, and an awful lot of the time this problem evaporates as a problem. But you haven't taken very much care of this problem yet because you've approximated the one-two of the auditor, you see? You've really not done anything about the problem. You've just eased it off. See? You've gotten in there so that you could do something about it.

But you will very often find out quite magically that for the purposes of destimulation and getting on with the session on what you were doing yesterday, and so forth, that it's quite adequate. And you'll very often find that in the field of psychosomatic auditing that it's quite adequate.

The severity of the illness has *nothing whatsoever* to do with the ease or difficulty of its release. These two things are not comparable. You'll find some guy with some sniffing, little sinus condition that merely nags him, that takes a thousand hours of itsa before it finally surrenders. And this other bird has got a busted back and can't even move his feet, and you might cure the whole thing up in five minutes. Don't ever measure – don't ever measure the length of auditing by the violence of the condition because they are not necessarily in keeping one after the other; they're not.

So anyway, there's your first chance just with an auditor. An auditor can sometimes sit down and audit a pc for a few minutes. He just gets in his communication line, you see? The other fellow finds out there's somebody he can talk to, the auditor, with his good discipline and everything. And all of a sudden, the guy feels wonderful, see? And he says, "Well, it's all settled now."

And the auditor says, "Wait a minute that can't be. I didn't do anything, you know?" Well, that's true, but as far as this guy is concerned it's all settled. He's found one human being out of the whole sun, moon or stars he could talk to and this was enough to momentarily key him out and make him feel better. Perfectly adequate action. And then you go around waiting for this miracle to happen again, don't you see? Well the miracle, maybe, won't happen for many a pc because, of course, what the missing thing was is you didn't do anything for this first pc and you knew it. So you get lazy and you expect to go on through auditing not doing anything for people and have them feel marvelous.

I think that's the one-shot Clear and so on. You see, if that existed, we'd all be out of work. So you can bless your stars it doesn't.

But you occasionally get this type of a reaction. You'll get somebody reading, just reading a book on Scientology and all of a sudden going well all over the place, you see? Well, that's because somebody understands them or somebody knows what it's all about or somebody has put his finger on what the score is with life. And just the fact that this data could exist all of a sudden gives a guy a resurgence and he gets out of his sick bed. This has happened many, many times. But that's just the first step, see? That's the communication step.

Now, this other step, when it doesn't occur automatically, you want to be able to do something about it. You don't go around expecting the accident to happen all the time, you see? So you ask this – let me take it up in the most elementary session form possible, terribly elementary session form and that is, "Do you have a present time problem?"

"Oh, well, yeah. Oh, yo – boy, do I have a – oh, oh, man! Ha-ha. You should ask."

"All right, well, is there any communication you have not completed with regard to those problems?"

"Oh, *brr, brrzz, brzzzz, brzzzz, brzzz, brzzz, brzzz, brzzz, brrzzz, brzzz.*" Problem is all gone.

You say, "What magic! How marvelous!" All right. That's fine. That's fine, but remember what you have just done is the lick and the promise. See, you have not gone any more fundamentally into it than that.

Now supposing you were in the horrible condition of having said, "What communication have you failed to complete about those present time problems?"

And the pc says, "Oh, well, none of that would do any good. Nothing. One couldn't, you know? That's it." Now what do you do? Your favorite card trick has laid an egg. Now where do we go?

Well, there's number two. You see, you should realize that up to this point you haven't done number two. You haven't done anything for the pc so this second one is "done." You see, "doing something" is mostly "done." See, they rhyme; they go together very nicely.

Now, why? Because it's the highest common lock of the whole reactive mind. If he has a present time problem with something, he has overts against it. And if you really want to do something about these things now, you had better get off those overts. And if this has been getting in your way consistently and continuously, you'd jolly well better get off of those overts. You better get them off of that case, man, because they are big and they are flagrant and they are mad.

If your card trick won't work of "What communication have you failed to complete?" (I keep saying "failed to complete." You should never use "fail" as an auditing command, it's an old habit. "What communication have you not completed?" or "haven't you completed?") You got the other one – the other one. Now that's doing something for a pc. And there's such a vast difference between the amount of skill required between saying to somebody "What

communication hasn't been completed?" See, *brrrr-dada, da, da*. It doesn't upset him; it's not embarrassing, there's no social status challenged here. You're improving his communication so your communication with him improves. It requires nothing of your auditing discipline. See, that's the lazy, long sleep. Why? Because it's really just step one again.

Now you're going to have to "done." And man, that takes auditing – that takes some auditing. I know of seventeen different ways that you might have to approach a case in order to get off its series of overts to actually throw out of the existence all of the pc's upset about it. And you might have to use every single one of them.

There are lots of them. There's overts in chains; there is the subject of recurring withholds; there's the subject of the recurring overt; there's the subject of the – getting the basic-basic of something; the formulation of the proper question to ask so that – this can get pretty complicated. We've had all that technology here over a period of time. A lot of you are here who have been here before, and so forth, have sweat it out. But it's very valuable technology.

Some individual keeps telling you that he threw mud at a car when he was sixteen, and this is an overt. And he gives you this overt and he gives you this overt and he gives you this overt, nothing happens. But he keeps telling you this overt. Well, now, you have to know what is happening here and know what to do about it. Otherwise, he'll just keep on giving you the overt. This is part of a chain of overts. This is what's known as a recurring overt.

And the trouble with it is, is you're nowhere near its basic. And now you have to be able to codify the question necessary to get the basic of the chain and you have to be able to audit this sort of thing by chains. And this can become very interesting indeed. And then you have to be prepared to find no overt as the bottom of the chain. And that is one of the more mysterious things. The guy has *always* believed that he had an overt there and none was there. There's that phenomenon which can hold a chain in. Another is – there's plenty to know about this.

But man is basically good despite his reactive bank. The reactive bank is only composed to make a man commit overts, which is against his better nature. If he commits these overts, therefore, he'll trap himself because he won't go on communicating, having committed them. So it's the perfect trap. You do not want to talk to people you have wronged. I very – I'm very shy of letting anybody wrong me, not because they will do me any damage, because they can sure cut themselves up. They commit an overt act, don't you see, and then they will try to withhold and sever the communication line for fear that they will commit another overt act. That actually is the fundamental think of man.

After awhile he goes out of control and he just starts dramatizing. And then you have the murderer and the thief and the rest of the fellow who has no responsibility or anything. He's actually left the human race at this – by this time. But along some line, that individual will still have a sensibility: He will still be sensible in his responsibility in some zone or quarter. And, in handling such a person, an auditor has to be terrifically good. He has to find some zone in that person's existence that that person could commit an overt on.

Oh, the person has slain cities full of people, don't you see, and he's done this and he's done that. Put any – put any crime on the book; this person has done this crime without the least qualms. Ah, well, the auditor contest there is to find *what!* You see, he's totally out

of communication with everything, that's why he can commit the crimes. He's gone. He's just dramatizing. He's not even there, he's *wooof!* All right. You've got to find, as an auditor, some zone he can still commit an overt against. What overt would be real to this individual? And you'll find *some* little corner of his existence is still an overt.

Now, there's other ways to build up overts in an individual. You say, "All right. What have you done? What have you done?" And the individual will give you perhaps something which is a rather banal statement. You can ask him, "Well, why was it all right to do that?" And he will give you a lot of justifications and so forth. There's that approach.

Now "What terrible, vicious, mean thing..." This is another thing, you see? Just "done" is just "done." You know, "What have you done?"

"Well, I've eaten breakfast." That's a perfectly adequate answer to the question, see?

But "What mean vicious thing have you done?" Now, this would be another branch that we call overts. See, just "What have you done?" that can be used – that can be used all by itself as an auditing question. "What have you done?" But you wouldn't, really, except if you were – educated your pc into answering the question under some special connotation, you really wouldn't get nothing but overts, you see? But it's perfectly valid to do that – to get such answers and so forth. The only modification which you require are "What are you absolutely sure you have done?"

Now, let me tell you why that is vitally necessary that you understand these two branches of "done." One of – "What have you done that is socially reprehensible that will prevent you from communicating and doing something else?" That's what we call an overt. And the other one is just having taken an action in the direction of. That's just "done" see? It means just that. It means having taken an action in the direction of, see, nothing, no significance with regard to it at all.

Now if we run just plain "done" on the individual, we could be totally knuckleheaded as an auditor and not guide the individual in any way, and he would immediately start doing something else. Now, what would he start doing? He would start looking for the explanation. He's running a process – you're running – you're saying, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done?" And the pc is no longer running that process. Now, hear me now. This is the big liability of this "done." The pc now starts looking for an explanation for what has happened to him. And he's now running the process "Explain what has happened – maybe this will explain what has happened to me."

You might as well be asking, "Explain what has happened to you. Explain what has happened to you. Explain what has happened to you." That's the process he's running. He's running "Explain what has happened to you," but you're running "What have you done?" Now, unless you're aware of the fact that almost any pc under the sun will convert the process "done" to "Explain what has happened to you," you will never be able to run a pure "done" on a pc. If you don't know this, then you can't run "done" on a pc. He'll convert it. He starts looking for the explanation, and he will start inventing things he has not done in order to get rid of the consequences which he is experiencing. He's trying to find a good enough overt to explain what is occurring in his life.

Now there, there is your considerable difference in these processes. And what an auditor has trouble with there, then – we'll recapitulate very rapidly – an auditor then has trouble differentiating between communicating with the pc and doing something for a pc. And then when he gets into running "done," he doesn't want to sacrifice his communication line in order to press home any nasty personal little facts, you see? So he never really presses home his question. And the next action is he runs into the square brick wall of the pc doesn't run the process. The pc runs "Explain what has happened."

Well, a fellow is subject to continuous headaches. So he will actually, in a desperate condition, start giving you fictitious deeds – fictitious deeds. He'll very often go on to the far backtrack to give you a fictitious deed. You always want to beware of that because you know at once that this happens, that the individual has done this to you. "I shot fifteen Praetorian guards in Rome." *Ah-ugh-hoo-oh*, no, no, no, no, that is not an answer to the auditing question because the auditing question is, understand, "What do you jolly-well, damn-well know you've done?" But what auditor is going to sacrifice his communication line by cutting up a pc down in – shooting him down in flames to that degree? No, you'll listen to a couple of these, but all right, steer it back to where it belongs because he's looking for an explanation.

He isn't trying to find what he'd done. All you want is "What are you certain you've done, bud?" That's all the answer you want. "What are you – what are you real certain – what do you know, absolutely, that you have done?"

You could work a gradient scale up from "I know I've eaten breakfast. In fact, I know that sometime during the last year I've eaten. Yes, what have I done? What am I absolutely certain I know? I know I've spent some money. I know I must have spent some money in the last few days. I don't really have any exact recollection of any money, but I have less money now than then, so therefore I must have spent some money in the last few days."

"All right. Well, do you know you've spent some money in the last few days?"

"Well that – ." This is an actual auditing sequence, you see? "Do you know you've spent some money in the last few?"

"Well, I must have because I have less money now."

"Well, that is, you're just computing that you spent some money in the last few days. Do you know that you spent any money in the last few days? Come on. What – where did you spend some money in the last few days?"

"Oh, my God, you ask me a question like that, I *o-o-o-oh-ooo. Hum-m-mm-m-m. Hmmmm*. Done. *Hum-m-m*. Ha-ha-ha. Sixpence. I spent a sixpence for a lolly."

"All right. Good enough. Here's the next question. What have you done?"

"Well, well, well, let's see. What have I done? What have I done? Let's see. Let's see." Starts squeezing his head a little bit. "What have I done – so on. Well, I was a headsman once that worked up in the Tower and I missed Ann Boleyn's head and hit her with the flat of the head with an axe." You know what he's – what he's figured out? He tried to answer the question, he got a headache, so he tried to explain why he had the headache, so he reaches back into the past and he gets some uncertain piece of something. So he tries to offer you

something that is enough overt to give him that much headache. And that's why it's very difficult.

Now, you'll find that people who answer the question that way – the test is do they ever get well? No, they have an awful time. They have a pretty bad time.

Now, it isn't, actually, whether they did do it or didn't do it. It's their degree of certainty on having done it. See? And I can very easily go 500 years ago back into France and give you the name, rank and serial number of a lot of things, see? And I can give these things to you, but after I've run a few of them, I start running into "Let's see, was her name Mary? or was it Marie? or was it...? And did that happen at Agincourt? or was that at Poitiers?" And next thing you know I'm in a fog. And if I go on this way very long, I'll start wondering whether I even was alive yesterday because I haven't entered it from a zone of certainty. See? I've entered it from a zone of dim recollection or something like this, you know?

So "done" is built up on a gradient of certainty, not built up on a gradient of explanations of what is happening to the pc or has happened to the pc. You might even convert the question so that it's "What are you quite positive that you have done?" You want to be careful about saying "absolutely certain."

See, it's no criticism of the pc or even the pc's memory, but that pc is actually trying to explain something or they wouldn't be shooting back on the backtrack trying to give you an explanation. See, that's the thing you've got to watch. That's the thing you've got to be awful careful of because they're going to dig themselves in in an awful hurry.

So, again, you wouldn't be doing anything for the pc by running "done." So, again, it comes under the heading of doing something for the pc. Well, there's a lot of things you could do with a pc without doing anything for the pc. There's a lot of phenomena that you can achieve without achieving anything for the pc. You can turn on some very, very handsome somatics at one time or another on a pc without turning them off, too.

So, anyway, you've got a problem here in doing something for the pc because you're liable to be doing A and the pc is doing B. And then you go on doing A while the pc is doing B, and then somewhere down the line you wind up in a hell of a mess. And you say, "Well, what happened?" Well, the pc never did what you said, so you didn't do anything for the pc. There was in actual fact no barrier to your willingness to do something for the pc but there must have been a tremendous barrier to your understanding of what was going on. That you could ask A and the pc answered B, in itself showed the auditor observation was very poor. So, therefore, the auditor wasn't in communication with the pc so again the communication factor was out so once more we weren't doing anything for the pc.

Now this is where the thing adds up. Now, if you're going to communicate with the pc – if you're going to communicate with the pc – it's to the end of doing something for the pc. Now, if your communication with the pc is good, you'll wind up then in a position to do something. But having gotten in a position to do something, for heaven sakes, now do something. See? Don't halfway do something or partially do something. This isn't difficult, what I'm talking to you about. It's just putting things in their right boxes in their right compartments.

Don't ever think, because the pc likes you and everything is going along fine and you get along together so well, that you're doing something for the pc. No, you're communicating well to the pc. So, in communicating very well to the pc, you now have an opportunity to do something for the pc. But then your own communication channel to the pc could go out, and you could be asking the pc A and be getting answers for B. And then, again, you wouldn't do anything for the pc if there was a second place where it can break down.

Now, you're just – the gist of the situation then is that O/W is liable to be the most productive zone or area for big recovery on the part of the pc, providing the auditor knows how to steer it, and *will* steer it, and isn't being too tender about it. There's dozens of ways to run this sort of thing. You can get in there and you can say, "All right. What big overt have you committed in this lifetime?" That was to take O/W from the version of *overt*, you know, so on.

All right. "What overt have you committed? What big overt have you committed in this lifetime?" Think, think, think, think, think, think, think, think, think. "Well, I upset Joe. Yes, yes, that was about the biggest overt in this lifetime. I really upset Joe."

"All right. Fine." You think you've gotten someplace now. Of course, you haven't gotten anyplace: Your tone arm hasn't moved; there's been no cognition; there's been nothing like this. This thing is in a situation where there can be set up in a dozen different ways. You haven't gotten anyplace yet but you've gotten a big overt.

Now, you think perhaps that his having told you, now, should somehow or another magically discharge this thing. No, why should it magically discharge it? He hasn't answered the auditing question for one thing. He doesn't think it *was* an overt. "What *big overt* have you committed in this lifetime?"

"Well, this horrible thing I did to Joe." And he tells you what it is, rather proudly. And you say, "Well, O/W doesn't work because nothing happened." Man, you didn't even get your big toenail wet on the side of the Pacific. The sixty-four dollar question now is, "Well, why wasn't it an overt?"

"Oh, well, it wasn't an overt, because Joe is a heel and because of this and because of that, and so forth. And he deserved it, and it's the common thing to do in those circumstances; everybody expected me to do it. And, of course, it was natural that I would because I have a reactive bank and it forced me to do it." [laughter] And a guy can go on for some time on the justification of this overt. And you'll start to get tone arm action, tone arm action, tone arm action. Now, you're watching the increase of responsibility along certain zones or lines. And this person has not flattened the process because he has not come up to a cognition or a recognition of anything yet, but he's sure working on it. And that tone arm is a-moving and it's a-moving and it's a-moving and so forth, and we're going along on this. "And after all, Joe really was a heel. And he wrote me a nasty letter once which was a *greh-tajub-a rub* and it was absolutely inevitable and impossible that I would have done anything else but this because everybody expected me to do this, don't you see? And if I hadn't done this, it would have committed an overt against a great many other people." "Now, on this overt against Joe, is it really an overt after all?" and so on.

All of a sudden a – the guy is liable to get this little sensation of the glee of insanity, or something like that, as far as it goes. I'm not kidding you. It's a sort of glee of insanity that starts coming off the surface, and so forth. And some little corner of him is taking a look at this thing, "You know," he says, "that there was some part of that that was an overt, mostly against myself, of course, because..." [laughter]

And a guy will actually worry that and worry that and worry that. Now I'm not – I'm not prepared to tell you how many hours he could go on worrying this, producing tone arm action all the way. I don't know. It might be a twenty-five hour intensive on one overt, don't you see? Until you get the thing worn down and eventually, all of a sudden, he says, "Well, even though it could have been explained, you know, that was a hell of a thing to do to Joe. I shouldn't have done that to Joe. I'd completely forgotten. I'd completely forgotten. I had it completely in my choice whether I did it or didn't do it. And I did it. *Whoo!* Yes. Yeah, I committed an overt against Joe. Yeah." Boom! *Pswwwwwww*. You see it blow. And you won't get another scrap of TA out of that whole thing.

You got one "done," see, one "done" off the pc. See, there are numerous ways to handle these things. Now, while you have him going through all of this, and so forth particularly as his being a Scientologist, he may know all the ropes, keep him guided into this channel and keep him going right on down the line and keep your communication channel, and so forth, open to the pc during this period of time. That's all a trick; that's all takes some doing. But in the final analysis you will have done something for the pc, *for* the pc, not to him.

Now, there is – there is the auditing of O/W. Now, a lot of this lecture, I apparently have not been talking to you much about the process of O/W, I've been talking to you about the version and guises of auditing. But unless these things are understood in their proper relationship, one to another, you will never run any O/W and never get any overts off anybody and really never get any withholds off anybody. You know? You have to know the technology, you have to know how to audit and you have to, yourself, be in communication with the pc to know how to handle this situation.

Now, all the way along the line of what I've been talking to you about, you are raising the cause level of the pc. All the way along the line you are raising the cause level of the pc. You do these things, fairly slippily, fairly expertly; you're raising the cause level of the pc. And he's walking right up and he'll be able to as-is more and more and more and more and more and more and more and more. Your pc will be changing under your eyes; your pc doesn't come into session with so many PTPs; your pc is much more able to get the show on the road. The pc is this and the pc is that. And you're seeing this – this thing progress, don't you see? Now, you could go into "done" in numerous other categories. I'd swear, I don't know, if you piled up all the bulletins on the subject of O/W and running withholds and chains and all of this kind of thing; man, if you stacked those all up together, you wouldn't be able to hardly look over the desk. There's lots of technology. You don't need all that technology perhaps, but it's very nice to have it. If you're going to be very expert along these lines, why, there it is. Because the mind is quite funny in the various ways that it works.

Very often you get a tremendous failure in this particular field in trying to direct somebody to do something in this field. They don't understand some of these ramifications

I've been pointing out to you. I've asked somebody – a girl is lying dying in a hospital for no apparent reason or something of this sort. And somebody asks me frantically, frantically! They'll say, you know, over a long distance line or something of this sort, "What can we *do* to bring this girl back to *life*?" and so forth. And frankly, it's not with any hope at all that I tell them what they can do, because I know that ordinarily they won't consider it heroic enough. I'd tell them the exact fact of what to do. In such a case as that, the exact thing to do was find out what her family doesn't know about. That actually was enough – they were in sufficient communication with the girl in this particular case – that was enough to have gotten her out of that bed and back on her feet again.

It wasn't that I knew anything she had done, but I just knew from the sudden discussion of it that having retreated from home to this and then gone to that point and then suddenly gone to a hospital with an exclamation point and fireworks and lying there dying from no apparent reasons or causes and so forth, that obviously there was a withhold there. And that would have taken enough off the edge of it, don't you see? Because I knew that any situation like that, no matter how heroic it appears, must have been terribly hard to maintain. That – situation like that is so unnatural, you see? Well, look at how hard somebody'd have to work at it to put it all together this way. And it's just like any other complex situation, you touch one corner of the house of cards and down it'll come. Well, that's the good point to touch.

Some stranger saying to the person, you know, "What doesn't your family know about?"

The girl might have opened up, "Well, they don't know I had this affair with Bill," and so forth, "and that I'm enceinte." And then all of a sudden it felt much better, don't you see? And says, "What am I lying here dying for?" you know, and got out of bed. [laughter]

Because people – people look at the heroicness of the condition, they always add it up that it must be an heroic comparable action, and it's not. It might be very complex, the reasons they're there, but the very complexity makes it untenably hard to hold on to. No! It – a madman down here in an asylum, he has a hell of a time. Poor fellow must work day and night, staying in there. He just must work overtime! You can see him, "Now I will be ferocious," you know? The point of entrance on the thing. It's just, actually, the same points I've been talking to you about. You get into communication with him and you ask him what's sensible, see, or you ask him what he's done or ask him what he's withholding. And you'll just see it crack up in front of your eyes.

And that's actually the magic of the world of auditing. That's the magic that can be done with auditing. And you get the long grind situation. It looks like a long grind to you, because you say, "What have you done?"

"I've murdered the local vicar." [laughter]

And you're stopped right there; where do you go from there? You have no responsibility, you have no nothing, and so forth. So, recently, we have developed ways of handling these "no-responsibility." It's actually a new development, and compartmented them out so they're much more easily handled.

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it, but when I ask you to get some withholds off somebody or get some overts off somebody or raise somebody's cause level, now, at least, you know what I am talking about.

Thank you.

Male voice: Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 17 APRIL 1977
(LRH is quoted)

Remimeo
Tech Divs
Qual Divs
Auditors
C/Ses

RECURRING WITHHOLDS AND OVERTS

Ref:	HCO PL 7 Apr 70RA	GREEN FORM
	HCO B 15 Aug 69	FLYING RUDS
	HCO B 10 Jul 64	OVERTS ORDER OF EFFECTIVENESS IN PROCESSING
	HCO B 6 Sep 68	CHECKING FOR FALSE READS
	HCO B 11 Sep 68	FALSE READS

DEFINITION

The definition of recurring withhold or overt is an overt or withhold that keeps coming up, repeats again, or shows up again. Definition is obtained here from the American Heritage Dictionary and "the Scientology Tech Dictionary." Before a recurring withhold or overt can be handled it must be understood what one is. It is simply a withhold or overt that has already been gotten off and comes up again as an answer to an apparent reading withhold or overt question. The pc may also become exasperated at having to get off an overt or withhold that has already been gotten off. The pc may become upset, seem resigned or even protest a recurring overt or withhold. These are just a couple of the signs of a recurring withhold or overt.

METHODS AND HANDLINGS

1. When a pc gets upset with a withhold being demanded that they already got off and they get into protest then "there is obviously a false read as the pc is getting off overts already gotten off."

HANDLING: "Check for false reads on overts by asking the pc what overt he or she has gotten off more than once and tracing it back with the pc to what auditor or person said something read when it didn't. You would clean all these up." (REFERENCE: HCOB 6 SEPT 68 CHECKING FOR FALSE READS.)

2. When number 1 above doesn't handle the recurring overt or withhold:

HANDLING: "Who said or seemed to infer something read when it didn't? Then this would be dated to blow and located to blow." (REFERENCE: HCOB 11 SEPT 68 FALSE READS.)

3. When a pc gets upset with getting off withholds or overts or mentions he or she felt his or her overts weren't accepted.

HANDLING: Ask who wouldn't accept it E/S. (REFERENCE: HCO PL 7 APRIL 70RA GREEN FORM.)

4. "The pc has been invalidated for getting it off."

HANDLING: Find out who invalidated the pc for getting off overts or withholds. (Note any terminals for later handling on the PTS RD.)

5. "The pc has been punished for getting it off."

HANDLING: "Find out who punished the pc for getting off overts and withholds. "

The above methods of handling recurring overts and withholds can be found in the reference materials listed above.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

Assisted by
Paulette Ausley
LRH Tech Expeditor

LRH:PA:lf

Remimeo

ROBOTISM

(Reference HCOB 28 Nov 1970, C/S Series 22, "Psychosis".)

A technical advance has been made in relation to the inactivity, slowness or incompetence of human beings.

This discovery proceeds from a two and a half year intense study of aberration as it affects the ability to function as a group member.

The ideal group member is capable of working causatively in full cooperation with his fellows in the achievement of group goals and the realization of his own happiness.

The *primary* human failing is an inability to function as himself or contribute to group achievements.

Wars, political upsets, organizational duress, growing crime rates, increasingly heavy "justice", growing demands for excessive welfare, economic failure and other age long and repeating conditions find a common denominator in the inability of human beings to coordinate.

The current political answer, in vogue in this century and growing, is totalitarianism where the state orders the whole life of the individual. The production figures of such states are very low and their crimes against the individual are numerous.

A discovery therefore of what this factor is, that makes the humanoid the victim of oppression, would be a valuable one.

The opening lines of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* comment on Man's lack of an answer for himself.

The group needs such an answer in order to survive and for its individual members to be happy.

SCALE

	Pan-determined
	Self-determined
Robot	Other-determined
band	Oblivious
	Insane

NEEDING ORDERS

The exact mechanism of needing orders is to be found as an outgrowth of the mental condition outlined in HCOB 28 Nov 1970, "Psychosis".

The individual with an evil purpose has to withhold himself because he may do destructive things.

When he fails to withhold himself he commits overt acts on his fellows or other dynamics and occasionally loses control and does so.

This of course makes him quite inactive.

To overcome this he refuses any responsibility for his own actions.

Any motion he makes must be on the responsibility of others.

He operates then only when given orders.

Thus he *must* have orders to operate.

Therefore one could term such a person a *robot*. And the malady could be called *robotism*.

PERCEPTION

Studies of perception undertaken since HCOB 28 Nov 70 reveal that sight, hearing and other channels of awareness *decrease* in proportion to the number of overt acts – and therefore withholds – which the person has committed on the whole track.

By relieving these sight has been remarkably brightened.

Therefore a person who is withholding himself from committing overt acts because of his own undesired purposes has very poor perception.

He does not *see* the environment around him.

Thus, combined with his unwillingness to act on his own initiative, there is a blindness to the environment.

OVERT PRODUCTS

(see P/L 14 Nov 70, Org Series 14)

Since he does not act upon orders he is taking responsibility for, he executes orders without fully understanding them.

Further he executes them in an environment he does not see.

Thus when forced to produce he will produce overt products. These are called so because they are not in actual fact useful products but something no one wants and are overt acts in themselves – such as inedible biscuits or a "repair" that is just further breakage.

SLOWNESS

The person is slow because he is moving on other-determinism, is carefully withholding himself and cannot see anyway.

Thus he feels lost, confused or unsafe and cannot move positively.

Because he produces overt products he gets slapped around or goes unthanked and so begins a decline.

He cannot move swiftly and if he does has accidents. So he teaches himself to be careful and cautious.

JUSTICE

Group justice is of some use but all it really does is make the person withhold himself even harder and while a necessary restraint, nevertheless does not itself bring a lasting improvement.

Threats and “heads on a pike” (meaning examples of discipline) do however jar the person into giving his attention and channeling his actions into a more desirable path from the group viewpoint.

Justice is necessary in a society of such people but it is not a remedy for improvement.

MALICE

Despite the viciousness of the truly insane, there is little or no real malice in the robot.

The truly insane cannot control or withhold their evil purposes and dramatize them at least covertly.

The insane are not always visible. But they are visible enough. And they *are* malicious.

The robot on the other hand does control his evil impulses to a great extent.

He is not malicious.

His danger mainly stems from the incompetent things he does, the time of others he consumes, the waste of time and material and the brakes he puts on the general group endeavor.

He does not do all these things intentionally. He does not really know he is doing them.

He looks in wounded surprise at the wrath he generates when he breaks things, wrecks programs and gets in the way. He does not know he is doing these things. For he cannot see that he is. He may go along for some time doing (slowly wasteful) well and then carelessly smashes the exact thing that wrecks the whole activity.

People suppose he cunningly intended to do so. He seldom does.

He winds up even more convinced he can't be trusted and that he should withhold harder!

FALSE REPORTS

The robot gives many false reports. Unable to *see*, how can he know what is true?

He seeks to fend off wrath and attract good will by "PR" (public relations boasts) without realizing he is giving false reports.

MORALE

The robot goes into morale declines easily. Since production is the basis of morale, and since he does not really produce much, left to his own devices, his morale sags heavily.

PHYSICAL INERTIA

The body is a physical object. It is not the being himself.

As a body has mass it tends to remain motionless unless moved and tends to keep going in a certain direction unless steered.

As he is not really running his body, the robot has to be moved when not moving or diverted if moving on a wrong course.

Thus anyone with one or more of such beings around him tends to get exhausted with shoving them into motion or halting them when they go wrong.

Exhaustion only occurs when one does not understand the robot.

It is the exasperation that exhausts one.

With understanding one is not exasperated because he *can* handle the situation. But only if he knows what it is.

PTS

Potential Trouble Sources are not necessarily robots.

A PTS person generally is withholding himself from a Suppressive Person or group or thing.

Toward that SP person or group or thing he is a robot! He takes orders from them if only in opposites.

His overts on the SP person make him blind and non-self-determined.

BASIC WHY

The basic reason behind persons who cannot function, are slow or inactive or incompetent and who do not produce is

Withholding self from doing destructive things, and thus unwilling to take responsibility and therefore needing orders.

The exact wording of this **why** must be done by the individual himself after examining and grasping this principle.

If one writes this principle down on the top of a sheet and then asks the person to word it exactly as it applies to himself one will attain the individual why for inaction and incompetence. It will produce GIs and F/N at the Examiner.

PROCESSING

Physical work in the physical universe, general confronting, reach and withdraw; and Objective Processes go far in remedying this condition.

Touch assists regularly and correctly given to proper End Phenomena will handle illnesses of such persons.

Word Clearing is vital tech to open the person's comm lines, wipe out earlier misunderstandings and increase his understanding.

PTS tech will handle the person's robotism toward SP individuals, groups or things. To this and the PTS Rundown can be added the **why** above as it relates to the things or beings found as suppressive as a last step.

The why above can be used in Danger Formula work such as HCO P/L 9 April 72, Correct Danger Formula, and HCO P/L 3 May 72, "Ethics and Executives". Other individual whys can exist in these instances.

EXPANDED DIANETICS

The miracle of well done perfectly executed Expanded Dianetics eradicates both insanity and robotism. Drug handling and other actions may be necessary.

END PRODUCT

The end product when one has fully handled robotism is not a person who cannot follow orders or who operates solely on his own.

Totalitarian states fear any relief of the condition as they foolishly actively promote and hope for such beings. But this is only a deficiency in their own causes and their lack of

experience with fully self-determined beings. Yet education, advertising and amusements have been designed only for robots. Even religions existed to suppress “Man’s Evil Nature”.

Lacking any examples or understanding many have feared to free the robot to his own control and think even with horror on it.

But you see, beings are **not** basically robots. They are miserable when they are.

Basically they prosper only when they are self-determined and can be pan-determined to help in the prosperity of all.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.bh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 21 JANUARY AD10

Fran Hldrs
HCO Secs
Assn Secs
HCO and HASI Staffs

JUSTIFICATION

When a person has committed an overt act and then withholds it, he or she usually employs the social mechanism of justification.

We have all heard people attempt to justify their actions and all of us have known instinctively that justification was tantamount to a confession of guilt. But not until now have we understood the exact mechanism behind justification.

Short of Scientology Auditing there was no means by which a person could relieve himself of consciousness of having done an overt act except to try to *lessen the overt*.

Some churches used a mechanism of confession. This was a limited effort to relieve a person of the pressure of his overt acts. Later the mechanism of confession was employed as a kind of blackmail by which increased contribution could be obtained from the person confessing. Factually this is a limited mechanism to such an extent that it can be extremely dangerous. Religious confession does not carry with it any real stress of responsibility for the individual but on the contrary seeks to lay responsibility at the door of the Divinity – a sort of blasphemy in itself. I have no axe to grind here with religion. Religion as religion is fairly natural. But psychotherapy must be in itself a completed fact or, as we all know, it can become a dangerous fact. That's why we flatten engrams and processes. Confession to be non-dangerous and effective must be accompanied by a full acceptance of responsibility. All overt acts are the product of irresponsibility on one or more of the dynamics.

Withholds are a sort of overt act in themselves but have a different source. Oddly enough we have just proven conclusively that man is basically good – a fact which flies in the teeth of old religious beliefs that man is basically evil. Man is good to such an extent that when he realizes he is being very dangerous and in error he seeks to minimize his power and if that doesn't work and he still finds himself committing overt acts he then seeks to dispose of himself either by leaving or by getting caught and executed. Without this computation Police would be powerless to detect crime – the criminal always assists himself to be caught. Why Police punish the caught criminal is the mystery. The caught criminal wants to be rendered less harmful to the society and wants rehabilitation. Well, if this is true then why does he not unburden himself? The fact is this: unburdening is considered by him to be an overt act. People withhold overt acts because they conceive that telling them would be another

overt act. It is as though Thetans are trying to absorb and hold out of sight all the evil of the world. This is wrong-headed, by withholding overt acts these are kept afloat in the universe and are themselves as withholds entirely the cause of continued evil. Man is basically good but he could not attain expression of this until now. Nobody but the individual could die for his own sins – to arrange things otherwise was to keep man in chains.

In view of these mechanisms, when the burden became too great man was driven to another mechanism – the effort to lessen the size and pressure of the overt. He or she could only do this by attempting to reduce the size and repute of the terminal. Hence, not-issness. Hence when a man or a woman has done an overt act there usually follows an effort to reduce the goodness or importance of the target of the overt. Hence the husband who betrays his wife must then state that the wife was no good in some way. Thus the wife who betrayed her husband had to reduce the husband to reduce the overt. This works on all dynamics. In this light most criticism is justification of having done an overt.

This does not say that all things are right and that no criticism anywhere is ever merited. Man is not happy. He is faced with total destruction unless we toughen up our postulates. And the overt act mechanism is simply a sordid game condition man has slipped into without knowing where he was going. So there are rightnesses and wrongnesses in conduct and society and life at large, but random, carping 1.1 criticism when not borne out in fact is only an effort to reduce the size of the target of the overt so that one can live (he hopes) with the overt. Of course to criticise unjustly and lower repute is itself an overt act and so this mechanism is not in fact workable.

Here we have the source of the dwindling spiral. One commits overt acts unwittingly. He seeks to justify them by finding fault or displacing blame. This leads him into further overts against the same terminals which leads to a degradation of himself and sometimes those terminals.

Scientologists have been completely right in objecting to the idea of punishment. Punishment is just another worsening of the overt sequence and degrades the punisher. But people who are guilty of overts demand punishment. They use it to help restrain themselves from (they hope) further violation of the dynamics. It is the victim who demands punishment and it is a wrong-headed society that awards it. People get right down and beg to be executed. And when you don't oblige, the woman scorned is sweet-tempered by comparison. I ought to know – I have more people try to elect me an executioner than you would care to imagine. And many a preclear who sits down in your pc chair for a session is there just to be executed and when you insist on making such a pc better, why you've had it, for they start on this desire for execution as a new overt chain and seek to justify it by telling people you're a bad auditor.

When you hear scathing and brutal criticism of someone which sounds just a bit strained, know that you have your eye on overts against that criticised person and next chance you get pull the overts and remove just that much evil from the world.

And remember, by and by, that if you make your pc write these overts and withholds down and sign them and send them off to me he'll be less reluctant to hold on to the shreds of them – it makes for a further blow of overts and less blow of pc. And always run responsibility on a pc when he unloads a lot of overts or just one.

We have our hands here on the mechanism that makes this a crazy universe so let's go for broke on it and play it all the way out.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:js.rd

Moral Codes:

What is a Withhold?

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 4 October 1961

Okay, now. What a quiet crowd today. Well, I'd like a little applause for. I put that than on my bills, Susy. [laughter]

(Female voice) All that accounts on you! [laughter]

Okay, we have a new student today Karl Wilson from Riverside California. Stand up, Karl. [applause] We are glad you are here.

And this is the 4th – 4th of October. I wasn't thinking so much about the date. I want to make sure you have your adjustments on the mic cause I wanted to have it closer. Okay, if I can remember all this, I mean that seriously.

By the way, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

If I can remember all this, I'll give you the whole rundown on overt-withhold and how it got that way and then you will be much smarter cookies. I mean that. If I can remember all the put-together, how it goes together. Because, let me tell you, it's complicated – very, very complicated.

Told you some time ago, this is very apropos to a Class II Auditor; this is part of Class II Auditor skills. This should be known and known very well. This should be understood. And if you're ever going to make anything out of a Security Check, if you're ever going to get any advances with a Security Check, you'll have to know this sort of thing.

It is not enough to be able to sit there and say, „Well, have you ever raped anybody? No? Well, have you ever raped anybody? You haven't... Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good.“ Keeping TR 0 in, of course. [laughter]

That has very little to do with Security Checking. Security Checking is not a repetitive command. You ask the question, you get the answer and you get off the withhold.

But what's a withhold? What is a withhold? Well, you's just about to find out. And it's a good thing, too, because I'm saving your bacon in the nick of time. I come in here, I find Mary Sue tearing your scalps off on the subject of it, and what have you been up to? Of course, she must have found somebody auditing on this basis: „Well, have you ever done anything to a fellow staff member?“

„Well, yes. I heard that Joe went out with Bessie.“

Oh, no! Now, your first order of business as an auditor is to get an answer to the auditing command. And will you tell me how that is an answer to an auditing command? „What have you done?“ „I heard that...“ He hasn't done anything! How can it possibly be a withhold?

I'd put another question: „Have you ever ruined people maliciously by gossip?“

Clang, clang, clang! „Yes.“ Correct, they have.

Do you know people will make up withholds just to get other people in trouble? And you're going to sit there and let them do it? And you're going to hear people saying things – people that have heard things about people who heard things and they understood that something and they knew that so-and-so – and you let them get this off as a withhold?

Well, what auditing time are you wasting. Well, you're wasting your own time and you're wasting the pc's time. And basically you have demonstrated that you don't know what a withhold is, but that is excusable up to this moment. One hour and a half from now it begins to be a crime. See, it's not a crime for the next hour and a half, but an hour and a half from now, the cat will be out of the bag. Only in this particular instance, it is a rather big cat, about leopard size, that is leaping out of a rather big bag, because this is one of these jackpots that we hit every once in a while in Scientology.

You know, you pull the lever expecting to get out a couple of quarters, and florins, shillings, sixpences, so forth, cascade out on the floor for a half an hour. I mean, that's the sort of a thing which has just occurred here. And those of you who haven't been to Las Vegas can ask those who have what I meant.

What's a withhold? What's an overt act? It's important to know these things.

Mr. Doakes sits down in the auditing chair – because you, of course, being a pc, don't pay much attention to auditing – he sits there and he says to you, he says, „Well, I have robbed banks – uh – murdered women – uh – strangled babies – uh – embezzled it, yes. I – uh – ruined marriages, I did this and I did that,“ and you don't get a single knock on the needle.

Oh, you say, this person is not security checkable. Aha! But from this moment on you're going to see that there is no such thing as a non security checkable person. Because you're going to say that this pc you had is not capable of registering on the meter, because obviously these are tremendous things. They're social transgressions against your code of sociality to a point where, God almighty, he should be shot, put in a straitjacket, given a pill by a medical doctor – most horrible things happen to him. Why? Because, look, he's robbed banks and murdered women and so forth and you don't get a single knock on the E-Meter.

You say, „Well, the man is conscienceless. Therefore he has no withholds.“ Aha, and that's right – against your moral code, he has no withholds, because they were not transgressions to him.

Now, your task in doing a Security Check is to get off withholds. But what is a withhold? What is a withhold? Now, you could say grandly, „It is what the preclear is withholding.“ You could say, as we have been saying about an overt act, „What is an overt

act? An overt act is what the thetan thinks is an overt act. Therefore, if I do not think I have committed an overt act as I strangle this person or that," you see, "then I have not committed an overt act," you see?

No, those are not adequate replies, and those are not adequate definitions, and those are not adequate answers, and they do not add up to useful, workable definitions in the field of auditing I think you will agree with me that you, yourself, have been puzzled about this.

How is it that one person gives you some kind of a stuff and it's not a withhold, and yet says, "Well, I – I looked down the road." you know, it's *clang!* You know, you got *clang!*

And you say, "What did you do? What is that?"

"Well, I looked down the road," and it cleared.

And you say, "Well, what kind of a withhold could this be?" you know? "There must be more to it." And of course you immediately exceed your function as an auditor, which is to clear the meter. If "looking down the road" cleared the meter, that was a withhold.

Now, what puzzles you is that you're fixed on a moral code, or lack of one, which is yours, circa now. And you consider that the pc that you are security checking only has withholds if they are transgressions against the moral code which you consider a moral code – now. And therefore you just make fantastic numbers of mistakes. See what I'm talking about?

All right. Now, let's take this criminal. Aha, this criminal. And we've got him on the meter, you know, and we say, "Well, have you ever –?" You know what a criminal should be security checked at: "Have you ever robbed a bank?" *Clang!* You see, you would think, boy, that's going to go *clang!* You know, because we know he's robbed a bank. He's actually been in Joliet, and Columbia University and other prisons [laughter]– obviously he has. And you get not even a twitch of the needle. And he looks at you blandly and says, "Yes, I have robbed banks."

Well, you see, what is astounding you at that point? There's only one thing that is making you astonished: is that he has said something that is a transgression against what you think is his moral code, you see? And therefore you go on security checking him against your moral code, and that isn't the code he lives by. And he is not free of withholds. He has tremendous numbers of withholds, but only against the moral code he lives by. Did you ever hear the moral code of a criminal? "Thou must not squeal to the cops." "Thou must not peach." You could write up a long one all about how "after you've robbed the bank you must equally share, except if somebody didn't help you rob the bank very much, and then you should cut his throat." "Not to kill a cop," could be against that moral code in some societies.

So that you ask the question from the bearing of your current moral code, and you say, "Have you ever killed a policeman?" And there's no fall. You're checking on the wrong moral code. You're checking a pc who has a different moral code.

The question should be, "Have you ever had an opportunity to kill a policeman and failed to do so?" *Clang!* See, it's against his moral code not to kill a cop. Other criminals wouldn't speak to him. Do you follow this?

In a prison, you'd have to security check along these lines: „Have you ever failed to keep a guard in the dark as to what was going on?“ See? „Have you ever cooperated with prison authorities?“ „Have you ever told the truth to any official?“ „Have you ever spoken to a screw kindly?“ [laughter] Because it's against the moral code of the prisoners and they have their own moral code.

You can say, „all PCs have withholds,“ but these withholds are not necessarily against your moral code. So we add to it: „all PCs have had moral codes against which they have transgressed.“ And when you locate the moral code against which they have transgressed, you will then get off the withholds of the case and only then will you get off the withholds of the case – only then.

A withhold, then, is an unspoken, unannounced transgression against a moral code by which the person was bound.

Now, how many moral codes are there? How many moral codes have there been? I'd say circa right now, there is probably a different moral code for every group, each one, large or small, in every city, county, country, continent of Earth. There's probably five hundred of them for every language there is on this planet and there are fifty thousand languages on this planet.

I'll give you a moral code question to a Zulu: „Has anything ever been lying around loose that you didn't steal?“ *Clang!* „Who didn't you tell that to?“

„I didn't tell my father. I wouldn't dare. He would beat me.“ Because it's moral for a Zulu to steal. Interesting, isn't it? So not stealing is his withhold, and you think his stealing would be his withhold. So you ask for a stealing withhold and you don't get any response and you should have been asking for a not-stealing withhold.

Therefore it is incumbent upon the auditor to have some idea of moral codes. What's a moral code? We'll get into that in a moment. But how many more moral codes do you think there have been? Now look, if circa right now there are possibly a hundred or five hundred of them for every language on Earth – let's be moderate about it – and there are fifty thousand languages on Earth, that gives you quite a few right here in present time, right? All right, let's go back on the track. How many moral codes do you think there have been on the whole track in the last two-hundred trillion years? How many moral codes do you think there have been? It is some unimaginable number. You could start up in the corner of this wall and start writing – after you put down one, then just start writing zeros in tiny microscopic writing clear from that side of the wall, clear to the other side of the wall; go back to the beginning, write it all the way across again and then when you've filled the whole wall down to the bottom, then you put it twenty-first power. That would be quite a number. That would be quite a number. Now, that is an awful lot of moral codes.

So, what's the anatomy of this? What is a moral code? It is that series of agreements to which a person has subscribed to guarantee the survival of a group. And that is what a moral code is. It's that series of agreements to which a person has subscribed to guarantee the survival of a group. That's what it is.

All right, I'll tell you an old short story. This is the most *vignette* sort of a thing. There was a couple of fellows and they heard there was a buried treasure. A galleon had gone up on a reef down in the South Pacific or down in the Caribbean. And they heard this galleon had gone up on a reef and that there were – just before it sank they threw a tremendous amount of gold into its bronze guns, hoping they could come back for it later and put the tampions on the guns. And the galleon sank and these great, belled cannon were still down there filled with gold. So a couple of men got together and they picked up a native boy and they – as a crew – and they sailed away and they dived and dived and dived and dived for this old galleon's cannon.

They had agreed a hundred percent what they would do with the gold. They had agreed completely what they would do with the gold. They would split it equally and the shares would remain on board the ship until they were taken to a certain point and at that point a banker and trucks would come down to pick it up and it would be transported properly to Switzerland. And they had agreed utterly and completely; they knew exactly what to do. And they had agreed also not to squander it and not go getting drunk and not go doing this and not go doing that, until it was all safely cared for and they were back in their own country. They'd agreed what to do about the bills of their trip. They had it all taped.

Well, they found a couple of cannon, but they reached their arms down the muzzles of the cannon and they couldn't find any tampion. And they went ashore after many days – their supplies were running out, everything was going to hell. And the supplies were running out and what were they going to do? They hadn't found any gold.

Well, they had an agreement for everything except failure. They had no agreement as to what they were going to do if they failed, so they began to wrangle about it after the fact. And they got more and more wranglous and more and more wranglous and finally one of them picked up a dirk and sank it in the other one and the other one simultaneously lopped off the other fellow's arm with a sword. And they had an awful time because they didn't have any agreement at all what to do in case of failure.

And about that time, as one of the fellows was dying, he looked back at the boat and these guns that they had already hauled up on deck, the backs had evidently fallen out of them, being rolled around by the native boy and the native boy was throwing handfuls of gold into the sea.

But they had no agreement on failure. And you'll find out that man has learned down the track, in weird ways, that where he has not agreed upon codes of conduct or what is proper in eventualities – he has agreed – where he has agreed, he survives, and where he has not agreed, he doesn't survive. And so, people, when they get together, always draw up a long, large series of agreements on what is moral (that is, what will be contributive to survival) and what is immoral (what will be destructive of survival).

Now, moral, by these definitions, are those things which are considered to be, at any given time, survival characteristics. A survival action is a moral action. And those things are considered immoral which are considered contrasurvival.

But remember, this is for any group in any special circumstance. And here you have a group of two men going out to find gold or a whole nation being formed after the conquest of

the land from some other race. It doesn't matter what the size of the group is: They enter into certain agreements. Now, the longevity of the agreement doesn't have much to do with it. It could be an agreement for a day, an agreement for a month or an agreement for the next five hundred years.

There's a Constitution in the United States that is an agreement. It was an agreement made by thirteen states as to how they would conduct their affairs. Wherever that Constitution has been breached, the country is now in trouble. There mustn't be any income tax, the first one said. Well, they managed to muck that up and they managed to muck up another one and another point and another point and another point. And each time they have busted up the agreement, why, they're in trouble.

Well, why are they in trouble? Well, that's because there aren't any other agreements than the basic agreement. You don't have modified agreements. If the agreement didn't exist in the first place, you can't keep patching it up and expect any great, lasting success. But what I have just said is to some degree a matter of opinion, because moral codes either leap full-armed from the brass tablets of Moses as he walks down from the rain and the mist saying, „Thou shalt not sell pork to thy neighbor. Sell it to a stranger if it is tainted.“

You didn't know that was one of the Commandments, did you? But I've mentioned it before that it happens to be there. There are about 162 of the Ten Commandments. And they contain all sorts of interesting bric-a-brac. But that is just a moral code.

Now, perhaps that was fine, and everybody got along fine with these first 162 precepts or principles and so forth and then somebody came along with a pitch and put a big curve into the line and altered the agreements and redefined it all, you see? And after a while nobody knew what was moral, so it got to be a confusion. And then everybody tried to enforce what was moral and what wasn't moral, but nobody could make up his mind. And the confusion got greater and greater, and then people departed from the group and dispersed. And these people, dispersing, entered into other moral groups and new moral codes were formed, which they then followed, more or less.

And eventually those moral codes, of course, got diluted and messed up. And time marched on and what did we then find? All kinds of confusion would then enter in to what was moral and what wasn't moral. And the next thing you know, somebody would jump up and a group would get together and they would agree on a brand-new moral code, you see? And then that moral code would get all messed up somehow or another, and people would offend against it somehow and then that group would disintegrate – because, of course, its moral agreement disintegrates, why, it – the group disintegrates. And then that confusion is succeeded a little later on the track by these various group members, now members of other groups, forming up new moral codes which go into disintegration. You see?

So you've got a cycle there. And the cycle of action of civilizations is simply this cycle of action: It is an agreement on optimum conduct; a disintegration of agreement and optimum conduct; a disbanding of the group; a formation of a new group with the agreement on – new agreement on – optimum conduct; a disintegration of that agreement; the dispersal of the group; the formation of a new group. Do you see the cycle? Now, that's the cycle of civilization. And that's the cycle of action.

The create-survive-destroy, in this particular instance, is, of course, they create a series of agreements and conducts of what is right and what is wrong. They establish what is right and what is wrong, what is moral, what is immoral, what is survival, what is nonsurvival. They establish this thing. That is what is created. And then this disintegrates by transgressions. And these transgressions – unspoken, but nevertheless transgressions – by each group member gradually mount up to a disintegration.

And the person who transgresses the most, quite commonly can be the person who is up there screaming the loudest that the others must follow the moral code. You look at the various Calvinist preachers and things of this character. Man, those fellows had a ball. Ten million withholds per preacher, you see, and they were screaming to the rooftops how everybody must follow the code. Of course, you get a disintegration after a point like that.

You see how this thing goes? So your „survive,“ of course, is as long as the codes or agreements continue in action. And then your „destroy“ or your destructive confusion, of course, is what occurs when everybody has withholds, when everybody is going the other way to, token payment to the code but actually no adherence to it; everybody has withholds from everybody else concerning it. The group, of course, disintegrates on the basis that when you have overts, you have separation, individuation.

So the group disintegrates and you go into a new cycle now. It stays – sometimes they stay disintegrated for a year, sometimes for hundreds of years.

There are countries on this planet right now whose moral codes have disintegrated, who haven't yet formed a new one. Several Mediterranean countries have done this right this minute. They really don't have a new moral code; their old one is pretty doggone shot.

The white man, with „life, liberty and equality“ as spread by Tom Jefferson and so forth, now, down in Africa, is experiencing the agony of having his moral codes, as natives, totally destroyed, completely. And everybody says, „Isn't this wonderful! Isn't this marvelous! Look, all we're doing for these natives,“ you see, and the natives are getting sicker and sicker and falling apart and they can't handle themselves or anything else. And everybody says, „Isn't it wonderful what we're doing. Look, we're giving them washing machines. Of course, they don't have any electric power in their house, but we're giving them washing machines! And look at the marvelous things we're doing here.“

Well, the marvelous thing they're doing, of course, is disintegrating the moral code of the tribe or the tribal unit and bringing about a total disintegration of the individuals concerned with it.

Now, there is your general hue; there is the general state of affairs with regard to a cycle of action of civilization. Do you see how that went? You see how it goes?

All right. You in Scientology are involved right this minute in a certain mores. There is a certain moral code of one kind or another. Actually, it isn't completely formed yet. It is still in a state of formation. But one of the reasons why you find it difficult to process another Scientologist is not that his case is worse, but because you, when you flub, transgress against the moral code of „Thou shalt be a good auditor.“ That's it.

And because you are subscribing to a code of conduct that is survival, therefore, when you have overts against that code of conduct, it is the code of conduct by which you are auditing and progressing in life. So naturally, these things, then, take paramount importance in Security Checks. The last two pages of the Form 3, all of Form 6, when straightened out, will do more for a long-term Scientologist than anything else. Why? It's not that he's – why, he's been doing all these things in the name of helping people. „Well, yes,“ you say. „Well, he has a perfect right to go nattering around about, 'Well, Ron has changed his mind again!'“ You know? You think he has a perfect right to.

Well, I personally believe he has a perfect right to, don't you see? I'm not upset by this in any way. I've been shellacked by experts, you know? And I can stand up to a lot more hurricane than somebody sitting back in a corner nattering slightly about something or other. „Oh, well, these bulletins aren't in order, you know? And Ron should have gotten these bulletins in order,“ you know?

All right. But it just so happens, by the principles of the thing, that the very fact that he is thinking them is a transgression against something he apparently has agreed to. All right, the transgression is such that it holds his case up.

It is the *current* moral code, then, which is the most important to the case. It is the code by which the person is now living which has dominance over all other codes. So we get a practicing Scientologist and so on and the first thing that we've got to do with him is straighten out his transgressions against the group agreement: „Thou shalt be a good auditor.“ „Thou shalt not flub.“ „Thou shalt pronounce thy commands properly.“ [laughter] Get the idea? And „Thou shan't get Scientology in trouble.“ You know? This kind of thing. Whatever these codes add up to, they are what they are, don't you see? They aren't so much what I say they are, they just are what they are. They're what you're forming up.

All right. Transgressions against those things, then, tend to make you feel like an outsider from the group of Scientologists, and to that degree you can receive no benefit from Scientology, don't you see? It's very simple.

It is not that the action is monstrous; it is the degree that the action removes the person from his group.

So that is the definition of a transgression. This has very little to do with our own moral code, only that we just, oddly enough, are suddenly – suddenly look and see what we're doing, you know? I mean, here we are, we're forming up a new series of agreements. They're not all completely formed yet, not by a long ways. But there they are. They're a new series of agreements. They're a way of life. There's „this is survival“ and „that isn't survival.“ The fact that these things are – resolve life and take dominance and command over so many other moral codes and can actually run out now and change all other moral codes, of course makes this a fantastically powerful code by which we're operating.

I'm not now talking about the written Code of a Scientologist. I am talking about what you think a Scientologist should do and should not do – what you think he should do or not do, see? Not what I think he should do or not do. That is basically the moral code which is being formed up here.

Well, it's a very strong one because it has dominance over all other moral codes. You think it should be this way and it should be that way or it shouldn't be this way and it shouldn't be that way. And it all is added up to you and adjudicated on what you consider survival and what's not considered survival. And of course we're in a position where we're dominant over [over] all other activities. But let's not worry about that for a moment. That has very small bearing on this particular lecture.

What I'm talking about is, what is a moral code? Well, a moral code is a series of agreements to which members of the group have subscribed to promote their survival. Now, that is a moral code.

And their transgressions are the degree that they have separated themselves from free communication with the remainder of the group. That is a transgression: the degree that a person has separated himself from free communication with a group. And that's all a transgression is.

Now, you say, „Well, a transgression – after all, he murders a member of the group. That's certainly a wilder transgression than this...“ Well, I don't know. He murders a member of the group and so they burn him at the stake or something of the sort or assign him to being skewered with E-Meter cans in the public square. Something goes on. It actually is not much of a transgression.

That is sort of a livingness and groups do get enturbulated one way or the other.

But get this one: Murdering a member of the group and hiding his body and never mentioning it to the rest of the group – oh, oh, oh, oh, oh. Now he is pretending to be part of the group while no longer being part of the group and it is out of that sort of thing that you get the disintegration.

So, he murdered a member of the group and everybody found out about it and they all knew him. They saw him do it, and they skewered him with E-Meter cans in the middle of the square and told him, „Go thou and never get audited again, you dog“ And so he went out and picked up another body. And one day an auditor runs into it in session and runs it out, see?

But he actually has not been separated from the group. The only person who can separate one from a group is himself, and the only mechanism he can do it by is withholding. He withholds transgressions against the moral code of the group from the other members of the group and therefore he individuates from the group and the group therefore disintegrates. This should be very simple; this is very well taped.

Now, how does this all come about in the first place? What are – are there any other mechanisms back of this? Yes, there is the mechanism of co-action, the mechanism of co-action. The last time you were dancing with somebody you were indulging in a co-action. They were moving and you were moving and so forth. The last time you had a fight with somebody, you were in a co-action; yes, you were in violent disagreement with their actions and they were in violent disagreement with your action, but unfortunately, underneath all this, you were both fighting.

Now, I'll give you an example of a co-action of magnitude, if you will forgive the slight excursion into maritime affairs. I'll tell you anecdotes about the Phoenician navy pretty

soon, but right now I can only tell you anecdotes about current ones that you would be interested in.

A ship is no good until it has braved some tremendous danger or indulged in combat. The crew is no good and the ship just isn't integrated. There's nothing to it.

You take these harbor launches that everybody goes home to the wife every night, and they come aboard, and so forth. Well, they fall apart. There is no group there to amount to anything.

But a ship, in essence, is a fairly isolated group and therefore gives us a good example.

And you recruit everybody up and you've got all the proper number of ratings and men and they're all at their proper stations and they're all in the proper slots and they've all been trained for their duties – and nothing works. It's so interesting. Nothing works. There is no more nightmarish nightmare than putting a ship in commission with a new crew. For the first month or two or three months even, you are in a position where you don't know whether the guns are going to fall off or the keel is going to suddenly wind up down the stack. You just don't know.

The supplies never seem to get aboard and the fuel never seems to flow freely to the engines or burners. Nothing seems to ever happen in the ship. It just – nothing happens! Except a sort of a confusion. Some kind of a weird confusion goes on.

And then one fine day this ship is out and it meets a great storm. And this storm is battering away at force 8, 9, 10 and huge, raging seas are racing on every side of it and every man is braced, and down in the engine room they're trying to keep the screws turning over somehow or another, and the water in the bilges are sloshing all around and somebody forgot to close a seacock. And the next thing you know, they're all being punished for their omissions.

And somehow or another they hold the ship together. Somehow or another they hold the ship together. And then the storm abates. And for some peculiar reason we now have a ship. This is a noticed fact. I mean, a lot of people who have gone to sea, and so forth, could tell you this fact.

It is true of a flight group. It is true of a military company. You never really see any organization hang together at all until it has been bruised, heavily and hard, and then you will see an organization hang together.

The reason business organizations is so hard to hold together as groups, and there are so many transgressions against their codes of operation, is centered totally upon the fact that they never get mauled. The boss gets mauled and the accountant gets mauled and somebody else gets mauled, but nobody ever takes the whole building and mauls it. There is no mutual danger to amount to anything.

One could be created. Instead of the manager taking it all on his back every time somebody writes him a nasty letter, if he got the staff together and read it to them and they had a chance to find out what was going on and discover what was under attack here or what wasn't under attack here, you might get a cohesed group and organization. Otherwise, no.

What is this? They have experienced the necessity to survive, and that is the whole summation of it. A group becomes a group when it has experienced mutually the necessity to survive. And that then makes a very strong group.

A ship going into action for the first time goes into it as a disintegrated series of agreements. It has no moral code, it has nothing. Why? Because nobody sees any necessity at all to survive. And then they take a rare shellacking. They've left a seacock open and they forgot to test out the ammunition hoist and a lot of other things weren't done on this ship. And all those sins start to catch them out. And they suddenly say, „We've got to survive around here and we had better put it into high gear.“ And when they come out the other end, they're all friends, oddly enough. They've gone through a mutual experience of some magnitude and they're friends. And their friendship for one another expresses it in itself – of a knitted group which has its own mores.

You'll find out that every ship which has been long together with itself under any kind of – well, just mediocre, the most medi – it isn't leadership that makes a ship, it's lack of interference by leadership that makes a ship. And you'll find out that these boys will have developed a whole civilization of their own. They have their own jokes. You'll be walking down the deck of a strange ship that is lying in some harbor someplace and somebody will say, all of a sudden – turn around and he'll say (he'll look at another little boat in the water or something like that) and he'll say, „Ten feet tall.“ And everybody – every member of the ship's company that is near him – will laugh like mad, you see?

„What – ten?“ You're an outsider. You don't know what he was talking about.

Well, something has happened on the ship or somebody got razzledazzled into some peculiar way and it somehow or another centers around this joke, „ten feet tall,“ and everybody knows this joke, but the outsider doesn't. Well, that's as much a part of their civilization as: all the ship's members know that when you go down a certain companionway and open a certain watertight door, you'd better for sure get your fingers the hell out of the road because it inevitably slams back. They all know that, but you're a stranger and you don't know that, so you get your fingers caught. [laughter] But they have a whole technology, and it's just a group of men running one piece of machinery.

An oil rig, running out in the middle of Texas someplace or standing out on a Texas tower in the Gulf, something like this – the crews attached to that thing, after they've gone through certain experiences and so forth, cohesed and become a group. And they have certain morals that are different. It runs different, place to place. But there's a certain pattern runs through it all. And the basic thing is you mustn't injure the survival of a fellow group member – common denominator of a transgression. And that's also, by the way, the common denominator of the code in the first place: You mustn't injure the survival of a certain group member.

Therefore, a manager has a tendency to be far more isolated from a group, or the leader of a group has a tendency to be far more isolated from the group, than group members. Why? Because he every now and then does injure the survival characteristics of a group member. No matter if he does it reluctantly, every now and then, on every side of him, he will find members of the group are absolutely insisting that Member X be expelled. Member X's

transgressions, in the cumulative sense, have gotten so antipathetic to other group members that they find that it is impossible to survive with Member X around. And who do they turn it over to?

Well, now, the leader of the group is not particularly aware of the transgressions of Member X because he doesn't live the same life as the rest of the group. He's a little bit isolated, don't you see? So he does an independent overt without a motivator. He dismisses the group member. He says, „Thou shalt be shot. Thou shalt be turned out to starve,“ or something.

So he tends to get all manner of overts against group members. And then he seldom tells anybody else in the group what exactly happened to Member X, because he thinks it'd be too enturbulative. He never posts it on the bulletin board or something like this. „For the seventh consecutive time, Member X was found eating crackers in somebody else's bed and therefore is no longer amongst us, by popular demand.“ [laughter] He never does anything like this, you see? He operates sort of on a constant withhold. And he can actually drive himself straight out of his own group. It's quite interesting. Ah, you get this in the isolation of command and so forth.

Now, this is so true that man has at length accepted the idea of isolation of command as a normal course of human events. It's not necessarily normal at all. But you see, there is one of your breakdowns.

Now, leadership is one of the frailties of a group, while at the same time being one of its greatest strengths. So that you change the leadership of a group, you can change, to a marked degree, some of the characteristics of the group. But if you change the group over to a leader who then violates or changes all the mores of the group, ahh, well, we've got lots of trouble now. We've got lots of trouble.

I have a case in point: There was a very successful company. You heard of Nick Carter and Diamond Dick and all the rest of these old pocketbooks – in their day, the comic books of the 1890s. Well, those were all published by a company known as Street & Smith. And it had become very, very wealthy over a long period of time, and it had its mores. Boy, did that place have mores.

It owned a whole square block – imagine it – in the middle of New York City, where a square foot is worth about a hundred thousand dollars. And it owned a whole, huge square-block building about four stories high that was the clammiest, most fallen-apart old building you ever heard of, and it had printing presses in it. And the building was so shaky that when these enormous presses started to roar, the whole building shook. You could hardly hold the inkwell on the desk, you know, up in the executive offices, and so forth.

And they had – they had just gone on for years. They had unpublished manuscripts of O. Henry. They had all kinds of things. I went into their vaults one day, and there were the originals of Ned Buntline, you know, and Annie Oakley and all of this kind of stuff. Fantastic.

And there were certain codes by which you couldn't speak to people and could speak to people and certain precedences by which you went to lunch and did this and did that. And

there were promotion precedences in every place and it was a very hidebound old outfit. Well, after all, it had been in existence for the better part of a half a century.

And all of a sudden young Mr. Smith inherited it on the basis of death dues, you see? And he had a wife. And his wife believed that it was a nasty thing to publish things like that. Her friends wouldn't like it. But they would like such things as fancy women's magazines.

And so Mr. Smith Americanized himself to the degree of saluting the wife and saying, „Yes, sir.“ And at the time he took over – at the time he took over – there was a seven-million-dollar sinking fund in that company. Just – just the sinking fund! There were no strings attached to it. There were nothing. It just sat there and made money. Everything made money in all directions.

He took their high-power presses, which could spit out more dime novels and magazines than any other high-power press in America and sold it to his nearest competitor. And then they could spit out more magazines than Street & Smith. And when he got through, he owned *Mademoiselle*, all on the cuff. [laughter]

And the company was gone and the building was gone and everything was gone. And that is – it's things like that, you see, which give rise and credence and get loyalty devoted to such things as socialism, communism, things of this character. Because they recognize that the leader of a group is the most capable of destroying the group.

The group might survive all sorts of storms and financial crises and crashes, but all one – well, just one thing has to happen, you see? The leader of the group goes bad, marries the wrong girl, who decides that her friends won't speak to her quite well enough if she is connected with printing blood-and-thunder magazines, don't you see?

I don't know what happened to all of that, but the staff dispersed all over the place. And you would see these people afterwards, and they'd be sitting around in a sort of a degraded fashion, you know? They were old Street & Smith people. They were never anything else. They were not new popular-publications people, you see? They were old Street & Smith people, because it was one of the oldest publication groups in America.

Now, you can answer the question, „Why is it that the old soldier is always degraded?“ Just hire an old soldier someday to mow the front lawn. You usually will have had it. They have a very bad employment reputation, old soldiers. Now, I'm talking about *old* soldiers: the sixteen-year man, the twenty-year man, the thirty-year man.

And you say at once, „Well, the army must have done something horrible to this fellow to bring about a total disintegration of his personality and therefore the army is very bad training and therefore the army is degrading and therefore the military is very bad.“ And you can get a whole nation believing the military is very bad because every product of the military which they see, after the fellow has spent ten, sixteen, twenty, thirty years in the military, is the guy is walking around in a fog, you know? He's walking around in a daze of some kind or another or he takes to drink or he's unreliable and he won't do his job. And they see this sort of thing, so they say the military must be very bad.

No, they're looking at another phenomenon. It is the phenomenon of a group member who is no longer part of the group. That's the phenomenon they're looking at. He's a perfect-

ly good soldier, but he has no group. How can he go on being a perfectly good soldier? There's no mores. Any mores that he has – „Thou shalt not tell the sergeant,“ you know? „Thou shalt sneak in after hours when thou dost not have a pass.“ „Thou shalt raise hell with the mess sergeant.“ „Thou shalt scrounge anything that isn't nailed down, providing [laughter] – providing it doth not belong to thine own company.“ Tremendous mores, various kinds, you know? „Thou shalt raise hell with second lieutenants but be respectful to captains.“ All these kinds of things.

Well, this is the moral code by which he is living. And of course he's living by a moral code and he has no group connected with it anymore; he is degraded.

Is he degraded, actually, because he had overts against the army and his moral code? *No*. No. He is merely degraded because of this interesting phenomenon, which you must pay some attention to: If a person is no longer a member of the group, he feels automatically that he must have had overts against it and was driven out of it. Through no fault of his own, this group has ceased to exist or he is no longer a member of it. Just the fact that he is no longer a member of the group makes him automatically – flick – believe that he must have had overts against the group.

You see, this is the reverse phenomenon. Now, you run into this every once in a while. As a matter of fact, you run into it rather constantly. Because the punishment or the result exists, people then believe the crime must have existed. Got the idea?

You'll see every once in a while some fellow whose wife has left him. And he will then believe that he must have been mean to her or that he is not a good family man. Maybe it had nothing to do with it whatsoever. Maybe there was a typhoid epidemic in the area and then she died. But he gets this other sensation, you know? The other sensation is he's no longer a part of the group, therefore he must have offended. And you'll find people nattering and chattering about this.

One notable example, there was one girl I knew that – whose father died in an automobile accident exactly two thousand miles away and she sat around all the time trying to figure out how she killed her father. How had she killed her father? Well, was it because she didn't answer his telephone call when he put a telephone call through to her? Was it because she didn't phone at the time of this? Was it because of this? Was it because of that? Was it because she had gone to this other city in the first place? Now, if she hadn't gone to the other city – and so forth.

Well, all of this nattering, and that whole thing which the psychiatrist – ooh, this just drives the psychiatrist mad. He worries about this more than anything else. He sits up all night sometimes worrying about this one. He will – if he finds this in a patient, he sits there and the perspiration just drips all over his white, somewhat smudged-edged weskit. The person thinks he killed his father. And he'll just do everything he can possibly do, you see, to try to convince this patient that he didn't kill his father. And he doesn't know the mechanism connected with it, and actually we didn't either until just now, in the last few days here.

Well, his father's gone, so therefore he must have offended against a group called „son-father“ or „daughter-father.“ See, that is a group. Daughter-father: must have offended

against it because he's no longer a member of the group. And you might say this is the common denominator of people's degraded feelings. They are no longer a member of the group.

So you will very often be processing somebody who feels that he had tremendous overts – this is not in the majority – but you'll feel this is somebody who had tremendous overts against a group, and you won't be able to *find* them. And you won't even be able to – you won't be able to locate them on the meter, which is what I mean. No, the group is gone and he – it's not any longer there, and he's no longer with the group, so he figures it out, you see, that having suffered the final punishment for transgressing against the group, then he must have transgressed against the group. And what's worrying him is to try to figure out how he transgressed against the group rather than simply face the fact that he's no longer a member of the group. You got the idea?

An awful lot of people finished up World War II, or the Korean War, feeling degraded because they were separated from their military units. Well, they were separated from their military units. Well, if they'd gone through a lot of cosurvival motion, see – if they'd gone through a lot of motion with other fellows in an effort to survive – then it cohesed the group. And of course, how did they leave the group? Well, they just left the group by being demobbed, that's all. (Naval terminology: they were „separated from service.“)

Well, that was some action of some character in some personnel division someplace. And the fellow afterwards wonders if he shouldn't have been nicer to the squadron, you know, and he shouldn't have been nicer to the company or if he shouldn't have been better to those people and what did he do? And he'll sit around and grieve, actually, about the horrible things that he did do to these fellows. Well, he's integrating the whole thing against the fact that because he's no longer a member of the group, then he must have transgressed against the group. You see?

In other words, he does an identification of the punishment with the action. See, it's – only the action is necessary.

Now, what actions are actually necessary to cohesed a group? Co-action in the direction of survival. If you have co-action in the direction of survival, with two or more people, you inevitably have a mores. It's tiny and it's not very explicit, but it's a mores. And it has to do with two people who went against many survival, ah... antisurvival forces. They coacted against antipathetic forces, so therefore they are a group.

And now one of the people dies or departs and we have the other person then believing he must have transgressed against the other person. And sure enough, he does have transgressions and you'll find out he's very, very happy to find out and get off his withholds and transgressions against the other thing and it will blow at that time. But it's blowing for another reason. The reason you think it is blowing is because you've gotten off these little, petty, two-bit withholds, you know? No, no, he was very happy to have found he really did merit no longer being a member of the group. You got the difference?

See, he figures, „Well, it was justified. They were right, throwing me out, because look, I did have some withholds, see? I did have some of these withheld transgressions. So therefore, obviously, there it is.“ See, happy as a clam, you know?

So he's willing to be separated from the group. Up to that time it's unknown, it's unexplained. Did he have transgressions against the group or didn't he have transgressions against the group? And the only evidence he has – he's no longer a member of the group, so he must have transgressed against the group. That's what the equation is. If the fellow is no longer a member of the group then he must have had action against the group.

You'll find out that the fellow who has a dogfight over France with a German pilot, let's say, and they go round and round and round and round and they have this hell of a dogfight and so forth, and they finally break it off and go home – do you know, there's always a little bit of an oddity between the two of them, so on. You know, they – every once in a while after a war, a couple of pilots who have had aerial duels and so forth, will meet. And they meet like old pals, man. That is the group. But you see, just to that degree, they formed a group.

Well, what kind of a group was it? It was a group of tremendous co-action – contra-survival. But each one is trying so forcefully to survive that their action is in agreement. It's an agreed-upon action: a dance of death in the sky. They're both firing at each other, aren't they? They're both flying airplanes, aren't they? They're both trying to survive, aren't they? They're both in the same sky, aren't they? They're both in the same time period, aren't they?

Well, they know they aren't a group. Each one knows the other is an enemy and they know this positively and violently, that they are not a group. And so they can never explain why the dogfight hangs up. Of course, there are withholds against their own groups in there. If one didn't shoot the other one down, it's actually a sort of a transgression against his own group, just to that degree.

But if he has a dogfight, fails to shake – shoot the other one down and then goes home and never mentions it, now he's actually got a transgression against his own group. You get the degree of complexity with which this mounts up. Well, it mounts up on this basis, this basis: agreement. What is agreement? It's two people making the same postulate stick. Two or more people making the same postulate stick – that's what we mean by an agreement. Two or more people making the same postulate stick – an agreement.

Well now, what if they go into mutual action and their mutual action is in the direction of survival? Oh, they've got the same agreements that they're trying to make stick and now they're going through similar actions by which they're trying to make survival possible? Now, what have they got now? Ah, they've got co-action and they have a confusion of one with another. They don't quite differentiate their own action, so they misown other actions in their immediate vicinity.

Fifteen men pulling on a rope trying to pull a seaplane out of the sea: Afterwards you say, „How much of each one's motion was responsible for the seaplane coming out of the sea? Exactly how many ergs of your motion was part of the recovery of the seaplane?“

Well, you try to break it down like that, he takes the easy course, you see? And he says, „Well, *we* did it. *We* pulled it out of the sea.“ He doesn't differentiate how much each one did pull it out of the sea. He just says broadly, „*We* pulled it out of the sea.“ In other words, it was fifteen men contributing unequally, some more, some less, to a line and they would contribute unequally if they were just at different positions on the line, because the

lines get bent and twisted around things and people who are closer to bollards, you see, can't pull as well as people who are far from them. You get the idea? So, it's an incalculable mathematical problem. How many ergs did each one contribute?

Well, they all solved the problem by saying, „We did it.“ Oh, and they're very happy about this – „*We* did it. *Our* motion.“

Now, you take some fellow who has been running an engine for an awful long time. He's pulling water or something up a hill into a reservoir, you see? And he runs this engine and he sees the pumps running, the water going up the hill and so on. And he runs the engine and he runs the engine and he runs the engine. Well, why, after a while, when you talk to him, does he go kind of „gurgle, gurgle,“ you see? Or like these engineers that I had and so on, they start their motors. They start their motors before they begin to talk. They say, „*Wrawr, wrawr, wrawr,*“ and then they get to firing off and they give you the sentence. It's quite interesting.

I don't think anybody would believe that. But I've got Peter as a witness. He's talked to them over the phone. It's quite marvelous. They start their motors and then they talk.

See, they „co-action.“ In other words, their action of running the motor is undifferentiated by them with the action of the motor. So their action running the body and the motor's action in running the pump – these are mutual actions. So you get co-action.

Now, you can go into this on havingness of motors and you can go into it on causes of things and you can go into it in other ways, but you actually separate it best by just getting the fellow to get the idea of a mutual action with the motor. And all of a sudden he – up to that time he's been totally identified. His action was the motor's actions and the motor's actions were his actions and so *they* had actions. They had actions. And if the motor conked out and all of a sudden its coil went bad, why, he goes home and has a stomachache or something like this, you know? Their mutual action is too tied in.

And that is the source of an overt. Now, let's get around to what we're talking about here. That is an overt act – or, that is the source of overt acts. You have mutual action with something else – and you call it a group member, a mores, a moral code – anything you want to call it – you see that, but it's mutual action. And then you do something cruel to that with which you have mutual action and of course you experience the somatic. And it's just as easy as that. It isn't any deeper than that. That is an overt act-motivator sequence and that is its exact mechanics and that's all there is to it.

Now, you wonder why I've been talking about mores and groups and group action and survival and all that sort of thing. Well, it just adds up to that fact. After you've had a tremendous amount of group co-action, you then embark upon a *cruel* action to what you have *co*-action with and you'll get the somatic. You must have had a cruel impulse toward co-action before you can get the somatic you administer to somebody else.

You take somebody with whom we have co-action and one day, for some reason or other best known to somebody else, you accidentally break his arm. You go around afterwards nursing your own. Why? Because your arm is his arm. And that's how that crosses and

that's what an overt act-motivator sequence is and those are all the mechanics there are to it. There aren't any fancier mechanics than that.

There isn't any mechanic such as, „Well, you should be punished because you have offended against another member of the group.“ No, that is the group dramatizing the fact I just gave you.

Religionists come along, Religionists come along. And these religionists, they tell you, „Well, do unto others as thou shalt turn thy other pig“ I don't think that's one of the commandments, but it's something like that. They get this thing reversed.

In other words, they are forcing into existence something that already exists. See, they're saying, „Well now, you get mean, you gyp your fellow group member, and you're really going to suffer. You'll suffer in the long run.“ Yeah, great. “Eighteen paternosters and three pieces of bread; that's what it's going to cost you or you'll suffer from here on, you see?“ They get paid for it.

But actually, there is nothing there to be paid for. A person who makes an overt act against something with which he has mutual action, of course, is incapable of differentiating what is his action and what is the other action. Fifteen men on a rope, one of them trips and butts the other one in the back and then he has a somatic in his own back, you see, because he didn't know whether the force was his or the force was theirs, but he engaged in a cruel action.

Now, all overt-motivator sequences become very pronounced when cruel actions are maliciously engaged upon while withholding. One is really a member of the group, one is really coacting with the group, but one engages on a cruel action toward another member of the group and then tries to back out. Why does he try to withhold? He tries to withhold by – just this reason: He tries to withhold because he doesn't want the effect of the co-action. See, he tries to individuate from the group when he does a cruel act because he knows that if he does a cruel act to something he has co-action with, then, of course, he's going to get it in the neck. So he tries to back out.

In other words, he disowns the co-action because he's trying to get rid of the motivator he will inevitably get. So he shoots a fellow group member and having shot the fellow group member, he then seeks to withhold the fact that he has shot a fellow group member so as not to be liable to the somatics of co-action, which experience has taught him will always occur.

And we're just down to the basic fundamentals of nondifferentiation and identification, that is all. He identifies every group member's action with his own action, so therefore if he is mean to a group member, he of course is liable to get it, so he tries to escape the penalty of what is woven straight into group action amongst all thetans and seeks to back out. And this will ordinarily coax him into withholding, too. So, withhold is part of the backout.

Now, if you ask him to recognize his co-action with that group member prior to his overt act, the overt act of course will blow. That's the mechanics of it, you see? You've got to get the *prior* action. Now, of course, the more commotion and the more action and the more withholds and the more nonsense preceded his overt act, the more the overt act is going to

hang up and the more he's going to try to withhold it. Do you follow that plainly? That's quite easy.

In other words, he can only suffer from his overt because of former action – former co-action. He can only suffer from his overt because of former co-action. And that co-action is the most aberrative when it is mutual survival – mutual survival. And, of course, that means a disturbed, confused area. And it also – you will spot earlier and earlier overts against fellow group members as you're doing this, which is earlier and earlier efforts to back out.

Well, of course, he is involved in mutual survival, mutual action. He is involved with other people with mutual survival. And because he is involved with this mutual action, every time he has tried to back out of mutual action, he, of course, had sought to deny the mutuality of the action. And he thinks he can get off the overt-motivator sequence inevitability by denying it, you see? If he just denies it enough, then he's no longer part of that scene. So he individuates, you see, gradually out.

And you have to knock out his individuation totally before he can walk out. That is what is the most peculiar phenomenon about it all, you see? The action he takes to escape punishment is the action which then settles in the punishment. This is all very mechanical. There is nothing much to it. You'll see this thing unfold. You'll see this thing unfold left and right. It becomes very – well, you audit a pc and you ask him for a prior confusion. Well, you could ask him for a prior survival and you'd get about the same answer.

You're asking him for a former co-action. And of course you will find, every time you find a former co-action, it opens up the track a little bit more, so he finds a former withhold. And then you look earlier than that withhold, and of course you've found a former co-action again – usually a confusion, because it's a survival action against odds, a battle of some kind or another with these two people facing the world or these ten people or this race, you see – and you find him backing out a little bit more.

And then you get a little more co-action off the case by asking him what some earlier confusion was and of course he remembers another withhold, another effort to individuate from the group. And these uncover just to the degree that you uncover prior confusions or prior survivals.

It's quite patent. In other words, you've got to get the co-motion – if you want to use that word – the co-motion which preceded the withhold. That doesn't mean the overt act that preceded the withhold so much as it means the co-disturbance which preceded his effort to individuate. And of course you'll get the withhold and the motivator, just right now. You get it right now. You ask for the co-action, and of course, that blows the mutual action he was involved in with another group member, and having blown that, you then can release the other. And it – and then he no longer withholds this fact about what he was trying to do to the group, so he's no longer trying to disintegrate from the group, so he can move on the time track.

Every time he has a withhold, he parks himself on the time track, you see? And he can keep parking himself and parking himself on the time track till the whole time track looks like just one big now. And that one big now *is* the reactive mind. And that's all there is to the

reactive mind; it's the combined withholds which he has stacked up, which have all become part of now. But they're efforts to individuate from groups.

Well now, he really never has succeeded in individuating from any group he has ever belonged to. Isn't that fascinating? It doesn't matter whether he talked to a shepherd back in the old days and they were talking there and all of a sudden a wolf came „rompthing“ over, operatically, and the flock scattered. And so the shepherd picked up a cudgel and went after the wolf. And he was just a gentleman passing by the way, but he picked up his sword and he went after the wolf, too. And they both got ahold of the wolf and they chased him over the hills and far away and made nothing out of the wolf. And then they came back and gathered up the sheep and they shook each other by the hand and he went on his way.

All right. He made a group, didn't he? He made a group and they had an agreement. The mores of the group is: „Protect sheep. Kill wolves.“ That was their morals. That is what they were supposed to do.

Now, all right. He went along for a few years and one day a shepherd drove all the sheep through his rose garden and so he went out and put a sword through the shepherd. And he got it right in his chest. And, „Doctor, Doctor, I have this horrible pain in my chest. I just can't understand what this horrible pain in my chest is.“

The doctor said, „Well, we – we look – we look upon that as advanced, galloping consumption. That's what that is. And you take this horrible black potion here, and it'll get you over it.“ And about eight, nine thousand bottles of black potion later, why, they bury him. [laughter]

He formed a group with a shepherd and then he killed a shepherd. Wasn't even the same shepherd. Well, what's he done? He's done an identification of shepherds, in the first place. And then he's done an identification of motion with a shepherd earlier. You follow this? So he gets an overt act-motivator sequence.

But nobody has ever left any groups. The magicians: Well, there have been magicians ever since there's been track. But magicians, from time to time, have expressed this in saying – they haven't come close to this at all. As a matter of fact, it's not a stable datum of magic. But they say, „A magician who starts in on one religion should not change his religion just because he's practicing magic.“ That's one of the rules of the game in magic. Mustn't change your religion. They know it's bad luck. They know people go to pieces on it.

Well, all they found out, just to that degree, is the fellow had subscribed to a religious group of some kind or another, and now if he goes and shifts his religion, why, he's going to get an overt-motivator sequence of some kind or other, he isn't going to be able to explain to anybody and there he's had it – which is quite interesting.

This opens up an interesting door for Scientology, because if everybody is – if no one has ever left any group he ever belonged to, against which he had a transgression or an overt, why, that means that all new groups being formed are formed by transgressors. [laughter] And then that follows, then, that if Scientologists could get off of that particular mechanism, they would form the first true group that has existed since the beginning of the universe. Isn't that interesting? Interesting vista suddenly opens up in that particular direction.

That's all rather beside the point at this particular moment. We're just talking about the mechanics of this thing. But that's true, that would happen.

Now, what, what is a moral code? A moral code would be agreements – a series of agreements – which had been cemented by mutual action aimed toward survival. And a transgression is an action against a person or being or thing with which one has a moral code or an understanding or a co-action.

Notice that we're trotting out *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health's* SURVIVAL, in caps. Notice it's right back with us again. Because it is the action by which beings sought to survive that then brings about *co-action* on the part of those beings; which brings about, then, the development of a series of agreements; which then brings about the possibility of a transgression. And the transgression, withheld, is an effort to act against the co-action of the group without suffering the consequences. But the co-action, followed by a withhold, then parks the person right there.

You see, because that's not an action. Let me call to your attention that a withhold is a no-action after the fact of action. You break the cookie jar and then you don't tell your mother. And you're processing this person and he's going along the track and there he is all of a sudden and he's standing there in the kitchen. He's not looking at anything. He's not looking at anything.

Have you noticed the number of pictures which pcs have where they're not doing anything. Have you noticed this? They're not killing anybody, they're not breaking any bones, they're not robbing any cookie jars, they're not doing anything, see? There they were, just innocently standing there, just an innocent bystander.

They'll have a picture, suddenly, of a street; and there's absolutely nothing happening on this street. They'll have a picture of a kitchen; there's nothing happening in the kitchen. They will have a picture of a pot and there's nothing happening with regard to the pot at all.

Well, what are these things? These are the points of withhold where a person has withheld his transgression against the group. And the transgression may lie minutes, hours or days before the picture. You just ask for the commotion which went on before that and he'll give it to you and you find the withhold, then the fact that he withheld it against the mores of the group and the picture will spring, just like that. Very tight, close mechanism. There's nothing much to it at all.

So, you look for the prior confusion. The rule of the prior confusion comes out of this. So if the person is parked anyplace, he, of course, has a withhold at the point he is parked, but it is immediately preceded by a *co-action* or co-motion, for sure, and then an overt against that co-action and co-motion. And then the withhold. So it follows down consecutively in terms of time: 12 o'clock, co-action, co-motion, as a part of the group; 1 o'clock, overt against this group; 2 o'clock, parked – see, withhold against the group, the effort to move out of the group. I'm just giving you 12, 1 and 2 so you can see what I mean by consecutively in time.

So, we have childhood, co-action with a family; teenage, overt against the family; young adulthood, complete upset with the family and awfully parked; withhold, won't talk to the rest of the family. You get the idea, see?

Well now, this goes as far as this: One can withhold one's self – and you mustn't overlook this in processing. That fellow who thinks he should have been drafted and join the army and who didn't then join the army, will be found to be in possession of a withhold which is inarticulate unless you know this particular fact: He is withholding a body, you don't just withhold thoughts. You just don't withhold deeds. You can withhold a body. You can also withhold stolen goods. You can also withhold objects of various kinds or another, which really aren't stolen, but they're withheld.

But withholding self is the commonest one, because wherever a person has engaged in a dogfight, such as I spoke about a few minutes ago, he all the time was trying to bring about the death of the other person while withholding himself from death, which makes a disagreed unreality about the whole thing. There's no agreement there of any kind whatsoever.

If you ask somebody, „Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you.“ „Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you,“ he'll wind up in all kinds of dogfights and all kinds of activities of one kind or another where he was trying to do something. It's not a good method of spotting overts, but that would find a hell of a lot of overts. You'd find a lot of overts.

You say, „Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you.“ „Get the idea of withholding your body. Thank you.“ And the guy would be parked right in a whole series of overts. They wouldn't necessarily resolve, because that isn't where he's stuck. He's stuck just a little bit later, in each particular case, because – if he's stuck at all – because withholding your body from a dogfight is a moral action. That is a moral action. It's immoral to depart from your squadron. But to do something which is against the survival of the squadron and withhold that is far more aberrative. Far more aberrative.

So, the transgressions against the group – well, that's all this thing adds up to. That's all there is to it. That's all there is to an overt act-motivator sequence, that is all there is to taking one apart and that is how everybody is stuck.

Now, I'll give you – I've given you a Class II Auditor skill, which is simply, „Locate the prior confusion.“ Now, when you locate the prior confusion, of course, you're going to locate some prior co-motion – motion with – and you will fall at once into an overt, and then you'll fall into the withhold.

And you keep saying „prior confusion“ and you'll just go *bing-bing!* See? You can force the pc's attention into the prior confusion, they come up to the overt and they'll hit the withhold – *zoomp, boomp, bang!* It's just a one, two, three, because that's the way it goes. Because they're held on the track by the prior confusion, apparently held on the track by the prior confusion, but only because they have a withhold later.

So it takes all three steps to park somebody on the track. It takes a prior co-action, then it takes an overt and then it takes a withhold. And when you've got those three things,

you get a person stuck on the track and that's all there is to it. And that makes up the reactive bank. And that is the anatomy of the reactive bank.

First there is co-action, then there are overts and then there are withholds. And then that compositely gives us, eventually, a total jam of time. And that total jam of time, totally buried, becomes the reactive mind and that is the reactive mind. And that's all there is to the anatomy of the reactive mind. That's the lot.

Now, when you clear somebody, you, of course, clear those identities which the person has more or less teamed up with and those identities and their now-I'm-supposed-to's and their particular withholds and withholding these identities and helping the surv – first helping the survival of the identity, then overts with or against the identity and then withholds with or from the identity. And that is the goals terminal that you are running and that's the anatomy of the goals terminal, when you get right down to it. When you run the Prehav Scale, you run all the sides of this thing off.

Every engram a person has, has these stuck that has this sequence in it. This you will find everywhere. This is the pattern which is stamped all over the universe.

Now, I would be less than kind if I didn't give you a very broad, general process that anybody could run rather easily, but there is one which knocks this rather heavily. There is one which is rather amusing. There is a rather amusing experimental process about this – is you find something the person has identified with something and you simply tell him to think of a mutual action with the one and then a mutual action with the other and of course these two identifications will spring apart.

I'm giving you an idea. You find out, quite by accident or by being smart or something of the sort – you find out that the pc has horses and beds totally identified. So you say, „All right. Think of a co-action, or a mutual action with a horse. Good. Think of a mutual action with a bed. Thank you. Think of a mutual action with a horse. Good. Think of a mutual action with a bed. Thank you.“ And all of a sudden these two identifications will spring apart.

Don't get bugged off into this, because all of a sudden, fifteen or twenty other subjects will emerge out of that particular zone. Well, don't get him to thinking about those, too. Just keep him with horses and beds. Oh, he'll be thinking about horses, women, beds. That's the first thing that'll appear on the thing. Well, if you Qed-and-Aed with him, you'd say, „Well, think of a horse. Think of a woman. Think of a bed. Think of a mutual action with a woman. Think of a mutual action with a bed.“ That's been suggested to him, don't you see, by the stuff that's coming up. Well, don't Q-and-A with it because the next thing you know, he'd think in connection with beds, laundresses, for some reason or other, you see? If you Qed-and-Aed you'd say, „Think of a mutual action with a horse. Think of a mutual action with a woman. Think of a mutual action with a bed. Think of a mutual action with laundresses,“ see? And this will keep on. And you could get about seven or eight hundred of these things, and seven or eight hundred pieces of the auditing command. It'd be seven hundred or eight hundred parts to the auditing command if you just kept this up. So you better not do that. You just better say, „Think of mutual action with a horse. Think of mutual action with a bed,“ and go on that way, and he will just give you more stuff that is tearing off of the bank, because, of course, you've found a point of direct cross.

That is not a very practical activity, but it's an interesting activity.

Here is one, however, which is very practical and is a broad, one-command process and nothing else but. And that process is: „Tell me a group you are no longer part of,“ or any phrase – phrasing thereof.

Thank you.

SEC-CHECKING: TYPES OF WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on 5 October 1961

We have a new student in our midst: Ellen Carter. Stand up, Ellen.

How long ago were you supposed to be dead, Ellen?

Ellen: Oh well, 1936, they x-rayed me and lied about what they found, 'cause I couldn't live.

You're still with us. [laughter]

OK. This is the 6th...

Audience: 5th.

...of October. 5th? It isn't. By George, it is! [laughter]

This is the 5th of October, 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. And I'm going to talk to you today about Security Checking. And boy, do you need a talk about Security Checking. Because what you don't know about Security Checking would fill volumes.

Now, of course, I am a very bad authority on Security Checking from a subjective point of view because you realize that if anybody went into my crimes, it would just be too grim. No auditor would be able to stand up to that. We realize that, you see? These crimes are so innumerable because they cover such a long period of time. That's the main thing.

So I'm not talking to you from the viewpoint of sinlessness. Now, you must get your point of view oriented there.

If I were talking to you from the point of view of total sinlessness – this is an optimum state which religiously people get into. They somehow or another lay the right pennies on the right altar and at that moment they become totally sinless. Then they can condemn everyone. And this gives them the right to condemn everyone, you see? And they can't approach this subject objectively. And unlike various people of the past who have said, "Repent ye. Repent ye. Ye kingdom of heaven is at ye hand," something of that sort, people who do have sins, you see, find it much easier to talk about the subject. They have some reality on the subject. And let me assure you that from my point of view, if I had it all to do all over again, I would probably do the same things. [laughter]

So I don't want to give you the false impression that I give you any lecture on the subject of Security Checking from the basis that my security, unlike yours, has been pure for 200 trillion years. That would make a very great unreality. No, amongst us boys and us girls, what we have all been up to, only could not bear the light of day because we *think* it couldn't bear the light of day.

Now, it's funny that every group that has sought to enforce sinlessness on one and all, with the stake, vast punishment, condemnation, assignment to hell – that is the, that was the primary mechanism: They give you a ticket straight to hell.

Doesn't work sometimes, by the way. There was a rash of murders – I've told you this story before, I'm sure – but there was a rash of murders up in the Eskimo tribes. And the Royal Northwest Mounted Polices went up there to get their man and they found out that there had been a missionary in the area. And the missionary had told all the Eskimos what was right and what was wrong and had convinced them, of course, that if they murdered anyone, they would go straight to hell and burn forever. And the idea of being warm enough for any length of time... [laughter]

So you see, lecturing from the high platform of sinlessness, you very often run into the creation of more sin than you get rid of. And what's interesting is that any group which wishes to blow itself to flinders simply has to engage upon an activity of making everybody guilty of their sins. It'll hang together for a little while and everybody will be miserable while it does, but it'll eventually blow up.

Why? Because it now gives people a complete map on how to accumulate withholds. The group mores defines what is a withhold. It says you must not be guilty of such sins and such sins and such sins and therefore and thereby blows itself to pieces, of course, because it says everybody that has committed these sins should withhold them, even though they are saying at the same time: "You must confess them." But they make confession, you see, rather rigorous.

Now, we have to understand this at the outset of Security Checking. Thou, the auditor, are not sinless. That's what we have to understand about it. And thou art not an enforcer of a public mores while thou art being an auditor. Thou art simply a Security Checker, period. You got it? You're not the avenging angels of the Mormon Church or something like this, see, while you're security checking. You're simply a person who is skilled in certain technology to attain a better frame of mind and actually a much greater honesty and decency on the part of somebody else.

You have the weapon in your hands with which to attain a greater decency, a greater state of health, a greater efficiency, a greater ability, higher ability for ARC – you've got the weapon in your hands with which to do this. There is the E-Meter and there is the Security Check, and there is you and your technology.

So you are going to be able to accomplish what groups have been trying to accomplish for a long time. You are going to be able to make an honest man or an honest woman. You have the weapon with which to do this. That's very important for you to realize, because all of these other mechanisms – such as, "make the person guilty," "show the person the right way," you see, "and the error of his ways," and frowning upon him and punishing him in some fa-

shion or other because he's just gotten off a withhold – are mechanisms of older groups by which they sought to enforce their mores. Because they had no way to make honest people that was positive and lasting, then they used these very poor mechanisms of: "Make them good and guilty, punish them, show them what will happen to them if they do that again." All of these other things are added in. But what are those?

Those are the security mechanisms of yesteryear. Those are yesterday's tools. So you don't combine Scientology with other therapies. And that is all that you would be doing if you were trying to make somebody guilty and so forth, and doing something else with a Security Check rather than just getting off withholds.

So let us get down to a simplicity. You, the auditor, may have successfully waded through innumerable Sec Checks and be in good shape and so forth. That doesn't necessarily mean that "thou hast been without sin all the days of thy life." That hasn't anything to do with it, you see? It simply means that technically you've gotten up on this step. You were lucky. You came 200 trillion years along the track with red hands and black heads, and finally got out anyhow.

Well, that's beside the point. This point is important because if you, the auditor, are still worried about your own withholds or if you are trying to put up the presence of being – because you are a Scientologist and an auditor, and maybe a Release or something like that – if you're trying to put up the attitude, you see, that you yourself are sinless, then you will sometimes Q-and-A and avoid the other fellow's withholds.

In other words, you let the public sell you the idea that because you are a Scientologist, you should never have any sins. You get the idea? What have they done in essence? They have managed to bottle you up just like putting a cork in a bottle. Now you don't ever dare get off any withholds, you think, maybe, you see?

You can get into all kinds of odd cul-de-sacs, because we are still crossed up with the older therapy of condemnation and punishment and that was unworkable.

Let me point out that there are several people in prisons in the world. There are lots of people still doing penance in religious groups in the world. And if we add this up and recognize it clearly, we won't put ourselves in the same category. The old processes haven't worked. So don't let them work on you in reverse.

Don't ever get into a state where, because you are in a district or an area where you are holding the fort and keeping the torches burning, you never dare get off any withholds. You've permitted yourself to be sent on the road to hell. Do you see that? And your Security Checking would deteriorate. Inevitably your Security Checking would deteriorate. You would be afraid to ask people questions. You would start tacit consent. You'd start mutual avoidance of certain subjects. You get what I'm talking about, don't you?

The most serious barrier that an auditor has to overcome in Security Checking is not necessarily his own case, but a courage in asking – to ask the questions. You know, that's kind of a raw, mean, brassy sort of a thing to do.

You sit down. Here's this nice young girl. Everybody knows she's a virgin. Everybody knows this. And you're in very good ARC with her and everything is going to go along fine.

And then you say to her, crassly and meanly, "Have you ever committed any carnal sins of any character or another? Have you ever been to bed in the wrong place at the wrong time with the wrong man?" [laughter]

And put it mildly, this is a startling question. But since I've started security checking, I haven't found any virgins. [laughter]

Well now, it requires a certain amount of brass, it requires a certain amount of nerve, to sit there and ask all these fantastic questions, you know? "Have you ever – robbed, murdered, burned, slain, gutted, lied?" you see? And it sounds like you must be sitting there running off a catalog of the penal codes of French Guyana or something, you know? And here you go! And well, that's rough enough, if all of your withholds are off, that's rough enough. You sit down – perfectly inoffensive person – and you all of a sudden start asking him this sort of thing, you know?

Well, if you've got a whole bunch of withholds that you yourself are very afraid somebody is going to get next to, you will back straight off of the whole subject of Security Checking. And that is the only thing I see in the future of Scientology that could happen, is all auditors become "without sin" – they have never had any sin and because they are Releases or Scientologists or something, you see, then they never dare get off their withholds because the students in the Academy might hear about it. And all sorts of catastrophic actions might occur. And their reputation is utterly smashed and ruined, you see? So therefore, the best thing to do, you know, is just kind of avoid the whole subject. And that's what they'll finish up doing, too – avoiding the *whole subject*. They won't have that additional *élan* necessary to ask this poor, little innocent girl, "Have you ever raped your baby brother?" you see? You know, it's just something that they would not bring themselves to be able to do, providing they themselves were actually withholding withholds. Do you see the point I'm trying to make with you here?

So you could get a broad and general disintegration if you permitted the public at large to insist that because a person was a skilled Scientologist and in good case shapes, he had never done anything wrong. You see how that could be added up on you?

Now, you'll find some Instructor in an Academy here and there, and he's thinking to himself "*Uuughh!* If the students ever heard about this – ." And you think somebody in the HGC and he's saying, "We-ell, I don't know. I don't know. I don't know. Last year – here's this whole subject of Security Checking coming up again and if they found out last year that after I audited that girl, why, that happened – ."

And he sits there and he starts sweating over this thing: "What would the D of P think? What would other auditors think? What would the organization think?" so on. And the next thing you know, he's sitting in session and the question comes up. He has to make the decision whether to security check this person or go on running the level. Oh, he will go on running the level every time. He'll avoid Security Checking.

That person who is avoiding Security Checking in his own life will avoid Security Checking of other people. And you can just mark your – mark it down that if you find somebody who is ducking Security Checks in all direction, you have somebody who will not security check.

You would be amazed how your Security Checking improves to the degree that you yourself have gotten through the Security Checks. It is absolutely fabulous. You can almost tell whether an auditor has withholds to the degree of skill that he security checks. And the worse his Security Checking is, the more certain you become that he has withholds. That's an interesting coordination, isn't it? And yet it's a visible one.

So that going up the line and on the long haul in Scientology, you actually could get to a point where the public insists that those people who are carrying along – because Scientology is getting more and more important – more and more important. You could actually get people running an operation on you. They would start running this old therapy, you see? Because you're the leading auditor in an area, or something of the sort, you therefore must never have done anything in your whole life. Doesn't follow. But what it operates as is an "ought to be." And you could surrender to this "ought to be" and therefore never permit yourself to be security checked because somebody might talk.

Do you realize that that action alone would slow down the whole forward impulse of Scientology by putting in lousy case shape every important auditor and person in Scientology? It could be done. And that is the Achilles' heel of Scientology. That is it. That we become so important that we must therefore – it follows in some peculiar way – be without sin, without mishap, without ever taking our finger off our number in life, and without ever forgiving it if somebody has. If we ever got into that state, we'd be finished. We'd be finished.

But we don't have to get into that state because we've got the tools which keeps a group together without the whip. See, the whip has become a useless and antiquated object. Like the electric shock machine, it can be dedicated to the museums of tomorrow.

Now, someday we're going to take one of these prisons here and set it up with dummies just as a showpiece of what man used to do. That's the only use you'll have for it.

By the way, we did have a use for Washington one time – this is completely non sequitur, but we – you know, I think I ought to at this moment probably make you all members of a very secret society. [laughter] Speaking of withholds, there is a very secret society. It doesn't do much withholding, but it is very secret, mostly because nobody recognizes it as an actual society. They all think it's a joke, see?

The society's – is the SPG. And the SPG. And I'm now going to make you all members of the SPG. It's the Society for the Prevention of Government. [laughter] Interesting society. All you have to do to be a member of it is say you are.

You know, I don't think a single revolutionary charge of any kind whatsoever could be filed against a member of this organization. Because everybody prevents government to some degree, you see? It'd just be to what degree are we preventing government? The only thing governments get upset about is the overthrow of government by force, which means, of course, the setting up of another government on top of an existing government. We're – aren't interested in doing that. We're just interested in preventing government.

But anyway, the mechanisms by which man has been governed had in it the idea that man was evil and therefore had to be held in line by evil practices. And if man was evil, then

he had to be held in line with evil. And they never noticed that the evil in the world stemmed totally from holding man in line. That was the fascinating part of it.

You have to have been a member of a police force to recognize that the police create crime. They do it quite unintentionally, but they do create crime. They get a game called "cops and robbers" going. In this game – every criminal busily plays this game. If there wasn't that much to it, why, there they'd be.

Well, for instance, there's some young fellow was walking down the street one day and he suddenly read his name in the newspapers and reported to the police. And for the next six or eight days he was sitting under the hot lights and they were questioning him and throwing him into cells and being mean to him and so forth. Actually, he hadn't done a thing. He hadn't even been there. He hadn't even been present. And they turned him loose after a while. He's very relieved to have been turned loose. What do you think his ideas are going to be on the subject of police now?

Now, we start building it up from there. A society without ARC is a society which inevitably will have crime. Man is good, but he is only good to the degree that he's in ARC with existence. And when you throw him out of ARC with sections of society or whole governments at one fell swoop, he gives the appearance of being very bad. Actually, all he's trying to do is survive and protect himself and keep the thing from going all to hell. He has his own peculiar notions about how he does this and the primary mechanism he uses is withhold. That's how he thinks he can hold everything together – by withholding everything. The primary mechanism.

So the police are dedicated to making everybody withhold till the mores of the criminal mainly consists of: "You must not talk to the police." Well, that's quite interesting. "You mustn't talk to the forces of law and order." Ah, well, that's interesting. Well, that necessarily forces somebody further out of communication with law and order.

And if you think criminals are without government, you're mistaken. They have their own government. And a very wild, gruesome government it is, too.

But the society is forced apart to the degree that people are made guilty.

Now, why does a man wind up as a murderer? Well, he has long since resigned from the human race – long since. If you want to prevent a murder, you don't hang murderers. You make it unnecessary to resign from the human race. That's easy.

I'll give you a murder where the law was definitely at fault. Washington, DC. A taxicab driver – if I remember the story right – had a wife and this wife kept going off with another man. And he had a hard time of it because he tried to take the matter to court, he tried to get a divorce, he tried to quiet it down, he tried to hold the home together – he took every measure he could possibly take, but of course there was no law that would back him up. You see, he didn't have any evidence and he didn't have vast sums of money, you see, to buy detectives to accumulate this and that, you know? And there was nobody he could go to. And he got more and more and more seething about this, because he was basically out of communication, and he finally killed both of them.

Well, what was interesting to me about this particular case is that for two years this fellow had had some sort of a grievance and there was no agency in society to remedy any part of that grievance; there was nothing he could do about it. So he finally did the last desperate jump. Now, of course, he himself had various withholds, but were these withholds actual or unintentional? And now we get to a very interesting subject: the unintentional withhold.

This is where you get your new ARC break process, by the way, in the rudiments – is the unintentional withhold. So it's quite important, this unintentional withhold. I mentioned to you yesterday that a person very often finds himself in a position and then considers he's guilty because he's in that position. He finds himself outside the group, so therefore he feels he must have done something to be expelled from the group, which is quite remarkable.

Well, this unintentional withhold is the same thing. The person is not able to tell anybody. Now, it might be that there is nobody there to tell it to. He's not able to tell anybody. It's not that he *wouldn't* tell anybody if he *could*, but he *can't* tell anybody because there isn't anybody to tell it to or nobody will listen. And you'll find these all over insane asylums. You'll find people sitting around with unintentional withholds because nobody will listen to them.

They say, "Well, these bugs, they just keep crawling all over me," and the psychiatrist and everybody says, "Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. We know, we know, we know. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes." And the person just knows he isn't reaching anybody and he just gets more and more fixed and obsessed with this idea of these bugs crawling over him, because it's an unintentional withhold. He doesn't intend to withhold it, but he finds himself in the position of doing so because nobody will listen.

So you must take into account this as a factor. It is a very important factor or I wouldn't have put it in your rudiments processes. "What weren't you able to tell an auditor?" Well, that makes a withhold. Well, you weren't unwilling to tell the auditor, you see? You were trying desperately to tell the auditor, but the auditor never listened.

And when you run this ARC break process, you are really knocking out unintentional withholds. And the results that you get from that particular ARC break process are quite similar to the results of a Security Check. But in this we're addressing some other subject. The Security Check is addressed to the more or less intentional withhold. But that ARC break process is addressed to an unintentional withhold. It is a withhold.

Now, there's many a criminal has walked in and said, "I've just murdered my wife," and the desk sergeant has swatted a couple of more flies and paid no attention to him. And he's walked outside and he's gone up to the cop on the beat and he said, "I just murdered my wife," and so forth. And nobody paid any attention to him and nobody ever found the wife. And he was perfectly willing to take the penalties of society, but nobody believed him. And you get the most peculiar kind of withhold there is. And you mustn't overlook this as a withhold in Security Checking. The unintentional withhold.

So that is, you might say, about the lowest rung of withholds. It's unintentional. He didn't mean to withhold it, but nobody will listen.

All right. Now we get the intentional withhold which is a withhold because he would be punished if he admitted it. And we get a different type of withhold although it has the same mechanism, produces the same actions.

And then there is another withhold: He must withhold it because it will damage his beingness – in other words, his reputation. Those are reputational withholds. He's got an idea of what people think his beingness should be and he's upholding his beingness by not admitting to certain withholds because other people might get another notion of him than the notion which he is trying to broadcast. So therefore he mustn't have reputational rumors and gossips and things of this sort of character. So therefore and thereby it's a reputational withhold. He hasn't really done anything. It's well, actually, his family came from the lower marshlands of the Thames or something, down in the mudflats of Southampton or something, you know? And he just – well, *ha-ha, ha-ha* – he just wouldn't rather this be known, you know? His family, by advertisement, always came from upper Berkshire. It's quite interesting.

Now, familial connections aren't the least of it, you see? People are always trying to represent themselves as a little bit better. Well, that's fine. There's nothing wrong with that, but it results in a bunch of reputational withholds.

Now, between the last two categories there's a borderline category of things which, if they were out, people would think much less of him – you know, that kind of thing. He really wouldn't be punished, he isn't worried about it on account of beingness, he's just thinking, well, people wouldn't talk to him or something like that if they knew this sort of thing.

Well, if you'll notice, all these things add up to cut communication. And a group is based basically on communication. So a group falls apart to the degree that there is no communication and these are the three broad categories: the unintentional withhold, the withhold for fear of punishment and the withhold in its various grades that protect beingness. And these three things, of course, are all shattering to groups. They knock a group apart in a hurry, but in fact, up to a certain point, appear to cohesed a group.

I don't know if you've ever been on Fifth Avenue or upper Fifth Avenue or in Hollywood or something like that and listened to what went on in lieu of reputation. It runs on something on the order of fifteen or twenty lies a minute when they're talking, you see? It's almost impossible to keep up with. And there's the most fantastic unreality about those particular groups. They are very unreal. And you get near those people, you see, and around in those groups, and you think, "Oooooooooo, I don't know," you know? It's a – . You don't quite know what's going on. You're just not quite sure what is – what is wrong there. But there just is something wrong. Well, what is wrong is that it's a group with totally cut communication lines.

Well, how can you have a group with a totally cut communication lines? Well, I guess they're the only people who will listen to each other's lies, so they stay together. Something on this order.

Now, a Security Check, or any method by which you are overcoming withholds, is dedicated to the restoration of communication. And it happens that if communication is totally restored, you see – if man knew what he was doing when he made people withhold slightly – with communications totally restored in any past group of which the fellow is no longer part, he will no longer be hung up in that group.

See, if you just restore his communication – it's just the ability to communicate; that's all you're restoring – why, you'll get this phenomenon of him no longer being parked on the track with that group. And that's the only thing you're basically doing. And those things which exist in present time, of course, prevent him from becoming a part of any group to which he is attached and so give him a basic isolation.

And of course the basic group with which you are working is not necessarily the group called Scientologists. The basic group with which you – which in itself is a powerful enough group and it has enough group to it by far – but the group in which you are doing the withhold is a group called a session: auditor and pc, you see? Now, that *is* a group.

And when the individual is too individuated and when he develops an unintentional withhold in that group, or the auditor conducts himself in such a way as to bring about punishment because of a withhold or a crime, or the auditor demands specious reactions from the pc, the auditor has shot the group.

It is a group. It's a group of two. Auditing is a third dynamic activity – even though sometimes it deteriorates into a second. And now and then deteriorates into a first. You burn your finger, and there's nobody around and you stand there and run it out.

Now, there, all three of these things must be pretty well patched up before you get a good group called a session. You've got to have the unintentional withholds off; that's for sure. Just try – you know the only thing that can deteriorate a profile in twenty-five hours is ARC breaks.

Now, if you're interpreting profiles – you find a profile and here it is, there it is, and the profile has dropped. Now, it is true that profiles move and they are pictures of valences and they do come on at the bottom and go to the top – all of that is also true. But the particularity we're speaking of now is where the person didn't do well and dropped: you can assume the pc was being operated with an ARC break.

Now, the basis of an ARC break is being made to have an unintentional withhold from that immediate group. And that, actually, apparently, from the immediate empirical results which one observes, is more serious than an actual withhold, intentional. An unintentional withhold in an auditing session reflects more seriously on the auditing group and on the results of processing than an intentional withhold. This is very interesting

And now we move into another category. I'd hardly dignify the person with the title of "auditor" who pulled this one, but we have an enforced withhold on the basis of improved state. And you'll find this happens every once in a while. Some person who is pretending to audit gets no results whatsoever and then he shakes his finger in the pc's face and seeks to convince the pc that the pc has been much bettered by it all and is now Clear or something. And the pc thinks he had better not say anything to the contrary of this and you've got that third grade of withhold. You've got something there which is protecting beingness.

You see, he's now got a withhold. His withhold is he really didn't get any improvement and yet the auditor has forced him to admit that he got improvement. But actually what he's withholding is the fact that he didn't get any improvement, and if he said he didn't get any improvement, this would hurt his new status.

We just finish auditing the fellow, and you take him out in front of the PE and you say, "He's Clear." So now the fellow doesn't dare break down and say he's aberrated as hell and so you get one of these reputational withholds.

So all three kinds of withholds can occur in an auditing session. The unintentional, the intentional and the reputational. These three things can all occur as a result of an auditing session.

You very, very seldom find the third one occurring, because very few auditors are that bad. But you sometimes find a pc who is trying to propitiate and who is trying to tell the auditor that he feels much better now while his head is falling off, because he doesn't want to make the auditor feel bad. You know the mechanism. So they don't want to make the auditor feel bad, so they say they feel better and they don't. Well, now they're sort of protecting their beingness in some fashion or other by a projection. They're protecting the auditor's beingness by not feeling any worse.

You'll find all of these mechanisms can be present in an auditing session. So where you get the idea of Security Checking – and very odd, we very often develop a word in one field, you see, in one field of endeavor; and then we, because we have an agreement on that word, we develop a special term which is thereafter more or less meaningless to one and all. We all know what a Security Check is. A Security Check is something you do in processing to make the pc better.

Well now, how did that happen? Well, basically a Security Check was developed in order to weed out personnel and keep randomness from occurring in Central Organizations. And then Area Secretaries and Association Secretaries began to find that this made people much better, and the Area Secretary would be busy spending morning, noon and night and all the weekend trying to catch up with his Security Checking – because sometimes they took, for one Security Check, twenty hours. So we get down to the *reductio ad absurdum* that Smokey told me about the other day: somebody actually turned in a whole bunch of overts on a written questionnaire against the Area Secretary in order to get another Security Check. [laughter] So I would say that at that point the idea of creating security with a Security Check was a – not a very useful nor workable activity.

And yet we have this word. And I've two or three times halfheartedly started to change it over to the idea of processing check, and started to call it a processing check and so forth. But it still remains a Security Check.

Now we do have a Security Check, which is Form 7. There is an actual Security Check now in existence. So what do we call this Security Check? And I find myself, in writing a bulletin, getting into the interesting state of – I write: "Now, you should security check – the Area Secs should security check – ." And then, well, how do I say this? So, the best way to say it is underscore security. So you have a Security Check and you have a *Security* Check. So anyway, well let it ride, let it ride. It won't pull anything down if it stays that way.

So here we have – here we have this thing called a Security Check. Well, basically, it's trying to establish a group which can engage in assistance. And no assistance can occur if there is no group there on the auditor to pc. So you have right in your rudiments there a method of getting around this. And you are asking the pc for all of his unintentional withholds

when you say, "Is there something that you haven't been able to tell an auditor?" And you are really running a Security Check right at that point.

Well, of course the basic reply to it is, "What didn't an auditor do?" which would be the games-condition response that occurred at that moment. So these two questions go together rather powerfully. One of them is asking for an unintentional withhold and the other is asking for an auditor in a games condition. And they go *bing, bing, bing, bing*. And I think you find that since I dreamed up these new rudiments and tested them out, that you're doing much better.

I'll make a remark in passing about those new rudiments. There is an assessment that has to be done for the present time problem. I never bothered to remark on it. I thought you'd latch that as you went by.

It says, "What is unknown about that," or some such wording, "problem with *blank*?" Now, you can't run a condition as the blank.

The pc says, "Uh well, I'm terribly worried, I'm terribly worried about the airiness of everything."

Well now, the auditor then can't put the thing together as, "What is unknown about that problem with the airiness of everything?" You'll find this is nonfunctional.

What you've got to do is do a little assessment and get him to state the problem more exactly. And you do the assessment on the meter. And you try to find the terminal that is airy or the terminal that is everything. And you shake that down and you do a little bit of a terminal assessment and he suddenly comes up and he says, "Well, the airiness of the room," or something of that sort, or "The airiness of my car. It hasn't any hood anymore." [laughs]

And you would run it, if you had to, by that time. You see, you only run those things which you can't get rid of with two-way comm or assessment. You realize that, don't you? That running is the way you take care of the things that didn't blow. So you always be prepared to have an ARC break, a present time problem or anything else blow before you had to run it. You just start doing an assessment on one of these undifferentiated problems and you'll find it doesn't react anymore.

And you repeat the question, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" And, you see, you had some enormous surges on the meter and so forth. And you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" before you settle down to run the thing and you can't even get a quiver on it, see? You've blown it by assessment.

All right. Now, the pc who has a present time problem that the auditor will not take up is being given a withhold. So there is another source of withholds that cross at the present time problem level. But at the same time, the pc will very often try to withhold present time problems because he's afraid the auditor will take them up and waste session time. Because auditing is very valuable. All PCs consider auditing time very, very, very, very, *very, very* valuable. There just isn't enough auditing. That's it.

And this gets so catastrophic that a pc will force auditing where it shouldn't occur in some direction: He wants the auditing that is necessary to resolve his case, not the auditing

which is just fooling around with those fool rudiments, you see – and will actually sometimes attempt to withhold a present time problem for fear that the auditor will take it up.

All right. Now, the action of running a Security Check is a relatively simple action. It requires a high degree of familiarity with the meter so that you aren't fumbling with the meter. It requires a very definite, positive knowledge of the E-Meter. It requires, in addition to that, a knowledge of whether or not the needle is reacting on the question or on the parts of the question. You have to know how to compartment a question. You have to know how to make the E-Meter tell the truth. And that is sort of high-school E-Metering

People who didn't know much about E-Meters – . I think there was somebody in – I think it was almost into Canada (someplace in the United States; they were just about as far – as close to not being in the United States as they could be) got the idea that everybody had been PDHed throughout the United States by everybody else. And this became ridiculous in the extreme. And they were going all over telling everybody how everybody was PDHing everybody and they were just having a marvelous time. And they were getting out magazines about the subject, and so on.

And the most awful quiet ensued. There was a quiet where you could have heard an engram drop, you know? [laughter] Because after I explained compartmentation in an article in *Ability* magazine, well, you know, we never heard another word. It is the most profound silence. It is a sort of a negative silence. It has texture.

Well, that's because of this: That whole nonsense took place because somebody couldn't really handle an E-Meter; they didn't know how to compartment questions. So if you ask anybody if he had ever been the *victim* of *pain-drug-hypnosis*, well, of course you were going to get a fall, a fall, a fall and a fall, because you get falls on just the word *victim*, you get falls on just the word *pain*, you get falls on just the word *drug*, and you will occasionally get falls on just the word *hypnosis*. And if a person has withholds on somebody else, you will get a fall on that other person's name – if you got withholds and overts on some particular line. So there's a source of five falls in one question.

"Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis from President Eisenhower?" [laughter] Five falls. You see, it's falling on the words of the question. It isn't falling on the question. And the way you do that is you take the question apart. You knock out – just say the word: "Victim." And you get a fall. You say, "What was that?"

"Well, victim."

Well, what – what not?

"Well," you say, "what about victim?"

"Well, I always hate to be a victim."

"Well, what the heck. Have you ever made any victims? Have you ever accused anybody of being a victim?"

"Oh yes, my wife. She's being a victim all the time, all the time, all the time. *Always* a victim. Yes, yes, yes, yes, always a victim. And she says so, what's more."

"Oh, is that so? 'Victim.'" No reaction. Ah, we got that word cooled. "All right. Pain." *Clang!* goes the needle, you see? And you say, "Well, what about pain?"

"Oh, I've always been afraid of pain."

"Well, what about the word *pain*?"

"Well, oh, the word *pain*. Oh-ho-ho. Oh, you mean the word *pain*."

"Yeah. Well, how about the word *pain*?" No reaction.

"Okay. Drug Have you ever taken drugs? You ever give anybody drugs? Are you afraid of drugs? Anything wrong with drugs? Have you ever given anybody any drugs illegally?" *Clang!* "When did that happen?"

"Oh, well. My mother was very sick and I forged a prescription."

"Oh, is that so? Oh, how interesting. All right. Now, when was that?"

"Oh, such and such a time."

"All right. Thank you very much. Drug." No reaction. See?

"President Eisenhower." *Clang, clang, clang, clang, clang.* "What about President Eisenhower?"

"Oh, nothing. I was part of a ban-the-bomb march, and we said we'd dance on his grave. Yeah. That's what that was. Yeah."

"Is that all there is to that?"

"Well, yes. I've been violently opposed to that particular activity."

"Oh, yeah. All right. How many – how often have you done that?"

"Oh, lots of times. Lots of times."

"All right. How about President Eisenhower? Okay." No fall.

"Now, have you ever been the victim of pain-drug-hypnosis from President Eisenhower?" Now, if the person has, you will now get a fall on the question. And if you want to be absolutely sure, go back all through all the words again and compartment them.

Now, there is more to it than this on compartmentation. I noticed the other day one of the boys didn't have it quite straight. And that is, you compartment the *phrases* in addition to the *words*. You take the *words* and get the charge off them. And then you take the *phrases* and read the phrases out and see if each phrase is clean.

And then when you read the whole question, let me assure you that if there is a fall, it is true. There is no withhold or charge on it unless it is true. And there won't be a single needle quiver. And that is the proper way of compartmenting a Security Check question. And you'll find you very often have to compartment them quite painfully. Otherwise, you'll make some fantastic error.

Now, the first and foremost method of preventing yourself from making an error is to forget all about two needle phenomena. One of the needle phenomena you should forget

about is the latent read. Just ignore all latent reads. Have nothing to do with a latent read. If the read occurred more than half a second after you finished the question read, ignore it. Just ignore it. Just drop it. Because it'll be on somebody else or is on another Security Check question. It isn't on the same question or it didn't happen to them.

Now, that's how come you sometimes wind up getting off other people's withholds. Other people's withholds will give you a latent read. So you are buying latent reads. You ask somebody, "Well, did you ever drown a cat?"

"Well, my Aunt Mamie drowned a cat once."

This would be the response. Now, that would be a latent read. You would get that as a latent read. And every time you pick up a latent read on a Security Check question, you can expect that you haven't got a withhold, you've got a red herring. And you can go chasing all over the bank looking for this red herring. And you waste more time on latent reads than any other single action in auditing.

That read, if the person has a withhold on it, let me assure you the question does not wear out. If the person is still holding onto a withhold on that question and it's not on one of the words of the question, it's not on one of the phrases of the question – nothing of that sort – but is on the question: the more you ask it and the more he withholds, the more instant the read. It gets so that he just realizes you're going to ask the question again, you get the read. There isn't a tenth of a second lag.

You read the question – *pang* – it's acting. You read the question – *bang!* – it's acting. Read the question – *bang!* – it's acting.

You see, the reactive mind is an instantaneous mind. All time is now. And if it's a really reactive mind, of course, the closer it is to reactivity, the more rapid and instant the read will be. And it's as simple as that. It is very simple. And if it is not reactive, the read will be latent. It will wait before it falls. It'll wait for half a second. It'll wait for a second.

And an auditor who sits there and asks the question: "Have you ever drowned a cat?" watching the E-Meter, and then gets a reaction, and then says, "What was that?" is going to find Aunt Mamie drowning a cat. And it was something the pc didn't do and it was something the pc never has withheld. You can just count on that.

One of the tricks of reading, one of the bad tricks of reading on latent reads – is to look at the meter, then look at the question, then read the question, then look at the pc, then look at the meter. You'll catch more latent reads that way and boy, will you miss more instant reads. You will just miss them left and right. Why? Because your eye isn't on the E-Meter at the moment you ended the question. And your eye *must* be on the meter needle the instant that you end that question. Otherwise, you're going to miss the twitch. So what you do is – the sequence is always: question, look at the meter and speak the question and then look at the pc. Paper, meter, pc.

Paper: You see that the question is about rape. You don't care whether the question is exact or not. That is to say, "Have you ever raped anybody?" You can ask that in a thousand different ways. "Have you ever contemplated rape?" "Have you ever had ideas of rape?" "Do you – have you ever remembered anything odd about rape?" "Has something odd to you – "

like this. And you're going to get down to some kind of a withhold if there is one. So you look at the question and then you look at the meter and you say the question and then you can look at the pc all you care to. And you won't get into this nonsense about latent reads.

The way I see auditors doing this is they look at the paper and they read the question and then they look over at the E-Meter and then they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait and they wait. And the question is, what the hell are they waiting for? Because it would have occurred in a tenth of a second. If you're going to follow it through, it would have occurred in a tenth of a second. And that's the way you security check. Man, you can really tear down the line if you do that. Yeah. You can really rip up a Security Check. *Whammity, whammity, whammity, wham.* Pc doesn't even have to speak. You look at the paper: "Have you ever raped anybody?" Nothing. That's all.

Now, if you want to go at this a little more academically, you never look at the meter at all until the pc says "no." The Security Check can be totally without the meter right up to the point where he says "no," at which time you repeat the question looking at the meter. And that makes for very good sessioning. When you find you're doing this easily, oh man, it just goes on and on and on.

Why are you looking at the meter if you're not trying to catch him out? See? You're trying to find out if something is reactive. That's why you're looking at the meter. Well, if the guy is going to tell you his withholds, why are you looking at the meter? That's what it amounts to.

You say, "Well, have you ever robbed a bank?"

And the pc says, "Well, if you put it that way, yes. – I uugh-uh – yes, I robbed a bank," and so forth.

And you say, "When was that?" and so on, so on, so on, so on, so on. You can go a little further. "Who've you been withholding it from?"

"Oh, I've been withholding it from everybody," and so forth. "My fellow bank robbers. I didn't want them to know that – ," so forth, and then, etc., yap-yap, and so on. They got it all – they got it squared around. Good.

And you say, "All right. Now, you ever robbed any other banks?"

"Well yes, I did," and so forth. "And that was pretty bad," and so forth, and etc.

And you say, "Okay. Well, have you ever robbed a bank?"

Pc says, "Aside from those, no."

You say, "Good. Have you ever robbed a bank? Yes, what's that? What's that next one?"

"Oh well, that's just that little old bank down in Joliet." [laughter] "That'd hardly count." Got the idea?

Then you finally ask him again, "All right. Have you ever robbed any other banks?"

"No."

You look back at the meter, you say, "Well, have you ever robbed any other banks?" Meter's quiet. Go on to the next question.

You never look at the meter until he says no. You'll find out that really holds them in-session, man. That's very good sessioning when you can do it this way.

Now, the only bug that occurs when you do this is that you're repeating the question and apparently calling him a liar slightly. But you'll find out this isn't very damaging. He's already told you no, and so you confirm it.

Now, leaving a question hot is another very damaging action on an E-Meter. That's a very damaging thing to a session. Oh, that is something you mustn't do – leave a question with reaction on it. Don't ever go to the next question as long as a question is reacting. And don't ever go on to the next question unless you're absolutely sure that the question you are on has no further instant actions in it. Remember, we care nothing about the latent action.

There's no instant action left in a question, you can go on. And if there is, don't you dare! Because if anything is calculated to throw a pc out of session from there on out, man, let me tell you, it is leaving a question hot.

You know, there's been considerable randomness occurred because of this occasionally. HGC pc, and end of session comes along and – . One girl ran all over town telling everybody how Scientologists were all frauds and they were bums and how they were all trying to rape her and shoot her and so forth. And she actually blew the HGC and wrote letters to everybody that night before they could finally get hold of her. And finally they trailed her down and – they heard the rumors going around and they wondered what all this was about, so they traced them back down and they found this one girl. And they got her down and the question was something like "Have you ever committed adultery?" And boy, it was just falling off the pin. It wasn't an instant read. It was just – it was blowing up before the auditor could open his mouth, you know? *Bang! Bang!* And they got these fantastic withholds off of her, and that was it.

"Oh," she said, "I guess I committed an awful series of overts," and she hurriedly did a volte-vis and tried to straighten up everything she'd been doing.

But look at that. Isn't that interesting? It just – one question, and I think it was an end-of-intensive question. And the auditor just foolishly said, "Well, it's the end of the intensive, and that's it." Never flattened the question. I haven't got that particular particularity, but I do know that the rest of it did happen. They had about ten people running all around trying to round up what all this was about. It was just an unflat Security Check question. And you just mustn't leave questions unflat. Sure, take them up in the next session. You've got to, sometimes, because one question can go five hours – has done so.

The fellow is the father of eight children. And you ask him the question, "Have you ever spanked a child?" And he already feels awfully guilty about this and he's left his family and this is a great point of disturbance with him and the punishment of children is a very hot subject and so forth. And, man, you can just go on and on and on and on with this particular subject.

He's just getting off withholds and getting off withholds and getting off withholds. No one cares how long it takes to clear a question as long as the auditor is working on the clearance of a question, not getting off somebody else's withholds through the pc, not trying to find out what the pc thought or heard or did about somebody else. We're interested in the pc's withholds. And as long as the auditor is getting actual withholds off the pc on instant reads, continue with the question.

The only way you can waste auditing time on the thing is to just wait there for the latent read and then take that latent read. The read occurs two and a half – three seconds after you've read the question. You read the question ... fall. You say, "What was that?" You knucklehead. You're immediately going to get something like this: "Well, I just thought it was getting awfully late." That's true. That's what it fell on. Didn't have anything to do with the question. Or, "Oh well, yes. That made me think of a book I read once that I wasn't supposed to read."

Look, this is a question about stealing, see? "Have you ever stolen anything?" See? Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait – *clang!* "Well, what was that?", you say on the latent read.

"Oh well, that was a book, I guess. I – I was thinking about this book."

"What about this book?"

"Well, I read this book. Well, it would – it talked about stealing."

"Oh well, what about that?"

Well look, knucklehead, nothing about that, you see? I mean, it – there just isn't anything. It doesn't have anything to do with it except the pc's mind was out of gear for the moment. It's like finding the gear wheels disengaged, you see? And you sit there and wait, and eventually the pc is going to think about something, isn't he? And if you wait long enough, you'll always get a reaction, even if it's just on the ARC break of "Why are you so damn quiet?" [laughter]

It's factual, and it follows through. Serious withholds or withholds that should be gotten off the case or have anything to do with a case and all the things that the person himself hath done, are as a result of an instant read. And you must follow through on that particular basis.

All right. The next thing that you should pay attention to, besides clearing every question as it goes on down the line – the next thing you should pay attention to, is selecting the type of Security Check. This is very important.

There is no sense in security checking somebody on something he has nothing to do with. That is rather frightful. Let's say that we have a special Security Check on the subject of boilermakers, see? So we get this girl who is a milliner. And we run a Security Check on boilermakers on this milliner. And we say, "Well, she's got clean hands because she didn't have a single fall." Well, that's for sure.

Similarly, it is equally an error to take a generalized Security Check when you know very well your pc has a particularized professional or action area. If this pc is living by some particular framework of mores – . Well, let's say you're security checking a person who pro-

fessionally, this life, right now, is a bank teller. Well, all right. That might go along all right and so forth. But you just never seem to get around to writing up some additional questions to give him as a Security Check. And of course, you'll miss it every time. You just give him the generalized form of the check, and it only hits banks on about three questions. Now, you yourself have to be able to project your imagination and initiative with regard to that situation.

You'd say, "What would be the withholds of a bank teller? What would they be?"

And of course, it turns up at once what they would be. We're liable to find something like this: He has to stand in back of this cage all the time and he hates people. And the word of the bank is that you must be pleasant to all the customers as you take in the money. And you must stand there with a smile on your face, you see, and take in the money and pay out the money. And you just can't figure out what's wrong with this guy's job, see? He's unhappy and he isn't doing well and nothing is going on and so we give him a general Security Check and it goes on and on, but it never takes into account what the man does in life. You get the idea? Now that is a floob. That is – comes under the classification of a boob.

We do put one together around what we think a bank teller might possibly have as withholds and then we find all sorts of very interesting things. He has held a deposit for twenty minutes so one of his customers, you see, wouldn't be overdrawn. Interesting thing. Nothing very much, but it was something to him, because, man, are you supposed to have those deposits right into the drawer and they're supposed to pass down the endless belt and go into the machines and so forth, and so on.

And he actually has, on his own initiative, which is just – that's pretty adventurous – has actually put his fist into the machinery of the bank and he has held it for twenty minutes. And that is a withhold to him.

And then you find maybe he's standing there with all kinds – every time a customer comes up he has a game that he plays on something on the order of an unkind thought. And he just has nothing but long streams of unkind thoughts. Every time somebody comes up – *bzzzzzzz*, got this long thing.

And you ask him the right question – you say, bank teller. Well all right, bank teller – he must have customers. And you say, "Well, have you ever had an unkind thought about a bank customer?" And you're liable to run into an avalanche. And it'd just sit on that case till the end of time unless you yourself security checked against the reality of the pc. That you must always do. Whatever else you do with Security Checks, *also* security check against the reality of the pc. And that takes into account the moral codes by which he lives.

Now, you security check a Catholic some time or you security check a Baptist and you'd have two different Security Checks. They'd be different. You security check an Afrikaner and security check a Zulu. You're going to have two different Security Checks, man. And they're almost vis-à-vis different Security Checks. Almost everything one thinks is right, the other thinks is wrong.

Who's to say who's right or who's wrong? That hasn't anything to do with it, which is why I gave you a little bit about the moral note at the beginning of it. The rights and

wrongnesses of things are what groups have determined on in order to perpetuate survival. And that's the rightnesses and wrongnesses of things. It's what is survival to the group, not whether you are enforcing the mores of a group because you are so sinless. So you have to actually be able to security check both sides of the fence.

Now, security checking a cop would be quite different than security checking a criminal, of course. Security checking a soldier would be quite different than security checking a chambermaid. It would be different.

So if you omit specialized Security Checking and putting together a list of questions that concern the activities of the person – if you omit this entirely, you've boomed.

Another thing that you do – that you mustn't do, is read a Security Check as a repetitive question. "Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Ever raped anybody-?" Who are you auditing?

Your job is not to run a repetitive question at all, but to get off withholds. The auditing consists of getting off withholds.

Well, how do you get off withholds on the subject of rape? Well, some fellow says, "Well now, I just don't want to answer any questions about that at all. No, I just don't think you'd better be asking me any question. Let's go on to the next one. We'll still be friends. But we'd better go on to the next question." [laughter]

Well, how are you going to get around that? You can still ask the question, "What have you got against rape?"

"Oh," he'll say, "well, it isn't what I have against rape, it's what other people have against rape."

"Well, who has things against rape?"

"Well! My mother and my father and the public and the preacher and the parson and the state," and so forth.

"Well, when did all these come down on you on the subject of rape?"

"Well, that was when I got in the newspapers on the subject." [laughter]

"Oh, when was that?"

That is what is known by pulling a withhold from the back door.

Now, the next thing you must remember is that a withhold is generally a withhold of an overt act against the mores of a group. Now, actually, the enforcement of the mores of the group to make other people withhold is the overt act of withholds. Trying to make – you get the idea? You're enforcing the mores of the group against another person *to make them withhold*. It's the overt act of making people withhold, see? So you err whenever you don't ask the "make guilty" question.

You can take every Security Check you've got and simply add an additional question below each level on: "Well, have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?"

You get this girl. She keeps telling you, "I have been raped. It isn't that I am withholding raping somebody; I have been raped." And the question is still hot.

And you say, "How in the name of common sense am I ever going to clear this question? How am I going to clear this question? How could I possibly clear the question? Because she just says – and of course she's an offended member – no, she hasn't raped anybody. She's *been* raped." Well, if you Q-and-A and just go off and say, "Well, we're not security checking now. She has a bad engram and we might as well run this engram and find out all about all of this rape and when she was raped and so forth," are you still security checking or are you doing something else? You're doing something else. You are auditing processes, you are running engrams, but you're doing something else. You're not security checking so you don't stop security checking and start doing something else. You go on security checking. In other words, gets off the withholds. But of course, the overt act of a withhold is making somebody else withhold. And of course, the moment you ask the question, "Well, whom have you made guilty of rape?"

"Oh, well" – you get a nice big meter reaction, and "Him, of course, and him and him and them and them and them and them and them and them and them and them and them," and so forth.

"Well, have you made anybody else guilty of rape?"

"Yes. Well, them and them and them."

"All right. Anybody else you made guilty of rape?"

"Uh, well, no."

"Anybody else you made guilty of rape? What was that?"

"Well, it's just – I'm just restimulated by the whole thing."

"Well, have you – have you ever raped anybody?"

"Yes."

In other words, the "make guilties" all lay on top of an actual fact. She been raped all right, but Shakespeare's statement "Methinks the lady protest too much" can be Hobson-Jobsoned over: "Methinks the pc protest too much."

And whenever the pc protests too much, you are looking at the boiling broth. And you might as well pick the pot up and look under it, because you're going to find fire.

"You shouldn't be asking me that question. It is insulting." Oh, man. Why don't they run up a signal halyard and fly fifteen flags from it, you know; get blinking lights going in your face? Because that is the one question that is hot. And of course a person who has fantastic motivators which just keep rocking and rocking and rocking. The person says "Well, I haven't ever raped anybody; I have been raped. And that is why it is falling."

No, remember your original question was, "Have you ever raped anybody?" and you got an instant read. And the facts of the case are that the pc has, but the pc has tried to make

other people guilty to such an extent that this lies on the top of it as the overt from the withhold motivator. Do you see? So there's what you got.

So you ask the "made guilty" questions any way you want to phrase it. "Have you ever protested against?" "Have you ever accused?" Do you see? This type of questioning for each subject matter of a Security Check will be found to be very, very beneficial in freeing up a whole security question; because, of course, it is making other people withhold and when you get the overt off, then the pc gives up his withhold. It's not actually, you see, an additional question. It is another way of asking the same question.

And then you come back and you always leave a Security Check question that has fell [fallen] – you always leave it with the same wording that you asked it in the first place that produced the fall. Never miss that. And that is usually, for your ease, the way it is written on the paper.

You've been asking all sorts of things about rape. You said, "Well, have you ever made anybody guilty of rape? Have you ever – rape?" and so forth and so on. And "All right. Have you ever had unkind thoughts about rapists? What have you done? Have you ever wished you were raped?" Doesn't matter, whatever you were asking, you see? What produced the reaction – the reason you're asking these questions – is: "Have you ever been raped?" And the question you're trying to clear is the one that *produced* the reaction. So you always *repeat* that question in the same wording to see if there's any *additional* reaction before you leave it. And then you're sure that that question is clean. No matter how many other variations you ask – and you should ask variations in order to get the thing cleaned up – you go back to the same question again before you leave it.

In other words, always go out by the same door you entered. Don't go ducking out the side door. You've cleared up have they ever made anybody guilty of rape, see? So you say, "Well, that's it. Well go on to the next question."

Oh, you missed and you will leave a question hot if you do that.

All right. I've tried to cover here some of the elements of Security Checking.

You can tailor up Security Checks any way you want to. You can always *add* to a Security Check. You can always *add* to a Security Check.

You may never subtract from one. The reason why we lay that injunction down is that somebody who has a withhold on a subject who runs into it on a list will then not be tempted to avoid it.

And you would be fascinated at some of the Security Check questions being made up by people who have buttons on the subject. You never quite read as much of an avoidance as you get when you do that. You take somebody who's sitting down here in Dartmoor Scrubs and have him write a Security Check up on the subject of criminals, and you get a three-question check.

But you ask him to write – he has never been a soldier – and you ask him to write a Security Check question on the subject of soldiers and he writes you eighteen pages. It's quite interesting.

But people subtract from Security Checks where they have withholds. So you lay down this injunction; you say: "Always give the standard Security Check; add anything to it you please. Write up any special check you care to, as long as you give a standard check, too."

And then that keeps anybody from ever indulging in tacit consent and avoiding a question because "We know, of course, that this person has never stolen anything from the organization. Of course we know that, so we just won't ask that question." And sometimes a person does this in all innocence. It just seems to him like the question would not produce any particular result. That's all there is to it. And then somebody asks him the question and it goes hotter than a pistol.

And he says, "But I never have! I just never have." And you go tracing it down, and he has. He actually doesn't remember having done so. But the meter knows.

And the one final injunction on this is, please believe the instant read of the meter. A person who is telling you a lie, a person who has a withhold, gets an instant read on the question. And if they're getting a read, a needle reaction, there is a withhold. And never buy anything else.

I have seen a slug of hours of duration with the needle continuing to react and the pc saying "No" and almost in tears over it, because the pc cannot remember, the pc cannot differentiate it, the pc cannot tell what that withhold is. It just doesn't seem to elude anybody. And for the auditor to leave it is a serious error, because at the end of those hours, so help me Pete, it *was found*, and it *did clear*.

Now, I've had people with some pretty nasty withholds on the meter. And I've never failed to have the meter react when the question was charged so long as it was against the moral code of the person I was checking. That was the important point. And it's quite interesting to watch it. It will not wear out. The question will not wear it out. That is what is fascinating. You can ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it. And it won't wear out. It'll just produce, if anything, a little faster reaction. Until the withhold is given up, the action occurs.

So don't ever think your meter is busted. Make sure that your meter isn't before you start the session. That's the time to make sure the meter is all right, not in the middle of the session, thinking, "Well, it's just reacting. This rock slam must be because some dust has gotten into it." No, the rock slam is coming from a withhold if you're on a Security Check. Okay?

Male voice: Right...

All right. Well, I hope this clarifies a few points for you on the subject of Security Checking 'cause you're going to find this is a very, very important subject. It's going to be with us for a very, very long time. It's one of the basic skills of the auditor and is the first thing that an auditor should know how to do very, very well. He should know how to security check well. Because you can do anything under the sun, moon and stars with a Security Check. You can do anything with it. And the better you are at handling the basics and fundamentals of Security Checks, then the better you will be at making them work.

Thank

you.

How to Security Check

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard

on the 2 November 1961

Thank you.

Well, here we are at what date?

Female voices: November the 2nd.

Two Nov. AD 11. It's a 1.1 year. We're being very covert this year.

All right. I'm going to talk to you today about Class II skills in Security Checking and several new developments in this particular level and line that you ought to know about. And if you're not up to the point at this stage of the game where you know how to read an E-Meter, why, there used to be an old gallows – this was a Norman keep, you know? And we'll have to build it again and hang you. But you've got time during the building to learn.

The worst thing about E-Meters is of course TR 0. TR 0 goes out, if you haven't had any TR 0, it's not fairly flat, you have trouble with E-Meters.

Now, an E-Meter is a deadly weapon, and you can slaughter a pc with one by misreading it. It's not like a rifle. The only way you can do any damage with a rifle is use it with great accuracy.

Well, of course, you can also have a backfiring sort of rifle and you can also look down the barrel and put your toe on the trigger experimentally. But an E-Meter is not deadly at all unless it's misused. And if your TR 0 is out and you're looking at the pc and looking at the E-Meter and looking at the question, and you've only got two eyes, you see, and you need three, you can actually miss reads.

Now, a – the only read that is important is an instant read; you're never worried about latent reads. So you said the question and then you waited for a while, and then it finally sagged. Well, you'd just better go on to the next question because the thing is not there. What – all you want is an instant read. You ask the question: within a tenth of a second you get that needle reacting. If you've got an instant read, you've got a read on the E-Meter. If you haven't got an instant read, if it takes a half a second, a second or something like that, providing of course you're using a standard E-Meter of an approved pattern....

There are meters around, by the way – they're corny stuff that has been brought around – which have brought E-Meters into bad repute because they have a second lag built into them.

Have you ever seen one of these? They used to be quite prevalent in England. Somebody'd go down to the dime store and buy bits of old tinware and hang it together with some electric light cord. And they actually built a lag into the meter so when you asked the question it wouldn't react for a second. We have some of them in here in the electrical shop. I'll have to show you sometime. It's how an electronics man can fix it up so that you don't get any results. Well, that is an unexpected one and we cut that one out by saying you use an approved E-Meter and we know that E-Meter will react instantly and behave properly. It's not a light thing to do work with a bad E-Meter.

The British Mark IV is the best of these meters. It is not the least destructible. It is a little tenderer. It's a better meter but it is more tender than the American meter. The American meter can be dropped for three floors and go on working. The British meter can be dropped one airmail flight and arrive at the other end with somebody having to look into it. We've got most of those bugs out. When we were originally sending these around the world, by the way, the extreme temperatures in a cargo hold would crack the transistors. Quite interesting. But we got that licked.

Anyway, with an approved meter you get an instant read and that's the only read you're interested in. And you're not interested in a latent read. If you follow up latent reads, your pc will start telling you what the other fellow did and what they have heard and that their aunt Mamie had a cat once that they think was stolen. Very valuable. It does a great deal for the case.

Now, the danger is, you take too many of these things off the case – you know, I mean, you get a latent read and he says, "Well, Aunt Mamie had a cat and this cat was in a decayed state. And I think it was stolen and I heard that and I thought at the time ..." yap, yap, yap.

And if you go on like this, you're going to wind up with a needle getting more and more sluggish, and more and more sluggish and more and more sluggish. And don't you be puzzled after you've let somebody get off an awful lot of "I hears" and an awful lot of unkind thoughts and an awful lot of that sort of thing, that you wind up at the other end of an E-Meter session with the tone arm not moving and the needle stuck and everything gummed up and the pc feeling like hell. How come?

Well, you let him sit there and get off nothing but overts. You let – the session was an overt. See? I mean, you let the man sit there, or let the girl sit there and commit overts for an hour. All right. So now they've got all these new overts. Isn't that what it amounts to?

But your latent read, when pursued, winds you up in the middle of nowhere. That works on all types of assessments. Whatever you're assessing, pay no attention to a latent read, a read which takes place – well, be on the safe side – takes place after a half a second.

Now, there's a borderline in there, the borderline in there: some pcs have got sort of a delayed-bank effect. And you'll notice working on some pcs the sound itself takes a moment to go through the circuit. And if you really wanted to be absolutely safe, you could space it out to three quarters of a second, but don't go any further than that.

Comprehension is landing on the reactive bank which is instantaneous. And those reads which are latent are landing on the analytical mind and the pc is figuring it out. That works for all types of assessments.

So I say again, if you want to be a successful E-Meterer, have your TR 0 flat so that you know what you're looking at, you know? Don't watch the ceiling and watch the floor and then look back at the E-Meter to find out if it's reacted, because your instant read is the only important read and it is the one which, of course, you are going to miss. Naturally you'll miss it.

You look at the pc and you say, "Now, have you stolen any lollipops today?" And then you look down at your E-Meter. Well, it's read and gone. The reading is gone.

Now, this is why the E-Meter can be dangerous: because we have learned that if you miss a Sec Check question on somebody, you can wind them up in a ball. Not every time you miss a Sec Check question does the pc burn down the house. That is a commentary on the psychoanalyst who says, "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal something, he burns down the house." I love that "every time," you see? It classifies as a type of a remark of "jewelers never go anyplace." It's just about as nonsensical.

It is not a universal phenomenon that when an E-Meter read is missed and you miss the Sec Check and you leave the question and go on to the next Sec Check question with the last one unflat, that the pc always burns down the house, shoots the Director of Training or does something desperate. This is not always true. It's just 99 percent. There is still 1 percent of the time the pc does not do it.

Your pc comes in to session next time – "natter, natter, natter, natter, unkind thought. *Whoo-ah-nyap-yap-yap-yap*. I wonder if Scientology works," and so forth. And they go on and on and on and on and on and on and on.

You sit and listen to all this stuff. When are you going to get smart enough to put them on the meter and say, "Who missed a Sec Check question on you?" and find out what it was and clean it up?

And the person says, "Oh, well."

This is a very fascinating phenomenon that the fact of missing a Sec Check question is apparently a cross invalidation of everything that is going on. If you couldn't nail them, they now doubt. It's very funny. I don't care how long or how often the fellow has been sec checked. You miss a Sec Check question on him, he gets unhappy.

Now, that's a very important thing because there resides the easiest way to get rid of new Scientologists known. So I'll just lay it down there. If anybody wants to go out on a program of getting rid of every person they connect with that wants to have anything to do with Scientology, why, the program would be to either audit with a broken meter or a squirrel meter or something that didn't react, or to use a type of TR 0 which confronts the back wall or your own eyeballs while you should be reading the E-Meter and miss Sec Check questions. That's the first and foremost way of getting rid of people. They'll blow. They'll be very unhappy. It messes them up.

I think some of you have a little reality on that. Now and then, why, somebody has missed a Sec Check question on you wildly. And then you have found yourself sort of chewing your fingernails and nattering to yourself and not quite know what was wrong. And then somebody fortunately comes along and says, "Who missed a Sec Check question?" or something like that. And you get it off and straighten it out and all of a sudden you feel better. It's quite mysterious. It's quite mysterious.

I'm not going into the mechanics of how this happens. I can tell you the mechanics of how a bank beefs up, now. I've studied that for two or three days and finally got the answer to that. When you run the terminal, which is not the terminal of the pc, his attention is too bound up in his own terminal and goal to as-is the collapsing mass. So the auditor has – being more in control of the pc's bank than the pc, can of course push masses in on the pc. But the pc's attention is so bound up in his own goal terminal that this new terminal, which is being pushed in on him, does not get as-ised. And that is all there is to it. In other words, he hasn't enough attention to as-is anything but the goals terminal which he is stuck in. Do you see that? So his bank beefs up.

Similarly, your E-Meter starts up to the degree that the person is not as-ising what you're throwing in on him. So you get a high arm, high arm, high arm – an arm goes way up, an arm sticks. The person's attention is too bound up in something else to as-is what is being thrown in on him. Do you see this? So you could sec check a person into a high arm as well as sec check a person down from a high arm.

Now, how would you sec check a person into a high arm? Well, you'd make sure all the rudiments were out. You'd very carefully make sure that all the rudiments were out before the Security Check was entered in on. You'd make sure that the pc was unhappy in the room, had a present time problem, didn't want you to audit him, had an ARC break and had several withholds right in present time and then start security checking him on heavy questions. And the pc can't confront the question, can't give you the answer. Do you see the struggle which now ensues? And he can't get his attention out of present time, he can't remember the past and you actually could plunge him around until the arm would go high.

Now, it is not true that every arm going high during a run must be avoided, but you should understand why an arm is going high and why an arm hangs high during a Sec Check or during any other kind of run. An arm, a tone arm, goes high and stays high if more is being thrown in on the pc than the pc can handle or as-is. Period. That is all there is to it.

Let us say, if a pc were a coal burner and he were able to generate enough flame to burn one piece, one small cubic inch of coke per hour, and you emptied the hod into the furnace, you're going to get a rising tone arm which, of course, is measuring the additional mass entered in on the pc which the pc isn't as-ising. That make sense to you? I studied it out the last couple of days to see what the mechanism exactly was here and what was happening And it becomes valuable.

So when a pc's arm is high – you can just make a little side rule to go along with it that will serve you in good stead – be very careful to do one of two things: audit with the rudiments very well in or find where the pc's attention is stuck and audit that. Now, that doesn't

say that you should run an engram, because the engram might have *been* the thing which was the hod of coal. You see, that might have been the upended coal hod.

The pc's attention was busily stuck, gorgeously impinged, upon a flower. You've been running a process, "What flowers have you failed to withhold?" or something. And all of a sudden an engram comes up. And you can ask too many questions about the engram and that's the same as throwing the mass in on the pc, you see?

You can say, "What's the largest object in that engram? All right. Now, what's some other object in that engram? Now, is there any masses in that engram of any character?"

Well, of course, that is understandably throwing heavy mass in on the pc, but you know, you can get the pc into the engram so the pc can't easily extricate himself, simply by asking the pc too pointed and too direct a question about the engram.

I'll give you a right-wrong example of this.

This is the right: pc says, "*Woo!* What an awfully big mountain. I wonder what's going on here?" and so forth.

And the right thing to do is to say, "Oh. All right. Okay. Here's the next question."

And here's the wrong thing to do: "Oh? Well, what is going on around there?" See, that's the same as upending the coal hod.

Now, don't be too surprised if the tone arm starts up right at the point you asked that question and stays up thereafter. The auditor can push mass, pictures, circuits, track in on the pc and move that track more easily than the pc.

This is one of the hardest things – over the last eleven years, this has been the hardest single point of instruction: that the auditor can move the bank more easily than the pc can move the bank.

I've even given demonstrations and told the bank to go north, east, south, west. And somebody who was totally stuck on the track and couldn't possibly move on the track and all that sort of thing, and I just said – not even to the pc – I said, "All right. Now, it will change to the picture of a theater." It did.

You know, the pc irrevocably stuck in this incident and can't possibly get out of it. Well, "All right. The incident will now become the picture of a theater." Bang! It did. He was no longer stuck in the incident. You can do things like this. You can move the bank around more easily than the pc.

So your interrogation – your interrogation of the pc can itself pin the pc's attention at various parts of the track where maybe it shouldn't be pinned. It's all right to get curious; it's all right to find out what's going on. But there are times when you should restrain yourself just a little bit.

The pc all of a sudden starts looking very sad and you say, "What are you looking at?"

"Well, these pictures of these pyramids. They're very interesting pyramids."

And you say, "Oh, all right," and give him the next question. That's real smart, you see?

Pc starting to look slow and comm laggy, you know? All right. All you'd have to say is, "What about the pyramids? When did they come up?" When did they come up isn't so bad. But, "What about the pyramids? Do they have big tops? Do they have small bottoms? Is there anything going on around the base of the pyramid? What is happening on the other side of the pyramid? Are there any ditches dug or anything like that around it?" This will – you're writing script now, you see, so that's – probably give him a good ARC break right at this point.

Now, you can go on and audit the process you've been auditing for another half an hour, and you say, "What are you looking at?"

"Oh," he'll say, "these damn pyramids, of course."

You gave him the pyramids. Now, don't be so alarmed about it because all you'd have to do is take them away from him.

Well, how would you take them away from him? The easiest way to take the pyramids away from him, the easiest way, is simply to tell the bank to do something else. You know? Say, "Well, what happened toward the end of that life?" You know? The bank will shift.

And you say, "What happened a couple of lives later? Is there anything that happened in a subsequent life to that that answers the auditing question?"

"Oh, there is. Oh well, what do you know?" You won't hear any more about pyramids.

You can move the bank around. One of the primary reasons auditors have trouble auditing engrams is they kept expecting the *pc* to move the bank. They would sit there and they would say, "All right. What are you looking at?" And be perfectly willing for the *pc* to go on and go through the incident, but nobody was moving through any incident. Why? Because nobody was moving the incident. *Pc* was incapable of moving the incident and the auditor wouldn't.

All the auditor would have to say is, "Well, the end of the incident will now appear. One year has now gone by. The picture of *that* incident, whatever is there, will appear."

It's very weird, you know. The *pc* says, "Well, you see, I was a beggar. I'm a beggar and I see all this. And it's a horrible marketplace and I'm a beggar. I'm sitting down there and I got leprosy," and so forth. And it's just not running, don't you see? And you say so on and so on.

He keeps saying, "Well, and this leprosy, and I – I've been leprotic for a long time," and he's getting more and more into the dramatization of the thing, and so forth.

And you say, "Well, was there a life later than that when you didn't have leprosy?"

Well, in essence, you've moved the bank.

He says, "Well, if you ask me that way, yes. Yes, as a matter of fact, I haven't had any leprosy since."

"Well, what are you looking at now?"

"Well, I'm looking at a small boy."

"All right. That's good."

Wrong: "Well, does the small boy have leprosy?" [laughter]

You can move the bank around just by the most innocent questions. You can audit, actually, with – by moving the bank by innuendo. Not anything direct – north, east, south and west – just ask the pc about this and that part of their life.

Now, you expect a pc to cycle through an ARC question. You just expect him to. He cycles through an ARC-type process, you see? He goes out of present time, he goes back into the past and back into present time again.

All right. If you depend forever on that automaticity, you're going to get lost somewhere because he's going to get into something he's not going to get out of.

You could always say to him – you're trying to get him back up to present time – "Well, was there an ARC break later than that?" or, let's say ARC processing, "Well, did you communicate to anybody after that?"

"Oh, yeah. Yeah."

"Well, the following year did you communicate to anybody?"

And he'll have to say, "Let's see, what year was that?" and so forth. And you figure it out for him, you know? And he figures it out.

And he says, "Oh yeah, well, that was 1942. Yeah."

"Well, all right. Good. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1946? Oh? All right, all right. Okay. You did. All right. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1950? Oh, all right. Good. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1955?"

"Oh yes, yeah. I did."

"Anybody communicate to you in that year?"

"Oh, I'll say they did."

"All right. Has anybody communicated to you in the last few days?"

"Oh yes, yes, yes."

"Well, have you communicated to anybody today?"

"Oh, yes."

"And anybody communicated to you?"

"Oh, yeah. As a matter of fact, you just did."

Well, you've moved the person up to present time by just interrogation. Interrogation with dates. You just asked him questions about dates. You didn't directly say "The bank will now shift 1.89 years north." But you could do that.

The reactive mind is always keyed to other-determinism and never to self-determinism. And one of its common denominators is other-determinism. So, of course, the auditor can always move the bank.

Now, in Sec Checking you very often get somebody into some kind of a situation, and by your pressure and your demands – you're saying, "Well, have you ever *stolen* anything?"

And the person says, "No, I haven't."

"Well, have you ever stolen anything at all? Now, *stolen*. Have you ever *stolen* anything?"

And the person says, "No, I haven't" – you're not getting any read on the meter because you're not looking at it and you aren't getting any anyhow.

"Well, you mean to tell me in the last two hundred years you've never stolen anything?"

"Well ..."

"Now, I'm going to – when I snap my fingers something you've stolen will appear." [snaps fingers] "Well, all right. All right. When I snap my fingers something *bigger* you have stolen will appear." [snaps fingers] All right.

Well, don't be too startled if the tone arm goes up. It isn't an ARC break. You could probably get away with it but you've just given him more and more mass that he is not prepared to accept. He isn't about to as-is it. And then if you just walk off at that point and don't do anything else about it, you leave these things right there. So make things vanish that you made appear. A good magician, when he makes a girl disappear on a stage, particularly at these straight-laced times of police and all that sort of thing, usually shows her again to the audience, you see? Well, that's a good principle. Good principle to follow. It's the *decent* thing to do.

Of course, in tougher, rougher, ancient times, we didn't do that. We showed the audience this brand-new trick: You put the girl in the box and you put flaming torches in at every corner of the box and you opened up the box and there was no girl. And they thought this was marvelous. And it was a marvelous trick. Of course, she'd burned up. [laughter]

But I call to your attention that you're auditing in milder times than that. So when you say, "All right. Take a look at those pyramids," remember to say, "Take a look at something else."

All right. Now, the auditor who is sitting there doing TR 0 on the report or on the auditing sheet only – no TR 0 for the meter, no TR 0, you see, for the preclear, no TR 0 for the room, and so forth; he's got – TR 0 has advanced as far as the point of a ballpoint pencil, you see, and he can write and he sometimes can even read an auditing command off a sheet but doesn't pay much attention. Boy, the man's dangerous. Do you see why he's dangerous?

He not only never finds out what's going on with the pc but he never sees these instant reads in answers to his question. He never clears these things. He never finds out what's going on. If something did go on, he wouldn't do anything about it because he wouldn't think anything was going on. All very fascinating.

But the high arm is often, not always, but is often cleared with withholds. You get a withhold off the case – any old cotton-picking withhold, it doesn't matter at all, any withhold – and you'll see the arm start down a little bit if it is a withhold to the pc.

Now, what makes it a withhold to the pc? Whether or not it is against the mores that the pc has subscribed to. That is what makes it a withhold. We can broaden this definition. We used to say, "Well, it was a withhold if the pc thought it was a withhold."

All right. That's fine. But that's not technically usable. Let's take a more usable statement: A withhold is a withhold if it is a violation of a mores the pc has subscribed to and knows about.

In other words, you get a violation of a mores and you got a withhold. In other words, if the withhold is a violation of a mores it'll register on the meter, the pc will consider it a withhold, he will give it to you as a withhold and he will feel better.

All right. Let's get down a little bit closer here. Why do some people feel so wonderful when you get off some withholds and others don't notice anything?

Why is this? Why is this apparently spotty? You sit down and you say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" And pc A – you say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" And he gets a tremendous fall and you say to him "All right. When was that?"

Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! And he says, "Well, that was Chicago, 1931. We robbed a bank. There was La... Louie the Pits and a few of us guys, and we robbed the bank and we – we got away wit da loot. And as a matter of fact, we shot each other afterwards and threw da money in Lake Michigan and then I was killed. Yes, I robbed a bank. I – I got a recollection on it," and so forth. And that's fine. And you expect the pc to grow wings at this moment, you see, and so forth. He's gotten off a withhold. Oh – he wasn't withholding it. Nothing happens with the pc.

He did get a fall. We don't know what the fall is traceable to. We ask him now, "Did you ever rob a bank?"

And he says, "*Nah*," he says, "I never robbed any banks. Not any other banks than that."

And you don't get any more reaction on the needle and you say, "Well now, the pc should feel wonderful." But he doesn't. "Well, it did fall. So he should feel wonderful." Well, no, you see, robbing banks is not against the mores of bank robbers. And there being so very few citizens who subscribe to law and order in Chicago, you see – they're in the minority – that it doesn't make a mores. Quite the contrary.

Now, he might very well go into – get a terrific relief on the thing. You say, "Well, is there anything you've ever reported to the police? *Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha*. Have you ever reported anything to the police? *Ha-ha-ha-ha!* Hm? Hm? Hey? Have you ever reported anything to the police?"

"*Ooo-o-oh*," he says, "that's really bad."

You got an instant read here. "Come on. Come on. Come forth!" [bangs on the table] What's this you reported to the police?" You know, good, smooth ARC here. [laughter]

And he says, "Well, I – I reported once my dog had been lost." And the fall comes off the meter, and he feels wonderful.

You say, "What on earth is this? How come?"

Same fellow, you see? He robs the bank, they shoot each other up, they throw the loot – they don't even get the money – they throw the loot into Lake Michigan, and so on. And this has been a terrific withhold and a great unsolved crime of all time, and here it is. And he gets no relief. But he reports a dog to the police and he says, "My, I'm certainly glad you're auditing me. I'm getting such terrific results."

Well, that's because you're operating from one mores and he's operating from another, as I've already talked to you about. Fantastic isn't it?

Now, supposing we find out something about the pc's past and we guess at what the mores of the various groups and societies he's belonged to might have been. And we do a Security Check from this particular level. We are always going to get some kind of a result. But this is a rather stunt proposition. Is there a faster way to do this? Yes.

It's called Security Checking by Dynamic Assessment. There is the most available body of life or segment of life, the most available segment of life on which he has a reality, against which he could be security checked. And you will miss, miss, miss, miss, miss if it all still seems reasonable to you that he is sitting there in a body, part of a race, and so forth and so on, and all these "I'm-supposed-to's" are all taking place, and this is a social world and so forth. And you think this is all ordinary and reasonable.

You forget. You forget that it's very unusual. A thetan is sitting in a meat body in a culture of some kind or another that is doing some weird, odd things of some kind. It is not usual. And you know, the whole thing can be security checked out? Let's look at it from that weird angle.

All right. Do a Dynamic Assessment. Here's the way you do it. Dynamic Assessment is done, of course, to find the most needle change of any one dynamic amongst the rest of them. It is done, really, by change of pattern rather than largest fall or something like that. It is done the same way you assess anything else.

Now, you can do a Dynamic Assessment by Elimination – brand-new news for you. That improves Dynamic Assessment a bit. You can assess by elimination. It'll leave you sitting there with one dynamic on which he has some reality.

All right. What are the parts of that dynamic? And we now are confronted with the task of composing a great many new Security Checks. They will be the teen series. There will be check number 11, check number 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18. And each one of those is subdivided, as necessary to – let us say, second dynamic would be Form 12, family. That would be A. So Form 12B would be something on the order of children. You see, you already have a Child Security Check, but that should be its number.

And Form 12C, which would have to do with marital sexual relations and what is – commonly passes for mores in the present society. I think that's the total moral code, is contained in that narrow sphere.

Twelve D would have to do with unusual practices on the second dynamic. And in other words, you can get a number of Security Checks plotted out here. Of course, they go by the number of the dynamic. So your 18, naturally, is a bunch of Security Checks – questions on the subject of God. They're just religious Security Checks of some character or another. So you have a whole bunch of these things.

"Have you ever blasphemed?" Okay? That kind of – that kind of a Security Check. "Have you ever used paraphernalia for other purposes?" "Have you ever used a church for any other purpose than was intended?" [laughter] You get the idea. You just dream up all of the possibilities of misuse/abuse crimes that fitted into innumerable areas.

Of course, number 14 would be your species checks. And that's pretty easy, but it probably subdivides.

And a Dynamic Assessment could be done for the subdivision so that you could get not only the dynamic but you could also get the subdivision of the dynamic and you could wind up with a proper Security Check. But no exact form Security Check is ever going to do the whole job. You're going to have to add your own questions to it as they may appear.

Your Dynamic Assessment directs you to that zone of life on which the pc has most reality and, therefore, would consider he would have the most crimes as it exists. You will find a pc all messed up on seven dynamics and able to be security checked on the remaining dynamic. He's got some reality on it, so he's *done* something to it. He knows, you see, it's his withhold.

Now of course, Sec Check Form 11 – none of these are written. You're going to write them. Any time you're doing this and you're asking questions, now, by golly, you write the question you ask down. And I don't care how much little side time that you spend going off and grabbing off somebody's folder and find out what you're supposed to run on them next week and actually dream up a Security Check.

Make sure it stays in the folder and then we can go back over these things and we will get some horrendous thinking on the subject. Okay? And it makes a good show. As a matter of fact, some of you who are not sec checking this week but who will be sec checking next week have in these folders, right this minute out here, you have this type of Security Check to do. And those which are security checking – will be security checking tonight – you just run into it like a truck hitting a wall. You're going to open up the folder and there it is, and you're going to see, "Well, do an eight dynamic Security Check. Dream up the questions," it'll say. All right. Well, dream them up. And you will find that you're getting off the case the withholds that come nearest to this pc's *locus aberratus*. And there he sits.

In doing Security Checking – let's get out to a higher generality here on the subject itself – the trouble with Security Checking is that the auditor is usually security checking from his viewpoint rather than from the pc's viewpoint.

The auditor is security checking against what *he* thinks would be a crime in his own view. And it is not a crime to the pc. So the auditor gets all upset because this question should have worked, and he's got this bright, sweet, innocent little thing sitting across from him – a little high-school girl – and she's sitting there and she's saying, "Oh, yes. Well, I was raped in

the third grade, the fourth grade. As a matter of fact, raped several boys in the fifth grade. Yeah, as a matter of fact, I'm having clandestine relations at the present moment with my uncle, except when I'm down at the firehouse."

So he says, "Man, you know, when I get all this off, when I get all this off and get all this straightened up, this girl going to be flying right, you know?"

About three, four weeks after he's finished this laborious task of Security Checking, he walks by the who- firehouse and she in her negligee waves from the window. [laughter] What he missed – what he missed was this, what he missed was this: her dynamic was the – was the eighth dynamic, and she was a renegade from the Temple of Astarte. And of course, it would have been a *awful* break of mores for her to have done anything else.

Now, if he'd asked her questions such as "Have you ever been leaning out a window and have not whistled to somebody?" he would have gotten a fall, and she would have gotten this off, maybe with considerable grief. She meant to do right. [laughs]

Now, the odd thing about thetans is they are thetans. That is the oddest thing about a thetan. And a thetan is not natively a member of any culture. There aren't just natural-born eighth dynamic thetans and natural-born second dynamic thetans, and so forth. They are just thetans. And they've come down the track by their own devious routes accumulating, in their own peculiar way, civilizations, cultures, mores, group ideas and so on. And some of them have come a long way down the track without finding out any groups exist. And all sorts of wild things have gone on, you see? It's quite weird, you see?

It isn't that everybody has the same body of aberration at all. They're thetans. And in view of the fact that all the rest of this stuff is collected, well, it's just what do they collect? Some collect stamps, some collect blondes, some collect debts, some collect executions – sort of a hobby.

But the various mores in which they operate are registered very clearly and cleanly on the dynamics. And as soon as you start doing this, why, you're going to see some interesting renewed upsurge results out of Security Checking

Of course, I'm put to it right now. I have to have a zone and level of auditing which is a comprehensible, highly usable, highly workable level of auditing prior to finding the pc's goal and terminal. And I have to do that fairly rapidly because you have a Class II Auditor and he has to have a body of skills. So I'm not just busy inventing them, I'm busy throwing them together.

It's like the other day, I looked up in horror in realization that we had no co-audit processes of any kind whatsoever that could be trusted in a co-audit. By the new safety table, I – you look it over from a viewpoint of the co-audit, why, you're in a box. That's a bad spot. But there's an old one, 1951, that could be run in a co-audit: Rising Scale Processing. Probably be gorgeous! Probably be gorgeous. You can probably even do an assessment on the people as they walk in. You know, I mean you could take the old Chart of Attitudes and kind of work it out. What did this fellow want? He tells the co-audit Instructor what his goals are. All you had to do is pick out the column, that's Rising Scale he runs. He'll make it.

It's quite a remarkable thing what you can do with concepts and that sort of thing – leaving terminals alone – the gains you can get.

Now, in this body of Security Checking, here is a whole zone of activity – a very simple zone. There will be forms developed for this particular thing and all the Security Checks. We haven't got them all now but that's no reason why I can't show you what it is or we can't use it, don't you see? You, after all, don't have to be led down the road with your feet being picked up one at a time and set down on the cobbles by somebody else.

Do a Dynamic Assessment, take the most active dynamic, preferably by elimination, take the parts of existence which might be the subdivisions of that dynamic; look those over and take the most active one of those or the most fruitful one of those – just dream up a Security Check that has to do with it.

Security Check the pc on that particular zone and area. You will be asking him things he never dreamed of were an overt. He's doing them all the time. And all of a sudden, "It's horrible! Oh, God!" He feels terrible about that. And he is so relieved.

A vegetarian, for instance, that is also on the fifth dynamic – she has other reasons that she could be a vegetarian – it might be on the seventh or eighth dynamic. It's something they should be doing, you know, because of some religious action or something of that sort.

But when a pc is on the fifth dynamic and vegetarian, and we security check him, here's where your reasonableness will get assaulted, you see? You're going to ask this person such things: "Have you ever eaten an animal?" and the needle is going to fall off the pin. And you'll find out he's been withholding every dinner he ever ate that had any meat connected with it, and so on. All sorts of wild things here.

You ask somebody along this line that falls on the fifth, "Well, have you ever walked on the grass?" Needle falls off the pin. He's liable to explain to you that he had to. There wasn't any way you could go around the grass. Of course, he realizes he smashed up a lot of grass in his day.

You see, you look on this as being so ordinary, you know, for people to walk on grass or kill plants or eat animals, or something of this sort, or chop down trees or do various things on the fifth. This is all so routine that you wouldn't think – bang! like that, that it would have any effect on a case because it's too ordinary and *shouldn't* have any effect on the case. Well, that doesn't follow at all.

What has an effect on a case is what has an effect on a case, you see? What – it's what the thetan thinks is a withhold. And that goes back to what group mores are you operating against?

Well, any member of the old biological survey that was operating around here about six hundred million years ago has his hair stand on end, whether he knows it or not, every time a new species becomes extinct on Earth or every time man plows up another thousand square miles and plants it in cute cottages at contractor prices, you see? That's grim. And his hair stands on end. He knows it's very usual and that he ought to be doing it. He knows he should be doing it, you see, because it's a usual thing to do. And that's *okay*. And nobody else thinks it's bad.

But he looks at this or doing something like that and he kind of – it's just not quite right. He doesn't quite integrate why it isn't quite right. He doesn't think the thought through. He just sort of snarls a little bit to himself quietly, or he thinks of it as an overt or as something and he's disturbed by it. Well, it's against the mores of the biological survey. That's all.

"Thou shalt plant and populate planets, pard." They kept the life cycle going and balanced. Also, I imagine any one of them that ever gets in a schoolroom, and the teacher says, "Now we are going to talk about the balance of nature," you see? And they go back into the current biological nonsense about how there was a spontaneous explosion of an atom somewhere in some sea of ammonia that got there by accident, and then, by natural selection, [laughter] and quite by accident, everything got planned out this way, you see?

Well, a person that's been on that line is – somewhere back in his bank, you know, things gonna go whirr, and whirr. Well, it's an awful invalidation: the time he spent on computers figuring out how many petals there should be on a delphinium! [laughter] And of course, then they wog him. He finally doesn't like this explanation, so goes over to the church and they tell him God did it. [laughter] And suddenly he begins to feel sort of megalomaniac, you know? And it's – "I wonder if I did create all these thetans." [laughter] He didn't do anything but run the computers that planned the posies on this particular type of planet.

But you'll find these are overts. When they register on that dynamic then you have to plot out what the overts would be on that particular line; and you ask those questions, you'll find out the fellow has got overts, he's got withholds and there he is. And he'll all of a sudden feel much better. And some odd and peculiar things that he has been doing in his life suddenly come straight. And he remembers things, and so forth.

You see, men are very often so busy being ordinary that they don't recognize that every one of them is slightly, somewhere, extraordinary. And this professional ordinariness that we get, particularly in these socialistic times, is a great repressor. It not-ises the differences. And unless you can reestablish difference, you can never reestablish differentiation. You see, it's very easy to establish similarities and identities. This is fairly easy to do. Man does this very well.

He just dismisses all problems by saying "Everything is alike." You ever hear a girl that's had a bad love affair? She says, *inevitably!*, she says, "All men are alike." That's her next statement. They walk around, and she's liable to be saying something on this order for some days or... well, hours anyway. [laughter]

And – but she's done the easy way out. The way to solve all of mankind is simply and ordinarily and only to say that they are just all alike and that's it.

So you don't have to worry about it. And then the next thing to do is if you want to – don't want to have to go any further or exercise your wits any, all you have to do is say, "Well, they're all bad." So the easy way to do is to say they're all alike and then all bad, and therefore you're safe. And this is apparently a safe thing to do. You say, "Well, they're all alike and all bad and, therefore, after this I will be warned. And now I'm perfectly safe. Of course, I'm miserable but I'm perfectly safe."

And a person will then try to justify this kind of reasoning. Well, that kind of reasoning is so idiotic and so simple and so stupid and not-ises so many things that it's no wonder that countries cycle down into some – the great melting-pot togetherness of it all. "Pigs are more equal than others," you know? This kind of a – this kind of an attitude.

It isn't that thetans are unequal, but it isn't that they're equal either. Perhaps at the beginning of track this might have been true. But they've been gathering inequalities for some time and then masking them by pretended equalities until they're very hard to separate out.

Well, if you go ahead and look this over in Security Checking, you'll find out that the Dynamic Assessment is a very marvelous way to get a zone of life on which the person has overts and withholds. And you'll find that that works fine, and produce some rather interesting results.

All right. There is another thing called the Problems Intensive that we have been working on, and I'll tell you how to do this Problems Intensive. It's a simple thing to do; nothing much to it.

It's a form. And you fill out the form. And the only differences that you find from this and the first time I told you about it is you don't run the problem. You fill out the form. You get all the self-determined changes of the pc's lifetime. Then you assess those self-determined changes, you find the one that reacts the most and then you ask for the problem immediately earlier than that change. They give you a problem. If it's the right change, they will give you a problem which is a tremendous overwhelming problem that they have had for many, many years and that is their present time problem of long duration. And they would recognize that as such and that gets out of the road very nicely. The statement of it, of course, makes it easier. But now there's a faster way of auditing it than running the problem. A problem is too close to still to be audited swiftly. It isn't that a problem can't be audited. A problem can be audited but it audits more slowly than approaching it through motion.

In other words, it's close to a still, a problem is. You ever notice a workman when he runs into two pieces of timber that are going the wrong way in the structure: he stands back and looks at it. Yeah, he inevitably stops. And problems are associated with stops.

So what you do is take it as a still point on the track and find the area of prior confusion and then you sec check that area of prior confusion. Find out what the person was doing at that time, find out what he withheld and from whom and how he did it and what he did and why he said it. And you know, that – you just find out all of the things and stuff in that particular area which preceded the problem. And all the change in the problem, all you do with the change he made in life and the problem is use them as a milepost in time behind which you look for the confusion. And then you sec check the confusion. And you'll find out, then, the problem will blow unless it's gone back fifty thousand years and you're actually trying to sec check his life as a student barbarian or something – which you can run into.

You get that area of confusion unraveled and you'll find the problem blows, the change blows. And what do you know? It's usually accompanied by a somatic of some kind, and it'll be some kind of a chronic somatic, and that will lessen somewhat or sometimes even blow entirely. Don't be disheartened after you've got the person a goals terminal, and you are run-

ning him on the line, to have the somatic reappear where it really occurred on the track. And it'll reappear and blow.

Now, Sec Checking, however, will alleviate and get it out of the road and it usually stays out of the road, so – it stays lessened anyway.

And so doing a Problems Intensive, then, merely consists of finding all of the self-determined changes a person has made in a lifetime, listing those, assessing those, finding that change which gives the most reaction, finding the problem stated by the pc which existed immediately prior to that change and then finding the area of prior confusion to the problem. Find that area and sec check the living daylights out of that area.

What was he doing at that time? And who'd he know? And all this sort of thing. And basically and principally, *what* did he do and *what* did he withhold from whom?

Now, you don't have to do it person by person. You actually can delete the assessment of the people in the list. You needn't do that, there is no real point in it at all. You needn't make a list of people on a Problems Intensive and then assess that list of people, because it's a violation of a goals terminal.

What you should do is just go in on the basis of an area of confusion, find out who was present in it and then find out *to whom* he did *what* and *from whom* he withheld *what*. And all of a sudden the problem in a majority of cases will blow. Now, that is a – you call that a Problems Intensive, you see?

Now, a dynamics – Sec Checking by Dynamics is an entirely different activity and it is an isolated activity of its own. And a Problems Intensive is an isolated activity of its own. These things are distinctly different activities.

Sec Checking usually depends for its workability on the ability of the auditor to ask the right question at the right time. Now, when we're making the basic class of a very functional type of auditor – I mean, an auditor that we would depend on the skill of, that basic Class II Auditor – we're not going to say that the Class II Auditor is a muzzled auditor, and so on and so on, you see, the way we used to say there was a class. Class II is above that. This person has got to have enough imagination to ask the right questions and put together the right questions in order to knock apart this mess; that'd give him enough to think about. And you have to be very good at it. As a matter of fact, several members of this particular class are *extremely* good at this. I'm very interested in watching it occur. "So we found the hidden confusion and that was the end of the problem." You know? Bang-Bang - Doing it very well.

Now, what's interesting is, is that you could sec check out of existence every out-rudiment. Isn't that interesting. You could take the room and you could take the present time problem, you could take the auditor, you could take the ARC break, and naturally the withhold, and you could sec check out of existence all of these out-rudiments by just asking for the prior confusion. You find the rudiments out so you find out what went on before it.

You see, a rudiment can't hang up unless there's an unknown in it and an unknown can't exist unless there is a withhold.

These people who walk around being fond of being stupid should get wise to themselves because all they're doing is declaring that they have withholds. Here we have a class of thing which is all of a – all of a piece: unknowingness, forgettingness, withholdingness and stupidity. These all go together. These are all of a class. They are not the same thing but each one interdepends on another. It's kind of another triangle like we used to have in ARC and still have. But unknown and stupidity and withholds go up and down accompanying one another. They are hand in glove. The more withholds a person has the more stupid he'd be; the more unknowns he will have. And you've got these three things just marching up and down beside each other. And as you improve a person's withholds, if they're actually withholds, of course he will get brighter.

But if you think you're going to take a member of the Bank Robbers Security League and sec check him on a churchman's moral code and wind up with an increased IQ, of course, you're quite mistaken. This will not occur.

What you've got to do is sec check within the reality of what the pc is and what the pc has done. You have to sec check within that reality.

Well, there is one method of finding the zone by dynamics, and another method: zones of action by change. That is the Problems Intensive.

Well, the hidden confusion was when he was in school. All right. Now, that is not anything but a school mores. It couldn't be anything but school mores. It is not familial mores, particularly; it's school mores. The confusion immediately before this change that you assessed out was going to school. So therefore it's a school mores. It's a schoolboy's attitude toward the parents; a schoolboy's attitude, you see, toward teachers; a schoolboy's attitude toward all the other aspects of existence. Well, what are these, what are these? And what's the morals? What's the mores of a school? "Thou shalt not give the headmaster an even break," you know? It's the thousand-odd commandments of the schoolboy. "Thou mustn't peach. Thou mustn't inform on thy worst enemy." All kinds of weird moral codes, one kind or another. "Thou shalt take revenge." It's quite weird, you know? Somebody was mean so therefore all the other boys enforce the fact that there must be a fight.

You know, it's quite weird. But so is any of these moral codes. And if you're living comfortably, ensconced in a sort of a even, easy-go sort of a society, and you'd say, "Well, I know what's moral: 'Thou shalt not, thou shalt not and thou shalt not and thou shalt not,' and that's about all there is to it. And, of course, I am a moral person." That is the emptiest remark that anybody ever made. "I am a moral person." There isn't any other kind.

It doesn't make him a well-behaved person, except in one group: the group that happens to have the same morals. See that, and then he's a well-behaved person only in that group. It's very interesting. The auditor's viewpoint can be thrown out. The auditor can sec check securely from the fact of the Presbyterian church and then with what amazement discover that nobody but Presbyterians ever lives by the Presbyterian church. Always discovers this with some shock. And never under any circumstances realizes there's a moral code amongst marijuana addicts. See, so that is *immoral*.

Well look, it's only *immoral* to those groups that have a moral code that says what the other side is doing is bad.

I'm not now trying to tear down and rip to pieces every single moral code that has ever been developed anywhere. As a matter of fact, we have the only means that has ever been discovered of straightening them out. I don't know how anybody can be a Presbyterian after having been a Roman Catholic for fifteen hundred years. [laughter] If the Presbyterian church was smart, if it was very, very clever, why, it would come around and find a bunch of us auditors and get us to sit down with our E-Meters and put the congregation up the line out of the moral area that they are stuck in so that then they will hear something of what the preacher is saying. I think it's a waste of air and church heat and a few other things. He's standing up there and he's ranting and pounding the pulpit and telling them they must not sin. And just think of this fellow who is totally stuck in the Never-Give-a-Planet-an-Even-Break Space Jockeys Protective Association. [laughter]

And here's this preacher ranting at him, "Thou shalt not sin. You must learn to become a moral person."

And something in the back of his mind says, "You know, I don't want to kill any more women." [laughter] "And this fellow is standing up there demanding that I kill women. And that is why I left the Space Jockey Protective Association because it was just too much – just one too many women. Now, why does the Presbyterian church want me to kill women?" This is what goes in crosswise, you see, in the reactive bank. And the fellow is very puzzled about Presbyterianism. And he can't articulate what it is and he can't understand about it. He just thinks that, well, it's not quite for him.

And if you ask him about it, almost [snaps fingers] on a flash response, "What does a Presbyterian church want you to do?"

[snaps fingers] "They want me to steal ships and kill women." And even he at this point looking at that would say, "You know, that's peculiar." Because they don't want him to commit sin.

If you raved and ranted at a large group of people with great force and decibels of sound that they must not sin, that they must be moral people, and never at any time held up what you were talking about or defined morals or showed them any moral code or anything – you just collect them at random and then just start screaming at them that they mustn't sin, they mustn't be immoral, so on – people would walk out of there and do some of the weirdest things. [laughter]

You should realize that there is no act pronounced immoral in any one part of Earth which cannot be found to be moral in some other part of Earth. So remember that, when you are doing Security Checking. Security check against the moral code of the prior confusion.

And, well, if your prior confusion, let us say, is a period after the person has been an auditor for years and it's a big confusion and it has something to do with auditing in an organization or something like this – there was a big confusion at this time, and after that he changed something or other, and that's the confusion you assessed, and that is the confusion that you are security checking. And you've learned that in his early life he was a Presbyterian or something. You know he's probably crossed up one way or the other. But probably the code he has gone against is the code he understands to be the code of a Scientologist – not the written Code of the Scientologist. The written Code of the Scientologist is *not* the code of a

Scientologist, oddly enough. It is simply something that is held up as a – as some kind of a model of action to keep us from getting our heads kicked in. But we have developed quite a structure of morality, you know? "Thou shalt not audit badly." That's one of the foremost of them.

"Thou shalt not audit a pc with a PT problem" – it goes off into technical things, don't you see? And it – so on. A person, actually, is getting into a moral structure. He's not into a technical structure; he's also into a moral structure. And by sec checking him, you will find out that he thought of it as a moral structure. That was a moral structure to him. You look on it as a technical structure, but no, it's a moral structure.

He knew very well, he knew doggone good and well, that he shouldn't keep auditing this person badly after 3:30 A.M. He just knew he shouldn't ought to be doing that because it was against all of his principles: what he wanted to do and what anybody else wanted him to do and so forth – it was just bad. Pc was getting tireder and tireder and tireder and practically finally spun in. This gets to be a hell of an overt.

Somebody walks into the front room and swears and damns and screams and raises the devil about something or other and practically knocks the person's lease to pieces, don't you see? And you get that as an overt amongst Scientologists? You don't get it as an overt until they find out that they disturbed an auditing session that was going on. [laughter] You see? All right. They disturbed this auditing session. Well, that's an overt. Something they shouldn't have done.

So gradually out of technical lines and out of behavior actions and group associations, Scientologists are building a moral code of what they consider proper behavior. And it's built exactly and entirely against their experience, not what they've been told or what they've been dictated to. It's built against the experience of what they know to be survival and what they know to be nonsurvival. So you see, you check against that moral code one way or the other.

Now, you have a Security Check for an auditor. Now, whether it embraces all those points or not is debatable at the moment; I haven't got the thing to hand. Possibly it doesn't.

But you see, you're in the driver's seat if you're security checking a Scientologist. You see, that's easy. That's nothing to it. Just all you have to do is say, "Well, what would I consider wrong?" You see, "As an auditor, what would I consider wrong? Well, all right. I'll ask him if he's done it."

"You ever disturb an auditing session? You ever done this? You ever done that? You ever written a nasty letter to Ron and couldn't get it back out of the post?" [laughter, laughs] See, anything, anything, you just bing, bing and think those up, just bang! bang! bang! That's because, you see, you're auditing in the same sphere of the moral code.

Now, let's move it just one out. You're security checking a person who is your fellow countryman and who has gone to similar schools to you, and so forth. Well, this is pretty easy. You know what you'd consider wrong so you can ask him what's wrong, and bang – you'll get all kinds of withholds and so forth, and that's dandy.

All right. Let's move it out just a little bit further. You're a member of the human race and you're checking – security checking a member of the human race. Well, you get past the

language difficulties; you could dream up a security thing. You could – you know, you know enough about it – vaguely, other races and things – and you could dream up something. Even if it was only "Have you ever done something that a Chinaman would consider immoral?" You know, you had to be that stupid about it but you could still brace it in somehow or another here and get it through.

All right. Now, let's security check a monkey. Well, what do monkeys consider moral? What do they consider immoral? I don't know. I haven't talked to one lately. But they go on a monkey code. They must have one because they all behave alike as a species. Don't they? Well, they must have a moral code of some kind or another which is a racial code of some kind.

All right. How about security checking a blade of grass? I can show you that a tomato will register. I can show you that a cabbage will register on an E-Meter. Well, the only problem there is *not* just how to get in communication with the cabbage? See, that's *not* the major problem. That's not the *only* major problem. The other major problem would be well, "What does a cabbage consider immoral?" That's from a Security Checker's viewpoint. I imagine "Not to be eaten," or something. You never know about these things.

The basis of which you operate must be the viewpoint of the pc, not the viewpoint of the auditor – the only point I'm trying to make here. You must – you must security check from the viewpoint of the pc, always. Doesn't mean you've got to be in his 'ead, but it means you've got to do some dream-up.

All right. If this person was a WRAC, was a WRAC for years, and the incident you're security checking and the zone of confusion – the prior confusion that you're security checking – finds that she has been a WRAC for some years. What is the moral code of a WRAC? Who knows? Well, you could ask some questions about it. You could dream it up.

"Have you ever spoken pleasantly to your commanding officer? Have you ever failed or refused to make catty remarks about a sergeant?" See? Who knows what their moral code is? But it might be immoral, see, it might be immoral to apparently be on good terms with your sergeant.

See? It might be. All kinds of wild things might be going on. You're not sure, because there are different standards of survival. And the standards of survival can be so different that there it is. It's laid out in front of you. Your work is cut out for you.

But you always – the rule is, you always security check within the moral structure of the pc, not the auditor. You *never* security check within the moral structure of the auditor. You just make a damn fool of yourself if you do that. You sound like a parson yapping. You've got a moral code. Well, what's so moral about it? I don't know. But there it is. You got a moral code.

Now, all moral codes tend to propagate themselves and people try to force other people into a moral code within a group, and so on. So an auditor does have a latent impulse to force some old moral code of his off on the pc while he is security checking. It's perfectly all right to force any moral code you want to on anybody, but *not* while you're security checking.

You security check by the moral code the pc has violated and you'll get some terrific case gains. You'll get that tone arm coming down, and so on.

Well, I've given you two excellent methods of doing this; they're very, very good: your Problems Intensive to find areas of confusion; your Dynamics Assessment followed by a Security Check along that particular dynamic line. I think you will find these things are quite productive of interesting results.

The question very often comes up, extremely, "Well, aren't you just running perpetual withholds, withholds, withholds, withholds? Aren't you running withhold on the Prehav Scale?" No. It never flattens; it's one of these total duration. If you've asked somebody, "Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George?" Yes, that will flatten and that will run out. But "Have you ever in the last two hundred trillion years restrained a communication or restrained a reach or restrained anything? Have you ever done this?" I'm afraid would take a long time to flatten.

Now, it is much more rapidly flattened if you say, "Have you ever overtly acted against or withheld yourself from some moral code that – ?" so on. Now, we've got what his real withholds are. We can get those out. So it flattens as fast as you've cleaned up all the moral codes which he has violated.

How many groups has he belonged to? I don't know. It's an inexhaustible amount. Fortunately, you don't have to do it that particularly to get a good result.

Now, there's one thing more here and that is the subject of the use of "blame," the use of "make guilty," in Security Checking and the ways of doing that. And there's one more item: is the use of critical thoughts in Security Checking.

Blame has nothing to do with a Security Check. Just forget it. It's just a part of the Prehav Scale. It comes under the heading of irresponsibility, by the way, not under the heading of overts and withholds. To "make guilty" – I notice there's a tendency to ask people if they have ever blamed anybody as a Security Check and so forth. And this just doesn't exist. It isn't anything. It's nowhere.

Now, if you ask somebody "Have you ever made anybody guilty of...?" and Security Check question – if you ask that bluntly just like that, your chances of getting a factual answer are something on the order of a roulette wheel in Las Vegas. There it is. Because the thing that is wrong with your pc is that he or she has never really succeeded in making anybody guilty of anything, anytime, and they are still trying. And the basis of their aberration is the *effort* to make others guilty, not the fact of accomplished guilt. You always use "*tried* to make guilty," "*attempted* to make guilty." Such words as that must modify this "made guilty."

"Have you ever attempted to make anybody guilty of rape?" That's a perfectly *proper* Security Check question.

"Have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?" Well, this is Las Vegas. This girl and – I don't know, she's been raped by the firemen, the police; she's been raped by most anybody and everybody, and just been raped for years. And all during this period of time, she has been saying, "You beast! You dog. Get thee hence. Take thy dark shadow away from my doorstep"

and other equivalent remarks, less ladylike, in an effort to make fellows guilty. And she has never succeeded in doing it.

And you ask her, "Have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?"

Well, this is nonsense. No, she never has. That is the answer and that's the reaction you'll get on the needle. No, she never has. Tried for years. Never succeeded yet. [laughter]

But you ask, "Have you ever *tried* to make anybody guilty?" Ahhh, well. Now, that's a guilt of another hue. And you'll find your tone arm is reacting to that one. It can go up and down and back and forth. Do you realize that the only reason anybody has a victimish, motivatorish attitude is just an effort to make somebody guilty. But remember, it's only an *effort* to make somebody guilty. It is not successfully having done so.

Now, you can actually produce a considerable change of mental attitude on the part of a pc by saying, "Now, all right, get the idea of your mother and father standing in front of you and saying they're *so* sorry, and then have them fall away and die. Thank you." And the person will just cheer up.

There's a tremendous effort to accomplish that exact end. There's a tremendous effort. Everybody has it. It's not singular. They've got something they wanted to make somebody guilty about and they haven't ever made it. And it's still hung on the track.

So it's always "*try* to make guilty," it is always "*attempted* to make guilty." It is always a modifying word of that character and it is never, "Have you ever *made* so-and-so guilty?"

You ask a judge in sessions. You take him and you say, "All right, judge," and you put him on the E-Meter. And you say, "All right. Now, judge, we're going to find out if you ever made a prisoner guilty." And it gets no fall. Man, he has been sentencing them to be hanged, he has been sentencing them to prison, he's been banishing them out of the society, he's been shooting them from guns for years and years and years. Why, they've been sent to Old Bailey and Wormwood Scrubs, and here they go. And he's never, in *his* estimation, *succeeded* in making one feel guilty. They always have the insouciance as they walk out the door, "Well, I really didn't do it," you see? "And he's just a dog. And somehow or another, I will bear up with all this," see?

He's always got this as his image: he didn't succeed in making the fellow guilty. He pronounced sentence. You say, "Have you ever pronounced sentence?"

He will also say, "Yes. Oh yes, I've pronounced sentence, pronounced sent..." You probably won't get any fall on the meter either. That's what he's supposed to do. Pronounce sentence.

But you say, "Have you ever *tried* to make a prisoner guilty?" The thing will fall off its pin. Just run by the hour.

You just – well, how many prisoners do you want? Just one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, oh, Joe and Pete and Roy and masses, masses and masses of prisoners. Because every time one of these ones would come up accused of some very hideous crime, he didn't think his punishment was adequate half the time or he didn't think the person would experience it in any way, and he's busy pounding with the gavel and screaming at the fellow, "Hang

him by the neck until he's dead, dead, dead!" And the prisoner looks at him, you know, and goes kind of white and walks away. All the judge gets is a reaction after that, that somebody won't speak to him now. [laughter]

See, the fact of making the other fellow guilty may have been accomplished, but the person seldom finds out about it. May have been accomplished. But what he does know for sure is that he attempted to.

You could get a great deal of response, but it's always "try" and "attempt."

Now, another little point I'd like to bring up about Security Checking is a debatable one – this isn't a clear-cut point: whether or not you should ever take an unkind thought as an overt.

I say it's debatable just for this reason: that sometimes it's the only thing that is available on the pc. Apparently you can find nothing else, but they thought an unkind thought about somebody and that was an overt and they withheld it, and it sort of frees up. And it – a few of these gotten off will make the person feel more friendly and so on. Yes, there's some reaction to it.

But apparently – and this is not on my own observation – but apparently, there is evidence to the effect that a person with a body of unkind thoughts against something or somebody has an actual overt which he is wi... or she is withholding underneath those unkind thoughts. And just like you see a little flag waving above the powder mine, you go along and flutter at the flag, you see, and you don't pay any attention to the mine, you just don't get anything done about it, you know? You just monkey with the flag, you know? "Well, I had an unkind thought." So you make the flag wave a little bit more, you know? And factually, there's a powder mine there.

And you say, "What have you got underneath this here critical, unkind thought?"

"Nothing. I have been a pure, honest, good Samaritan, washing my feet properly morning, noon and night, and drying it in my wife's hair. I've been doing all the moral things I should be doing" (you'd be surprised how many moral things there are), "and I have never done anything in my whole life to that person and I have no withholds of any kind."

Well, there's little plumes – there's a couple little openings we're going to have to put in up here when we start this type of Security Checking to let the smoke out of the E-Meter because it's going to react.

So there is evidence to the effect that if you get some unkind thoughts, you ought to whistle up for the bulldozers and the cranes and the big grab hooks to reach in and find out what the devil the overt is because the unkind thought is apparently the indicator which shows that an overt and a withhold exist. And if you audit unkind thoughts in Security Checking as themselves, you are doing the same thing as leaving a Security Check question *unflat*.

So this is another reason, apparently, why a pc can be given a Security Check, and they get off a lot of unkind thoughts, unkind thoughts, and then all of a sudden, why, the needle gets all gummy, and they just don't feel so good and they aren't so good, and so forth.

Well, actually, the unkind thoughts were indicators. The little flag was waving in the breeze, and the auditor never really asked a comprehensive question such as, "*What have you done to William?*"

"Nothing" – *thooong*.

"What was that? What are you withholding from William?"

"Nothing. Nothing but his inheritance and his wife and all of his baggage and a few things like that," you see?

But it comes up as "Well, I thought William's tie wasn't so nice today, so that's a big overt." Actually, those things are not sufficiently important. They are not adequate to aberrate anybody; they won't do much for a case. But they are indicators. And there are several things in life which are these little indicators and something big lies under them.

Now, it isn't necessarily true, though, that the pc can get to it at his state of case now. It's something that you could kind of – you may not even get a reaction on it on the meter. It's too unreal to the individual, see? But a little X across over in the border on the Security Check indicates to you that sometime, someday this pc is going to come up the line and then you're going to find out, "Well, William ..."

Well, actually, he didn't do anything to William, really. But when William was dead broke and didn't have any train fare, he made him walk from London to East Grinstead. And when he got to East Grinstead, and so forth, had made sure that the place that was going to employ him had a bad reference on him. Yet he hadn't done anything to him, you know? And it was in the rain. And he got pneumonia and died. [laughter] Otherwise, he's done nothing to William. But pcs are not good at facing up to overts, so they miss them in that particular character.

All right. Well, there you are, and I hope this gives you some more data, some more interesting insights in Security Checking. But remember that Security Checking belongs in the category of metering. And unless you operate the meter, Security Checking is a very dangerous pastime, and I wouldn't attempt it if I couldn't run a meter.

Thank you very much.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 19 OCTOBER 1961

Franchise

SECURITY QUESTIONS MUST BE NULLED

The main danger of security checking is not probing a person's past but failing to do so thoroughly.

When you leave a security check question "live" and go on to the next one, you set up a nasty situation that will have repercussions. The person may not immediately react. But the least that will happen is that he will be more difficult to audit in the future, and will go out of session more easily. More violently, a pc who has had a security check question left unflat may leave the session and do himself or Scientology considerable mischief.

About the most unkind thing you could do to a person would be to leave a security check question unflat and go on to the next one. Or to fail to nul the needle on withholds in the rudiments and go on with the session.

One girl, being audited, was left unflat on a security check question. The auditor blithely went on to the next question. The girl went out after session, and told everyone she knew the most vicious lies she could create about the immoral conduct of Scientologists. She wrote a stack of letters to people she knew out of town, telling gruesome tales of sexual orgies. An alert Scientologist heard the rumours, rapidly traced them back, got hold of the girl, sat her down and checked auditing and found the unflat security check question. The Withhold? Sexual misdemeanors. Once that was pulled, the girl hastily raced about correcting all her previous efforts to discredit.

A man had been a stalled case for about a year. He was violent to audit. The special question was finally asked, "What security check question was left unflat on you?" It was found and nulled. After that his case progressed again.

The mechanisms of this are many. The reactions of the pc are many. The summation of it is, when a security check question is left unflat on a pc and thereafter ignored, the consequences are numerous.

THE REMEDY

The prevention of security check being left unflat is easily accomplished:

1. Know E-Meter Essentials.
2. Know the E-Meter.
3. Work only with an approved E-Meter.
4. Know the various bulletins on security checking.
5. Get off your own withholds so that you won't avoid those in others.
6. Repeat questions in various ways until absolutely sure there is no further needle reaction on a question with sensitivity 16.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH: md.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 16 NOVEMBER 1961

Franchise

SEC CHECKING GENERALITIES WON'T DO

The most efficient way to upset a pc is to leave a Sec Check question unflat. This is remedied by occasionally asking, "Has any Sec Check question been missed on you?" and getting what was missed flattened.

The best way to "miss" a Sec Check question is to let the pc indulge in generalities or "I thought..."

A Sec Check question should be nulled at Sensitivity 16 as a final check.

A withhold given as "Oh, I got mad at them lots of times" should be pulled down to when and where and the first time "you got mad" and finally, "What did you do to them just before that?" Then you'll really get a nul.

The pc who withholds somebody else's withholds and gives them as answers is a card. But he isn't helped when the auditor lets him do it.

Situation: You ask the pc for a withhold about Joe. The pc who says, "I heard that Joe..." should be asked right there, "What have you done to Joe? You. Just you." And it turns out he stole Joe's last blonde. But if the auditor had let this pc go on and on about how the pc had heard how Joe was this or that, the session would have gone on and on and the Tone Arm up and up.

We have pcs who use "withholds" to spread all manner of lies. We ask this pc, "Have you ever done anything to the Org?" The pc says, "Well, I'm withholding that I heard..." or the pc says, "Well, I thought some bitter thoughts about the Org." Or the pc says, "I was critical of the Org when..." and we don't sail in and get **what the pc did**, we can comfortably stretch a 5 minute item to a session or two.

If the pc "heard" and the pc "thought" and the pc "said" in answer to a Sec Check question, the pc's reactive bank is really saying, "I've got a crashing big withhold and if I can keep on fooling around by giving critical thoughts, rumours, and what others did, you'll never get it." And if he gets away with it, the auditor has missed a withhold question.

We only want to know what the pc did, when he did it, what was the first time he did it and what he did just before that, and we'll nail it every time.

THE IRRESPONSIBLE PC

If you want to get withholds off an “irresponsible pc” you sometimes can’t ask what the pc did or withheld and get a meter reaction.

This problem has bugged us for some time. I finally got very bright and realized that no matter whether the pc thought it was a crime or not, he or she *will* answer up on “don’t know” versions as follows:

Situation: “What have you done to your husband?” Pc’s answer, “Nothing bad.” E-Meter reaction, nul. Now we know this pc, through our noticing she is critical of her husband, has overts on him. But she can take no responsibility for her own acts.

But she *can* take responsibility for his *not knowing*. She is making certain of that.

So we ask, “What have you done that your husband doesn’t know about?”

And it takes an hour for her to spill it all, the quantity is so great. For the question releases the floodgates. The Meter bangs around.

And with these withholds off, her responsibility comes up and she *can* take responsibility on the items.

This applies to any zone or area or terminal of Sec Checking.

Situation: We are getting a lot of “I thought”, “I heard”, “They said”, “They did” in answer to a question. We take the terminal or terminals involved and put them in this blank.

“What have you done that (doesn’t) (don’t) know about?”

And we can get the major overts that lay under the blanket of “How bad everyone is but me”.

This prevents you missing a Sec Check question. It’s a bad crime to do so. This will shorten the labour involved in getting every question flat.

Every session of Sec Checking you should ask the pc in the end rudiments, “Have I missed a Sec Check question on you?” In addition to “Are you withholding anything” and “half truths etc”.

And if your pc is very withholdy you can insert this “Have I missed a Sec Check question on you?” every few questions while doing a Sec Check.

Always clear up what was missed.

A pc can be very upset by reason of a missed Sec Check question. Keep them going up, not down.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:esc.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 MARCH 1965

Remimeo
Students

All Levels

ARC BREAKS

Great News!

I've found the basis of ARC Breaks!

As you know, only a PTP (Present Time Problem) can hold a graph unchanging and only an ARC Break can lower one. Therefore the Anatomy of an ARC Break is more vital to know, as it can worsen, than the anatomy of a PTP. But both are very important and with the overt act and misunderstood words in study form the vital four things anyone should know in auditing Pcs.

The average student has a hard time getting rid of ARC Breaks in others, mostly because he never really finds the ARC Break. One Auditor was sure a Pc had been ARC Broken by "the last few inches of a lecture tape" and was madly calling Washington to borrow the tape so the poor Pc could "listen to it again to cure his ARC Break"! Well I don't mind being cause, but my tape never ARC Broke the Pc. The Auditor just didn't locate the Charge.

The whole trick is to keep cleaning up the ARC Break until the Pc is *happy* again and then quit. When you find it, that's it. You don't find it and still have an ARC Broken Pc! No, the terribly simple truth is that

1. The Pc is ARC Broken because something happened.
2. The Pc will continue to be ARC Broken until the thing is found.
3. The ARC Break will *vanish* magically when the source is found.

Finding the ARC Break and indicating it clears the ARC Break. If it *doesn't* clear on what you find, then you haven't found it!

You must not continue to run a Pc on some process when the Pc is ARC Broken. You must find the ARC Break and clear it.

The Pc will go into a sad effect if you don't find the ARC Break but instead, continue the process. If you *think* you have found the ARC Break (and haven't) and then go on auditing, the Pc will go into a sad effect.

ARC Broken Pcs are easy to identify. They gloom and mis-emote. They criticise and snarl. Sometimes they scream. They blow, they refuse auditing.

If you can read a lighted neon sign at 10 feet on a dark night, you can detect a Pc who has an ARC Break. Some Auditors can detect them sooner than others. I can see one coming in a Pc 1½ hours of auditing before the Pc starts to get misemotional in earnest. Some newcomer in the business might not detect one until the Pc wraps a chair around the auditor's head. As I say, the ability to perceive one varies. The better you are the sooner you see one. If an auditor's Pc isn't bright and happy, there's an ARC Break there with life or the bank or the session.

The thing to do is find it and clean it up.

And now all is revealed: This is what makes an ARC Break occur:

An ARC break occurs on a generality or a not there.

THE GENERALITY

Example of a Generality

"They say you are cold-hearted." "Everybody thinks you are too young." "The People Versus Sam Jones." "The will of the masses."

CASE MANIFESTATION

Example: Little boy screaming in rage when he makes a mistake in drawing. Auditor observes little boy is upset.

Auditor: "What are you upset about?"

Little Boy: (howling) "My drawing is no good!"

Auditor: "Who said your drawing is no good?"

Little Boy: (crying) "The teachers at school (plural)."

Auditor: "What teacher (singular)?"

Little Boy: (sobbing) "Not the teachers, the other children (plural)!"

Auditor: "Which *one* of the other children?"

Little Boy: (suddenly quiet) "Sammy."

Auditor: "How do you feel now?"

Little Boy: (cheerfully) "Can I have some ice cream?"

THE FORMULA

1. Ask what the Pc is upset about.
2. Ask who thought so.
3. Repeat the generality the Pc used and
4. Ask for the singular.

5. Keep 3 and 4 going until the Pc is happy.

As it's a near Q and A it should be awfully easy. They name prunes, you say what prune is prunes.

RESULT

It's quite magical done barehanded or on a meter.

ERRORS

You can miss in English sometimes on **you**. The Pc says **you** are mean. We have no plural or singular signal in the word **you**. Therefore a statement that "**You** are ARC Breaking me" or "**You are mean**" may not mean, as an egocentric auditor may take it, the auditor but **you** may be being used as **The Whole World**. The above formula holds 1 to 5. Just find out "Which person is meant by the word you?"

Our old "Look at me, who am I?" was not too wrong.

So next time your Pc says, "The Instructors are mean," don't be goofy enough to indicate the charge with "OK, you are ARC Broken because the Instructors are mean." And then be amazed when the ARC Break continues. You didn't find out "What Instructor is Instructors?" If you ask a bit further you'll find it probably wasn't "the Instructors" but somebody else. And that somebody will be a unit, not a group.

A less workable but interesting approach is "Who uses the word 'everybody' frequently?" It's of interest only because "everybody" makes a dispersal which the Pc can't see through. It will take quite a while sometimes for a Pc to spot such a person!

How many people have died heartbroken because "they" were mean to him. And it was just one vicious being who had been blown up to "they".

The Not There is also a generality because it can be anywhere. But it is a special case.

When something becomes unlocatable it can cause an ARC Break.

The cure for this one is to find out what's gone.

If you see somebody with a cold, ask "Who's gone?" and you'll be amazed at the recovery *if you* pursue the matter.

One concludes it's less the loss than not knowing where something has gotten to, making a one into a generality.

The common response to sudden loss is to feel everything is gone or going.

This is the state of anxiety explained.

The beaten and downtrodden respond well on this (when brought up through normal levels to the Level of Remedies).

A very sneaky question is "Who (or what) was everything to you?"

But use it sparingly. The Pc will go whole track like a flash if overworked.

Remarkably (at *this* late date to find it!) that's why he rather fancies his pictures! At least he has a picture of it!

Dreams follow a sudden loss. It's an effort to orient oneself and get something back.

LEVEL VI ARC BREAKS

Of course, there's nothing wrong really with a thetan but his reactive bank. He can recover from the rest. And his reactive bank is *full* of generalities which explains the hard ARC Breaks of Level VI. But don't tamper with Level VI if the Pc belongs at II. You can get enough locks off any day from normal life to cure the ARC Breaks you'll encounter getting up to VI.

Main thing to know is: **An ARC break occurs because of a generality or a not there.**

Fortunately it doesn't always occur. Only sometimes. And when it does: Find the singular form of the generality.

In Admin particularly you save more executives that way. And in auditing you just don't have failed cases or blows if you *know* it.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:wmc.aj.cden

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 11 JANUARY 1962

CenOCon
Franchise

SECURITY CHECKING
TWENTY-TEN
THEORY

All valences are circuits are valences.

Circuits key out with knowingness.

This is the final definition of havingness.

Havingness is the concept of being able to reach. No-havingness is the concept of not being able to reach.

A withhold makes one feel he or she cannot reach. Therefore withholds are what cut havingness down and made runs on havingness attain unstable gains. In the presence of withholds havingness sags.

As soon as a withhold is pulled, ability to reach is *potentially* restored but the pc often does not discover this. It requires that havingness be run to get the benefit of having pulled most withholds.

Therefore on these principles, I have developed Twenty-Ten. Providing the following items are observed and the procedure followed exactly, Twenty-Ten will appear to work miracles rapidly.

REQUISITES

1. That the auditor is Class II (or Class IIb at Saint Hill).
2. That a British HCO WW Tech Sec approved meter is employed and no other.
3. That the auditor knows how to find the pc's havingness process (36 Havingness processes).
4. That the havingness process is tested for loosening the needle at the beginning of each time used.
5. That standard HCO Policy Letter Form Sec Checks are used. The last two pages of the Joburg and Form 6 for Scientologists, the childhood check and Form 19 for newcomers, the remainder of the Joburg and other checks for all.
6. That the procedure of Twenty-Ten is exactly followed.

TWENTY-TEN

A Class II Auditor's Skill

1. Use Model Session HCO B of 21 December 1961 or as amended.
2. For every Twenty Minutes of Security Checking run Ten Minutes of Havingness.
3. If the Security question is not nul when the Twenty Minutes period is ended, say to the pc, "Although there may be withholds remaining on this question, we will now run Havingness."
4. If an unflat question is left to run havingness, return to it after Ten Minutes of havingness and complete it.
5. Run by the clock, not by the state of the question or meter on both security questions and havingness.
6. Be prepared to have to find a new havingness process any time the one being used fails to loosen needle after 8 to 10 commands. Do can squeeze test before first havingness command and after 8 to 10 questions every time havingness process is used.
7. Do not count time employed in finding a havingness process as part of time havingness is to be run.
8. Use "Has a withhold been missed on you?" liberally throughout session. Use it heavily in end rudiments.

APPLICATION TO GOALS PROBLEM MASS

The GPM is often curved out of shape by present life enturbulence to such an extent that only lock valences are available for assessing. This gives "scratchy needle" and also can lead to finding only lock valences.

Lock valences are appended to a real GPM 3-D item. They register and even seem to stay in but are actually impossible to run as 3-D items. An item found by an auditor and then proven incorrect by a checker was usually a lock item. If this happens, even the new item found by the checker may also be a lock item.

To uncover correct 3-D items it is better to run Twenty-Ten and other preparatory processes for 75 to 200 hours before attempting to get a 3-D package.

If the whole GPM keys out, one need only find a goal and **Modifier** to key it in again.

Preparatory time is not wasted as the same or greater amount of time is all used up anyway, at a loss to the pc, if a pc has a twisted GPM with earlier lock circuits abundantly keyed in in present time. In such cases (the majority) the preparatory time would be eaten up in keeping the pc in session, let alone improper items.

Twenty-Ten is urgently recommended for immediate use in all HGCs.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:ph.cden

SECURITY CHECKING: AUDITING ERRORS

A lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 26 October 1961

Thank you.

The subject of the lecture today is Security Checking. And this is the 26th of October AD 11. It better be called AD 11, because something new and strange is happening. There are some cases breaking up, in a fine way. Of course, you probably don't think so. [laughter] Do you think anything is happening to cases?

Audience: Yes.

Female voice: Yes.

Oh, you *think* something is happening to cases. Isn't that nice? Isn't that nice?

Is anything happening to your case? No. Nothing is happening to your case. Is that right?

Audience: Yes.

Tell me the truth. Do you think anything is happening to your case?

Audience: Yes!

All right. Do you think anything is happening to your pc's case?

Audience: Yes!

Male voice: Yeah.

Well, is your goal to make something happen to cases?

Female voice: Yes!

You sure? [laughter] All right.

Okay. I want to talk to you, why things don't happen to cases.

There are certain definite fundamentals of processing which must be observed before a result is obtained in auditing. There are certain safe things you can audit: You can audit concepts, ideas; you can Security Check and get overts, by getting the times an individual's attention was pinned on another terminal on the track; you can find the goal and terminal of the pc

and run it; you can run engrams on the goals-terminal line after a long run has established that they are on a goals-terminal line. And that is about all you can do. That's just about all you can do, successfully, to a case.

If you try to do anything else – such as run a generalized terminal (to run "Mother" out of the case while his terminal is "a tinker"); if you try to make him create things which are off his goals-terminal line; if you try to do many other things having to do directly with terminals and running terminals which are not his goals terminal; or if you ask questions too searchingly so that they are repetitive and are *newly* attracting his attention to a terminal which his attention was not on before – you're going to get a slowdown. His bank is going to become more solid and he's going to be upset.

I'll give you an idea. Your idea of what's wrong with the pc is he's having trouble with his father. Well, your idea stems from the fact that the pc has told you repeatedly that he's always having trouble with his father. So you say, "If I could just get Father out of the road, then we're all set here and we will therefore run Father." "Now, what have you done to Father? What have you withheld from Father? What have you done to Father? What have you withheld from Father? What have you done to Father? What have you withheld from Father?"

You see, it sounds almost right. Sounds just like you're going to get away with it and everything is fine. And then the pc doesn't recover and things look a lot different to the pc – all bad. You see that?

Because you're saying, "Father, Father, Father. Your attention on Father? Put your attention on Father. Put your attention newly on Father. Put your attention – brand-new attention – let's search for more things which you have done to Father." The guy has already given you everything he's done to Father, you see? "So put your attention on Father. Put your attention on Father. Put your attention on Father." And of course, that means "Take your attention off your goals terminal. Take your attention off your goals terminal." That's the one thing he must not do.

At no time must he take his attention off his goals terminal. He knows this. This is the one thing he knows better than he knows that there's air and sunshine. He never found that out yet that there's air and sunshine. But he does know that there is this terminal, "a tinker."

Of course, he knows it so well that he doesn't know it at all. It's buried completely down in the further deep reaches of the coal mines. Yet, it is nevertheless there and it is reactive. So we can say bluntly what some of these oddities that we have run into occasionally – we've piloted our way through them; don't think that we've just been making mistakes left and right, and front and center. We've had things that prevented any casualty from occurring along in this line.

But let's take a look at what you could do that would be wrong. Let's take a list of wrongnesses that an auditor can pull: (1) he could disobey the Auditor's Code; (2) he wouldn't know his business; he – (3) he audits a pc with a screaming present time problem; (4) he audits a pc when the pc knows he can't communicate with the auditor – which is Clause 16 of the Auditor's Code, after all, goes out of two-way comm, but that's a particularly serious one. And he could run the case with tremendous withholds on it, and of course, this is another violation of Clause 16. It's a violation of the Auditor's Code to run a case with tremendous overts

undisclosed on the case, because the pc is not in two-way comm with the auditor. So that would be dead wrong. And the other dead-wrong thing he could do would be to pick a terminal at random and run it *ad nauseam*. And that's – that's dead wrong

That's the first time you've heard that that was dead wrong This is the first time we've known that was dead wrong. Before, we said only do a terminals by assessment and only do this and only do that. These are little preventives which kept very much bad from occurring, but now I can tell you broadly that you just shouldn't fool with it. You just shouldn't run any terminal but the goals terminal of the pc.

All right. Now if you can't run any terminal but the goals terminal of the pc, where does this leave you on the subject of Security Checking? Because you've got to find out what he has done to his mother and what he hasn't done to his mother and what he's withheld from his mother and so forth. Is that running a terminal? No. It is not running a terminal as long as it's run against the E-Meter and you're only asking for it every time the meter falls. Because every time the meter falls, the pc's attention is stuck on that other terminal and it is a violation of his attention being off his goals terminal. And every time your meter falls on a security question, you have located a time and zone on the track where the individual has violated "attention must be on the goals terminal." This is the basic modus God-'elp-us of the pc. This is the stuff of which he is built. His attention must be on the goals terminal.

So every time you get a knock on the meter, and you say, "Have you done anything to anybody? Have you withheld anything from anybody?" – you actually find a knock on the meter, you find a reaction on the needle; it immediately says his attention is stuck in violation of the goals terminal. That's for just Security Checking. That isn't the – what's back of every fall you ever get on a meter. But that's the violation of the goals terminal.

So, on an E-Meter, where you get a needle reaction, you have a violation of a goals terminal. Now, if you leave him in a violation of the goals terminal, you have an upset pc. If you find one, you got to clear it. That's the rule which goes along with it.

This assumes tremendous importance, because here, there, I've been picking up cases, time after time after time where an individual has been left with an uncleared withhold. And I've found in every case that he's squirrely; he's thinking unkind thoughts; he's wondering about things; he's wondering if Scientology works or doesn't work; he's having an awful time. Actually, he dreams up all sorts of gossip trying to lessen the overts of one kind or another and he just gets into a terrible spin.

And this is an empirical datum. This is a datum which I've been watching now through auditors' reports coming in from Central Organizations, from this particular class and they are just mounting up to be legion. They are innumerable. This is a datum which is being forced upon me by constant, constant, constant observation of that datum. And it is not a datum which you can ignore, any more than I have been able to ignore the datum. So I say, "Well, all right. Huh – Susie Ann is in an HPA class and she doesn't know what she's doing, and so she misses a couple of Security Checks. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. So what?"

Oh, I'm afraid that an auditor has to learn how to swim perfectly the first time he's thrown in the bay on a Security Check. Isn't that interesting Because frankly, you could get blows out of the Academy. Every time a student sits down and he picks up the E-Meter and

he says, "Let's see, these are the – that's the tone arm. No, no, no, that's – that's – that's – . Ah-ha," and so on. And he hands it to somebody diffidently and he says, "Now let's see."

The Instructor finally comes around disgustedly and says, "This is the 'on' button, and ..." – throw it on.

"What's this moving needle?" [laughter, laughs] "When you turn it on, the needle moves. Move the tone arm; needle moves. Ha-ha! Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha! Ha-ha-ha! Move the tone arm and the needle moves. I see what they're doing. When the auditor gets something on the pc, he moves the tone arm and that moves the needle. Now I understand an E-Meter."

And he understands it all for two days and then a pc actually has a stray, unkind thought about what he's doing, you see – one of his fellow students – and the needle moves when he isn't touching the tone arm. "Broken." [laughter]

And during that period of time, unfortunately, although he has to be practicing in something vaguely resembling meter actions and so forth, he is asking people questions and these questions, any of them, we could – then become Security Check questions. And he doesn't know enough at this period of time that he's got to clear it off. The needle moved: What's he supposed to do? Well, he writes it down on the piece of paper he has, "Needle moved."

The Instructor comes around and says, "Where's Pete?"

And this fellow that's just written it down, "I don't know. He went out..." [laughter, laughs]

And you have the HCO squadron of cavalry riding all over the neighborhood trying to round up Pete. By this time he has socked a policeman, he has done this, he's done that and slept with his best friend's wife.

Well, somehow or another they get it patched up, but that is the immediate consequence of what would happen if he missed a Security Check question. We can't ignore the fact. That *is* what happens. It's just in from every place. Some of the most confoundedly *weird* things have occurred you have ever heard of.

Girl in an HGC: They missed a Security Check on her. She rushes straight out. She sees every friend she's got. She says, "All auditors are doing in that organization is sleeping with their pcs and there's all this going on and there's that going on, and it's all terrible and it's awful over there, and horrible things are occurring in that organization." And then this girl went and wrote a whole bunch of letters on the subject, and all this in relatively a few hours. She was the busiest person you ever saw.

And you know, it took the organization about a week to round this up? They got ahold of the girl and they put her down, and had enough sense to realize that the last thing she was doing was unflat. That was probably all that was really known about it.

So they made her do the last thing she was doing and it was a hot question on a Security Check. And it was something to do with the second dynamic. And the auditor had simply gone on, you know, and not asked any questions about it and then sort of ended the session and it was never going to come up again, and *boom!* Immediate repercussion.

So hell hath no fury like a pc whose withhold isn't pulled. It works completely reverse. I don't know whether the pc instinctively realizes he's been done wrong or if he has had something reactivated so that he must compensate for it or if he is making – trying to make nothing out of the overt by making nothing out of the people who might have gotten the overt, so that nobody will believe them when the overt does come up, you see? But an unpulled overt has horsepower in it. It has real horsepower. And it drives people to the most confounded excesses you ever heard of.

I think the excesses of the criminal are simply on the basis of just tremendous numbers of overts against the society. And the overts and the withholds – the overts which are a withhold – then become the horsepower which make the criminal. Not quite that the man goes wrong, you see, and then – who hides it from the society, the way we ordinarily look at it. I think it's quite different.

I think, because the individual *is* withholding something, then you get horsepower. I think this is a source of explosive reactor fuel of some kind or another. So a restimulated withhold becomes a lighted charge of dynamite. And when you ask the pc if he has a withhold and then you don't get it, you have just the same as stuffed a stick of dynamite down his throat and litten the fuse. You've lit the fuse and then you say, "Well, you don't have anything." You see? That's it.

After a while in the distance, there's a dull *boo-om-m-m-mm!* You see? And you say, "What's that? It has nothing to do with me. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. It has nothing to do with me. I mean, I audited him. I tried to help him. Tried my best, but he came to us too late."

You see, you could get off into all sloppy things. You realize this – a psycho-analyst always and totally excuses every failed case on that one phrase: "He came to us too late," which I think is quite amusing. He believes this, too, you know? He believes it implicitly. Fellow has been with him five years and "He came to me too late." Always. I've talked to these birds and they tell me with a perfectly straight face. Well, three of his patients have committed suicide in the last month. And he tells you this, quite frankly: "Oh, yes, they committed suicide in the last month. Yeah, a lot of them. Well, there's Bessie. She came to me too late. And there was George. If he'd come sooner, I could have done something. And then there's Mehitabel. Well, long, long overdue. She should have come to me much earlier."

You say, "Well, what were you doing with these patients for that time?"

"Well, they just lay there on the couch and talked."

"Well, did you ask them any questions?"

"Well, of course. I asked them what had been done to them in their childhood." [laughter] Restimulate every overt in the bank, don't you see?

Boy, I tell you. You talk about people who have taken people's lives in their hands, look into that field. But it'd be any field where you didn't pursue the question.

Now, the poor old Catholic church that I have raised so much the devil with occasionally, from time to time – the poor old Catholic church – for the lack of this datum which we're

talking about right this minute, has developed all of its heretics, its Martin Luthers and the lot. The boys they've had all the trouble with, they manufactured at the confession box.

Person comes up, he's just groveling in the dust, you see, and he's just got through having intercourse with his sister or something. And he scratches on the confession box, you see, and he says, "I have something to confess."

And the priest is sleepy that day, you know? He says, "Yeah, what – my son."

And he says, "Well, I've done something very..." And his courage fails him, as you see in pcs all the time. The guy's courage fails him, you see? And he says, "Well, I – I heard some nasty gossip about the mayor." [laughter]

And the priest says, "Well, what was it, my son?"

"Well, I heard the mayor was sleeping with the alderman's wife and that the alderman – and that the alderman has committed incest with his sister." [laughter]

And the priest says, "Well, that's eighty-nine and a half paternosters and two ump-teegahs, so tool off now."

And the fellow says, "*Whew!*"

And a little time goes on and the Inquisition all of a sudden is called upon to find out what all this sin is going on over there and what's all this commotion against the true church. And all this commotion against the true church is getting more and more commotional.

Well, they managed to burn most of them. After they'd missed their withholds, then they had to burn them. But they managed to burn most of them, but they missed just enough to cause an overthrow of the Catholic church, because it's no longer the dominant church on Earth. Well, I forget, we in the white race consider ourselves extremely, egocentrically, as being the races of Earth. But as a matter of fact, there are so many other churches elsewhere that are bigger than any church we have anywhere that that was it. But one time the Catholic church could have numbered up along with some of the great Eastern churches, and so on, and it doesn't anymore.

But that's it. There's your Martin Luther. There's your Calvin. I'm sure that it happened right there at the confession box: priest didn't have an E-Meter. I think it's very poetic justice, because he buried most of the knowledge – the church buried a great deal of knowledge that came out of ancient Greece and Egypt, and so forth. They put a lot of this knowledge away because they didn't think it was good for people. They kept it in the catacombs. Actually, they released Aristotle – just in the Middle Ages, they suddenly broke out Aristotle complete and released it to the scholarly world.

Nobody had ever heard of Aristotle and Plato before that. They broke out Plato so as to prove that Catholicism was the true religion. All of these various things occurred and they sort of shut off knowledge, one way or the other. And they didn't have an E-Meter. That's – that's what it amounts to.

Well, what problem are you faced with then? You're faced with an immediate heretic. He doesn't like you. He doesn't like your organization. He's going to dream up all sorts of

wild tales and lies about you and your organization, or about others or something, because of the missed withhold. And what are you supposed to do then?

Well, let me caution you against following the policy of our immediate forebears on this particular planet. Firewood is very costly. If only on economic grounds, why, you shouldn't have to go burn every person, you see, who has been missed on a Security Check.

Now that's what it would amount to, sooner or later. You're walking up the line, you see? You're walking into a heavy – a heavier power position on this particular planet and that's what it would amount to. You already have means and ways of cutting down the overts against the group, to keep the group from being sundered and keep individuals of the group from being cut to pieces. You have that, inherently, in a Security Check.

Now, supposing the Security Check becomes badly done and overts get missed left and right. Well, the very mechanism which is supposed to prevent dissension and upset and slowed-down cases, and all of this sort of thing – that very mechanism is the mechanism which restimulates an heresy, of some kind or another, which eventually brings about an overthrow of the group.

So it's no very light thing I'm talking about now. And this has been presented to me so many times, on so many folders, by so many people, and it has happened so often, that we must conclude that it – not that it is an invariable reaction. No reason to conclude that it is invariable, that because somebody has had a withhold and it hasn't been pulled, that this person immediately tries to destroy everything under the sun, moon and stars. We're not justified in concluding that, because it's happened many times without repercussion. And some auditor got it later or didn't get it at all and the case merely stalled. And some Director of Processing or some auditor someplace noticed the case wasn't moving sooner or later, and decided to get ambitious, and went back and found the withhold.

And the only thing that happened there is the case stalled, which is an overt enough, but nothing happened to the group and nothing happened to individuals. But you can count on the fact that it will happen sufficiently often that a repercussion will follow the act, that in the cumulative centuries it could utterly destroy anything we're trying to build up.

It is not at *all* a tiny mechanism. It is a big, important one. You could disobey most of the Auditor's Code and you wouldn't get into terribly serious trouble, except a pc would be upset, and case gains, and ARC breaks and you'd feel unhappy, and a few things like that. But Clause 16, "Stay in two-way communication with your pc," is violated the moment that you find – that is you tick, that you come close to – a hot withhold and don't get it.

You're asking a Security Check question, you say, "Well, have you ever raped anybody?"

And the individual says, "Well, people who rape people – actually, I heard about a terrible rape, and there was an awful situation occurred over in Northumbria, and so forth. There was a number of rapes over in Northumbria and I think this is pretty terrible. And that's what the needle is falling on."

And the auditor says, "Well, I guess it is pretty terrible," and goes on to the next question. As I say, it isn't invariable that he burns the house down. It's amusing that the psychoanalyst in – Freudians, in dealing with kleptomania make statements of this character.

They're the most generalized, sweeping statements you ever wanted to hear in your life. It's something on the order of "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal anything, they burn the house down." I don't think there are that many houses. That statement is part of a text. It's a direct quote. The bad English in it is not mine. "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal anything, they burn the house down."

Well, it isn't of this order of generality. It's every now and then when you fail to get a withhold, you set off an atomic bomb. And it's often enough as a group repercussion, and it's often enough and far too frequent as an individual repercussion, because you get a stall.

The individual goes through this cycle: The overt having failed to be pulled by the auditor restimulates the necessity for the pc to minimize the overt that he has done by running down the target against which the overt was committed. So the pc, far from having an overt pulled, or having a withhold pulled, has been tricked into committing a new overt on top of the withhold, against the people who tried to get it. You see the mechanism?

All right. The Rosicrucians were trying to get the withhold and they failed to get the withhold. The individual would then go "natter, natter" and his withhold, then, is against the Rosicrucians. So he immediately tries to blow up the Rosicrucians. You got the idea? They have no such mechanism as this. But, I'm just giving you an example.

If his overt is against the ETU, and he's withholding it like crazy, and it's the ETU that ticks the overt – see, that tick the withhold, but not get it in any way – he is liable, if it's a center-line withhold of some sort or another, fly into a fantastic potpourri of yip-yap against the ETU, don't you see?

The overt is always against the people who fail to pull the withhold. Knowing that, I think it might put a little spurs to your ambition never to miss one, because the succeeding overt is always against you. You fail to knock out the withhold and you or your group will get the benefit – questionable benefit – of the succeeding overt. And this is one of the primary principles of mental reaction.

They try to lessen the overt, to make nothing of the people who might find out. They've had the overt restimulated, so now they have to make *nothing* of the people, to *everyone*, so that nobody will ever *believe* the people, if the overt-withhold is suspected.

They might have an idea that – you see, as long as the thing is unpulled, it has dynamite. The second it is pulled, there's no dynamite connected with it. It's just – they just throw a flounder out on the table, you see? It's a very mysterious action, this whole thing of pulling a withhold. You reach down into the pc for this smoldering volcano, you know, with lava running all along, and the villages burning on all the mountainsides; everything going to pieces, you see, and the steam flying out of the sea. And you've reached down his throat to pull out this unsavory, bombastic object, and you drop on the table a dead haddock.

Just in the process of it passing from his throat to the middle of the table, it goes flop. There isn't even a cinder. Have you noticed this? A cleanly pulled withhold transmutes from

the most bombastic explosive manufactured to about the limpest fish ever caught, in the process of being pulled. It is just nothing. The pc sits there and he looks at it. And he says, "What on earth is that?"

And he's mystified. There's always a little "unknow" follows this thing, which doesn't do him any damage at all: "I wonder why I was so upset about that." He always has this kind of little action. You yourself who have had a withhold of magnitude pulled on you have probably experienced the same thing, you know? You just grind and you worry and you search, and so forth, and you're, "It's – well – *mm-ulp*. Oh, I'll try – I don't know. Well, let's see if I can get away with not telling them. Well, actually, the truth of the matter is, I really have never had anything.... Well, I'm gonna tell him. *Ahem-ahemmm*. All right. Well, I'll come out with it... All right! All right! I pick my teeth. I pick my teeth. I pick my teeth."

"What is the matter here? There's nothing very important about picking your teeth. Now, why was I so upset about telling the auditor?"

And when you've had a big one that you've been sitting on for a long time, you – you can see the partnership in that particular series of reactions. It is – absolutely feels ghastly just before you hand it out. Have you had something like this occur? Some. All right.

Now, supposing it went this way: "Well, *tsk*. On the subject – well, you a- you got reaction on it. You – you sure your meter is working? Are you sure your meter is working? Oh, you're not sure your meter is working? Oh, well. Oh, well. That's – it's ... okay. Well, I feel much better now. Let's go on to the next question. All right. That's good."

And the auditor goes on to the next question. And you get outside the door, you know, and you say, "Should have told him. No, I couldn't have told him. *Uhrrrrrrr*."

You get home at night, you know. Wheels start going around, and you say, "God, he's a lousy auditor. Well, that's terrible. Horrible things. I remember something Ron did once." [laughter] "Let's see. *Hm. Hm*. And I heard of an auditor one time who – who charged too much for auditing, and so forth. And see, see, see, see, see?" Immediate reaction of that kind of thing on a withhold of magnitude that's missed.

And a guy sits around – actually, he's disappointed. He's left sitting on the middle of something. It's too much for him. He can practically feel the steam coming out of his ears and nobody did anything for him about it. He basically is disappointed.

Also, he knows that it is so forceful and so powerful that if he had told about it, there might have been great repercussions on the subject. And therefore, it's much better that he didn't say anything about it and he has really won because, you see, if it got around that he'd picked his teeth – oh, well, I don't know, lots of things might have happened. The Dental Association might have gotten onto him, and all kinds of things might have occurred. They might be ... so it's a good thing. It's a good thing. And – lousy auditor and he shouldn't – know better. And actually, truth of the matter is ...

But that's all because the withhold is simply restimulated, don't you see? And the person is fighting back and forth, and he's left sitting on a charge of steam, dynamite, volcanic lava, and so on, all of which amounts to – when he finally gets out and looks at it – in the final run, why, he picks his teeth. He picks his teeth. He picks his teeth.

Well, what was so important about picking your teeth? And when you've had – seen that mechanism occur, you'll realize that if you interrupt it before it is displayed, you've left the pc with a full head of steam. And of course, the pc is liable to do almost anything. Do you see this?

You know, you might as well face up to the fact that there are liabilities to auditing. There weren't liabilities to unsuccessful auditing. There weren't liabilities to very mild auditing. There weren't liabilities to simply running out a few engrams, if you could get your hands on them, and so forth. There weren't any great liabilities to it, nor were there any great liabilities to running concepts – no real mess on that. So we got away with that fine.

Now we move over into the heavy artillery, and we bring up parks of 155s and German 88s, and we string it out along the line. And then we put a bunch of rocket launchers in the lineup. And then we say well, that's fine. Let's take some B-47s and line them up over here and put atom bombs in their stomachs. And now let's – let's go ahead. And along about this time, you're possessed of sufficient tools, that what – the stuff you are handling, which is the root stuff of human aberration, and so on, has to be handled as it should be handled. That's all.

Now you'll go, in this basis, from one extreme perhaps, to the other. I don't remember if this was the exact sequence, but it makes better telling this way: A bunch of recruits who were just out of boot school were assigned to a ship and they were afraid of ammunition. And the main battery was sitting there, and they, of course, were the loaders. And they were handling the ammunition and slamming it into the breech – they were supposed to, you see? And they'd pick up a long shell, you know – a shell about that long, you know, with an explosive fuse nose, that if you ever dropped it, you know, it'd go *m-m-boom!* and that would be obliteration with magnitude.

And they'd pick up this thing, you know, and they'd – they'd pick it up with their – you know, and hand it to the next one, you know? You can see in a – in a rapid-fire action, that shells being passed with that slowness and that care into the breeches of guns, you see, are not going to obliterate anything. It's quite the contrary. They're liable to be dropped on the deck and blow everybody in the gun crew to smithereens.

Well, I adjudicated that they had been talked to too long about the great *care* that they must use, the great care they must use in the handling of ammunition. I assume that they probably had been talked to by fellows from the Ordnance Department, that explained to them, "These were the nose fuses of the goodygumps and if you ever dropped one, why, it went *blang!* and so forth. And you must *always* be careful to keep the ammunition in its proper cases and in its proper slots and you must always keep it marked and flash-marked, because it's all very dangerous. It's all very dangerous. It's all very dangerous."

By the time they got to the ship, of course, they were afraid to touch a piece of ammunition. They had no familiarity with the ammunition. They just had the sensibility that the ammunition was dangerous.

Well, I saw this, at drill, you know, that sort of thing. They're trying to whip this gun crew together and so on. And at drill it was just this matter of "*Huh-n-huh-n-nhuh-oooooooo-ahhhh*, you got – you got it, Joe, you got it, Joe? Ha-ha-ha! Oh, thank God, you've got it, Joe. All right. Now open the breech very carefully. Don't hit its nose against anything, you know."

Oh, God, it was terrible. So I asked them if they had any dummy shells. I asked the gunner's mate if he had any dummy shells. And he said, "Yeah, I got some dummy shells."

And so I had all the gun crews of this particular type of gun in the main battery around and line up in a ring on the foredeck. And I took one of these dummy shells and I handed it to them and told them to play catch with it. It was the same size and weight, as everything. It was just what was used in order to demonstrate or drill-load something. And of course, they were very happy with that. And they'd catch back and forth and kicked it around, and they got so they were – they'd throw it so it was spinning to one another and toss it back and forth across about five, ten feet of deck, you see, to one another. They were happy with this dummy shell. Of course, not live, no fuses in it, no powder, nothing.

And they kept doing this and doing this, and I had them do it for two or three days, if I remember rightly or maybe a day or two. And I saw they were at it one morning and they were having a fine time playing catch. So I went down, opened up the magazine, had the gunner's mate hand me a real brass case, fuse-loaded, nose-fuse-set piece of artillery.

And I said, "Here you go!"

And the first guy in the line – they were looking at me sort of like snakes – you know, like birds who'd just sighted a snake or something, you know. And I took the first shell and I said, "Here you go." And I just threw it to him across the open deck, you know?

The guy caught it. "God! *Theept-eept-eept.*"

Three days, they were throwing that live shell with a set nose-fuse fifteen feet across the deck to one another, playing catch with the thing. Some ordnance officers came down from ordnance and saw this ship lying there alongside of the pier, and its gun crew was playing catch with a live shell, and he went straight up and a mile south.

He had no authority over us. He pointed out to us though, if anybody had dropped it, it probably would have been the end of the USS *Washington* which was lying alongside of us. And I said I didn't like battleships anyway. [laughter] But he totally was overlooking some of the principles with which we are now totally familiar: that a person has to become familiarized with a dangerous object before he can use it easily and well and not have accidents with it.

The way you can have accidents with a dangerous object is to *know* it is dangerous and not know there is any way to handle it. And if you know a dangerous object is dangerous, you can always have accidents with it.

Now, the actions of an auditor are given publicity on this particular basis: because people are generally very nervous about auditing and very nervous about looking into people's human minds, and because "everybody knows" you mustn't have anything to do with a human mind – oh, "everybody knows" that.

Some of your friends – you say, "I'm studying Scientology."

And they say, "Oh, well, what does that have to do with?"

You say, "Well, that just has to do with the human mind."

And they say, "Oh, well, you shouldn't – I don't know if you ought to tamper with that or not. It's a pretty dangerous situation. You mustn't have anything to do with it."

Well, why don't you point out to them at that time, "Well, you mustn't have anything to do with it? Don't you think they have an awful lot of casualties with this thing they mustn't have anything to do with, you know? Don't you think it's kind of dangerous not to have anything to do with it? Haven't you got one? Have you got one? Well, don't you have anything to do with your own mind?"

Whooo-uh, that would be a staggering thing, but the guy is liable to go into a funk when he realizes that every time he figures out an arithmetical problem, he is tampering with the human mind. [laughter, laughs]

And we're liable to err along this line. We're liable to say – we're liable to say to people, "Oh, well, auditing is very easy. You can't make any mistakes. There's no way to make a mistake. There is nothing you can do wrong and you just sit there, and you go through a certain – there's nothing to it. You actually can't do any damage." And there is a tendency on our parts and on the part of Instructors and so forth – in order to give students confidence – to say that you can't really do anything very damaging or very wrong.

There's a tendency on our parts to do that. And that is in the effort of restimulating their courage because, well, students in an Academy and that sort of thing, are awfully nervy characters. They sit there and they pick up the E-Meter and wonder if they're handling a thirty-megatron hydrogen bomb, you'd think, to look at them. They can't even look at the thing. The needle wobbles and they don't even know what it's all about. They think it's a dangerous weapon.

So we say, "Well, it's not dangerous and there's nothing you can do to hurt anybody, and so on and so on."

Well, we've actually leaned too far in the other direction. All this attitude was possibly perfectly justified in 1956 when we were running a tremendous number of concepts, and sort of Havingness Processes and SCS and things like that, all of which are perfectly valid. (Add to your list of processes early in the lecture: objective, physical-universe processes as a safe series.)

But all of these things are valid. And they – you don't get into danger with them and they don't blow anybody's head off. But look, for years and years and years now, Ronnie has been at work. And I've been trying to get the hydraulic jacks underneath of the basic core of human aberration to a level that any case – without paying much attention to the auditor – that any case could be resolved fairly easily, within some finite period of time. Well, they're resolving Clears now and some of the places are making Clears, and so on. We're resolving Clears maybe, in something on the order of two, three hundred hours, some top figure. It's a finite period of time. Last Clear made in Australia was 118 hours. This is finite time, you see?

Yes, but what have we paid with? With what coin have we paid for the speedup? *Ha-ha-ha-ha!* We have paid for it with stripping the safety precautions off, because now we *have* to run things that, run wrong, wouldn't spin somebody in, but it'd certainly make a pc unhappy

as hell. It'd certainly mess things up. It won't do any permanent or lasting damage, but it'll certainly make somebody awful sad. And it'll certainly make them *very* uncomfortable.

And done wrong – we have moved into a strata of processing – done wrong – that will make somebody awful miserable, because you've got hydraulic jacks. And all you have to do, you see, is you just take another little notch on one of these jacks and it puts thirty tons of pressure against this particular engram. And the pc says, "Well, it isn't resolving." And all you've got to do is lean over and put another notch on the thing and put another thirty tons of pressure – another inch, you see? And the pc still says, "Well, it isn't resolving." And you're dealing with technology that it is very easy just to pick your finger up and just put that jack over another inch. It's the wrong object you got the jack leaning against. Wrong target.

And your pc, of course, gets very uncomfortable and blows session, gets very upset with you and gets extremely disturbed, and he acts like a nut. And part of his shame is the fact that he doesn't know how come he is acting like a nut. This is a mystery to him, don't you see?

You've sat there being nice and sweet and kind, and there's – you're not doing anything wrong. Obviously, you're sitting there to help him and all of a sudden he feels like hell. Well, what is this? You didn't do it, so he feels guilty every time he gets upset and you have a much harder time with it. And he's upset of course, because something has gone awry in his bank – don't you see – that a gross error has to be entered in.

Don't think that it's a minor error the auditor would be making, you know, like running a command one time too many. No, it'd have to be the wrong terminal and the wrong command, run on top of a present time problem and an ARC break. But the auditor, because of the processes he is handling and so forth, actually can, in spite of all this, *hold* a pc in-session and throw that hydraulic jack an additional notch. And of course, that's the one notch it shouldn't have been thrown, because the whole thing is awry anyhow. You see what I mean? I mean, you're dealing with high horsepower, high – highly skilled technology. And if the technology is wrong or if you do some of the most obvious wrongnesses that can be done, you're going to get a repercussion. And the repercussion is considerable. I don't wish to minimize it, so I'm just leveling with you. Do you see?

So on the one side, we could say, "Oh, auditing is easy and anybody could audit, and there's nothing you could do to hurt anybody's human mind, and so forth." Well, it's true. There's nothing we can do to permanently injure or damage somebody's mind, but oh brother, could you give somebody a very nasty cold, for instance. Could you give him an awful bad bellyache, could you do a lot of other things, don't you see, that would be damnably uncomfortable. They'd all fade out in three days or ten days or a couple of weeks, or something like that. But it wouldn't be good.

Now, there's no sense in saying, "Well, you can't do anything. You can't hurt anybody and *nothing* will ever upset the pc, and so forth." That's an extreme and it's a dangerous extreme because it's not, strictly speaking, true.

And on the other hand, on the other hand over here, we say, "Oh well, auditing the mind is very dangerous and there is no way possibly that you could really tamper with somebody's mind. It ought to be done by an expert. Call an electrician," or something like this, the way the psychiatrists are doing these days. And you get over to this and you can say, "Well,

it's very dangerous and you shouldn't have anything to do with it at all," you see? Between these two extremes, there is the sensible level of: "Yes, there are tremendous numbers of things you can do with the human mind, if you don't make *gross* errors."

Now, the errors that you can make that will be damaging errors to the human mind are, all of them, under the heading of gross errors. They are *glaringly* large. They are huge. They loom up out of the rundown like Marble Arch up in Hyde Park. I mean, they're big. You run into that with a car and you'd know it was there. And if you've got the idea that an auditing error is the size of a twig that just fell off a tree on Rotten Row, *tsk*, change your mind, you see? You go over that with a car wheel, it just goes *flick* or something like that. You hardly know it's there, and so on.

Auditing errors are not of that order of magnitude. The auditing error, to produce a bad result on the pc, has to be *absolutely huge!* And you, in running auditors or directing an HGC or doing something in this particular zone or area, do a good job only when you get your eye off the twigs and start looking at the marble arches that have gotten across the road.

You know that that's quite interesting? It's quite an interesting fact, that people directing auditing and supervising auditing, when they get auditing reports and see that the case is not running well, or something like that, always look at twigs. Yeah, the little tiny things, and they say, "Well, are you very sure that you're giving him an acknowledgment every time? You know? Are you very sure you're acknowledging well? How is your TR 0 as you're auditing him?" You know? Little, little things.

Of course, the auditor's TR 0 has to be good, but an auditor's TR 0 can be totally out and the case will still make gains. It's fact! And the acknowledgments can be nonextant. You can say, if you're running a goals terminal or something like that, you're running some level, "Well, how have you helped a mugwump?" "How have you helped a mugwump?" and "How has a mugwump helped you?" "How have you helped a mugwump?" "How has a mugwump helped you?" The preclear probably wouldn't notice from one second to the next, whether you acknowledged him or not. Do you realize that? He's just so interested in the thing. He follows the auditing command and so on. He doesn't notice it.

On the other hand, he gets so interiorized into high-power techniques that you acknowledge him perfectly, your TR 0 is perfectly and everything is perfect, and he never notices that either. You get the idea?

So these are tiny. These are tiny. You've got to know your TRs to be a good auditor and the combined effect of all TRs out can be rather interesting. But let's not, when we say something is happening with this case that is wrong, go into these tiny things. And do you know that you will most often avoid the gross errors, you know? And it's the gross error... Now, what's a gross error?

Well, was the auditor there for the session? Now, that would be a gross auditing error, don't you see? And you know, in directing auditors, you almost never ask these burning questions: "Did you have your E-Meter turned on? Does it work? Have you gone into any screaming fits at the pc?" These are all *gross* auditing errors, you see?

"Now, when you clear the rudiments, do you clear the rudiments?" Gross error is: "Do you ever look at the needle while you're clearing rudiments?" That's a gross auditing error of course, how the devil can you audit and find out anything about the pc if you're not looking at the meter? And you would be amazed how often this *is* the auditing error which causes the miss. The auditor under training is doing everything but looking at the meter. He asks the question and then looks at the meter. The meter's reaction takes place in a tenth of a second and he takes a half a second to look from the question to the meter. So he misses all reactions. And do you know we've had that going on right here? That comes under the heading of a gross auditing error. It's just *not doing auditing*.

All right. Now, you read along and this auditing report is just fine and everything seems to be okay about the thing, and you just can't understand why this pc isn't making any advances and you say, "Well, now, are your rudiments all in?"

"Oh, yes, rudiments are all in. Yeah."

"Well, is – you're running the goals terminal on the run? You're not overrunning the assessment? Still getting tone arm action?"

"Oh, yes, getting tone arm action."

You check it all out. Everything is perfectly beautiful, and you're running in some Po-dunk, someplace, where you've got auditors there, you know, that haven't been very well trained, or something like that on the line. Whole case becomes a total mystery, and you say, "Well, gee, we must have some wrong combination or the technology is wrong," and we start adjusting the little things, and we say that the auditor's TR 0 has got to be improved, and there must be a different command used here, and there must be a this, and there must be a that, and we fix it all up and we get a whole bunch of extraordinary solutions.

Truth of the matter is, if we went back and checked it up from beginning to end or if we had a motion picture of the session, we'd find out that the session went along just fine, except right in the middle – because after the break every day and after they go back into session every day, the auditor gives the pc a total spinal adjustment! [laughter]

Now, you think I'm kidding, but this kind of thing – this kind of thing is the usual – the usual gross auditing error. It belongs in that category, don't you see?

All right. Gross auditing error: You could actually audit a pc on the technology you have today with somewhat of a present time problem. You could get him through one session, and he has a bit of a present time problem, and just kind of bully it through and somehow or another arrive at the other end, and he'd get a little bit of gain. It'd be almost impossible to miss. But you couldn't do it with all rudiments out. Or not running any rudiments at all. You say to the auditor – it's this pumpkin center that you're running and you say to him, "Well, now, are you sure you got your rudiments in?"

"Oh, yes, sir. I got my rudiments in. They're all in," and so on.

And then a brilliant stroke of genius comes to you and you say, "Well, when you're putting the rudiments in, do you put the pc on the E-Meter?"

He says, "Oh, no. Never."

"Well, how do you know if the rudiments are in?"

"Well, the pc tells me so."

"Well, how does the pc tell you so?"

"Well, I ask him, 'Are all your rudiments in?'" [laughter]

Now, this sounds utterly, fabulously idiotic to you. But do you know that auditing errors of this magnitude exist? And when you're supervising a large number of auditors and so on, you will always have some people who are just out of the Academy, who are pretty green, that sort of thing, and you can just beat your brains to pieces trying to figure out why the technology isn't working. The technology always works. But is it being applied?

And the gross auditing error comes in the application of the technology. And that's the zone you should look in, in order to correct a case.

Now, we can add to these gross auditing errors, leaving a withhold in restimulation. Because then, I assure you, the case is not going to make any progress.

We right now have a course running someplace in the world, and in weeks of run they have only found, in a number of students, a goal or two. And those they have found a goal or two on early, they found no terminals for. You'll find this quite common in various places, by the way.

A whole group can go sailing along and getting no terminals and no goals and no nothing and so forth; we were doing it right here, till I finally just got right down and figured out what the devil this was all about. And I found out the rudiments were just wildly out and the auditors were actually in a games condition on the subject of goals. You know? I mean, just frankly that: they were in a games condition. They were so ARC broke on their own goals, they were damned if they were going to let anybody else have any goals. I think that was about the way it added up – something of that sort. So, by straightening the rudiments out, and raising the magnitude of importance of keeping rudiments in, why, what are we running into now?

Well, I was just asking a question. There's a student been here for about two weeks and a little bit – two weeks and two days – and we don't have his goal and terminal. I'm starting to ask questions. What is happening? Because this is not usual now.

You see? We've learned to keep our rudiments in before we do goals and terminal assessments and having learned that, why, we find our goals and terminals, and that's about all there is to it. That was the gross error: It was just not having any rudiments in.

It wasn't that we needed new trick methods of finding goals and terminals, we just had to have somebody sit there and actually ask for the goals and ask for the terminals, and not invalidate any of them and not add a bunch of things to the nonsense that was going on. Keep the rudiments in; we found goals and terminals just bangity-bang! It's very easy to do. And some of you right here were – have experienced that particular gruesome experience. And that was gruesome, wasn't it?

You see, the light and dark of the situation was too fantastic for words. The first course I taught, immediately ahead of this course, I found all the goals and terms, I think they were all found the first few days, weren't they?

Female voice: Yes, it wasn't very long. We did Pre-session 38 first and then ...

We did Pre-session 38 and shook down a lot of – 37 and 38, wasn't it?

Female voice: Thirty-seven and 38, too.

Yeah, and we'd had them – we had their PTPs and their withholds all off – and *bang!* Assessment: There was just nothing to it, just fell in your lap. Nothing to it.

Well, now, this unit, at great distance from here, happens to be running into the same difficulties right this minute. And I have sent over cables about "Get your rudiments in," see? "Get your rudiments in. Get your rudiments in." And I don't know whether this will be heard or not, because this has to amount to looking at the E-Meter. And I've just had a datum, from that particular unit, that some of the students on that particular course can be forced to stand and look at an E-Meter which is reacting and be asked what the reaction was, and they can't tell you that the needle moved.

Well, we look for a gross error, so I tell them, "Get the rudiments in, get the rudiments in, get the rudiments in." I probably ought to be saying, "Show them an E-Meter and find out for them where the tone arm is. Show them which is the knob or black object, that wiggles." We'll find out it's some gross auditing error, you see, of that magnitude.

It always defies your imagination when you run into these gross errors, and running a great many people, a great many auditing teams or a great many staff auditors, or something like that, all – it's a great many students – it all boils down to the same thing: You're just sure that you have a dog case that has avoided technology, and then you try to do *everything* under the sun, moon and stars you can with technology, in order to straighten out this case. And you find out the case hasn't advanced for some time, because "Well, you see, actually we're supposed to look at tapes at four o'clock and the auditing session is also at four o'clock, so we, of course, have been skipping the auditing session."

The case wasn't being audited. I mean, this sounds idiotic, but that is how idiotic and that is how gross most of these errors are.

"Oh, yes, I always get the rudiments in on the pc. Yes, I always get the rudiments in on the pc. That's very good. I make sure that the needle is moving when he says he has withholds. When he has no withholds, if the needle moves, then I know I can pass on to the next rudiment."

I know, they're all so stupid and all so incredible that they get missed. And you are very often persuaded into being very inventive about technology. This is – even I have been. On the basis of persuading some – of being persuaded that you just – you've got to think of some new solution, that's all, because this case just isn't moving, you know? And then we find out that, well, he doesn't get audited, either. Tapes are at four o'clock, and the case is supposed to be audited at four o'clock, so he just doesn't audit the case, but hasn't really had

nerve to tell you. Or something *wild* like this, you know? And it comes down to something fundamental.

The common denominator of all of this is *no auditing done*. It'll be some degree of that, and I wanted to give you the common denominator of it. It's some degree of no auditing done: Whether they just – the auditor never reports to the auditing session at all or after he gets to the auditing session, omits some large section of auditing, oh, doesn't run the goals terminal of the pc; decides actually that he's got to get Mother out of the way first, and he just goes on for ages auditing Mother. Mother, Mother, and we audit more Mother and supposed to be auditing "a tinker."

And you'll get errors of this character and I hate to say it, because staff auditors are actually terrific. I have lots of confidence in staff auditors. I've never had staff auditors balk at doing anything; I've never had them do anything but – when they followed through results – just try their level best to deliver. Terrific willingness. Main failure has been – is me telling them, comprehensibly enough, what I wanted done, so that it could be understood.

I consider that any main failure, because the willingness – there's never been any want of that. So therefore we come down to a simplicity, and they can do this and everybody goes off at a smart trot, and everything is working along fine this way.

But I've seen some of the wildest miscomprehensions of a relayed communication, such as this: You run the level – this actually happened – you run the level until the tone arm gets moving and then reassess for the next level. And that was the way the auditing direction was interpreted. You know, you run a level long enough to get the tone arm moving well, and then you assess for the next level of the Prehav Scale, and you run it.

Man! I can tell you that if you did that for about four or five levels, the whole case would come down to a slow jam and the pc would feel like he was going crazy! It'd take him about ten, twelve days to get over the idea, too. He'd just feel like he was going crazy!

If you want to audit a pc into a feeling that they're nuts, don't do a terminals run on his goals terminal, but just take some kind of a general Routine 2 run and assess the pc – very carefully assess him – and find out a real live level, a good level. Find his level real good and then audit it and audit it until you get the tone arm moving good, see? And then just skip it. And then do another assessment – and ignore the fact that that one is still going – and pick up some other level of the Prehav Scale, and then run it – don't get rudiments in – [laughter] and run it, run it, and run it hard and run it hard and run it hard and run it hard, and all of a sudden the needle will freeze up and the tone arm will freeze up or something.

Well, insist that that isn't so good, you see? That isn't so good that it did that; run it a little bit longer. And don't get in any rudiments – no need of end rudiments, either.

Now on the next line, assess again, get some other level of the Prehav Scale, and just run that one till you finally get the needle broken loose – just get it broken loose. And then reassess again, and your pc, about this time, will go "*Hmmrh!* What's happening? Everything is going green! I have this horrible sensation that this ear keeps tying a bowline with this ear! Ha! I knew I shouldn't have drunk the coffee." [laughter]

He'll actually have a sensation of going mad. He won't go mad! A few days later it'll drift out and he will merely spit every time he sees you. [laughs]

But that actually – that actually is the direct results of not flattening levels of the Prehav Scale. But that's a pretty gross auditing error: Every time you get the needle moving, every time you get the tone arm moving well, reassess and get another level; and when you get the tone arm moving well, reassess and get another level. Never flatten anything. And on the Prehav Scale, of course, a person feels like he's going mad if you do that, because you're using one of the most powerful set of boosters you can. You talk about thirty-ton hydraulic jacks! The commands can't help but move his mind around. You know, he could sit there and resist even doing the command and suddenly he realizes, well, he does it, you see, and *Rrrrr!* *Rrrrrrr!* It's running a ship on a rocky ocean, believe me.

Do you see what could happen? Because the technology is quite adequate to really pushing the thing down the line, you see? He will do it, willy-nilly and he goes far in, much further in than you would ever dream that anybody could be pushed.

It'll all drift off in three to ten days and he will feel fine, whether he gets any auditing or not. But that's not the point. You've wrecked a pc and you may have wrecked a goals-terminal line. And believe it or not, this actually occurred in a Central Organization. This actually occurred.

Yeah, the interpretation of my request was – wasn't any backwards reason – is as soon as you get some motion in the tone arm, you reassess and do a new level.

All right. *Gross auditing errors* is what you are dealing with here. That is a far, wide departure. Now, technically, there aren't too many of these things. One would be, right now, to run any terminal but the goals-have terminal. We would consider that a very gross auditing error, because it would really make a mess out of things.

Leading that, in term of violence or even worse than that, is leaving a withhold question unflat. That would be a gross auditing error. We have to move it up to there, because it produces a gross mess when it is done.

Doing a wrong assessment or using an assessment that was done carelessly, indifferently or incorrectly and not getting it checked: That would be a gross auditing error. Getting or using an assessment that was briefly and carelessly done, or even lengthily and carelessly done. But use an assessment that you just aren't sure of: It's a gross auditing error.

Failing to continue to security check a pc as his case advances, because again this is quite case damaging and is a gross auditing error.

You haven't heard that one for some time, have you? But nevertheless, it's very much present right now. Do you realize the faster the case gains, the more withholds are going to come to view? And if there's no Security Check to pull them off, your case can ball up in a knot quick as scat. So, the auditor who is running the line should think of his withhold point of the end and beginning rudiments – and the withhold should be left into the end rudiment, also. Just add another one in there. You know, add a "Have you told me any half-truths, untruths?" and so forth. And also add withholds in, because your technology is going too fast, it gives you another crack. So you got an additional one, additional crack at it.

I haven't given you a new write-down of this, because I'm still redoing the end rudiments. You'll see it shortly. There are two or three things that I'm questioning and don't know quite what to do with yet, but I'll know pretty well, very shortly. That's why I haven't issued you a new slip on it.

And the auditor who is running a run on a goals terminal – having found it and he's running a run on it – and he doesn't pay a considerable amount of attention to withholds in beginning and end rudiments, is actually guilty of a gross auditing error, because the withholds are going to appear by the reason of the case is making advance, and the case will advance just to the degree that the withholds are off of it.

And he'd say, "Well, I got all the withholds off at the beginning of the week, and the – it was just clean as a wolf's tooth. And so the rudiments are in, so I don't have to pay very much attention to withholds on this particular case just now." And then we had two days of marvelous and wonderful gain and everything was just going along beautifully, so of course we're going to have a third day, aren't we? Ah, that's an unjustified assumption, because there is this about withholds: The withhold which is not pulled – which is restimulated but not pulled – can raise hell.

That's "missing a Security Check question"; can just raise the dickens with a case. And a case advance is also marked by an advance in responsibility, and being marked by an advance in responsibility, brings to view more overts than were formerly available to a Security Check.

That is a test: Is a case advancing? If a case is advancing it develops more withholds; more withholds come into view if a case is advancing.

Now, I'll give you an example of how a case is not advancing. We've done a Security Check, we've cleaned the rudiments, we ask a sort of a Pre-session 38-type of question in the rudiments, and "What question shouldn't I ask you?" And we've done a good job and we've got the rudiments all clean, and he's just had a Form 3 and everything of this sort. We already have his goals terminal; we go on a goals-terminal run. And we run it Tuesday, and we run it Wednesday, and we run it Thursday. We pay no more attention to withholds, see, and we – Thursday and Thurs- what the hell happened? Everything is stuck, and so on. The pc is very unhappy and appears rather blowy. And Friday ... oh, well, it's an ARC breaky session; it's all very upset.

Well, what could possibly be wrong with the case? Well, the case advanced – that's what's wrong with the case – and if a case advances it develops withholds.

Now, this is how it should run, according to some auditors. Let's look at this one: Now, you get all the withholds off, and you get it all straightened out, and you run him Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. And you do another Security Check and you're just very careful of withholds on Friday, and you make sure they're all polished up and of the end rudiments, and so on, and so forth. And you don't find any more. There are no more withholds than there were on Monday.

And you say, "Boy, I'm sure doing a good, clean job of auditing." *With absolutely no advance of any kind whatsoever.* It's almost unthinkable you could do that these days, but it theoretically could happen.

And if you got no gain on the case of any kind whatsoever, it will occur then, that the case will not raise in responsibility of any kind whatsoever. So it will occur, then, that at the end of a considerable period of auditing, the person will not have remembered any new withholds of any kind whatsoever, because no raise in responsibility, no additional or new withholds that he hadn't remembered before. See?

Gross auditing error not to keep the withholds off a case while you're running it. It's one thing that can really stall it down to a walk. It can just go to a sudden *thud* and so on.

Withholds, then, make a good test of case advance. Actually, you could take a short Security Check and shake a case down at an end of a short period of auditing, and find out whether or not the case was winning. You do the short Security Check at the beginning, then you audit him for a little while, and do the same exact Security Check at the end, and he has remembered nothing new – no advance in case. Much more reliable than a profile. A profile is reliable, too, but it'd tell you directly and immediately.

Yeah, because in the first place, remember that withholds are not relegated to current lifetime only. What happens if you start opening up whole track? Don't you think anybody has got any withholds on the whole track? You mean they – you mean they lived all these lifetimes right up to this lifetime, and so forth, and they never had any withholds in those lifetimes? They just died by natural acts and causes, you see, and everything would go along. But this lifetime is different; in this lifetime they have withholds.

Well, you start opening up a track and you, frankly, will see it in running this Groups Terminal Process. The individual all of a sudden realize he has a withhold from a certain particular group. *Ughh!* He didn't tell them that!

And then it finally occurs to him, at the long end of a run, or something: "You know, I'm not in that group anymore? And this amounts to the fact that I am actually withholding my body and my beingness from that particular group. Yes! I have a withhold on that group."

He'll recognize with great clarity that he isn't in the group and therefore is withholding himself from the group. He recognizes things like this, and they didn't occur to him earlier.

"Oh yes, well, there was the Marcab government, and there it was, and still there! Yeah, I was part of it once and it's still there. No, I haven't anything on them. No withhold. No. There isn't anything I've done they wouldn't like. It's funny, you are asking me that, because, actually I've never done anything, you know, as far as they didn't like. I never have, never have. They get along fine, I got along fine with them, and there's just nothing, you know; and it's all kind of imaginary anyway and hasn't anything to do with me."

And after you've run the process for a while, why, you come back across the same thing, and he says, "Well, the Marcab government is – *eeulpt!*"

And you say, "What's that?"

And he, "*Ugh!* Well, the last time I was there they had a warrant for my arrest. Ha-ha-ha, ha-ha! I'm not about to go back *there!*"

And every time, of course, you run across one of these "I am not about to go back there. I am not going to there anymore. No, I do not want to be a member of that group! *No-o-o-o!* What? Become a member of that church? Oh, no! Under no circumstances! Well, that's silly! Stupid! I mean, I don't want anything to do with them, you know, I mean, *ruhh!*" and so on. "Of course, I'm totally unemotional about it."

"Have withholds from the subject?"

"Oh, no, I don't have any withholds! What made you ask as ... ? oh, wait a minute. Ha-ha-ha-ha! We had a treasurer once that robbed the exchequer and took all the cash that was in their account. I know that happened and the group was pretty mad about that."

And then we go through and we mix up – and a few questions later, maybe the next auditing session, all of a sudden the pc goes back across this church group, and he says in a little small voice, "You remember my telling you about the treasurer that embezzled all the money? Ha-ha-ha. That was me!" [laughs]

Well, what's the phenomenon? It isn't that he didn't *recall* it. It's that it was below his level of responsibility. And if his responsibility increases, he eventually remembers more clearly what the situation was and takes responsibility for his own overt.

So actually, the number of overts and withholds that show up newly on a case haven't very much to do with what a criminal the person has been. Everybody has plenty of withholds. You can just assume that – everybody has got plenty of withholds.

The question is, how many are available at any given instant? How many can be pulled or how many are they willing to talk about at any given instant? Well, it's a direct coordination with the amount of responsibility the case has.

Now I'll give you a brand-new way of thinking about this: Everybody has *a* number of withholds. Let's just say everybody has *a* number of withholds. This would be pretty close to a fact, you see? It's a finite number of withholds – 800 billion or something – but it'd be the same for every person. People aren't necessarily different from one to the next. But that number could be considered more or less constant, person to person, pre-auditing – before they're audited.

All right. Now, what is different? What is different is the degree of responsibility the individual can take for his withholds. So that you have a criminal sitting there. And he says, "Yeah, I robbed, I – and I did this and I did that, and I did the other thing, and I did.... Oh, yeah, yeah, I murdered babies and so on. And I just killed my wife and children one time and left home," and so on. There's not even a knock on the E-Meter.

Well, his irresponsibility is down to such a level that they're not even withholds. All right, he gets some auditing progress, and he finds out that out of this whole potpourri of crime, one time he was standing outside of a bank and he turned the dead guard over with his foot. And that's an overt. That's a real withhold. And he hadn't remembered that, and now he's

telling you. And he sort of feels a little bit bad about it, and he's happy to get it off of his chest.

Then we go on, a little bit more auditing and we got – a session or two later – and other things are coming and going, and so forth. And he tells you, "Well, *wheegh*, I just realized I'm wanted in Chicago," even though that was two lifetimes ago. "Remember that bank guard I said I turned over with my foot? Actually, I shot him."

You say, "All right."

Few sessions later, you're running across things, and so on, and you're getting off withholds and so forth and that's fine. And the criminal comes back across this point and he says, "You know that bank guard I told you I shot? Well, the truth of the matter is, I shot him when his hands were up and his back was turned to me. And I read later in the papers that he was the sole support of his wife and children and two aged parents."

And you say, "Well, all right. Good. All right." And he's glad to get that off of his chest.

And then you audit him a while and he comes back across this thing later and he happens to be clicking down the line on his various overts and so forth. And he says, "You know that – that bank I was – told you I robbed in Chicago. And I was just a hood and I was just nobody, and so forth. Actually, I was the leader of the gang. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Hate to have to confess this, but I was, and we dealt exclusively in bank robberies, and we brought about the panic of 1929. Yes. Ah-ha. I hate to have to tell you about that. There – there it is. There it is, you see?"

You get the idea? Perfect pattern of it was pulled by a fellow one time – I mean, a pc, a very famous guy. I won't particularly expose parts of his case, but he said, "We had a plan one time. And this plan... Well," he said, "it was just a bunch of us fellows, and we put some people in ice cubes, and we got rid of them – and, you know, heh-heh, just – just nothing. Didn't have anything to do with thinking of anything. Nothing much going on, so we just thought this'd be a good thing, and it was a gay thing to do. And we – later on, I realize it was bad, now, but we just froze them up in some ice cubes and dumped them in an ocean on another planet, and that's all there is to it."

Well, on a little further questioning, why, it turns out that well, actually there was some plan in it; there was some reason they did it, and so forth, and it went on on this kind of a stupid gradient, and so forth. And we find out that we're talking to the fellow who thought up *the* plan, and executed *the* plan, and directed *the* plan that had to do with the implantations of all planets in this corner of the universe.

That was just too much overt, don't you see? It starts out with the basis, "Well, a bunch of us got together and some people weren't behaving very well, and just some crummy little people, didn't amount to anything very much, you know? And we just put them in some freezer compartments, and we took them over and dumped them in an ocean. Ha-ha-ha! Funny joke, wasn't it?"

You get the difference of magnitude in how these things walk up. Of course you don't know what series of withholds are going to develop into big ones, and what will nearly remain little withholds.

But the only thing dangerous about it is not clearing the question that you come to as you go across it. So it amounts to one of the greater auditing goofs, and it is a goof of magnitude. The individual that you let sit there and, "natter, natter, natter, natter, natter," you're actually ruining his case, because you're letting him sit there and lessen the overt, lessen the overt, lessen the overt, lessen the overt. And you should realize what he's trying to do. He's trying to tell you, "I have a withhold!"

And you never say, "Yes, yes, but what did you do of that type and kind that would make you feel that way, yourself?"

And the individual says, "Nothing!" and the needle falls off the pin. And then you find out, "Well, yes, as a matter of fact..." And it is quite something else, the time you do this. And all of a sudden it clears! And the case starts going Clear.

But by finding things which other people have done on the pc, you see, getting the motivators, and finding that the pc's – other things, and so forth – you worsen a case.

The only thing you ever want is what the pc *does*, and what the pc *did*.

But it comes under one of the headings of one of the finer crimes, to leave a Sec Check question unflat. It can do more damage per case, per question, than any other single action; obviously, from the case histories which I have immediately and directly at hand.

So take it to heart, that's something you should never do. Make sure that it's flat before you leave it. And then don't think that a little later – when the person has had a lot more auditing – that the question, if found unflat now, was left unflat at the time it was hit – it wasn't. This is a whole new series of withholds coming up under the heading of the same question, and you differentiate that particular difference.

Okay?

Audience Voices: Yes. Mm-hm.

Well, will that do you any good in your auditing?

Audience Voices: Yes, sir!

All right. Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 NOVEMBER 1974

Remimeo
Ex Dn Spelsts
Class IVs
Qual
HCO Dept 3

ROCK SLAMS AND ROCK SLAMMERS

A lot of controversy has shown up this year on the subject of R/Ses and R/Sers. I thought I'd better write an issue on the subject to clarify it. The research on this was actually done years ago.

R/SES

An R/S or Rock Slam is defined as a crazy irregular slashing motion of the needle. It can be as narrow as one inch or more than a full dial in width, but it's crazy! It slams back and forth. It is actually quite startling to see one. **It is very different from other meter phenomena.**

Recently Auditors arriving on Flag were found not to know what an R/S was but were calling Dirty Needles, Dirty Reads, Rocket Reads, even Ticks as R/Ses. That comes from never having been trained on what an R/S is and never having seen one. **R/Ses are unique in appearance.**

Actually this is quite a serious matter because pcs get labelled as R/Sers and get run on Evil Purposes connected with this "R/S" that isn't one. You can really foul up a pc that way, believe me.

A real R/S also has a crazy meter. It doesn't read then it does. This happens because the meter reads just below a pc's reality. If the pc has no reality on the subject, then the meter won't read.

So you get a faulty meter. It doesn't read on what it should, then it reads, then it doesn't.

ROCK SLAMMERS

In a group of 400, the actual percentage of R/Sers is low. It's about 8 in 400, or 2-2¹/₂%. Those figures should seem familiar. They are the same percentage for SPs. And that gives you a clue to the identification of an R/Ser.

Where requirements for Scn or SO Orgs have been established for R/Ses they apply to the 2-2¹/₂% of real R/Sers as these are also considered security risks for staff purposes.

These people can of course be salvaged as pcs using Expanded Dianetics. Letting them on staff could be disastrous, however.

CHECKLIST

To assist you in the identification of R/Sers I have done a complete checklist of characteristics and their references.

This checklist is to be used whenever a C/S is called upon to inspect a folder to determine whether a person is an R/Ser.

1. The R/Ses reported are actual R/Ses and not some other read or broken meter leads, a dusty or worn TA or Trim “pot”, or cans in contact with metal such as rings, bracelets, etc.

Ref: *E-Meter Essentials*; *The Book of E-Meter Drills*; *The Book Introducing the E-Meter*; HCO B 8 Nov 62, “Somatics – How to Tell Terminals and Opposition Terminals”, pp. 2 & 4; HCO B 6 Dec 62, “R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX”; BTB 14 Jan 63, “Rings Causing ‘Rock Slams’”; HCO B False TA Series 24 Oct 71, 12 Nov 71R, 15 Feb 72, 18 Feb 72, 29 Feb 72R, 23 Nov 73.

2. R/Ses have to do with Scientology or one or more areas of the old Scientology List One found in *The Book of E-Meter Drills*.

Ref: *The Book of E-Meter Drills*; HCO B 5 Dec 62, “2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 and Routine 2-10 Modern Assessment”; HCO B 23 Nov 62, “Urgent – Routine Two-Twelve”; HCO B 12 Sept 62, “Security Checks Again”.

3. Pc is Slow or No Case Gain. Also is in a chronically nattery or critical state.

Ref: HCO B 23 Nov 62, “Routine Two-Twelve”; HCO B 5 Dec 62, “2-12, 3GAXX, 3-21 and Routine 2-10 Modern Assessment”; HCO B 6 Dec 62, “R2-10, R2-12, 3GAXX”; HCO B 28 Nov 70, C/S Series 22, “Psychosis”; BPL 31 May 71RA, PTS/SP Checksheet and mat’ls.

4. Pc chronically ill or who acts most “PTS”. This can be suppressed and hidden from view, however.

Ref: HCOPL 15 Nov 70R, “HCO and Confessionals”; HCOB 28 Nov 70, C/S Series 22, “Psychosis”; PTS/SP Pack.

5. Pc’s product is consistently an overt act and his activities destructive to others.

Ref: HCOPL 14 Nov 70, Org Series 14, “The Product as an Overt Act”; PTS/SP Pack; *HCO Manual of Justice*.

6. Pc’s behavior or condition or OCA classifies as psychotic.

Ref: HCO B Ex Dn Series and tapes; HCO B 28 Nov 70.

Where the answers to this checklist are yes you have an R/Ser. HCO handles and Qual programs them for rehabilitation.

PCS WHO R/S

Pcs who R/S are given Ex Dn. This does not change even though the pc is not an R/Ser. See HCO B C/S Series 93.

Where a pc R/Ses he will have Evil Purposes and be on a succumb as a result. R/Ses indicate an area of psychosis which will ruin the pc's life if allowed to go unhandled.

SUMMARY

This HCO B in no way changes Ex Dn as a requirement for R/Ses or makes it ok not to handle them.

Staff concerned must be able to identify an R/Ser which is different from someone with an R/S.

I thought you should have this data and hope it clears up any remaining confusion in the area.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:nt.rd

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 1 MARCH 1977
Issue II

Remimeo
Confessional Auditors
Class IV
SHSBC

CONFESSSIONAL FORMS

Never subtract anything from a Confessional.

The best method is to write out a predetermined series of questions, as an additional thing, which is for that person particularly. You figure out about what their relationship to life has been, and then you write a little special series of questions.

It's always possible to write up an additional list. Don't make that the only Confessional form. Give that along with a standard Confessional.

You get the idea of what kind of life your preclear has been leading, what his professional and domestic zones are, and you adapt Confessional questions to that and you add it to standard forms.

Compiled from LRH Taped Lecture
"Teaching the Field Sec Checks,"
SHSBC 6109C26 SH Spec 58

Approved by
L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
Assisted by
Training & Services Aide

LRH:JG:lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 7 MAY 1977

Remimeo

LONG DURATION SEC CHECKING

It has been found on some cases which did not immediately R/S, even though their crimes and past would seem to indicate they should have R/Ses, that when Sec Checking was carried on for several sessions, one each on several consecutive days, R/Ses then began to show up. In two cases, List One R/Ses showed up on persons who had never been noticed as having R/Ses before.

It can then be concluded that R/Sers do not R/S necessarily on casual brief Sec Checks.

Part of this phenomena is that the person quite commonly gives off very shallow overts of the order of "I stole a pen from HASI" or "I thought your TRs were bad and I didn't tell you" and other shallow PT answers to searching Sec Check questions.

This is so much the case that whenever I see shallow wishy-washy "averts" coming off a case day after day, I suspect that sooner or later a good auditor will suddenly find real roaring overts and R/Ses sitting there.

The soft-spoken quiet "inoffensive" person is also a candidate for this sort of disclosure.

Particularly notable is the person who "has never done anything wrong in his whole life and has no overts of any kind."

These are just special cases of the same thing and an auditor should be alert to them.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:cb.dr

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 7 DECEMBER 1976

Remimeo
LRH COMM
HAS
Ethics Officer
Qual SEC
Staff Section Officer
Staff Chaplain
SS and Product Zero
Payroll I/C

LEAVING AND LEAVES

It has occasionally happened in the past that a staff or crew member has used the fact that he or she was leaving an org to spread upset.

It is a common make-wrong in children to threaten to run away. And it is a common action of suppressives to spread upset and dissatisfaction by saying they are leaving.

There are some people who leave wherever they are obsessively and the most casual check reveals they have seldom remained anywhere; committing continual overts, they are routinely running away from any job, any post, any group and from themselves and life.

As the actual reason behind blows is overts and withholds, the excuses for leaving are usually simply justifications and are actually a third party action of associates, usually false reports.

Therefore, informing fellow staff members and others that one is leaving is hereby properly labeled a suppressive act.

Where it is found that this is occurring and if the person concerned does not report it to the proper terminals, HAS and staff chaplain, departure will be followed by a declare.

If one is going to leave an org the proper action is to report it only to the HAS and staff chaplain and not to fellow staff members.

Where a person is secretly planning to leave and making private preparations to do so without informing the proper terminals in an org and does leave (blow) and does not return within a reasonable length of time an automatic declare is to be issued. Should any moneys or organizational property be found to be missing in consequence, action is to be taken on criminal charges.

All persons whose contracts expire without renewal and all persons who wish to leave are to be security checked by an auditor who is qualified in Qual to make prepared lists read.

This will remove the overts and withholds inevitably connected and relieve the person and the org of the usual justifications and false reports.

LEAVES

All persons before going on leave, must be given a security check by an auditor qualified to make prepared lists read. Final pay before departure is to be withheld until this action has been done.

All persons returning from missions or leave must be security checked.

Any staff or crew member falsifying the reason why a leave is needed or requesting a leave when in fact blowing is to be the subject of an automatic declare.

There is no intention of holding onto people who do not want to be where they are.

There is every intention to use our tech to prevent false reports and suppressive actions from occurring, both to the detriment of the person himself and to an organization.

There are enough lies in the world without generating more as to the reasons one is leaving or seeking to use the fact to damage an org or its staff.

The vast majority of Staff want to be there and are **not** leaving and they don't need 3rd partying SPs around. The vast majority are good guys.

L. RON HUBBARD
FOUNDER

for the

BOARDS OF DIRECTORS of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:LRH:nt

Craftsmanship, Fundamentals

A lecture given on 3 May 1962

Well, how are you doing tonight?

Audience: Good.

You're looking better. Perfectly unrecognizable some of you. Marvelous, marvelous. At least 25 new students here. Pretty good, huh?

Allright. And Herbie forgot... no Robin forgot my E-Meter, as usual. Second time it happened. [laughter]

Anyway, I'd like to make a few small comments on the session you saw last night.

Let's see, this is what? Three Mar. [May] AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, first lecture. Where is the pc? Is it all right if I make a comment on that?

Female voice: That's fine, yes.

All right, very good.

Some of you I understand, were... Thank you, Sir, thank you. Getting that "Sir" from Reg, it's restimulating my life as a Confederate Officer. [laugh]

This lecture, in general, is what I expect out of an auditor. That's what this is. But before we go into that too broadly, I want to make a few comments on that.

There's apparently a considerable amount of surprise expressed here and there that one would stop buying skim milk. And if you were to replay that tape, you would find out at the beginning that the auditor spent something like five or six minutes getting the pc to say something she had done, not something she had intended. Got it?

A missed withhold picked up in a session is anything the pc thinks, anything the pc is withholding. That doesn't matter. That's a session missed withhold, you understand? Pc didn't tell the auditor he was uncomfortable. That's all right for a session missed withhold. But we were prepchecking, and Prepchecking means meat. We only buy meat in Prepchecking, see? We don't buy skim milk. See, we want meat. Preferably with blood dripping off of it. Get the idea? We want some meaningful acts; we don't want meaningless acts. That's a big difference, see?

We don't want antisocial acts, particularly, like "I picked my nose," you know, just because this is seamier – the seamier side of life, you see? An auditor can actually start specializing in just the seamier side of life. And they have nothing to do with anybody, didn't do any-

thing to anybody, don't you see, and specialize in picking up weird and peculiar practices on the part of the pc. He didn't do anything to anybody, you understand, he just had a weird and peculiar practice, you know? It doesn't mean shucks! Heh! Worthless.

For instance, you could take some of the Book One subjects, like masturbation, something like that. Oh, this is embarrassing. Yes, it shows up as something of the sort; it's the human race, you see? And it's not really doing anything to anybody, unless it is doing something to somebody. You get the idea? A lot of auditors specialize in embarrassing things, see, as the very thing you must pick up. To hell with them! You know? Well, pick them up, but *thathathabooh!* No, we're interested in things people have *done* to people. See? We're interested in *overts*. We is not interested in a withhold because it is simply seamy. Do you get the difference here? There's a considerable difference. He'd done something to somebody. He has an accusative attitude toward somebody, and we want to find out immediately afterwards what he'd done to somebody. Accusative attitude – so what? It merely means he's done something to this person, that's all, see? He's critical of Joe. Well, why is he critical of Joe? Well, he's critical of Joe because he's done something to Joe. See?

Heh, you pick up a missed withhold, "Well, I was critical of Joe." Balderdash! Nonsense! You can pick up 8,762, see, and the pc won't be any better. And all of a sudden somebody gets bright, and say, "Well, what have you done to Joe?"

And he, "Oh, this is nothing – slept with his wife. Didn't tell him. She committed suicide later. He always thought he did it. I realized all the time I had, you know?" Oh yeah. This starts getting something, see? This is more the comparative side of existence, don't you see? I mean, this is more factual. *Done* something, see?

Now, in this session we found out something – and a good auditor could have extrapolated from this – we found out affection was trapping people. See, it was a bad thing. Affection was a bad thing.

Now, if you reach way back into your fundamentals: Auditors either audit by fundamentals or by music. And the best auditors audit by fundamentals. But the job can be done auditing by the words and music, see? You know, just auditing by rote and ritual. Fundamentals. There's an old triangle, and if you think real hard you might be able to remember it. It's called the ARC triangle. And we have found the A triangle was an overt. So therefore, things must look pretty unreal. So therefore, communication of any kind is an overt; so therefore, the thing to do is withhold. And withholding is a virtue, not an overt.

So my next Zero question, having cleaned up the Zero question we went in on, would have been, "What communication, in some portion or another, added up to an overt act?" Got the idea? As a matter of fact, we were picking some up. "Hit a girl with a rock in the stomach." Communication, overt act. See?

Now, part of the present time problem was the dissemination of Scientology. If affection – let's just audit by the seat of our pants here, see? – if affection is trapping people, then communication of Scientology would be reprehensible reactively. You got it?

Audience: Hm-mm.

I'm sorry, pc.

Female voice: That's fine.

That's an evaluation.

Female voice: Thanks.

All right. But there it is. See that? She had two PTPs and we were cleaning up two chronic present time problems. And one of them was a continuing present time problem she's having all the time with her husband which enters into a communication battle all the time, see? See? Letters and telephone calls, and then she has an upset and can't get into session, see?

How could anybody sit around and look at this for a long time, you see, without doing something about this? See, at this point I should get cross with you, because obviously, obviously, there's something else. See? Must have been. But you didn't have the technology. You didn't have the technology down pat.

All right, let's get the technology down pat. I understand you had the technology down pat today, and that is it must have been a missed withhold of the magnitude of a doingness to cause a continuous present time problem – the withhold missed by the person with whom we had the present time problem. So that cleaned it up, huh? In the process of doing this, we didn't have a second session following immediately after this, but the second session we would have cleaned up the other side of the PTP, which is "can't disseminate Scientology." And we had the answer, right there, see? Got the answer gratuitously. See? ARC. If affection trapped people, then communication must do them up in a ball. See? All right, so we'd have to clean up communication withholds. That is, things that she had done with communication that were reprehensible. See? We clean some of those up and we find out, all of a sudden, the whole problem falls apart. We also find out any IQ difficulty that she kept complaining about – the IQ would soar. Do you see why it'd soar? See, it must be down, because she mustn't communicate, which in itself is a continuous withhold. And stupidity equals withhold, you understand? So she feels stupid, so therefore it's the area of withhold. Okay? That make sense to you?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

That's auditing by fundamentals. See?

I wanted to call something else to your attention, which you might have found very, very interesting, is that we had twenty or thirty incidents on that chain that we never touched. The old man just went earlier. Do you realize I picked up the first incident on the chain? Huh? And went earlier? What was I doing going earlier? If the first incident on the chain showed that there was no sexual activity prior to the first incident on the chain, what were we doing going earlier? Well, I just went earlier because you go earlier. And did you see that the question nulled? Nulled beautifully. Do you realize there are twenty or thirty incidents the pc probably never recounted? Well, where were they? What happened to the charge? See, that's the mystery of it all. What happened to that charge?

Well, you pull basic-basic on the immediate chain by pulling all the underpinnings out of basic-basic, if you want to get it that way. Anything that added up to why she would do this, we pulled. The rest of it must have just gone brrrzt! See?

So if you go at it on the basis that you're running engrams called withholds, and you run every engram, do you see – if you're going at it on that basis – it's going to take you forever. See? I think the pc will tell you we had a nice win last night. See? Yet we never did touch the upper part of the chain. We never even touched the subject of the PTP. Isn't that fascinating? There was only one comment on it and then from there on we cleaned it up. You see that? Audit by fundamentals. Get the earliest on the chain and release it. And if you can get the earliest on the chain, you can pull it out of the mud, and all the later ones go.

There was one oddity about this case that you might find real odd: is that basic-basic was a not-knowingness about a nothing. Fascinating, you know? That was fascinating. There was no basic-basic. The pc thought there was. And we looked in vain. And why did we look in vain? Because every auditor had always looked in vain.

How come you're always looking for a somethingness? This was a trick case. This was very trick. The whole trick about it was, is there was nothing at the basic. And she hadn't done anything but thought she had, and must have because auditors had kept her looking for it. But we must also add into the fact that she must have kept handing it to auditors. See? And then we must have had the auditor never look at the E-Meter.

Now, did you see this last night? I said, "What happened when you were four years old?" And we had some ticks and tocks, and we cleaned that up. Now, "What happened when you were four years old?" And eventually we could find nothing. There was no charge on anything happened when she was four years old. Obviously nothing had happened. That was very tricky and very freaky. But how come I found it? Well, I found it simply because I audit by fundamentals. A not-knowingness is a not-knowingness.

Wrote a story once called *Fear*. A guy lost four hours and his hat, you know? All you have to do is lose four hours and your hat sometime and you've had it, see? Particularly if somebody keeps insisting that something happened. I'm sure some of you, in college or around and about, have tried to convince some compatriot of the terrible things he did while he was drunk, or while she was drunk. Of course, it adds in a not-know because they can't say they did and they can't say they didn't. So you'll get a not-know basic which serves, mechanically – it is a not-knowingness that begins the chain. So, of course this chain stood hooked in because there was a not-knowingness about it. But the not-knowingness was in reverse at this time – there was nothing had happened. Right? It's just crazy.

You by the way won't find that ordinarily in auditing pcs. That was just freaky. But you audit by fundamental, and of course a not-knowingness at the bottom of the chain of course is just a not-knowingness at the bottom of the chain. It doesn't have to even be a not-knowingness about something. It doesn't have to be anything about the bottom of the chain. That's elementary. Well, enough about that.

This should give you some kind of an idea of what I mean by auditing by fundamentals. You just never give up on the fundamental. Now, I'll give you an idea here, see? Pc:

"Yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, and I am tired of listing!" See? And "I can't think of any more."

Now, the reasonable auditor says, "Of course you can get tired listing." And it is true, he couldn't think of any more. This is absolutely true. But the auditor says, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" See, he audits not by reasonableness, but by a fundamental. When the pc gets nattery, he has a missed withhold. He doesn't care whether this missed withhold is justified or not justified, understandable or not understandable; he just audits by the fundamental that a missed withhold must be present, and you ask for it and pull it, and the fellow keeps on listing again. That happened today, and I was very, very interested to hear about it. See? You mustn't be reasonable, you must be fundamental.

There are certain basic truths and laws about the human mind. They are not very many. They are astonishingly few. You audit by those, not by how reasonable it is that something else would be the case. You actually have to isolate out for yourself what is true and what is fundamental. I could give you a list of things here and punch it down your gullet and get you examined on this thing until you were green in the face, you see? And I'd say, "These are the truths and that's all there is to it." Well, that's something like feeding this boa constrictor I was talking about, see? And if the auditor is unable to regurgitate the proper datum at that instant, why, he'd be sunk in any tough situation, you see, in an auditing session, wouldn't he? He'd be sunk, right there.

Well, actually, a stable datum fixed in by a confusion, and not by understanding, doesn't happen to be available in a tight spot. So you don't audit by fundamentals, you audit by being reasonable. So you must recognize a fundamental for what it is. A fundamental is a fundamental. I can go this far: I can say to you, "This is a fundamental. Damn it all, find out about it!" And tell you eight, ten, fifteen times, "It's a fundamental; find out about it!" See?

And then one fine day you say, "Well, I haven't got anything else to do; I think I'll find out about this. Oh my God, it is a fundamental." At that point it becomes a usable tool.

You can go on believing these fundamentals are fundamentals and never using them or never spitting them out at the time they're required and you'll go on being a ritualist. You go right on being a ritualist. All of a sudden, pc after pc you'll miss on. And you say, "Why am I missing on this pc?" It'll be something on this basis – since here was a pc we hadn't been missing on one way or the other – be on the basis of the auditor does not feel free to recognize that a fundamental applies here.

We're always asking this question, "What is an overt?" To one case it's one thing, and to one – another case it's another thing. But we had this gratuitously offered, see, on this case I audited. Case described an overt. Well, we're not much interested in sensation – auditing sensation – so therefore affection, see, traps people. All right, great. I can tell you a secret, that it isn't going to move very far in Prepchecking. Why isn't it going to move very far? Well, because you're just auditing straight sensation. You're saying, "Have you ever grief?" "Have you ever grief?" "Have you ever grief?"

"No."

"Have you ever – have you ever used communication so as to harm somebody?" or something like that. Oh well, now we're on real fruitful ground, aren't we? See, by taking the ARC triangle and moving around to another corner of it that does apply, we've got it. Well, that's fundamental.

All of you have ARC down real well. Well, it's fundamental. It exists. When the R goes down the A goes down, the C goes down; when the R goes up, then the C goes up, when the A goes up, you know, they always go up – all of them, all together.

So there's an opportunity to improve communication. And of course, lack of communication or jammed communication (withholds equals stupidity) – we could have made the case brighter. This is by fundamentals, you see?

One day you yourself will be puzzling around. You will be puzzling as to why a withhold makes people so stupid. And after you've sat there being stupid about it for some time, you will suddenly realize that it has something to do with something that has nothing to do with communication; that the reverse of communication must be happening here. And you'll eventually think the whole thought out all by yourself and look back on it and say, "Oh, well! Heh-heh! Huh. I sure been feeling stupid for the last five minutes! I wonder if I was withholding something? Well, I was withholding the answer to it," or something like this. And you suddenly add it up and say, "Ha-ha-ha! Withholds equal stupidity. Heh! For sure!" See? So therefore, lack of communication equals stupidity, you see? Quite fascinating.

But you can take these things, and because these data are known, you can get a hopped-up, speeded-up, enormously increased look at the things. You got a chance to look at these things and you will eventually see that they knock out other things. And you don't need these 8,655 superstitions like "I must not stand under a karo tree because it's what gives women babies," you know? I mean, other true data of the human race. I imagine there's girls right here that have been Polynesians or something like that, and have been part of a taboo-ridden society, and they don't realize why they always flinch alongside of lampposts, or something like that. [laughter]

And on the other hand, some of us have often lived a canine life. [laughter, laughs] But these are superstitions. And when you get down to the bottom of the pile, why, all these superstitions become understandable.

But what I expect of an auditor is to audit the pc that's right there in front of him by the most fundamental fundamentals that he can command and understand. And if he does that, he will always get wins. See, this auditor will always get wins. He won't go around in any kind of a fog about it. And he'll see that the Prepcheck system is put together very adroitly. But it becomes totally nonfunctional when you take off from a Zero question, get no overt, put down any What that should have been a Zero A or something, get no overt on it, buy a lot of "thinks" and "supposed-to's" and that sort of thing, go on down a whole long chain of meaningless stuff – you know, not even getting the soles of the shoe wet. And nothing is clearing up and it's all very arduous and just goes on and on.

When you've done that a little while, you get the idea "I wonder if there isn't some better way to go about it?" And you go for broke about that point. And I can put your attention forward to this point: that unless you get something the pc has done, you see, for your What

question, a specific incident (I don't care whether you're asking for missed withholds because it all depends on the Zero, what you're asking for), but unless you get a specific incident, and it actually has doingness in it, and you make a chain at that point – you just spot that there's a chain here at that point, and word it at that – that you're not going to get anything happening. You will see this and then the mechanics of the mind sort of start unraveling, "Oh well, yes, of course!", you know? And after you've run some of these chains down to the bottom then you'll find out that all chains are anchored because of not-knowingness in the bottom incident.

I point out something to you: on two or three demonstrations you have seen that my What question was not on the button. See? It was close enough to have created a breeze past somebody's ear. See? But it was not dead center. Because the only time you know enough to ask the exact What question is when you've finished Prepchecking! See? And then you can ask the exact What question. And if you want to appear a genius to an instructor, why, never write the What question down until you've finished the session, see? [laughter, laughs]

The What questions are never quite on. They're just sighting questions, that's all. They're never quite on. Because you really don't quite know what's on that chain, you see?

So you should realize that if it's that unknown to the pc, what God-given, turban-wearing prescience do you have that you're going to know all about it when the pc doesn't, and you haven't found out from the pc yet? Well, you can't find it out that exactly. But because when you're auditing by fundamentals, you know something about it – you know about what's going to turn up – you ask a What question that will probably turn up something that resembles this. And I'd say it's the sheerest luck, one out of a hundred, that a What question is dead-on. We had a What question of "What about sleeping with men to trap them?" See? Oh, that's pretty good. That was pretty good. Served our purposes beautifully and went null gorgeously. But it wasn't the chain. The chain all followed that What question. We had a chain that went on from there, but we were actually taking it back from an incident and were asking questions which relieved the What question which wasn't described by the What question, which I thought was quite fascinating. But I never expect your What question to be any closer on than that.

Pc gave you an overt, you actually did get an incident, and the pc actually did something in this; and then you put your What question to it, so as you get a chain of that type of incident, and then go earlier, you'll almost always find yourself out in the blue if that was the first incident. But it doesn't relieve; there must have been a lot of other factors. And you find yourself asking questions about other types. They're almost on, don't you see?

They'll be on the same dynamic. They will be the same type of personnel, you know? And you get those erased and all of a sudden the rest of the chain will blow. Your What questions are almost never dead on.

You would be a swami beyond all swamis if your What questions were absolutely accurate every time, see? So you just get a What question which describes the incident, in its workably general – not too general – terms and 'ope for the best! And fire from there. And you'll work it out every time. And that's all you're bound and determined to have to get null, is the incident you found. And sometimes the incident will go null. Well, if you notice, in working a Prepcheck question, I will only go over these things a couple of times, with me eye on

the meter – and nothing was dying down. And that told me loads. Because I tell you, one withhold system, you know, I mean, one "When," "All," "Appear," you know, and "Who," and it didn't blow, well, it's something like the curiosity: "Well, we fired an 18-inch shell into the middle of the jam tin and it still sat there!" There must be some other thing holding down this mirage called a jam tin. We couldn't possibly have fired at the jam tin. We must have an image of the jam tin. Now let's find the jam tin. See? And the jam tin always lies earlier. Nothing ever locks up because of a later incident.

And you all of a sudden, when you go down, you finally pick up this pebble, and you don't even use the withhold system on it; it just kind of goes *whhh*. And you go back up the line and maybe use a withhold system on something else that was a little bit hangy and then come back to your What question and just ask the What question again, and it's null, see?

It is an inexact activity. Prepchecking is not an exact activity. It depends on the pc in front of you. I expect you to be able to audit and understand the pc who is in front of you.

Now, here's what else I expect of you: because Prepchecking itself is an inexact activity, I ask you to do it on the framework of total exactitude. See, just groove that in madly. That sounds weird, doesn't it? But give it in a Model Session, God 'elp us! You see? Your TRs, marvelous. Your E-Metering, superb. And when you've got those things all down so that you don't think any more about them than you think about your coat while you're eating dinner, man, can you prepcheck. You see? Got an exact frame: You got the withhold system, that's exact; you got your Model Session, that's exact; your E-Metering is exact; the fundamentals on which your chains are stacked up in the pc's mind will be found to follow those exact rules – always held in at the earliest incident; it's a cousin to the chain – and you take your exactitudes and just play by ear from then on.

There's probably nobody plays by ear better than a symphony soloist. There's nobody better trained in music, you see? These jam sessions – you hear some of these boys whoopin' up down around N'Orleans. Huh! Got a record upstairs that tells how that impromptu jam session was put together, you see? They worked on it eighteen or twenty hours and managed to get its impromptuness to sound imprompt. But the upshot of this is, is – well, you take a symphony orchestra drummer. I don't know how come they get these guys into symphony orchestras, unless it's the high-class or snob-level something or other. And then they get them into symphony orchestras and they must trap them there in some fashion, because these guys make Krupas look awfully, awfully dim! They're technicians. Man, they're marvelous.

One guy, one night ... You know, your jazz orchestra boys, they all have to use these whiskers, or something. These whisks, you know? And they get one of these whisks and they go over the top of the snare drum, and it says *snif, snif, snif, snif, snif*, you know, that sort of thing. Symphony orchestra man does it with a pair of drumsticks, and it goes *whisk, whisk, whisk, whisk, whisk*, you know? And where's his whisker? It isn't anyplace. You know? I swear those guys could play snare drums with their kettle drums if you asked them to, see? They're marvelous.

But they are precision musicians. They really can play by note, you see? They really can do their stuff. And after that, why, hell, they can do anything, you see? But let's get some high-school kid and before he learns how to back up Wagner, why, let's let him extrapolate

with some jazz. It sounds that way, too. Never seems to – . It's just noisy. See, it's just noise. And actually, at any – this is always the illusion of any craftsman, is that he can do it offhandedly. It looks as though there is terrific ease. There's just nothing to it, you see? You see Weller out here whittling a block of wood. And you say, "Well, anybody could do that" – or look at something he's built, or something like that – and you say, "Well, anybody could do that." Go ahead, see? It looks so easy.

The mahogany despatch boxes that sit on the back ledge of my desk back there – he didn't cause any fuss building those things. They're all hand fitted and hand carved, without any tools to amount to anything, you see? The guy is a craftsman. He's been at that for a long time. And you give old Jenner out here a pile of stone. You see, nobody can work stone. Give old Jenner a pile of stone and you say, "Build me a wall." Well, you can give him specifications about the wall, but somehow or another a wall happens. It's all so easy. You see him working out there and you see stuff going up and there's nothing much to it.

Well, now and then he makes a mistake. But the only mistakes he actually makes is when he and me come into a planning or design disagreement. And once in a while, why, we won't see eye to eye on some planning or design thing – something else is going to go up after that that he doesn't know about or something like that. But as far as actually doing it, it looks awful easy. It looks awful easy till you get somebody else in who calls himself a bricklayer. And the guy goes out, and my God, you know? He *works*, and he's got *bricks* stacked up, and he's got *mortar*, you know? And he picks up bricks, you know, and he puts them *down*, and he *smooths* them out and he gets the mortar on top of them, and it falls all over the drive and we've – . There must have been such a bricklayer at work around here, because one wall that we found out there was plumb. And he makes a lot of work out of it, and you wind up with no wall. Well, it's just basically because he just doesn't – the guy wouldn't know really how to handle mortar with a trowel. It comes down to little, tiny fundamentals, you know?

You take the fellow who does a great job of sculpture: He knows his clay, and he knows this and he knows that. They're not something he's trying to learn while he is making the sculpt, see? He's all set, and then he sculpts. He knows how to do these things.

Your old-time painters had this down to perfection. I know; I was kicking around over on that side of the channel, back in them thar days – I mean, the real old-timers around 1350, 1360 – the real Flemish school that the other fellows just hah! you know, came along afterward and *pspt!* you know? Rembrandt – *pfhoo!* Well, he – copyist. [laughs] But in those days you couldn't run down to the paint store. You could have run down but there would have been no paint store. [laughter] And the way you learned how to paint is you went and found a master someplace and you ground color for him. And your little girlfriend would be saying to you, "Jan, how come you is so blue tonight?" [laughs, laughter] And you'd mortar and pestle his color. And you finally found out all there was to know about drying and color and pigment and what pigment did and what pigment didn't and how it was blended and how it was put together and what constituency of it is – and the darned paintings painted with it are still there.

Fascinating. They must have known something, huh? When you got all through, you knew how to – you'd find out how to spread the stuff and how to work it, and so on. And you

actually go on for years. And someday, one day, why, the master would give you a brush, an old used brush of some kind or another, and say, "Well, you see the wall over there; well, make a paint stroke on it." And then you'd go over and you'd make a paint stroke on the wall, you know?

And he'd say, "Oh, my God! Give me that brush," you know?

You'd say, "What have I done wrong?" you know? Well, he couldn't find out what you'd done right! That was ...

You look at the Japanese work with brush and that sort of thing. They don't do it overnight, you know? It looks so easy. You know, you look at a Jap and he paints his bamboo, you know? He paints it all up and so on. He paints. And when it's all finished here's a beautiful free sketch, you see, of a bamboo.

You say, "That's easy." You take some charcoal or something, you know; you take a big piece of paper and you say, "Well, now let's see." And go *bzupt!* and *bzupt!* [laughter]

Well, the little Jap, he knows where to get the ink-stone, you know, and he knows how to grind it up, and he knows how to mix it and he knows how to handle brushes. And he could probably write with a brush as fast as you can write with a pen. Amazing!

And all of those things, however, are built out of a great ability to do a small detail. That's the common denominator of all great art. It's great ability to do a small detail. And out of that you get great art. And that's why these schools of drawing that you see down in Greenwich Village – well, they're all lined up along the board fence and so forth, and why in fifty years nobody can find those pictures around. They're definitely not going for 285 thousand pounds for one sketch. More likely you find them filling a mouse hole someplace to keep the draft out. And that's because those boys went on an entirely different idea: They see the ease with which it is done and mistake the tremendous skill in the tiny detail. Because the tiny det- it looks so easy, you see?

They see one of these boys painting, they see the results of the painting; it all looks so natural, it all looks so easy. So they use the same abandon with which the master works, you see? They use the same abandon with which the master works to paint their paintings or sculpt their sculptures, and it's mud. It's mud. And the only thing that's missing is "How do you take a small brush and flip it across a palette to bring it out to a point, and paint an absolutely straight line?" How do you do that?

Give you some idea of this: Michelangelo used to go calling on his friends, and if they weren't home he'd take a piece of chalk and he'd draw a circle on the door. And they always knew Michelangelo had been to visit them. He was the only man in all of Italy who could draw a freehand circle that was perfect. He'd draw a perfect circle. All of his friends recognized it as a badge, you know? Craftsmanship is built out of these – the exact skill, the exact response, the thing. I don't care how great the man's name is, or how splendid the accomplishment he's trying to accomplish, or how tiny or unimportant the thing is. The factor is still there. It's still craftsmanship. And craftsmanship is built out of tremendous expertness on the tiny detail. That's all you really have to know.

Now, our tiny details consist of a meter. One of the reasons we can clear today and get further today on cases, and get Goals Assessments and find terminals on cases, is because we have a better meter. All right, that's all right. That's neither here nor there. It still takes an auditor who is absolutely fabulous on reading a meter.

I went through a session this afternoon that I – . Yesterday my auditor said – he sort of wound up the end of the session and he was sort of stunned because he thought – sudden thought struck him which was: "What if some beginning student had been trying to do that goals check?" It whumped him for a second. He suddenly realized how far he himself had come. He was reading a microscopic clean needle, but it was microscopic. And he was reading some that were going sporadic and some that were going unsporadic, and were going naturally and well, you see? And it was a job of work, you see? And because he was centering in toward the center of a goal, of course he was getting suppressions and invalidations left and right because already he was stirring up its oppterm, you see? He was stirring up both its terminal and oppterm. He was picking off missed withholds, invalidations and suppressions, and getting the read, and getting the read off suppressions and missed withholds and invalidations, and getting the read back on the goal. Then he had to test all of the goals that had been there to make sure that each one of those didn't have invalidations or suppressions, do you see, or missed withholds on them and about them, you see? And then he had to check those to make sure that they weren't still reading – make sure they were null.

And he was working around on this for about an hour or so – well, more than that – checking out this goal line, you see? And the thought afterward struck him; all of a sudden he realized how far he'd come. I guess what thought really occurred to him is what would he have done a year ago? See? The guy was doing it very easily and very naturally, see? There was nothing to it. Meter was talking all the way. Now, he didn't have time to do that and worry about the meter and worry about rote and ritual, and so forth. He didn't have time to worry about these other things. He had to have a lot of things down pat, didn't he?

He had to know this meter backwards. He had to know exactly what this meter was capable of and so forth. In other words, his attention couldn't be on the meter; his familiarity had to be sufficiently great that he could take the meter for granted and it still wouldn't knock his head off. Furthermore, his Model Session had to be absolutely perfect; he didn't have any time to worry about his Model Session. He had to know the exact fundamentals of what he was handling; he didn't have any time to figure out what he was handling, see? The whole thing was wrapped up in the fact that he was right in the middle of a Goals Problem Mass goal, and all of its little masses and so forth were just kicking the living daylights out of the goal because he had them stirred up like mad, do you see?

And he read the thing out and the end of the line, why, perfectly fine about it. And as I say, it suddenly struck him that what if he'd been trying to do it a year ago? I think that's what hit him. But it was all made out of little pieces. It was all made out of little pieces; the tremendous ease with which he could run a meter, the no worry of any kind on Model Session. He didn't have to fuss around with his TRs, don't you see? He didn't have any worries about these things whatsoever. He was totally relaxed. He knew those things backwards. He knew them forwards. And he knew he knew them. So he had at no moment any worry about them.

Now he could think of fundamentals. And the fundamentals are – is goals get invalidated and rudiments go out in any session, particularly a Goals Assessment. So all he had to do was just outguess the next missed withhold, you see? That's all he had to do. And keep checking and keep rolling. And it was dead easy. But it would have been un... insurmountable, utterly insurmountable, if he had been – had any worry about his meter; if he'd had any worry about his sessioning, you know, his TRs; or if he didn't know for sure that if the pc starts doping off all you did was pull the missed withhold. You know, it goes like this: He sees the pc start to get dopey, he pulls the missed withhold, see? And bang! the pc is right back there again. Get the idea? And he suddenly sees that the goal is not reading, and it was reading a moment ahead. Well, he doesn't say, "Thank God, we have nulled it out at last." He says, "Is there an invalidation on this?" Pang! "All right, what was that?" Clean it up. "Is there an invalidation on that? That's clean. All right." Now, he repeats the goal again, he gets no read on the goal. Now he says, "That's null." Careful workmanship, see? Pays off, all the way down the line.

How do you get to be a superb auditor? It's just by knowing all those little parts. That's all. And just knowing them perfectly. And if an auditor finds out that he is apparently creaking on one of these infinitesimally unimportant skills (you see, he'll be creaky on it) – if he ever is sitting there auditing and is saying, "I wonder – I wonder if that pc is getting my acknowledgments" – if he finds himself worrying about this or wondering about that, you see, I swear he'll never have time to do anything else. But what he should do, at this particular time, if he finds himself worrying about these things, ah, he ought to practice with some TR 4, get somebody there until he really gets that TR 4 in there, you know? Really gets it going good – or 3, or 2, or whatever else he's out on, see? That's the smart auditor.

The smart student of auditing would make himself a checksheet of these various parts of auditing. I'm talking now about the parts of mixing the pigments, you see? Grinding the lapis lazuli – that stage of the game. Well, just make himself a checksheet on these things, and go over that checksheet very carefully, wondering if at any time, in any recent session, he has worried about any part of his checksheet. See, make a checksheet which includes the various parts of the E-Meter. You know? The sensitivity knob, the trim, the dial, tone arm dial, something like – that he's had trouble with, or worried about. Just go over this checksheet which has all of these various parts and items and TRs and things like that. And go over that, and just ask himself honestly, "Now, in the last few sessions have I had any concern with this?" See? "Well, then, how about this one? I have trouble confronting pcs lately? Oh, yeah. All right. Well, we'll cross that one." And then just take those points he's crossed and just go ahead and drill them. Just drill them. Just treat it like a parade-ground drill, that's all.

A dancer: he finds out that he usually stumbles on his exit. You'll find him going out on the stage and practice that step that gets him exited until he doesn't stumble on his exit.

Only then will you be free to be a craftsman, be a master of what you're doing. Only then will you be free to audit the pc in front of you. You won't be free to audit the pc in front of you as long as you're enslaved with don't-knows amongst your auditing tools. Because you've got a chain of error which mounts in the session on the basic not-knowingness. And your session errors just mount like mad. "Oh my God, what am I doing?" And you eventually, checking these things off – and the chances are you might not find out what you're doing

wrong for a little while, until you've cleaned some of the garbage off. And you suddenly find out, "You know, I – I really have never dared ask anybody because of embarrassment, but what is a null needle?" *Hmm-hmhm-mm!*

Well, that's what it takes – that's what it takes – to become a master of a craft. And don't think that you're going to get results, real honest-to-God results, if you're anything less. And that's the discouraging point of auditing.

Today's auditing is not aimed at the repetitive process: No attention on the pc; you just run a repetitive process on the pc and you hope for the best. Now, the funny part of it is, is that system circa 50 on – started to develop in 50, was best developed along about 52, 53 – that system actually does make a lot of people well. And you could be fooled by the fact that it does make a lot of people well. So does engram running.

See, there's a lot of things you can do with the skills of yesterday. And if anything, we are victimized slightly by the tremendous workability of what we have been able to do here and there. And any auditor who has audited consistently along the line – this person and that person and so on – well, has had some rather interesting wins. He gets hung on his own wins. Because we have never had techniques, before 1962, which reached all cases. And that's something we haven't all learned yet.

And the other thing about it is, is these techniques require a master's touch. They are that strong. They are that powerful. You can unman the pc's mind. His reactive mind doesn't have a prayer, you do these things right. You have broadly, broadly workable technology that's been going in that direction. But at the same time, we inherit along with it a precision of application which knows no second-class or "just as good as." All of the various points which make precision in auditing must be actually precise.

When you sit down across from an auditor who does his E-Metering so well that he never worries about an E-Meter; he does his TRs so well that he never worries about his TRs; he does his Model Session so well that he never worries about his Model Session; he knows what he's supposed to do with the processes he's given, whether they're a Routine 3 or a Prep-check or anything else, you see, and he does just these things. And honest, the pc, as a pc, he'll just say, "Gosh!", You know? "Gosh! It's so easy! I am so comfortable sitting here being audited." How come? What makes this? How did that combination of events take place? Is it because the auditor was born as the seventh son of a seventh son? Is it because he gave a present once to the Witch of Endor? Is it some fantastic prescience of some kind? Is it because his thetan can read your thetan? Well, it doesn't happen to be a single one of these things. It would be because the auditor knew the little points of auditing absolutely perfectly, did them as a whole, with perfection, so that he was under no tension by reason of auditing because he knew all the parts and could then apply fundamentals to what he was doing

When you will sit down, someday, across from such an auditor, you'll all of a sudden say, "Whew! Uhh!" And you yourselves, if you learn your business here, will go home and you'll sit down and start to audit somebody – somebody that you used to audit – and they'll say, "My God, what happened to you?" And there really wasn't anything happened to you except you are doing less and you're doing it much less arduously than you used to do. And the results just fly. Nothing to it. You finish up a two-, three-, four-hour session. You're per-

fectly calm. So what? You'd just as soon audit another two or three hours. Because you're under no tension. You're under no not-knows.

But first and foremost, in order to attain any result requires a technology. Well, we have those technologies. And you have to also get a confidence that when you sit down and audit somebody, he is – by these technologies – he is going to get a result. So that that takes out the last not-know out of it, is "Is the pc going to gain or win?" And what you're doing today, you do it right, the pc keeps winning. That pc just wins, that's all. The pc goes on winning and you all of a sudden get confident in the fact the pc is going to win. If you audit him, the pc will win – bang! That's all there is to it. You'll win, the pc wins. Everybody wins. And that's the final tension that goes out of it. And after that, my God! The results you can get in auditing are just fantastic.

And frankly, that's what I expect of you here. That's what I expect you to learn how to be able to do: to audit like a master before you get out of here.

Thank you.

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 6 SEPTEMBER 1978

Remimeo
Tech Staff
Qual Staff
HCOs
Confessional Courses
Level II Checksheets
All Auditors.
Supers. C/Ses

FOLLOWING UP ON DIRTY NEEDLES

(Ref: HCOB 3 Sep 78	DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM
HCOB 28 Jun 62	DIRTY NEEDLES
HCOB 17 May 69	TRs AND DIRTY NEEDLES
E-Meter Drills 17, 20, 21:	<i>THE BOOK OF E-METER DRILLS</i>
TAPE: 6205C23; SH TVD-7	FISH & FUMBLE, CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES.)

The only valid definition of a dirty needle is given in HCOB 3 September 78, DEFINITION OF A ROCK SLAM, as:

“Dirty Needle: An erratic agitation of the needle which is ragged, jerky, ticking, not sweeping, and tends to be persistent. It is not limited in size.”

It is caused by one of three things: 1) the auditor’s TRs are bad or 2) the auditor is breaking the Auditor’s Code or 3) the pc has withholds he does not wish known.

The definitions are pointed up in the above HCOB because it is *vital* not to confuse a dirty needle with an R/S. They are distinctly different reads. The difference is in *the character of the read*: it has nothing to do with size.

Auditors, supervisors and C/Ses must understand the difference between these two reads and must be able to recognize each instantly when they occur.

Because of the underlying causes of these two different types of reads they are both most apt to appear when Confessionals are being done or when areas of O/Ws are being addressed. But they are different and the auditor must know the difference cold.

A dirty needle must not be ignored especially when doing any type of Confessional action.

If the auditor’s TRs are in and he is maintaining the Auditor’s Code, a dirty needle, taken up, will either clean or turn into an R/S. It is not to be overlooked.

The dirty needle is your hottest string to pull in finding and turning on an R/S. *Whatever is* behind it, ignoring it will cut the comm line between auditor and pc and wreck the auditing comm cycle.

The area that is producing a dirty needle, when questioned to get full data, will either clean or go into an R/S.

The area is considered clean when you can go over the area that gave the dirty needle and it no longer produces a dirty needle.

If it still produces a dirty needle then there is more to the withhold itself or something the pc isn't voicing about the withhold or how he feels about the withhold, or the auditor's TRs are terrible, but – pursued and taken up with auditor's TRs in – this dirty needle will either turn into an R/S or it will fully clean. Until it does, however, it is still a dirty needle.

The procedure for fishing a read is covered in AUDITING DEMO TAPE 6205C23 SH TVD-7, "FISH AND FUMBLE, CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES." Cleaning a dirty needle is covered in E-Meter Drills 17, 20 and 21 as well, and Class II auditors and above should be very adept at this.

The rule is: **Don't ignore dirty needles. Always follow them up.**

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:mf

TV Demo:

Fish and Fumble - Checking Dirty Needles

An auditing demonstration given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 23 May 1962

LRH: We are going to give you a proper session, and we're going to do some fish and fumble there.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: I told you just a moment ago, we're going to look for this tick-tick, and we're going to see if we can find this tick-tick, and find out what it was, because that had me mighty curious when I had you on the line.

PC: *That was the one on – on that Prepcheck chain I went down.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's right. That was an interesting thing I actually did narrow it down to just that, and – since then.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: So we'll see if it's still there.

PC: *Great.*

LRH: Okay. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC: *Yeah. Not really.*

LRH: All right. All right. Here it is.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Start of session.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: *To be able to get to sleep easier at night. I've been having trouble getting to sleep.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *The last few nights. And to ...*

LRH: Good.

PC: *... to stay in present time when I'm studying. When I sort of run out of – get out of present time, find myself reading over a paragraph of a bulletin or something like that without reading it.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Any other goals?

PC: *That ought to do it.*

LRH: All right. Got an ARC break there? All right, thank you. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC: *I'd like to – well, I have a goal: it's – it's – it's an imp – almost impossible goal, but maybe it's possible, you know?*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *To get Class II by the end of the month, or by the end of this period. But, you know, it's getting pretty close there.*

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: *I'd like to be auditing next week. Start auditing.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Champing at the bit. I want to – like those – a little like those commandos who want to, you know, get out.*

LRH: [laughs] All right. Okay, Fred. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. All right. Now, let's see. What process was working on you? It was Touch, wasn't it?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Put the cans down. All right. We're going to run a little bit of Touch here. All right. Touch that table. Thank you. Touch that wood. Thank you. Touch that ashtray. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Touch those cans. Good. Give them a squeeze. Squeeze 'em. All right. Squeeze 'em. Hey, that's a difference! All right, thank you. All right. That's it. Now – check this on the meter. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. Thank you. Relatively clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Just a little slowdown; doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Feel better?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Hey, what do you know? That was fast enough, wasn't it? All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. That's clean. Since the last time I audited you ...

PC: [laughs] *A lot of water's gone under the bridge.*

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? I have an action there.

PC: *Well, I – I – I – I got an overt against Robin, I guess.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *I – I thought that was pretty clean. Anyway, when I – I left the – I left that post, I – I wrote a whole series of notes ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... explaining the job to ever – whoever. I – I addressed them to Franchise Secretary from Fred.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Whole series of notes explaining the job, explaining various aspects, vari – you know, the various things I was working on. And I – I wasn't exactly sure Robin was going to come on the post, but I was pretty sure. And – but I thought it would be kind of funny if I – you know, it would be interesting, if I ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... wrote these notes and told Robin how to do the job. But anyway, it was kind of an overt on Robin.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *It was.*

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? Got a little tick there.

PC: *Well, it's uh – I uh ...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... this friend of mine – it's about this – this ... Remember about – suspicions about that key and about ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... this friend ? This is about that key. I – I never got in touch with him. I wrote him a letter ...*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *... saying, "Oh, you know, gee, I haven't seen you, and give me a call." I got the letter back – no – n-n-not at – not at that address.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know? And I was, you know, wondering what – what happened. Something's – something's wrong there, you see?*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *I have to check in ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... because, (a) he wouldn't move without letting me know his new address.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Um – (b) I might have wrote it to the wrong address ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... but I – I – I don't think so.*

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: *And something wrong there. I have to look into that.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this on the meter.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? Little tick, much smaller.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *I had a party at my place, and some girls over, and kind of a wild party.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *I told you about that, I think...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... probably the group, you know ...*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *... but not about that party.*

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? That's cleaner than a wolf's tooth. Very good?

PC: *Yep.*

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. That's clean. Okay. Now, I told you about fishing around here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And we're going to do some fish and fumble ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... see where we wind up here. And mysteriously, I have no tick-tick.

PC: [laughs] *Well...*

LRH: Obviously, you're ... What were you going to say?

PC: *I don't know. It was on that chain, and it was on that past life, or connected up with it.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *Maybe if I found that again and I could – I don't know if it was that or something else, or what.*

LRH: Well, that, you know ...

PC: *It was something – it was something about messing with little girls ...*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: ... You know?

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Something – messing with little girls ...*

LRH: There it is. There it is. There it is.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Ha-ha, ha-ha!

PC: *Uhh.*

LRH: All right. Well, we didn't have to fish very long there, did we?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Something about messing with little girls.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And just like that, we get it back. All right, let me check it now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay? What about messing with little girls? Well, that isn't quite the tick-tick.

PC: *No.*

LRH: Now, let me see if we can get it just a little closer than that. There it is. What did you just think of?

PC: *Dang! I – I – I just look – kind of looked at a little something there, and kind of looked away. I can't – you know, sort of a hunk of something, you know?*

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

PC: *One of those gray hunks of something ...*

LRH: That's right.

PC: ... that don't have any definite ...

LRH: There it is again.

PC: [laughs] *I – it looks like a – a rocket ship nose, or something, or – or a bomb nose, or something like this. I don't know.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Is that it, or ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... or not? I ...

LRH: Well, let me check this over again. What about messing with little girls? Ahh, there – there's a tiny little slowdown there.

PC: *I looked at that thing again, when you mentioned it.*

LRH: Something here about messing with little girls in the nose of a rocket ship?

PC: *I – that's what the – I looked at that, and there was something connected there or someplace; I don't know why.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *But, you see, it ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *It's a – it's kind of a, you know, what's happening here? You know? How come – how come this connects up like this or something like that, you know?*

LRH: All right. Well, I'll find it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I'll find it. Now – there it is! Who are you looking at?

PC: *Well, it – that was th-th-those two little girls that we talked about in that Prepchecking session that I ...*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *... those two twins.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *They were either twins or – or sisters that I messed with ...*

LRH: Uh-uh.

PC: *... in – back in early – early days in my life.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *I was ten years old, or so. And so ...*

LRH: And we were going down that chain.

PC: *Yeah. Yeah. We kind of went past them, and ...*

LRH: All right. Let me see if I can get a What question that's right into the middle there.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about sexually interfering with little girls? That's it.

PC: *Is it?*

LRH: I get a tinier, smaller read.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I might be able to vary that just a little bit. There it is. What's that?

PC: *That's a picture of sexually interfering with a little girl.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *I don't think it's this lifetime. I mean, I don't know ...*

LRH: Well, that doesn't matter.

PC: *Yeah. That's that sex pervert or ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... probably a sex-pervert thing. But that's tied up with that other – that – that ... Well, it – I – I think it's the same little girl as in that other picture I've had so many years, I looked at.*

LRH: What was that? The ...

PC: *The one of having a little girl with her panties down, and with a – switching her.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And seeing – this picture is seeing an – an older man do this. Watching it from the bushes, something like this ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... in – in the yard of this ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... place with ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... a stream going by or something like that.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *I've had that picture so long, you know?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And this – I'm not sure if it's the same girl or not.*

LRH: All right. Now, hold your cans still there and let me check it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check another little What here.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about punishing little girls?
Clean.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about sexually interfering
with little girls? It's not giving me the same
read as the double tick.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: There – what's that?

PC: *Switching little girls.*

LRH: What about switching little girls?
That isn't it.

PC: *Eating little girls?*

LRH: Beating little girls?

PC: *Beating or eating?*

LRH: Eating?

PC: *Eating little girls.*

LRH: All right. What about eating little
girls? Well, I get a something of a reaction
there. What about eating little girls? It
cleaned.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Let me try another What
question here. What about stealing little
girls? I get an action here.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: You see, the reason I'm putting that
together isn't a shot in the dark. You were
talking about taking over a body before
this lifetime.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: See, and I was ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... getting a reaction on that. Now,
what about taking over little girls? I don't
get the same reaction.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: What about stealing little girls? I
get an instant read on that. What about
stealing little girls? It's not the same instant
read I'm fishing for, however.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: There it is. There it is. It was just
for a minute and we went by it.

PC: *Boy, that's awfully fast, you know?
It's – it's ... Boy, it's something that's really
occluded.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

PC: *Ha! No – all around it, but I can't
...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... can't get to it.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But I keep popping – keep thinking
about – on the same line, I don't know if
it's just jazz chat or what. But some inci-
dent I ran – some past life incident, way
back.*

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: *Spaceship – just wound up taking
over the ... Supposed to burn off this planet
and save one city and rape the city, or so-
omething like that.*

LRH: What's this now? Take a ...

PC: *I – I – I.*

LRH: ... a burner ...

PC: *Yeah, to burn off the whole planet.*

LRH: Oh, you burnt off a whole – I got it.

PC: *Yeah, I was supposed to blow –
burn the whole thing off, but I saved one
city, and I raped the city before I burned it
off.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *And part of that was it – at least as I came up in – I don't know, it – hell, it picked them – I mean, it's just not ...*

LRH: Well, now there – there's the double tick.

PC: *Yeah? It's – I take – took all the – asked all the five-year-old girls in the – all the five-year-old blond little girls in the town into the palace, and raped them all.*

LRH: Hm-hm. We're getting the tick-tick.

PC: *Yeah. Huh!*

LRH: We did.

PC: *And then – did that and my – I ordered my men, or my men and I raped – raped all these little girls ...*

LRH: Mm-m. There's your tick-tick.

PC: *... five-year-old girls. And then afterward, we burned the city off.*

LRH: All right. Let's see if I can make up a What here.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about raping a city? All right. What about raping little girls? What about raping little girls? No. What about that auditing session? What about that auditing session that you ran that in? That's it. There's a latent on that.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. What auditor was that?

PC: *Think it was Stan.*

LRH: Who?

PC: *Stan Stromfeld.*

LRH: Yeah?

PC: *Think it was him. Must have been him.*

LRH: Was it? I don't get a reaction here.

PC: *No?*

LRH: Was it Stan Stromfeld that ran that? I don't get any reaction on that.

PC: *I'll be darned.*

LRH: Somebody earlier than that?

PC: *Janine? No. Unless it was New York. Oh, maybe it was Doris. Marge? Damn. I don't – I can't remember ...*

LRH: All right. Let's put it together here.

PC: *... who it was. Raping – past lives and ...*

LRH: There – you got the – there's the ghost of a tick.

PC: *Denise?*

LRH: Yeah. There it is. Microscopically smaller.

PC: *Yeah, I know it. You ... Something there.*

LRH: I just want to know what auditor it was.

PC: *...I'm not sure. You know? I mean, I – I – I don't really get anything.*

LRH: All right. Well, let me help you out, may I?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Was it a girl auditor? Was it a male auditor? Male auditor.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Did it happen in the United States? Did it happen in Paris? All right, did it happen in Paris? Now I've got a double tick.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What are you thinking about? Happening in Paris?

PC: *Vincent? Mario? Maybe it was Jack Campbell.*

LRH: All right. Was it Jack Campbell?

PC: *Maybe it was.*

LRH: All right. Was that auditor Jack Campbell?

PC: *Yeah, I guess it was.*

LRH: There's something here about it now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I'm gettin ...

PC: *Yeah, I guess it was. 'Cause he – he – he – he ran me on RT-3, think it was – OT-3.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *And it kind of went way back ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... into a lot of stuff ...*

LRH: Now we're getting a double tick here.

PC: *... past life stuff. Yeah. There was that.*

LRH: All right. You remember this now?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. And, now, did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you?

PC: *Undoubtedly! [laughs] No doubt.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah, I think he did.*

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Let me check that on the meter. Did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you? I get a reaction.

PC: *Yeah. [laughs]*

LRH: All right. Now ...

PC: *It – it's like saying, did Jack Campbell ever audit you? You know, I mean, it's like the same question. In fact, it was – it was funny.*

LRH: Now, we're taking off from that as a Zero question.

PC: *All right. Ooh.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *There must be something there? Line charge? Or something. [chuckles]*

LRH: Okay. Now let me check out a possible One.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: Okay. What did you successfully hide from Jack Campbell? All right, let me check that. Now let me check another one. What have you done to Jack Campbell? Well, we're going to take that first.

PC: *Yeah, it would be a good idea, I think.*

LRH: Rightly or wrongly, we will take that first, because it'll flatten rather rapidly.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. We will test that now. We know that you have withheld from him.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: All right. Would that be doing something to him?

PC: *The action of withholding from him?*

LRH: Yeah, we actually are wrong here in phrasing this What question ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... but I'm just testing this thing. Is there a specific overt?

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: I get a tick.

PC: *Yeah. It – it's a kind of a – a specific overt, many times, in a sense, you know?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Well, the first overt, really, is that I considered that kind of – something was not quite right, or I didn't quite ... Well, when I first took the Communication Course in Paris, this ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... You know, in Scientology – the Scientology Communication Course – you take the Communication Course.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I – I didn't have the money for the course, and I told him that – oh, I was – I – I knew he liked me.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *All right, I knew he and Gernie liked me, I knew they were interested in me, they liked my work in the theater, blah-blah-blah.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And so I said, "Well, I – I – well, I – I'm – gee, I'd like to take this course, Jack, but I – you know, I can't pay for it. Don't have the money."*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Like that. Now, I might have been able to scrape the money up if I had really – you know. You know, if he'd said, "Well, no, you go after the money and come and take the course."*

LRH: All right.

PC: *But he said – I don't have the money. I – I can't take this ..." and he said,*

"All right. It's all right," he said, "We – we want you to get the course. You can pay me later." I said, "Fine."

LRH: Well, tell me this now. Good. Tell me this now: Was that – the question we're on is doing something to him. Now, what specifically did you do to him there?

PC: *I kind of conned him into – I conned him into giving me the course for nothing. You know?*

LRH: All right. Good. You conned him into it.

PC: *Yeah. After – yeah ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... after a fashion.*

LRH: That's it. All right. Now, what about conning Jack Campbell?

PC: *Yeah, that's a good What question.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah. That's a good What question. Very good.*

LRH: Good. Well, that's the one we are going to work.

PC: *Yeah, it makes me sweat a little bit.*

LRH: All right. Very good. When was that?

PC: *Summer of 1958.*

LRH: Very good. Is that all there is to it?

PC: *Oh, I thought, well, if – you know, what do I have to lose here, you know? Nothing – nothing in this course, and, well, figured on paying him later on.*

LRH: All right. Good enough. All right. And what might have appeared there?

PC: *Well, I could have shake – shaken some money up from someplace, I think ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... to pay for it.

LRH: Very good. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: Well, Jack didn't. I – I – I – the fact I could have gotten the money someplace to pay for it, I think.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know.

LRH: Very, very good. Okay. When was that? Very specifically.

PC: July of – gee, the Moscow Art Theatre was in town.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I think it was the end of June. I think it was the end of June. End of June in 1958.

LRH: All right. Good. And what else is there about this?

PC: Well, I – I – I – I went on and took the course, and conned him again into giving me the HPA Course without paying for it over there.

LRH: All right. Okay. And what didn't appear there?

PC: Fifty thousand francs for the HPA Course.

LRH: Oh-ho-ho, I see.

PC: Still hasn't appeared.

LRH: All right. And who didn't find out about that?

PC: Well, the – the people who I owed money to didn't find out that I was spending more money or, you know ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... putting myself into more debt ...

LRH: I see.

PC: ... in a sense.

LRH: All right.

PC: Kind of a little bit of an overt against them. Very funny.

LRH: What?

PC: Just getting more debts without paying them off.

LRH: I see.

PC: You know, something like that.

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now, let's test this What question.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell? Have to test it again: What about conning Jack Campbell? That seems to have a tiny little bit of reaction on it. Let me ask you this. Is there any earlier moment there? Is there anything earlier, before that Comm Course? What's that?

PC: Yeah, had coffee or something with Jack and Gernie...

LRH: Yeah?

PC: ... and – I – Jack paid for the coffee or the drink or something – earlier, when I first met him. And I kind of conned him there a little bit. You know, he paid for the drink.

LRH: All right. Well, when was that?

PC: Was after a – hm. It – it was – well, it must have been after a – it must have been that spring, along in March or something like that.

LRH: Get a tick-tick.

PC: Yeah. In March ...

LRH: Yeah. All right. Good enough.

PC: ... that year. Yeah.

LRH: All right. What else is there to that?

PC: *I just – that was the first time I saw him. That night.*

LRH: That's the first time you ever saw him?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. Bang.

PC: *Yeah. Gernie invited me for a drink after an American Embassy Little Theatre group ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... production.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I'm not sure if it was hers or somebody else's. And – with her and Jack, and I saw this character first appear.*

LRH: All right. Okay. And what might have appeared there?

PC: *Hm. Well, I don't know. A couple of hundred francs from my pocket, I guess, to pay for the drinks, could have appeared.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *I think I was broke, or something, and I had to con him. You know, I couldn't pay the drink. I don't think I had any money on me, or something like this. It was funny.*

LRH: All right. Very good. who didn't find out about it?

PC: *Well Jack and – Jack and Gernie didn't.*

LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Let me test this What question again: What about conning Jack Campbell? Still got an action. Did you meet him any earlier than that?

PC: *Not that I know of.*

LRH: Ah-ah-ah.

PC: *Yeah?*

LRH: You meet Jack Campbell earlier than that?

PC: *Man, I don't remember if I do.*

LRH: Come on, come on, come on. Did you meet him earlier than that? I got a reaction here.

PC: *No.*

LRH: Let me test this very carefully, before I send you off on a wild-goose chase.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than that? You've got a reaction here, man.

PC: *I'll be darned. Jack Campbell earlier.*

LRH: Yes, Jack Campbell earlier.

PC: *I knew Gernie before I knew Jack.*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *The first I remember Gernie is meeting her after one of my productions there.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And, I heard about Jack. Damn! Or something, and I was kind of curious about him.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And...*

LRH: What are you plowing around with there? You got a double tick.

PC: *Yeah. It was meeting Gernie ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... after that production ...*

LRH: Right.

PC: *... in – in – in the foyer of the ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... *American Students and Artists Center* ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... *and – this – there's some unknown there. I can't remember about this – that ... Something ... I – I wondered where Jack was, or something like this. I'd never met him, you see?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But I wondered where Jack was ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... *or something. You know? I mean, there's – there's something like that.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *This – about all I got.*

LRH: All right. Just experimentally, was there a desire to withhold yourself from meeting Jack? No. All right. Let me check this What question again: What about conning Jack Campbell? Still reacts.

PC: *I intended on meeting Gernie ...*

LRH: Good.

PC: ... *I intended to get – get her interested in my theater project.*

LRH: Ah!

PC: *And maybe that's conning Jack a little bit, by getting Gernie interested.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Inadvertently conning Jack – conning Gernie into – into getting her to back my theater project.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Because I heard she was important, you know ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... *she had connections* ...

LRH: Now we got little tick-tick. Yeah.

PC: ... *and money, and – yeah – money and connections, and ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: ... *may – maybe it's kind of overt against Jack, and conning him, too, or something.*

LRH: Well, you don't have to add it up to him. Were you trying ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... to con Gernie?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Now is there a missed withhold right there at that meeting?

PC: *First meeting with Jack? Yeah.*

LRH: No. With Gernie.

PC: *Gernie.*

LRH: There a missed withhold there with Gernie? What would it be? What didn't she find out about?

PC: *On me? Gee, I don't know. That – well, the first I – when I first met her, I – I didn't – here was this big, fat woman here, you know?*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *Yeah. And – but – had a lot of – pretty alive, you know? Gernie is pretty alive.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *She – and she was interested in – in – in me because she had seen the production and liked it. And I didn't know who she was.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *She – very nice talking, and gets – I got some admiration there, and stuff like this ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... You know, it was nice.*

LRH: Well, have you answered the auditing question there? Is there a missed withhold from Gernie? I haven't got a reaction on it.

PC: *No, I – I – I can't think of any.*

LRH: All right. Now, let me test this. What question again, huh?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. What about conning Jack? Now, we've still got a little tick here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell – coming back to one we had before ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? All right. Let me ask you once more. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? I'm not getting a reaction on that.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I'll – I'll say it once more, because you're getting dives here.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? No, that's clean.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Now, is there a meeting between that first meeting with Gernie and what you were saying was the first meeting with Jack ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... when he bought the drinks?

PC: *The meeting with Gernie? Between that time?*

LRH: Yeah, well, is that – is ... Yeah, yeah. Is there a second meeting with Gernie before you met Jack?

PC: *Gee, I sure got it occluded if there is. There must – I ...*

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: *... yeah, there must have been. There must have been.*

LRH: Uh-huh. We got a ...

PC: *Must have been.*

LRH: The double action is on there.

PC: *Yeah. Funny, I've a little charge, too.*

LRH: What goes on here?

PC: *Gee. I'm just trying to think of what it was.*

LRH: All right. Good. Good.

PC: *Yeah. You know, it must have been, because by the time I met Jack, Gernie and I were already good friends, you know, there ...*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Wonder what happened in there.*

LRH: Yeah. All right. When might that have been?

PC: *March? Well, yes. I first met her, right ... God, 58. What was that, Streetcar Named Desire?*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *Yeah. Streetcar Named Desire. I first met her then, when – when she was – it must have been after Street – no, it must have been sooner than Streetcar. Man, I've got so much confusion through this period, you know?*

LRH: Interesting.

PC: *It's interesting.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: Okay. Well, how can I help you out there?

PC: *Well, I – I – I – I'm not sure what you – what to look for now. I kind of got lost off of that ...*

LRH: All right. Now, I asked you if there was a meeting ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... with Gernie, before you – from that – between that first meeting ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... and when you met Jack. I was asking you ...

PC: *Yeah, there must have been several of them.*

LRH: ... when was that period?

PC: *Yeah. I can't remember when I first met Gernie.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Do you follow?*

LRH: That's it. We haven't got the first meeting spotted, have we?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Well, when might it have been?

PC: *I – it seems to me it was after Waiting for Godot. I – I – after I did that production. And that was in – sp – well, spring of 57. Yeah.*

LRH: We're getting a bit of reaction there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Is that all there is to that meeting now?

PC: *Yeah. You mean that meeting with Gernie?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Yeah. Far as – yeah.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Far as I know.*

LRH: All right. What didn't appear there?

PC: *Well, Jack didn't.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Did you particularly want him to appear on that scene?

PC: *No, I didn't even know about him existing, you see, at that – at that point, really.*

LRH: Oh, you didn't know he existed at all?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. And who didn't find out about that first meeting? I got a reaction.

PC: *Oh, the – yeah, the – the people that ran the American Students and Artists Center didn't find out about that.*

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Very good.

PC: *'Cause they were supporting me, they were behind me, and it was kind of – I don't know.*

LRH: Well?

PC: *I was – I was getting support from other people, too. Confused. I was, you know, very confused there.*

LRH: Well, all right. Now we're getting onto something interesting. While they were supporting you, were you looking for support from other people?

PC: *Yeah, for my – well, not really. But I felt kind of guilty about – people would off – or something. You know, I'd – I'd get admiration and stuff like this. I was becoming an independent figure, you see?*

LRH: I see.

PC: *Kind of like this.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *In a sense.*

LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check this over now. Another What question here incidental, just to be checked.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about these meetings with Gernie? Now there's a double tick on these meetings with Gernie.

PC: *They're certainly occluded, in through here.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *There's a year ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *See, there's a year going through there ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... about that.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: I'm going to put that down as a ...

PC: *Boy, I sure had trouble with Gernie later on, so there must be – there must be something in there.*

LRH: Yeah? You do something to her?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: What?

PC: *Oh – I – later on there, I fought with her, you know?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Fought with her ...*

LRH: Did you do something to her specifically? We got a tick.

PC: *Yeah. I – yeah, one time she wanted to – she wanted to come and have supper with me. I told her no, I was going to go with some other people.*

LRH: Hm-km.

PC: *I – I – you know, kind of pushed her away.*

LRH: You what?

PC: *I kind of repulsed her.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Repulsed her and ...*

LRH: Well, let me ask this question: What about refusing Gernie? No, that isn't live. It isn't quite right. What would you do to Gernie? You repulsed her, then.

PC: *That time. Yeah.*

LRH: Well, when was that?

PC: *Was quite a bit later. This – I was back ...*

LRH: Well, when was it?

PC: *Nineteen – Jesus – Sixty. Spring of 60.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *March of 60.*

LRH: Is that all there is to it?

PC: *Well, there's other stuff during that incident. She was producing; I was directing a production there.*

LRH: Ah. You were working with her.

PC: *Yeah, working together.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Long time.*

LRH: Good. All right. And what didn't appear there?

PC: *In that particular instance there of repulsing her? Well, some friendliness on my part didn't appear.*

LRH: All right. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: *Well, Gernie didn't, really.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me ask you a couple of just leading questions here, could I?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Is there any affair – is there any affair with Gernie? Is there any refusal to have an affair with Gernie?

PC: *Yeah. Not – do you mean love affair? Or ...*

LRH: Yeah, I don't care.

PC: *Yeah. It was never – it was – it was neither way, you know? It was – we got together one time and – on this American Theatre Association thing, and she said, "Fred," she said, "I'd help you, but I want something out of it."*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And I – at that time I – I – I – I wondered – I had the consideration that, well, people should help me because they should help me, you know? Not because they want something out of me.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *You know? Very ...*

LRH: All right. We're on the double-tick line.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Go on.

PC: *Yeah. And that – that I deserve to be helped. You know?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *I – I – and I don't – I don't need to give anything in return.*

LRH: Ah.

PC: *Except my – my "contribution of art to the world," you know?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *Or something like that – some jazz like that. I'm important enough, and I'm – you know, I should be helped and not be bothered about things like this, and what have you. I – I kind of left her with a maybe on that whole thing.*

LRH: What did she mean by, she expected something out of it? What do you think she meant?

PC: *Well, she – she expected to direct a play now and then, when she wanted to, you know ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... enter in artistically into the thing. And I wasn't interested in letting her do this. I didn't consider her capable at the time of ...*

LRH: Did she ever find out about this?

PC: *She never found out about that, no.*

LRH: Oh. Is there a consistent withhold here on the subject of her capability?

PC: *There certainly is, yeah. Certainly is. Certainly is. All through – all through our relationship. Kind of culminating up into producing this play ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... together.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *I found out, in working together, that she was very capable.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *Before that – you know.*

LRH: You had an opinion through that period?

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

LRH: All right. She didn't find out about this at any time?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did Jack ever find out about this?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Might Jack have found out about this when he was auditing you?

PC: *Yeah, he might have, if he'd ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... asked me.*

LRH: Is there anything else about Gernie that Jack might have found out about? That's it.

PC: *I – I had a feeling she was interested in me as a man, you see, sexually.*

LRH: I see.

PC: *I couldn't – you know. I wouldn't want Jack to know that, that I kind of got*

the idea from her. Not through any really terribly overt – kind of covertly, I mean.

LRH: I see.

PC: *And I wouldn't want Jack to know about that.*

LRH: All right. All right. Now let me disentangle ...

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: ... all of this a little bit here.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: And let me ask that question again, check it on the meter.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Might Jack have found out something about you and Gernie when he was auditing you? Getting a little action on this.

PC: *Seems to be something else.*

LRH: It's what something else?

PC: *He might have found something else out – something else about me and Gernie, beside what I said.*

LRH: Something else ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... than this capability thing.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Was there anything else to find out? Got a reaction.

PC: *I didn't like her!*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *I didn't like her.*

LRH: Good. Well, might he have practically blown your head off if he'd found out about your opinions with Gernie? What do you think? Something going on here.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: I'm trying to get to the bottom of it.

PC: *Yeah. I – I – I don't know – I – my considerations at the time or my considerations now?*

LRH: Your considerations at the time.

PC: *At the time. Well, you know, I – he might have – he might not have liked me, or something like that. But that's the missed withhold.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this lineup now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay? What about conning Jack Campbell? Got a reaction.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Instant reaction.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: But it's not now the dirty needle reaction.

PC: *Yeah. I mean, there are some other times when I conned him, kind of.*

LRH: Oh, just give me a rapid rundown. What's the relationship here?

PC: *Well, I – I – I got some books from him and never paid him for the books.*

LRH: All right. Good. Thank you. Any other one?

PC: *Oh, I – I – I was going to trade twenty-five hours of auditing with him.*

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: *That's – that was a con, because he was a better auditor than I was.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Actually I got twelve and a half.*

LRH: Good. Good.

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: Any others?

PC: *Can't think of any right now.*

LRH: All right. What?

PC: *No, it's a motivator.*

LRH: Well, that's all right. What's the motivator? Perfectly all right with me.

PC: *Yeah. Well, there's – there was – there was some confusion with him about when I was on the course – when he came on the ACC over here. That's ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... when he was a student on an ACC. He and Vincent came over here. And – well, no, there – th-th-th-th-there's an overt in there. Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah, that's what I was going to just ask for, but you saved me the trouble.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What's the overt?

PC: *There's an overt in there. He left Mario and myself to teach the course there. Mm?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And we were supposed to work together in teaching the course.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *But Mario went on a concert tour, didn't come back.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *See? And he was supposed to come back in a week, didn't come back.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... at all, you know. But I went ahead and taught the course, myself.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And spent the time blaming Jack, kind of, for not – you know, for Mario – to let Mario – Jack, everybody else, whereby ... The overt was – golly, it's kind of – there's something to do with holding down the whole thing by myself ...*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *... and proving to them that they were no good, or something like this. You know, I don't know.*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Something like that.*

LRH: Good enough. Thank you. All right, let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? All right. I don't know if that was a reaction or not, I'll check it again.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got some kind of a reaction. Let's get the 1B checked here.

PC: *All right.*

LRH: What about these meetings with Gernie? All right, let me check it again. What about these meetings with Gernie? That is clean.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Now let me check the first one again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Let me check it again. What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got a reaction on that.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: It's much quieter.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Everything is smoothing out. There is something else here. Is that the first meeting you had with Jack Campbell?

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: Was it?

PC: *Yeah!*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Far as I know.*

LRH: Now, did you and Gernie talk about Jack Campbell? All right. There's no reaction there.

PC: *Hm-m.*

LRH: Is there any other con there that you might have skipped? Did you ever borrow money from him, or ...

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

LRH: ... never paid it back? You so far have just mentioned course fees, and so forth. Did you ever borrow money and not pay it back?

PC: *I think I paid all the money back I borrowed from him.*

LRH: I get no reaction on it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Did you ever take a girl away from him?

PC: *No.*

LRH: Did you ever steal anything off of him?

PC: *No.*

LRH: All right. Did you ever take a fee while you were teaching there and didn't pay it back, or something like that?

PC: *No. No.*

LRH: Huh?

PC: *No. Huh.*

LRH: What do you mean?

PC: *Oh, yeah!*

LRH: What?

PC: *Yeah, I just remembered an overt I got against him ...*

LRH: Yeah, all right.

PC: *... on that.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *While I was there, teaching – you know, teaching the course, holding things down, his – I'd use his office, you know, I mean, his office there.*

LRH: Yeah, yeah.

PC: *And he said, well, I wasn't supposed to go in the bottom left-hand drawer of his desk.*

LRH: Right.

PC: *I'm not supposed to touch that bottom left-hand drawer.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And so I went in the bottom – so I did go in the bottom left-hand drawer ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... and rummaged around there a bit, and found some dirty pictures down there.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *And never told him about that. Never told him about it.*

LRH: Okay. Did he audit you after that?

PC: *Yeah. Oh, yeah.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good enough. Now let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Well, this is getting to look much cleaner.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. What about conning Jack Campbell? I am not now getting an instant read ...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ... but it's a little bit before, and it's a little bit after.

PC: *Yeah. Well, there's a lot of – must be a lot of – several other things I have done to him, you know?*

LRH: Well, think of any offhand?

PC: *Hm, hm, hm.*

LRH: What's that?

PC: *Oh, well, I – yeah. I conned him there.*

LRH: What?

PC: *I took the test, my final exam paper ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... from the HPA, home, and did it at home ...*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *... in a sense. That's sort of a con. Well, yeah, because I – I – I went home and I – actually, when I took this paper home, I thought it was a joke about learning the Axioms. I – I – you know, learning, memorizing all those Axioms. That was silly.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And when I – I came – I brought it back. I copied them out of the book, you know.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Brought them back, you know, I brought them back. And he looked at it, and he checked it over, with me there, and he saw that everything was perfect in it.*

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: *You know? And he looked at me kind of funny, like "Well, you got it right."*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *I conned him there, because I realized when he looked at me funny that I – it wasn't a joke. I should have memorized those Axioms.*

LRH: Oh, I get you.

PC: *And I – I hadn't.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And – and at that moment I knew that – really that – that I hadn't. You know, I mean, I should have, or something, you know ?*

LRH: Hm-hm, yeah.

PC: *And I conned him there.*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: We got it taped now.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? This looks fairly clean.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: I'll check it just one more time. What about conning Jack Campbell? I haven't got anything on it.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's clean.

PC: *That was a – that was a – actually, that was the big one there. I mean, that – that one there.*

LRH: Yeah. That cleaned it. All right.

PC: *Funny, because I told you about that once, but it wasn't – it wasn't as precise.*

LRH: It wasn't "who missed the withhold," was it?

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

LRH: Yeah. Now, all right. Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

PC: *Nope.*

LRH: All right. Are you sure of that?

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

PC: *Now about the double tick? Is that off?*

LRH: I knew there was – I can't find it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: It started disappearing when we cleaned up Gernie.

PC: *Hm. Hm.*

LRH: And I haven't seen it.

PC: *Hm?*

LRH: But ... you ask about it there. There's ...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ... there's a wide motion, there's a wider motion.

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: It's about so long, but it isn't the tick I had in the first place.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: I've got a tick here of some kind or another.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: It's not a tick. I've got a – a stop and a sweep.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: But I was looking for a dirty little tick-tick.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: And it seems to have dived for cover at the moment.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: There – no, there it is again.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Why? What are you thinking of, as you think of that?

PC: *I don't know. That's the funny thing, you see? I kind of look at something. I kind of look at an area of the bank.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *You know, or something, or a piece of a ridge there, or something like that.*

LRH: Well, that's all right.

PC: *You know ? And I get it there ...*

LRH: It's all right. It's all right. Okay.

PC: *I can bring it back by sweeping, you know? Scanning across.*

LRH: Well, try it – to bring it back.

PC: *To bring it back? It's – I don't know.*

LRH: Yeah. A little bit. Little bit.

PC: *Yeah, there's a little button there, it's – push – I don't know.*

LRH: All right. There it is.

PC: *Creeps up on me. I was just trying there ...*

LRH: All right. But do you think we've attained anything there, on that?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Okay.*

LRH: Okay. Now, let's see what we've got here. Okay?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you told me any half-truth? What's the half-truth? That's it.

PC: *Oh, about writing those things for Robin, maybe. That's what I thought of ...*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *... right there.*

LRH: Thank you. I'll check it on the meter. Have you told me any half-truth? Got it. Check, bang. It reacts.

PC: *Hm-hm. Half-truths. Gee, I don't know.*

LRH: Hm?

PC: *I don't know what it was.*

LRH: Think of anything at all? What's that?

PC: *Oh, well, there must be some other things with Jack, I think.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I was ...*

LRH: You weren't satisfied that the What question was clean?

PC: *Yeah, I was satisfied.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *There was probably other things on the chain there along some – you know, little ones ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... like that, but not enough to ...*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Thank you. I'll check the auditing question. Have you told me any half-truth? Clean. Untruth? What's the untruth?

PC: *Untruth.*

LRH: That's it. Untruth.

PC: *About Gernie? I don't know.*

LRH: Think of an untruth?

PC: *Well, she didn't actually – I don't think she really ever really insinuated that she was interested in me, sexually.*

LRH: Ah.

PC: *You know? I – it – I think it was mainly my own ideas or something. You know, I mean, I kind of switched things around or something.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Have you told me any untruth? Got a reaction.

PC: *Hm. Huh, I don't know what it is. Untruth.*

LRH: There's something.

PC: *I don't know what it is.*

LRH: Something there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. I'll ask the question again.

PC: *Yeah. Yeah.*

LRH: Your answer is you don't know what it is?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: *I- I got an idea.*

LRH: What is it?

PC: *Something about beginning rudiments.*

LRH: Did you think one of them was still hot?

PC: *Maybe I had kind of a suspicion or something. I wasn't sure.*

LRH: Oh, yeah?

PC: *Well, it could of – yeah, well, kind of a – of a missed withhold or something, you know?*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *I was – I was – when you said – when you asked about a present time problem, I had a tiny present time problem that I haven't been able to get to sleep too well ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... over the last week or so.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *And I thought that it might show up. And then it didn't show up. And I thought it might show up, and uh – but it didn't show up.*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And so I thought maybe that was something wrong there.*

LRH: All right. Is there an untruth? Was any of that an untruth?

PC: *No, no, there wasn't an untruth on that.*

LRH: Well, was it an untruth? Did you tell me that it ... ?

PC: *An untruth, huh?*

LRH: Thinking of something there.

PC: *Well, yeah. If I said I had a present time problem and it didn't react on the meter, then it would be an untruth.*

LRH: Is that right?

PC: *Yes.*

LRH: Is that what occurred?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: You're not sure?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Is that your answer?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Very good. I will check that. All right. Have you told me an untruth? I get a reaction. Let me check it again ...

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: ... because you got a pretty dirty needle.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you told me an untruth?

PC: *Gee, I don't know what it is.*

LRH: This is very equivocal.

PC: *Yeah?*

LRH: Do you have a guilty conscience about telling untruths or something of the sort here? This is not getting the same reaction ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... constantly at all.

PC: *I – I – I have a guilty conscience. It's just, you know, a general one-has-a-guilty-conscience guilty conscience, you know?*

LRH: Well, does that upset you that I asked you if you've told an untruth?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Is that what this is falling on?

PC: *Yeah, maybe.*

LRH: Well, is it or isn't it?

PC: *Yeah, I didn't expect it to fall.*

LRH: Oh, all right. Okay.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Let me check it again. Have you told me an untruth? Now, I still get a reaction on this. That's it.

PC: *Oh. About my friend with the letter?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *My friend ?*

LRH: Well, what's the untruth there? That's it.

PC: *Well, I'm not – I'm not absolutely positive I wrote it to the right address. Huh? Have to go back, I have to check my – my address book ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... to make sure, because I just – I wrote the address out, you know ...*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *... after having remembered it. And I'm not – I have to check my address book.*

LRH: All right. Thank you. Is there an untruth in that anyplace?

PC: *Well, I said that ...*

LRH: What was the untruth?

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: That's it.

PC: *Well, that he – that I'm sure – well, that I'm sure that he would have – would have told me if he had moved.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And maybe he wouldn't have. I'm not sure that he would have told me that he moved.*

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: *Right.*

LRH: Very good. Have you told me an untruth? All right. That's clean. Or said something only to impress me? I'll check that again. Have you said something only to impress me? Have you said something only to impress me? I haven't got any reaction on that. Your needle is banging around here ...

PC: *Oh.*

LRH: ... so I have to check it a little bit. Would you care to answer it?

PC: *I was thinking maybe that this overt on Robin I said, but it wasn't only to impress you. No, it wasn't.*

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check it again.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? Now I am getting a kick on this.

PC: *Oh, it wasn't only to impress you, but maybe I – it was a little bit to impress you. This overt on Robin, about writing him notes and stuff ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... like that.*

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? That's clean. Or tried to damage anyone in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Now what's the ping on that?

PC: *I was looking for that – that double tick.*

LRH: Oh!

PC: *You know?*

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: *Looking for the double tick that I had.*

LRH: Very good. All right. I'll check that. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I get a little tick on it still.

PC: *Well, I implied that I could influence, I suppose, to a certain extent, if I could "push the button." I said I could "push the button" there and get a double tick.*

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: *You know, and that – if that was true, then I could push the button any time and get a double tick.*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *Sort of push the button.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *That wasn't true, you know.*

LRH: Okay. All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Very improbable. I will check it one more time.

PC: *Oh, I don't want it to read when – when I can't find anything to – to – for it to read on.*

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: *You see?*

LRH: All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I haven't got a reading here ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... but subject seems to be kind of mucky.

PC: *Well, I've kind of held my breath at times, hoping that I wouldn't get any read, or something on that. Read a body read or – I mean, it was silly, you know? I was sort of holding my breath or holding my body still and holding my hands still to make sure that the E-Meter doesn't read.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: Good. All right.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Okay. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Well, this is a *bzz-bzz* ...

PC: *Hm-hm.*

LRH: ... sort of question. It isn't reacting very hard, but there's something there. Feel you gave me a lose by making – I was trying to clean up this double tick, or ...

PC: *Something to do with that. No, not so much.*

LRH: ... or something like that? Any feeling like that at all?

PC: *Yeah. Well, yeah, maybe – maybe I thought it at the moment when I said "What happened to the double tick?"*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *And I thought, well, the double tick should have gone by now, you see?*

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: *It cleared up with Gernie, then that was the end of the double tick.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *Then it came back.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And in a sense I felt I influenced the E-Meter, or something, to bring it back on, you know, like that.*

LRH: Hm. All right. Okay. Now let me check this question again.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That is clean. All right. Have you failed to answer any question or command I have given you in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you withheld anything from me? It's a trifle latent ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... but what is it?

PC: *I was thinking there was one, just – there was one question that I may have failed to answer ...*

LRH: What was that?

PC: *... much earlier, and I'm surprised it didn't react. I was thinking there was one, and it should have reacted.*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *Or something like that.*

LRH: All right, what question was it?

PC: *The one about "What about those meetings in between?" I never did find a meeting in between ...*

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: *...you see, those two.*

LRH: Thank you. I'm sorry I asked you a double question there.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? I got a reaction.

PC: *I don't understand what you meant by double question. Or ...*

LRH: I ask you a question, you answer it and I ask you another question. I was just apologizing

PC: *When was that? I...*

LRH: Just a moment ago.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: All right. Let me check this ...

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: ... again. Hm? Have you withheld anything from me? Well, this – this is greasy. This hasn't anything to do with it.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? There is not an instant read on this.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Withheld? Well, there's a bing on withheld.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Withheld? Yes, there's a bing on withheld.

PC: *Lot of things I'd like to talk to you about. I – you know ...*

LRH: Well, all right. Now, get the question here, now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Have you withheld anything from me? All right. It looks much cleaner.

PC: *Yeah. There's a lot of things I – I don't tell you or talk about, or something like that. You know, sometimes I ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *...I've withheld – I've withheld communicating to you how pleased I am to be on the course, and how – how – how ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *... and how many gains I have got and how tremendous I think it is. That's all.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know?*

LRH: Very good.

PC: *But it's not an overt act. I'm trying to give overt acts that I've done and I've withheld, you know, or something like that.*

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Have you withheld anything from me? There's a slight needle change ...

PC: *Uh-huh.*

LRH: ... right there on the end of that.

PC: *Uh...*

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: *Yeah. All right. All right. This is very funny. I – I got myself in the front – right at the front of the class ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: *... this week, under the assumption I was no longer an old – a new student – that I'm an old student. Last week Herbie caught me in the third row from the back, in the first lecture, and I – here you know I – I kind of snuck up to the third row that first day ...*

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ...you know. He told me I could sit in back, you know ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... new student, next time. Well, yesterday I got in the second row from the front ...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ... and no one caught me at it. If – if now, as – a little games condition thing there, and I was just seeing if – if the second week, if you're still a new student, and – and if I wouldn't be (a) I wouldn't get caught at it or (b) I would – could argue my way out that I was a new student.

LRH: All right.

PC: And – or something like that. Anyway, it's silly.

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Have you withheld anything from me? A halt as it goes, as it comes back up.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There. What are you thinking about?

PC: Well, I ...

LRH: There.

PC: I had an argument with – a little argument with Robin.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... about – after I took over the post.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And I ... oh, I don't know, I didn't tell you about it.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that it?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Let me check this question on the meter. Have you withheld anything from me? It's just a little roughness. Pretty clean. Just a little roughness.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Hardly detectable. A slowed rise.

PC: I'm trying to differentiate between motivators and, you know, overt acts, and what's really a withhold, and what isn't, and, you know, I'm still a little confused on that.

LRH: All right.

PC: And...

LRH: Does that answer the question?

PC: Yeah. And I'm not sure what – what a withhold is at this point, in a sense, you see?

LRH: Oh.

PC: And...

LRH: I see.

PC: Because it ...

LRH: I get you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Well, go ahead, if you want.

PC: Well, it's just a "damage somebody," you know? I mean, it's not – see, I'm confused.

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know, it's – it's that – that's – it's – it's – it's not a withhold, really, because I wouldn't mind telling you*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You see?*

LRH: All right.

PC: *So I don't ...*

LRH: Very good.

PC: *... but if I did tell you, it would be kind of a "damage"; then it would be an overt act, then it – you know, it would – the rudiments would go out. And then, you know, I'm a little confused on what's a withhold. It's something I did.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *And I can't think of anything I did that I, you know, withheld from you.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *You know.*

LRH: Let me check the question again.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? Still get a reaction.

PC: *Still get a reaction.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Right there.*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Well, I – I – I ...*

LRH: There it is.

PC: *Well, it's kind of an overt act now. I changed the franchise thing a – a little bit while I had the post.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And it didn't really become an overt act until Robin got excited about it when he took over.*

LRH: Hm.

PC: *And then – then I – something happened.*

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: *And I put in some – made franchises a little stiffer, you know, to get a franchise.*

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: *And made co-audit centers beef it up a little bit to – you know, to get more information to them for people who didn't, I felt, deserve franchises or, you know, because they weren't working at it, you know?*

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: *To kind of give them a gradient to get up to a franchise. Well, I withheld from you telling you that – that since Robin had taken over he's – he's switched it back and made franchise very easy to get, you know, and everything else. And I think that's wrong. And I withheld telling you that I think it's wrong.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *But it's none of my business anymore.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Huh.*

LRH: Thank you.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay. Let me check the question. Have you withheld anything from me? Well, it's clean.

PC: *Yeah. Oh, is it?*

LRH: All right. Okay. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Thank you. Squeeze them cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Put the cans up on the table.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Touch the table. Now, we were running Feel, weren't we?

PC: *Yeah, well, same thing.*

LRH: Does it mean anything?

PC: *Yeah, yeah.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Touch the table. Thank you. Touch your chair. Thank you. Touch that. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Good. Touch the top of your head. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Touch your chair. Good. All right. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. That's much better. Squeeze them again. All right. We are going to let it go at that. Thank you. All right. Made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: *I think so.*

LRH: Okay. All right.

PC: *I think cleaning off this stuff on Jack will help me in Scientology – (a) in Scientology, help me in my – in studying.*

LRH: Stay in PT while studying? All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Good.

PC: *And – what was my other goal?*

LRH: Sleep.

PC: *Sleep?*

LRH: Sleep at night?

PC: *Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, no trouble. No trouble. Won't have any trouble.*

LRH: You're postulating that, or do you – do you know?

PC: *No, I know. I just know.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *I'll just go to sleep easily.*

LRH: You're not trying to make me look good?

PC: *No, no.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *No. I – I just – I just feel better, and feel kind of tired, and feel like sleeping, instead of nervously tired. There's a difference.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Okay.

PC: *Yeah. I've been nervous. And I don't feel as nervous now.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *So...*

LRH: I see. All right. Well, have you made any other gains in this session you care to mention?

PC: *Cleaned up on Scientology.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Remembered a few things, that...*

LRH: Okay.

PC: *... didn't remember otherwise.*

LRH: Anything else?

PC: *Hm ... I just feel more rested ...*

LRH: All right.

PC: *...you know. I don't feel as frantic as I used to feel.*

LRH: Good. All right. Thank you.

PC: *I got on television again. [laughs]*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *It's a game.*

LRH: All right. Okay. Is there anything you care to say or ask before I end this session?

PC: *No, but thank you.*

LRH: All right. You're sure?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Let me check that. Anything you care to say or ask before I end this session? Thank you. All right. You're all right, then, huh?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right. Is it all right with you if I end this session now?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right, here it is. End of session. Has the session ended for you?

PC: *Yeah. Yeah, it has.*

LRH: Has it?

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: All right.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Very good. Tell me I'm no longer auditing you.

PC: *You're no longer auditing me.*

LRH: Thank you.

TV Demo:

Sec Checking with Comments by LRH

An auditing demonstration given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 27 March 1963

Well, how are you today? How are you today?

We've got a demonstration today. We're going to be sec checking somebody, showing how you dig something up. Your attention is recommended to the fact that the auditor is not there to miss withholds on the pc. This is not a definition of an auditor.

What's the date, by the way? Twenty...

Female voice: Twenty-seventh.

Twenty-seventh of March 1963.

And the art of Sec Checking is very, very well established. It's one of the finest arts that we have. But it is to a large degree an art. It is restimulating the material to be picked up. And then picking it up.

I think somebody here recently went through a – in one week of four hours of auditing – I think that was right, wasn't it – one week of four hours of auditing, went through the last two pages of the Joburg, a Form 6A and what else?

Female voice: And a student Prepcheck.

And a student Prepcheck. Oh, boy! That's really remarkable. I don't know how he did that. In the first place, it isn't that we want to audit slowly, we want to audit thoroughly. And thorough audit is very much the point.

Now, one of the things which you will find, one of the things which you will find consistent and so forth is that a good auditor gets something done. He audits the pc in front of him. He gets something done. And it's *not* getting *through* the Prepcheck; it's getting *through* to the pc.

Withholds restimulate. They are actually not there. They have to be keyed in. And I think you will see some of that happening now.

Now, let me see if we're ready downstairs here. Yes, we're all ready downstairs, and we're about to see some Sec Checking. Okay? There we are.

Auditor: Hmm? Is that right?

PC: Nearly. This will do.

Aud: Okay, Leslie. Well, what we're going to do in this session is that I've got here the uh – Joburg, the last two pages of the Joburg...

PC: Hm.

Aud: ...which I understand has been flattened on you over the – in the pavilion.

PC: Well, we got something alive on it.

Aud: You still got something alive.

PC: Something alive.

Aud: All right. So what I'm going to do, I'm going to check down this list, to see what's reading or not, and then if we get through that, then I've got some more questions I'm going to put to you, to clean those up as well.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Okay. If I can get some of these questions alive, that's good for both of us, all right?

PC: All right.

Aud: Good. All right, now, that's fine, thank you. Just give the cans a squeeze. Thank you. Let them go. All right. Just once more and let them go – right. Thank you. All right now, I'm not going to put in Model Session here, if we do need it however, I will, but I'm not going to put Model Session in. Is that all right with you?

PC: Yes, it's all right.

Aud: Okay. Now, is there anything you want to tell before we start, at all?

PC: No, except that we were having trouble cleaning up something this morning and I felt a bit sort of shaken since. I was quite sure this morning I didn't have a missed withhold that they think I had.

Aud: Okay. All right. Now, anything else?

PC: No.

Aud: Good. All right, now how about this room? Is it all right to audit in this room?

PC: Yes, it's all right.

Aud: All right. Very good. Now, is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Okay. Start of session! Session started for you?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Very good. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC: To clean up anything that's been missed.

Aud: Good. All right, any other goals for this session?

PC: Just to do my best.

Aud: Good. All right, is there anything else?

PC: I think that'll – that'll be all right.

Aud: That'll be all right, very good. All right. Good. All right, now we're going into – straight into the questions here, and the first question I'm going to ask you is: Do you know any communists personally? All right. That's the question I'm going to ask you. Now, tell me what does this question mean?

PC: Well, it means, do I know anybody who I know is a communist.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: And I think it means in this life.

Aud: All right, thank you. All right, well now, here's the question. Do you know any communist personally?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. Did – a good look at that?

PC: Well, if I – if I do, I don't know that they are.

Aud: Hm-hm.

PC: I mean, I might know somebody who is a communist unknown to me, but not known to me.

Aud: All right, thank you. Has anybody told you – think who might be a communist or anything, do you know?

PC: Well, I just thought of one preclear who gave us a bit of trouble about a year ago, but I don't think he was a communist.

Aud: All right.

PC: I just thought of him then.

Aud: Okay. Is there anybody else?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. I'll check this question on the meter now.

PC: Hmm.

Aud: Do you know any communist personally? All right. You possibly have an answer there, do you?

PC: No, no – I just felt nervous and wondering if it would read or not.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right. Okay, I'm going to check that question.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: We had an equivocal read there.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: Do you know any communist personally? There is a read here.

PC: The only thing I get there is something which has come up in processing before.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: It's some – came up on this question, some past lives stuff, that's very confused and I'm not sure about it. But that's all I get.

Aud: All right.

PC: Hmm.

Aud: What actually do you get here?

PC: I usually think of Lenin and...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...sometimes Karl Marx.

Aud: Yeah.

PC: ... and I used to get the idea that I had had something to do with starting communism.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: And it gave me a horrible scare ...

Aud: All right.

PC: ... and I backed off that one.

Aud: Okay. Now, I'll ask you the question, do you know any communist personally?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. I'll check it on the meter. Do you know any communist personally? All right, do you agree that's clean?

PC: Hmm.

Aud: Okay, thank you. All right, now,

the next question I'm going to ask you is: Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology? That's the question I'm going to ask you. Now, tell me, what does that mean to you?

PC: Um, have I ever damaged it or hurt it in any way, or...

Aud: Yes...

PC: ...um – injured – it could mean have I prevented it from advancing, like I really feel it shouldn't advance, by...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...by not doing things, too.

Aud: All right. Okay. And on the question "On Dianetics," what's this mean to you?

PC: Well, I haven't had very much to do with Dianetics except for...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ... trying to sell the book to a few people.

Aud: Right.

PC: Hmm.

Aud: And Scientology?

PC: That means just the general science all over the world?

Aud: All right, okay. Now, how long have you been in Dianetics or – and/or Scientology?

PC: '59.

Aud: Since 1959?

PC: Hm.

Aud: All right. Okay, well, have you been working in an organization or something?

PC: No, with Eddie, in the franchise center.

Aud: Hm-mm.

PC: Uh – I did – did a little bit of auditing in Melbourne.

Aud: All right. Okay, well now, I'm going to give you this question. All right. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: Well, the thing I thought of there, straight away, was uh – the preclear I had in Melbourne ...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... auditing her.

Aud: Yes.

PC: I was – I had to leave Melbourne and go back to New Zealand and I hadn't completed her intensive. She still had missed withholds at that time.

Aud: All right.

PC: It wasn't a break of agreement there, but the fact was that I felt that I could have done a better job auditing her than I did do.

Aud: All right. What did you actually do there?

PC: Well, I left Melbourne while she still had missed withhold.

Aud: All right. Okay. Any other doingness there?

PC: I didn't use my own judgment...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...in the sessions.

Aud: Very good. Anything else there?

PC: No, I don't think so. I think that's all.

Aud: All right, okay. I'll give you the question again. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: Yes, by being slow with dissemination.

Aud: All right. Now, when was that?

PC: Thing I thought of there was once – uh – we were going to put an advertisement in the paper for a course in something and I slowed Eddie down in doing it in some...

LRH: You notice that rock slam – that rock slam there that she's turning on over this question. You notice that it's early and late. That is quite common.

PC: ...very banky sort of way, and...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... oh, no, we won't do it just yet, you know, sort of – I said something like that, and we actually put it off.

Aud: Yes, all right. Okay. Now, I didn't quite hear what Ron said then and I wondered if he could repeat it.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right.

LRH: I said it was just early and late, that rock slam, and that she does have a rock slam there on this subject – but it doesn't get instant when they do that on a Sec Check. You can expect it to turn up and turn off, and she's really shadow boxing with something. That's all I said.

Aud: Thank you.

LRH: You bet!

Aud: All right, now. I'm sorry, I didn't get – quite get the last of your communication there.

PC: I've forgotten what I ...

Aud: All right, okay. I'll tell you what I'll do, I'm going to give you this question again. Have you ever injured Dianetics or

Scientology?

PC: I didn't get any definite answer there, nothing that ...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... I've definitely done.

Aud: All right. Um – what – were you looking at there?

PC: Well, what I was looking at before was uh – slowing Eddie down in getting an advertisement put in the paper advertising testing, that might have been.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Sort of a back-off of confronting new people.

Aud: All right. Okay.

PC: And I – and I was successful in doing it. I realized it was an overt.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right. Anything else you did around that time?

PC: No, I didn't get anything there at that time.

Aud: All right. Well, let's have another look. [PC laughs] All right. Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: I feel as if I have, but I don't get anything there.

Aud: All right. Well, what are you looking at there? Something there.

PC: Just – just a feeling of grief.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right.

PC: The – the thing is that I feel that I've done wrong, and – and – to do with Scientology and Dianetics, is in – in not making myself get a bit of necessity level on it and start things.

Aud: All right.

PC: That's the thing I feel.

Aud: Okay, when didn't you – when didn't you do this thing?

PC: Oh, I haven't done that all the time. Ever since I came into Scientology, all the time, it's been constant really. I – I do a little bit, now and then.

Aud: Yes.

PC: And when I do, I usually do – well, a good enough job to know that I ought to do a bit more, you see?

Aud: All right. Give me an example here. What's that?

PC: Well, that was 1960, before we started practicing Scientology.

Aud: Hm-hmm. Yes?

PC: And feeling we ought to start. I think it was 1960, I'm not quite sure of my dates.

Aud: Yes. All right.

PC: But at that particular time we were having a bit of confusion, Ed and I, and Ed was a bit down, and I had the feeling that I ought to do something.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Sort of get cracking, you know, quite strong, and I just didn't do it. But I – I knew I should have done it a certain time, and then I sort of forget about it.

Aud: Yes, well what was it you didn't do here, at that time?

PC: I'm getting a bit mixed up.

Aud: Yes, well...

PC: I – I didn't run a PE Course.

Aud: All right, okay.

LRH: That's a pumping needle, by the way, you see there, class, that's a pumping needle.

Aud: All right. Now. What was at – at that time, what was it you actually did?

LRH: It can also be caused by somebody having their cans against their clothing while breathing.

Aud: There.

PC: It would be – the thing I did would be, say, just go out to the pictures or something like that and do a...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...just do lazy sort of things instead of doing something worthwhile.

Aud: Yes, very good. Very good. Can you give us a specific time when you did this. An incident?

PC: Gee, I've got this shut off.

Aud: All right. Okay. Some time when you went to the pictures.

PC: I just get the idea of – of going in the truck, you know, just being – having my body in the truck, moving toward the picture theater some time, but I couldn't tell you exactly when it was, it must...

Aud: Yeah.

PC: ...have happened dozens of times.

Aud: All right, now you're telling me that you got this feeling you – what was it you were doing? What was this general thing you were telling me here?

PC: Doing things like being irresponsible, going to the pictures, instead of getting here.

Aud: All right, have you got one time when you went to the pictures?

PC: Well, the – the time I've got when I – I had this urge to do something was ...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...coming home from the pictures. I've got that time.

Aud: All right, what happened there? What was it you did?

PC: Oh, I think I'm starting to see a bit of daylight.

Aud: All right, very good.

PC: There's more to this, this – this – I was processing Eddie at the time...

Aud: Right.

PC: ...and he was getting upset as a – as a preclear.

Aud: Yes.

PC: I think that was what it was.

Aud: Hmm.

PC: And – um – this is before missed withholds, you know.

LRH: See that needle go clean?

PC: ...and uh – the cause would be in giving – giving bad auditing and no results, because he was confused and didn't want to – didn't want to start until he was sort of more sure.

Aud: Yes.

PC: And I had this urge to do something, real strong this time, and I probably made him feel guilty about it, but the fact was I had done an overt before that.

Aud: Yes.

PC: Because if I had done good auditing he would have felt all right.

Aud: All right. So what – where was this overt to here then?

PC: I don't know which overt you want.

Aud: The actual overt you got in mind when you said you'd done some bad auditing on him.

LRH: See, this is ...

PC: I don't have it there, except that I – just a general idea of – of a bit of confusion near his processing.

LRH: See that needle dirty up again the moment that she started talking about this bad auditing.

PC: And...

LRH: Moving on down toward what she really did.

PC: Once I blew of from him in the session.

Aud: I beg your pardon?

PC: Once I blew from him in the session...

Aud: I see, yes.

PC: ...probably around about that time.

Aud: Hm-hmm. You – what actual – how did you blow the session? What actually did happen? Tell me about it.

PC: Uh...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: The – the one – I've got one there now.

Aud: Good.

PC: I've done it after this, too. I – I did this a – a few times.

Aud: All right.

PC: Uh – first one would be – uh – I was trying to get his case going and I'd be running a process – "What part of that scene you are looking at can you be responsible for?" or something like that

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...and he got upset in the session, you see, and I'm trying to get this process going and I got angry because he was an-

gry and I blamed him, you see?

Aud: Right.

PC: It just went – and I think I said, "You can go to hell," and I just left. And I realized when I got to the door – I was in a real rage...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... what I'd done, and I came back.

Aud: Yes.

PC: I don't even remember if I ended that session or not. But I did go back.

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, is there anything else you did to that – in that session?

PC: Oh. Break the Auditor's Code.

Aud: All right. Anything else? Anything else there?

PC: I – I didn't get anything. There must be, but I sort of ran up against a blank wall.

Aud: All right. Well now tell me, when was the first time you blew sessions on this preclear? That's it.

PC: There was twice, very close together and I don't know whether the one I'm telling you about is the first one. I think it is the first one.

Aud: Well, what was the other one here, then?

PC: The other one was – uh – one – early one morning.

Aud: All right.

PC: Quite close to that time, probably within two months.

Aud: All right. Now, what happened on that occasion? Hm-hmm? You have got something there.

PC: Not – not anything yet.

Aud: And what happened in that session? The other session where you blew? It's there. It's there.

PC: Oh, yes.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Uh – he – he got upset about my auditing.

Aud: All right. Okay.

PC: And I just – I just didn't confront that.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: So I blew.

Aud: All right, and what had you done then in here?

LRH: Notice the auditor properly called that a motivator, see? "He got upset and I blew," so now we got to get the overt, see?

Aud: There it is.

PC: I didn't want to audit him.

Aud: All right. Now, the – when – when was that? That.

PC: I – this was all the same time. It was the – the one... it directed me to another one, there were two close together

Aud: All right.

PC: ...and this is the one morning before I went off to – to school.

Aud: Right, fair enough. Now, what had you done in this session? There. There. There you are.

PC: I get the feeling I haven't got it yet.

Aud: Okay, just have a look there, something you did. There you are. There.

PC: Oh, I thought I started the session late.

Aud: All right, okay. Well, is that what

you did?

PC: I'm not sure, but that's what I've got, that's what came up...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...just then, when you said "that."

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, is there anything else in that session that you did? Something there.

PC: Well, I would've Qed and – Qed and A – Q-and-Aed before I got angry. I – I would have said something back.

Aud: Oh, all right.

PC: I don't remember what.

Aud: Okay. Let's have a look at this. What – what was said in this session that led to this? Something there.

PC: Uh – all I got there was the idea of Ed saying to me I wasn't doing something right, and I can't even remember what I was doing or what it was I wasn't doing right.

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, what was before that, was it, that you weren't – that you'd done in this session? Before he said that to you? ... You've got something here.

PC: Not seeing anything yet.

Aud: Hm-hmm. Let's have a look. Was it an auditing flub?

PC: Well, it would be an auditing flub.

Aud: Hm-hmm. All right.

PC: Would be an auditing flub.

Aud: Well, what was the auditing flub?

PC: Not understanding the preclear.

Aud: All right. Okay. What didn't you understand there?

PC: I'm getting a bit of – bit of it back.

Aud: Hm-hmm, good.

PC: Um – I didn't listen fully and – and acknowledge his difficulty.

Aud: All right.

PC: There was some difficulty with processing...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...in Scientology, and his case. At that time he felt that he could help other people with Scientology but nobody had helped him, you see?

Aud: Right.

PC: And – uh – it used to come up a lot in sessions.

Aud: Yes.

PC: And now I think it's – feel that that would be what it was.

Aud: What would it be, actually, then?

PC: Well, I must have done something that he – made him feel awful, the preclear was feeling lousy anyway, that's for sure.

Aud: I didn't quite hear that.

PC: I must have done something to make him feel bad, because the preclear would have been feeling really bad in the session.

Aud: Oh, all right. Okay.

PC: And – and got a failure...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... somehow or other, about auditing.

Aud: Yes. Now, was there something on this you didn't understand or something that you did in the session?

PC: Oh, I didn't understand it.

Aud: Oh. All right. Now, where – um –

well, tell me this, which house was this a – did this session take place in?

PC: Oh, this was in – uh – uh – River Road, 574 River Road.

Aud: All right. Is it a big building? Small building?

PC: No, a medium-sized house.

Aud: All right. How many rooms in it?

PC: Oh, I don't know how many rooms – one, two, three, four, five.

Aud: All right.

PC: Five major rooms.

Aud: All right, now which room were you auditing in?

PC: We were in the front – the front lounge.

Aud: All right. Tell me, how – how's that room furnished in?

PC: Oh, I get that view all right!

Aud: All right.

PC: A carpeted floor and a settee and the sofas.

Aud: Hmm, yes. Very good. All right, have you got the picture of that, when you – when you had this session with him?

PC: Yeah. Yes.

Aud: All right.

PC: It's getting better.

Aud: Good. Anything – um – distinguishing – anything distinguishing about the preclear that day?

PC: Only being upset, I guess.

Aud: Yes, all right, well, his attire or his clothing?

PC: I seem to think he had on his green jersey, but that's what I think.

Aud: All right, very good. All right, now have a look at this session, see what it was you did ... It's kicking here ... All right. How you doing?

PC: Uh – all right.

Aud: Good.

PC: I'm sort of just looking, trying to find something.

Aud: Yes, all right. Well what – what process were you running? What sort of auditing were you giving him on this occasion?

PC: It would be what was out at that time, I think.

Aud: Well, what would be – what was it – what were you running in the session.

PC: Gee, it's hard to recall. Could have been Havingness and Confront.

Aud: All right.

PC: Or it could have been uh – uh – one of those routines.

Aud: Well, all right. Was it one of those routines?

PC: There was another one, another – another routine there and I'm trying to pick it up, what it would be.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: Hmm. I'm not sure.

Aud: All right, now what – what were you doing at the moment when he – when you started to get – when he started to get ARC broken then?

PC: Running a process, I'd be running a process when it happened.

Aud: All right. Okay. And what were his words to you?

PC: I'm not sure whether this is right or

not, but...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...I get the idea...

Aud: Yes...

PC: ... of him saying, "I don't think this is doing me any good."

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, what was it – what would it be that wasn't doing him any good then? What process were you running at that time?

PC: Christ! I don't know.

Aud: All right, how's this doing – going?

PC: It's a bit hard to get – get what it is.

Aud: All right. Well now, tell me, this wasn't the first time you'd audited this PC?

PC: No.

Aud: All right. Now, were there some earlier sessions when you'd audited this PC?

PC: Yes.

Aud: All right, now, in any of those earlier sessions that you got something that you'd done wrong in them?

PC: Plenty of things. I hadn't blown in those earlier sessions, but...

Aud: Pardon?

PC: ...I hadn't blown...

Aud: No, all right, okay.

PC: ...in those earlier sessions, but plenty of things.

Aud: All right. Now, was there an earlier session you can recall here, with this PC?

PC: Well, it – it might be the first or second session I gave him.

Aud: All right, now how's that session seem to you? What did you do in that one?

PC: We were running uh – overts and withholds.

Aud: Good. All right, yes. Now, what – uh – what did you do in that session?

PC: Well, I'd be running "What have you done to me," "What have you withheld from me?" That would be what I'd be doing.

Aud: All right. Now, how did that session go?

PC: First session went all right.

Aud: Good. Your second session?

PC: Second session...

Aud: Yes?

PC: Ah yeah, the second session was when I started getting uh – uh – some trouble with the ARC...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...in the session.

Aud: Very good. Now, what was it you did in that session?

LRH: There's an additive in that first session.

PC: All I can get in the second session was, uh...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: In the second session I gave him uh – we were – were at this time, we weren't married...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...and we were just going together, and I was a bit keener than Eddie was at that particular time.

Aud: All right.

PC: And in the second session, some of this started coming up as his withhold, you see...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...in that session. But I didn't do anything wrong in that session, I just acknowledged and went on. But I felt shaken up, but I might have done something before that.

Aud: All right, very good. Well, what about the first session then, that you ran? Yes? [pc laughs] Hm-hmm, yes?

PC: I've looked at this before, and...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...the first session I ever gave him, the only overt I could – I can think there, is quite a – quite a good-sized one, really ...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...and it would be – would be teaming up – I sort of suggested that we audit each other...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...and the – the teaming up there was sort of for Scientology, but the – my main goal uh ...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ... was second dynamic goal, I sort of – sort of fell for him, you see. And I was really...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...after him...

Aud: All right.

PC: ... in a cunning sort of way. So the auditing would be as a means for that, really, underneath.

Aud: All right. Now, was there anything in your auditing, along these lines? Second dynamic lines at all?

PC: No, not at that point, I don't think, no.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: I was only running overt-withhold on me.

Aud: All right.

PC: Oh, well, I get his overts off on me, and he won't fly!

Aud: Pardon?

PC: I get his overts off on me and his withholds, and he won't fly.

Aud: All right. Okay. Is that it?

PC: Oh, yes, well, that's part of it.

Aud: All right, now, is there anything else in that session?

PC: No, I don't see anything else there.

Aud: All right. Well now, how about this pc now? And the subsequent ARC breaks? Still something there.

PC: He didn't really start ARC breaking...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ... him... himself, until that's – probably about three or four sessions, and maybe even a week later.

Aud: All right.

PC: I think it would be within a week, really.

Aud: Okay. Now, after the first session, what about the second session? Is there anything you did in that session? Yeah?

PC: I don't get anything I did, I was just looking at the session...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...just – just looking at it there.

Aud: All right. Now, was that – how – what was the purpose of running that session?

PC: The purpose would be to clean up the overts and withholds, get the – get it clean.

Aud: Yes. Very good. All right, now any other purpose as far as you were concerned?

PC: No, no, the – actually the other one I told you about, I didn't consciously fully realize it about that at the time, but...

Aud: Hm-hm.

PC: ...I could see it afterwards...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...that it was there. But it wasn't – uh – I had it nicely suppressed.

LRH: [talking to auditor]

Aud: Um. Uh-huh. Uh-huh. All right. Okay, well now, why did you come into Scientology then? What was the original idea of coming into Scientology?

PC: Uh – the original idea of coming into Scientology.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: I had read a little bit about it in a book.

Aud: Yeah, hm-hmm.

PC: And got a bit interested...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...and I then heard a bit about it from my father, just a little bit.

Aud: Right.

PC: And then I saw – I was very bored and dissatisfied with my job...

Aud: Right.

PC: ...and so I wrote to the Christchurch Scientology people to find out if they had a course. And that's – that's...

Aud: Yes.

PC: ...primarily – I think that was the first reason why I came in.

Aud: Yes, all right. And you wrote for the course, then what did you do?

PC: Pardon?

Aud: You wrote for details of the course...

PC: Yeah.

Aud: ...then what did you do?

PC: I went to the PE Course!

Aud: Right, yes. All right.

PC: And Eddie was running it. That's where I first met him.

Aud: Oh, I see.

PC: That's where I got my eye on him.

Aud: Pardon?

PC: I said that's where I got my eye on him.

Aud: All right.

PC: Sounds awful, doesn't it?

Aud: Okay. Thank you. Now, what – uh – then – was there any purpose then of continuing on?

PC: No, no, I don't think I had any strong second dynamic feelings until probably partly through the week, I sort of thought "Oh, he's nice," something like that.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: And I thought, gee, you know, nice boys like that in Scientology...

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: ...you see. But first of all I really was sure at that time that Scientology was something.

Aud: Good, all right.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: So what was your – what happened after the PE Course, what was the next move?

PC: I – I went on to a co-audit...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...in Christchurch. And did the extension course.

Aud: Okay. Now, why'd you go on that co-audit? Yes?

PC: I went on that co-audit with the – with the reason – I don't want to own up to this one.

Aud: All right. Yes?

PC: Because I thought he might audit me.

Aud: All right, okay. All right. Now, any more on that?

PC: No, he didn't.

Aud: All right. Okay. So that was the original purpose there, was it.

PC: It would be part...

Aud: All right.

PC: ...would be partly, not wholly.

Aud: All right, okay. All right. I'm going to check this original question again now, all right?

PC: Hm-hmm.

Aud: Have you ever injured Dianetics or Scientology?

PC: I feel a lot better about it, but I don't really see one.

LRH: Yeah, nice and clean, isn't it, huh? Nice and clean.

Aud: All right. I didn't quite hear what

you said here.

PC: I – I feel a lot better about it.

Aud: Hmm, right.

PC: But I don't know if there's anything there or not.

Aud: Well, we got a nice clean needle here now, all right?

PC: Yeah.

Aud: Okay.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right.

LRH: You can close it off.

Aud: All right, now, uh – it's a nice point to finish up...

PC: Hm.

Aud: ...on the session, so if it's all right with you I'm just going to finish the body of the session now.

PC: Yes, that's all right.

Aud: All right. Anything you want to say before I do uh – finish the body of the session?

PC: Well, I've had a little look for this before...

Aud: Hmm.

PC: ...since missed withholds came out, with Ed, but I haven't had a good a look at the whole sort of picture like this before.

Aud: All right. Okay.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right. Well then, have you made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: Hmm.

Aud: Which was to clear up anything that has been missed, and to do your very

best.

PC: Hmm.

Aud: All right.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: How'd you make out in those?

PC: I feel good about that.

Aud: All right. And on this one "to do my best"?

PC: Yes.

Aud: All right. Now, are there any other gains you've made in this session you'd care to mention?

PC: I didn't feel too worried about the audience.

Aud: All right. Very good. All right, anything else?

PC: Only – only a comment.

Aud: On goals and gains I was asking you if...

PC: Yeah, yeah.

Aud: You want to make a comment? Do so.

PC: Oh, just – just a comment that it was so much easier to get – get to it when – when we went earlier.

Aud: Hm-hmm.

PC: I got – couldn't get that later one at all.

Aud: All right. Very good.

PC: Yeah.

Aud: All right. Okay. Now, I'll just check your havingness, all right?

PC: Hmm.

Aud: Just – uh – good. Now, give the cans a squeeze, would you? Let them go.

All right, now, your havingness is down. What is your Havingness Process?

PC: "Touch that" or "feel that," I think they work.

Aud: All right, okay. Put the cans down, then, would you? All right, I'm going to run "touch that," okay? Touch that table. Good, all right. Touch that cord. Good. Touch the top button of your jacket. Very good. Touch your right cuff. Good. All right, touch your nose. Fine. Touch your hair. Very good.

Pick up the cans, would you? Good. Give the cans a squeeze. Well, that's working nicely. Put the cans down, would you please? Thank you. All right, touch this cord. Good. Touch your right elbow. Good. Touch your left elbow. Very good. Touch your right ear. Good. Touch your right knee. Very good. Touch that can. Good. Touch the microphone. Very good. Touch that little bit of dirt there. Very good.

All right, pick up the cans. Okay. All right, now, good. Now, give the cans a squeeze. Okay. Let them go. All right. And once more. All right. Well, we're almost back to where we started there and I'm going to leave it at that. How do you feel about that?

PC: I feel all right.

Aud: All right, very good. Now, is there anything you care to – uh – end of Havingness Process. All right, is there anything you care to ask or say before I end this session?

PC: No, just thank you.

Aud: All right. Is it all right with you if end the session now?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Okay, here it is: End of session!
Session ended for you?

PC: Yes.

Aud: Very good. All right, tell me I'm no

longer auditing you.

PC: You're no longer auditing me.

Aud: Good. All right, thank you.

PC: Okay.

Well, there you have an example of Sec Checking, actually, with a first cousin to the withhold system. Pressing it back to the earliest time, picking up the earliest charge and carrying it on forward.

I want to call to your attention, very distinctly and very definitely, that there is a wealth of difference between Sec Checking and getting mid ruds in or some other type of activity.

Now, you get the mid ruds in, something like that, or clean up something, it is simply for the perfunctory, the perfunctory purpose of getting a session going, getting things out of the road, momentarily, so that you can carry on with what you're doing.

In Sec Checking, you are doing auditing with this type of action. You're doing auditing with it. In doing a Prepcheck, such as on purposes, you are doing auditing. That's different, don't you see? You're doing auditing of the pc's case with the process. In other words, with Sec Check questions and with Prepchecking – doesn't include Prepchecking a goal or something like that – but in Prepchecking – by which I mean you're trying to find times when well, you're trying to find out how certain purposes have been suppressed and that sort of thing – you are actually doing the auditing with the Prepcheck. You understand?

So on, however, goals running or 3M or some other process, you are simply using the mid ruds; you're simply using the mid ruds to brush the pc off of it – so they won't get in your road, do you understand?

Now, you can either audit with these things – as you just saw a demonstration of – you can either audit with these things or you can just set a pc up so they can be audited. Do you see that? In other words, there's two distinctly different uses to such things as a Sec Check question or a Prepcheck question, do you understand? They are two distinctly different uses.

The one use is to get auditing *done* with it. And of course, that's hammer and tongs. That's get the earliest one on the chain. That's this, that's that, that's the other thing, you see. Steering the pc's attention, finding out if there is anything. Restimulating the pc, if you please, to find out if there's anything that can be picked up and then going ahead and picking it up.

And then on the other side – on the other side – we have their use, very permissive, just lightly brush off, "In this session has anything been suppressed?" "In this session has anything been suppressed?" Pc says no, you say, "All right, I'll check it on the meter: In this session has anything been suppressed? That doesn't read on the meter." And away we go. You understand?

Now, that same question, that same question, used on the subject of purposes might go very well this way: "How has a purpose been suppressed?" The pc says, "Oh, I don't get any-

thing on that." Oh, no! We're doing a Prepcheck, you see, we're using this thing to get auditing done. So we have to say "Well, what do purposes mean to you?" "What are purposes all about?" "What's suppression?" "Did you ever have any purposes, like that? Do you suppose there... any purpose was ever suppressed? Anybody's purpose was ever suppressed?" Anything like that.

Pc says, "Oh, I see what you mean. Yes, well, I've badly suppressed my father's purposes, and so forth." Well, of course, you realize by the limits of the question you can't just have "What purpose was suppressed?" That's a bad process. You have to say – it's like "Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with." Spin the pc. So you have to say, "All right. Now, how did you suppress that purpose?" And all of a sudden, why, the pc is giving you answers. You don't have to keep badgering the pc – that isn't the point, you can just keep giving the question, as long as the pc gives you answers.

Your tone arm sitting there, as you've had tone arm motion and so forth, and the pc all of a sudden puts on the brakes and he says, "That's all!" Well, all you've run into is something the pc is unwilling to tell you. So you just have to go ahead and find out if this is the case. It's – pc has something there that he doesn't want to tell you.

There's a difference here, in other words. When you use Sec Checking and Prepchecking for the purpose of auditing, you are pressing the question home to the pc. You are making sure that the pc *understands* that question. You're making sure that the pc knows this question applies to his life. And you're trying to pick up the earliest incident that is available and carrying it on forward. You've walked the pc down a chain, and so forth. You get auditing done, in other words, with this question.

But, over here, on the other side, just rudiments and Havingness. All right, well, we just do a light brush-off, with the rudiments, we make sure they don't read on the meter, we run some Havingness on the pc – pc comes up smiling. We don't badger the pc at all. Do you see that is a difference? Two entirely different modes of auditing. The mode of auditing done in W is very different than the mode of auditing done in Z. You have to learn both modes of auditing. You need both of them.

How are you going to pull somebody's missed withholds, to set him up so they aren't going to explode in your face all the time while you're trying to do 3M? Well, you'll have to take up the whole question with him, you have to restimulate these things, in other words. You have to discuss these things with him. Sec Checks, of course, are very good to do this with.

Now, your concept and understanding of this is invited. You haven't – you actually can't be called an auditor unless you can sec check and press it home. You understand? And you actually can't be called an auditor if you don't know this other method of just a light brush-off and dash on. You understand? Because you're trying to get your Routine 2, Routine 3 processes done these days, don't you see? Well, you're not trying to press anything home.

But let's take the borderline process, which is your 2G1. And that pc just goes on answering, answering, answering smoothly. But if the pc isn't answering, you have to know how to press that question home and get it answered. So it's at 2G1 that you have the great divide between these two things. It's a part of each, you understand?

Now, where a pc is having difficulty and a rough needle and a lot of things are very poor about the situation, where all these things are going on – pc is uncomfortable, and so forth, about life – you can straighten them out with a Sec Check. And your procedure would be more or less the way you saw it.

But as I press home to you, it is an art. It is an art. It's not a – it's not a one-two-three – four-shift, one-two-three-four-shift, one – you have to audit the pc in front of you. Pc's saying, "*Rah, I don't rah, rah, rah, gahr* and I've never done anything to Dianetics and Scientology, except, of course, I'm pretty critical of the way you're auditing me and I'm pretty critical of the organization," and so on. Well, realize that there must be an overt beneath the criticism, that's one of the stable data of Sec Checking. It's up to you to find that chain of overts. And it's up to you to get the bottom chain of overts. It's up to you to release those overts. You notice this girl went down to female Clear read on this. Well, one of the things that happens on Sec Checking is that a high tone arm gets cancelled out. And you get them coming down on it, if you do good Sec Checking.

So it's quite an activity all by itself. And it's a distinctly different activity than that carried on in Routine 3 and finding goals and that sort of thing. Do you see that?

Now, you have to learn both kinds of auditing and learn when to use each. And I hope that you've got some idea of that now.

There's one remark I'd like to make technically, rather than post it on the board, and that is that 2G1 is not run on the needle. Sec Checking is run on the needle. 2G1 is right part of its old ancient grandfather – and I'll give you more talks about it – was Routine 2 Prehav levels. And that is all run on the tone arm. And you run it up to a high tone arm, more or less stuck, and then shift to your next level. And it's all done on the tone arm. It is *not* done on the needle. No part! Nothing! And no part of the auditing commands are run on the needle in 2G1. Do you understand that? Only the tone arm. And you have to be able to persuade the pc to answer it a few more times. As long as there's tone arm motion going on, you have answers.

Now, there's 2GPH, which is the original Routine 2 Process, which is by Prehav level, applied to purposes. And you will be learning that one, too.

But I'm just calling that to your attention because those early 2Gs are all tone arm. All tone arm. Not needle. Sec Checking, rudiments, Havingness is *all needle, not tone arm*. You got the idea? They're quite distinctly different. Not only different processes – they use different parts of the E-Meter.

All right. Well, I'm very pleased with that demonstration and I think we ought to give Reg and Leslie a big hand.

Thank you. Thank you very much, and good night.

DEFINITIONS

Confessional, Security Checking (Sec Check), Integrity Processing, Repetitive Prepchecking, Prepchecking by Repetitive Command are to some degree synonymous. Following you find the short definitions to each term. Please also refer to the Technical Definitions and the source materials to get further data.

Security Checking, Sec Check:

Was developed to check if a person is any security risk for an org. (Ref. HCOB 3 Feb 60) Its focus was strongly on the E-meter, e.g. if the TA was high or if a question couldn't get cleaned. Was ordered and done by HCO, was not considered as auditing, although it later became synonymous to Confessional. Sec Checks are today no more recommended, see HCO PL 15 Nov 70.

Confessional:

The forefather of the Confessional is Security Checking. It stems from the word "to confess" and is auditing, adhering fully to the auditor's code. Today we are mainly applying confessionals.

A Class II Auditor takes a Zero question and gets overts connected to it off, goes earlier similar as needed.

Integrity Processing:

Another word for Confessional. Same routine and purpose. This name was made up in the 1970s for PR reasons. See HCOB 24 Jan 77

Prepchecking:

Also called Prepchecking by withhold system. With the help of a Zero Question an overt is found, based on that overt a What Question is formulated and the pc is getting off all overts which answer the question, back to the earliest. Full procedure can be studied in HCOB 24 June 62 PREPCHECKING and in several SHSBC tapes. Today this procedure is only used by auditors of advanced training.

Repetitive Prepchecking:

The auditor gets off all overts connected to a Zero question he is working on. He does not go earlier similar but repeats the question. Before leaving it the question is checked for read and cleaned. See HCOB 3 July 1962 REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.

Middle Rudiments (Prepchecking the Middle Ruds):

A question like “Since I have been auditing you, is there anything you have suppressed?” is asked until no more answers, then the question is checked on the meter and cleaned as needed. See HCOB 3 Jul 62 REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.

Prepcheck:

See also "Middle Ruds". Today we have 20 buttons (suppressed, evaluated, invalidated, etc.) which are used to get off charge on a subject. For example: "Regarding the 2D, has anything been suppressed?" Each button is audited repetitively to F/N. See HCOB 14 Aug 64 PREPCHECK BUTTONS.

(Note: in 1978 this procedure was also called 'Modern Repetitive Prepchecking'.)

Big Middle Rudiments

See also "Middle Ruds" and "Prepcheck". Same technique. Nine different buttons are used in the Big Middle Rudiments. See HCOB 8 Mar 63 USE OF THE BIG MIDDLE RUDS.

Fast Check (sometimes 'Fast Ruds'):

See also "Prepchecking the Mid Ruds".

Using the package question “In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?” If one of the four reads, use it singly to clean it in the same worded question and do the remainder of the Middle Ruds singly: “In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?” HCOB 3 Jul 62 REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING.

Zero Question:

The Confessional question of any Sec Check form used to get at a chain of overts. See HCOB 24 Jun 62 PREPCHECKING.

Abr. Zero

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 15 NOVEMBER 1970

Remimeo
HCO Hats
Tech Hats

CONFESSIONALS

HCOs may not do Confessionals or "Sec Checks".

HCO may only do Meter Checks. This consists of putting the pc on a meter and noting down the TA, state of needle and attitude of pc.

Where these reads are non optimum (no F/N VGI state of meter) the pc may be sent to Qual for further check.

Too many cases, too many case programmes, have been fouled up by non C/Sed Sec Checking or Confessionals in the past for the practice to continue.

Real criminals may have bad meters but crimes are often so unreal to them that they do not read (meters needle read only on things within the reality or borderline reality of a person). This permits unskilled Sec Checking or Confessional actions to pass right by the culprit.

HCO should learn full investigatory procedure and should only do metering to establish the pc's meter state, asking no questions.

HCO Investigatory Procedure P/Ls that **must** be known to HCO are:

HCO P/L May '65 - ETHICS OFFICER HAT

HCO P/L 19 Sept '70 - Data Series No. 16, INVESTIGATORY PROCEDURE

HCO P/L 19 Sept '70 Issue II - Data Series No. 17, NARROWING THE TARGET

TECH & QUAL

Asked to do "Confessionals" or "Sec Checks" Tech and Qual may do them only as part of a C/S programme and only as a gradient in the general action of improving the reality of the case.

An R/S still means crimes. All the other data is true and should be known but **polygraphs, lie detectors, meters only register at the reality level of the being**, and the reality level of a criminal is too bad for reads to occur in a majority of cases. Thus the guilty are falsely freed and the innocent are subjected to annoyance and upset.

Overts, crimes, etc. may come off first as a critical thought under which lies a harmful (overt) act. On such gradients one builds up reality and so releases overts.

No meter or Sec Check or Confessional is sufficiently valuable to use in detection of crime. The state of the meter itself is of value since it tells one whom to investigate.

Thus neither Tech nor Qual should assist investigations but should work on the case against proper C/Ses to get off the overts and withholds for the case benefit.

Overts disclosed in sessions may not be used for justice purposes. Therefore only crimes discovered by routine investigation are actionable.

It could be that a crime discovered by investigation is also gotten off in session. That it was also gotten off in session does not protect the person from discipline. That it was gotten off in session is irrelevant and sessions are not part of justice procedures.

SICKNESS

The broad general clues about suspects are:

The person with the worst meter (TA and needle state) is the most suspect.

The person whose job product is itself an overt act is the most likely to commit other crimes.

The person who is most crazy is the most likely to be the guilty one.

The person who is chronically ill is a suspect.

These are true because the cause of insanity and sickness is overts.

The person who acts most "PTS" is the one who has most harmed his fellows.

The person with the worst stats is the most likely suspect.

Beyond these technical observations one cannot go in the field of justice.

HCOs should learn Investigatory procedures when looking for criminals. Confessionals and Sec Checks will fail them and they also mess up cases. Investigatory procedures are quite good enough.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:sb.rd

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
30 AUGUST 1962

Revised & Reissued
19 September 1974 as BTB

Remimeo

(Revision in Arial)

Cancels
HCO Bulletin of 30 August 1962
Same Title

MISSED WITHHOLD HANDLING

There are three very important factors mentioned in the HCO Bulletin of May 3, 1962, ARC BREAKS MISSED WITHHOLDS and the HCO Bulletin of July 4, 1962 BULLETIN CHANGES, and these appear to be completely overlooked by most Auditors.

The first is that whenever one of the fifteen manifestations of a Missed Withhold occurs in an auditing session or whenever the Auditor learns of the preclear doing any of these outside session, his primary duty is to pull the missed withhold or missed withholds which have caused any of these manifestations to occur.

If the preclear begins to boil off in a session, the Auditor should immediately pull the missed withhold or missed withholds. If he is in the middle of the Auditor rudiment and the preclear begins to boil off, he immediately pulls missed withholds and then returns to cleaning the Auditor rudiment. He does not wait until he has cleaned the Auditor rudiment or wait until he has completed the beginning rudiments to pull the missed withholds.

If the preclear becomes angry and critical of the Auditor in the middle of a process the Auditor, there and then, pulls the missed withhold. He does not wait until he has completed the process.

The reason for this is that any missed withhold will, if not pulled immediately, cause the preclear to go to some degree or to go completely out of session and will cause the E-Meter to respond less well for the Auditor.

So when any of the fifteen missed withhold manifestations occur in a session, immediately pull the missed withholds and then return to whatever cycle of action was interrupted and complete that cycle of action.

The second factor is that the missed withhold rudiment or random rudiment is always used *repetitively*. You ask "In this session have you thought, said, or done anything I have failed to find out?" by the repetitive system. The reason for this is that because of the missed withholds, the preclear is practically out of session and the E-Meter is not functioning as well as it could.

By the repetitive system, you get the preclear talking to you, thusly putting him more into session and making your E-Meter more operative.

The last and most important factor is that a missed withhold or missed withholds have been pulled when the preclear no longer demonstrates the existence of one of the fifteen missed withhold manifestations. This is a factor most Auditors do not comprehend in the least. Daily I will have some Auditor come to me and say, "The preclear is in a terrific ARC broken state. I pulled the missed withholds and preclear is still angry as everything." Say I, "Then you haven't pulled the missed withholds. Pull them." Says the Auditor, "Oh, yes I did. The random rudiment is clean and gets no reaction on the E-Meter." Say I, "Your preclear would not still be angry if you had pulled the missed withholds. The only proof that you have pulled all the missed withholds is not whether your random rudiment is clean, but whether your preclear is no longer angry. Pull the missed withholds."

So the missed withholds have been pulled when the dopey preclear is no longer boiling off, when the angry preclear is no longer angry, when the non-communicative preclear is communicating, when the exhausted preclear is no longer exhausted, when the critical preclear is no longer critical of the Auditor, Scientology, Scientology Organization or Scientologists and so on – not when the E-Meter, which doesn't operate well if the preclear is not in session, indicates no reaction to the random rudiment question.

Auditors needing a rule or a set pattern to work by always ask me what to do when the E-Meter shows no reaction to the random rudiment question and the question appears clean. Well an Auditor can do one of two things. He can put in the reality factor by telling the preclear, when the preclear is insisting that there is nothing on the random rudiment question and the E-Meter, not working as well, appears to agree with the preclear, that the Meter isn't reading on the question, but as the preclear still appears upset, would he continue to look and answer the question. Or the Auditor can ask and clean repetitively any question which will pull the missed withholds and get the preclear back into session.

Here are some examples of questions which will pull missed withholds and which can be used as a random rudiment when required according to the preclear's manifesting the presence of missed withholds:

1. In this session has anything been misunderstood?
2. In this session has anything happened which I failed to know?
3. In this session have I missed a withhold on you?
4. In this session have you decided not to tell me something?
5. In this session has anything occurred to you which I should know, but don't?

There are many, many possible questions to ask. Just keep to the basic definition of what a missed withhold is and you won't be far wrong. A missed withhold is "an undisclosed contra-survival act which has been restimulated by another but not disclosed". So keep this fundamental in mind and really pull missed withholds.

MARY SUE HUBBARD

Revised & Reissued as BTB by
Flag Mission 1234

I/C: CPO Andrea Lewis
2nd: Molly Harlow

Authorized by AVU
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:MD:AL:MH:MSH:mh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 3 JULY AD 12

Central Orgs
Franchise

REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

As the Prepchecking we have been doing is a complicated skill and as recent rudiments developments open the door to simplified handling of overts, you may lay aside all versions of previous Prepchecking and Security Checking and substitute the following.

This is in the interests of improvement of auditing and keeping pcs from being enturbulated by unskilled auditing. The version herein is far easier to train students into as it uses the same actions as Repetitive Rudiments.

REPETITIVE PREPCHECKING

We will still use the term “Prepchecking” and do all Prepchecking by repetitive command.

We will refer to the older version as “Prepchecking by the Withhold System” and abandon it as of this date as too complicated and too susceptible to restimulation of pcs in semi-skilled hands.

THE AUDITING PROCEDURE

We handle any Zero question exactly as in repetitive rudiments, (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962).

The session is started exactly as per Model Session, HCO Bulletin June 23, 1962, (or as may be amended). A Mark IV Meter is used (using earlier meters on Prepchecking can mean disaster as they miss withholds).

The auditor then announces for the body of the session, that a Prepcheck will be done on such and such a subject or Form.

The auditor then takes an already prepared Form (such as Form 3⁹, 6A¹⁰, Prepcheck Mid Ruds, Goals Prepcheck Form [not yet released]).

⁹ Editor’s Note: See HCO PL 22 May 61, “Only Valid Security Check”, Vol. IV, p. 275

¹⁰ Editor’s Note: See HCO PL 7 July 61, “HGC Auditors Sec Check”, Vol. IV, p.356

Step One

Without now looking at the Meter, the auditor asks the Form question repetitively until the preclear says that's all, there are no more answers.

Step Two

The auditor then says, "I will check that on the meter" and does so, watching for the Instant Read (HCO Bulletin May 25, 1962).

If it reads, the auditor says, "That reads. What was it?"¹¹ (and steers the pc's attention by calling each identical read that then occurs). "There... That... That..." until the pc spots it in his bank and gives the datum.

Step Three

The auditor then ignores the meter and repeats Step One above. Then goes to Step Two, etc.

Step Four

When there is no read on Step Two above, the auditor says, "Do you agree that that is nul?" The auditor watches for an Instant Read on this and if there is an Instant Read on it, does Step Two above, then Step Three.¹² This gives a double check on the flatness of a question.

This is *all* there is to Repetitive Prepchecking as a system. Anything added in the way of more auditor questions is destructive to the session. Be sure not to Q and A (HCO Bulletin of May 24, 1962).

Be sure your TR4 is *excellent* in that you *understand* (really, no fake) what the pc is saying and acknowledge it (really, so the pc gets it) and return the pc to session. Nothing is quite as destructive to this type of auditing as bad TR4.

THE ZERO QUESTIONS TIME LIMITER

There must be a time limit on all Zero questions. Although it says, "Have you ever stolen anything?" the auditor must preface this with a **Time Limiter** such as "In this lifetime..." "In auditing..." or whatever applies. Form 3 (the Joburg) has to be prefaced with "In this lifetime..." on every question. Form 6A, as it speaks of preclears, etc, is already limited in Time.

¹¹ Editor's note: Note the later datum from HCOB 3 July 71R, "Auditing by lists": "We do **not** tell the pc what the meter is doing... We do not say to the pc, 'That's clean' or 'That reads'."

¹² Editor's note: revised by HCOB 4 July 62 as per which the auditor should not pay attention to any reaction to the question. As per today's tech a reading confessional question must be brought to F/N, ref. HCOB 14 March 71R, "F/N everything".

In Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, use “In auditing...” before each question or other appropriate limitations.

The Zero *must not* swing the pc down the whole track as Middle Rudiments then become unanswerable and a fruitful source of missed withholds.

MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

In Repetitive Prepchecking the Middle Rudiments can be Fast Checked (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962), (using the package question “In this session is there anything you have suppressed, invalidated, failed to reveal or been careful of?” If one of the four reads, use it singly to clean it in the same worded question and do the remainder of the Middle Ruds singly: “In this session is there anything you have failed to reveal?”).

Use the Middle Rudiments Fast Checked every time you clean a Zero Question, whether the pc had answers for it or not.

PREPCHECKING THE MIDDLE RUDIMENTS

To begin or end a series of sessions (such as an intensive), Prepcheck also the Middle Rudiments.

In such Prepchecking the Middle Ruds, for havingness sessions,¹³ the Zeros are as follows:

“Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have suppressed?” “Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have invalidated?” “Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have failed to reveal?” “Since I have been auditing you is there anything you have been careful of?”

To these standards add, in the same question form, “suggested” “failed to suggest” “revealed” “told any half truths” “told any untruths” “damaged anyone” “influenced the E-Meter” “failed to answer a question” “failed to answer a command” and “Since I have been auditing you have you shifted your attention?” Flatten off with O/W as below.

O/W ASSISTS

As a Prepcheck by form and even beginning rudiments are not calculated to handle a pc who is *very* distraught before the start of session by reason of upsets in life (howling PTPs

¹³ Editor’s note: “Havingness session”: Mentioned in HCOB 23 June 62 “Modell Session revised.” It says there, “If a pc has a badly behaving needle, do a perfect Model Session on pc for 2 or 3 sessions using Havingness or, better, Prepchecking in the body of the session, and you will see the needle smooth out.” Thus in this text here such a “Havingness session” is meant where one uses Havingness, as opposed to a “normal session” where you would run a major action in the body of the session.

accompanied by misemotion) or who is too ill physically to settle into auditing, an earlier rudiment immediately after start of session can be used. This is general O/W (Overt-Withhold):

“What have you done?” “What have you withheld?”

These are run alternately. This is *never* run on a terminal (i.e. What have you done to George? etc). Only the general type command is now used.

When the pc is much better, go into the usual rudiments.

(Note: This is, by the way, the best repetitive process for an assist.)

This is run to a nul needle on both questions. If either gives an Instant Read, continue to run both until both are nul, much as in steps One, Two, Three and Four of Repetitive Prepchecking.

When used to flatten off a Prepcheck on the Middle Rudiments, whether for Prepchecking or for goals type or ordinary Repetitive Prepchecking, the O/W command wording is as follows:

“Since I have been auditing you, what have you done?”

“Since I have been auditing you, what have you withheld?”

Both must be nul to conclude the process. If either is found alive on the needle, run both.

When used to begin a session, or when used to Prepcheck the Middle Ruds, O/W must be followed by a Fast Check of the Mid Ruds.

SUMMARY

This type of Prepchecking – Repetitive Prepchecking – is more easily done and more thorough than Prepchecking by the Withhold System and its earlier forefather Security Checking. It replaces both of these.

In view of the fact that the same system is used for Repetitive Rudiments (HCO Bulletin of July 2, 1962), by learning one, the student also learns the other, thus saving a lot of time in study and training.

Repetitive Prepchecking replaces former auditing requirements for Class IIa and *is* the Class II skill.

It should be thoroughly instilled in the auditor that extra doingness by the auditor is destructive from the system and that every additive is a liability, not required in the system and liable to upset the pc. It is a *must* that the auditor be very capable with TR4 and that the auditor makes no attempt to shut off routine pc originations as the intensity of “In Sessionness” generated by modern Model Session used with Repetitive Rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking is such as to make the ARC breaks quite shattering to the pc if TR4 is bad.

If Repetitive Prepchecking is run right, with good metering, the only remaining source of missed withholds is the inadvertent withhold caused by bad TR4. (The pc said it but the auditor didn't *understand* it.)

This bulletin culminates three years of exhaustive research into the formation of Model Session, Rudiments and the handling of overts, and overcoming the limitations of the auditor and student in handling sessions. This, coming with the broad success of Routine 3GA, rounds out auditing from raw meat to clear for all cases capable of speech. These techniques represent a data span of 13 years and a general research of 32 years.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:dr.cden

BOARD TECHNICAL BULLETIN
4 JANUARY 1962
Reissued 6 March 1977

Revises and Reinstates
HCO Bulletin of 4 January 1962
“Security Checking: Fundamentals”
as a BTB

Remimeo
Franchise

CONFESSIONAL FUNDAMENTALS

The most fundamental thing to know about confessionals is that a case with withholds will not clear. And the next most fundamental element to know is that; **a case with withholds will not clear.** Perhaps, if this is repeated loud enough and long enough, not only preclears, but perhaps even Auditors will realize that this is an absolute, unavoidable truth, one which can not be overlooked or neglected at any time, under any circumstances.

First of all, what is a withhold? A withhold is a no action after the fact of action in which the individual has done or been an accessory to doing something which is a transgression against some moral code consisting of agreements to which the individual has subscribed in order to guarantee, with others, the survival of a group with which he is co-acting or has co-acted toward survival.

Because a withhold is a no action or no motion after doingness, it naturally hangs up in time and floats in time – due to the actions or the overts which preceded the no action or no motion of the withhold. The reactive mind is, therefore, the combined withholds stacked up which the individual has against groups from which he feels that he is individuated from but from which he has not separated due to the fact that he has these withholds in his bank and also all the combined agreements toward survival of all these groups, from which he is not separate, and which he uses reactively to solve problems now without inspection.

Example: The individual belonged at some time to the Holy Fighters. One of the mores of this group was that all should be destroyed who do not accept the Word. The Holy Fighters went out on a punitive expedition against a neighboring tribe who would not accept the Word, but accepted some other belief. There was a great battle with much killing, however, during the battle, the individual took pity upon a helpless child and did not kill him, but took the child off the field of battle, gave him food and drink, and left him; returning, himself, to the battle.

After the battle was successfully won, the Holy Fighters had their usual service during which all spoke of how they had killed all non-believers. Our individual withheld from the group that he had not only failed to kill, but had saved the life of a non-believer. Thus we have the no action of the withhold after the overt or action of saving the child, all of which added up to a transgression against the mores of the Holy Fighters.

Because of such similar transgressions, the individual finally individuated from the group of Holy Fighters and became a member of the Board of Directors of the Society for

Kindness to Humans, which itself has its own agreements to survival and with which the individual agreed; however, when difficulties or problems arose, the individual instead of treating all with kindness tended to covertly try to destroy all who would not accept the tenets of kindness. So he reactively was solving the problems of the Society of Kindness with a survival more of the Holy Fighters. Due to all his transgressions and withholdings of his destructive impulses while a member of the Society for Kindness, he finally individuated from this group.

Now he is a member of Anti-Emotions, Incorporated, but he finds that he can't rule out all his emotions, but tends to be destructive and kind at the same time. So he is still solving problems not only with the mores of the Holy Fighters, but with those of the Society for Kindness to Humans. And so it goes.

Processing this individual we will find that he has all these withholdings of overts against the Holy Fighters, the Society for Kindness to Humans, and Anti-Emotions, Incorporated. After we have pulled all these overts, he will truly be separate from these groups and no longer reactively use their survival mechanisms as solutions to problems.

Further the action of withholding is one point where the preclear does what the reactive mind does. He withholds his own overts of transgressions against the moral code of a group in order to avoid punishment, thusly enhance his own survival, and he withholds himself from the group finally in an effort to avoid committing further overts. So just as the reactive mind contains all past survival agreements which are used to solve problems threatening the survival of the individual, so does the individual decide to withhold transgressions, in order to survive himself, and withholds himself from groups to avoid committing overts. Withholding and surviving occur at the same time. So the communication bridge between the preclear and the reactive mind is the withhold.

The pulling of overts which have been withheld then is the first step towards getting the preclear to take control of the reactive mind. The more withholdings he gives up, the more the old survival mechanisms of the reactive mind are destroyed.

Further as a withhold of an overt creates a further overt act of not-know on the group with which one is co-acting with toward survival along an agreed upon moral code, so we are running off all the ignorance created for others by an individual which results in ignorance to himself. In this fashion, we are processing the individual up toward Native State or Knowingness.

Therefore, in doing confessionals upon a preclear, you are really attacking the whole basis of the reactive mind. It is an activity which the auditor should earnestly and effectively engage upon. In doing this the auditor always assumes that the preclear can remember his overts and can overwhelm the reactive mind. Just as with the CCHs so with confessionals, any objections raised by the preclear as regards confessionals are only a confusion being thrown up by the reactive mind, but the individual is really trying to look for what is there despite the reactive mind's doing this. This is why any failure to pull an overt is considered a crime against the preclear. The auditor in failing to pull an overt has given the reactive mind a win and the preclear a failure, and has further given the preclear another overt against the group he is now associated with, namely, that of Scientology, because he has succeeded in withholding from it.

So in confessionals the auditor on any particular question never looks at the E-Meter on that particular question, until the preclear has reached an impasse on that question, and says that he really and truly can think of no further answers. This creates confidence that the Auditor and the preclear are really working together to overwhelm the reactive mind.

When the impasse is reached on any particular question, then the auditor asks the whole question looking all the time at the E-Meter. If the meter gives an instant read (any needle reaction, i.e. Fall, Rock Slam, Theta Bop or change of needle characteristic which occurs within half of a second or up to three-quarters of a second, in case the preclear has a delayed circuit on hearing) to the question or any word or phrase in the question, then the auditor uses the E-Meter to assist the preclear in pulling all further overts.

It is only at this point of impasse where the preclear *insists* he has no further answers, but the question or parts of the question still react, that the auditor varies the original confessional question, compartments the question as to reacting words and phrases, and cleans all reactions off any word or phrase in the question or the question itself. A stable datum as regards this is that if the question or any part of it still reacts, there are further withholds there or not all about a particular withhold was pulled. Never allow a preclear to persuade you that it is only already pulled withholds which are still reacting. A withhold pulled will not cause a question to still reacting; it can only be that not all about the withhold was pulled or that there are further undisclosed withholds on that question.

Do not leave a confessional question until the auditor, the preclear, the reactive mind, and the E-Meter are in absolute agreement that there is nothing more on a particular question.

Remember the E-Meter is not bound by the Auditor's Code. If it still reacts on a question, then the auditor must null that question.

What is meant by nulling a question is that the auditor in the first place has enough presence as an auditor to get the E-Meter to read properly, and remember this depends upon his ability to get Rudiments in well and upon the ratio of his reality to the preclear, and the whole original question and no part of the rudiment question gets any reaction including no needle pattern, at Sensitivity 16. Any needle pattern on a confessional means that there is a reaction to the question and all must be pulled on that question until the needle is null, or rising.*

A confessional question must never be left unnullled. If the preclear's intensive is terminating, you must null that question no matter how many extra hours you have to put in on the preclear. If he is continuing his auditing, you tell him that the question is not null and you will null it in the next session. Any failure to pull an overt is a crime against that preclear.

Eliminate all 'unkind thought' questions on any confessional, and substitute 'done anything to' in the question. Unkind thoughts are merely tags telling you that the preclear has actually done something. Unkind thoughts are merely a mechanism of lessening the overt.

In pulling overts, be careful that you do not allow the preclear to give you his justifications for having committed it. In allowing him to give you motivators or 'reasons why' you are allowing him to lessen the overt.

You are only interested in what the preclear has done, not what he has heard that others have done. So never allow a preclear to get off withholds to you about others, except in the case where he has been an accessory to a criminal act. A preclear reactively trying to give you other people's withholds, normally is giving lying withholds, so you must be careful to check over your new end rudiments carefully.

Remember that your duty as an auditor is to simply employ your skill to obtain a greater decency and ability on the part of others. You do this by performing well your function of clearing the meter and getting off all overts and withholds. An auditor is not an enforcer of public morals. If an auditor tries to make a preclear guilty, he is violating Clause 15 of the Auditor's Code, which says: 'Never mix the processes of Scientology with those of various other practices.' Punishment is an old practice which is not part of our activities in Scientology. Do confessionals against the reality of the preclear and his moral code and do not try to make him guilty. The value of any withhold is only the value the preclear puts on it.

As a case improves, his responsibility level will increase, and if his responsibility level is increasing he will get off further, new withholds. If an auditor is not getting new withholds coming off a preclear, he had better look for a gross error in his auditing. He either is disinterested and unwilling to help the preclear, or he is technically unskillful on his TRs, Model Session, and the E-Meter, or he does not have the preclear in session or he has withholds himself. Only an auditor with withholds will fail to pull them on others.

The number of withholds a preclear has available at any given time depends upon those that are available at that given time. To clarify this point, assume that all preclears have the same set number of withholds. Well, the number available within the realm of the preclear's present state of reality and responsibility will naturally vary. Preclears with a high reality and responsibility level will have more withholds available for pulling than preclears with a low reality and responsibility level. This is why it is so important that confessionals be continued throughout auditing. His reality and responsibility level will increase throughout processing bringing to light many new overts. If these are not pulled, the preclear will be forced into unintentionally withholding them and his case will bog down and not progress.

There are many HCO WW Confessionals to assist you in pulling withholds. In using these, an auditor must never, never omit a question on any of these, but he can add questions to them. Then there is the Problems Intensive, Dynamic Confessionals, specialized confessionals tailored to fit the professional or present activities of the preclear, and special confessionals to cover the transgressions of the preclear against the moral code of any group with which he has co-acted. On the latter, as a person in one lifetime only has belonged to many different groups, you can see the tremendous possibility of confessionals applied to the moral code of all groups on a whole track basis. Particular attention must be paid to the present group with whom he is currently co-acting, namely Scientology. This is why it is important to do the last two pages of the Form 3 and all of Form 6 on all Scientologists first because in the first place he is expecting something to help him against which he has overts and to that degree these overts are overts against himself as they will, if not pulled, prevent him from being helped, and in the second place overts against current groups are most important, then overts

* Editor's note: As per HCOB 14 March 71R, "F/N Everything", a reading confessional question must be brought to an F/N. This datum was not known in 1962.

committed in this lifetime, and then overts committed on the track, the reason being that he is still connected with these current groups and with this lifetime.

Confessionals are the most fruitful source of cognition, because you are pulling off the preclear's not-knows on the Third Dynamic, which have kept others in ignorance and himself in stupidity. Besides this, you tremendously increase the preclear's ability to communicate. And on top of all this you make a preclear much easier to audit. And if all his withholds are pulled, he can be cleared.

Pretty good gains to work for? Well then, let's get busy.

Taken from the Tape Lectures of
the Saint Hill Special Briefing
Course
By Mary Sue Hubbard
For
L. RON HUBBARD FOUNDER

Revised by
Training & Services Bureau
Authorized by AVU for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:AH:RT:LRH:MSH:esc:lf

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 29 MARCH 1963

Central Orgs
Franchise

SUMMARY OF SECURITY CHECKING

(As Security Checking is the one form of auditing that does not interfere with R2 or R3, I asked Reg Sharpe to do a rundown on what we know about it – L. RON HUBBARD.)

Security Checking has an important part to play in modern auditing. We have the datum that as a pc comes up in responsibility so does his recognition of overts. This factor can seriously hamper a pc's progress. Security Checking is a case cleaning activity and it should be thoroughly and competently applied. It is not something to be done just for form's sake. It is done to speed up the advance of the case. A pc who has overts ready to be pulled just cannot make the rapid progress which modern clearing techniques make possible. So don't underestimate the value of Sec Checking. Learn to do it. Learn to do it well and when you do it, go in and do an expert and thorough job.

Security Checking is a specialized type of auditing, and it takes a lot of skill and at times some courage to do it well. Auditors must not be kind nor yet unkind. This does not mean that you steer a luke warm middle course between kindness and unkindness. Neither of these two impostors have anything to do with it. You just go in and audit, you go in to find – and that means dig for **overts**. If you go in with pc's needle clean and your questioning can get that needle to react, then you are winning.

The success of an auditor can be measured by the extent to which he can get reactions on the needle and then cleaning those reactions getting more reactions and cleaning those and so on. It's a probing operation like probing for sore places on a body, locating them and then healing them. The skilled auditor, however, gets to the root of the trouble and clears up a whole batch of overts at once.

Security Checking is done in Model Session. The beginning rudiments are put in and by the time you start the body of the session, in this case the security check, the pc should have a nice clean needle. The next thing is to tell the pc that you are going to help him to clean up, and really clean up, the questions on the Form that you are using. **Remember it is the question you are going to clean – not the needle.** You've already got a clean needle and you could probably keep it clean by bad TR 1, failure to dig, or just sheer bad auditing. No, it's the question you are cleaning, and in the process you are going to get a dirty or reacting needle. So really get it over to your pc that you are going to **clean the question**.

The next action is to announce the first question that you are going to clean. The important thing at this stage is to groove in the question. There are a variety of ways to do this, e.g., ask what the question means. What period or time the question covers. What activities would be included. Where the pc has been that might be something to do with the question. If any other people are likely to be involved. In other words you are steering the pc's attention to various parts of his bank and getting him to have a preliminary look. When this has been done, using very good TR 1, you give him the question – **off the meter**. You can forget your

anti Q and A drill. You take your pc's answer and bird dog him about it. If he gives you a general answer you ask him for a specific time (or a specific example) **don't accept motivators**. If he gives you a motivator you say "OK, but what did you do there?" and you want something before the motivator. Example: – Pc: "I got mad at him because he kicked my foot." Aud: "What had you done before he kicked your foot?" In this case the pc is giving an overt "I got mad at him" but in fact he is cunningly selling the motivator "He kicked me in the foot". So the rule here is "go earlier than the motivator". Similarly you don't accept criticisms, unkind thoughts, explanations. You want what the pc has done and you want the Time Place Form and Event.

When you have succeeded in this you don't leave it there. You ask for an earlier time he had done something like it and you keep going earlier. What you are after is the earliest time he stole, hit somebody, got angry with a pc or whatever is his "crime". Get the earliest one and you will find that the others will blow off like thistle-down.

Keep a sly eye on your meter and you can tell when you are in a hot area. Use it to help you to know where to dig, but don't use it to steer the pc at this stage. This encourages laziness on the part of the pc. **You** want him in there foraging about and digging up his bank in the process.

Only when your pc is thoroughly and healthily exhausted do you check the question on the meter. If you have done an excellent job the question will be clean.

However if you get a read you steer your pc by saying "There", "There" whenever you see a repetition of the original read. When he finds it you repeat the procedure outline above. **You** don't go back to the meter until you have really got all there is to be got. When you have got a clean needle you put in your mid ruds on the session, and if these are clean and only if they are clean you go on to the next question. If the ruds do bring out something then you go back to the question and start over again. And so you go on cleaning question after question. The success of a Sec Check Session is not judged by the number of questions cleaned but by the amount of looking you succeeded in making your pc do.

If you do this properly, that is the whole outline, you will have a well satisfied pc. If he ARC breaks then you have missed something, so pull your missed withholds. A rising TA is a clue to something missed. If a pc isn't happy – very happy – at the end of a question then you have missed something. Pc's will tell you a hundred and one things that are wrong with your auditing, the D of P's instruction, the form of the question, etc., but they all add up to the same thing – something has been missed.

Finally do End Ruds and these should run quickly and smoothly. Run a bit of havingness if necessary. Sharpen your pencil for the goals and gains and you'll leave the session happy and satisfied because that's how your pc feels.

One word of warning. If you leave a question unflat, mark it on your auditor's report and **tell your pc** it isn't flat.

Good digging.

Issued by: Reg Sharpe
SHSBC Course Secretary for
L. RON HUBBARD

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 23 JULY 1963

Central Orgs
for info
Sthil
SHSBC

**AUDITING RUNDOWN
MISSED WITHHOLDS
TO BE RUN IN X 1 UNIT**

(supersedes HCO Bulletin of July 11, 1963, same title,
which was issued to Sthil SHSBC only)

1. Ask pc following question:
“In this lifetime what have you done that you have withheld from someone?”
2. When pc has answered ask:
 - (a) “When was it?”
 - (b) “Where was it?”
 - (c) “Who failed to find out about it?”
 - (d) “Who nearly found out about it?”
 - (e) “Who still doesn’t know about it?”

Each withhold and answer must be written down and the sheet of withholds and answers must be turned in with the auditing report.

The sheet will be made available to all instructors on the Briefing Course.

The above suggestion was made by Bernie Pesco, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course student, and accepted for use.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.jh

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 NOVEMBER 1978R

Issue I

Revised 3 December 1978

Remimeo

(Revision in this type style)

(Also issued as an HCO Policy Letter under same date and title.)

PROCLAMATION
POWER TO FORGIVE

A Scientology minister who has been duly trained and certified in the Confessional procedure of the Church of Scientology and is in good standing with the Church with his certificates in force, is invested with the power to forgive the admitted sins of an individual to whom he has administered full Confessional procedure.

Confessionals have been part and parcel of religion nearly as long as religion has existed.

It has been broadly recognized down through the ages that only when a person has owned up to his sins can he experience relief from the burden of guilt he carries because of them.

In Scientology we have had, since the early years, procedures whereby an individual is able to confess his withholds and the overt acts underlying them. We have long known that confessing one's overt acts is the first step toward taking responsibility for them and seeking to make things right again.

The acknowledgement that follows each confession in Scientology procedure is an assurance to the person that his confession has been heard.

Such assurance helps him to end cycle on the bad things he has done and unsticks him from a preoccupation with his guilt over them to where he can then put his attention on constructive activities.

That is the purpose of any Confessional.

There is another element that further helps the individual to accomplish this, and that is forgiveness.

Thus, at the end of a Confessional, when it has been fully completed, the Scientology auditor who has administered the Confessional must inform the person that he is forgiven for the sins he has just confessed, and that he is cleared of these sins and free of them.

The statement that is used is:

“By the power invested in me, any overts and withholds you have fully and truthfully told me are forgiven by Scientologists.”

A special certificate is to be issued to each Scientology minister who has been trained and certified on the Level II Course or the Confessional Course to administer Confessional procedure, and who is in good standing with the Church with his certificates in force, investing him with the power to forgive the sins confessed to him by an individual in a Confessional session.

Any auditor who is trained to deliver the Ethics Repair List has priority in the issuance of such certificate.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:jk.nc

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO BULLETIN OF 10 NOVEMBER 1978R-1
Issue I

Addition of 26 November 1978

C/Ses
Auditors
Tech/Qual
Confessional Course

PROCLAMATION: POWER TO FORGIVE
ADDITION

Addition to HCOB 10 Nov 78R, Issue I
Proclamation: Power to Forgive
Reference: BTB 8 Dec 72RC,
The Confessional Repair List (LCRC)

On any adverse reaction to the proclamation of forgiveness, get the rest of the withhold or repair the withhold session.

When the Scientology minister doing a Confessional or Ethics Repair List acknowledges the confession and informs the person that his confessed overts and withholds are forgiven, the usual response is instant relief and VGIs. Rarely the person may react adversely such as not being able to accept forgiveness or still feeling bad. This is because something has been missed. The person is still stuck in the shame, blame and regret of the unconfessed overt or withhold and will not feel better until all is told. The Scientology minister encountering this in session must get the rest of the withhold or repair the withhold session. Should the person show this reaction later, outside of session, the folder must be turned in to the C/S to handle immediately.

An incomplete confession can be due to the following errors:

- (a) Did not tell "all."
- (b) Thought of one overt, but told a different overt.
- (c) Told part of a withhold but not the rest.
- (d) An overt or withhold was not taken earlier similar to basic.
- (e) During the session an overt or withhold was restimulated, but not asked for or gotten off.
- (f) There have been errors in the Confessional such as withholds gotten off more than once, false reads, out-TRs, invalidation, evaluation, etc., and these must be cleaned up.

The above categories and the Confessional Repair List are useful to a C/S in correcting any adverse reaction to the Power to Forgive Proclamation, by ensuring that the person gets the full relief and VGIs which invariably accompany a complete confession and forgiveness.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder

LRH:dm.kjm

0-IV EXPANDED GRADE PROCESSES – QUADS

PART D GRADE 2 PROCESSES

based on BTB 15 Nov 76 IV

Revised 22 Mar 2008 according to Qual Board Recommendation Bulletin of same date. The "note" in the introduction was inserted and process 1 accordingly changed by adding brackets to F3. In processes 3 and 11 footnotes were inserted. Process 3 got a newly formulated Flow 1. In process 7, the "also" part was changed according to source materials; in process 11 the "also" part was added and in process 17 the statement was deleted that only reading items should be run, both according to source materials. In process 16 some flows were deleted that changed the meaning of the process. Re-revised 27 Oct 2011 to add brackets to the F3 of process 7 according to QBRB of 22 Mar 2008.

This BTB gives a checklist of the Expanded Quad Grade Process commands. It is not all the possible processes for this level. If more are needed to attain full EP for this level additional processes can be found in LRH Bulletins, Books, Tapes, PABs and other issues.

Each process is run to its full end phenomena of F/N, Cog, VGIs. Any processes previously run are rehabbed or completed and any missing flows run. A copy of this checklist is placed in the folder of a pc being run on Expanded Grades and the processes checked off with the date each is run to EP.

On any of these processes where the pc answers only yes or that he did it find out what it was by asking "What was it?" This keeps in the itsa line from the pc to auditor. (Ref: 30 June 62 HCOB)

THIS BTB DOES NOT REPLACE THE ORIGINAL SOURCE MATERIALS.

Note: where F2 and F3 of a process are identical except for changing the word "another" to "others" F3 is put in brackets. It is recommended to ask the pc for interest before taking the F3 up, as these are really not different flows and many pcs run the F2 with a concept that covers the singular as well as the plural; thus, running F3 without further notice could constitute an overrun and/or lead to protest.

1. R2-25 VIEWPOINT AND VIEWPOINT ARC STRAIGHTWIRE - VIEWPOINT

Ref: Creation of Human Ability, R2-25

F1. "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for you to look at." to EP _____

"Give me emotions it would be all right for you to look at." to EP _____

"Give me some efforts it would be all right for you to look at." to EP _____

NOTE: The auditor must make sure that the preclear is absolutely certain he is comfortable in viewing such objects. The process fails when the auditor is incapable of pressing the preclear until this certainty is attained.

F2. "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for another to look at." to EP _____

"Give me emotions it would be all right for another to look at." to EP _____

"Give me some efforts it would be all right for another to look at." to EP _____

(F3). "Give me some things which it would be comfortable for others to look at." to EP _____

"Give me emotions it would be all right for others to look at." to EP _____

- "Give me some efforts it would be all right for others to look at." to EP) _____
- F0. "Give me some things about yourself which it would be comfortable for you to look at." to EP _____
- "Give me emotions of yours it would be all right for you to look at." to EP _____
- "Give me some efforts of yours it would be all right for you to look at." to EP _____

also VIEWPOINT ARC STRAIGHTWIRE

- F1. "Who would it be all right to have like you?" to EP _____
- "Who would it be all right to have agree with you?" to EP _____
- "Who would it be all right to have communicate with you?" to EP _____
- F2. "Who would it be all right for you to like?" to EP _____
- "Who would it be all right for you to agree with?" to EP _____
- "Who would it be all right for you to communicate with?" to EP _____
- F3. "Who would it be all right for others to have like them?" to EP _____
- "Who would it be all right for others to have agree with them?" to EP _____
- "Who would it be all right for others to have communicate with them?" to EP _____
- F0. "What would it be all right for you to like about yourself?" to EP _____
- "What would it be all right for you to agree with about yourself?" to EP _____
- "What would it be all right for you to communicate about yourself?" to EP _____

2. ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES- HAS VIII

Ref: HCOB 19 Jan 61 ADDITIONAL HAS PROCESSES

- F1. "Get the idea of people making you friendly." _____
- "Get the idea of people making you unfriendly." to EP _____
- F2. "Get the idea of you making people friendly." _____
- "Get the idea of you making people unfriendly." to EP _____
- F3. "Get the idea of people making other people friendly." _____
- "Get the idea of people making other people unfriendly." to EP _____
- F0. "Get the idea of making yourself friendly." _____
- "Get the idea of making yourself unfriendly." to EP _____

3. MELBOURNE 3

Ref: HCOB 30 Nov 59 ALLOWED PROCESSES 1ST MELBOURNE ACC

1. Do a Dynamic Assessment

Ref: HCOB 6 Mar 59, How to Do a Diagnosis in Dynamic Straightwire

F1. "What part of you could (terminal) confront?"
 "What part of you would (terminal) rather not confront?" to EP _____

F2. "What part of a (terminal) could you confront?"
 "What part of a (terminal) would you rather not confront?" to EP _____

F3. "What part of a (terminal) could another confront?"
 "What part of a (terminal) would another rather not confront?" to EP _____

F0. "What about yourself could you confront?"
 "What about yourself would you rather not confront?" to EP* _____

4. REPETITIVE CONFRONT PROCESS

Ref: HCOB 8 Mar 62 THE "BAD" AUDITOR

1. "What could you confront?"
2. "What would you permit another to reveal?"
3. "What might another confront?"
4. "What might another permit you to reveal?"
5. "What would you rather not confront?"
6. "What would you rather not have another reveal?"
7. "What might another hate to confront?"
8. "What might another object to your revealing?"
9. "What should be confronted?"
10. "What shouldn't anyone ever have to confront?" to EP _____

5. CONTINUOUS CONFRONT

Ref: HCOB 14 July 60 CONCEPT HELP

F1. "What could another continue to confront about you?"
 "What would another rather not confront about you?" to EP _____

F2. "What could you continue to confront about another?"
 "What would you rather not confront about another?" to EP _____

F3. "What could others continue to confront about others?"
 "What would others rather not confront about others?" to EP _____

F0. "What could you continue to confront about yourself?"
 "What would you rather not confront about yourself?" to EP _____

* Note: This flow should only be run once even if F1-F3 are run with several terminals.

6. VIEWPOINT STRAIGHTWIRE

Ref: Phoenix Lectures

- 1. "Tell me something you wouldn't mind knowing."
- 2. "Tell me something you wouldn't mind looking at."
- 3. "Tell me an emotion you wouldn't mind observing."
- 4. "Tell me some effort you wouldn't mind observing."
- 5. "Tell me some thinking you wouldn't mind observing."
- 6. "Tell me some symbols you wouldn't mind seeing."
- 7. "Tell me some eating you wouldn't mind inspecting."
- 8. "Tell me some sex you wouldn't mind looking at." to EP _____

7. WORRY PROCESS

Ref: HCOB 22 Dec 60 O/W A LIMITED THEORY

- F1. "Get the idea of another worrying somebody or something."
 "Get the idea of another not worrying somebody or something."
 "Get the idea of somebody or something being worrisome to another." to EP _____
- F2. "Get the idea of worrying somebody or something."
 "Get the idea of not worrying somebody or something."
 "Get the idea of somebody or something being worrisome." to EP _____
- F3. "Get the idea of others worrying somebody or something."
 "Get the idea of others not worrying somebody or something."
 "Get the idea of somebody or something being worrisome to others." to EP _____
- F0. "Get the idea of worrying yourself about something."
 "Get the idea of not worrying yourself about something."
 "Get the idea of something being worrisome to yourself." to EP _____

NOTE: People, animals, things can be used in place of "something". SPECIFIC ITEMS MUST READ. "Somebody" has been added to the commands F1-F3 to make the process more understandable.

also run

- F1. "Get the idea of getting attacked."
 "Get the idea of not getting attacked." to _____
 EP
- F2. "Get the idea of attacking."
 "Get the idea of not attacking." to _____
 EP
- F3. "Get the idea of others attacking."
 "Get the idea of others not attacking." to _____
 EP

F0. "Get the idea of you attacking yourself."
 "Get the idea of you not attacking yourself." to _____
 EP

8. CRITICISM STRAIGHTWIRE

Ref: HCOB 13 Oct AD 9 A USEFUL PROCESS

F1. "Recall another being critical of you."
 "Recall another withholding criticism of you." to _____
 EP

F2. "Recall you being critical of another."
 "Recall you withholding criticism of another." to _____
 EP

F3. "Recall others being critical of others."
 "Recall others withholding criticism of others." to _____
 EP

F0. "Recall you being critical of yourself."
 "Recall you withholding criticism of yourself." to _____
 EP

9. REVELATION PROCESS X 2

Ref: HCOB 15 Mar AD 12 SUPPRESSORS

F1. "What wouldn't you want another to present to you?"
 "What has another presented to you?" to EP _____

F2. "What wouldn't another want you to present?"
 "What have you presented to another?" to EP _____

F3. "What wouldn't another want another to present?"
 "What has another presented to another?" to EP _____

F0. "What wouldn't you want to present to yourself?"
 "What have you presented to yourself?" to EP _____

10. RECALL A SECRET

Ref: PAB 146

"Recall a secret." to EP _____

11.

Ref: PAB 146

Auditor makes up a list of valences, paying great attention to those the preclear considers "unimportant" or is very slow to divulge. The auditor takes this list and runs repetitive straightwire on all reading items in descending order of reads as follows:

F1. "Think of something (valence) might withhold from you." to EP _____

F2. "Think of something you might withhold from (valence)." to EP _____

- F3. "Think of something (valence) might withhold from others." to EP _____
- F0. "Think of something you might withhold from yourself." to EP* _____

also:

- "What couldn't (valence) have?" "What could you have?" alternating to EP _____

12. O/W FLOWS PROCESS 8

Ref: HCOB 25 Jan 62 FLOW PROCESS

- F1. "What has another made you outflow?"
 "What has another made you withhold?"
 "What has another made you inflow?"
 "What has another made you hold off?" to EP _____
- F2. "What have you made another outflow?"
 "What have you made another withhold?"
 "What have you made another inflow?"
 "What have you made another hold off?" to EP _____
- F3. "What has another made others outflow?"
 "What has another made others withhold?"
 "What has another made others inflow?"
 "What has another made others hold off?" to EP _____
- F0. "What have you made yourself outflow?"
 "What have you made yourself withhold?"
 "What have you made yourself inflow?"
 "What have you made yourself hold off?" to EP _____

13. DYNAMIC STRAIGHTWIRE

Ref: HCOB 6 Mar 59 HOW TO DO A DIAGNOSIS IN DYNAMIC STRAIGHTWIRE
 HCOB 16 Feb 59 HGC PROCESS FOR THOSE TRAINED IN ENGRAM RUNNING
 Staff Auditors Conference of 16 Feb 59
 PAB 155

Run the following on terminals found per HCOB 6 Mar 59, in descending order of reads.

- F1. "Think of something _____ has done to you."
 "Think of something _____ has withheld from you." to EP _____
- F2. "Think of something you have done to _____."
 "Think of something you have withheld from _____ ." to EP _____
- F3. "Think of something _____ has done to others."
 "Think of something _____ has withheld from others." to EP _____
- F0. "Think of something you have done to yourself because of _____."
 "Think of something you have withheld from yourself because of _____ ." to EP _____

14. O/W STRAIGHTWIRE AND SELECTED PERSONS OVERT STRAIGHTWIRE

* Note: This flow should only be run once even if F1-F3 are run with several terminals.

Combined as commands for Quad are the same for both.

- Ref: HCOB 11 Jun 59 LOCATION OF TERMINALS
 HCOB 3 Feb 59 HCO CURRENT PROCEDURE
 HCOB 24 Feb 59 TECHNICAL HCOB
 HCOB 3 Jul 59 GENERAL INFORMATION PAB 155

Do a Dynamic Assessment and run reading terminals as follows in descending order of reads:

- F1. "Recall something _____ has done to you."
 "Recall something _____ has withheld from you." to EP _____
- F2. "Recall something you have done to _____."
 "Recall something you have withheld from _____ ." to EP _____
- F3. "Recall something _____ has done to others."
 "Recall something _____ has withheld from others." to EP _____
- F0. "Recall something you have done to yourself due to _____."
 "Recall something you have withheld from yourself due to _____ ." to EP _____

15. NOT-IS STRAIGHTWIRE

- Ref: HCOB 22 Jan 59 NOT-IS STRAIGHTWIRE
 HCOB 3 Feb 59 HGC CURRENT PROCEDURE
 HCOB 16 Feb 59 HGC PROCESSES FOR THOSE TRAINED IN ENGRAM
 RUNNING OR TRAINED IN THESE PROCESSES
 Staff Auditors Conference of 16 Feb 59
 HCOB 3 Jul 69 GENERAL INFORMATION
 PAB 155

- A. "Recall something that you implied was unimportant."
 "Recall something somebody else thought was important." to EP _____
- B. "Recall a time when you thought something bad was unimportant."
 "Recall a time when somebody else thought something bad was important." to EP _____
- C. "Find something unimportant about this room." to EP _____

16. O/W PROCESSES

- Ref: HCOB 12 Jul 64 MORE ON O/Ws

- F1. "Tell me some things you think another should not have done to you."
 to EP _____
- F2. "Tell me some things you think you should not have done to another."
 to EP _____
- F3. "Tell me some things others think they should not have done to others."
 to EP _____
- F0. "Tell me some things you think you should not have done to yourself."
 to EP _____

also

"Tell me what you've done that got you into trouble." to EP _____

also

"What wouldn't you do over again?" to EP _____

also

"What are some things a person shouldn't say?" to EP _____

also

"What gets a person into trouble?" to EP _____

also

F1. "What has another done to you that he/she regrets?" to EP _____

F2. "What have you done to another that you regret?" to EP _____

F3. "What have others done to others that they regret?" to EP _____

F0. "What have you done to yourself that you regret?" to EP _____

also

"What have you said you wish you hadn't?" to EP _____

also

F1. "What has another advised you to do?" to EP _____

F2. "What have you advised another to do?" to EP _____

F3. "What have others advised others to do?" to EP _____

F0. "What have you advised yourself to do?" to EP _____

17. UNIVERSE O/W STRAIGHTWIRE

Ref: HCOB 5 Oct 59 UNIVERSE PROCESSES

Assess: Thetan
Mind
Body
Physical Universe

Run the best reading item with the following. Then re-assess the remaining three items etc. until all items have been run.

F1. "Recall something _____ has done to you."
"Recall something _____ has withheld from you." to EP _____

F2. "Recall something you have done to _____."
"Recall something you have withheld from _____." to EP _____

F3. "Recall something _____ has done to others."
"Recall something _____ has withheld from others." to EP _____

- F0. "Recall something you have done to yourself because of ____."
- "Recall something you have withheld from yourself because of ____."
- to EP _____

18. KNOW TO MYSTERY STRAIGHTWIRE

Ref: HCOB 17 Apr 59 KNOW TO MYSTERY STRAIGHTWIRE FOR EXTREME CASES
 HCOB 25 Sep 71 TONE SCALE IN FULL Rev: 15 Nov 71 Re-rev: 4 Apr 74

Use the Know to Mystery Scale as given on TONE SCALE IN FULL:

- | | |
|---------------|-------------|
| KNOW | SYMBOLS |
| NOT KNOW | EAT |
| KNOW ABOUT | SEX |
| LOOK | MYSTERY |
| PLUS EMOTION | WAIT |
| MINUS EMOTION | UNCONSCIOUS |
| EFFORT | UNKNOWABLE |
| THINK | |

Get a list of "What terminals could represent 'unknowable'?" This is not Listing and Nulling. Run each terminal in order of descending reads as follows:

- F1. "Recall something ____ has done to you."
- "Recall something ____ has withheld from you." to EP _____
- F2. "Recall something you have done to ____."
- "Recall something you have withheld from ____." to EP _____
- F3. "Recall something ____ has done to others."
- "Recall something ____ has withheld from others." to EP _____
- F0. "Recall something you have done to yourself because of ____."
- "Recall something you have withheld from yourself because of ____." to EP _____

Then do the same as above on each line of the scale moving upwards.

19. REGIMEN 6 O/W

Ref: HCOB 6 Oct 60 THIRTY SIX NEW PRESESSIONS

Make a list of 6th Dynamic terminals (not listing and nulling) by asking - "What terminals could represent the 6th Dynamic?" When pc has given all he can think of run the reading terminals in descending order of read as follows:

- F1. "Get the idea of (terminal) doing something to you."
- "Get the idea of (terminal) withholding something from you." to EP _____
- F2. "Get the idea of doing something to (terminal)."
- "Get the idea of withholding something from (terminal)." to EP _____
- F3. "Get the idea of others doing something to (terminal)."
- "Get the idea of others withholding something from (terminal)." to EP _____
- F0. "Get the idea of doing something to yourself because of (terminal)."
- "Get the idea of withholding something to yourself because of (terminal)." to EP _____

Also

- F1. "What has (terminal) done to you?"
"What has (terminal) withheld from you?" to EP _____
- F2. "What have you done to (terminal)?"
"What have you withheld from (terminal)?" to EP _____
- F3. "What have others done to (terminal)?"
"What have others withheld from (terminal)?" to EP _____
- F0. "What have you done to yourself because of (terminal)?"
"What have you withheld from yourself because of (terminal)?" to EP _____

Also

- F1. "Get the idea of (terminal) having done something to you."
"Get the idea of (terminal) having withheld something from you." to EP _____
- F2. "Get the idea of having done something to (terminal)."
"Get the idea of having withheld something from (terminal)." to EP _____
- F3. "Get the idea of others having done something to (terminal)."
"Get the idea of others having withheld something from (terminal)." to EP _____
- F0. "Get the idea of you having done something to yourself because of (terminal)."
"Get the idea of having withheld something from yourself because of (terminal)." to EP _____

20. O/W PROCESS ON PROBLEM PERSONS

Ref: HCOB 14 Apr 60 NEW PE DATA

Ask "What persons do you have problems about?" Person is changed to persons to eliminate possibility of pc running this as an L & N type list.)

Run the following on each reading item in descending order of reads:

- F1. "What has _____ done to you."
"What has _____ withheld from you." to EP _____
- F2. "What have you done to _____."
"What have you withheld from _____." to EP _____
- F3. "What has _____ done to others."
"What has _____ withheld from others." to EP _____
- F0. "What have you done to yourself because of _____."
"What have you withheld from yourself because of _____." to EP _____

Also the following responsibility process:

"What part of your life have you been responsible for?" to EP _____

21. BEST RESPONSIBILITY PROCESS

Ref: HCOB 4 Feb 60 THEORY OF RESPONSIBILITY PROCESSING
 HCOB 11 Feb 60 CREATE AND CONFRONT

Locate an area where pc cannot do, is having trouble or cannot take responsibility. Find charged terminals that represent that area. Run each reading terminal in descending or of reads as follows:

- F1. "What has _____ done to you."
 "What has _____ withheld from you." to EP _____
- F2. "What have you done to _____."
 "What have you withheld from _____." to EP _____
- F3. "What has _____ done to others."
 "What has _____ withheld from others." to EP _____
- F0. "What have you done to yourself because of _____."
 "What have you withheld from yourself because of _____." to EP _____

22. WITHHOLD PROCESS

Ref: HCOB 14 Jul 60 CONCEPT HELP

- F1. "What could you withhold from another?" to EP _____
- F2. "What could another withhold from you?" to EP _____
- F3. "What could others withhold from others?" to EP _____
- F0. "What could you withhold from yourself?" to EP _____

23. LOCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Ref: SCIENTOLOGY CLEAR PROCEDURE, Iss I.

"You look around here and find something you could be responsible for."
 to EP _____

"You look around here and find something you don't have to be responsible for."
 to EP _____

"You look around here and find something you would permit another to be responsible for."
 to EP _____

24. LEVEL II QUAD

Ref: HCOB 8.8.71 Iss II TRIPLE GRADES

- F1. "What has another done to you?"
 "What has another withheld from you?" to EP _____
- F2. "What have you done to another?"
 "What have you withheld from another?" to EP _____
- F3. "What has another done to others?"
 "What has another withheld from others?" to EP _____

F0.	"What have you done to yourself?" "What have you withheld from yourself?"	to EP	_____
-----	--	-------	-------

25. HAVINGNESS

Ref: HCOB 8.8.71 Iss II TRIPLE GRADES

F1.	"Tell me a flow another could get you interested in."	to EP	_____
-----	---	-------	-------

F2.	"Tell me a flow you could get another interested in."	to EP	_____
-----	---	-------	-------

F3.	"Tell me a flow another could get others interested in."	to EP	_____
-----	--	-------	-------

F0.	"Tell me a flow you could get yourself interested in."	to EP	_____
-----	--	-------	-------

Revised by the QUAL BOARD of the
RON'S ORG COMMITTEE

As assisted by the

TECH EXAMINATION BOARD

I/C: Max Hauri

2nd: Otfried Krumpholz,
Dominic O'Brien

BDCS:DM:KU:JE:DM:JG:PD:MH:AL:MI:ROC QB:TEB:MH:ok