

## SEC CHECK QUESTIONS: MUTUAL RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on  
20 June 1961

Thank you.

Give her the applause, she's doing all the work! I don't know how she does it. I think she's got you all fooled.

I've seen her tremendously popular. I've seen her step up on a congress stage and I didn't think anybody on the whole continent had ever heard of her, you know. And, you know, for the local Assoc Sec everybody applauds, you know, a little bit. And everybody applauds, and applauds for the others. And all of a sudden, you introduce Mary Sue, and the chandeliers jump! You know? I don't know how she does it.

I'm sure that being a very excellent D of P, always getting results, all that sort of thing . . I don't think that has much to do with it.

It's the prevailing opinion in most Central Organizations and Scientology areas, current moment, that getting tremendous results and big wins has nothing to do with administration or income or keeping the show on the road or doing anything about the world. And this we are trying to change. And one of the things this Saint Hill Course is devoted to is trying to change just that. Okay?

Now, let's see. This . . when I last looked . . it might have changed since I came down here . . but it was the 20th of June when I was upstairs, and it was 1961. But looking around here, I see that it isn't 1961, in a couple of cases.

Now, I see a note here, that a question has been asked sufficiently of Mary Sue, that she wants this answered by me in this briefing lineup.

She says, "When doing . . ." I haven't read this in advance. "When doing a Security Check, don't just keep repeating the same question, allowing the person to say, 'I don't know.' Vary questions, so as to give the pc a hand, returning always, of course, to your original question in the Security Check."

Oh, man! This is a wide-open invitation to a Q and A, like I was talking to you about the other day. And every time auditors get turned loose on varying the question, a tremendous amount of randomness enters into auditing. And tremendous auditing failures occur, madly, in all directions.

So, when I tell you that this is something you have to know very well . . the difference between varying a question, and Q-and-Aing with the pc.

Now, if you can get that down, you can really do a red-hot Security Check. But let me tell you, that this has been a very difficult point to get across.

Now, I'll give you . . try to give you a couple of examples, here, off the bat, that are like this:

Auditor: "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

Pc: "Well, I don't know."

Auditor (having seen a reaction on the meter): "Well, do you know anybody that has stolen any cats?"

The pc says, "Yes, my aunt once stole some cats."

The auditor: "What was her name?"

Now, that is a Q and A. In the first place, who does it . . what does it matter who else stole some cats? We're not auditing his aunt. Well, we couldn't care about this. This is not a varied question.

The next point is, that is a direct Q and A. Now, a Q and A is defined, this way. The reason it exists . . it is question and answer. But there is a technical fact that the perfect answer to any question is the question. It is colloquially used.

This is the Philadelphia Congress of 1953 . . Philadelphia Congress, fall 1953 took this up, completely, and it's never been mentioned since.

It is an oddity, and a perfectly worthwhile one to know, that the perfect answer to any question, of course, is the question. Therefore, when the question is phrased exactly right, it answers itself. This is the engineer's version of this.

There's a fellow by the name of "Ninety-nine Percent Johnson" at MIT, and every student from time immemorial called the man "Ninety-nine Percent." I don't know that he ever knew this. But he was fond of saying, "The question which is asked right is already 99 percent answered."

And this is very true. You can take an engineering problem, or any other kind of problem, or a human problem (if there's any vast difference), and if you can ask the right question . . the exact question . . it's already practically answered.

You're trying to lay out, let us say, the location of serving equipment or something, in a hotel kitchen. And you keep pushing escalators and dumb waiters and so forth around on your drawing paper, you see. "And you get this and so on." And you finally wake up and say, "Well, what the hell am I doing here?" You know?

This is all a good thing to do, sooner or later, after you've been working on some problem, it hasn't solved itself in a few hours or days. "Why, what am I doing? Just what am I doing?" And that is an awfully good question.

And you suddenly wake up to the fact that what you have been doing is arranging machinery. But what you are really doing is trying . . trying to arrange serving equipment in a hotel kitchen.

And you say, "Well, what am I doing?" you see. And the answer is "What am I trying to arrange?" or "What am I trying to get accomplished?" And these questions are different questions.

And you all of a sudden say, "Well. Ah, yes! I'm trying to get food." I'm not fooling with an engineering dra . . ."

This is why there's very few good layout engineers, or very few good design engineers. A country's mechanical progress goes along as fast as it gets good design engineers, by the way. And they're, accidentally, only as fast as or only as good as they are able to ask questions of themselves or their work or the world at large.

And a smart one will go down . . after he's worked with this for a long time and he can't seem to get all his pantry equipment in straight . . he's liable to get the actually brilliant idea of going down and finding the man who's going to use it, and asking him, "What do you try to do in a kitchen?" you see? "In getting . . what are . . what are you trying to do in a kitchen?"

And the fellow gives him this terrific, revelatory answer, you see? Which is, "Well, we're preparing food for the guests."

"Huuuu . . ." That's a new one, see? "Aw, then, all of this stuff I've been fooling with on the drawing board . . . You mean, I'm trying to get food from the kitchen to . . how many rooms? How many dining rooms?"

“Well, there’s eight private dining rooms. There’s the staff dining room. There’s the main dining room for hotel guests. There’s a public dining room. And all the food comes from this one galley . . this one kitchen here. And it all goes . . .”

The guy says, “Yeah! Now, let’s see. You’re trying to get food there. What condition must the food be in when it arrives?”

“Well. . .” The guy says, “Well, it must be hot. It must be still crisp. It must be this, it must be that. It must be easily identified, and it must be very rapid. And there must be a place, down here, for the cooks to get orders, to put it together and throw it up onto things, and then it can be recovered and shunted . . .”

“Oh,” the fellow says, “what you need is a . . an IBM sorting system.”

The fellow says, “An IBM sorting system in a hotel kitchen? What are you talking about?”

And the dining engineer says, “That’s what you need. That’s what you’re going to get, too.”

And then so all of a sudden, mysteriously, at the Conrad . . the Conrad Filcher, new hotel in Glasgow . . which never before has it ever happened that anybody in the dining room ever got anything to eat . . all of a sudden, this starts occurring And everybody gets very happy all up and down the lines, and so forth. Why? ‘Cause somebody asked the right question. That’s all.

Well, old Ninety-nine Percent Johnson . . he claimed that if you phrased the question that you were asking exactly right, that it was instantly answerable, see? Well, theoretically, the 100 percent . . not the 99 but the 100 percent answer to “How is the weather today?” is “How is the weather today?”

See, that’s a perfect duplication on the cause-distance-effect communication line in Scientology, see? So, “How is the weather today?” . . “How is the weather today?” Now that’s the 100 percent.

What you’re trying to do is come as close to the 100 percent as you can. You want this withhold. So it’s “What am I trying to do? I’m trying to get the not-knows that this character is running on the world off of the case, so that he’ll brighten up and get on the run.” See, “What am I doing here?” That’s the first thing you’ve got to ask yourself.

Now, that you know . . I told you just the other day . . this is why you are giving a Security Check. Not to be nosy, not to make people feel embarrassed, and not because Ron said so, see, but actually, to get the characters to release these tremendous overts of not-knowingness, because it’s got them parked in total stupidity. You’re not running failed withhold on the pc. You are running overts called “Keep ‘em stupid.” Got it?

Now, when he stole something, it disappeared and its owner couldn’t find it. And a tremendous not-know was entered into the owner’s sphere of livingness, right? It’s an overt. To hell with whether or not MEST passed. That is the basic overt.

So when you make these things known and scrape them out of the pc’s reactive bank and get them up into his zone of knowingness, you raise, of course, his intelligence. Therefore, you raise his knowingness. Therefore, his responsibility comes up enormously, right?

Processing, in general, raises his responsibility and throws these not-knowingnesses into restimulation And unless they are released or vented, then the pc does not make any further progress. And the fastest way in the world to stop a pc’s progress is to do a lousy Security Check.

Now, you can audit with your finger just exactly, properly, correctly held in holding the E-Meter. You can say all the right incantations and rituals. You can have incense in your electrodes, swinging from right to left in a rhythmic way. You can do your auditing with the proper Latin chant going in the background.

No matter how good this auditing is, no matter how expertly you have assessed your pc, no matter how minutely you have followed through the auditing command and cleared each one, no matter how well you've gotten the rudiments off; you are still going to run into this one: You're going to get that case along just a few yards up the line, and you've increased his responsibility to a point where his overts now hurt.

These withholds, these not-knowingness overts now hurt. Because you're increasing his knowingness, so therefore they're being revealed to him. And they're not-knowingnesses, and he cannot vent these things, and he can't get rid of it. And that not-knowingness just stays like a cyst in his mind. See, his case progress stops right there. Boom.

This makes another method of stopping case progress.

One of those methods is to audit with a rudiment out. The way you can deteriorate a case is to audit with an ARC break in existence. A case will deteriorate with the ARC break. A present time problem? The case will not change. With a withhold on, the case will not change.

And by failing to give expertly administered Security Checks at routine and regular intervals throughout processing, you stop the overall progress of the case, just as though you had let him run into the bumpers on the end of a train track.

He's going to get unhappy. And the better you audit from there on, the unhappy he's going to get. Why? Because auditing begins to hurt. So he all of a sudden realizes that it wasn't a smart thing to do to jilt these nine girls in high school, that he really upset them. That years afterwards, actually, he found out that he'd made a tramp out of a couple of them, you know? And this was not smart.

You're auditing away on the "Failed Sneeze." And he all of a sudden goes, "Uuuuu." You're asking this boy to confront his life, aren't you?

Well, the reason he didn't ever get well in the past, automatically, was because it was too painful to take responsibility for the things he had done. It hurt. So he'd take his theetie-weetie, Dale Carnegie Dramamine pills, and get to feeling a little bit better. And he'd go thumm!

This, by the way, is the manic-depressive. He feels wonderful until he suddenly realizes he has an overt. So he feels lousy. Then he recovers from this, and then he feels wonderful till he realizes this same overt again. Well, it just will keep going in the same stupid, dizzy cycle, on and on and on and on. It'll never release.

So when Scientology got hot and its case advances got rapid, all of a sudden this new factor showed up. And it was a brand-new factor: that cases exceeded . . . could be made to exceed, through auditing, their ability to tolerate their improved condition, and what you had to do was let the steam off. And the mechanism to let the steam off . . . that was absolutely necessary in this particular case . . . was what we're calling Security Checks, more properly called processing checks.

And unless those are given well, wow! You're just going to park a case. And your rudiments can be out, and you won't get gains on the case. You can have a wrong assessment . . . that'd really be a nice way to get no gain on a case. And you can fail to give Security Checks properly and, man, then you'll get no gain on a case, beyond a certain zone.

Why does this fellow's leg hurt? You audit it, it feels better, and then the next day it hurts. Why? Well, you audited it up to a point where he could recognize his responsibility for it, and then you didn't give him any chance to come off of it. Isn't this cute? Isn't that fascinating?

About the cruelest thing you could do to a case would be leave its withholds on it, for any reason under the sun, not to clean up this case's withholds.

Now, we found that auditors don't do well when they're just turned loose to ask, "Do you have any withholds? Thank you. Do you have any withholds? Thank you. Do you have any withholds? Thank

you. Do you have any withholds? Thank you.” They don’t do well this way. So you have a Security Check that particularizes all types of withholds.

As a matter of fact, there are some new Security Checks. We were dreaming them up the other day. I said there could be Security Checks. Jan got real busy, Dick got real busy, and man, they really whipped you up some Security Checks. There's some staff member Security Checks, there's an HGC pc Security Check, Academy student Security Check. The staff member Security Check isn't being yet, but the others are.

Now, that's just particularized types of withholds that would be . . . if any of them were out . . . it's like rudiments . . . if any of those were live, the case would only do so much advance and then stop advancing. Unless that withhold is gotten off, in other words, the case is going to stop in its advance, right there. Screaming brakes . . . boom! Do you see this?

Why? Because the auditing increases his ability to take responsibility. His ability to take responsibility blows into view the withholds!

As soon as the withhold comes into view to him, if he has no chance to impart this withhold, oh, he's miserable! So of course, he says, "I'd feel better if I were aberrated." And he's absolutely right. He'd feel much better being stupid and aberrated and president. You got the idea? I mean, he halts his own forward progress.

And there's the primary reason why you had Clear slumps. That's the reason for your Clear slumps, not the guy postulating himself into the ground. He ran into his own bank. He had to confront it all at once. And gradually, as time went on... I said there was a settling out period for a Clear? Well, if any time during that settling out period he all of a sudden found himself confronted with the tremendous irresponsibilities of his own background, and it became too painful, he said, "I better be aberrated."

Absence of Security Check, then, is the most effective way of halting a rapid case gain toward Clear. Have you got that? This was a bug.

We used to have another mechanism, and actually have had for seven years another mechanism, which we used rather constantly. And we don't find it in our midst right now. We used to do this with a responsibility process of one version or another . . . Confront or Responsibility. You got it?

We used to accomplish, less ably, the same mechanism. Unless you ran responsibility on an engram, we used to say, why, it wouldn't stay stably gone. Okay? You remember that? All right. Well, now that was the same mechanism at work there, but not well articulated, not well understood, and so forth. Now, we've got another mechanism that supplants that and that does it a thousand times better. So, you've got to learn how to use that ably.

But just as the pc does not clear up well on “Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a withhold? Thank you. Have you got a with “ You know you can run him for a week and a half on that process with no difficulties whatsoever? They did it on the 22nd American, didn’t you? And it didn’t arrive anywhere. All right, why?

Well, the pc is trying to avoid all of his withholds. And if the auditor can't remember all of the viciousness of man all the time, you then don't get any interrogation which results in a release of the exact withholds the pc is withholding. So this is fast! Presession 37 went back to the oxcart. You know? We relegated it to the Metropolitan Museum.

I heard from them today, by the way, or yesterday. And I find out, they have all the art objects of any kind that they will ever need, and know all there is to know about the whole track.

And I'm on an awful withhold today from the Metropolitan Museum. On two or three occasions, I've been doing work with Scientology organizations and other things . . . sitting up at my desk, talking to

Peter, doing other things. And it's a terrible temptation to write them and say, "Congratulations." You know? "Congratulations upon the abundance and finality of all of your collections."

How I'd come to hear from this, I'd asked them an embarrassing question or two, and I found out that they don't need anything in their museum. Nothing. They've got everything.

I wasn't trying to give them anything I was . . . I thought that there was a possibility that there was a place they might get something. And we find out they have everything they want.

I think that's pretty good, isn't it? It's like some self-satisfied pc. And you'll get this self-satisfied pc that doesn't want to improve. Well, why doesn't he want to improve? Because it might be painful, and something might show up.

You would have to audit the curators . . . combined and collected . . . of the Metropolitan Museum, and get off their whole track overts, before they would accept the specimens that they ought to have in the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York City. Because it shows up grandly that these characters are restimulated by the crown jewels of Ophir. Because they, of course, stole them once. That's why they're there. They're now in the valence of the brass watchdog they used to have on them.

But any more collection would lead to more knowingness. And more knowingness to these characters . . . because of the peculiarity of their position . . . might be painful. So we have whole societies becoming very self-satisfied about what they know. They know all there is to know about everything. That is a mechanism.

"Let's not run into the pain of having taken responsibility for what we've done. If we knew that, it would be painful. So therefore, if we know more, it might be possible that we would come to know that, too. And if we came to know that, then that would be very painful.

"So we'd better keep telling everybody, 'Well, psychology, that's . . . ha-haha-ha-heh-heh . . . that . . . that's . . . that's the kind of a science we want . . . haha-ha-heh-heh!' Doesn't reveal anything. Ugh-ugh. Yeah, that's what we want. Nice, nice, stupid sort of thing, you know? And the more stupid the people we can get in it, why, the happier we'll all be."

That's true, too! The crazier they'll all stay! That's true, too. And the crazier they'll get. That's true, too.

So pcs play this game on you just like societies do. And you'll find the pc sitting there . . . Dianetics 1950. That was enough for him, that was it. He's got it. Doesn't care to know anything since. Doesn't care to know anything since.

That's it. Why?

It might be painful if he found out his own overts. If he knew a little bit more about the mind, he might find out about overts. And so, you had something on the order of a third to a half of the people who were interested in Dianetics 1950, and so forth, very content to stick with that level of it. And not at all willing to advance up into Scientology. Do you remember that as a phenomenon in the States? It was interesting, wasn't it?

Male voice: Yes.

All right, that's the mustn't-know-any-more factor.

Now, the mustn't-gain-any-more factor and the mustn't-know-any-more factor is something that you, as an auditor, can Q-and-A with the pc with. If you yourself aren't getting auditing and getting off your withholds, then you're liable to get into a situation where if this pc found out more, it'd be very painful. So the kind thing to do is not to do anything else but just say the process. Let's do the minimum; let's do the minimum.

So, when we ask, "Have you ever stolen any cats?" the pc gets a fall on

79 the meter and it says, "I don't know." Do the minimum.

The minimum is "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

And the pc says, "I don't know."

And so you do the minimum. And you say, "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

Believe me, you're just going to get nowhere from there on. That is the slow way to go about it. But you've found a nice eddy from the mainstream of life. And you can sit there, under the banks, with the willow trees full of pigeons. And use it as a repetitive question.

The Security Check is not a repetitive question process! It's not!

Now, because you might Q-and-A, your Instructors don't get enthusiastic about turning auditors loose with this.

So we get the "Have you ever stolen any cats?" . . fall.

"What was that?"

"Now, well, uh . . . hmm . . . Uh, I don't know."

"Well, have you ever stolen any cats?"

See, that's the extreme one. "I don't know."

"Have you ever stolen any cats?" Repetitive question.

All right, now here's the next version: "Have you ever stolen any cats?"

This is a Q and A.

"I don't know."

"Well, what was that fall?"

"Uh, well uh . . . hmm, I don't know."

"Uh, well, has your . . . has . . . do you know anybody that has ever stolen any cats?"

The pc says, "Oh, yes, my aunt stole some cats."

"Now, well, uh, what was your aunt's name?"

Now, of course, this is the same mechanism as the repetitive question.

This again, blocks any further knowing on this line, which we all know will be painful. But in a Security Check this is the only way to take the pain off. The only way you can reduce the pain, of this additional knowingness is give a decent Security Check. So the Q and A is . . is well . . poorly situated.

So what do we get here? "Have you ever stolen any cats? What is your aunt's name? Where did she live? Do you remember what she used to wear? Have you got a picture of your aunt there? Uh, do you have a picture of the house? How long did you live with your aunt? Do you have any of the illnesses your aunt had?"

That is a mechanism of denying further knowledge. Because you don't get any more knowledge on the subject of has the pc ever stolen any cats? And that's all you want to find out.

So now, here is a non-Q-and-A, knowledgeable, advance version of this. And here's . . here's . . here's the way it'd go:

"Have you ever stolen any cats?"

Pc (gets a fall) says, "I don't know."

And you say, "Well, what was the fall?"

And the pc says, "Well, I don't know, because I have never stolen any cats."

All right, now there's a dozen things you can do. But they all have to do with the direct and immediate question of the cats and the pc having stolen them. Not his aunts, cousins, sisters or the moon.

Now, the way to illuminate this, the first rule . . don't try to do this by rules. But a rule, that goes back of this is compartment the question. That's one of the nice, handy, good things to do with any security question.

You're asking somebody, "Have you ever . . have you ever been in DC before?" The pc falls off the pin. And you say, "Well, when was that that you were there before?" And you don't get a reaction. And it's all very mysterious and gets very confused.

DC were the initials of Davy Crockett. The pc is in full restim on this. So whenever you say "DC" to the pc, you mean Washington, DC, and he means Davy Crockett. And believe me, you're not getting anywhere.

All right. So you ask the question, something of this order:

"Have you ever stolen," (no reaction) "any cats?" (reaction)

"Well, what gives with you and cats? Have you ever stolen any cats?" (reaction)

"Any cats?" (reaction)

"Have you ever stolen . . .?" (no reaction)

Phuh. Promptly, the whole thing clarified.

"What gives with this cat? Cats?"

"Yu-uuhh."

"Well, what about cats?"

"Thh-uhhh!"

Now, you're pressing the button that the meter fell on. And it's awfully smart to stand there with the unlimited switchboard of the pc and your great big wide thumb.

You need bartender thumbs, see, from the mother-lode district. They used to hire bartenders with inch-broad thumbs, because a drink was a pinch. And the bartender would reach into the prospector's poke, with his thumb and forefinger, to take out the pinch of gold for the drink. So they'd get this inch-wide thumbs, you know?



Well, you need these great, big, inch-wide thumbs, actually, to run this here switchboard called the pc; it's not just the E-Meter.

And what you're trying to do is find out what is the meter falling on?

And you may come to one of two conclusions: that it's falling on one or more parts of the question, or that it's falling on the question. Now, it's falling on something in the question.

There's nothing mysterious about this. You don't have to clarify the question on this basis of "Well, are you allergic to cats? Have cats often disturbed your sleep?" No. Once more you're off the line, because you're trying to find out what the pc has withheld about cats.

And by compartmenting the question, "Have you ever stolen . . . ?" That's null.

Why are you pursuing this question, then, "Have you ever stolen cats?" as long as you get a fall on cats?

So this kind of questioning opens up, "What's a cat?"

And you find a cat is a feline object that has long teeth and is colored purple, and is very often forty feet high, and is used to moor ships.

And you say, "Aw, come off it."

So, you clarify the question. And you say the whole question again, because this was the question you were trying to clear.

"Have you ever stolen any cats in this lifetime?" No fall. Go to the next question.

All right. You say, "What's cats?" . . . clarification.

The E-Meter says, there are certain parts of the question that are alive, or all of the question is live. So it's up to you to find out what part of the question is burning. And then take your bartender thumb and step on that button hard, hard, hard, hard.

And the pc all of a sudden says, "All right! All of my life, I haven't been able to understand cats. I just haven't been able to do anything about cats. That's all I can do, is just every time I see a cat . . . heh! I used to keep this Holland and Holland .50-caliber elephant gun. And every time I heard a cat meowing outside, I would shoot him! Hooh!"

Or you hear something remarkable, "Well, I used to have a trap in the backyard. And whenever a cat would get into it, I would take him down in the basement, where nobody could hear him, and I would cut his paws off one after the other. And I've begun to realize, recently, that this probably isn't nice."

Now, the E-Meter says there's buttons to be pressed. And you in your interrogation are only trying to find out what button. Exactly what is the button?

So, for a while you press with your bartender thumb. And then you take your little finger, which has a long, pointed, Chinese fingernail that you can actually press very delicately, and you press the exact combination. And the pc goes . . . boom! And it's in a hurry. It happens fast.

You say, "Have you ever PDHed anyone?" And you get a big fall.

Well, for God's sakes! say "Have you ever?" You get a fall. "Have you ever? Have you ever?" . . . get a fall and get a fall.

All right, "PDHed someone? PDHed someone?" Null.

"Well, have you ever what? What? What? for pity sakes? Have you ever what?"

“Huh . . I was afraid you’d ask that.”

See, it means something, exactly and immediately and directly to the pc. And he finally tells you, “It’s just you asking all the time, ‘Have you ever, have you ever, have you ever, have you ever,’ and I have never.”

And you say, “All right, what have you never?” if that’s the button.

“I’ve never had nerve enough to ask a girl. I haven’t dared tell anybody.”

Bang! You’ve sprung the trap. You see how that would work?

It is a matter, actually, of not playing any instrument more complicated than a one-finger version of “Home Sweet Home” and “God Save the Queen” on a piano. And you can even play it out of tune and still get it done. But you will never get it if you do this other thing.

Either you just take no responsibility for getting the question answered, and you say, “Have you ever stolen cats?”

“Don’t know.”

“Thank you.”

“Have you ever stolen cats? Have you ever stolen cats? Have you ever stolen?”

Did you ever hear of this process, “Have you ever stolen cats?” I’ve never heard of this process. I’ve read all my bulletins and I don’t read it in them anyplace. “Have you ever stolen any cats?” No such process. So it certainly is not a repetitive question.

The other way of debarring information is to w-a-a-ander.

You see, here sits this console keyboard in front of your face, and lights are lighting up. You know, like a pinball machine. You know? The meter is saying “Something’s hot! Something’s hot! Something’s hot! Something’s hot! Emergency! Emergency! There is smoke in Number Ten compartment!” And you say, “Well, well, what do you know!”

Well, this is no time to say, “Well, there’s too much motion in that thing. I think I’ll put that aside, and we’ll go on with this calm thing of finding out. . . Because I very well suspect that he doesn’t like pea soup. I think so. And I think I’ve found the person here, in his aunt, who made pea soup. I think I’ll just find that out now.”

And this poor console is sitting over here and “Smoke in Number Ten compartment, smoke in Number Eight compartment, smoke in Number Two compartment, smoke in the engine room. Abandon ship! Abandon ship!” You know?

And you say, “Well, it’s got too much motion in it. Let’s get rid of that thing. And let’s carry on something here with a true professional mien, that has dignity and aplomb. And let’s not get into any of this wild excitement.” Because it can get pretty exciting.

It’s like if you don’t know how to interrogate on an E-Meter, you can get the E-Meter to say anything, anything, anything! You can say that it’s PDHed the pc, and so forth, just by associated think. Because it falls on this, it falls on that, it falls on something else. You find out what it’s falling on. You got that?

Now, we had somebody the other day who had the word “shop” mixed up with a business. Got the idea? So it’s a good thing to say “What’s a shop?”

You take everything apart, almost syllable by syllable if you're having any trouble, and give them each one of these things. And you say, "Aha! That's hot, and that's hot, and that's hot. And these three things, added up together, make something else. Now, what gives here?" See?

And the person says, "A shop. A shop. Well, a shop . . . that's a business."

"What kind of a business?"

"Well, that's an administrative office, a shop is."

"Oh, it is?" And right away, why, the interrogation, of course, narrows down promptly and instantly.

And your taking something on the order of twenty-five hours to clear a question, is a bad comment on your ability to compartment a question and to step on the buttons. Because the pc is very often quite willing to answer your

???and .

questions if you ask them. So if you don't ask the right question, you're not going to get a right answer. Follow that?

Now, this is very true. In fact, nearly all of your Security Checks depend utterly on your skill in taking apart each question, asking the fringe questions necessary to it. Now, what do I mean by a fringe question? Well, your fringe questions actually occur after you've taken the question apart.

You say, "Have you ever stolen a cat?"

"Have you ever stolen . . . a cat?"

"A cat" is dumb . . . numb. You get no reaction on it. You get a latent reaction. Pooh! Ignore it.

"Have you ever stolen?"

And the pc says, "No, really, no! No, no!" and so on.

You say, "Well, you ever stolen?"

He said, "No."

Aw, come off of it. Get good. Get good, right at that point.

"Have you ever been accused of stealing?"

"Yes. Yes, yes! And I didn't do it! I didn't do it! I . . . I really didn't do it, nobody'll believe me," and so forth.

"Well, were you lying at the time?"

"Well, yes, I was."

Smooth, swift resolution of withholds depends upon the auditor asking the right question. You've got to be right there on the ball.

The pc actually needs help, because the thing is still about two-thirds or better in his reactive sphere. He is not very conscious of what it is.

The borderline between the reactive mind and the analytical mind is the broad savanna of “I don’t know.” And when something moves out of the reactive mind of total unknown, it moves into the foggy mist that is coming up off the bayous. And it’s just a mist. The pc needs help.

It isn’t this kind of a situation:

You say, “Have you ever stolen a cat?”

Instantly name, rank, serial number of all cats stolen appear, magically, and go by in a little railroad car, and all he has to do is read them off. Well, that isn’t what happens.

You say, “Have you ever stolen a cat?”

The reactive mind says, “We’ve had it boys,” and so forth, and goes clamp! And the mist goes up.

And the pc says, “Whoo-ooo-ooo-ooo!”

Because there he is attached into the “I don’t know” of reactivity, you see?

And he says, “Whoo-oo, wait a minute, wait a minute. Whoo-who-oo. What . . . what’s going on here? Phoo! Just a moment ago, I could look clear out there. And I could see the palm trees and the city in the distance. And there’s nothing now but this horrible miasma which is coming up around me, and so forth, smelling of dead fish. I wonder what this is!”

He’s wondering what it is as well as you are, you see?

But it’s just moved into view, he knows something is there. You ask the question again, it clarifies the question a little bit. But that’s about all you’d ever accomplish on a repetitive question.

You say, “What fog are you in, Mutt?”

And, of course, this machine is going to tell him. Tell you and tell him. Because “Have you ever stolen . . . a cat?” Pang!

“A cat? Well, what gives with cats? What have you done to cats? What have you done to cats?” Pow! See?

“What have you done to cats?”

“Oh-oh-oh-oh,” fellow says, “Didn’t amount to very much. Never felt bad about it before. This just doesn’t seem right, right now. But when we were little boys, why, we used to lower them into boiling oil, an inch at a time. Because their screams annoyed our mothers. And I don’t think that was so good.”

Get the idea? And right away, why, your Security Check picks up in velocity, picks up in velocity, picks up in velocity, you got it?

You must also be able to compartment a goals question. All of these things are subject to compartmentation. You got it? All right. So much for that.

All right, there’s one other thing I want to talk to you about. I have just discovered something of magnitude. This is a magnitudinous, cam laude, ne plus ultra discovery that ranks with a cognition on the part of one of our early pcs. It’s big. No kidding.

We for a long time have known there was difficulty in some co-audit teams . . . for a long time, knew there was difficulty in a co-audit team. They make slower progress.

They sometimes kind of went out of this world. And they would go on grinding, grinding, grinding, grinding. And per hour of auditing, their auditing was less effective than HGC auditing, or something like this, you see? It's been a big mystery. And this has been on the track for years and years and years and years. They make slow progress. And I found the answer to it. And the answer you wouldn't really suspect.

Now, the first inroad I had on this "Why do they go so slow?" . . the first clue I had for this . . was that when a D of P checks the rudiments on an auditor's pc, he often finds them out, even . . that the rudiments are out, even when the auditor, having just checked them, found them in.

This is rather constant. This is rather constant. All right. Take it from there.

This has led Ds of P into the belief that the auditors were careless and couldn't run rudiments, and has lessened executive opinion of auditing ability, and has lessened Instructor opinion of auditing ability, and so forth.

The truth is that the rudiments weren't out with the auditor. Because that auditing crew, grinding together, even so much as twenty-five hours, can develop a mutual set of rudiments. This is the dizziest thing you ever heard of, and yet this phenomenon exists. They develop mutual rudiments and their mutual rudiments are out.

The rudiments they have in common are flat to each other but not to anybody else. And they make a solid, small island in the middle of the sea of not-know, where they don't have their rudiments out to each other, but their rudiments are out to the rest of the world.

Now, let's get a good one on this. Let's get a good one on this. They are both agreed that the family of one of them are a bunch of swine. So, of course, no rudiment really goes out on the subject of the family, because the pc is in perfect agreement with the auditor and the auditor is in perfect agreement with the pc about the family being a bunch of swine.

But somebody else comes along and checks the rudiment and what does he find? He finds there's a fall on "family." Because he's not a part of the agreement. You got that? He's not a part of the agreement. This is quite remarkable.

It's almost as if the auditor is saying, "Now, has anything unusual or is there anything unusual going on about the family?"

And the pc says, "No, it's just the same old grind. The stinking swine, the skunks, are just the same as ever."

And the auditor knows they're swine, so he says . . he's out with them too, you see? And he says, "Well, all right. Well, there's nothing new or unusual about that." And of course, there's been no fall on the meter.

Why is there no fall on the meter? Because the meter registers disagreement, and you have a pair of people who are in perfect agreement. And it's as simply, mechanically, as that. Don't you see?

Now, this is the dizziest one that has ever come up. And you know, I've been tracking this thing and sneaking up on the edges of this thing and sniffing at a spoor seen in the far veldt for years.

Why didn't co-audit teams make more progress, or more rapidly? Because, actually, their ARC should build up easier, and they know each other's cases better . . every reason in the world why they should get along well.

Well, I attributed it, to a marked degree, with the fact that they had spats and upsets with each other and ARC breaks with each other, and they'd chew each other up. But therefore husband-wife teams had a liability, or guy-and-girlfriend teams had a liability, you see? That the two . . something like this.

That isn't the answer. That isn't the answer, because auditors have these things with pcs, too, anyway. No. The answer is mutual rudiments.

Now, there's a dozen ways to solve it. The most thorough way to solve it is do a new . . . do an old-time Formula 13. List of all the people, you know, in the physical universe at this present time. Let's make a list of them. And now, let's run them each and individually.

Let's assess the list for a fall, and then let's run something on that person. And then, let's assess it again for another fall and run something on that person. Assess it again for another fall. Have you got the idea? And just clean up all these people, irrespective of whether one agrees with this or not.

Now, one of the things odd about this . . . I must mention it in passing is . . . the reason I never noticed it is Suzie and I never have this trouble. This is one . . . one spot where we've evidently had a variation of some kind or another from the norm.

We're both sufficiently cold-blooded about auditing. That is to say, auditing is auditing, you see? And evidently, there's a recognition that if you feel bad about something or somebody, whether it is agreed with or not, it will show up. And I will go in like a small or a very large pavement-breaker, one of these widow-making drills they use to bust up concrete, you know?

And I'll finally say, "All right, what is it? What is it?"

"No, I don't have an ARC break with the maid. No, I don't have one," and so on.

And I can understand it perfectly, that the maid is probably giving her a bad time, and that sort of thing. But I don't buy it. Because she . . . I know she probably has an ARC break with the maid. And I want to clear it up with the maid, you see, something like this.

So I'll keep on going on with the pneumatic drill, and I will finally spade up the fact that, agreed upon or not, "Yes," and actually knock out the mutual-agreement factor practically every time, and so forth. And she'll do the same thing.

You got an ARC break; well, that's it, you know? An ARC break with is an ARC break with, and an ARC break is an ARC break.

So I was slow to notice this. I don't say we're better than others, but we've . . . Co-auditing has its adventurous aspects, you know?

The auditor, who has just run all of the mean, vicious, violent things he has ever done to the pc, out of the pc, has had to sit there, tamely, listening to the damndest distortions, the wildest interpretations of things he never could have been guilty of, you see?

And the . . . and on the reverse wise, why, it goes reverse end to. But for the twenty-four hours after that session the auditor, willy-nilly, will be rather cool. But the pc, in this case, is galumphing up and down the halls, feeling sprightly and wonderful to get rid of all of that burden of woe.

And then they get to the next session. And now the pc is the auditor. And the guy goes in, sits down, suddenly settles into the irresponsibility of being a pc and starts to give.

He'll say, "Well, goddamn you!" Some polite opening! You get this kind of a notion? Well, it's real bravery. It's real bravery.

The only time you can't make it is when one . . . a party is . . . just won't audit, won't do any auditing, and won't be audited. And that's a total impasse. And those people are nuts anyway. So.. . hell, you could probably even do it with the CCHs.

But the point I'm talking about is that a co-audit can have its ups and downs. And I thought these ups and downs of, you know, the overts and the withholds and the this and the that, and "Now all is

revealed. And that is why, all during 1957, you treated me like a hound dog. O-ohh-hh! No kidding! And you'd been out with that guy five times, and didn't even tell me!"

You see? This kind of thing. "Blaa-hhh!" You know, that gets rough.

All right. Now, what do you do? What do you do? It must be that, that was keeping co-auditing teams from advancing. Well, it wasn't. That was just so dramatic, and it was so well known, that it looked logical.

And the thing that slows down a co-auditing team is the mutual rudiments out. They have an agreed-upon regard toward the rest of the world. And they begin to settle more and more into this agreed-upon "that's the way things are." And so their rudiments aren't out to each other.

The first way of blowing it up, as I say, a Formula 13 (even old-style Formula 13) or a Prehav 13. You take an assessment of everything . . . everybody the person knows in the physical universe, and you assess them all for the heaviest terminal at the moment. Run that terminal on the Prehav Scale, preferably with a two-way command "What have you done to them?" "What have they done to you?" That sort of thing, you know? Two-way command, at whatever the level they assessed at, see? Not a five-way bracket, but just two-way. Bang. You find out it'll knock out fairly rapidly. Prehav Scale is very powerful.

You don't even make a twenty-minute test on that sort of thing, you know? That's . . . you just take the needle action out of it, and go on to the next person and assess them. And you just clean up everybody they knew in the physical universe in this particular fashion. That is new Formula 13. That's Prehav 13.

All right. There's another, simpler way of doing it . . . is just substitute "we" for "you" in the Model Session rudiments, beginning and end rudiments. And you won't find those rudiments are now calm. Just substitute "we."

"Have we got an ARC break?"

And you'll find out that all of a sudden the thing livens up and becomes very wild. We've got an ARC break, but I haven't got an ARC break, don't you see? It's an incorrect question. It's very sequitur to what else I was telling you, about Security Checks. It's an incorrect question.

You say, "Have you got an ARC break?"

No, he hasn't got an ARC break, we've got an ARC break, you see?

"But I haven't got an ARC break that you don't know about. And you would agree, perfectly, with this ARC break that I've had. Because all day long, salesmen have kept coming to the door. And you know how busy the place can get around here. And I have an awful ARC break with salesmen." That might be the actual answer.

But you say, "Do you have an ARC break with anybody today?"

The pc knows that the auditor would totally understand that salesmen interrupting every fifteen minutes when they're trying to get something done would be very annoying. And he'd say, "Well, that's too bad." But he knows, also, that's usual.

And the present time problems are usual. And the ARC breaks are usual. And the withholds that they have, mutually, are all usual. And their opinions of other people are all usual. And their unkind thoughts are all usual. And so they don't fall on the meter.

And that is quite a discovery. And you can count on the fact, this isn't just a co-auditing team. This is any auditing team that's been going longer than twenty-five hours. It happens that fast. It happens in HGCs all the time.

Somebody has been going for a hundred hours, and the D of P calls him in, checks the rudiments to find all the rudiments out. Yeah, but they're not out for the auditor. And the auditor'll stand there practically jibbering. You've seen them, you know?

And they say, "But the rudiments . . ." (they always say the same thing, the same words) '4. . . but I just checked them before I came down here and they weren't out!"

And the D of P thinks an unkind thought about the auditor and says, "I'll bet you did, you knuckle head!" or something like that. Or maybe he didn't think that exact question or that exact answer, but it's something like, "Well, yes, yes, we'll have to get some more expert auditing done here. He's kind of. . ."

Actually, that was a totally incorrect judgment. It was absolutely true, the rudiments were checked and they weren't out. And he came down to the D of P, and the D of P checked them, and boy, were they out!

Now, we made enormous progress in the South African ACC, 3rd South African, by making everybody. . . All the students were checking the rudiments of all the other students' pcs and pointing it out with a nasty, long, bony and critical finger. In other words, on an auditing team, we were routinely making other students do D of P checks on other auditors' pcs. And we were making very nice progress.

And I thought this would be a good idea, in case any of those people ever got to be auditors or Ds of Ps, they would know what this was all about, and it'd . . . already had the advantage of doing a police job, you see, on the thing.

And there was an accidental lying in that whole thing. There was an accidental.

But it is the mutual . . . the mutual rudiment. And that could hold up cases, that could keep them from advancing, that could get them all upset, that could just 810w it down to a walk. You got the idea?

So I found a new method of slowing down auditing Just get into total agreement with your pc that his viewpoints against life, and get in total agreement with your auditor, that this viewpoint against life is ordinary and usual, and therefore isn't out, but would be considered unusual by somebody else. So if somebody else checks the rudiments, of course, they're out. And if the auditor checks the rudiments, they're in. You got that?

That's a sneaky one, isn't it? Well, you should think it was sneaky, because let me tell you, it has taken I don't know how many years. I don't know how many years this observation has been made by me or how often.

And I looked that over and my eyes popped, and I said, "By golly, here's this old problem sitting here in front of me again that I've tried to solve time and time again. Maybe I'd better look it over a little more closely." And just the night before, I had checked a co-audit team where this exact thing had occurred again. And I just looked at it, and I said, "Oh, wow, now, what is this? There's something here."

And then, Mary Sue . . . I was checking rudiments on Mary Sue with her auditor, and they were out. And then she gave me some data about this other team. And all of a sudden I said, "Oh, no!" And that's the way it is. That's the way it is. It just fell out of the hamper, just like that.

You see it, don't you? It's perfectly crystal clear what'll happen. You've got an island against the storm of the world. And it doesn't react to the rest of the world, after a while, because, of course, the E-Meter reacts only on disagreement. Got it?

Three solutions. I repeat, three solutions. Old Formula 13, the failed-help proposition on everybody you know under the sun, moon or stars-that's the longer one, but very thorough. And I point out that the first Clear made in South Africa had fifty hours of Formula 13 immediately before she came on course. Not a bad process, huh? All right.



The next one-next one would be to do Prehav 13, which is just Prehav Formula 13, which is just to make a list of everybody they know. Assess the terminals very rapidly. Take the one who falls the most on that particular assessment. Assess it, then, on the Prehav Scale. Form a two-way command for that particular level. Run the needle action. Just that.

Soon as the needle is still on this person, you ask them again, “How do you feel about this person?” You get no twitch? Come off of it, right now.

Do another terminal assessment. Take that terminal; do another primary Prehav Scale assessment. Form another command for that particular level you’ve now found this next person at.

Run the needle action out until you can say, “How do you feel about Joe?” and they say, “Oh, I feel all right.” And the needle . . . the needle now doesn’t react on Joe.

That might happen, you know, in five minutes or fifteen minutes or an hour or two hours or it’s a very undetermined period of time. So you ask the question often “How do you feel about Joe now?”

All you’re trying to do is clear Joe as a mutual rudiment. You’re not trying to run processes here, you see? You’re trying to clean this person’s ARC breaks out of existence as a rudiment.

And what you’re doing is broadening the question “Do you have an ARC break?” And you’re broadening this question to include everybody they could possibly have an ARC break with in present time.

And you’re just running . . . you’re assuming they’re-all these people might have ARC breaks. And you’re clearing all these people off for the immediate lifetime. And then the pc doesn’t get ARC breaks and interrupt the auditing, and the case doesn’t worsen, and it speeds up. Okay?

There is that Prehav 13. Okay?

The next one is a very fast one . . . maybe not as good, but certainly more broadly applicable . . . is “Do we have an ARC break with anyone?” See?

“Do we have a present time problem?” Got it?

”Is it all right if we audit in this room?” You got it?

“Now, do we have a withhold?” You got that?

This is sparked up by the fact that I found out there was another pc who is having difficulty and is worried about Security Checking because he thinks he is holding some data that has to do with another person that might be discreditable in some fashion. Well, part of the data is correct and part of the data is false. But this pc has not bothered to clarify this data but is afraid of being security checked to protect somebody else. Interesting state of affairs.

Now, this could be broadened up into a basis where they have to have a special auditing team. This fellow has to be specially security checked by some special person, and now the two of them think they’re going to make some progress. Let me tell you, they’re not going to make any progress because we now have a withhold. Do you see that clearly?

So the road out is not a special Security Check by a special person so that all will not be revealed.

I happen to know, by the way, that about three-quarters of the data which this pc thinks he has is a lot of bunk. So he’s not only holding on to something that way, but he’s also holding on to something that’s highly fallacious. Well, boy, how about . . . how about having a delusion as a withhold?

Pretty grim, huh? That’s what this person is doing.

So you got this “mutual rudiments out”?

And I think we can end, right now, a lot of slow gain on the part of an awful lot of long-drawn co-audit teams. And we can also end slow gain in HGCs when the auditing goes up to a hundred hours, or something like this, or fifty hours.

After about twenty-five hours you’ve got a unit there. You’ve got an agreed unit. The auditor agrees that the pc has been treated badly, and the pc agrees this, and so on. And they agree so thoroughly that it’s never a fall on the meter. Okay?

All right. You’re welcome to that one. And we’re already overdue, so go and get your mutual rudiments in!

Thank you.