SECURITY CHECKS

A lecture given on
6 June 1961

Thank you.

Well, here we are at the 6th of June.

And our course seems to be going very well. If you don't recognize me today . . . Actually, as I explained to Edgar, it isn't, actually, that I like to wear my hair long; it's just that there aren't any barbers. Go ahead, I dare you; try to find one. Since we took Edgar out of the profession? there's nobody anymore left in the world who can barber. There's a small fee for this commercial.

All right. I suppose by this time you actually have in your small, moist palm a copy of the HCOB that has to do with these routines. Is it in your hands yet?

Audience: No.

Well, then it probably will be tomorrow morning. It's the first bulletin concerning the routines, and so on. Now, what's going to change that bulletin? Let's look at the future just a little bit.

We are not now trying to find out what auditors need as theoretical or ideal tools to clear people. We are not at that stage. We passed that stage a long time ago, actually. We are trying desperately to discover right now what auditors will use, and what they can use. And SOP Goals and its related processes have been in development for use for some time. Please understand that as a difference of action. There's two things: It's what will auditors use – what *will* they use? And what *can* they use? And these two things monitor what is put in their hands. You got the idea?

Now at first, just the Prehav Scale was put in their hands, and they had pretty good success with it here, there – just general runs in the Prehav Scale. They weren't able to goof it up too badly and they got some good success. And I had some rather resounding profiles sent in here. And everybody seemed to be very happy with the idea of assessing the pc on the general scale and cooking up some kind of an auditing command – even a bum one – and running a pc on it, and rudiments in, out or upside down, you know? And they got somewhere. They got somewhere with this. We got some good results. So we have to assume that an auditor not only will do it but can do it. See? 1) And – is it well accepted? and 2) is it within his realm of ability?

You have to think of that when you're training students – training people in Scientology. It's what they can and will do. Now, if you have somebody who can only run CCHs and you have him in a group of people who are doing auditing on outside pcs, well, wouldn't you be rather foolish to give him a set of tools that he would not or could not apply. Because immediately your auditing results would break down right at that point – sharply, clearly and immediately. You get the idea?

Auditor can run CCHs, and yet you say run the hooble-goobles second differential of the integral *zim*. That's what it sounds like to him, see? I mean, you've said something very comprehensible to you. You've said find his Havingness and Confront Process. And yet it sounded like the gobbledygook I just gave you, see?]t doesn't make any sense to him. So with great willingness, perhaps salted down a little bit with making you wrong, he will go ahead and louse up the lot. Why? Well, he's being told to run something; he thinks he should understand this; and you may come around for a long time and find out that he just hasn't told you he didn't understand it.

Now, the test of anything is whether or not it produces results. But remember this – that a result is determined by several things: 1) the adequacy of the tool being employed. That is the first thing a result is established by. That is first and foremost. Nobody will argue about that at all. If you haven't got the tools, you can't do the job. That's it. And that's what Scientology *is* basically – the tools that do the job.

Now, this is modified by what auditors *will* apply or what people *will* use. You see? What *will* they use? And that again is modified: What *can* they use? So we actually have three sets of determinisms here on what is a good process. It isn't whether or not the process used under ideal conditions will produce every time a stratospheric flight. You see, that is *not* the test all by itself. Without that, nothing is going to work; that's for sure. But it's monitored by these other two things. And when you're training auditors, for God sakes, keep that in mind. Huh! We've had the principle for a long time, but I never articulated it. And one of the parts of it was: If somebody comes in raw into an HGC, you find out from him what processes he has been having success with. You could also ask him this one, oddly enough: "What process has worked on you?"

And he says, "Oh, 8-C. 8-C. I had a wonderful gain back about '54. Nobody has run it on me since, but back about '54 I had a wonderful gain on 8-C. And I've run it on a lot of pcs and so forth."

And you say to this fellow, "All right. That's all you're going to run on pcs." And you know, you'll get better profile gains than if you told him something else. You got it? Until you can get him trained up and get a reality on something else, you had much better let him run something on which he has an adequate reality.

And if he's going to get a result, it's because he himself believes he can get a result. Now, you can enter far too far into the esoterics of all this. Look at the factor you're involved with. If an individual doesn't have a subjective reality on something, you cannot expect the individual to employ it with reality, can you? And there's nobody more sensitive to an unreality in a preclear than an auditor. But certainly there's nobody more unsensitive to unreality in an auditor than a preclear. Yeah, that's true.

So all of these things are monitoring factors on what auditors can and will use. And right now auditors broadly have apparently had considerable success with the CCHs over the years. They've been running them all wrong and backwards, because they've been running them doctored up and changed and alter-ised and "improved," see? When, as a matter of fact, it was something on the order of trying to improve the last space fleet that was developed in the last galactic empire at its utter peak, you see? And from there on all you were doing was pinning pink roses on the things. And you finally pinned enough pink roses and blue bows on these spaceships until eventually the fleet didn't fly anymore. That's about what happened.

Now, the original CCHs was the only thing on which I did any research, and it was done in the vicinity of 1957. I didn't employ them thereafter. It's an interesting story in connection with that: is I personally wanted to find out if I could audit this way. And I trained myself within a hair's breadth of auditing the CCHs. I could audit those CCHs in my sleep. You know, put on the perfect Tone 40 performance. You know, I grooved myself in – like you're learning Model Session now, you know. And I found out when I used this I got tremendous and very worthwhile gains. But it was used according to the old regimen. You see?

Now, all the research was done, all of the training of people on how to do it was done, and then I skipped it. And then we had an ACC or two, and we ran into modifications. For some reason or other, they weren't quite as keen to do the original version as they were a modified version – students.

Now, I just give you that in passing because this mustn't happen again to the CCHs. The CCHs work perfectly when done a la 1957. That was their nadir, and that was it. And it was CCH 1, 2, 3, 4. And they were done this way up in London.

There are some old tapes up there that'd utterly fascinate you – I think they're in the other room here – all about how you do the CCHs. And they're mostly tapes of "Don't alter-is it. Thank you. Don't alter-is it. Thank you. Don't alter-is it. Thank you." That's about what they amount to. That's what Ken ran into head-on here the other day. Because we had, actually, a good process system destroyed by about 1958, and it was less and less in use.

Well, why was it less and less in use? I wasn't paying much attention to it. And I was finding out that it wasn't producing the results before. And now that we need it, I've turned around and reviewed it, and I find out what is now called the CCHs bears no resemblance – any more than Little Eva did to Topsy in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. They're just not the same breed.

CCHs are very simple. They're very straightforward. You do all the things it says. You put your intention into the pc. You don't Q-and-A with the things he does. You hold, actually, his body in an exact position. You run them close up. You're not trying to do anything but increase his reality and his control.

You see, CCH means Communication, Control and Havingness. And if you get this duplication – this was the sneak factor I suddenly discovered about the time of the first Saint Hill ACC: this duplication. So the less duplicative you are, the less havingness the pc has. Interesting, isn't it? Well, anyhow, there's the CCHs.

Now, the Security Check proposition. Now, I'll tell you what auditors wouldn't do the world around – what they wouldn't do. They wouldn't be imaginative enough to get the withholds off the case. I'll give you an example of a Security Check that was written at a Central Organization. And I actually ought to frame it as how not to win. It says, "Do you have an ARC break with Norma? Do you have an ARC break with Joe? Do you have an ARC break with Bill and Pete? Thank you. You've passed the Security Check."

One just doesn't penetrate reality to that extent while one is taking responsibility for it, see? One won't be responsible for taking the reality of this, because it's pretty grim asking for withholds, see. All right.

Auditors were perfectly willing to make people well. They were perfectly willing to audit people. They were perfectly willing to work with the most confoundedly gee-whiz cases you ever heard of. But ask for that withhold? Well, they weren't unwilling to ask for the withhold. They were just unwilling to be sufficiently imaginative to do anything concerning it.

Oh, a fellow murdered his first wife, you see? The auditor would never bring himself up to feeling that critical of the human race. You get the idea? Well, maybe the fellow just beat his first wife. You ask him if he murdered his first wife, and he'll tell you, "No, I just beat her." See, you can always overask a question, and auditors would not do that! Imagine it. They'd sit there with their rudiments out, their rudiments out, their rudiments out, their rudiments out. Well, it was killing people. I mean, not actually, but it was just murder, you know? A guy was feeling bad, and so forth; the auditor never asked for the withhold!

So, we had to remedy this because this was a rather whirled-around condition. And that whirled-around condition resulted in what? When I got down to South Africa, I found that somebody had dreamed up a Security Check on my orders down there to parallel the laws of South Africa. And these laws are very imaginative because they're dealing with people who have extremely imaginative crimes. And actually there were things in there that I myself wouldn't have thought of doing. Exceeded my reality. But over a period of years, South Africa had collected them in their law books.

Oddly enough, the South African Security Check – here's a joke on Johannesburg – contained originally, no single question concerning overts or withholds on the organization,

any staff members, any Scientologists, me or anybody else. Isn't that fascinating? Had omitted that 100 percent from the zone of interrogation. And the people who were putting it out had overts, really, only in that field. Fascinating, isn't it?

All right. Now, I put together this thing, doctored it up and called it the Joburg 1st, see? But for a very long time – to show you how hard this one is to get into operation – people will eventually wake up and use it. "Oh, oh," they say.

You know, you've been standing there; you've been screaming; you've been saying, "Use it. Use nothing else but it. Now use that. That is a Security Check. That is what you're supposed to run on staff members. That is what you're supposed to *use.* When you security check somebody, you *use* this form, *Johannesburg Security Check, HCO WW Form 1! You* understand?"

And they say, "Okay." "Do you have an ARC break with Norma? Do you have an ARC break...."

Lots of people would like to rewrite this Security Check. And apparently the law is this on rewriting Security Checks – it works like this: If the person is permitted to delete or skip one of the levels of the Security Check, or if you give it to somebody to take certain levels out that do not apply, the person takes out the very withholds he has, even though he doesn't remember he has them. Isn't that curious? So you must never permit a Security Check to be rewritten; you must never permit one to be edited for special use. You understand?

I learned these things by accident. "Oh, you want all the Johannesburg Security Checks sent in to you, personally. Well, here are all the Security Checks on the staff. We've only given one Johannesburg Security Check." They've had it for months. They've got another Security Check. Got the idea? So you have an HCO Policy Letter along about this time of life that says, "The Only Valid Security Check." And when we say, "The Only Valid Security Check," we mean the Johannesburg Security Check, or by whatever name it may be called by HCO WW. And it will only be the complete form of a form issued at HCO WW. Got it? That's how hard that one is to hold in.

That's interesting. They will give a Security Check. They will learn how to give Security Checks. They will ask the most outrageous questions as long as they are written down and are part of a Security Check. But then you've got this other impulse all the time that is going around, a little bit here and a little bit there: '<Well, it's not necessary to ask this question. It's about illicit diamond buying. That only applies to South Africa, and we're up here in northern Siberia."

I was speaking, by the way, as though I were in Chicago. They're trying to pass laws out in Chicago these days that everybody who is pronounced crazy by anybody that happens to know his name are instantly shipped to Siberia – I mean Alaska. Did you know that? Wonderful way of get – clearing up the political scene. The only trouble is, the people who are

in power when they dream these things up never quite remember that someday they're going to be out of power. That's because they don't know they're going to live another life, too. It's very, very amusing that all the legislatures and so forth, on the laws they pass – because they're old men and no longer effect them – walk into their next lifetimes and are totally subject to all of their conscription orders, to all their educational orders, to all their child labor blah-blah. The whole lousy works, you see? And you talk about being cause of your own effect, God help a legislator.

Anyhow, in passing, this Security Check is not an alter-isable proposition. So don't let people edit them and don't edit them when you're giving them. You say, "Have you ever done any illicit diamond buying?" – *IDB*. Well, it's even a phrase in South Africa. Do you know how many pcs we've caught in England and America on this? Well, it's fascinating, you know? Because it doesn't fall on illicit diamond buying necessarily; it falls on anything to do with diamonds. And people – the weirdest things they will do with diamonds: they smuggle them, and they swallow them, and they . . .

Now, that question alone is left in there as a bit of a gag It's to identify the check, and probably till the end of time I hope to keep that question in – "Have you ever done any illicit diamond buying?" – just to identify the source of the check. But very shortly this is going to become HCO WW Form 4 – Security Form 4. And it will be called by another name – be called by another name – probably be called an HGC Processing Questionnaire. See, something very mild and innocuous, but it'll still be HCO W [WW] Form 4. There actually will be a few more questions. There will be a whole section in there which could be at once applied to the student and could be applied to the HGC pc.

We found that an awful lot of HGC pcs hang up in processing because they get mad at the Chief Registrar, or they're discourteous to the Receptionist or something. And they're just having an awful time this particular morning, and we don't quite understand why they're having a hard time. It isn't what we think they should do; it's evidently what *they* think they should do. you see? They're having a dreadful time. And they start asking for withholds and they get a fall. And they can't imagine what dreadful thing this is, and they find out the pc didn't say good morning to the HASI Registrar. See, it's a withhold. They meant to say good morning, but they decided not to say good morning, then they decided it was discourteous that they had done this. You got the idea?

And they get messed up with withholds on Central Org personnel or Scientologists just in, really, the relatively few days that they're around the place. Because they come in, you see, on obsessive, unkind-thought automaticities. See? They walk in and they got unkind thoughts going off automatically, see? And it's going *brrrrrrrrr* a thousand miles a minute. You know? Unkind thought here, unkind thought there, and an unkind thought someplace else, and an unkind thought someplace else, and an unkind thought someplace else. And golly! These things get square across their processing line.

So it is in an effort to keep auditors from breaking their hearts and people from wasting their money; you have to give a full check. There will be a new section in it then that refers to students and preclears, the kinds of things that *they* possibly might do. And there will probably be a section in there for the benefit of the field auditor. Like "Have you said anything unkind to anybody you know about your auditor?" You got the idea?

Well, you know, you'd be surprised how many things are going to fall. And this auditor is trying his best, and he feels good about it all. And this pc is just withholding like crazy, because he goes out in propitiation and gets even with the auditor by telling everybody in the neighborhood what a dirty rat he is, and that he keeps seven women under the bed. (He only keeps two.)

Now, the only way you can make one of these things work is to clean things up at the same time you're using it. You see, it's a two-edged sword. If you're going to be reprehensible about unkind thoughts about Scientologists and organizations, and if this holds people up, then it should be – we should be quite militant on setting it up so that we don't merit these things, you see? And this includes – oh, I don't know, I can think of several dirty words off-hand, speak – thinking of unkind thoughts.

There's been somebody crashing around the United States who has evidently – since 1952, has been complaining to me bitterly about all of the thetans that come in the night and PDH him. And he has now gone on an all-out in the United States, and he's writing mimeograph sheets to everyone telling them that they've been PDHed, and that everybody in God's green Earth has PDHed them, and Central Organization members have PDHed them, and I've PDHed them. What conceit!

And I've shown you the little trick and actually written an article in *Ability* in America, which is probably out right about now. It's "The Sad T-a-i-l of PDH." And it's how you can demonstrate conclusively that the cat has PDHed you.

That's a piece of our technical training around here now. So those of you who have just come in, get somebody to show you – show you, with you on the meter – that the cat has PDHed you. The meter will say so, if you don't know how to run a meter. Or if you know how to run a meter very, very well, you can make a meter say almost anything by getting associative words in. And of course you'd really – if you really knew a meter, they wouldn't fool anybody because they'd see the sporadic and uneven falls, you see.

You'd – just association of words. Anybody will get a fall on "pain," anybody is liable to get a fall on "drug," anybody is liable to get a fall on "hypnosis," and anybody is liable to have done anything to a cat. So what you do is spot the moment when he's done something to the cat, and that was the date. The meter will answer up as "Has the cat PDHed you?" You just pick the moment of the overt, that's all. And he could pick the exact moment on the time

track of something like this as long as he had an overt right at that instance, see? If it clicks. It's marvelous.

Difficulty is that a meter will not clear – will not clear – on an untruth. If the pc is – if you're still – you've still got an untruth and you're trying to foist off on the pc some untruth, the meter won't clear on it. But as soon as you put the pc through the jumps on this kind of thing, why, the pc clears on it, you see?

All right. How does a person get in a kind of a state that he'd run around saying all such incredible things, and so on? Well, he gets in that kind of state because he's had case advance without ever anybody pulling his withholds. So countering the fact that it might be a little bit embarrassing to have some of these things disclosed, is the fact that if it isn't administered, you don't get any case gain and actually will practically torture a pc by proc-essing him for a long period of time without getting off his withholds. In other words, it's a very unkind thing to do. to use tools that boost his case way up and leave him with all of his withholds. Because his withholds now turn in, with responsibility, to overts about which he's going to feel very bad.

He managed to stay sufficiently irresponsible and *da-de-da-de-da-de-da* that they never bothered him, bothered him. And all of a sudden he gets a little more responsible, and he says, "I don't think it was nice to strangle that little girl. I don't think that was so nice. I wonder if it hurt her."

You know, and about this time he gets a little more case advance and he says, "Oh, God," you know? "But of course, I don't dare tell anybody. They'd execute me."

So he gets another little bit of a case advance and he says, *"Blaw-rra-yea!"*

He gets another little case advance, and actually he could get to a state of where he'd go – be going around craving peppermint candy. You have forced him into a life continuum. You've snapped the valence in on him. You've increased his responsibility without permitting him to be responsible for what he's done. And when you increase a person's potential responsibility without letting them be responsible for what they have done, no more desper-ately vicious mechanism could exist in processing. Have you got it?

So if you *don't* administer a *good, tough* Security Check, and if you don't *keep* that Security Check good and keep it whole, you're just setting it up for pcs not only to not be cleared but actually to start feeling miserable. Oddly enough, feeling miserable, they're better off than they were being irresponsible. You got the idea? And they'll tell you so, too. But you just peg them. You peg their processing gain. It isn't that you do something overt that forces their case down; you peg their processing gain. And it'll peg right up to the point where they become responsible for some overt act in the past. And there the case will hang. And that's it. They've had it from there on. And you won't get any further advance out of that case.

So one of your rules is, is when a person ceases to advance rapidly, you just pick up Mr. Joburg and start in at the beginning and run through to the end. And you all of a sudden will find out why.

Yeah, but here's your theory: If you get all of his withholds off early in processing, why, you won't run into this, will you? Oh, but wait. He doesn't know anything about these overts. He doesn't even consider the things he's done overts.

Here's this girl. She has kept all of her brothers and sisters in a state of total blackmail and terror – the oldest girl of the family or something. She locked them up in closets. She's responsible for one of them now being a permanent cripple, and so forth. And you give her a Security Check. And the first check, the only real withhold that you get off of her is that at the age of about seven she thought that her sister probably wasn't as pretty as she should be. And that falls on the meter, but nothing else falls.

Now, the person has to be processed, and you suddenly find these other things. Those withholds come off. You process them again. Now you've got a whole new array. And by consistently doing this one against the other – processing against the Security Check – you have an indirect measure of the progress of the case as well as opening up the road for the case to drive on it. Because if the person doesn't have any new withholds, you have laid a large ostrich egg in your last few hours of processing. See? But if you find new withholds on a case that weren't hitherto disclosed, you know you're making progress.

So don't say to yourself, "Ah, I must be terrible at security checking, because after all, I ran him on the general levels for about eight hours and so forth, but just before that I must have missed all of these withholds. Look at them. How could I have been that stupid in running an E-Meter?"

No. They weren't there. Because a person has to have some reality on a terminal or a condition before it falls on an E-Meter. And that's why you assess terminals, is because you don't want to run a terminal on which the pc has no reality. And when this thing reacts, it says reality. You could call it an ARC meter and you'd just be in dandy shape. It says reality! Reality!

Now, *you* know what's wrong. *You* know what's wrong with Mamie Zilch. You know it's her husband. You know. So you take right off and you don't use an E-Meter and you run, "Now, Mamie. Now, Mamie, you've heard of this process, O/W. What have you done to your husband? What have you withheld from your husband? What have you done to your husband? What have you withheld from your husband?" and so forth.

And Mamie says, "Let's see, I – I uhm – I uhm – I actually find the question very difficult to answer. I really have never done anything to the brute. He kept throwing me down wells. And every time he'd back the car out of the garage, he'd call me out just to make sure that I was standing right behind it, so that he could run into me. And he used to write letters –

I never saw any of these letters – but he used to write letters to all of my friends saying that I had venereal disease. Let's see. What else did he do to me?"

You say, "No. No. The question is 'What have you done to him?' "

"I've never done anything to him in my life."

You say, "Wait a minute. What goes on here?" Well, what goes on here is very simple. The pc has not taken any responsibility for any acts with regard to her husband. Now, it doesn't matter whether the husband was a good man or a bad man. You understand? The pc has taken no responsibility for these acts, and so there's nothing the pc has done to the husband is real.

So, what is the source and why do you come about with overts and withholds anyhow? It's basically, they're based on something getting unreal to the pc. So the more overts and withholds a pc has, the less a pc registers on the meter. And you'll finally find the pc floating here at 2.0 with a totally stuck needle, and they won't move off 2.0, and you can't get the tone arm off 2.0. The sensitivity is up here at 16, and you say to them, "Gee! You must be Clear."

You know, a lot of people checking out Clears very early rather tended to invalidate the state of Clear because they didn't know anything about a meter at all. There was very little known about a meter. But it takes that free floating needle. It takes that needle there that is going to – . When you first see one of these free floating needles, they're unmistakable. Ah, it's awfully hard to fake one. I don't think it could be faked. It's just a smooth flow with no sticks and no reactions, you see. Well, that looks an awful – that's with sensitivity way down here.

And that looks an awful lot different than a person at 2.0 and the needle totally stuck. And you kick him in the shins and you don't even get a drop of the needle. Well, that's a state of total irresponsibility. That's what that state is, because you're registering a dead thetan in a body that somehow goes on ticking. You're just getting the body reaction.

Well, of course, this pc is going to go down here to 1.0 – through 7.0. There's 7.0 on this E-Meter, by the way, but it can't turn to it. You once in a while will find a pc there, and you'll go nuts trying to get him on the meter. It'll be down here at 6.5, and then you'll get down here to 5.0, and you get down here to 4.0 – this is over a long, long course of processing – and he'll wobble around here for a while, and he'll finally get back here to 3.0, or if a girl, get back here to 2.0, and there it is. It's the same reading all over again. Ah, except the sensitivity is down and the needle is just floating, and the needle is no longer stuck. Okay?

But that's a high state of responsibility. Now, how can a person take responsibility for his acts unless you give him a chance to? And if he does take responsibility for his acts and isn't able to communicate them to you, he goes out of session. He blows. He doesn't finish his intensives. He doesn't keep on with the auditor. He gets upset about auditing. All these

various evils we have seen in the past are all explained by this mechanism of the person goes up and hits the ceiling. And the ceiling is the number of withholds for which he has become responsible and that he can't tell anybody. So you got to take out the ceiling and let him move up to the first floor. You got the idea?

So here's the picture, in other words, of this new bulletin. It just plays this mechanism about which I've been talking, one against the other. You give the person a case gain with the fastest tools you know how, and his responsibility is increased, so you get off his withholds. And the best thing to use, according to what auditors *will* use and auditors *have* used, is this thing called a Security Check. It asks them all, man. And if there's anything missing on it, they'll eventually appear on it. We don't care how long it takes to give a Security Check, because it's an unkindness not to give one. That's the story of this bulletin. That's at the background of this bulletin. Perhaps there are – a person can run SOP Goals on a person right out of an institution. If he were a good auditor, he could actually get the person's goals and so forth. Now, it might take him two hundred hours. The pc would be advancing the whole time.

It's merely what auditors will do. And at the present time you don't want anything but Routines 1 and 2 being run anywhere. You don't want to see these things run anywhere, including Los Angeles. You ought to send a cable tonight saying, "A bulletin is coming to you, date (so-and-so). Use nothing but Routines 1 and 2. And if I catch you using any other routines, I will have a few bleeding hearts. Because I can now run out my overts; I'm dangerous." Got the idea? Why? Because they've proved abundantly that they can run levels (Routines) 1 and 2. And they've proved abundantly they can't run level – Routine 3. They have proven this abundantly.

Some of the people who turn up here, some of the goals that have been found on them – man, all you do is ask them twice and you can't find it in the back of the meter or the bottom of the meter or anything else, and yet they've been run on it. Now, do you know what can happen if you find the wrong goal – wrong terminal on a pc? You can live-up the whole Prehav Scale, that's what's going to happen. And this is one of the tests: About the third time you have found a level, about the third assessment you give him on the terminal you have found, watch that list as you assess it. And if there's something on the order of a dozen levels live, *eheaah,* you've got the wrong terminal. The wrong terminal makes every level of it live. Look at the state you're putting the poor critter into.

The thing is so compiled that about four levels of it will be live anyway. You'll have four levels of it. But if a dozen up – a dozen or more – are hot and alive on this scale, it's not there's something wrong with the rudiments, it's just something is wrong with that terminal. So along about your third reassessment you could do a check on SOP Goals.

But that's kind of vicious, because do you know that if you only partially flatten levels on the general Prehav Scale on the goals terminal, you know you can make the fellow feel like he's nuts? He starts going kind of nuts. Well, you're driving a ten-thousand-horsepower

machine, see, and it starts feeling kind of *meummm.* He's got level after level unflat. You yourself can demonstrate that.

We had some auditor up here – he was being coached over the telephone from Saint Hill – running somebody once. He had all of his data. He had it all laid out in tape. He could run it off like a parrot. There wasn't any reason under the sun he shouldn't have done it. And you know what he *did ?* He ran *four* levels in an afternoon on one pc, because he'd interpreted the instructions – which wording, by the way, never occurred in any instructions and doesn't. He said he interpreted the instructions because they were written wrong. Well, they weren't written wrong I went and checked it out.

On all the bulletins, you never find "You barely take the motion out of the tone arm and then you reassess." That was what he thought the instruction said. It doesn't even use those words. You could say, reversewise, "You run it until the tone arm is barely moving," but not even these instructions occurred in the literature and instructions he was given, see? He couldn't even have made that mistake. It's sort of a *whew!*

Now, the assessment was fairly accurate and had been done for him. He didn't even have to do that. In other words, faced with goals and terminals, a lot of these people sort of go to pieces. Takes a lot of training.

Furthermore, the pc is so easily ARC broken – so very easily upset. He advances so rapidly that his responsibility is rising up to a point where he's got withholds by the bucket coming up all the time. And if he isn't well handled with perfect mechanical approach, perfect technical, perfect TRs, perfect E-Meter operation – I mean perfect – well, you're never going to clear anybody. That's it.