

TEACHING THE FIELD SEC CHECKS

A lecture given on
26 September 1961

Okay. This is the what? The 26th of September AD 11.

And some are departing and some are arriving and some are getting Clear and some are spinning in. That's the majority, of course – the majority, of course. And the fate of the world is in your hands. I say that very lightly, but that happens to be true. Interesting state of affairs, isn't it? And here we are congregated in a little basement room at Saint Hill and the fate of the world is in your hands. Well, look, that's very interesting.

There isn't a single Saint Hiller has gone home to date without getting into a very high state of indignation at what is being called Scientology in the far corners of the world.

How would anybody know about Scientology, whether it worked or didn't work, unless it were practiced? Now, you're going to come in under, when you leave here – after a long series of this – you're going to come under some heavy fire. If you get Clear, you're going to come under some heavy fire. If you simply go home released, you're going to come under some heavy fire.

And, by the way, I – we have had some Release certificates in the process of being printed, and I think there's only one or two students have left here that haven't been a very high state of Release. I'm going to start issuing those certificates.

The state of affairs is, there should be something that signalizes this fact, because I don't like to see anybody go out of here who isn't in a – in a pretty fine state of knowingness and whose case won't be able to stand up to it a bit because of this other factor. And this other factor is that if you go home and in the vicinity in which you will be operating, you are bound – and it is inevitable that you will stand up to some fire. Why? Because your own state of indignation will invite it.

Audience: Yeah.

That's perfectly all right. Be indignant. You'll find Scientology, she ain't practiced in that area, you're going to raise hell. That's for sure. I know. And I can see the bodies strewn around now.

And this is going to cause what? This is going to cause the people you shoot at a small amount of unhappiness. People are going to demand of you that you promptly sit down in their immediate vicinity and their auditing chair and process *them* and take on the immediate responsibilities where they are. And, of course, you probably won't do that and that will make them unhappy with you.

That's just one source of things. That's already happened and so forth.

But there hasn't been anybody left here who had a course completion, there have only been two students left here without a course completion that haven't found a great deal to be very hot and snarly about in the way of Scientology practice, because it practically hasn't been done. And you might want to know at this stage what is the thing you can put people to doing that will produce the best results in your immediate area? Would you like to know that?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Well, get them to – this is technically – get them to doing TRs and get them to get down pat the E-Meter and Security Checking. Get them to get down Model Session and the new rudiments processes.

Now, if you do just those things with them on the technical basis, you will find there's an enormous increase in it. It's not all the doodle-daddles and theory. You see, people who are low on the effort band most easily go to thought, not action. You see? And they'll just sit around and figure forever and ever and ever about the difference between two theories, you see, whether or not the theta-MEST theory is correct or something like that. And they just can't even do their TRs, don't you see? And you'll find there are a lot of people very learned on the subject of theory who can't audit. That's because it can't go any further than theory, you see?

Well, let the theory fall where it may. If they can perform these technical actions at a professional level, they will get auditing results. And if they can't, they won't. And it's as simple as that.

Now, I'll add one more to that as an afterthought. They should know how to do the CCHs, because they are inevitably going to run into this problem. Somebody is un-security checkable. And so they're going to have to know how to do the CCHs. That is the prime indicator as was just practiced and just discovered – not newly, but rediscovered and so on. But again when you cannot security check – and we're talking now about field auditors; we're not talking about you. We're talking about a practice way out someplace, where they can't security check. Person gets off all kinds of things that should be withhelds and there's no needle reaction. Got the idea? And you say, "Well, did you ever rape anyone?"

“Oh, yes, I raped fifteen girls and twenty-seven men and seven dogs and – and so forth. I remember bashing a baby in the head one time after raping it and so forth and...” There’s no needle reaction of any character on any of this. It’s never been audited before.

But these things are not withholds; the person sees nothing wrong with these things at all.

Security Check is *an answer*. It is a good, positive answer, until it runs into that null, no-reaction.

The person’s never been security checked, don’t you see? And no social misconduct is a withhold – you’ve got the CCHs. All right. And they can be applied in that particular circumstance *with success*. And you apply them, of course, the way the CCHs are supposed to be applied. Not flatten CCH 1 and seventy-five hours later be sending a telegram to Saint Hill to find out whether or not you now flatten the left hand.

Female voice: Jesus!

Happened – it has happened.

You run each one flat – as flat as it looks on a twenty-minute test and go on to CCH 2, CCH 3, CCH 4, flattening each one on a twenty-minute test and if it produces no reaction within twenty minutes, of course, you go back to the beginning and CCH 1 – start all over again. Flatten them in rotation and you’ll find out the CCHs always bite like mad.

All right. Now, that becomes a borderline, a bridge point. If you can’t security check, you’ve got to have the CCHs. So the person *technically* should be able to run the CCHs properly.

All right. So that gives you actually the totality of the technical list. There are – there are no other items here of vast importance. You get many second grade items such as Auditor’s Code, the various odds and ends that are the old HCA/HPA standbys, that sort of thing. But I’ve – just gave you the list of paramount importance.

All right. Now, what do you give them as a process then? What do you give these people as a process? Do you say, “Well, all you do is find the pc’s goal and terminal and then you assess it on the Prehav Scale and then you run it and then you run some engrams when they come up after you’ve got a level flat.” you tell them this? Well, no, you’ve just picked them up by the scruff of the neck and thrown them in the sea of tar as far as they’re concerned. They’re from nowhere.

In the first place, they’re probably in a games condition with pcs. And they’re not about to let anybody have a goal and they’re not to let – about to let anybody have a terminal. And they’re not skilled enough to put rudiments in easily. Well, all right. There’s an old gag occurs to me about somebody or other and swimming Lady told a bunch of little boys who

wanted her son to come swimming with them, “Well, my Abie can’t go swimming until he knows how.”

Now, that’s very applicable here in auditing. You say, well, if the thing to do to really get a case on the road is to find the person’s goal and terminal and assess it on the Prehav Scale and flatten a level or two and find some engrams and run that. And if that’s the way the person will go out fastest and yet you can’t do any of these things unless you’re a skilled auditor, how do you ever get any auditing skill in order to do this? Well, you’ve got the Security Check. And what you teach them how to do is a Security Check. And boy, do you teach them how to security check. And you just keep at it and you use these various skills. And that’s why you have to have this CCHs, you see, in case they can’t be security checked.

You know, the person just gets no reactions on anything. They’ve been a – they’ve been a social evil, the kind that Billy Sunday lectured about for his whole lifetime and yet they never have a quiver. They get reverse actions on – you can tell this with null questions, by the way. You can find this out before you find it out. Those null questions on Sec Check 3 – if they get reverse reactions, if the person reacts every time he tells the truth – that goes along with the reverse can squeeze. Actually, the needle rises when they squeeze the cans. You can suspect that if either of these two phenomena occur... You say, “Well, am I sitting – are you sitting in that chair?” and they say, “Yes,” and get a steep fall. And they’re supposed to answer – what is it – no to each one of these questions, you see?

Well, they’re supposed to – if they were supposed to answer yes to each one of these questions and you asked them, “Are you sitting in that chair?”

And they said, “Yes.” They would get a steep fall.

And you say, “Are you on the moon?”

And they’d say, “Yes.” And there would be absolutely no reaction on the needle at all.

In other words, lies don’t react but truth does. Well now, these boys around in “psyrology” who are fooling around with personnel security checks, police, (quote) experts (unquote).

By the way, they’ve already been legislated against in the state of Massachusetts. The unions have managed to bring in legislation dead against doing any lie detector checks of any kind on personnel for employment. I thought that was quite interesting, but it shows how the thing can be muddied up by a bunch of guys doing something they don’t know what they’re doing. That has no significance beyond the fact that it is a sign of the times. Such legislation, of course, could practically wipe you out eventually. A trained operator must always be part of any such legislation.

But anyway, these boys would, of course, never get a Security Check reaction – the psyrologist – he’d never get a Security Check reaction on the most irresponsible people. And

if the only criteria for employment was no reaction on the machine, you would only employ psychotics or neurotics, you see? You'd only employ the totally irresponsible people. Quite interesting, isn't it?

Now, the thing to do when you walk into an area is you tell people to get these things straight. Get these things straight that I just gave you a list of there. Get those things straight. Their TRs and the E-Meter and Model Session – the things I gave you there – get those straight and do those extremely well while security checking, because they can't mess people up doing Security Checks even if they audit rather badly. And Security Checks are the single most certain case gain we know of below Routine 3. See, easy to do; positive results. Good, good results.

Now, you can do all kinds of weird things with Security Checks. Including tear up the Security Check that might compromise the auditor. You'll find that being done occasionally.

Well, this Security Check 3, they wouldn't want to give that to people, so they have something: "Do you have an ARC break with Tom?" That's a "Security Check" question. "Do you have an ARC break with Bill?" You see, those are "Security Check" questions, because you see, "Security Check 3, that's too accusative, you know?" "Have you ever cooked company's books?" you know? "Have you ever been a bad boy?" "Are you working under an assumed name?" Crash! Crash! Crash! Crash! You see, this is invading privacy with a bulldozer. And you'll find that people here and there just couldn't confront invading privacy to this degree.

As a matter of fact, I myself hate occasionally to run a Security Check into the teeth of somebody just off the street that are from nowhere, see? And we just drive up with a Security Check Form 3, you see and start asking him these questions. If my primary goal with the person is to preserve ARC, I find it very, very difficult to start in like that, so I do a word of explanation about it. There's nothing personal about this, I tell them. But that's as far as I will compromise. And you'll find that other people will compromise further than that, such as tearing up all of Security Check Form 3 and substituting such things as, "Have you ever eaten candy and spoiled your appetite?" Well, that's a big withhold, yeah, you see? So they'll grade down a Security Check. So you must convince them that they can always add to a Security Check. Take out all of their proclivities for additivity on Security Checks. They can always add to Security Checks but never subtract anything from a Security Check. Ask everything *on* the Security Check and anything else they want to.

But 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 or something of the sort has been and then you write a little special series of questions.

We do it all the time for you here. Every once in a while you'll be sitting in the pc's chair during a Security Check session and you'll find yourself being asked some questions

that are peculiarly native to your case or might be. And generally, I've written them up or Mary Sue has written them up and handed them to your auditor to be asked.

Well, so it's always possible, you see, to write up an additional list. Now, don't make that the only Security Check – this additional list, you see? Give that along with a standard Security Check. So you can always add questions to a standard Security Check. So you teach people to do this, you see? And this is getting additives and this is getting very clever and this is getting complicated enough. Now, you recognize that people who are having a little bit of difficulty in life are having difficulty because they're slightly complicated. And it takes more complication to form a reality.

You'll find that the – I've forgotten what you call him – alienist. No, no, that's not the term being used. An electrician, no that isn't it. Well, whatever we call him, he's the fellow who handles the electric shock machines and the prefrontal lobotomy lives in the nut houses.

Well, this gent doesn't believe in Scientology because it's not complicated enough. Now you – you try to convince him, you say "Well, it's simple, you can do this." He knows you can't, because it's not complicated enough.

So is – there's the old cycle – 17th ACC is my reference on this. This was gone over tremendously in the 17th ACC. I think it was the 17th, wasn't it? Complications and Simplicities.

So, you'll find out that in trying to teach somebody something that you say, "All you have to do is sit down and read this series of questions to the preclear and then if you get a needle reaction, then you keep asking him the question in various ways until you've cleaned up the needle reaction." Well, this might not be complicated enough, see? It might not be complicated enough to – and they wouldn't think it was effective unless it was more complicated. Do you see how this is?

So, there are other complications that you can teach them about a Security Check, which is a good thing, because it measures the level of complexity. And they're all very factual. They're not anything you're just adding to dude it up, because it's a good thing occasionally with a case here and there to dream up a half a dozen questions or a dozen questions and add them to a Security Check.

This fellow has been auditing for quite a while and we're giving him a Form 6. And we happen to know that he has been auditing in a very peculiarly specialized zone. And there are a lot of security-type questions that might come up on the subject of auditing for that peculiar zone, don't you see?

Like we had somebody that was just in the navy – just got out of the navy. We'd give him a straight Form 6, you see, but we could interlard it with special questions or attach to it special questions or begin it with special questions about auditing in the navy, see?

“Did you ever audit an officer in a certain way as to make him think that you ought to be promoted?” or something like that. Oddball angles.

These things come up. So anyway, you then kind of get the idea of what kind of a life your preclear’s been leading, what his professional or domestic zones are and you adapt security questions to that and you add it to standard forms.

Now, there are, at this moment, eight distinct security question forms, one of which has a subdivision making, actually, nine. We are up to HCO WW Security Form 8 right now, which I think is the number of the children’s check.

Female voice: That’s right.

Well, there are several more that we haven’t released yet, so there are lots of them.

And, these – these all have their special usages, don’t you see? And you could actually pick up any one of them and you could teach people quite a bit about just any one of these Security Checks, you see.

Like the children’s check. Teaching them how to use a children’s check. That’s quite interesting. You, of course, mustn’t ask a question which the child can’t understand because you will have an immediate ARC break. He thinks he’s being accused of something; he doesn’t know what you’re talking about. So you have to rephrase all of the questions in the child’s Security Check, you see, so as to reach the comprehension level of a child.

Now, you can give that check to an adult and clean up his childhood and accomplish what Freud was trying to accomplish with – I think his standard course of psychoanalysis was 180,000 hours, wasn’t it? Three lifetimes. That was optimum. At sixty dollars a week for four hours, something like that. Or four hours of psychoanalysis per week, sixty dollars a week. And they spent the first two years finding out if they could do anything for the person. Yeah, it’s quite interesting, quite interesting swindle. Anyway – because it was a swindle because they knew very definitely at the beginning they couldn’t do anything for the person. They just hoped.

But what were they trying to do? They were trying to plumb the secrets of his childhood. Well, you could use Form 8 to do just that fact and it’d be quite interesting. You could lay open childhood. Let’s say – we quite normally run into people who cannot remember earlier than eleven. That’s quite astonishing. And if it’s astonishing to you, why, you just haven’t asked them. But they very often have some kind of a ceiling on the number of years of their life that they can remember. Well, they remember well back to five, you see. Or they remember well back to eight or something like that.

Well, all of that is quite aberrative because it’s simply unknown to them and it influences them in this lifetime and so they worry about it. And they’ll have a lot of think about it one way or the other. They won’t be worrying about the lifetime just before that perhaps to

the degree that they're worried about their childhood in this lifetime because they're still connected with it.

And the other can drop out of sight and may or may not restimulate, but their childhood certainly *will* sooner or later, because they are running into the same zones and sceneries.

The only time a past life really starts hitting you in the head and gunning you down and so on, is when it's being lived in the same surroundings – it was lived in the same surroundings you are now living in. Like we had somebody, I think, on the 6th or 7th – 6th – it was the 6th. And I think she had been born three times in the same house and lived her life the whole time in that house and that was the three lifetimes immediately preceding this one and she was still in the house. Something on that order. And that was quite upsetting. Because, for some reason or other, she didn't get more familiar with it. She got less familiar with it all.

But anyway, a Security Check can be slanted in the direction of opening up somebody's childhood. Now, that actually makes very interesting auditing. It might not be the finest auditing as far as hour for hour on Routine 3 is concerned, but we have to front up to this factor. What is the most result that an auditor – *an* auditor, a particular auditor – can achieve per hour of auditing?

Now, that isn't necessarily the best process for the preclear. You should understand that, because this has a tremendous bearing on the duties of a Director of Processing. It is not necessarily what the pc needs that will achieve the greatest result, but is what the auditor can effectively *apply* to the pc that gives us the greatest result. Now, that is – there's a difference there and when you're directing auditors in auditing, it is a factor which you must not neglect.

Well, we had an auditor one time that could run nothing under the sun but SCS-Stop. And it was quite marvelous. She even invented a new – a new bit to it. Called it Stop Supreme. Took it off of an old drill I had and that was it. But boy, could that auditor run that and that auditor could always get results with it.

And if you put that auditor to running anything else on a pc, you got no graph change, which was quite interesting. Or you even got maybe a graph cave-in. So the thing to do, obviously, was any pc that this auditor had was going to get SCS with Stop Supreme finally added too, don't you see? And to that degree, she was a good auditor. She could do this.

And another auditor, 8-C was about all this auditor could do well. But anyhow, there is a way of even adjusting this is – this is an old one in HGCs – is you get a new auditor, you've just taken this new auditor on. And, of course, people are paying for processing and you've got to have some kind of a result and you've got to have it right now. And you actually are setting up all kinds of upsets if you don't get them results instantly.

Doesn't matter what is wrong with the pc. If the auditor can process a process with confidence, he will get better results with the process the auditor can run, than the process which the pc ought to have. And that isn't just a compromise. I mean, it's a stark reality. And you ask an auditor just brought on staff that you've got to give to a paying pc, you ask this auditor, "What process have you had best results with in auditing?"

And the fellow said, "Well, I've just had absolutely marvelous results with Rising Scale Processing. I just wouldn't use anything else."

You say, "That's fine."

And during the weeks necessary to train him up into current rundown, you let him run Rising Scale Processing on any pc that sits down in the chair and you'll find out that you have continuous wins. You get wins.

Now, you try not to give him a pc that can *only* be run on something else. And then in that way you will win. And that is a method of doing it.

So now, with Security Checks you get fast wins. And that is what it takes to make an auditor reality. We are now talking about auditors auditing rather than pcs recovering, you see? And it – a fast reality.

Now, any auditor who has gotten tired of auditing and is upset about auditing has had a lot of loses. And you can just add those two factors together and they fit like the Geminis. Not interested in auditing: had a lot of loses.

It isn't necessarily true that an auditor has a lot of loses and then becomes disinterested in auditing. But it is true that if an auditor *is* disinterested in auditing, he's had a lot of loses.

It's true in life that when you say to somebody, "Why don't you learn how to audit if you want to really handle your staff well?" or something like that. "Why don't you learn how to audit?" you can ask him.

And if he says, "Well, no, learn how to audit. Oh, I couldn't do something like – I mean – *pat* – I'm a professional man who then – I'm just an administrator," and so forth "and learning how to audit."

He's just telling you, "I have many times failed to help people!" That is what he is saying in great big exclamation points. "I have failed so often in my efforts to help people beginning with my father, continuing through with my mother, my sisters, brothers, cousins and aunts; going out into all of my schoolmates; going out into my best friend – my best friend in college. I remember I helped him all one night and he went out the next morning and had an automobile accident and got killed. And life has been one long disaster in trying to help people."

That is what he is saying. If you ask him and say, “Well, why don’t you really learn how to handle people and help people and know what makes them tick and so forth, if you’re going to do a good administrative or foreman’s job or a boss job or an executive’s job or something like that?” And he tells you, “Oh, no, I couldn’t do that.” That’s – the parallel statement is “I have many times failed to help people.”

Now, you get auditors around in the field who aren’t doing very much auditing. They are phasing off of auditing; they are running *away* from auditing. Well, God knows what kind of auditing they were doing and what they were calling auditing and what they were running on people and how many thousand times they changed the process during one session and how many goofball things were going on here. But we don’t care about that.

But we do know that the person failed many times in auditing pcs. We know that. And this brings about hecticness in changing processes; hecticness in getting results. “We have to get a result in *one* session, you see or we should get two or three results in *one* session.” And this tremendously *exaggerated idea* of what we ought to be doing for the pc is totally built on failures to help. And the more failures to help, the more anxious they get and then eventually the more they fail. And they eventually will dramatize failure to help and they sit down and it’s as much as your life’s worth to be audited by them, because all that they’re going to audit you with is Failed Help.

They’re going to sit there and prove to you that you can’t be helped. Now, auditors seldom do this, but psychoanalysts do. And the most aberrative, broad, general disease, so-called in the society, is alcoholism. Although heart failure, I think, is the top dog Alcoholism as a (quote) disease (unquote) comes in there somewhere. And isn’t it interesting that their main society now has as a principle and primary datum that alcoholism is incurable and that you could do nothing for an alcoholic? And they prove it to their people as the first thing they have to accept is that nothing can be done for alcoholism.

You see how far a person can go with help? See, as they go down scale, they get less and less eager to and then they eventually wind up preventing it. So they’ve almost... Well, you could ask one of these Alcoholics Anonymous people, “What if the cure for alcoholism turned up, just like that?”

“Oh, well, that can never happen and so...”

“Oh, wait a minute. You mean to say you’re going to predict everything the human race is going to invent for the next century? Oh, come off of it, man. That’s a little bit broad.”

And yet they will just stand there didactically on that point and say, “There is absolutely no way. And the first thing you’ve got to know about alcoholism is nothing can cure it and nothing...” And of course they’ve had it, because we move in on the line and we can do something for alcoholism. And yet practically every member of Alcoholics Anonymous will

be a stranger to you, if you're running a center. They won't come near you, because that's a stable datum on which they operate.

And if you say you can help alcoholism or do something for alcoholism, they stay away in droves, you see, because their first datum is that you can't. And that's just failed help, failed help, failed help.

Well, the hardest person in the world to help is an alcoholic. I don't know if you've ever tried to help an alcoholic but, holy suffering catfish, that is a marvelous way to spin yourself in, you know. They lie, they cheat, they will do anything under the sun to get another swig out of the bottle. Boy, I'll tell you, it's mad. And their baby is without shoes and without food and without milk and could they please have a dollar? You give them a dollar and you can smell their breath in ten minutes and they've had a drink, you know? And it's just marvelous. They'll do anything.

It's – the dope addict probably is less observable in a society, but does more or less the same thing, you see?

So it's a great source of failure, alcoholism. And it winds up now with the stable datum that help is impossible.

Well, an auditor is going that same route when he is getting (quote) "tired of auditing". Then "when he doesn't audit well," all of these other things. So, if you're going to teach somebody to audit, you've got to give them something that gives them a fast result *now* and catch up with that anxiety rate.

And the funny part of it is, if they can do a Security Check well and the Security Check is well adapted to the person's case and circumstances, they will get fast results with a Security Check.

Now, I don't know if you have any terrific reality on that or not at this stage of the game, but you pull a withhold off of somebody and he suddenly feels different.

Now, it's all how you stack up the questions of the Security Check, how fast you're going to get a "Well, what do you know" on the part of the person. But the most dogged, plugging, never cognite, slog pc – the kind that just drive you batty, you know? They sit there and they run the process and they run the process and they run the process – what Smokey used to call "good pcs," or "educated pcs." They just keep running and running and running and running and just run commands and they answer commands and they never say – and I – this – old John's comment: he said, "You know," he said, "I get suspicious of somebody that never says 'Well, what do you know!'" "And it would be that absence of a "What do you know," you know, about his case that would make very sure that the person was making no progress.

Well, one of the most fruitful zones and areas of “What do you know?” is a Security Check. That is – that is very fruitful *if you choose the right check*.

Now, of course, here in your security checking, you’re going over general Security Checks and you’re keeping Security Checks parallel to case advance with Routine 3, see? So the pc’s whole attention is on case advance, Routine 3. And you’re not getting a very *real* look at a pure Security Check, because the person is all interested in finding his goal and interested in finding his terminal and interested in getting it run. He’s being security checked while he is stuck in the engram, you know? You get all that kind of thing, you know? And you’re security checking him as an extra. And this is a different view.

Now, a person who is pinning all of his hopes on the Security Check and that *is* his auditing, doesn’t act this way – if you’ve chosen the right Security Check. Now, that’s why there have got to be lots of Security Checks. And you will see more of them. I mean, there won’t be any finite number of Security Checks.

Because you can do *this* with a Security Check: You can cure a psychosomatic illness. Just that way. I mean, it’s that good. You just use the present time problem of long duration of the pc as the subject of your Security Check and you dream up a whole Security Check that has to do with the present time problem of long duration of the pc. You’re looking for hidden standards.

All right. A hidden standard. Now that – very succinct: A hidden standard is that which the pc uses to find out whether or not he’s making progress. So, of course, you’ve gotten the one thing on which his attention is fixed. I’m sure right now amongst you, you’ve got more than one case that has a hidden standard that you as an auditor haven’t spotted. You know, is he worrying less or is he worrying more? See? This would be a hidden standard. And unless you – unless you really take these hidden standards apart, you’re going to have a case stalling. It’s a present time problem of long duration and they use it as a hidden standard. And it’s the standard by which they know whether or not they are making progress or retrogressing.

So a present time problem of long duration becomes also a hidden standard. And you’ve got people that have two or three of these things maybe and they’re sitting around on them. Now, the easiest way to knock them out is Routine 3: Find their goal, find their terminal and audit it. That is the easiest way to handle any hidden standard, but we’re talking about another zone and area of auditing now. We’re talking about auditing that can be done by almost any auditor.

And we do this kind of thing. This is quite effective. We saw around on the case until we find a hidden standard. Now, “What – what would have to happen for you to know that Scientology was working on you?” is the clue question. That is the key question to it. And the person has to think a long time, because they very often have got these things very buried.

The person says eventually, “Well,” the person says, “oh, well, uh...”

“Yes?”

“Well, my arm would have to stop hurting.”

Now, sometimes you get a hidden standard answer on the subject of *this*, and this will baffle you and you are liable to miss it, because I missed it the first time I ever heard it. I was down in Greece, by the way, when I heard this the first time. In order to know that Scientology worked, first one person and then another person would have to improve in some fashion. Only the second person had nothing to do with and no connection with Scientology.

In other words, for this lady to know that Scientology was working, her daughter would have to get better. But her daughter is not an auditor, not part of the center, nothing of the sort. Isn't that a fascinating one?

In other words, the hidden standard is totally projected, has nothing to do with the person anymore, but has to do with somebody else. And that is a hidden standard. But of course that's an impossible standard. Actually, we know in fact that it is not an impossible standard because we have had people get well by straightening out other people's PT problems with them. But they will come up with something like this. “What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?”

“Well,” they'd say, “well, my son would have to get a job.” Now, you could twist this around saying, “Well, in other words, I would have to audit your son. And your son would have to come out of it and get a job.” That is not what the person means at all. It means, “If you process me, my son would have to be able to get a job.”

So admit that into your rundown of what hidden standards can consist of. The hidden standard can go on any of the eight dynamics. “God would have to be happy.” I swear someday somebody processing somebody is going to get that one. That's right. “God would have to be happy again to know that Scientology worked.”

Now, there's your extensional action. Now, an extensional action is a Security Check bait to end all Security Check baits. And when you can find one of those things, you can really start straightening somebody out *whamity-whamity-wham*. Because that is a natural for a Security Check. That is a perfect Security Check.

Naturally, you security check them on their son. See? You just run down a whole series of questions about anything they might possibly have ever done to their son and ask those questions; clear it as a Security Check. And they all of a sudden will have a case gain, because they've got some individuation which has made us – a terminal closure. And when you get those withholds off, you'll snap the terminal closure. You know, it will snap out. And they all of a sudden will become more themselves. And they will get a “What do you know.” You see how you can do that?

So that any time you search down a hidden standard, don't consider that it's going to be on the person's body or in the person's own immediate psyche. It's liable to be tremendously projected. "For me to know that Scientology worked, my business would have to prosper."

Well, you can almost understand that, can't you, except that they don't. You very often make the mistake of understanding something the pc doesn't. He has no grasp on it at all. You think immediately that he has said, "Well, if you made me more effective, then I would do my job better and therefore my business would prosper."

And this is not what he has said at all. He has told you, I am my business. And this lady down in Greece told me that she was her daughter. So what you're doing there is doing a terminal spring. And you can actually do a terminal separate. Nowhere near as good as a Routine 3 assessment, but nevertheless it is a terminal snap. Get the idea?

Now, wherever you can find one of those things, you can adapt a Security Check to it and you've got results. You're actually running the equivalent of "What have you done to - ?" "What have you withheld from - ?" on a highly directive, specialized basis. Because "What have you done to - ?" and "What have you withheld from - ?" is a part of the Prehav Scale. And if you run too much of it, you are just overrunning a certain section of the Prehav Scale.

Now, withholds don't add up to withholds. They add up to overts, they add up to se-crecies, they add up to individuations, they add up to games conditions, they add up to a heck of a lot more things than O/W, although we carelessly call them withholds. We're asking a person to straighten out their interpersonal relationships with another terminal - is what we are doing.

Now, our normal Security Check is addressed to the individual versus the society or his family. If you'll notice, practically every one of them except 6, is addressed to the society or the family. Because it's what people would consider reprehensible that makes a withhold.

In a Catholic society, not having kept Mass would be a reprehensible action. And in a non-Catholic society, nobody would think twice about it. So that most of our Security Checks are aimed at transgressions against the mores of the group. And that is the basic center line of the Security Check as you see it normally. Do you follow that closely? Do you see that as a specialized thing?

Now, do you see as well that you could have a special mores between the son and the mother? A special mores between the husband and the wife? Just as you have a special mores, of course, between the auditor and the preclear to which Form 6 is devoted. That's a special mores. That's what a pc would consider reprehensible or what other Scientologists would consider reprehensible as actions by the auditor.

Now, that is based on good sense. And that it is reprehensible, from the standpoint of human behavior, is incidental to the fact that it is simply a specialized mores. It's a moral code that you're processing one way or the other. You're straightening out somebody on the now-I'm-supposed-to's. And they've transgressed against a series of now-I'm-supposed-to's. And having so transgressed, they now are individuated. And if their individuation is too obsessive, they snap in and become the terminal.

So all of these cycles exist around the idea of the transgression against the now-I'm-supposed-to. And that's what a Security Check clears up. And that is all it clears up. Now, you see, it's a great deal more than a withhold.

Now, you can just see some blood-dripping priest of the Old Testament asking how somebody has transgressed against the ark of the covenant or something of the sort and having some member of the cult, you see, practically faint at the idea of having to come up with the fact that one day they accidentally spat as it was being borne by. And yet this would be a very aberrative fact, you see?

Now, having released this into the open air, we get less individuation involved.

Now, the Catholic confession is only one type of Security Check that is a kind of an automaticity trick, which doesn't depend in the least on interrogation, but just depends on whether or not somebody out of the goodness of his heart is going to spill the goods and get a few paternosters or something and go his way happily. And it actually has ceased to have very much punch.

But it's transgressions against the Catholic mores. Only that. And there is no wider perimeter to it. And it isn't actually a Security Check at all because it's just whatever the person feels guilty about, which means that no criminal would ever walk near the confession box.

And, of course, the whole Catholic religion was done in by criminals. The reason it hasn't the worldwide sweep that it has today is they just had a few too many, particularly in their own high places. Alexander the Fourth is a very good example. He made lots of money for the Church. The Church became a big business under Alexander the Fourth, but I don't think he'd have anybody in occupying a cardinal's hat or a bishopric unless the fellow had a long and involved record of some kind or another.

He held his position by poisoning. You know it today as a cliché of Lucrezia Borgia. That was his, I think, niece. Anyway, he used her in that fashion.

So you see, that type of Security Check lets everything go by the birds that doesn't register, because if the person doesn't feel guilty about it, it isn't freed. Don't you see? So it requires the factor of make-guilty in order to make the process work. Right?

So, any Security Check may have this factor added to it. If they're all based on frail mores of peculiar constructions and now-I'm-supposed-to's, then making people guilty of these things is another parallel check, isn't it? Hm?

Audience: Yeah.

Yeah.

Now, crippling somebody's right arm is, actually, an overt, but we have somehow or another made the man guilty of having a right arm, haven't we?

All right. Now, let's move in to the finer points of how you would free up a chronic somatic with a Security Check. In the first place, the person would have to have some reality on the fact that that was wrong with him.

In other words, they would want to do – have to want to do something about it. You, out of your own fell swoop, couldn't say this fellow shouldn't have leprosy.

This is the medical code, you know? The medical code assumes immediately that everybody thinks they ought to be well. And this is a hell of an assumption, because it's a long way from true. And you pick up fellows in various parts of the world and you ask them – that have various difficulties and you ask them whether or not they should recover from those difficulties and you're liable to practically get stoned.

You ask some beggar in some far off part of the world whether or not he ought to get rid of his blindness – which is simply some ophthalmialitis or something of the sort – and he's liable to be horrified. You're trying to take away his livelihood and all kinds of things. Or you ask somebody who has been successfully getting out of every war with a heart murmur if he wants to get rid of that heart murmur just before conscription is ordered for the next war, you know? And you're going to get “No.”

Well, the medical doctor's whole idea of psychosomatic medicine is based on people not wanting to get well. And that is what the medical doctor considers more or less psychosomatic medicine. It – he thinks all difficulties are an unwillingness to get well. Because he's bucked into this so often and he's been defeated by it so often that he's closed terminals with it. So he wants the psychic trauma removed to make the person well. Well, that is quite interesting too, because he is again assuming that the person wants to get well.

You can't assume this. You can assume that anything that is wrong with the person has some chance – no matter how slight or remote – but has some chance of being desirable to the person. Something that's wrong with them is desirable to them – some chance of this exists. But largely, in the main, something exists in their life that is wrong that makes it necessary for them to take this odd course of solution. And there is a confusion of some kind in their life that they are solving with this particular difficulty. And we have the old concept of the service facsimile. Getting back to an old friend.

Now, how do you get rid of that? How does this confusion start in? How does it exist? Well, it starts in with withholds. So somewhere in the zone and area of a person's life, there are a series of withholds which wind up with a psychosomatic as a solution.

Now, let's take the wife who is ailing. He has an ailing wife. Very, very, very fashionable – 1870's, very fashionable. It was dramatized enormously in the play about Camille and so forth. For any girl to be an upstanding piece of femininity, she had to have consumption or something like that. And you're practically a social outcast, I suppose, even today in the Bible Belt of the Middle West, if you don't have some horrible disease of some kind or another to complain about to your neighbors. Never met any of them yet that didn't have a misery. If you read their letters to one another, it's some of the most fabulous, misspelled, misdiagnosed medical hotchpotches that you ever wanted to read.

“Well, Zachary, across the road, now – well, Zachary, he's had a misery” – only they don't call it “a misery,” it will be an umbilicus or something – “for some weeks now. And he hasn't been able to work.” And it's just paragraph by paragraph. Have you ever read any of these letters?

I mean, it's impossible. Maybe that sort of thing is fading out, but I know that just a few years ago on a casual investigation of this I suddenly – I almost started laughing myself sick. These people don't communicate. They infect each other.

So anyway, those things are all a protest against life. Protests against life. Illnesses are protests against life. And if you look at it from that point of view, you can then tailor up a Security Check to match the zones of difficulty a person has had in life. And they all come out clean and slick as a whistle and the psychosomatic will disappear.

Now, as you can see readily, this is not a simple thing to do. This requires a lot of figure-figure. See? And you find out lots of auditors are very fond of this, very fond of it. Trying to figure out this preclear, trying to outfigure him. Well, God bless them. More to them. I've been right there in their same boots. But it's something to *do* about a case. It is a problem and something to worry about, but it's something to be very effective with and they will win. They will win.

Now, this woman with the daughter. All right. Her daughter would have to be well – that's her hidden standard. That would be the first thing you would tell the auditor to try to establish. What does the person want to accomplish in processing? In other words, with this question, “What would have to happen for you to know that Scientology works?” That's the same thing. That would be an immediate processing goal of some kind or another.

Then you would trace this back to some area or zone of existence or personalities or some activity. Now, this would appear very, very smart to the preclear, but we know that those activities which had to do with changing the position of mass – the heavier the mass, the more change of position – is the most aberrative. That's a fascinating factor.

We find somebody that all of his life has been a railroad locomotive engineer and he's now complaining about something of the sort. I'm afraid I would just tip my hat in passing to the amenities of auditing. I would be right in there pitching, getting off a Security Check type of questioning, whether I had it written down or not, on the subject of locomotives. I would want to know all of his withholds from locomotives, his withholds from everybody about locomotives. I'd want to know everything there was to know about trains in that particular zone and area. And I would give him a train Security Check of some kind or another that would suddenly wind up with the most unlikely recovery of his hearing. Do you see how this would work out? In other words, I would go straight to the person's handling of masses and changes of space or lacking a clue in that direction, would go into his most confused motional areas – not emotional areas, but most motional areas.

This fellow has been a recluse ever since he was twenty. He has not done anything since he was twenty. He hadn't ever been anyplace since he was twenty. There is certainly nothing much to security check, is there?

Well, his hidden standard is he would “get about more.” If he would find himself getting about more, he would know that Scientology was working. Well, where the hell do you start with something like this? He's been a recluse since he's twenty and he isn't getting about more. And you conclude immediately that it – as I had with error in years past. I tried to get people out of houses by security checking houses and to some degree succeeded – to some slight degree succeeded.

But there was a better answer and a faster answer. What area was he in before he was twenty? See? Staying in the house is a cure for something. So we put him on the E-Meter and now we can't find areas of moving heavy masses or changes in space before he was twenty because he wasn't working. Probably lies in the zone of maybe – maybe he was in the service? Maybe he was in a boarding school? Something like that. So all of a sudden we hit the jackpot. And we find an area of considerable activity. And we're looking for the area of activity which lies prior to the difficulty.

And then we run a Security Check on that area of activity. And we trace it back to boarding school. He's – there's one boarding school that he absolutely detests, he suddenly remembers. Boy, does he detest it. He was there between the ages of thirteen and fifteen. Well, that's what we security check.

Every question we ask has to do with this boarding school. Well, just add up the factors. Well, how many factors are there in a boarding school? How many things can go on in a boarding school? How many people are present? What is *there* in a boarding school?

Well, of course, there are students and boys and instructors and coaches and headmasters. And there's buildings and there's athletic equipment. You see what you're running into here. And probably there's transport from there to home. And there's probably a sick bay

of some kind or another, to go nautical on you and maybe a hospital orderly and a floor master. And let's just try and get all of this down and let's find out all the types of crimes that he might have been able to commit against these items. In other words, we can dream up a whole Security Check, see? We've got the guy on the E-Meter and we've sorted it out and we know what his hidden standard is and we know now the zone of heavy masses or we know the zone of most commotion, detestation and activity – we know all these things. Now, having done all those things, we're content with that session. And now we go dream up one. Don't just start running it off the cuff right at that point, because that gets to be nonsense. Because it looks like a big Q-and-A with the pc and so forth. And it throws the pc out of session and out of control.

But let's dream up one and let's get a nice Security Check all tagged around this thing one way or the other. One of the ways of doing it, crudely, is to take an existing Security Check and Hobson-Jobson it over – take an existing Security Check and just move it over into the zone of the school. But that's not as satisfactory as just scribbling down a – whole things that you really think he probably did in this school that he is never going to tell anybody.

And of course, you will be absolutely amazed at the life of crime he lived during that period. Because inevitably it will be an area of tight mores.

The military is an area of tight mores. You see, there are many crimes, that you could do in the military that never occur to you in civilian life as crimes, but are crimes in the military.

And it's some tight mores of some kind or another and he has cut up against those mores, so has individuated himself from the school, so cannot as-is any part of the track. Of course, he gets trapped in that particular zone and activity.

Now, I know one pc – I've heard Mary Sue say, "I know what's wrong with him" – this is from way back when, way back when – "I know what's wrong. He's stuck in college." And she pointed these facts out to me and by golly, she was right. And we've never security checked that particular person against college. And we certainly should. We certainly should, because he makes practically no case gains. He is a – he is a marvel at no case gains.

Now, he'd make – he'd make terrific case gains if you ran him under Routine 3. Don't get the idea he wouldn't, see? You find his goal and you find his terminal. And you'd run him on a whole track basis and he'd come up at the other end of it fine.

But we're talking now about trying to get a fast result on this particular case, not being able to well do Routine 3. Now, Routine 3 is something like handing a fellow a couple of Lewis machine guns, say and put a burp gun in his lap, cock all of them and tell him to juggle them. And that's the way he feels, you know? He's asked to make like – what are some of these Indian gods that have fifteen arms? He can't do it, he thinks. See, it's just all too much. It's all too sudden. And you're not going up against the same intensity of training that you're

undergoing here, see? You're trying to train this person to do something effective. Well, you can train him to do the various things which I have said. You get him on that technical routine and then you teach him about Security Checks.

Now, I'm just trying to give you, today, some kind of a concept of how many things you can teach a person about a Security Check and how many ways you can do a Security Check and how many targets you can have with a Security Check. And which way you can go with these things.

And let me tell you that if you could get all the auditors of an HGC doing excellent Security Checks on everybody who walked in, more or less on the basis that I've been talking about right here, if you could get them first, just first, to do nothing but a straight Security Check – you know, you just read the questions off, see? They're going to get some results, aren't they?

All right. Now, you can teach them as a gradient how to fancy this up. Let's adapt the Security Check to the pc. Now, this pc has lost his memory, he says. Well, of course – you – “Something you wouldn't mind forgetting” as a repetitive process. You can tailor up repetitive processes as D of P and get over to something like that. But let's get a very fast result with this character. Let's get a fast result.

He's lost his memory, has he? Well, the first thing that you could do on a broad basis, less effective, would be to run O/W against a deaf person.

Female voice: A deaf?

Deaf person, yes. Run overts/withholds. “Who in your family was deaf?” and so forth. “That's good.” “Who in your family didn't recall things well?”

“Oh, well, that's different, isn't it?”

“Well, all right. Good. Now, who in your family was always losing things? Oh, that's good,” you know. You cover all the zones and areas of shut-off communication. “Who in your family was blind?” What is forget but non-observe? Or an occluded observation? So that any set of cut sensory perceptions would operate as overt bait. Do you follow me? I see you looking a little puzzled there.

Forget, is a version of not-know, isn't it? So that any sensory perceptive cutoff is an effort not to know and you have a target. Now – person has overts against that person, he's liable to inherit some of the characteristics of the person.

Now, you've got a thing like “recover my memory,” you're going to have a hell of a time getting him to remember the person who couldn't remember if he's in the valence of the person who doesn't remember, aren't you?

So you could approach it obliquely and you could take all sensory cutoffs and get this type of action going. And you find out that he inadvertently really messed up a boy playmate, eventually, on a Security Check. When he finally remembers this which is totally occluded, he heaves one horrible sigh of relief and his memory returns. He blinded a boy. Well, that would operate as a side panel of forgettingness, wouldn't it?

Any version of not-knowingness. You don't have to go this far afield to get this esoteric. I probably have erred in giving you anything as widely esoteric as this. But the person comes in. He's got a goal. He's got a goal to recover his memory. Well, you could find out not *when* he could remember well or *what* zones he could remember well, but you could find out *who* wouldn't remember well or *who* insisted on his remembering or something of this sort, don't you see? And as a subsidiary to this, *who* didn't want to perceive, which would be the most able method of never knowing, is never perceiving.

You could break this thing down, in other words and then you could security check the person in that zone and area where this or that person occurred. Now, we find out that his whole family – he eventually remembers that his whole family was noted for never remembering anything. They were blind, deaf, dumb and halt, you see? And yet your pc doesn't sit there and say, "Well, what do you know." Sometimes he'll say, "Ha-ha. No wonder I've got a bad memory. Ha-ha. I just remembered the whole family couldn't remember. They were known all over the neighborhood for not being able to remember anything, you know?"

And he doesn't do a "What do you know." That'll be very rare. Well, you don't get a "What do you know" so you get a lose, don't you? Now, how often have you known exactly what was wrong with the pc and then pointed it out and that was what was wrong with the pc, but the pc never said, "Well, what do you know" and never recovered from a thing. Have you ever done that?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Hm? Well, do you know how to get him to say, "Well, what do you know?"

Take everything that you've worked up to right there and now do a Security Check on it and you'll eventually get a "what do you know." He's too in the thing to see it. You can see it because you're outside of it. So you say, "Well, you lunkhead, why the hell don't you see this thing?" you're sort of thinking to yourself, you know? You kind of grit your teeth and strain so the guy can, you know, see it. But he just doesn't.

"Well," he says, "I've always had trouble with women. I do everything I possibly can do not to have trouble with women. I never go with them if I can possibly help it. I never make myself personable to them and so get them in my hair. And I remembered that when I was married a long, long time ago, why, I just did my best. I did my best not to have any trouble with them. I never came home." And you've pointed this all out, you see? And he finally realizes that, you know and he says – and so on. You – you – you punch it up, you know?

You say, “Well, could it be possible that you’ve been trying not to associate with women?” or something like this, you know. You go over the edge just that far, you know? And the person says, “Oh, *yes, yes, yes*, that’d be possible.”

That’s all. I mean, the curtain rings down on a flop. There’s a way to prevent this flop is, you just take your quill pen and your very best gray carbon and water and make yourself a list of all possibilities of overts on that subject. Because if you’re running it on an automaticity basis of just very permissive, “What have you done? What have you withheld?” and “What have you done with women?” You’re running levels of the Prehav Scale against a terminal that may not have anything to do with his case. Actually, his terminal may not be women. This just happens to be as real as he can get. Let’s do a tremendous lot of security checking on the subject of women, the family, girlfriends and so forth.

Now, we have a very good example in Sec Check Form 3. There are all kinds of things in there that you could do to women, you know? That he might have, you know? Well, if you were to give him then Form 3, he’d probably recover from all of this, see? It’s just Sec Check Form 3, slog through and he would eventually recover from some of this if you got them all as you went through. This is rather a long process. And you’ve already isolated the fact that it has to do with women, don’t you see? So you do a little special Sec Check that goes along with this.

“Have you ever thought an unkind thought,” you see, “about a woman?” “Have you ever thought an unkind thought about – ?” how many things are there about a woman, you see? The way you build one of these things up. How many things are there about women? Well, there’s clothes and there’s houses and cookery and there’s children and there’s shopping and there’s various activities that are the common ordinary ones, don’t you see? And they have heads and feet and – you know? And you go into this various list of items or actions that a woman might engage upon. And then you make a Security Check around this thing, you see?

And it’s like this, “Have you ever done anything to a woman’s head?” See, you just put “Have you ever done anything to...?” to a whole list and you’ve got a formulized method of getting together a Security Check. You see how you do this?

You write up every noun you could possibly think of on the subject of the zone, area, dynamic that he’s having difficulty with and he fails to cognite on in any way, shape or form. You can immediately assume that if he doesn’t cognite in that zone or area, that he’s really pinned down and that he has withholds from you and from the area, on the subject of the area that not even he knows.

See, a cognition is totally dependent upon a freedom to know. And overts and withholds are dedicated to another thing. And these are dedicated to not-knowingness, aren’t they?

So if the person doesn't cognite, you can immediately assume that he has a large area of not-knowingness on the subject.

Well, how do you relieve this large area of not-knowingness? Now, you could run some kind of direct not-knowingness on it, perhaps, which would be your not-know version of a Security Check. But it'd still take some guidance like a Security Check to do the job neatly and rapidly. He doesn't even suspect. You as an outsider to his case, you see, can suspect. You see where this fellow is having trouble. Well, you dream up a Security Check to match it.

Now, the formula, I repeat, for dreaming up a Security Check is just make a list of all of the items you can think of that has anything to do with that target. Let's say his family, see? He always has family trouble.

By the way, you know, you can get this from a pc's PTPs. If you look at the type of PTP that the pc has, you'll know that it is a present time problem of long duration if he adds up to having – four times in a row or three times in a row or something like this – a PTP about his family. Then it must be a problem of long duration. And if you relieve this problem of long duration, he will feel much better. That's for sure. And it must be one of his auditing goals, see? Because he keeps putting it up as a PTP, it must be one of his auditing goals. He hasn't really inspected it. And the hottest way to get rid of that particular zone – *flick, flick, flick, flick, flick* – is security check it.

And again, the way you security check it is make a list of all of the nouns and all of the doingnesses which you can think of. And just ask the person if he has overts against any of them. Has he done anything to, has he interfered with anything about... You get the idea. "Have you ever interfered with schooling?" See, schooling is part of the family activity, see. So you put down "schooling." "Have you ever interfered with schooling?" You look that over. "Ever done anything to schooling?" "Have you ever prevented schooling?"

"Oh, well! Oh, well. It's funny that you'd ask that, but..." you see. And he gets it little by little. And it's little by little that this cognition will take place. It's not all going to take place on a *bang*, you see? It might suddenly appear in the long run as a *bang*. In the long run, it'll be a *bang*. But the *bang* only took place because you took the pebbles off the top of the thing, you see? And when you finally got the thing uncovered, why, he could look at it and blow it. Got the idea?

Now, any zone or – this is the rule: Any zone or area of life with which a person is having difficulty, if he realizes he is having difficulty in that zone or area or if he doesn't, it doesn't matter, is a *fruitful* subject for a Security Check.

Any zone or activity with which a person is having difficulty in life or has had difficulty in life is a fruitful area for a Security Check. And you'll find out, every time, he's got withholds in that zone or area.

One of the indicators of that is a present time problem. He gets present time problems about this. Well, therefore, you know it's a problem of long duration. Three problems of short duration equals one problem of long duration. You got the idea? It's a good detector mechanism. A person has three times come into session (according to his past auditing records or something like that) late because of lunch. "Oh," you say, "well, it's natural." The transportation is difficult and he doesn't have much time and that sort of thing. *No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no.* You're way off beam. How come he's in a situation where the transportation is difficult? See?

All right. So we can immediately assume that he has trouble with food.

Audience voice: With food?

With food. Just like that. And that's your next rule, is take the most fundamental expression that you can get of his difficulty. The most fundamental expression. In other words, if a person has a problem with lunch, we don't say he has problems with lunches. No, we don't say he has problems with lunches, breakfasts and dinners. It might not be really that he's having a problem with lunches. Let's isolate it on the E-Meter. He might merely have problems with appointments. But if he has problems with lunches, we can be pretty sure that he has problems with breakfasts and dinners. If he has problems with breakfast, lunches and dinners, he has trouble with food. And if Freud in 1894, by the way, instead of announcing the libido theory, had announced instead the chow theory, why, he would have had it made. He would have had it made, because food is a tremendous regulating factor. And this was actually what discredited his work where it was discredited, is you'd hear this long, drawn out argument and some psychiatrist or somebody would be sitting down and argue with another psychiatrist about Freudian analysis and it'd all come out to basis: "Well, if you put a naked – put a hungry man down at a table and you took a naked woman and you put her there..." This all seemed to titillate them, the idea, you see. I've heard the – I've heard the thing expressed time after time, I mean, by these Joes. "And you put a plate of hot food in front of him, he will eat the food."

Well, I have very often upset their calculations by saying that they have selected a careful number of factors which led to a proof of their own point. Now, this sailor had been well fed over the three months' voyage at sea. And you put a plate of ship's fare in front of him and put a naked woman there. He isn't going to eat.

But despite the academic aspects of this problem, the truth of the matter is that to *Homo sapiens* food is more fundamental than sex. It is. It's more aberrative because sex is not necessarily a continuous line of overts and food certainly is. Right? All right.

So, the rule here in Security Checking is break the problem down to its most fundamental expression. Then write down those nouns associated with it and those basic doings associated with this fundamental expression. And then just phrase up your Security

Check on the basis of “Have you ever...?” and any other verb you want to put in. You know, “Have you ever done this? Have you ever prevented this? Have you ever...?” You know, you could run all parts of the Prehav Scale against all the nouns if you want to really get fancy. But you don’t have to be that fancy, because that needle is going to fall whenever you come close to it. And you ask this series of questions one after the other. And there are things that he just never has dreamed of, man. He just has never dreamed of these things, you know? They’re just out of his ken. “What – have I ever done anything to food? Food, food, food. Ever done anything to food?”

Well, that’s a very broad thing, you see? Has he ever done anything with a plate? Has he ever done anything with a knife or a fork or a spoon? Has he ever done anything with a table? Has he ever done anything to a table? You got the notion here? Has he ever done anything in a grocery store? Has he ever done anything to a grocery store? Has he ever done anything to a grocer? You get the idea? Then all of a sudden it comes out he spent his whole career, as most children have, as a shoplifter in Safeways. And since that time he’s never been able to eat chocolate without a feeling of guilt. And you, all of a sudden he’d say, “What do you know, I’m not allergic to chocolate now. Hey! You know, that’s...” See that’s positive gain in processing. It’s a win. You see that?

But it’s just based on these fundamentals. That any area where an individual is having difficulty, he’s stupid. What is stupidity?

Female voice: Not-know.

It’s not-knowingness. How does not-knowingness occur? Through overts. But the overt has to be hidden, so it must be an overt which is withheld. So these withholds, then, add up to stupidity, so of course he has trouble. I mean, it’s as – it’s as – it’s almost as stupid as he’s being in its simplicity. There isn’t anything complicated about it at all.

All right. Now, that’s so much for a zone of activity in which a preclear is having difficulty which would constitute a present time problem of long duration.

Let’s take up the other branch of it now, since there’s two branches of this and that is the psychosomatic difficulty. And you must always assume that a psychosomatic difficulty is a solution after the fact. A psychosomatic difficulty is a solution after the fact. Of a what? Of a confusion.

A confusion consists of two things: Time and space, change of particles in, predicted or unpredicted. And if they’re unpredicted changes in space, you will have a confusion. And to resolve the confusion, he puts his attention on one particle and says that is it and all other particles must be ignored. That’s confusion and the stable datum. It’s best represented by you tearing up half a hundred little tiny bits of very lightweight paper and just throwing them up in the air. Of course, you have a confusion if you do this. That is a confusion of paper. But it

doesn't look very confusing to you because you have it in relationship to the still walls of the room, the ceiling and the floor.

Nevertheless, if there were no relative stillnesses with relationship to this cloud of paper which is swirling, you wouldn't know what the hell to do about it or which one to put your attention on or anything else, if that was all there was to look at. And the solution to that is to put your attention on one piece of paper and consider that all other pieces of paper are in motion in relationship to the *one* piece of paper. And that is the solution that the thetan always takes. It's a good solution, except it eventually winds him up with such things as chronic somatics.

He's got a war. war to him is a problem in confusion. It is a confusion to him. So out of all of the factors of war, he has chosen one on which he is now fixed. Well, what is the one fixed factor? What is the one fixed factor? Very simple. The one fixed factor, of course, is the fact that people get hurt in war. That is the most confrontable thing because they're the only undangerous people in a war: Officers are dangerous; even your friends are dangerous because they're all armed; the enemy is dangerous; everybody is dangerous. And what do we wind up with? Everything dangerous but a wounded man. So that makes a good solution, doesn't it? Now, when we add this up to the fact that if he is a continuously wounded man, he will never have to be in that confusion again. Oh, that's marvelous. So he puts himself immediately into the confusion forever. He gets betrayed by his own solutions. And there's his chronic somatic. So it's the difficulty after the fact. The chronic somatic is always after the fact of the confusion.

So all you have to do to resolve a chronic somatic is not find out how the man broke his leg, but find out what confusion existed in his life before he had trouble with his leg. And then when you've got that confusion sufficiently taped and squared around, what do you have? You have a fruitful Security Check which when executed will free him from the chronic somatic which solved the confusion. Because it was his overts in the vicinity of that confusion that made the confusion stick and made it necessary for him to select a chronic somatic to solve it with. You see how simple this is once you look at it. So always look before the fact.

This person has got sinusitis. All right. He wants to cure his sinusitis. That's why he's being audited. Sinusitis. That's the thing. That's the stuff. If he can just cure his sinusitis, that's his present time problem of long duration and so forth. Well, hell, let's not find even somebody who had sinusitis. Let's go at it in a much broader way. Let's do a much more positive, thorough job of this thing from all ways and shape and form.

Let's find out when he had an onset of sinusitis and then let's just take from that period back in this life to find zones and areas that he considered intolerable. And every time we find one, let's make a Security Check for that zone or area, run that Security Check and the

next thing you know, *bango!* We're going to have some freedom from sinusitis. It'll get a little bit better and then it'll get a little bit better. And then all of a sudden, we will have the zone or area which made it necessary for him to have sinusitis and now it'll just cure just like that. It's just gone. Because it's no longer necessary to have it because he no longer has overts against the confusion. Do you see how it works out?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. All of these things can be taught as I think you will see here, clearly. All of these things are teachable. And all these things are doable. The first thing you need to do is to tell people to get up with their technical presentation and then use the technical presentation against the interestingly simple format of a plain Security Check. Then they can get more complicated with this and actually have wins right on up the line with chronic somatics and everything else. And they will really be telephoning you to tell you how wonderful it all is. This is for sure.

Right here, right now, you're not seeing a Security Check in any stellar role. You aren't for one reason, is that your attention is definitely on a broader, faster line that requires infinitely more skill and care. But nevertheless, you're running a Security Check parallel to this. And as you're doing Security Checks, you yourself get a reality on what you can do with a Security Check. Go ahead and run the Security Checks that you're supposed to run on the person, but at the same time examine what that person is doing; examine their present time problems of long duration; find out what they're really trying to get done in auditing; find out what their hidden standards are; and trace it back with the two systems which I have given you here.

One, is to find – if it's a chronic somatic – to find the confusion which exists before the fact and in the other one, find out what area of life was intolerable to them. And if you do that and tailor up Security Checks immediately against those and ask some little brief line, you'll find, my God, there are withholds there you never dreamed of and actually the pc never dreamed existed. And you'll suddenly get rid of some of the chronic difficulties of the pc ahead of the fact of the pc running them out where they actually exist, which is on his terminal line.

Now, all Security Checks add up to very thorough key-outs. That's what a Security Check adds up to. It doesn't add up to a cure. It adds up to a key-out. But it'll stay keyed out. Don't worry about that, because the individual would have to accumulate this many overts and withholds again. And once he's been security checked on it, he probably finds out that he should know better next time. But it really is a key-out, because don't be too surprised if you run into the same somatic on his goals line which you got rid of on the Security Check – you ran into on his goals terminal line and you find out that the reason he keeps adopting a broken hip or a busted skull or something of the sort – you'll find the engram. The basic engram on

the whole thing. You'll find eventually the overt, you'll find everything about this, running his terminal line. The somatic will turn on sharply, as-is and be gone. You'll hit it again. But because you've done a Security Check on it, it's very reachable when you're doing a goals run. Okay?

All right. I hope some of that is some benefit to you.

Thank you very much.

Audience: Thank you.