SEC CHECKS, WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on
10 January 1962

Thank you.

Oh, you like me today.

All right. Good enough. This is what?

Audience: 10th.

Is this the 10th? No kidding. 10 Jan. 62, AD 12, planet Earth – I guess. I guess.

Now, we have a terrific amount of ground to cover because you're way behind.

You've got the nasty problem of having to confront effectiveness. And this is a summary of 3D Criss Cross, being the latest and the most. And you're in the very, very nasty position of having to confront effectiveness. And this is a wicked position for you to be in because I know what the processes can do if they are properly used. And it's now pretty easy to do these things providing you are perfect. That's all that's required.

Absolutes are unobtainable, as many of you will quote at me on occasion. And you'll say, therefore, we cannot have a perfect score because absolutes are unobtainable. I just say, "Well, I said that."

What you've got to face up to is that people, because you've been here, will expect the impossible from you, and all you've got to go do is go ahead and do the impossible.

And the advent of the impossible occurs with Twenty-Ten and 3D Criss Cross.

Now, you haven't yet, right here, seen these things in full, flamboyant action, and it's quite interesting. That's why I say you've got to catch up. Because I know where these things sit and I know what they are about and I know what they're capable of. And you have already seen very excellent Security Checking do some interesting things with cases, haven't you? Yeah, you've seen people brighten up and all that sort of thing.

All right. Now, what if you were able to take Security Checking and without any unusual questions – no unusual questions or no unusual action on your part but just doing what you exactly could do – produce some fantastic results just on standard Security Checks and so forth, on a case that has some psychosomatic difficulty. Some nice, tough, rough, psychosomatic difficulty.

Well, all you have to know is your Class II skills and be highly standard and it would be no strain on you of any kind whatsoever.

In other words, there's the case. And he's moaning and groaning and screaming that he's got lumbosis up to his ears, and there he is. And wouldn't it be very nice if you, simply by auditing this case directly with your routine actions and so forth, made him snap and pop and come out of it, and the lumbosis vanished, and so forth. That would be very nice, wouldn't it? Be very nice.

Well, you have that, potentially, in this Twenty-Ten. There you have it, but you should know the basics of Security Checking. The basics of Security Checking

If you know the basics and fundamentals of Security Checking, then you check with the basics and fundamentals of it, and therefore you can produce some interesting reactions and actions in cases.

And this is quite, quite pertinent, then, that you shouldn't be going around security checking by ritual. There's a considerable danger in your just sitting there security checking by ritual. You should security check by fundamentals. And if you security check by definition or fundamental, then you'll have the most relaxed time of it you ever had and you won't be worrying so much about ritual. Because here's what happens to you.

Because you don't quite grasp a fundamental, the next thing you know, somebody stiffens up the ritual. See, that's rather inevitable. And then because you don't quite grasp the fundamentals, then they again stiffen up the ritual. And the next thing you know, you're a ritualist. You're just doing everything by the count and you don't understand quite what you're doing, and so forth.

And you – therefore you can depart a considerable distance from effective auditing in auditing by ritual only, you see?

The thing to do is to get the job done, do you see? In the first place, auditing is what you can get away with. And that is what auditing is. What you can get away with, with the pc. Sounds almost criminal, but it's a fact. I have sat down with no Model Session, rudiments, or anything else with a pc who has withholds from here to Halifax, and taken his lumbosis and thrown it in the nearest ashcan.

And years later he's writing me a letter saying, "Well, Ron, I'll just never forget that auditing session you gave me."

And you would have stood there with your hair on end wondering what the devil I was doing Well, I was doing nothing but auditing the pc. And it was what I got away with, see? It was what I got away with.

Now, because you can't get away with everything, why, a ritual gets laid down circumscribing what you should try to get away with. But remember that within that ritual or

within that rote, you still have an enormous amount of things that you can get away with. you see what I'm talking about here?

Now, let's say we run a good Model Session. Well, I use Model Session because it's a good thing, not because it's a ritual. But because it covers those points *bang, bang, bang,* that are liable to give you trouble.

But let me tell you this about Model Session: Some pcs can't be audited in Model Session. Isn't that an interesting thing to know? They can't be audited in Model Session. Now, why can't they be audited in Model Session? Because you'd never get past about the third question in the beginning rudiments.

Let's take a pc with a bank that is absolutely crawling, see, with withholds of some kind or another, present time problems all over the spot, and so forth. And instead of going into session, he goes out of session because these aren't the things that have to be hit.

In other words, you could imagine a case that is so critically poised – he is not a case which is being audited, don't you see, routinely and regularly. He is a case that has just come to you; he's critically poised in that you have to find out what the mind is doing in order to parallel it. And because you have to find out what the mind is doing in order to parallel it, if you did a Model Session – now I'm talking about neurotic and psychotic cases, you understand – if you did a Model Session, or tried to do a Model Session, you would immediately find yourself in a cul-de-sac because the case is not that much concentrated or in communication.

Now, let's take an extreme case. Let's take a madman in a cell, and he's spinning around like mad, you see. You're going to run Model Session on this madman, are you? Oh, hell you are. But oddly enough, oddly enough, Scientology could handle him as it exists today, see? Just that. This is fascinating And under the exact definitions of Security Checking, Scientology could handle him.

Well, you can't even get him to hold on to an E-Meter, you understand? He couldn't concentrate that far. Well, you say, "What the devil kind of Security Checking is Ron talking about now?"

Well, I'm talking about basic and fundamental Security Checking. Why is he insane?

Well, he's insane because he's keyed in an insane valence. Well, how did he key it in? Well, he keyed it in, obviously, by withholding. He's got withholds.

All right. So just by definition, we know a 3D Goals Problem Mass – see, we know that the thing exists. We know if this fellow's insane, it isn't something that happened to him in this lifetime. You may not have thought this thought all the way through in your auditing and assessing, but it – *nothing* has ever happened to anybody in this lifetime which was capable of driving them even faintly worried. See, nothing Why, just wash it out.

People come around, and they tell you, "Well, my mother and father left me at a very early age, and I was on the streets by myself. And I learned to steal from garbage cans, and so forth, and that's why I am what I am today."

I generally ask them, "What was the author of that sociology textbook?" you see, because it doesn't have anything to do with them or their case or anything else, you see?

Well, answer this one. The fellows who have run into the mental field and run out again hurriedly and taken up psychiatry – something else distantly removed from the mind – they've consistently made this kind of an error, that they've tried to attribute all difficulties to this lifetime, you see? And then they've hung themselves. That's why you mustn't let somebody push you into saying, "Well, really, past lives is just a theory." Theory, hell. you can't make anybody well if you audit this lifetime only. you should know that. A lot of you here have tried it and nothing very spectacular happened. You got rid of some somatics for the pc, and so forth. But the pc was still back in there, his old, grubby self very shortly afterwards. You ever notice how consistently that occurred? All right.

This one boy, his father and his mother leaves him, and he leaves him on the street, and he has to eat out of garbage cans, and he goes bad and becomes a big-bad-wolf gangster or something of the sort, and there we have it.

And the next one's father and mother left him and he had to eat out of garbage cans and he went to the in the orphans' home and he just had all of the reasons why he should have had just as dreadful a time. And we meet him and talk to him and he's fairly successful these days. He's a salesman or something.

Well, you can't find the cause in this lifetime. So people then can say, "Well, of course, there's no answer to the human mind because you can't find the cause for difficulties in this lifetime." Do you see how that would be?

Well, they confuse this lifetime with the fundamentals of the mind, and they make mistakes on this line ever since. They've been doing it ever since they've tried to do this, you see?

Because this fellow is insane. He's keyed-in from Arcturus, Arslycus, to hell and gone back someplace or another, and he probably went nuts by processing invader troops as they came in through the spaceport, you see. Only he processed them, not the way we're doing it, he processed them with a little copper skullcap, see. And they'd blast these birds down, you see, and they'd throw this copper skullcap on them, and they'd give them the *zzzzurb-byut.* Because they knew what would happen, you see. The fellow would just exit out of the body he was in, go back and pick up another body, he'd pick up another rocket ship, and now he knew where you were, and come in and shoot hell out of you, you see? That was the way it used to be.

So, of course, you *had* to give him some processing of some kind or another or he'd really mess you up. I mean, that was the way they thought about it.

And after he'd done about ten thousand of them, and a lot of them had gone insane, you see, and spinning, and so forth, why, he himself, you see, got this all associated with the Goals Problem Mass. And after he'd been at it fifteen, twenty, thirty thousand years, you see, he eventually began to get the idea that he was a little shaky in his wits.

And then one day he went overboard in some fashion. He did some particularly outrageous thing like they had just bombed a town, and all the inmates of the insane asylum were running out in the streets. So he sat there back of the zap gun, and for no good reason at all, since he merely could have corralled them, he just shot them down one by one to see them squirm and scream. And then he occasionally wasn't himself after this, you see?

After a few more minor incidents of this particular character on the whole track, he has eventually developed a circuit package which is an insane person. He's got a good one now.

All right. We find this madman in the insane asylum. What's he doing in the insane asylum? How did he get there? What duress did it take to put him there? What overts did he have to commit to put him there? Well, they're all packaged up in a valence and he's sitting in the valence and there he is.

It's quite fascinating that crazy people can be clicked through valences just as fast as you can snap your fingers. You can click them into almost any valence you can think of.

In other words, they're susceptible to valences. Very. They go through the barrier and you can just go click, click, click. I've had an insane person being a dog, being a girl, being a boy, being a woman, being a dog, almost as fast as you could count.

"Oh, you'd like to see me be a dog, huh? *Woof; woof; woof* " And she'd be jumping all over the floor, and so forth.

Only she thought this was a sincere activity, and she thought she was a dog while she was doing that. Quite interesting

But anyway, what do we find here, then?

Well, we find a madman in a cell who has a keyed-in valence. Now, you for sure are not going to run out all the times he's gunned down insane people. That's for sure. Not the way he is. And yet you've got to start somewhere.

And we come right back to the basics and fundamentals of Security Checking. It is the not-know they have run on other people that results in a withhold on themselves.

So what basic and fundamental question could you ask this fellow and get him to answer that would start keying out this package called insanity? You could simply ask him, "What don't people know about you?"

And you know, he'd answer it? It's so fundamental he couldn't help but answer it.

You could actually spring that valence. In other words, move that valence off of him, and he'd turn sane.

Girl up in a hospital up here not too long ago, estranged from her family, very upset and dying Nasty situation withal.

I tried to get an auditor to go up and process her. I didn't make the grade on this particular activity, mostly because, when the auditor went up, the medicos had this girl on a cot out in a corridor or something of the sort or parked in the laundry room or something because the hospital was overcrowded and there wasn't any way anybody could do it, and nobody would let the auditor come near the patient. You know, standard hospital procedure.

And in overcrowded hospital conditions today, it's nothing for an accident victim to lie six hours on a stretcher someplace without attention in a hospital. If I had anybody smashed up in an automobile accident, I wouldn't take them to a hospital. I'd do something else.

But anyway, this girl was in very bad condition. She was lying there and she was about to pass in her chips. And I didn't get her processed, but the only thing I would have done if I *had* gotten near her is, "What doesn't your family know?" See, "What doesn't your family know about you? What have you been doing your family doesn't know about?" Now, she had a dreadful, incurable disease and you would have seen this thing gradually blow away. Because she was a young girl, and she was only worried about her family. So obviously her family didn't know something about her, see? Get the fundamental? Now, how fundamental can you get?

Now, if you'd gotten to process her before she died – because she did die in two or three days – if you'd gotten to her, if the hospital had let you and so forth and you had gotten to her, you would have been faced with this question: What to run on her? What to do?

Well, of course, you're not going to run a Model Session on her. You're going to get involved in was it all right to audit in this laundry room?

No, it's not all right to audit in the laundry room. Now, what are you going to do, see?

Ain't no shape to run rudiments. Rudiments process is too light. Person's mind's so intensely concentrated upon their own difficulties that, actually, to get the rudiments in would be to take their mind off their case, don't you see?

In other words, the case, as far as you're concerned, is in-session to a marked degree, already rolling

I did an interesting thing one time. A guy collapsed in the middle of a restaurant – a big public restaurant of one kind or another, a rather nice restaurant. So therefore, the nicer the restaurant, the quicker they try to dispose of the bodies.

You can always tell, you can always tell a nice restaurant because they're very anxious to get rid of people who collapse and you can always tell a bad restaurant because they don't care. They just keep stumbling over the person in the middle of the room. It's one way of classifying restaurants. Anyway . . . And so I saw this fellow collapse, so I got up from the table where I'd finished up dinner. I was about to leave anyway. And I kneeled down along-side of him, and asked him where he was on the track. This was back in Dianetic days, you know? I asked him what he was stuck in, you know? And pushed him on through what he was stuck in, and already, why, they'd been calling for his doctor, and so on. And they hauled him out into a pantry, so I stood by him in the pantry and ran him through the rest of the engram just as sort of passing by, you know, still wiping my hands on a napkin. That casually, you know.

And the doctor got there and the fellow was very much alive and was looking up and was much brighter. Well, I possibly underestimate or overestimate the condition the person was in as a result of this, but the doctor was quite startled, you know? His patient wasn't supposed to be breathing that way. After all, he was a patient.

And he wanted to know who I was. And I told him, "Well, I'm . . ." (paraphrase) "I'm just me," and walked out, you know? And left a mystery forevermore. Anyhow, done that fairly often.

But the point is there was no time to get any rudiments in on that person. This person is gasping for breath and is in asphyxiation and is strangling to death and probably hasn't got but four more breaths to draw. you got no time to ask him if he has any withholds.

And it'd certainly be an insult to anybody's intelligence to ask him if he had a present time problem.

Well, now, you get the idea. There's a point where Model Session must be done and should be done, but there are these emergency conditions, and so forth, where it'd be nonsense to do a Model Session, see? You have to decide that.

But here is a condition where a person's mind is very badly deranged and you couldn't get him to concentrate on anything anyhow, but you can ask him the question necessary to resolve the case. That question will normally – could be considered to lie most effectively – and the one that he will answer the fastest – somewhere in the vicinity of a Security Check. It'll be something other people don't know, you see? It'll be something he is withholding, something he hasn't let others in on.

Now, you see, the question "don't know" crosscuts and short-circuits this other question which is "What have you done?" and "What have you withheld?" or "What are you withholding" Now, this withholding kick, that's all very well for somebody that considers it a withhold. But as you're security checking in general, you'll find that most cases answer up very nicely to "What have you done?" and that sort of thing.

But when a case does not consider this – you don't only use "don't know" on this case. you could use "don't know" on many other types of cases, too, you see? It doesn't mean that because you're using "don't know" this person hasn't got what a withhold is; he's too far south to know what a withhold is or an overt is, don't you see? It isn't necessarily true.

People get worried sometimes because they think a process assigns level of case, and they refuse to run them sometimes. And it'd be a shame to avoid that one on that grounds because it isn't true. But it is true that a person who considers it an overt or doesn't consider it an overt – doesn't matter whether he does or doesn't or consider he is withholding or isn't withholding – certainly he will answer up to other people not knowing about it because that is factual.

And then, having answered that a few times, he will begin to consider that he has a withhold on the subject.

In other words, by getting off the "don't know" you get him up to enough responsibility to have an overt and a withhold, see? But up to that point, he's boosted, you see, by this "don't know." So it's an undercutting mechanism. So therefore, if you could communicate in any way with an insane person or a very sick person, and so on, it, of course, is the key question. And if you just ask somebody, "Well, what don't I know about you?" – if you just ask them that much, you know, or if you ask them, "What don't you know about your condition?" I mean, that's really coming into a total introversion area by, "What don't you know about your condition?" God help us. Anybody will answer that.

"Well, I don't know this, and I don't know that, and I don't know the other thing."

But present time is to these people an engram, and you're sort of running an engram as a not-know. But you ask anybody who is having any difficulty what others don't know about him or about his condition or about what he's been doing, and you're going to get some very fruitful replies. They will just rattle out left and right. And it's interesting to put it down at that level of an assist.

Now, any auditing, of course, that is done outside Model Session, except the CCHs, would – could only be regarded in the nature of an assist. So don't be too amazed if after you've done this patch-up type of auditing your pc falls on his head. They do routinely. They don't fall downstairs as far as you've picked them up. But very often after you've patched somebody's broken leg up or something of the sort with an assist, you see, a couple of days later his leg hurts like hell and he's complaining about it. Because the effects of an assist are not very lasting unless *all* of the withholds are pulled and a lot of Havingness is run in on top of it. Then an assist would be fairly lasting.

We had an example right here in the house. The children's teacher came in Tuesday, but only because the Tech Sec. and so forth, had processed her a bit on Monday night. She had a slipped disk, and of course she came in, she was all right because of the very minor

assist. And I assure you it probably wasn't very much of an assist because, naturally, she slumped. She felt wonderful and then she went downhill. Well, that is characteristic of an assist. That is just what you expect out of it. Because to have done anything for this particular case would have required hours of auditing and should have been done months ago or years ago or something of that sort, you see?

This business of waiting until somebody goes mad before you audit them is sort of a dull way to go about it anyhow. We've got a boy right out here on the grounds and one of these fine days he's going to take another motor car – which he just got through doing – and throw it through a brick wall, and they'll scrape him off the brickwork, and bury what's left. Because just today he saw a big curtain we were putting up in front of a garage area out here. And I was standing around and everybody was working very peacefully and getting along too well, so I interfered with them. And – wanted to show that I was important to the situation, too! And this kid came up helping it out, and all of a sudden he looked at that curtain and that was too much for him. It was flopping around. How were they going to drive in and out of a garage with a curtain across it. Well, he had the solution.

"I'd drive straight through it," he says. "I would, you know. I would."

And I said to myself, "I'll bet you would, too." That's the way he operates.

Of course, the time to process him is now. The time to process him is now. And the Tech Sec should actually get him by the nape of the neck and straighten him up a little bit on this kind of thing because he's a very good workman, a very good boy. But he just gets that way around cars. There's something about cars.

Anyway, that is an example of a case, of a case level, a case action, and so on, where the case should have been audited a long time ago and all of a sudden is sick and then you're going to do everything with an assist that you should have done with high grade processing a long time ago.

Well, of course, you can't do that much with an assist, so don't expect too much out of a Security Check. Just expect the person who is insane to go up to a point where they are only a bit neurotic, see? You can bring an insane person up. It's very hard for a person to stay on being insane, anyhow. Takes a lot of doing Neurotic tendencies, and so forth, are very hard to keep in place. I mean, an auditor just shakes them a little bit with Reach and Withdraw, and the person can sit up all night trying to put them back, and they won't.

And you would not expect too much. And after they were in fair condition, you would have to give them some decent auditing But while they're in that condition, this is no time to use a Model Session – getting back to what I'm talking about. But auditing which is done outside and not with a Model Session should simply be regarded in the light of an assist and should be handled on the light that you're going to pick it up later anyway. And then go ahead and pick it up or not as the case may be.

Well now, auditing by fundamental, then, would be to restore the person's communication with society or with that group to which he is most intimately connected. Therefore, you could expect a person who is ill and very worried about their family or very angry with their family to, of course, have withholds from their family.

See, these are the fundamentals of Security Checking.

A person who is being very angry at the society or is having a hard time with the social structure he's surrounded with, and so forth, has withholds from that social structure, and so it goes.

Now, that's just the fundamental Security Checking.

Now, you see this in vignette all the time. you see a little tiny, microscopic example of this. I wonder if this has happened to each and every one of you. If it hasn't yet, why, be alert for it. It possibly has happened, yet you haven't noticed it. That you missed a withhold and the pc got upset with you. Have you seen that yet? Have you got a reality on that?

You missed a withhold, and the pc had an ARC break. Let me put it that way. Or you found the pc sitting in an ARC break and when you put it together again, it didn't go together well until you get off a withhold. You get the idea?

Well, it's a severed communication line. I see that it hasn't happened to some of you or you haven't noticed it, so you just better get enthusiastic with your observation. Get your obnosis going because you've never had any trouble with a pc unless you missed a withhold. You've never had any trouble with a pc and you never *will* have any trouble with a pc until you miss a withhold. That is all there is to it.

Just reduce it all down to then because look-a-here. An ARC break, of course, what is that? That's severed communication. Well, you didn't sever the communication so somebody did. Well, it – the only other person present is the pc so he must have. Well, how did he sever the communication? By having a withhold that he didn't give you. That's the only way he could sever the communication line.

Now, we move out into this perimeter just a little bit further, and we find that a present time problem is because he has withholds from people. You go along with that, don't you? He has withholds from people so he has a present time problem with the people, of course. We don't care how antique the withholds are from the particular valences he's having a present time problem with. They're nevertheless withholds.

And the pc, then, in any rudiment in the beginning rudiments, of course, has fundamentally severed communications. Well, how has he severed communication? He severed communication with a withhold. There is something people don't know. And because people don't know, why, then he's severed communication with them. And that is all there is

to that. So naturally, the common denominator of all beginning rudiments out is a withhold missed. That's all.

Now, let me tell you, you will see at once what I am talking about. I see that this is causing a little bit of consternation with you, but let me assure you of this, that it's very, very easy to follow.

You shut the window rather noisily at the beginning of session, and the pc thinks it is rather noisy and doesn't mention it to you. Now, you try to get the rudiments in and you find out that the room isn't all right and they have an ARC break and they got a present time problem. And you're just a knucklehead if you go on running an ARC break and running a present time problem, and so forth. Just ask them directly.

"Well, what's your withhold?"

And the pc, "Well, I don't have any withhold."

Well, you clear it on a meter. Maybe it doesn't even register on the meter because they don't consider it a withhold. You see, a withhold is a withhold whether the pc considers it a withhold or not.

You know, there are laudable withholds. Laudable withholds. Have you ever not lost your temper with somebody? Well, that's a laudable withhold. You should be patted on the back, but you got a withhold.

You know, you can get awful mad at people you don't dare lose your temper with? Form 19 is either out or just out or will be in your hands shortly, and it covers all this. The Know to Mystery Security Check. And those are all laudable withholds.

Anyway, you've got a condition here of the pc didn't consider that he had a withhold from you but he was withholding something so you have to follow it up – you have to clarify this. "Well, did you think something you didn't tell me?"

"Oh, well, yes."

And your meter will fall off the pin.

"Oh, yes, yes. I did. I did. When you closed the window, you slammed it very loudly and I didn't tell you."

And all of a sudden he doesn't have an ARC break and doesn't have a present time problem and the room is all right and your rudiments are all in. From what? From just that crazy, tiny, little impulse, he broke his communication line with you. He severed it right at that point.

Now, if you're not looking for that type of withhold on your pc as an actual withhold and if you're not asking questions which get off that type of withhold at the beginning and during a session, you, of course, are having the devil's own time keeping rudiments in.

Because a pc is a busy, busy, busy little beaver. Figure, figure, figure, think, think, think, think, think. And you get some pcs that just have an avalanche like a critical circuit going all the time. And they're just sitting there natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter.

And they're looking at you, and of course they're getting madder and madder at you because of all the nasty things they're thinking about you. Well, logical, isn't it? Perfectly – the most logical thing in the world. What's more logical to get mad at somebody because you're mad at them? You see, that's the best reason in the world to get mad at somebody.

But of course, you won't get mad at somebody unless you're not being mad at them or you're carefully not being mad at them or you're carefully not offending them or you're carefully not. And if you get sufficiently, carefully not, believe me, you've got no ARC in all directions.

So, all right, now, I'll give you an example. This is an actual example of a session.

I was getting withholds in, in this session – I mean, getting the withholds pulled and getting them in view in this session – at the rate of two or three every five minutes. And this person had been audited quite a bit, but the package kept stopped – it stopped reading so I'd say "All right. Now, what have – what are you – what have you been busy thinking now? What have you invalidated now?"

"What are you withholding" in other words, I was also asking, although I apparently was asking, "What are you invalidating What were you thinking?" you know? "What reservation did you have about this?" and so forth. And they'd all of a sudden give me a withhold. And then I would vary this by asking for actual withholds; "Well, have you withheld anything from me during this session?" and so forth.

And the pc would think, you know, and the meter would go bang And the pc would say, "Oh, nothing Except – except right at the beginning of session . . ." or something stupid like this, you know.

They weren't really thinking critical thoughts about me. That was what was appalling about this. It was knocking the whole package out, but the person was actually not thinking anything that anybody would have ever considered a crime.

I've been meaning to tell you this for some time, that withholds are not confined to crimes. The amount of crime involved in the withhold does not establish the magnitude of the withhold. The amount of crime which you think the withhold has in it does not mean it has a magnitude of withhold. Do you follow me?

The quality of the withhold does not establish the magnitude of the withhold. And you might as well get that very plainly. It's the force with which they are withholding That is all. It's the amount that they are not informing, not the quality of what they are informing about.

All right. Now, I'll give you an example. A little kid sitting there; little kid wants you to like them, is rather dependent on you, wants something from you, and so forth. And all of a sudden the little kid has this appalling thought that you look awfully fat these days or something, you see? But the little kid says right away, "I mustn't say such a thing," don't you see?

And he's partially appalled at himself for thinking such a thought. And it occurred right then, you see, and he goes *nyaa-uggg,* you know? You can practically smell the rubber smoking, you know? And it makes quite a withhold. Get the idea? It's just the ferocity of the withhold, not the quality of it.

Now, a lot of people on Security Checking think if you can turn up some nice, juicy, antisocial crimes of some character or another in the pc – you can turn up some nice, juicy ones – why, you're all set, and the pc will get better. And then you find out that the pc raped the banker's daughter and hung her body in a tree and then hung it off on his best friend who got hanged as a result of it.

And you say now, of course, we've solved the case because look at the quality of this withhold. And he's sitting right there, and so forth, and it doesn't seem to bother him a bit. So we get appalled at this and we say, "Well, he . . ." Therefore, we explain it by saying this person must be awfully antisocial or terribly irresponsible. You see, it's not the quality of the withhold at all because we're liable to find – if we think that this is what constitutes a withhold, is the amount of crime or social reprehensibility contained in the withhold, then we're going to miss, miss, miss, miss, miss. Because he very well at some time on the track might have belonged to a society where the biggest crime you could have possibly committed against this particular society of girl rapers and murderers was to have let a girl stay alive. And that's the only thing they would have considered a crime, you see?

Like a thuggee in India. He doesn't kill his proper quota of people in any given month. And this would be a terrible thing, and he would be withholding this. And you would say, "What horrible crime have you committed?"

And he would look at you and he would say, "Well, there was a traveler rode down the road and there was a whole party of them following and they had not a gun amongst them. They had no protection of any kind. And I and three of my friends were standing there, and they went into camp and we want into camp, and we talked to them and we went away without killing them."

And he's liable to spill a grief charge. All kinds of misemotion is liable to come off of this thing. It's the omission of doing what – a now-I'm-supposed-to, you see.

So any time they omit doing a now-I'm-supposed-to, they consider themselves in trouble because that's against the mores of the society of thuggees, with Kali herself ready to take them apart as they step into the underworld, you see?

"And that's a pretty bum thing to do. And one of the merchants there was very affluent, and we didn't kill him and disembowel him."

That doesn't sound like the magnitude of the crime. That's the magnitude of the crime in reverse, isn't it?

So you cannot say with any pc, since the pc could just well be in the valence of a thuggee . . . Let's say he's a bank clerk, but let's say, as in many cases of countries that have conquered other countries, you get a bunch of people in the other country who are very anxious to get even with the conqueror. And the way to get even with a conqueror is go pick up a body and raise hell in that country. See?

I wouldn't go so far as to say that some of the upper-class English officials have occasionally been picked up by thetans of this character, but I would say that on a minor level it has happened, and so forth, like the secretary of the Treasury or something like that.

But it has happened. In any country which has been active in creating an empire and making any conquests, and so forth, can expect this as a normal course of human affairs. The people got awfully mad in the conquered country and they had no recourse at all but to – when they kicked off next time – to go over and pick up one in the conquering country. You can eventually wind up with an army which is almost totally composed of enemy soldiers. It's quite remarkable. It requires a considerable amount of study. The society doesn't realize what it's doing to itself with some of the unusual punishments which it undertakes.

And countries conquering other countries never realize what they're doing either. And if they make no provision for this kind of thing in their conquest and no provision in their reeducation and reorientation in the home country, of course, they're in trouble all the time.

This has been so bad on the whole track that factually people have – whenever a thetan was killed, he was supposed to come back and pick up a body, you see, at the base. That kind of thing, it's quite common. That's quite ordinary. And they used to have identifications and passwords. If somebody came back and picked up one of the bodies at base and didn't know the password, well, they got rid of him fast. That would sometimes give some of you an anxiety about recovering your memory.

One of the things you're trying to recover, of course, is the password. "This is X49C. The password today is 'spacecraft'. " Otherwise, of course, why, they'd just zap you out of existence. Your own folks, you know.

But anyway, not to make a long story out of it, it is not the quality of the withhold that you're in contest with at all. It is simply the degree that the pc is withholding it. And therefore, anything a pc is withholding constitutes a withhold, no matter if it's very laudable.

Now, you got a pc who is customarily trying to sock his auditor in the jaw, something like this, you can ask him, "Well, during this session, have you had any impulse to sock me in the jaw?"

"Yes, I did."

All right. You clear up eight of them and get the rudiments in. you get the idea? It is what the pc is not communicating that is the withhold. As soon as you can learn that as a fundamental definition of withholds and rudiments, and so forth, you will be security checking by definition and you will find some marvelous things start occurring

You'll get sessions in – *clank!* And all of a sudden, the pc will be running I was assessing an unassessable pc just on this basis right over in Washington, but every three, four minutes, I was sitting there getting off the withholds. And the pc was withholding the fact that it might be an overt for me to audit her because I was probably tired after the congress, you see?

And the pc thought and the pc thought and the pc thought, and a busy, busy, busy little pc. you see, they were all good, good deeds, you see. They were all kind things this pc was thinking and withholding them like crazy and would withhold one and knock the package out so that nothing would read and you couldn't null anything.

And then I'd get the withhold off and then for a – oh, I could get in there for about three, four minutes of nulling before all of a sudden I would say, "Well, something else has happened because the character of the needle pattern." And I asked the pc what they were withho- what she was withholding, and she would give me the withhold again, you got this? That's the way it was, I mean, it just went that way: one, two, three, four.

So you see, you're probably – if you're having any trouble security checking – you're probably looking for some quality of withhold. You're probably saying, "Well, if we could just find a good, slimy, solid rape-murder here, then this pc would recover."

Well now, if you think that's the case, then Security Checking is going to fail you. And it's going to fail you on this basis: because your expectancy was the quality of the withhold would give you the magnitude of the recovery.

You could say, "Well, if this pc got off a withhold of that tremendous magnitude, why, therefore, he should make a magnitudinous recovery," see? And therefore, your observation of the whole thing is completely unreliable. To you it's not comparable. So you think that Security Checking doesn't work or it's failing you, see? Because you think, well, if he got off this huge withhold and buried the body, and so forth, and never told anybody, got this withhold off, he ought to be sitting there mopping his forehead with a handkerchief, you see, and saying, *"Wheeew. I* feel so much better getting it off," and all of this kind of thing.

And you say, "Well, obviously."

Well, look. He'd only be doing that if he were worried about it. And you often get treated with this level of expectancy. You often get treated to another spectacle entirely.

"Yeah, well, I raped the girl and put her body in a culvert."

No handkerchief, no sweat on the forehead, no recovery, no reduction of the tone arm.

Oh, yes, the person was even withholding it, but not very much. So there was no magnitude of *withholding* There was only quality of crime in your mind. And here you're processing this fellow from upper Manchester, and you're saying, "Well, now, withhold, withhold, withhold. And did you withhold, withhold, withhold?"

And you're getting off withholds and they're not going anyplace. And you finally ask him – finally comes through to you that you're not getting off anything that the pc is withholding. The pc isn't withholding any of this. And it suddenly comes through to you, so of course, what's the difference?

Well, you still have to get it off – if the needle starts knocking, why, you have to get them off. But let's get smart about this time and find out what this pc considers a withhold, you know?

Well, one of the ways of doing that is, "What doesn't (eight dynamics) know about you?" See, that's the phrase question. "What doesn't (any one of the eight dynamics or any part thereof) know about you?" see? Or "What have you done," you see, "that God doesn't know about?"

And you could say this to the archbishop and he'd flip his wig, man. He'd have a ball right about that time. Probably find out the poor man has never – ever since he was made archbishop, he's never gone to bed on top of the bed. He's always had to go to bed under the bed because God could see what he was doing. Quite remarkable, you know.

You take somebody that's been deeply immersed in spiritualism on the seventh dynamic, and so forth. "What don't the spirits know about you?" And they get pretty shaken up. And they have taken some unusual measures to secure a small amount of privacy.

And you will ask some guy who is about three-quarters wogged in on electronics, or something like that, "What doesn't space know about you?" and the thing will fall off the pin. See? And you say, "Well, how could that be a withhold?"

Well, you find out he won't go out into space. He won't have anything to do with space, and he's withholding himself from space crazily. And as a matter of fact, the interesting part of it is, is the only way you have any gravity is by withholding yourself from space. It's quite amusing.

If you ran off a person's – all of a person's withholds on the sixth, they'd float, man. If you want to do a Houdini, why, just – or make a Houdini out of some pc, why, just roll up

your sleeves and get a Security Check on "don't knows" and "withholds from," and so forth, on all the elements of the sixth dynamic, you see?

If you want to make a very fine spiritualist, why, get it all cleaned up on the seventh. Very simple.

If you want somebody to do a Saint Francis of Assisi, why, clear him up on the subject of birds, you know?

And you could almost call your shots, you know. Once in a while you really miss on the fourth because you're so monomanic on the subject of being a human being that you don't realize that you're very often processing an ex-duck. And you'll find out that he has some very peculiar withholds on the subject. And, of course, an ex-seagull would have even more peculiar withholds.

But anyway, the person is doing what the person was, don't you see? So the fourth dynamic would be what specie a person had been most closely associated with rather than mankind because, you see, the fourth dynamic is simply a whole species of something, not mankind. Most people read it differently, you see?

You go back into the early descriptions of the fourth dynamic, well, it's ants or it's camels or it's palm trees or whatever unlikely thing the person might have had anything to do with.

And of course, the third. Now, we open up the ball. Now, we open up the ball because there are more groups than anything else. There have been more groups and more types of groups and more types of societies, and so on, that you could easily count. And every one of them has entirely different mores.

I imagine the Christian Science church of Boston would be shocked to discover that practically every Christian Science church in the world has a slightly different mores. See, they don't even all have the same mores, don't you see? But the one in Los Angeles, I'm sure, does not follow the mother church in Boston. I have no acquaintance whatsoever with Christian Science and the Christian Science church, but I have a large acquaintance with Los Angeles. I understand that Sydney and Cape Town share these honors in their respective continents. It always seems to be one of these cities.

Anyway, when you get into the third dynamic, you can't even say the goals, and so forth, of the thuggee because I imagine the thuggees of northern India and the thuggees of southern India – maybe it's Delhi that's the Los Angeles, or Calcutta. No, let's see. I don't know. Bombay is probably the Los Angeles of India. It would probably be entirely different, you see, in Bombay. There it's really an overt act to not let the corpses rot for a day or two before you bury them, you see? Up in the north country, why, it's merely a crime to not kill them, you see? It's gotten more complicated in Bombay, perhaps.

But you take the group after group after group after group as you go down the line, you are going to find uniformly and routinely that these groups are all different in their mores. So the moral codes by which they operate are not even constant from group to group.

Well, I imagine the Puritans of Holland and the Puritans of America were widely divergent in their mores although they were by label the same group.

So you get into a lot of randomity on the third dynamic. In fact, that is the greatest randomity known – is on the third dynamic. And there's where most of your Security Checking is done. So much so, and you get so concentrated on it and it's so complicated, that you forget the other seven dynamics. But they're – they exist and they're very fruitful sources of Security Checking

Now, your second dynamic, well of course, that defies all imagination – the amount of moral codes or immoral codes that can exist on the second dynamic! I was reading some books one time on the subject of the moral codes and sexual practices of some zone or area, and I think it was Zanzibar, and some psychiatrist, you know, knows that he will get all right if he goes out, you know, and collects enough obscene acts, you know, and catalogs them properly, he knows he'll be blessed in the insane asylum. So they always are doing this. And this – Freud, of course; old papa Freud rather, set the example, and so the boys can check these things off left, right and center, you know. And they've got all of these immoralities so well cataloged.

Well, of course, they followed this through – because psychiatry's a rather religious activity – they followed this through from the church. And the church, of course, has been death on creativeness, of course. Like in Ireland, you can't even get a PE course – in Ireland you can't get anybody in that course to give you a definition for "create." It's one of the harder jobs you would ever have. And that's just because the church has lain all over the top of them for so long

So that any overt, perforce, must have been a second dynamic action. I mean, it gets to that volume and violence, that an overt must, must have been on the second dynamic. If a person did anything to anybody anywhere, it must have been on the second dynamic. And you'll find an awful lot of people think that way.

I know it seems quite strange to your thinking, but that is – they couldn't think of any other type of overt. You could kill and slay and burn, but if it weren't with a sexual intent, it wouldn't be an overt, see?

As a matter of fact, matter of fact, some squirrel branches of psychoanalysis define overts all back into the second dynamic. If a person murders, it's because of sexual restimulation, see? If a person hangs somebody, well, it's because of a sexual bang of some kind or another, you know? It has nothing whatsoever to do – they're just – they got stuck on this one dynamic. So all overts and withholds must occur on that one dynamic.

Imagine a psychoanalyst beating his chops and his brains out, and so forth, in an office, and there's the pc on the couch, you see, and he's trying to find the pc's second dynamic withholds, you know? And he's just working at it. Just sweating, you know. And just – the perspiration running off of his brow. The pc only has withholds on the eighth dynamic. They didn't pray. The only type of withhold available on the whole case.

Yet they keep saying, "All right, now. Give me a detailed account of the amount of incest. Give me a detailed account of the amount of rape. What childhood activities didn't you engage in that you should have?"

And you get all this rolling along very nicely, only nothing happens. Case makes no recovery, keeps going this way. Psychoanalyst gets a total lose. Well, why does a psychoanalyst get a lose? He gets a lose only for one reason. Just one reason. He isn't asking for withholds in the zone where the pc has withholds. It's too glibly phrased to say he isn't asking for withholds that the pc considers withholds because, you see, I've already shown you the pc can have laudable withholds.

Pc doesn't consider them withholds. Doesn't consider anything wrong with them at all, but they're withholds. So you see, it's the zone of withholding If you want to consider it on the dynamics, why, you'll have a very good picture of it, don't you see?

And in Form 19, you've got it on the Know to Mystery Scale. And the Know to Mystery Scale gives you other fruitful zones of withholding.

All of this is quite interesting to follow down. But these are the fundamentals of Security Checking. It is what the pc is withholding And you can just redefine this from what the pc considers a withhold is because that doesn't work too well as a definition and this other works beautifully as a definition. And I've done quite a bit of work on it lately, which is what I'm trying to get you to catch up to. And that quite a bit of work demonstrates this one fact very conclusively: that a withhold is what the pc is withholding and it does not have to include what the pc considers is a withhold

So, therefore, the fellow who glibly tells you, "Oh, yes, I murdered her and threw her body in the culvert." He wasn't withholding it, was he? So it wasn't a withhold, see, by definition.

Well, if it knocks on the E-Meter needle, it's a withhold; plus if you can get it to knock on the E-Meter needle, it is a withhold; plus if the pc gained relief from telling you, it was a withhold. See, all those things are true.

Now, what do you mean when you say *withhold ?* Well, let's broaden the whole idea of withhold out as I've been doing lately and just say it is restraining self from communicating, and you've got it made. So you get a much better definition of a withhold. Do

you realize you've never had a definition of a withhold? It's restraining self from communicating

Now, the overt that goes immediately and directly with a withhold is restraining another from communicating. Of course, that will stack up to a withhold whether a person thinks it's a withhold or not.

Now, for instance, this fellow might have had a very good notion that the best way in the world to have gotten somewhere in the world was to have shot every policeman he saw. Every time he saw a policeman, shoot him. See, that's a natural course of human events. See a policeman, shoot him. And he was getting along well this way. Went along many lifetimes, all very successful, you see?

Then this valence dropped out and stayed out for many a millennia and eventually came in again. Only nowadays it is frowned on by his mother. In the old days his mother was made of stronger stuff, you see, brawnier mental material, and she used to pat him on the back and give him his porridge *only* if he had shot a policeman that day, you see? Something like that.

But this mother, this mother was raised in a different church, you see, and has different ideas about it, you see. And after all, things are sort of going down scale. And every time he has mentioned shooting a policeman, she has said, *"Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk. Mm-mm."*   And the guy goes around all the time withholding shooting policemen. And the more he withholds shooting policemen, the more he gets into the valence that shoots policemen. And there's the mechanics of the situation. And when you look at the basics of withholding, it doesn't matter *what* he is withholding, it is that he *is* withholding that counts.

Now, you see, mores, moral codes, all of these things add up into it, but to moral codes, you had better add patterns of behavior. So the moral codes are patterns of behavior of individuals or groups; or moral codes or patterns of behavior on all eight dynamics. And that takes in the whole confounded universe. And it means simply this: that you are triggering those moments when the pc was not communicating perforce, see?

He should have been singing and he was saying nothing That's the way it all adds up. He should be talking and he wasn't. That's what it amounts to. And that in essence is the ne plus ultra definition of a withhold.

Now, the ability of a thetan in this universe is expressed on the lines of reach and withdraw. Reach and withdraw. He is reached and withdrawn from and he reaches and withdraws from. There are four basic actions. There is another being who reaches toward him and withdraws from him, and then there is himself reaching toward another and withdrawing from another. And you have four actions.

Now, if you wanted to get real complicated, you go on right up into a five bracket and you can see the numbers of reaches and withdraws. And now if you want to get very, very complex about the thing, you can push it up into a fifteen-way bracket and now you can push it up to a thirty-way bracket and you can probably push it up, if you wanted to, into, oh, I don't know, a sixty-four bracket? I don't know how many . . .

Somebody was counting these up one time here in England, and I think he got tired. I've forgotten how high he got. But it was a high level.

Now, each one of those is a direction of a reach and a withdraw. See, that's a direction, and so forth.

Now, when the person should be reaching and is withdrawing, that's a withhold. Simple? That's a rough one. And that will come off with velocity.

Then you get the withholds of omission and he should be reaching and he's not. And that's just a withhold of omission and is not really of the same value as the one when he should be reaching and he is withdrawing.

I'll give you an idea. This individual will really bang on it. Let's find some war. Let's take almost any pc and let's find some war in which they were a soldier. And let's find an incident where they should have been – they received orders to attack, and they ran like hell. Well, armies consider this sufficiently important that they always shoot them when they do this kind of thing, although I always thought it was rather interesting.

Studies of tactics include having troops run like hell. As a matter of fact, the famous British Major Tarleton in South Carolina met his doom on just such a maneuver. The enemy troops were instructed to run like hell until his dragoons were caught in an enfilade fire.

So you see, it isn't the fact of running away, then, that is reprehensible. It's the reverse of the now-I'm-supposed-to. See, the person is supposed to be attacking and runs away. All right. He is withholding his whole body. Now you got a rough one.

All right. Now, he's supposed to be running away and he runs away. So what? He's supposed to keep his mouth shut and he keeps his mouth shut. So what? See, that doesn't amount to a withhold, see, if it adds up to his I'm-supposed-to's.

But on the other hand, you can get a very profitable set of withholds off a child which are quite interesting because it seems to improve the child, but that's the only reason you could say so. you run the other side of the bracket – people who didn't want the child to talk. Well, children are so outflowing that all this restrained communication puts a withhold in from the other side of the picture and adds it up so the child then starts withholding on other things of his own volition and you'll get things rather tangled up. But it gets assisted by the inflow on the child of "you mustn't talk."

Well, add all that up and what does it amount to? It amounts to failure to communicate with the environment, or restrained communication with the environment which, of course, winds up with not being here in the environment, which winds up with being – having the environment pulled in on oneself, which winds up with any other condition that you could possibly think of.

And insanity itself is simply must reach-can't reach, must withdraw-can't withdraw, just a built up ridge.

In other words, double sets of overts and withholds will produce the same mechanism.

In other words, he should have been shooting Germans and he wasn't, you see? But at the same time, why, he wasn't supposed to be shooting Germans and he did. you see, this would compound the felony and get it all mixed up in circles. And either one of them he might not communicate to anybody about, which would then constitute a withhold which is charged up with both of these contrary acts. you get this thing really going in circles after awhile.

You could ask somebody, "Well, what should you have communicated?"

Marvelous question. Doesn't apparently lead to anything at first glance. It's a marvelous pattern withhold question. Marvelous Security Check question. "What *should you have communicated?*" You're liable to take in a pc who's been running at a normal one division drop, and he falls off the pin on the thing He really has a ball with this thing He winds the tone arm around twice and comes out and a small cuckoo jumps out of the sensitivity knob.

In other words, you get action here. What should he have communicated? You didn't even say "and didn't." See, that's the trick question. What should he have communicated?

You can also get the same thing of "Where should you have been?" But, of course, this is an operating, full effort withhold, see, "Where should you have been?"

Well, you didn't even say that "you should have been there" or anything, and he will instantly leap to this conclusion, complete the whole situation just as you did a moment ago. He'll instantly complete the question. He knows that you meant that he should have been there. He would know that you meant he should have said and spoken and what he should have said and spoken, and so forth. But all you're asking is what should he have communicated. Not to anybody, and so forth. And you'll get an immediate response. Why? Because it sits on top of a withhold.

You see what you're fishing for.

All right. If your Security Checking is done in the perimeter of those definitions and understandings, it'd be very, very successful. And if your Security Checking is just done by a

wooden, wound-up doll proposition of "What are you withholding? Thank you. All right. Good. Thank you very much."

And the pc sits there and the pc says, "I'm not withholding anything" The E-Meter's not very lively or operative, you see. "What are you withholding.?"

You're getting a rise, and you keep on getting the same rise, and so on, you see?

"Well, what are you withholding"

"I'm supposed to ask you this question. It says over here on the sheet, 'What are you withholding?' All right. It doesn't produce any reaction on the E-Meter, does it? That seems to do it then."

Of course, the package doesn't read, and nothing reads, and you can't get the rudiments to read, and the pc won't talk to you, but you've done your duty.

No, you haven't done your duty until you've applied the fundamentals of the mind. And then you've done your duty.

Now, a very withholdy pc will stack up withholds on top of withholds, which is quite interesting. If they've got a set of withholds on a subject, then the tiniest, tiniest impulses to withhold will remain as withholds. So you see that mechanism all the time. This pc has critical thoughts, critical thoughts, critical thoughts, critical thoughts. Well, he's got some withholds behind all these critical thoughts, you see.

But for the purpose and sake of auditing, if you're not doing Security Checking, then it is perfectly valid for you to say to a pc, "What are you withholding"

And you get no fall, you get no needle reaction, go on. Because he doesn't know he's withholding anything But don't make the mistake of believing he's not withholding, because he is. He definitely is.

See, you got your rudiments in, and the pc – you didn't get a fall on the meter. You don't now have a missed withhold, see, to contend with. you obeyed all the rules of the game and you've got the pc now into session and going along fine.

But if you've made the assumption at that moment that the pc isn't withholding anything, then you're bats because the pc undoubtedly has some laudable withholds. This alone. This for sure. The pc has a withhold. He's being very nice. He's being in-session, see? The pc's sitting in the chair. He'd rather have sat over by the window and looked out through the window but he's sitting in the chair. Actually, he's withholding himself from sitting at the window. But he considers this a laudable withhold.

He's very happy because he's complying with what you want him to do and he classifies it all up under the subject of control and he's very cheerful about it and he won't get mad at you and everything is fine. But don't make the mistake of believing he doesn't have a

withhold because he does. He'd rather sit over by the window. He's withholding himself from sitting over by the window. No matter how lightly he's withholding himself, it's still there, you see?

Of course, that withhold possibly doesn't amount to anything unless all of a sudden the pc starts getting upset in the session from other causes. Now, you have to go back and pull the withhold that didn't register. It didn't register because it wasn't a withhold that he knew about. But it *was* a withhold.

And he all of a sudden goes out of session and you apparently have all the rudiments in, but you had all the rudiments in, but there was a withhold.

Now, "rudiments in" merely means in condition to be audited. That's all that means. If you always have to audit somebody through a present time problem who has one, this is a *reductio ad absurdum* and a piece of nonsense.

This fellow who's sitting there, he's got a set of crutches, well, you couldn't audit him at all, could you, because he obviously has a present time problem. He doesn't consider it a present time problem or a problem that is here and now although it is here and now. But he doesn't consider it so *at the moment* is the only thing that gets you by the withhold and gets you into the session.

But sooner or later, if you start ARC breaking him and upsetting the thing in general, and the pc isn't making any progress, you'll go back and you will find that there's always been a withhold on the subject that he had a present time problem. Because of course he had a present time problem. He has two crutches, doesn't he? And it's a hell of a job getting around. Of course, he has a present time problem.

Now, it doesn't register, however, as a present time problem, so you go on and get your auditing done because he isn't thinking about it. But you could stir up all manner of withholds on a case.

If your purpose was to use the rudiments to audit the case, you could always find the rudiments out. you could always shove... I can take any case right after you've checked the case, or one of the Instructors checked the case, and I could show you that all the rudiments are out.

You've just checked it for the auditor that the rudiments are in. The Instructor has just checked it for the rudiments, the rudiments are in, and so forth. And I could give you one of these "PDH the cat" routines and show you conclusively that the rudiments are out. I could sell the pc on the rudiments being out quicker than scat. See?

"Well, have you had an ARC break? Do you have an ARC break?"

"No." There's no response. That's what you've been asking and what the Instructor asked.

And I would say, "Well, have you had an ARC break lately?"

And the pc would say, "Well, yes, as a matter of fact. I was quite cross with the auditor yesterday," and so forth.

Now, I don't ask has that been handled, you see. I say, "Well, are you still feeling a little bit – well, just a little bit cross with the auditor?"

In other words, I'd pull the ARC break in present time from yesterday, don't you see? And then infer that it's happening now in a sort of a curve, and the pc would consider it and some casual observer would say, "Well, gee, you know, those rudiments are out. That's all there is to it."

Well, I put them out, see, overtly put them out. And "All right. Now, do you have a present time problem?" I get no reaction of any kind whatsoever. He isn't thinking he has a present time problem. That's the only thing you can say about it.

I could say, "Well, do you mean there's nothing wrong with you in this whole world?"

And the pc would immediately say, "Well, put it that way, I don't have much money."

"All right. Well, now, have you thought about that in the last few days? Do you think you'll be thinking about that in the future at any time? Well, could that apply to this session? Might your attention slide forward in the session?"

And I could completely sell the pc and sell anybody else observing, "Well, good God, these rudiments are way out. How could he possibly be audited?"

In other words, all these things are there latently and could be pulled into view, and your purpose in getting them in – your purpose in getting them in – is, of course, to cruise across the lot of them to where the pc's mind isn't on any of them and get the session going. And that's the only reason that you're running rudiments in the first place. And you don't want the pc ARC broke or upset during the middle of the session; well, the best way to guarantee it is to make sure the rudiments are in. But because you've got the rudiments in doesn't mean these things don't exist. And that's the only point I'm trying to make to you.

So if you can cruise across them this lightly in the rudiments – you say to this person, you say, "Well, are you withholding anything"

And he says, "No," and you get absolutely no reaction on the meter.

And then you say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

And he says, "Yes."

And you do get a reaction on the meter, well, then the rudiment which went just before that must have been out. You'd say, "Must have been out."

No, it wasn't out, you see? He couldn't have a present time problem unless he was withholding something so then obviously the withhold question is positive, not negative. But it didn't register because, of course, you didn't stir anything up, see?

You could have tackled it this way, you see, and you'd have found it way out.

"Do you have – are you withholding anything? All right. Nothing Thank you very much. Well, have you been worried about anything or anybody lately?"

Now, the guy is going to have a present time problem in just a minute, see?

"Have you been concerned about anything? Has your attention been on anything at all?" and so forth.

And he finally says, "Well, yeah. Matter of fact, attention's been on the boss quite a bit lately, and so forth and so forth. I've been thinking about my pay raise and whether I was ever going to get it or not."

And you say right promptly, "Well, is that a present time problem?" you know, hopefully.

And the fellow says, "Well, yes, come to think about it, come to think about it, it is. Hmm."

Now, you say, "Well, now are you withholding anything from the boss?"

"Well, yes. As a matter of fact, I haven't asked him for the pay rise."

"All right, then. Were you withholding anything when I asked you the question?"

"Oh," he'd say, "well, what do you know, I . . ."

He's guilty now, you see.

In other words, you could throw those rudiments into a cocked hat. The best way to clear up rudiments, of course, is to clear up the exact rudiments that are out. And to go through the rudiments like a little tin soldier on parade. You know, *"Brrrt-bup-bup!* Thank you. *Brrrt-bump-bump.* Thank you. *Brrrt-bump-bump.* What was the fall? Good. *Brrrt-bump-bump.* That's flat now. Thank you very much. *Brrrrt-bump-bump.* Now, we'll begin the session."

That's the best way to get through the rudiments. But that isn't the way you security check.

You security check quite differently. You security check more or less in the light I was trying to show you, you could always throw the rudiments out.

You always try to throw the rudiments out on the Security Check. Now, take that cautiously. But you get the idea? You use that same proceeding.

You're saying in effect, "Are you withholding anything on some dynamic or zone of action?" and so forth, whatever else you're saying.

And the pc says, "No."

And you say, "Well, do you mean you've never withheld anything on this?"

"Oh, well, that's a different proposition. You say I never withheld. Yes, well, I have had a withhold at one time or another on this subject. But that's all settled now" – fall on the needle.

And you say, "Well, what was that withhold?"

"Well, I've never told anybody that."

"Well, all right. Tell me now."

"Well, I don't know that I should tell you now, but, *ahhh,* here it is," you see?

In other words, you can throw rudiments out by implication. Do you see that? And therefore, you can get ahold of withholds by stirring up the bank.

Now, if you sit there running withholds the way I was telling you to run rudiments, of course, you won't get anything off the case.

If you run withholds with, *"Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you. *Brrrm-bumbump.* Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you. *Bmm-bum-bump."*

Well, you see he's clean, I mean, perfectly clean. But don't let me get ahold of that pc immediately afterwards because I'll show you some withholds. There's a question there: "Have you ever been mean to your wife?"

And he got off a couple of withholds, and so forth. And he doesn't now consider that any withholds are missed. It's all right. It's clean, you see? He doesn't think any withholds are missed. And it's all right. And that question will sit in place unless something drastic happens because he's still worried about his wife.

So, you say, "Well, have you *ever* withheld anything from your wife?"

You see, you've asked him, "Are you withholding anything from your wife?" you see. you know, that's *brrrm-bum-bump.* Like a rudiment question, you see? *Boom, you* see? "Thank you."

See, *brrrm-bum-bump,* now, all right. *Bang!* He says, "Well, I withheld the fact that I really wasn't at the club last night, that I was at the billiard parlor," or something, see?

And you say, "Thank you. Now, are you withholding anything from your wife?"

"No."

"All right. Now, it's all right. Okay. Good."

You go to your next question.

And you see that you could do this same gruesome trick that I was just showing I could do. Get ahold of this pc. It's a null question. You say, "Well now, what would be the consequences of communicating to your wife?"

Let's do it by fundamentals, see, let's not do it by rote.

"What would be the consequences of communicating with your wife?"

"Oh, nothing I could tell her most anything *Most* anything."

You say, "Most anything. Well, very good. Well, what is included on the ones you couldn't, you know? What's the rest of it from the most?"

And he says, "Well, that's another thing."

And your needle starts to get very restive now.

"Well, all right. Well, what couldn't you communicate to your wife about?"

"Well, I actually couldn't . . . Got a letter the other day from a girl that I said goodbye to a long time ago and promised my wife I'd never have anything to do with again. And if I told her about that – I wouldn't be able to tell her about such a thing, and so forth."

Well, you come in triumphantly on the end of this thing and say, "Well, are you withholding that from your wife right now?"

"Well, as a matter of fact, *ha-ha-ha, ha-ha-ha-ha, ha-ha-ha-ha,* as a matter of fact, I am, you know. Hadn't realized it, you know."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. Now, what else wouldn't you be able to communicate to your wife about?"

Good enough. And you're going to find out that he's got a whole stack of withholds, and you can sit there and get them all off by rote. you don't have to know anything much except what can't he communicate about where.

You could run a whole Security Check by just taking and writing down all the parts of the eight dynamics. And just going down the line and finding out where the pc couldn't communicate at all and what he's withholding from them. And you'd produce some fantastic gains on the pc. But after you've stirred them up, you've got to pull them.

But the auditor, in doing Security Checking, must realize that he has a mission, and *le. mission is* not to find the withholds so much as stir them up so the pc can find them, too. And the difficulty you're having in this – in pulling withholds, and so forth – is you're trying to pull withholds the way you find out if the rudiments are in, *"Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you."

You know, hopeful that nothing happens, see? Well, God, you must be hopeful that nothing happens in the rudiments. I tell you, I myself always sort of hold my breath from

beginning of session, you see, until I finally said that fateful word, "problem," and a good, solid, Tone 40 "Thank you." I try not to get too much relief showing in the final acknowledgment of the rudiments or too much speed going in, "Well, all right. Now, we'll run this process on you if it's okay," you know.

And sometimes the Model Session goes all to pieces at that point, you see, because I'm so elated; we got through the rudiments and we're really going to do some auditing here and everything is fine and here we go.

Oh, that's not the mood with which you approach Security Checking. The way you approach Security Checking is quite differently. You approach it as an auditing session and an auditing session is supposed to reach into the mind and pull out string after string like the magician pulls all of the magic flags out of his breast pocket and out of his sleeve, and out of the finger ring; just thousands and thousands of flags coming out of thin air, you see?

Well, you're supposed to find material when you security check because that is the stuff of which aberration is made. And the way you security check is as suggestively as you possibly can. But don't be like the psychoanalyst and decide from your own past what the pc's withholds will be. That is quite fatal.

You could do a Dynamic Assessment on the pc and get a Dynamic Security Check. Well, you don't have to be that crude. You could be much more fundamental. You wouldn't even have to have a form in front of you to do some of the most fantastic Security Checking you'd ever done in your life.

Just say, "Well, all right." Just watch the meter very carefully. Say, "I'm going to run a little set of items. Thank you very much. Now, just sit there quietly. Don't say a word. Shut up. Ah, that's good. Thank you. All right. Now, God. Spirits." You know?

And right on down through the first dynamic. Got a *bang* on one.

And you say, "Well, tricky, man. All right. Fourth dynamic. Mm-hm. Mankind. Good enough. That's very good. That's what you said, and that's what you got a fall on. Very good. All right. What doesn't mankind know about you?"

"What doesn't *mankind* know about me? Well, they don't know *anything* about me."

"Good. That's more like it." Now, let's get in there and kick, you know? "Now, what have you done that mankind wouldn't like?"

"Oh, well, first and foremost amongst these, I have to confess I've been a man. Oh, and that's not allowed."

"Well," you say, "well, that's very interesting," and you can carry right on down through the line.

You can just find not-know, not-know, not-know. "What have you done to – ?" "What wouldn't they like about it?" "What wouldn't this happen?" "What wouldn't that happen?" You got the whole thing all taped out in front of you. In other words, you've got the whole thing mapped.

You found a dynamic he was hot on. You'll find it'll only run for about twenty minutes on one dynamic before it shifts dynamic, I must warn you.

You don't sit there for a Dynamic Assessment for a twenty-five hour intensive. It's going to vanish on you in something on the order of one hour or two hours at the absolute outside. You've got to shift to another dynamic and then shift to another dynamic. Every time it starts going cool, shift to something else.

You'd have that case roaring But it's your job to find withholds and therefore your job to stir up withholds and therefore your job to get imaginative on where you're going to locate the withholds. And then, of course, you are bound by this consideration: that you mustn't miss any.

But what is a – what is "missing a withhold" mean? It means that something that falls on the meter and the pc thinks he's getting away with.

So therefore, the easiest way to handle missed withholds is just to clear any question you're asking and then say, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and watch for the fall on the meter. If you get none, you've not missed a withhold on him even though there are eight thousand more, because he doesn't think you've missed a withhold on him.

If he doesn't think you've missed a withhold on him, you have not missed a withhold on him. That is all, you see?

"Have I missed a withhold on you?" does not register on the meter, then you haven't. Simple as that. But you can always stir up withholds. You can always stir them up. And you ought to.

But you really, basically, should security check by definition, by fundamental. There are areas into which this person cannot reach. There are areas into which this person has reached that he shouldn't reach. You must get those things off the case. And all of a sudden he starts straightening out and the first thing that reacts, of course, is his communication. He goes more into session.

If you're doing Security Checking wrong, if you're doing *"Brrrm-bumbump. Thank you. Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you. *Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank *you. Brrrm-bum-bump.* Thank you,"* and think you're security checking, ah, well, you're not because the pc is going out of communication, not going into communication. Getting withholds off frees up the pc's communication line.

And the first place it's to manifest, of course, is in the auditing session.

So that's the long and short of Security Checking. Those are the bases of Security Checking. Those are the fundamentals with which you operate on Security Checking. And I wouldn't really consider that you were much of an auditor unless you could audit straight against fundamentals.

Very dangerous to teach an auditor to do anything else but audit against fundamentals and so you should know something about that.

And the next time you're security checking a pc – which will be in the very near future, in fact in the matter of an hour or two – you should try this on for size.

"What were you withholding?" "What doesn't (something) know about?" "What are the dynamics – are you out on?" "Now, what Security Check question should somebody have stirred up so that it would have been a withhold?"

In other words, realize that the auditor is monitoring them, dealing them through, and ready to grab them. And then you're going to see relief, providing, of course, you run adequate Havingness along with them to restore the pc's ability to reach after you've got off the reason he couldn't reach. And you'll see some miraculous things happening with pcs. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Thank you.