

WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on
6 February 1962

Thank you. Well, what did you think of the TV, huh?

Audience: Great. Good.

Think that will work out?

Audience: Yes.

Did any of you shudder at the thought of your overts suddenly showing – turning up on that circuit, huh? You did slightly, huh? Yeah. I think it will work out just fine providing we can find a totally indestructible pc. Yeah.

Okay. And this is the what of what?

Audience: 6th of Feb.

Well, make up your minds. It's the 6th, the 13th.

Audience: 6th.

It is the 6th. You guarantee this? All right, 6 February AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, I have some very interesting material here today, completely aside from everything else that's happened to you – some very interesting material. I finally equated why the missed withhold and the withhold is so interesting. So this is a lecture about withholds. What's a withhold? How come? And it equates right back to 1938.

Now, you should realize that any truth that has any distance or is going to get anything done with cases and so forth, actually equates against the dynamic principle of existence, Book One. The dynamic principle of existence is Survive.

If you look over Scientology and Dianetics, you'll find that that was the one breakthrough and although it was a rather elementary and simple breakthrough, it nevertheless is the basic pin of structure.

And I have found out over the years, it didn't matter when, that when a principle finally went back to Survive and all of a sudden it was an amplification of Survive, why, it suddenly worked like mad on pcs and was the cause of a great deal of this and that with pcs.

And all of this became very interesting to me when I put up my long ears and heard the back echo of this. Withholds equate to survive.

Now, this, at the same time, this is one of those points where a great deal of theory falls together and at the same moment, we have this – we have this: We have the reason why 3D Criss Cross works because we have the reason why an identity is aberrative. It could be said that an identity is that accumulation of withholds which make an individuation. Amazing, isn't it?

An identity is that accumulation of withholds which cause an individuation. And therefore, when you're auditing 3D Criss Cross, you're doing a Class II skill in gross lots. You see, you pick up an identity, you isolate an identity on which other identities are appended and pinned and you have at once gotten rid of 8,672,945 to the 21st power withholds all in one fell list.

Now you, right where you sit right here at this moment have an identity. So of course, you've got one part of 3D Criss Cross already done.

When we look at the pc and we say, “What's your name?” and the pc says, “My name, him Joe,” you've got one 3D Criss Cross item, “Joe.” Shocking, isn't it? There's a 3D Criss Cross item, “Joe.” A hundred thousand years from now somebody will be auditing him. Isn't that an entertaining thought, you know. They'd have to run you out of you. “Well, how come you're Joe?”

Rather high-toned space opera societies and so forth, you don't even read the numbers on their chests. You see, these doll bodies are turned out in gross lots, you know? Like a high-toned department store turns out a bunch of identical dolls for the kids, you know? But these things are turned out just pocketapocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. They all look alike. All of them are alike. There isn't one shade of difference from one body to the next, not a hair.

And yet people in space opera recognize each other rather easily. Isn't that interesting? How do they manage that? Well, it must be they recognize a person from his beingness, not his identity.

So where you have to recognize a person from his identity, there can't be much beingness present. See?

So that's what makes a 3D item. A 3D item is maximal identity, minimal beingness. And every once in a while, you get identity crossed with beingness and you have an historic character. But remember, it isn't his identity that makes him an historic character. It's his beingness.

So an identity is always bringing up the rear. It's always a minor affair. An identity does not amount to a hill of beans.

I myself have erred in this direction time and time and time and time again. I used to have a standard operating procedure over in Europe. What you do is accumulate yourself a God-awful identity, see. You'd accumulate yourself an identity of this particular type of being able to go down to the lists and knock everybody's head off, you see. Or you know – and you get yourself the current championship ladies' stocking for Europe, you know? They wore ladies' stockings then. They wear diamond belts today. I mean, about the same difference.

And just go down and every time there was any kind of a – of a tilt or anything like that, you see, accumulate yourself a little more identity.

You'd finally get it up to a point where all you had to do was ride up outside of a castle, something like this, you see, if you were for the Crown or something and you'd say, “Well, I'm so and so. Open up the gates.”

And whoever the robber baron was that was resisting all law and order, you see, he would say “*Roow*.” And all of his young squires would say, “Gee, John L. Sullivan's down there, you know.” Same atmosphere, you know?

They wouldn't do a thing for him. They'd go down and open up the gates. That's an identity. “Wild Bill” Hickok, Wyatt Earp. The television play this up to the nines. You get the idea? Identity. I've used it on other parts of track. Walk into the Senate, they say, “Now, shut up. That's so-and-so talking, see.” And immediately you had silence, see?

Other people talked and everybody else was talking at the same time. No, *bang!* You see, identity did it. That's the mistake. That's a mistake. That's a mistake you've made and that's a mistake I've made on and on and on.

They didn't shut up because of the identity, ever. They shut up because of the beingness. You could reach further and influence more than other people around, so you did. And that's as simple as that.

But the identity side of it was to be more of a lump of than anybody else which totally defeats the reach. So if you conceive of beingness as the ability to permeate, pervade, communicate to, fill up an area and identity as a method of not having to – see, it puts it on automatic, doesn't it?

They say, “Well, he fills up an area because his name is Bill or Sir Tristram or something, so then as Bill or Sir Tristram, you don't have to go to any trouble. You're just lazy on the whole subject, you see. Because the eagle that you're known by painted on your chest or the typical cut of your toga or something like that is not going to fill up any area. That's not going to fill up any area. Only you can fill up the area.

So what you've done is get a substitute for communication, a substitute for reach so that you could qualify an identity as a substitute for reachingness and a beingness as a reachingness. So these two things are contra, one against the other, you see?

An identity is reach on automatic and a beingness is reaching, you know. And by this – by beingness I mean our Scientological aspect of beingness. That is to say you *know*, the fellow really does it. He is doing it. You get the idea? It's because he *is* somebody that you do something It's because he *is* doing it. That's entirely different.

Now, that's a current activity. Beingness would be a current activity and identity would be a past activity. This fellow climbed the Matterhorn, therefore, he is famous. His whole value is climbing the Matterhorn when he is climbing the Matterhorn. That is his beingness, you got it? But identity is “the fellow who climbed the Matterhorn.”

Now, in view of the fact that the only thing that this universe punishes is being there and communicating – the only things this universe punishes is being there and communicating. Universe is incapable of punishment in the absence of those two factors. If a person isn't there, he can't be punished and if a person doesn't communicate, he can't be punished, you see?

So the universe is an anti-beingness universe and a pro-identity universe. This universe favors identity so it can punish.

All right. Now, let's equate a withhold. What is a withhold? A withhold is a not-reachingness. It's many other things. Don't make that into a technical thing because there's more here. That's not all of it.

What's a withhold? Elementary, my dear Watson.

A withhold, reversely, would be holding onto a piece of information which would damage survival. A preservation of identity. The self-preservation of an identity. Now, you have to remember that a thetan can't be hurt. A thetan can only get connected with something that connects with something that connects with something and then he gets himself onto the circuit.

So here is the thought involved in this: That a person withholds to preserve himself. You do not tell the police that you really did park three hours in the no parking zone, you see? You say, “I just arrived.”

Now, why do you withhold that information? That is the police could lessen your *survival* if they found it out. Correct?

All right. The police could lessen your survival if they found it out. Now, therefore, the withholds which you have are things which you feel, rightly or wrongly, that if you let them be known, they would reduce your survival.

That is, they would decrease your reputation or identity; people would think less of you – this is all part of the same thing, you see – people would think less of you if they knew and so on. So that withholds go into that category.

We've made the step now above the idea of a withhold being totally a matter of mores. Now, we've gone a little bit further and we have a little bit better rationale. And that rationale is that a withhold is something a person believes had better be withheld because, if he didn't withhold it, it would reduce his survival as, of course, an identity.

If you were building an identity on repute – nothing wrong with this. It's a standard trick of the universe. Your credit is good. People think well of you, you see. All of those various things which go into repute. It's a standard trick of the universe. I mean, you can't even live in this universe without this trick – in a body. And if you're – if you are working to enhance your repute to be a good citizen, a member of the community, a person on whom people can depend, a person who has good job references, you got the – all of the rest of this sort of thing You got your nose clean with the government so it'll pay your old-age pension, you know, that kind of thing. All of these things. You've never been known to vote for law and order. You always wanted what the government wanted. And – but what are you doing there? You're building up a survival identity. All these things build up a survival identity. Nothing wrong with this, of course.

All right. So you withhold those things which would depress this survival identity. So you withhold such things as: You always upheld the government except that time you refused to go to the polls and vote, refused to pay your taxes, refused to uphold the government's desire to savage somebody. You see, all these things that you didn't do, you don't let the government in on, see.

You tend to tuck those in against your bosom because this would hurt your reputation with the government. You see?

In other words, it would injure your self-preservation, so therefore you withhold them. If these things were known, you wouldn't be worth two whoops in hell, you think.

Well now, a thetan goes on the cautious side of this, so he always withholds more than he has to. And naturally, all withholds, then, are built uniformly on the basis of self-preservation. The source and cause of any withhold is self-preservation. That's it. I mean, that's your technical fact. Withholds, self-preservation. Self-preservation, withhold.

Well, let's put it as graphically as this. You've got a body and you're facing a buzz saw. And you withhold your body from the buzz saw and you don't lose a body, see. But if you didn't withhold your body from the buzz saw, it goes bzzz and you haven't got a body. You got that? It's that elementary.

Well, it's built on the mechanical force factors of this universe. Trying to preserve form, trying to preserve the form of a body, trying to preserve these things about a body, you see; and therefore, you withhold and protect, take care of, be responsible for, all the other things stem out from that, that we're so accustomed to using in processing.

All these other things parade out from this fact: selfpreservation. Now, selfpreservation, of course, is a misnomer. A thetan doesn't have to preserve himself. It would be silly for a thetan to even try to preserve himself. A thetan is only involved in preserving an identity. So self-preservation is a misnomer in that it shouldn't be selfpreservation. It should be the – identity preservation. Preservation of an identity.

So now let's cross straight into 3D Criss Cross and say with one fell swoop, then any identity which remains in suspension in the bank is the direct product of identity preservation. See, that's saying – well, it proves itself. It's there, isn't it? You can find this identity in the individual. You find this 3D Criss Cross item in the individual, so therefore the basic denominator in that item must have been it was preserving itself. If it was preserving itself, it's there. If it wasn't preserving itself, it isn't there.

In other words, the basic effort then of any identity is to preserve itself. Hence, we find these suspended 3D Criss Cross items starting with the person's own identity right now. Joe, Bill, Pete, Mary, Agnes. It doesn't matter what it is. This person is busy preserving Joe, Bill, Pete, Mary, Agnes, you see, right now.

To give you a reality on this, have you done anything in the last week – answer this question – have you done anything in the last week whatsoever to prolong your life?

Audience: Yes.

You have. All right. Now, what do you suppose is going to happen to the mental energy mass, which is this life, when you contact it? It will be prolonged, of course. Now, think of this last week as a section of time which somebody contacts a thousand years from now. Well, look it over now. A thousand years from now, they contact this little minute section of track. Of course, it doesn't amount to a hill of beans, you see. It isn't aberrative in any way, but actually those things that would be stuck – now, let's be very technical – would only be those points where you failed to preserve your life. That would really be stuck because it's the failed postulate. See?

But the postulate impulse, of course, was to preserve your life whether it won or lost. You see how that would be? Therefore, a death hangs up more than a life.

You see, here's a person's full integrity, his full power as a being, his full power as a thetan. Regardless of what this power could go into – . It's almost unthinkable right now to you that power could go into anything but selfpreservation, if you're looking at it and I got this all restimulated with you, you see? Well, what would a thetan concentrate on if the thetan wasn't concentrating on the preservation of self or one of the dynamics? What would he be concentrating on, you see? Of course, he'd be concentrating on one of these things, you can say to yourself. But at the same time, only those points would hang up where the individual has postulated it and has failed. And those are always the hang-up. The failed postulate

mechanism is, of course, senior to all of these mechanisms that I'm talking to you about at the moment.

It is much worse – you'd probably get no repercussion whatsoever for knocking a Gorgon's head off because, you see, that whole cycle of action came out. You intended to preserve yourself and not to preserve the Gorgon. And your intention, of course, was carried out in that you did preserve yourself and didn't preserve the Gorgon. See, so therefore, we try to find something wrong on the track when we collide with the knockout of a Gorgon. Find an incident knocking the Gorgon's head off and so on; it doesn't hang up at all. See, the expectancy is carried along the time track. One expects to knock the Gorgon's head off, he does knock the Gorgon's head off and that's all there is to it.

All right. Now, let's just get a little bit more complicated about this and one attempts to knock the Gorgon's head off and misses. And the Gorgon goes chomp and that is that. Now, that was not in the cards. That was an alter-is of the person's own postulate. And being an alter-is of the postulate, it tends to then make its own time track and so hang up in time.

Failing to knock the Gorgon's head off is the only sin, unless – now, let's go over and look at this other little mechanism – unless it was a sin to knock off Gorgons' heads. Supposing it was the king's private Gorgon and huntsmen are riding north and south and east and west, gamekeepers and so forth, wanting to know, who knocked the block off of the king's Gorgon because they're gonna 'ang 'im. They have a special piece of 'emp preserved for 'is 'ead.

And the person who knocked the Gorgon's head off makes the immediate survival computation. The immediate survival computation is, of course, to withhold. “*I will not tell him I knocked off the Gorgon's head because they will hang me.*”

No, “They will hang this identity,” was a much more accurate statement, “So I better not tell them because they will hang this identity,” see? So that's that.

It doesn't hang up right now. Doesn't hang up one identity, but it sure hangs it up on the time track.

Now, you're galumphing down the time track as an auditor looking around for pieces to snufflaccate and all of a sudden you get this odd picture of the head of a Gorgon, see. Individual goes up and down the time track and every time he comes around this section of anything, here's this Gorgon's head.

All right. There was nothing aberrative about knocking off the Gorgon's head. See, the Gorgon was going to eat you up or you were going to eat the Gorgon up and you wound up your strong right arm and you whopped the Gorgon and it knocked his head off and that's what you intended to do, and that's what happened and so forth. You see, there's no – there's

no hang-up there. I mean, that will just slide right on through on the time track because it's the postulate and so forth.

One has to have considerations about the evil of knocking off Gorgons' heads.

Now, instead of running the incident, if you just did this, the whole thing springs free. "What was wrong with knocking Gorgons' heads off?"

Or we just find this head floating in space, we ask some nebulous question such as "Well, what would you withhold about that picture?"

That's all we'd have to say and all of a sudden the whole incident would just unreel. *Rrrrrrrr*. You'd have the king's huntsmen riding up and down the land saying, "Here's this specially treated piece of 'emp in which we're going to insert somebody's head."

And you have the individual and this and that. And you'd get this whole identity hung up, because he's had to hide the fact, the new identity, the man who knocked off the Gorgon's head.

Only this is now a submerged identity and he can't advertise the thing, you see. He'd love to go out and tell all of his pals, "Well, you fellows think you can strike a nifty blow. Some moments, I have no doubt, in the middle of battle and so forth, you have been able to assume certain strengths. I'm sure you've knocked off some soldier or man-at-arms' helmet, I'm sure, but myself, I was out in the woods the other day. I met a Gorgon. And *pfft-ssa*, just like that. You try it."

See, he'd like to brag about it because it could be a survival point. All of his friends, he feels thereafter, would say, "E's the man who 'it off the Gorgon's head." See?

See, all kinds of value. Every time you go into the pub, somebody buys you a drink because you're the man that 'it off the Gorgon's head, see. Sooner or later they call the pub The Gorgon's Head, you know.

In other words, you've got all sorts of survival computations kicking around here on the whole subject of having done this fantastic deed, you see. You can't tell about them. You must tell about them, you see? You really shouldn't withhold it because it's a survival characteristic. You should compulsively outflow it to one and all. You should go down and beat your chest at the crossroads and tell the passers-by, you see. At the same time, you mustn't tell anybody because if you did, the king's huntsmen would have something to put in that noose they have been preparing, you know?

So what do you do? Well, the thing to do is not solve it at all. Just hang it up on the time track and let some auditor find it if anybody ever finds out about auditing. That's about the way it adds up, don't you see?

It's an inadmissible fact.

Now, you get the withholds off of this and then you get the compulsive outflows off of this, you could – you could almost – this isn't absolutely factual, but you can almost free up the track by asking a person “What should you have told people about?” see?

At first they equate it on the basis of what they shouldn't have withheld and then they get into these brags. They get into a big brag sector, you know.

“Well, I was on this – in this war a couple of hundred thousand years ago and there were fifteen enemy fighters and they were coming down out of the clouds. And I was all by myself and I was flying this little triplane, you see. And it was up on this other planet. And as a matter of fact, they were flying more or less the same kind of plane I was. And I had a machine gun there and through superb acrobatics and through the ability to shoot, the like of which nobody has heard of before or since, I shot down all fifteen. And after that they called me 'The Plane Killer.' And I was an ace. And as a matter of fact, I was the only ace that emerged from that particular war. All the rest were killed.” You see, brag, you know. Big deal.

But he just withheld it so hard afterwards because, you see, he wasn't supposed to be carrying a Mark 15 type machine gun. That was something he got out of the commanding officer's hut just before he left the field. And it was firing atomic type ammunition which wasn't supposed to be used in that war. They had a united spittoon organization on that planet, which said that “Everybody but us must not use anything that is effective,” you see. “And we who are upholding civilization are going to destroy it as fast as we can.”

And they had forbidden this particular type of ammunition. So he was using this type of ammunition and he stole the gun and also he never neglected to tell anybody about this, but the airplane he was using also was the commanding officer's. And the commanding officer was on leave at the time, you see and he didn't have any plane at the moment. His had been crashed, so if he admitted to having taken the plane up and the mechanics of the field admitted to him taking the plane up, he would have been courtmartialed, you see?

So this big mystery stands in the middle of this two hundred thousand year war, is how come all of a sudden fifteen enemy planes disappeared. They disappeared with no slightest explanation. There wasn't even anybody flying in that sector at that time. All official records show this. So there's big withholds on this subject while there should be big brags on this subject and you get a wonderful hang-up. And, you see, there's your – your facts of survival are equally matched. It's almost worth the same amount to brag about it as it is to withhold it. You survive, you see.

If you brag about it, your survival is enhanced. They make you a colonel and put you in charge of all of the flying girls, you see. And if you withhold it, why, you can go on holding your present rank of sub-captain to the subgroups, you see and drawing your pay and your old age pension, you see. So that's good survival. But, of course, if you did tell them

about it, they would court-martial you, you see and you wouldn't any longer be a sub-captain even, far from being able to brag about it, you see? And you get the most preposterous hang-ups.

So that you could say that any difficult situation is an unequated or unresolved problem in survival. So any hang-up on the track is an unresolved problem in survival. Person couldn't figure it out. There were balanced factors involved. If he admitted it, he didn't survive. But it would be a good thing to admit it because then you really would survive. But if he didn't admit it, then he would survive. But it was a bad thing not to admit it because then, of course, this made a liar out of him, you see.

So it stands right in the middle of that little crossroads and you'll find each hung-up part of an identity are these things. And when you get one of these black bundles called a 3D Criss Cross item – which is some old former identity – it is all hung together and totally interwoven with just these computations. It should talk, it better not. And if it talks, it's nonsurvival. If it doesn't talk, it's nonsurvival. If it does talk, it's nonsurvival, you see. And if it does withhold, it's nonsurvival. And in fact, all things are nonsurvival at this particular point. There is no answer to how to survive. There is no answer to the – this problem. And these are the things which you find hung up. Naturally, by pulling withholds off of the case, you release all of these things.

Now, an individual withholds an identity and withholds and withholds and withholds an identity until it parks on the track. And when you find a 3D Criss Cross identity, you, of course, have got this tremendous *key* to a tremendous section of track. When you find one of these real items that proves out, you see. You've got an identity there that should have been known, that mustn't have been known and the fact that you found it, of course, takes a great deal of charge off the case because the identity itself is dedicated to hiding. The identity has now gone into hiding and that you find it, of course, brings it out of that category.

So actually, disclosure of an identity destroys a withhold. And you will see a pc – you will see a pc every once in a while... You will be tracking down the line and all of a sudden the pc says, “*Oh-oh. Oh, oh, oh, oh. Hm-hmm.*”

You say, “What's the matter?”

“Well, *mmmm-mm*, nothing”

“Are you withholding anything”

“Well, I was going to mention something.”

“Well, what were you going to mention?”

“Well, I didn't want to really tell you.”

You can go round and round on one of these things. And the pc will get some kind of a computation that will say, “Well, they're probably looking for me yet.”

That is almost the cliché that goes along with each one of these situations. “They are probably looking for me yet. If they were to find me, then, oh, man. What would happen now?”

This pc has got this identity that he was trying to make famous, you see and trying to make it survive and trying to make it all polished up and a good citizen and then it didn't, see. So your intention was to become a good survival name that would go on and on and a total failure of that, of course, puts a person on a total withhold of something that's supposed to be totally surviving So he should have been exhibiting it, he didn't dare exhibit it and so it gets hung up. And you come on the edges of this thing and this pc starts to get very alert.

The pc says, “*Ooooooooooh*. They are probably still looking for me someplace.”

He gets the idea of his name being on sheriffs' boards and headquarters' bulletin boards, you know – “Wanted for moperly and dopery on the high seas,” you see. “Shoot on sight. If ever found, don't bother to return except mangled,” you know. This type of thing “George Aloisious Preclear. Wanted for the moperly of the dopery at the left-hand sector of the right front cross of the second-hand universe.” And he will. He'll all of a sudden “*Ooooooooooh,oooooooooh*, I don't know, if I . . . I don't know, if I ought to tell you or not,” you know.

Oh, my God, this thing he's telling you, see, is three trillion years ago and it was on some little old second-rate planet that didn't have anything to do with anything and he was selling grain to troopers' horses or something, you know. It just works out it's just nothing It's a horrible sensation, you know, of “I better not talk because they're still after me.”

And of course, this “still after me” is this thing of guilt that everybody was trying to get into in the field of therapy. Of course, you couldn't get into it from the viewpoint of guilt. It does give the aspect of guilt. The person looks guilty. And they are. I mean, why not accept it.

But entering it on the basis of “What have you – what are you guilty of? Thank you. What are you guilty of? Thank you. What are you guilty of? Thank you. Now, just lie back on the couch. Take some more sodium pentothal. Very, very nice. Now, breathe deeply. Now, you're all amongst friends. Here, put these electric shock electrodes on you. Now, what are you guilty of? Now, are – aren't you guilty of something and so forth? All right. You feel like you're guilty of something You think you've killed your father. Well, we're here to tell you conclusively you didn't kill your father, so therefore you are not guilty. Thank you very much.” Bzzzzzt.

This is psychotherapy, you see and it isn't psychotherapy at all because this feeling of guilt is as much a brag as otherwise, so that's always throwing the psychiatrists for a loop. He wants to know why this patient is going around bragging, you see, about being Napoleon or something. While withholding the subject that he is Napoleon, he's bragging about being Napoleon.

No, it's the person's idea that he's still being looked for, he is still wanted someplace or another with exclamation points, that he is very guilty of something. And this guilt feeling is simply that he should have talked, he didn't talk and either way he wouldn't have survived. There was no resolution to the problem of survival on any dynamic.

And when you've got one of those on a case, it'll come right straight forward to present time and it'll really knock somebody's head off. He really gets in a mess on this one.

“Ah, God. Well, I was supposed to have the regiment charge, you see. There we were at Balaklava and somebody issued the orders. And if you disobeyed the orders, you see, you would have gotten court-martialed, but if you charged, you would lose everything, so what were you supposed to do?”

Well, whatever he did was wrong, you see. He couldn't survive, no matter what he did, so any way he solved the problem equaled nonsurvival. And you'll get one of these computations coming up and the pc has an awful time. Now, when these things come off, the whole identities come off and withholdings come off of identities. And when you're pulling the identity, you see, you will get a withhold at the same time. The withhold there, the person “Ooooooh” – I mean, when you have that type of thing coming up. Now, pulling any identity, you should realize – off of a case, you should realize there's probably a withhold connected with it. Otherwise, it wouldn't be hung. Well, let me show you.

It is surviving, isn't it? There is an identity in the bank and it is floating forward to present time. Right? All right. Now, if that identity is floating forward to present time, it must have a withhold connected with it, see. It inevitably has to have a withhold connected with it if it is in the bank and here now. And therefore, this is *true* of *all* phenomena to be found in the reactive bank. Each phenomena has a withhold connected with it. That's uniSorm.

These phenomena were prompted by efforts to survive. And of course, efforts to survive are very, very silly and a lie themselves because a thetan can't do anything else. How people work to survive, you see. They work like mad to survive. Well, actually, they're not working to survive at *all*. They're working to get an *identity* to survive. Of course, they try to get this identity to survive. They're sweating away at it trying to get this identity to survive and they can't do anything else but survive.

Now, of course, if there's any effort involved in this thing, it must be built around a lie which the person doesn't recognize or realize. And that's the first thing he doesn't recognize or realize: that his beingness is one thing and his identity is quite something else, that he is one

thing and that this identity or body or designation – no matter if it's number 6077859 – that's still an identity. But this is something else, it is not himself, you see. So he has himself associated with the identity, you see. And then he's got the – also, he does another cross. He gets the beingness crossed with the identity.

He says, “My beingness is totally over the basis of being Joe Doakes. That's my beingness.” That isn't his beingness. His communicatingness is not dependent upon being Joe Doakes. As a matter of fact, it is quite deteriorated because he is being Joe Doakes. Now, therefore, all things have a withhold connected with them.

Now, whenever you miss a withhold, a person is volunteering to tell you something or a person is ready to tell you something or a person could tell you something and doesn't, a person gets a restimulation of a withhold. The withhold restimulates and the individual then gets the idea that he is in danger. There isn't any more rationale to it than that. Now, if you look any further than that rationale, you'll have difficulty understanding it. It is a Q-and-A, stimulus-response mechanism. If the person has a withhold that he must then withhold he, of course, is in danger. Do you follow that through?

You see, you can always enter one of these dangerous situations from two sides. A person must be in danger because there is a piece of hemp hanging over a tree. Now, that is restimulation. Has nothing whatsoever to do with anybody hanging him, but he knows a piece of hemp hanging over a tree is for hanging. So therefore, he can do this – he can actually think he has done something to be hanged for.

You see, any time – because the reactive mind is $A=A=A$, the conclusion can then put into action the causation. I'd ask you to grab this all in one minute. This is quite interesting.

We put George in a wrecked car. You see, the car has been wrecked.

There's blood all over the place – somebody else's from some other place. This car is pitched off of a curve and is lying in a ditch and we take George and we put him in the wrecked car.

Now, let's go a little bit further. Supposing George were dead drunk and just getting sober and were sound asleep and couldn't be disturbed and we simply picked George up and we took him down this bank and we put him behind the wheel of this wrecked car and scattered some dust over him and let him wake up.

His immediate conclusion is that he's been in a wreck. Isn't that right? Well it isn't – you could defy this all sorts of ways, you see. It wasn't his car. He wasn't out driving All of these things don't have to be present at all. He's simply sitting in the car and he can actually sit there and be totally convinced that he has been in a wreck. He can even exhibit psychosomatic injuries to prove that he's been in this wreck. He'd argue with you about being in the wreck if he woke up in this car. And he'd explain to you how he had driven from home in this car. He'd

even explain to you how he had borrowed the car. He would defend anything to try to make it agree with reality. This is an interesting fact.

The least he would get out of it would simply be a little shock about should he tell anybody. "What is this? Are there any consequences to having wrecked this car?" You see this? He needn't have been in the car wreck at all for him to think some of these thoughts to a greater degree or a lesser degree. You get an impression of having been in a car wreck.

In extremis he would argue with you, he'd tell you where he borrowed the car, he would give you the places where he was injured, he would show psychosomatic bruises. You see, that's *in extremis*. And the lightest thing is he'd feel just a little bit guilty about having gotten himself into that position although he had no responsibility for it of any kind whatsoever.

He had been drunk. He had been sobering up. You picked him up out of his bunk or off of a sofa someplace and took him down and put him in the car. And he'd blame himself for having gotten there. And he'd go back under a long chain of circumstances trying to figure out how he was to blame for being in that car. You find it?

So that you give a person any result of a chain of responsibilities, you give him the end product of any responsibilities and he will attempt to assume some of the earlier responsibility. I could give you... It's a very nebulous thing. I'll – let me see if I can't think up one for your particular case right at the moment.

Oh, I know. I know. You've got a picture of an army, so you assume you must have been in that army. See, you've got a picture of an army, so you assume you must have been in the army. Got that? You hardly even question it sometimes. And then you're very startled several sessions later to find out that you were a provision merchant and never had anything to do with the army, see. But you did have a picture of the army. You get the idea? That's jumping to a conclusion.

All right. Let me give you another example. Your rib aches, so you must have a psychosomatic picture of some kind. You got an aching rib, so you assume you must have a psychosomatic picture and then some of you girls sometime get home and find out that if you just loosen up the bra or something of the sort, that it was totally twisted and had been so all day. Did you ever have this happen to you?

You find out there was some actual fact of why you had a pain there and you had been going around trying – as a Scientologist, trying to explain this pain away. Got the idea? You couldn't have had any pain because it was only a button and a totally twisted hook or something of the sort digging into your live flesh, you see. So you figure there must have been a psychosomatic incident connected with it, you see.

You know, that this is natural and that it should be this way and you normally – to get such a pain without cause – you see, naturally it would take something like a psychosomatic incident. So you get the rare one where you had the actual pain which is right here and right now and you say it must have been psychosomatic. You get the idea? In other words, because you've got B, you conclude A with no evidence. You see?

So you'll get spook factors on a bank – in a bank of this particular character. And because certain conditions are true, then the pc assumes that other conditions must have been true adding up to these conditions, you see? And, boy, can some pcs write script on this subject. And you'll find them tearing off in some direction, writing script all over the place and during the session their bra was turned, you see, in such a way that a hook was inserted deeply in the flesh, you know. And they've been trying to figure out the whole session on who they must have stabbed in the back.

Now, the reason a person does this is consequences. Just – that's all. And you can have the consequence occur and then have the person figure out what the act must have been as well as do the act and then figure out what the consequence must have been. You see, it works both ways. Now, individuals do this first one. We understand this and everybody knows about this first one, is you go to the store and you get a dozen eggs and on the road home, why, you break every single egg Well, you know darn well when you get home, it's – *augh*, somebody is going to be upset with you, see. That's easy, you see.

So somebody is upset with you and you get to wondering about the eggs being broken, see and you weren't to the store. And this is very puzzling. You see, it can work both ways? So pcs get put into mysteries because of consequences, the accomplished consequence. And some of the hang-ups on cases is the reverse of the withhold. And that is to say the pc doesn't know what led to the consequence, so he figures he must have a withhold from himself.

Now, everybody has betrayed everybody, see. He's betrayed himself, he's withholding from himself and all of that, so he doesn't know, now, where he is supposed to wind up and he gets into a tremendous puzzle. And you get withholds on the first dynamic as well as the remaining seven.

One of the most interesting things you can do is sometimes go over with a pc and find – if you could do this very directly, it'd be very nice – but you can actually find the material that he “must be” withholding from himself but isn't. You see that?

His anxiety about identity would cover the whole picture. If you ask something, when have you contributed to . . . Well, let's say we find – we find this terminal “an angry man.” Let's say we've sorted this out with 3D Criss Cross and we get “an angry man.” Now, this will be a whole bunch of angry men – Joe, Pete, Bill and Colonel Stewpot and everybody else that he's run into, and so on. It's covered a whole series of identities that more or less came along in one chain.

And you could say, “What responsibility have you taken for the continued survival of an angry man?”

And you would see the package “angry man” just start falling apart into identities and into all sorts of bits and pieces and separate identities and so on. All right. We – let's say this individual is in a great deal of trouble with the gendarmes and so on.

Now, let's go further than that. If the individual can have any trouble with the gendarmerie, he must at one time or another have been identified with the gendarmerie. Some gendarmerie someplace, he must have been identified with it. You cannot have a motivator without having caused something. Now, that's the other point.

But the cause which you normally have – if you have been responsible for something and then ceased to be responsible for something, you can get your block knocked off. That's about the only way you can get your block knocked off. You take great responsibility for the welfare of the British Isles and then kick the bucket as prime minister or something of the sort and come back your next life, not caring, as a street cleaner. And you wonder why you're always being arrested.

It is perpetually you cannot park your dustbin on any corner of any street without getting a ticket, without being told to move on, without being threatened with this and that. If any bank robbers ever wished to get rid of the evidence of having robbed a bank, they'd drop it in your dustbin, you see and then you get arrested. And this is just fate at work, that's all. And guys like this, in this shape, can sit around forever and say, “Well, just fate is against me, that's all. I mean it's just fate is against me,” you see.

You've taken a wide zone of responsibility and then ceased to be responsible for it by postulates, you see. So you've taken a wide identity and then have killed the identity by postulate. You got tired of being a prime minister or something, you see. You get tired of it, so you say, “All right. Next life I'm not going to be the prime minister. I don't want anything to do with it.”

Well, this is the decline, of course – the declining days of being the prime minister is when this occurred, not between lives. All during the last five years of being the prime minister, a guy would rather have been shot than be the prime minister, you see. It was all fine for the first ten years, but then the Socialists got to work, you see. Well, we start tracing this back and we find out that the Socialists could get on his nerves because he had been a Socialist.

Being a prime minister could get on his nerves because he had been a revolutionary at an earlier time, you see?

And now, having been a prime minister and taken responsibility for the British Isles, he's a street cleaner and takes no responsibility for anything except one street of the British

Isles. That leaves the entirety of the British Isles permeated but no responsibility for them, no matter what his identity is because it is only beingness after all.

People can try to shift their identities, try to change everything, but it is only their beingness that counts.

Now, if he's got a beingness hung up in his background which is associated with his identity and then he suddenly cuts his beingness down to nothing in order to limit his identity, he'll be in trouble every time. Every other street in the British Isles can be the enemy of this street sweeper. He gets – he gets Mott Street beautifully cleaned up. I mean, it's just slick as a whistle. And then the bordering streets and the crossroads and everywhere, anything intersects Mott Street blows dust and dirt into Mott Street and he's got it all to do again.

That's the way it looks to him. He cannot function on this limited sphere because he has already accepted a much larger sphere, so he's always in trouble. So we could ask him this auditing question... He's always, always in trouble with the British Isles, let us say – the government of the British Isles or anything. And if we by any means were able to isolate what he was really against, we could say to him, “What responsibility have you taken for the survival of (whatever the sector was; we'll call it the British Isles).” And he'll go *zooooooooom, wog, thud*. And it gets very incredible to him, this tremendous zone of responsibility he's all of a sudden staring at. Because, you see, having been responsible for something he leaves an area in his reactive bank which is – which now, has an identity. And it can kick his head in.

I like these guys – they're – thetans are always doing this – having taken responsibility for the whole of Europe and having battered the whole of Europe to pieces in order to liberate it, all nations who took part in that activity, you see, now all draw back and say we're going to have peace and let the whole of Europe go to hell. They did that in 1914, 1918. They just skipped it after 1918. They told the British, they pardon me, the Germans were told by the British and the Americans, you see, they'd all be patched up and the Weimar Republic was finally put together and nobody would take any responsibility for the Weimar Republic. And there was – every measure that was proposed in order to maintain peace in Europe was no responsibility for any of the Allies. But remember that the Allies had taken full responsibility for peace of Europe.

And then one fine day we hear a mutter of guns and we have World War II, which is just about twice, three times as violent as World War I and did occupy much more area.

Now, these powers, having done this and having... They did learn a lesson at Versailles and they got up to a point now, where they're totally supporting all of Europe. See, they're into Europe, they're afraid to pull out. See, they say immediately there'll be World War III if we pull out of Europe. Haven't you heard this? We get Kennedy standing up and saying “Well, Britain must join the Common Market. We're not going to join, but Britain can join the Common Market, you see, because we must have somebody take responsibility for Europe.”

And then pretty soon you will hear him getting anxious about it and say “Well, the United States must take responsibility for the Common Market and we've got to go into the Common Market too because we've got to take responsibility for Europe.”

He knows better. They're now, dreading, you see, cessation of responsibility for Europe. They learned that in World War I. World War II came along, proved it. So they don't take any responsibility for Japan. And I think the – either the prime minister or the war minister – I think he's the prime minister of Japan – I think is the same officer that attacked the US Fleet at Pearl Harbor, which I consider rather interesting. And the president didn't dare visit Japan because it was too turbulent a few years ago. And Japan all of a sudden is on a full autonomy. So we must obsessively continue to take responsibility for Europe, you see, but we mustn't take any for Japan.

Where's the trouble going to come from? All of a sudden the United States Fleet gets up some morning at Pearl Harbor . . . You see how it would be?

In other words, having taken responsibility and then taking no responsibility, we get a consequence. And actually, that's what a consequence is. We're withholding responsibility for, that we should take. And that, of course, is a withhold of magnitude because it's a withhold of ability.

So a withhold can be a withhold of anything that we have had a permeation into or a communication with, so when a communication is followed by a no-communication, the advent of the no-communication operating as a withhold, of course, reduces survival. And an effort to carry forward survival is knocked in the head.

So it comes down to survival. We've made a huge area survive. Now, we're only going to make a little part of it survive. Do you follow that? We're going to make all of Europe survive and all of Japan and Asia. Everything is going to survive except we're going to ignore China, Mongolia. Look at the fight they had in Korea because they wouldn't really take responsibility for the Japanese empire. See, there's war after war developing over in this quarter cause nobody's really taking any responsibility for it. That's pretty gruesome, but not in Europe. They won't let down that responsibility area in Europe.

So that'll go on, but there's going to be some contrasurvival. In other words, if you had a large responsibility zone and then you suddenly take a small zone of responsibility in that large zone, you tend to set up the area you've had full responsibility for as an opponent to what you are now taking responsibility for. That's your mechanics of individuation. And the mechanics of individuation are first, communication into and then refuse to communicate into.

Now, because it's “communicate into,” you already have a commonness with it or a oneness with it. You have established a oneness with it by responsibility or communication into it. You follow that point? Do you see that?

Well, all right. I'll give you an idea. You live in a big house. You live in a big house and you take responsibility for every room in this house and the basement and the attic and everything and you're taking responsibility for the whole house very nicely. And then you decide to live only in one small room. Do you know, the noise from the remaining rooms as they pound against the wall of your one small room is going to be absolutely deafening And do you know, eventually your little room will completely fall to pieces because nobody took care of the major house, you see? And as its walls fell down, so did your walls fall down. Do you see that?

In other words, you cannot segmentalize responsibility into a smaller plane or a smaller zone without consequence of some kind or another. You can't take responsibility for the physical universe and then take responsibility for one room in a boarding house in two successive lives and not have planets hit you in the head. It'd be the most mysterious thing You'll be going down the street and meteorites always seem to land exactly where you are, you see. And there's hardly ever any air where you are and all sorts of wild things happen to where you are. All kinds of randomness is occurring. Weather – weather seems to be totally random all over the world. It is totally dry except right where you're standing it'll be raining See, here's your huge sector suddenly cut down.

Now, if it's cut down by a sequence of withholds, which it always is, you of course have energized what you're not now taking responsibility for. And because that is now energized, it can kick your head off because it's right on your wavelength, man. You did it, see? See, you energized this whole house and now, you say, “Well, the whole house now energized and I'm only going to energize this little tiny room in this house.” Man, the rest of the house is alive where you're concerned.

See, you could have walked into a brand new house that you'd never been in before and moved into one small room and you would have been all right, but thetans never do it that way. They usually get much broader and bolder. They usually walk in, occupy the whole country, then occupy a county, then occupy a town, then occupy a big house, then occupy a first floor room and then occupy a basement room, see and then eventually haunt the graveyard as a ghost and wonder why, if it is raining anyplace in the whole country, it is raining where they are, you see.

You know, it sort of looks to them like everything is agin 'em. That's sort of the way it appears. And it's absolutely true. It is. See, you've always been writing script on the basis of “Well, they're really not after me.” They are, but only those guys who could cut your throat effectively, the only fellows – the fellows that could do it best – let me put it this way – is your own palace guard when you have stated, thereafter, that you will no longer occupy the palace.

You see, you were king for a number of years. Everybody was happy with you. You were happy with them. You were executing people and they were bringing people for you to

execute. And everything was just going along swimmingly and splendidly. And one fine day you said, "Well, boys, I'm going to retire."

And at that moment six spears sort of magically appeared in your chest. "Yeah, I'm not going to do this anymore." It's almost as though you pull everything in on you the second that you take that zone out.

So therefore, a survival process discharges all withhold processes. So therefore, the principle of survival is senior to all overt-motivator sequences.

In other words, the superior process is responsibility, as we already know and survival type processes – persistency processes, identity processes. See, these are all types of processes.

Now, you can take apart a fellow by the name of Joe, who is sitting in the pc's chair in front of you. You can take this person apart; you can make this person much more functional as Joe. But you keep wondering what's kicking his head in, why he's getting somatics, why three-quarters of his stomach is missing all the time, you know. He's got this hollow feeling where his ears should be. You keep wondering where these are coming from. Well, that's when – that's when he was Agnes. And he as Joe will now take no responsibility for women. Women is something he doesn't want to have anything to do with at all, thank you.

You see how that would be? In his last life, his name was Agnes. He was a woman and he was a very strong, powerful woman that hated men. Because in his life before that he had been a man, you see, that hated women. Of course, any time you start to charge up or energize the bank or have him look at it in any way, he confronts nothing but opponents.

But the most horrible opponent a man can have or a being can have, of course, is himself because it's got his wavelength. Hasn't got his number, it's got his wavelength.

So you say with truth a man is his own worst enemy. And Scientology is that study whereby we're making a man his own best friend. That's true. Wouldn't you like to be a friend of yours?

Now, do you see what withholds are? Do you see what withholds are all about? A withhold is an effort to survive. If you find yourself withholding, you must be trying to survive, is the conclusion that you could reach at that moment. You see, you've done it so often this way, it's such a grooved pattern, that you must be trying to survive. So therefore you must be in danger.

Now, we have a pc, 1.6ing and tearing the roof off in strips. The pc has found himself or herself withholding. What are the immediate conclusions that run off automatically from that first conclusion? What are conclusions two and three? That they must be in danger. See, they found themselves withholding, so, (1) they found themselves withholding, (2) they must be in danger and (3) therefore that they must survive. That's sort of the actions that they take.

So you miss a withhold on the pc, he gets two and three automatically – *bang, bang* It doesn't matter which we call two and which we call three. But those are the conclusions he comes to.

“Oh, I am sitting here withholding something and the auditor hasn't pulled the withhold.” The instant reaction is “I must be in danger.” And the immediate response is “I must survive” by which he means “defend myself.” So he takes defending actions. He gets defensive actions at once.

You miss a withhold on a pc, you get a defensive action. Wild animals are savage for only one reason – because nobody ever pulled their withholds. Wild animals are not natively savage. They are – just happen to be in a state where they can no longer get off their withholds. That's all. See, they're individuated. A wolf is being a wolf. That he is being a wolf means he has withholds. So therefore, if he found himself withholding something, he would attack you. Or oddly enough, if he found you withholding something, he would attack you. Any withhold will restimulate a wolf. He goes savage instantly.

But do you know, wolves aren't necessarily savage? You know, they're the best fathers in the whole animal kingdom? They're rather interesting beings. But when they get the identity of wolf straight down the groove, they are very easily led to believe that they're withholding, that they are in danger and that they must attack. And these conclusions – it doesn't matter where you enter that triangle – they interpret almost anything that they're in danger. They interpret almost anything that they must attack. They interpret almost anything that they're being attacked and therefore they must interpret anything may kill them, so that they must withhold in the vicinity of almost anything So you seldom run into them.

I haven't seen any walking down Piccadilly Circus for a long time. Along about 565 A.D., the total population of Rome was two wolves in the Forum. Total population. But it's been better populated since. And it was better populated before that.

But they just don't show up in public. They very seldom come in and say “How do you do.” And that's because they couldn't say, “How do you do”, if they had to.

Now, in order to handle a wolf so that he wouldn't bite you, you would have to demonstrate to him conclusively that he was not withholding anything Isn't that interesting And do you know, that I handle wolves that way, very successfully? That there is no point in withholding anything, that there's just no point. They get into a very jolly frame of mind. They tackle you and you pick them up on both sides of their jowls and you throw them about twenty-five feet and you go over and pick them up and pet them. Well, it sounds absolutely incredible, doesn't it. But there's no point in withholding anything because they're not going to damage you any and also you're not going to damage them. It's quite remarkable, you get right down to it. You get an idea – there is a meeting ground at which nobody is hurting anybody.

It's just jolly good fun as we wrap each other around tree trunks, you know. A wolf will take an awful lot of punishment.

You walk up to a wild animal as though you're withholding something and you've had it. You've had it right now. You walk up to a wild animal as though you're not withholding anything and he stands there and looks at you and wonders what you're doing

So you show him what you're doing You very carefully always show him what you're doing You don't excite his curiosity so you don't have a withhold involved and you can actually walk right up to one, he'll never attack you.

It is – was not any magic that kept Daniel alive in the lion's den. It's just he never gave anybody the impression they were withholding

All right. Now, you've given the pc the impression in Security Checking that the pc is withholding And then you didn't pull the withhold to show the pc the pc wasn't now, withholding. What do you think the pc's going to do? He's liable to leap out of the chair with all fangs bared and does. Not that pcs are wolves, but the one-two-three applies to the pc.

If the pc is withholding then he must be in danger, then he had better defend himself. And that's how the missed withhold makes a pc so savage and what makes it such a deadly mechanism. And why you've to – you've got to handle this mechanism and stop fooling around with it.

If you're going to pull a pc's withholds, which is the only thing that keeps him – pulling his withholds is the only thing that keeps him from totally individuating, don't you see and he can now communicate and everything looks better and so on. But you just miss pulling the withhold and the fact that you are pulling a withhold or could pull a withhold restimulates the withhold, so he adds the consequences or the conclusions, you see, that he must be in danger and that you must be attacking him and that he must attack you. And he does, too.

He might not attack you from the auditing chair, he simply goes out in the hall, natters to somebody else about you. You see, but he's in danger. And that's the mechanism of the *missed* withhold. And of course, the *missed* withhold is far more deadly than the withhold. See, if you don't pull a withhold, that's pretty easy, so you don't pull a withhold. So you don't pull a withhold. You didn't ask for it. You didn't restimulate it. It wasn't important and you didn't pull it. The pc stays in there perfectly well. Otherwise, you'd have to pull all the withholds the pc has had in the last two hundred trillion years in one session. Otherwise, he'd tear your head off if that weren't true that I just said. No, you could – you can actually not restimulate or pull a withhold. Providing it isn't restimulated, you don't have to pull it and you can have a session.

Now, you've got reality on that.

But how about restimulating a withhold and then not pulling it? *Ooooooh*. That's what we're talking about. We're talking about a *missed* withhold. One that was restimulated and we didn't pull. *Ooooooh*. Now, what do we see?

So when we talked about missed withholds, we're always making this one remark. We're asking the auditing question, "Have I missed a withhold on you? Has anybody missed a withhold on you? Has any withhold ever been available that nobody ever pulled in that session, E-Meters or no E-Meters? Were you ever in a session where some information was available from you and was not asked for by the auditor?" You get the idea? I mean, this is how far downstairs this can go, E-Meters or no E-Meters.

"Now, at any time in life were you in possession of certain information somebody else could have had by asking but didn't ask?"

And you will find immediately sources and areas where the person could have been angry at somebody thereafter? It's the *missed* withhold. It's *missed*. See, that's a different thing than a withhold. These are *different things!*

One of the hardest things to teach I think there could be because you say to somebody, "Well, did you pick up the missed withholds?"

And the person goes in and says, "Well, yeah, I picked up the missed withholds. Yeah. Of course."

And you say, "Well, what did you do?"

"Well, I asked him if he was withholding anything"

You have to say, "*No, no, no, no, no. No, no. No, no. No, no.* Did you pick up the withholds that had been *missed*?"

"Well, he – yes, yes."

"Well, how did you do this?"

"Well, I said was he withholding anything?"

You say, "*No, no, no, no, no.*"

The withholds that had been missed, that had been restimulated. The withholds that were available that weren't picked up. And the auditing question would be, "When you were being audited by Joe Doakes, did Joe Doakes restimulate any reprehensible activities or something that you were withholding and didn't ask for it all the way and didn't get the dope? *Missed* withhold. Joe Doakes' session with you *when he didn't pick up the information that he restimulated.*"

And you finally will get it through, but it – I'm sure that it's going to cause trouble. Because you say missed withhold, everybody knows exactly what you mean. Unless they've

been here for training, they know exactly what you mean. Naturally, you're talking about a withhold. No, no, no. A missed withhold is a *missed* withhold. It's *missed*. It has been restimulated or asked for in some prior time to the time it is being asked for.

If you run a session on missed withholds, you never ask for anything the person is withholding during the entire body of the session. You don't ever say, "Are you withholding anything?" You just say, "Has anybody missed a withhold on you? Have I ever missed a withhold on you? All right, who was the first person to audit you? The first person was Joe Doakes. Joe Doakes ever miss a withhold on you?" Got the idea?

"Did your mother ever miss a withhold on you? Did your father ever miss a withhold on you? Did your father at any time ask you where you had been after school? And if he had asked just a little bit more insistently, you would have told him where he was and you told him something different and you didn't tell him right and you told him wrong and you were thereafter mad at your father?"

"Well, I see what you mean. Yeah, oh."

"Yeah, some information that your father restimulated, in other words, on you, which he then didn't get."

"Oh, that's what you mean. Well, yes, we can . . . Oh, yea, well, lots. Why didn't you ask something?"

Now, you say, "Well, were . . ." – this is an entirely different thing – "Were you withholding anything from your father? Did you ever withhold anything from your father? Did your father not know something about you? What did you do? What was there about you that your father didn't know?"

See, you could ask all these questions and not get a missed withhold answered ever. "What didn't your father know about you? What didn't your father know about you? What didn't your family know about you? What didn't your father know about you?" You go on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and never pick up a missed withhold.

"Now, at any time was it possible that your father could have found out what you really did in high school? Was there any period there when the information was available and your father didn't ask for it?"

And all of a sudden, why, the pc remembers having hidden the liquor – wine bottle under the bed suddenly before his father walked in the door. And the room was reeking with wine.

And his father never said, "What is that smell?" And he was always mad at his father afterwards and never knew why. Do you see how far this goes? See, the information was available, but Papa didn't ask for it. So therefore, Papa's guilty of a missed withhold.

Information available and not asked for. That is the thing which makes a wild animal out of a pc.

Now, I want you all to get a reality on it, that when a pc gets upset, you have a missed withhold, not that you have missed a withhold. That you have a missed withhold. You in the beginning rudiments said, “All right. Are you withholding anything? Oh, thank you very much. Good. Do you have a present time problem?”

And the pc was just on the verge of saying, “You know, there's something I've been doing lately that's out . . . Oh, do I have a present time problem?”

Half an hour deep into the session, the pc says, “Why do you keep repeating the auditing question over and over? You're about to drive me mad.”

What's happened here? You've restimulated him. You have told him that he is not going to survive. You have told him that he is going to have to defend himself and you've put him into the state of a wild animal. He can't do anything else but fight you. Asking for one and not getting it is the only real sin that you can commit as an auditor except not auditing. It's asking for one and not getting it, is what we mean by missed withhold.

We don't mean all those withholds that the pc has got. We don't mean all those withholds. He's got – I can guarantee you, ten to the twenty-first power binary digits squared, cubed and then after that, to the twenty-first power again would not begin to count the withholds he's accumulated in one trillion years. See, he's just got scillions of them. But restimulating one and not pulling it, you got a savage beast on your hands.

That's the whole source of ARC break and auditor upsets with pcs. Actually, your auditing poise and ability to handle the pc and so on is not anywhere near as bad as you think it is. It is better than you think it is in actual fact. But you believe that it is worse than it is because you've missed withholds and been chewed out by pcs so often. The pc was never concerned with your auditing skill. He was only concerned with your having missed a withhold that you might have gotten.

Now, you just put that down in your book and if I can teach you that and get you to audit by that principle and at the same time to get you to audit perfectly, wow, will you sail. Okay?

All right. Well, that's what there is about withholds. That's why they work and that's why they turn people savage. That's how they function and where they fit. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Any value to you?

Audience: Yes.

Good enough. Thank you.

