

# MISSED WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on  
7 February 1962

Thank you. Thank you. Okay. It's the 7th of February, AD 12 and here we have a lecture. You've just seen a demonstration. Did you learn anything from the demonstration?

*Audience: Yes.*

Any question you'd like to ask about the demonstration?

*Male voice: Yes. Should you always look for tone arm and needle action on the E-Meter?*

Needle action. Havingness is all with needle action. Of course, needle action is compounded by the absence of tone arm action and you start running Havingness on somebody without a quiver on the needle – doesn't work, that's all. It compounds the felony. Now, you would have to look for tone arm action on somebody who had one of these flying needles that was a hyperagitated needle. You'll see these needles once in awhile on manic-depressives, asylum cases, people who are very agitated and so forth.

You don't ordinarily audit this type of person. And you seldom audit one. But that is, you cut the sensitivity all the way down to nothing and the needle's still flying all over the place, then on Havingness you'd have to rely on tone arm motion. That would be about the only exception there would be to the rule.

Now, I made a couple of small errors. One error is not advancing the sensitivity knob before I asked the first rudiment question. Both for beginning and end rudiments, I did the same thing, all brought about through the mechanics of the demonstration. That is to say I'm trying to keep myself out of the road of the E-Meter while I audit. And you notice that shadow that came across the corner of the E-Meter a couple of times. Well, that's my shoulder and the E-Meter has to be moved over just a hair before I can be totally comfortable about it.

So I was sort of avoiding passing up the E-Meter and therefore didn't monkey with it. But that is not a standard review of the thirty-six Havingness Processes. That is to say, of how you get them or how you use them but would be a review of trying to patch up somebody's havingness. You're just trying to find something that works on the thing

And very often, if you know your business – which there is no substitute for knowing your business – you figure out, “Well, there is something going on here that we're not quite

sure what's going on.” So we try to find out what's going on, quietly. Nothing very ecstatically or something; just quietly try to find out what's going on with this pc, see? And we're running a Havingness Process and we're getting no needle action of any kind whatsoever. You noticed that, didn't you? Did you notice that before I did something about it?

*Audience: Yes.*

All right. Well, naturally, I just started talking about the aspects of havingness, you know. “Is there anything around here,” you know, “that would keep you from having something” and you know, that sort of thing And finally got on the subject of nothing reaching her and we had a drop, see? Well, that was enough. Then let's run “reach.”

“Reach” would obviously produce some kind of a reaction, if “not reach” produced a reaction. Of course, if I had run “not reach” very long, we would have had her on the floor. It was good enough for a test, you know?

And sometimes you can spring something the pc is terribly allergic to – you know, just *bang, you know* – on some kind of a havingness test in the room.

Okay. Well, that was a successful Havingness session in that we got the pc to get some havingness and repaired the pc's havingness. And of course, what you're watching here, of course, is a little bit different than an auditing session in that you are not running a pc who is in a calm state of mind at *all*. And pc is quite upset by an invisible audience and that sort of thing And before you get them settled down, why, you have to do a little bit of work on it. And they settle down; they work all right.

But actually, it takes a considerable amount of auditor presence. It'd take more, much more auditor presence to get anything done on a session of that character than it would be in an ordinary session.

The difficulties of handling a pc under demonstration with everybody present are just almost insurmountable. And they are surmountable on this type of demonstration. Of course, I'm used to this type of demonstration. I've done it before many times. Produced some rather interesting results. I'm against demonstration auditing by the way. I'm dead against it. I don't audit that way at all.

What I like to do is I like to get an auditing session going and do something for the pc. And for me, the session is always for the pc. And if I can't run a session on the basis of getting something done for the pc, well, I'm rather – I get rather upset.

I did learn something in setting that up that you should know. And that is, all due respect to having meters around... I was up at five o'clock last night trying to figure out how in the name of common sense to hold a session together, you see, underneath TV conditions and I found out something: that I never audit with a meter dial out of my line of sight with the pc. That's got to be a straight line. The pc, the dial, me, the dial, the pc. And just by lifting my

eyes, why, I can look at the pc and just by dropping my eyes, I can see what's going on with the dial. And I just found out I just never, never audit successfully at all with the pc out of line of sight.

And because the pc's treated to this all the time. You see, your head's being kicked over and that is, of course, a signal that "I am not interested in your case."

So, of course, a pc wouldn't stay in-session worth a nickel. And possibly some of your session difficulties – I just discovered this – some of your session difficulties is having a meter out of a line – out of the line of sight of the pc. There's the pc, there's the meter, there's you, see? And if you can rig it this way, it's fine. Actually, we have no such thing as an auditing chair. An auditing chair, as Suzie was saying last night, should have an arm that comes across and no opening on the – or no closure on the left hand side so that you slide out of the chair, you slide into the chair. And you got a bar or a plate or something between you and the pc. And then you got the meter on line of sight.

Well, I learned that and you put a great deal of stress or pressure on an auditing session, that you really have to observe what you're doing and analyze what it's all about and you're – undoubtedly will learn something about auditing And I just found out I never do otherwise. I wouldn't know how to run a session with my meter out of my line of sight.

See, actually, the meter is an extension of the pc to me and if my head is pointed toward the pc, all I've got to do is just drop my eyes slightly. I'll show you here, see. All I got to do is – I'm looking at you and all I got to do is drop my eyes, see. See? There's no motion to distract the pc, don't you see?

Give you a feeling like you're kind of in-session? All right. End of session. All right.

But an interesting little mechanic. It's one of these stupid things. It's like Dick said one day, "You do something that auditors don't do. You acknowledge the pc when he does something." These little – little bugs come up every once in a while. And we find out there's variations of them.

All right. Here we are. 7 Feb. AD 12 and I'd like to talk to you some more about missed withholds. This is in vogue just now. And the crash program which you, when you get back to Central Organizations, will have – will collide with and which you ought to pay some attention to because it sets up some new check spots in organizations.

You make sure that students don't sit around with missed withholds. You make sure that HGC pcs at least once during a twenty-five-hour intensive, but preferably toward its end, are given a check by a very good auditor separate from the auditor, you see, for missed withholds. And all you do is turn the pc back to the auditor to be cleaned up.

And you've got to keep this checked up, that's all. I mean, that's got to be straightened up. And on the – and on the auditing program of staff auditing, you've got to keep missed

withholds checked up on all of those cases going through. The first step of the crash program is to pick up all missed withholds. And that's being done in most Central Organizations at this very minute at a high rate of speed.

And the other aspects of the crash program are not as important to you at the moment. They exist, however. One is to get org rudiments in and. . . But this business of missed withholds is susceptible to the greatest misinterpretation and if I've had trouble teaching people about missed withholds, then you're going to have trouble teaching people about missed withholds. I guarantee it.

Because you say "missed withhold," and the auditor asks for withholds. You say, "Get the missed withholds on that case."

So the auditor says, "All right. Are you withholding anything?" And that is not the *mechanism!*

You say to somebody, "Have you missed any withholds on the case?" – he'll go back in and ask for withholds. And that is *wrong*. Wrrrrrrong! W-r-o-n-g exclamation point, underscore, in gothic.

Now, a missed withhold is this whole mechanism of what somebody should have found out and didn't. And it is what somebody *should* have found out and *didn't*. And that is the whole works. It isn't a withhold. It's a shouldhave-found-out.

So you possibly will save yourself a great deal of grief if you tell people to get the should-have-found-out's off the case. Rather than the missed withholds. Now, am I communicating? Should-have-found-out's.

"You and me was sitting here six months ago and we was doing a process and should I have found out anything about you, whether I asked for it or not?" That's a – it'd be almost legitimate to ask such a blunt question, you know. You could ask such a question like that. You know, you just – it just falls out of the hamper, you know. I mean, there's fireworks and small rockets go off in all directions and a great deal of relief comes on the case.

Well, look at somebody now. We could ask her – she's a nurse, all right? And you could ask her, "What should a doctor have found out about you, the knucklehead." And you produce the most fantastic amount of case gain.

Evidently, it's practically an affront not to be able to find out about something Any time you want to go around wearing a bath towel with a Woolworth diamond on it and be a swami reading people's minds, also take out a large insurance policy and get your burial arrangements straight. It's probably why they hung Christ, if they did. That's right. That's right. If he was the Son of God, he should have been able to find out about all the orthodox malpractices. And he didn't. And they hung him. They didn't hung him. They crucified him. Common practice of the day. If he existed.

It isn't true that he led a good life, so they crucified him. You see, that wouldn't be the right story. He should have found out about 'em and he didn't, so you see they had to crucify him and that's just about the way it would be.

Now, if you go around telling everybody you can read their minds – I know this might get you lots of pcs for a little while – be sure at the same time that you go down to the Bide-a-Wee Cemetery and get yourself a nice quiet lot because – probably you won't have time a little while later. It's very hard to buy a lot when you haven't got a body to pull money out of the pockets of. But that's about how it is, you see?

If you set yourself up on a basis of being able to read minds and all that sort of thing, it isn't going to be an every-time situation, but it is going to be frequent enough that you will wish, for God's sakes, that you'd asked for what you should have found out and didn't. Naturally, if you can read minds or you're up in that plane or you're supposed to be observing things and you don't find out something about somebody, hell hath no snowball able to resist the fury. It's going to be a mess.

Now, you sit down there as an auditor... You don't know how many times you and I do mean you, have done this with an HGC pc or a pc from the field – how many times you have done this. You have sat down in a calm, cool, collected frame of mind and have started up an ordinary session and two sessions later have had a God-awful ARC break with the pc that you couldn't spot what it was all about.

Well, now, this would appear even more mysterious if you weren't using an – E-Meters and if E-Meters weren't being used at that period of auditing. You see?

This person's upset because you haven't found out about him. That's what that person is upset about. You've been auditing there for two days and at any time he has expected you to suddenly come up and ask him, “Well, when did you rob the bank, Bud?” You know?

And you haven't said a word about it and he gets very upset. Well, frnkly, we don't care about the theoretical mechanism. This is not discovered from the field of theory. This is totally empirical. This is something that I have scouted down and have found to be true. And it is becoming more and more alarmingly, increasingly true. And the further I look and the more ARC breaks I check up on and the more dissatisfied pcs and the more ARC broke field auditors and the more upset people who didn't go back to the PE Course and all of that sort of thing – it is just getting absolutely overwhelming. And it's empirical; totally, completely empirical. It is gained from observation alone. And I don't care whether there – any theory under the sun, moon or stars fits this or not.

I've given you a theory yesterday which accounts for it very well. But I don't care whether that theory accounts for it or not and neither should you. It just happens to be a fact that all ARC breaks, dissatisfactions with Scientology, upsets in sessions, blows from

sessions, failure-to-gain profiles are all traceable back not to withholds but to *missed* withholds.

You can straighten people out by straightening out PT problems. You can straighten them out by straightening out ARC breaks. You can straighten them out in all these other things and that is all true and you can do it. But you can reach beyond all this. You can reach beyond this and straighten this pc out so fast, he won't know whether he's riding a streetcar or a jet plane by just finding out what you – what others should have found out and didn't or what you should have found out and didn't. Because a pc has some very peculiar considerations with regard to this. And these considerations are so peculiar that you would never, never, never be able to guess your way around them.

We don't care what the mechanism is or anything else. We just wouldn't be able to guess your way around them. So just stop trying to guess your way around these things and just overtly continue to ask for missed withholds. Ask for should-have-known's.

Use it routinely and regularly. Take one teaspoonful three times a session. Sig: 1 t-a-d. That's the way the pharmacist would state it.

Now, that's the way the cat jumps. That's all. Pc comes in, sits down in session, you run off an almost letter-perfect session. Halfway through the session, pc blows up, says, “When the hell did you learn how to audit? What am I doing sitting here? You haven't done this, you haven't done that, you just dropped the E-Meter on the floor and what was the idea of making the cans explode in my face? You've just evaluated for me and you've done this and you've done that.”

Now, let me – let me make this very clear: You might have done all those things, but it would not be cause for an ARC break unless you had missed a withhold. So you can miss a withhold in the session, just overtly.

You say to the pc, you say, “All right. Are you withholding anything?” And it goes *clang* And you're using a Pembry meter or something of the sort, or an old Mathison or something And it doesn't go *clang*, but it should have. A Mark IV would have gone *clang*, you see. And you say, “Thank you. Do you have a present time problem?”

The germs of war are sown. The Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse have begun to ride. Because anywhere within the next five minutes or the next half hour or the next hour and a half, you're going to make some little fumble of some kind or another or you're not going to make one or you're going to make a large one or you're going to run a perfect session, but you're going to have a God-awil, screaming ARC break. And the pc, according to his modifier, will behave.

And for some reason or other, the missed withhold throws the pc's modifier of his main goal exactly and immediately into full cry. You can always tell what a pc will do when

he has an ARC break, it will be the modifier of his main goal line. Now, whether or not you've fished this out, running 3D Criss Cross – if you've gotten to the point where you're getting a package and you're going in for the goal now to match up all the parts you've got – you will find the modifier on top of it and it will explain all of his session behavior.

Supposing the session behavior was – this would be very mysterious to you and you wouldn't quite know what an ARC break was if a pc had “and I'll cry and cry and cry and then afterwards go away and never come back.” Supposing that were the modifier.

The auditor would sit there and say, “I got some nice grief charges off the pc, but he didn't turn up for-the next session.”

You see, you could be very baffled. So you mustn't think that an ARC break simply climbs up with the smoke of the volcano. It doesn't. It follows the exact modifier of the pc and of course, as you know, if you care to look over a bunch of modifiers on assorted cases, you could see how varied this might be, how varied it would be. And it is very variable. But the pc's modifier goes into action and the pc starts to dramatize his modifier. And of course, from there on, you're just in trouble all the way.

And what starts this chain of material? What starts this one happening? Now, you can prevent it from happening by cleaning up ARC breaks as fast as they happen, by getting withholds off as fast as they happen, by making sure there is no present time problem. You get all these carefulnesses? Now, you can make sure that that is held in check. It's held in abeyance.

You can also, by the way, stop it from being dramatized if you know the modifier by repeating the modifier at the pc. This is rather poor show, but it's *in extremis*. You can always get a list to read again by chanting the modifier at the pc. It's a secondary action. It's not anywhere near as good as actually auditing the pc.

But something is going to happen here which is going to interrupt the session and you're going to have to do something about it. And as I say, there are many things that you could do about it. And of course you can't audit a pc with a present time problem and, yes, you shouldn't audit a pc with an ARC break and yes, this is all true, you see? And you shouldn't audit a pc with a current withhold. But if you really want to put all of these rudiments in, *clank* – wouldn't it be nice to have a weapon which would just put all the rudiments in, *swish, bang*, you know; I mean you wouldn't have any more trouble – you just run “should have known” to death and you'll have it all straight.

So in your beginning rudiments, “Are you withholding anything” – should undoubtedly be followed with a second line. I'm not going to necessarily insert this into any routine patter. It'd be nice to do so, but I'm going to say that it should be a technology which goes above patter because you should be able to use it at any time. And you should have it as a weapon which you will use, not park someplace back in a ritual, don't you see?

After you've said, "Are you withholding anything" say any version of . . . And you see, there – one of the – one of the difficulties of putting a pat patter there is there are so many ways it can be asked. You'd have to ask it differently for practically every pc.

Let's see. Well, you could work it this way. You notice the pc's there and everything is fine and it's going along, but you know the pc is getting a Sec Check session by another auditor.

Now, you want to set yourself straight. So you say, "Well, have – has the other auditor missed a withhold on you?" See, you'd use that wording "Are you withholding anything?" all right, that's for you. Now, that's routine. But you understand it's not even a cousin to this other thing we're doing. You see, they're not even cousins. Let's just divorce them completely. They're in different families of action. You can say, "Are you withholding anything" and you're right on the line. But don't think you should drop out "Are you withholding anything?" because you're going to ask a should-have-know.

In other words, just – these actually aren't even cousins. "Withholding anything" is all new stuff, kid. See, let's get the new stuff on the line. Let's open up the stock room and let's find out how many paper dollies and pornographic comic books that we've got on fHe here, you see. And we're going to take new inventory and it's new stock and – get the idea? That's all brand new.

But this other – this other – this goes back to what people should have found out. And that's past. That's old stuff. So you say, "Anything in..." – after that "Are you withholding anything?" That might fit the circumstances of the case.

All right. We know that we are auditing – I'll give you an example. We know we are auditing a girl who has a wandering eye. And she – she very possibly may have sinned against the twelfth or thirteenth commandment, whatever it might be, you see. And she might not have. But we know that we continue to get problems off of this girl with her boyfriend, see. We get problems all the time. Well, we're tired of these problems because they never lead to anything and they burn up about half the session. We just dispense with the whole lot. We get rid of this whole family of domestic, internecine warfares by simply asking, "What should your boyfriend, Ralph, have found out about you that he didn't?"

"Well, I was out with Joe last night, of course."

"All right. When was that?" All right. Good. Fine. You're not now going to have a present time problem to take care of. But omitting that, you see, at that point, the chronic favorite present time problem of the pc is going to pop up in the next rudiment. You've just short-circuited the whole thing by asking this.

You see why it can't be a pat rudiment. You note this girl's also getting Sec Checking. So you say, "All right. Did your Sec Check auditor miss a withhold on you? What should



your Sec Check auditor have found out about you?” You know, clearing all these points. “Is there anything I should have found out about you in yesterday's session? Is there anything I should have found out about you when you sat down three minutes ago?” You know? All right. It's all clean.

I'll guarantee you that if you clean that across the boards, you won't have an ARC break or a rudiment out for the remainder of the session. You just sit there and audit like a little soldier.

Now, there's one reservation I would make on this. If you're all of a sudden tearing up tons and tons of new material and you're knocking the bank appetite over tin cup and you all of a sudden have a large area of track on which the pc has recall, you get right in there and ask it again. You got it? Because the whole thing is reversed. The condition of the case has changed.

Now, I know that an auditor who's being paid by the hour might occasionally, unconsciously with his Freudian subconscious, not his Scientological subconscious – he might possibly realize that if the pc got no change, he would go on being audited forever. That would be a very mean thing to even infer and the only reason I bring it up – not to be sarcastic, because I seldom am. What I wish to bring up is the fact that I sometimes am amazed by your

lack of expectancy of change. I'm amazed by the fact that you apparently don't make a sufficient allowance for change in auditing a case.

And I've actually had auditors auditing me become very upset because my case was changing with too great a rapidity. Well, I was changing too fast.

No, an auditor should – is auditing to produce change. Now, of course, change will give him consequences. And the consequences are that the aspect of the case shifts. And you get a – you get this case and you're swishing along with this case and you're – and you'll – by the way, this never becomes more apparent than in doing 3D Criss Cross. It's very apparent in Sec Checking too. But in 3D Criss Cross, this could get quite dizzying.

You start out auditing a harlot in one session, you see and you wind up auditing a gleeful killer. And the pc will follow that terminal track through and you're auditing a different bank before you get through.

And if you've never noticed this, you better pick your eye up because at first, why, the pc is sitting there, you know, and at the end of the session, you've just shifted the bank.

Well, every one of those identities that you're going through has its own bank, see. You must realize that. It has its own bank. You are auditing different banks. You know? It's packages. It's whole packages of engrams and you got a new bank.

Now, when you're listing and if you're listing very effectively with the pc right practically coming straight through the E-Meter after you, you know – just right there, you know – man, that pc will be sitting awfully close to the terminal they announce.

And let's say you're listing at the rate of two new terminals a minute. That would be very slow listing Two terminals a minute. All right. You've got two cases a minute if your pc is right in-session. Now, you talk about change, man. That's why I'm trying to boot you up the line and why I'm being so insulting and so mean and so vicious – which I'm not being at all, actually you'd be surprised at the number of withholds you give me in doing your pcs' reports, you know. Like, I never remark on it, “Oh, my God, not again. For the second day,” you see. I just withhold it, and so forth. And it all has to be run out.

No, I'm trying to raise your level of expectancy of what you should get out of this, you see. And if you do it even vaguely right, you'll find. . . You think you've been running this old – this old Model T Ford, you see, you think you've been running this old Model T Ford down this back country road, you know. And it's going along at ten miles an hour and you're happy and so forth. And all of a sudden you slide into how to do it right and you find out that you're actually riding a jet plane that is outward bound for Arcturus, you know. And it's quite a shock when an auditor really starts grooving this thing

You make 3D Criss Cross work for you and you're changing a bank, a bank, a bank, a bank, a bank, you see? You're going through these lock valences, lock valences. And they aren't very deep or they aren't very penetrating, but if the pc's getting any cognitions, the pc's shifting The pc's just shifting all the time, shifting all the time, shifting all the time. And you've got a different bank – every time the pc goes through fifteen or twenty, you've got a *totally* different bank now, don't you see?

But every time you get an item, have you ever noticed the pc will dramatize the last item you found? Hm? In the next session, the pc dramatizes the last item you found. It'd drive you batty. You're accustomed to this pc throwing the cans down in the middle of the room. That's the custom. He throws the cans down in the middle of the room.

And all of a sudden with great shock, the pc carefully unclips the electrodes off of the cans and puts them very carefully on the windowsill before she blows, you know?

But you'll see case changes if you're really pressing ahead on 3D Criss Cross. And you get into one of these case changes – which I'm trying to drive through in this lecture – you see, if you get into one of these case changes there's a whole bunch of should-have-known's. The whole aspect of shouldhave-known's has all of a sudden shifted. And you handle these in the sort of the sloppy fashion of the middle rudiments. You get the rudiments in, you make sure the rudiments are in.

Now, don't distract the pc all over the place. Just notice, just please, please notice when a pc goes a tenth out of session. Don't wait till the pc goes half out of session or three-

quarters out of session or leaves the room. You start tuning your observational powers up to knowing whether or not a pc is in-session or not. And I just won't settle for anything less than that. It's a human observation.

This pc has started to talk to you rather coolly, distantly and so forth. You're already too late. You should have noticed it ahead of that.

And at the time you notice this, the one you get in, basically, is “should have known.

Oddly enough, for that valence the pc is now in, there are some missed withholds that weren't missed for the pc that you had a minute ago. You see how this could be? So when a pc starts to slide out of session, that first tiny little slide out of session is the one I want you to get.

I tell you, the quality of an auditor is observable at the stage of ARC break that the auditor asks or acts. You know, it's the stage of ARC breaks which causes the auditor to act.

Now, an auditor who is – who is the rhinoceros-type auditor, you see, handles the ARC break as the pc is going down the stairs. That's the time that auditor handles the ARC break. Now, an auditor who's a little more alert, considerably more alert, handles the ARC break at the moment the pc stands up to leave the room. Another auditor a little bit better and a little more alert, handles the ARC break at the moment the pc throws the cans down.

Now, a little bit better auditor notices the upward flick of the wrist. You see the gradient here. And now we're getting into a pretty good auditor. He knows that the pc has stopped talking. He notices the pc has not answered any question for a long time because it'll be a long time; the pc's gone on for a long time not really in communication, you see, before he starts throwing the cans down.

And then we get into the very, very perceptive auditor who notices that the pc is really not speaking sooth. He spake noteth sooth, he did. He – you ask him – I don't care what you're running; you're asking him for a list and he says, “A cotton picker. A cotton mouth.” And he's been going on, “A cotton picker! A cotton mouth!” and now he isn't talking that way, you see? He's saying, “Cotton picker. Cotton mouth. Mm . . . I um . . .”

Along about that point it just – it takes just that much change of pace on the part of the pc for me to perceive he's gone out of session. I mend the session then.

And oddly enough, the pc doesn't ever recognize there's been an ARC break. I take a little bit of pride in knowing there's an ARC break before the pc finds it out. And, man, can you patch up a session in a hurry if you patch up the ARC break which has occurred but the pc has not found out about yet.

Now, you can be too anxious on this point and you can patch up nonextant ARC breaks and cause one. So you see, it's a very, very tight little dividing line which is very tiny. And the dividing line is: Don't patch up nonextant ARC breaks or you'll cause one; patch up

extant ARC breaks before the pc find8 it out. And it's right at that little barrier point that you should pick 'em up. And that is really expert if you can do that. You got it made.

Now, you start checking on this sort of thing, you'll find out that a should-have-known undoubtedly is the theory which lies behind what has happened – a should-have-known lying in there someplace. Case has shifted and a should-have-known.

So you could say, “What should I have found out?” Anything as blunt or stupid as this. Or “What should people have found out?” You could say anything like this as a question and it'll knock the thing back in. The session will go back in again. Go back in again right now. Clean it up.

For instance, a pc who is on an incipient ARC break, a pc who has a shouldhave-found-out is always on the verge of an ARC break. Always right there on the verge of it if he's got a continuous I-should-have-found-out, they-should-havefound-out, you-should-have-found-out, somebody-should-have-found-out.

And that is what you call the ARC breaky pc. He is riding on a shouldhave-found-out. And anytime you have called somebody an ARC breaky pc, just think of that person and then reclassify what was wrong with him on a “He was a should-have-found-out person” you see? “They should have found out about me” and they didn't find out about him and so therefore, he continues to be an ARC breaky person.

Anybody who is going to blow, who is going to give you any trouble, who is going to give you a bunch of upset, who is going to vilify the organization, who is going to all of a sudden become disinterested in auditing, who is going to be very upset by what you are doing to them – all of these various categories crawl under the heading of should-have-found-out. And a should-havefound-out in some category or another that may have relatively little to do with you, but you happen to join the mob that should have found out, you see? You happen to be classified in that zone. Anybody you're going to have any trouble with.

Now, this one principle, above and beyond all other principles, lies behind your ARC breaks and this one principle is that principle more responsible for loss of dissemination and loss of Scientologists and public to Scientology than any other single factor.

This means, this observational fact coming up means a considerable change of policy with regard to the functioning of PE Foundations, the functioning of co-audits. The reason you lose people on co-audits, the reason why you're having difficulty handling this zone and sphere, why they don't move over from PE to co-audit has nothing to do with recognized truth. The truth which you are trying to tell them is easily recognized. But the truth which they are wearing that you should have found out about, if you don't recognize that, *ahhhh*.

So the way you could run – this is *in extremis* – the way you could run a PE Foundation would be simply on the basis that everybody in the PE Foundation is a

professional finder-out-about-er. You know, they don't tell anybody about the ARC triangle and they don't tell anybody about auditing and they don't hardly mention the name Scientology and you'd have a tremendously overwhelmingly successful PE Foundation. I think that's your bug on PE co-audit.

Now, that still has to be tested and put in operation, has not yet been squared up. But I think you will find that it lies in that zone and field. Anybody who walks in for a PE Course should be – until you find out otherwise – should be classified as a should-have-found-out case. This is a should-have-found-out person. And the reason most of them come in is to find out if you can find out what you should find out. And that is why people come in to PE Foundations.

They don't come into PE Foundations to learn about Scientology or to be helped or any other of the reasons why we think they come into PE Foundations. The greatest bulk of them, apparently – subject to test and further figures – apparently appear to find out if you can find out about 'em. And if you don't find out about them, they ARC break, it is all the worse, they go out and tell everybody that you're fakes and frauds and there you've had it.

So that if your PE Foundation was totally composed of should have – of finding-out personnel – finding out about people who should be found out – and nothing else, why, you'd be very successful about the thing.

Now, if you take a profile, if you have a test department and you take somebody's profile and you take this profile and you draw it all up and you put him on the E-Meter and you ask them how they feel about two or three things and coordinate their profile and put this all on file and then you write them a big, long rundown on the subject of their profile and you get it into their hands, you think you're performing a considerable service. Quite a few of those people will be with you, but the largest lot of them are now missedwithhold cases. How do you like that? And you have just created an antiScientology public.

Tests. You shouldn't be doing tests on these people. Put an E-Meter crew on the job.

“All right. Do you want to come down to this PE Course? Well, very good. There are certain requisites to this PE Course and we have a little form we have to fill out here. All right, Mrs. Zilch. Now, (sensitivity 16), just hold on to the electrodes there. There's a very small amount of current that goes through that won't shock you now. All right. Now, here we are, now. All right. What should we find out about you? Thank you.” Then clear it.

“Now, what should the last group you joined have found out about you and didn't?” Clear it.

You say, “All right. That's fine. All right. Now, what should have been found out about you by your last group?” No reaction. “Good. We got it off now. All right. What should

we find out about you? All right. We got that. Fine. All right. Here's your ticket to class." You'll never lose 'em.

That is what they mean by "You are the people who know." You're the people who know. What do they mean by this? What about, what about, what know? Yeah, we know all about life. We know all about the mind. But the reason why we know is because we know about them. That's what their idea of knowingness is.

What is knowingness? That they robbed a bank. That is knowingness. Here are all the riddles of the human mind laid out here in a string All you have to do is read on down the line. That isn't knowingness to this person. It's whether or not you robbed a bank. Whether or not you can find out he robbed a bank. If you can find out he robbed the bank, then you know. Now, you must be smart, you must be clever and you must know your business. And I don't think from that moment on you have to prove anything Isn't that fascinating?

You go on and give them standard PE Course, that sort of thing, afterwards.

Co-audit, unfortunately, becomes almost impossible under this particular line unless it's E-Metered. Then it would have to be Mark IV E-Metered. Then the people who were being run through co-audit would have to be checked out routinely on "What should have been known about you?"

You could possibly – you can always dream up the answers to this sort of thing, but I set up the impossibility that exists at the moment. If you continue to run a co-audit exactly as you're running a co-audit, you're going to lose more people off the co-audit than you keep on it. And that's why a co-audit doesn't build up. A co-audit builds up only if the should-have-knows are to be pulled off the case. If you were to pull all those off cases in a co-audit, then that co-audit would build up, up, up and you would get something done.

So that back of all rudiments lies the should-have-known. Therefore, we see the definition of knowledge to a person is knowledge about themselves in terms of their overts. That's hideous. But to the bulk of the public, the entirety of knowledge is just whether or not you know their particular overts. And if you know their particular overts, then you are a very, very clever person. And you are a true swami. And that's it. That's what knowingness is to them.

Now, we've been trying to climb this ladder backwards for a long time, trying to find out where bottom was. And that is the bottom definition of "knowing," the bottom definition of "knowledge."

Knowledge is overts. "If he knows about my overts, then he is a wise man. He is a typically wise man. He knows all the secrets of the universe because he knows that I routinely and customarily drink Gordon's Gin at work."

It's surprising, you see. You'd never really look for such an anticlimax on the subject of knowledge. But you see, that is the beginning of the ladder and after that, of course, you have to know. And the funny part of it is, you would have to know all about life and so forth to keep the ladder going on up. You'd have to know the lot of it.

And actually, apparently, knowing the lot of it really brings about this other datum which I'm just giving you, you know about these people in terms of their overts. You know what their overts are, then you are a wise man.

An auditor is always blessed who has pulled the pc's overts properly. He must be a good auditor. You ask auditors around, you ask pcs, "Who is really a good auditor around here?" And they say, "So-and-so," and this will be colored . . . In a professional group such as this one, of course, it'll actually be who's a good auditor. But in a – in an HCA/HPA trainee level or something like that, you'll get a different aspect entirely. And it'd just be who was able to get the should-have-knowns off.

Now, get the "withholds" off doesn't qualify. Get the should-have-knowns off, that does qualify. You get the difference between a withhold and a shouldhave-known. You're a *smart* auditor. You are a *clever* auditor. You are an *expert* beyond all experts because you got this one pc's should-have-knowns off. Didn't get his withholds off, you see. That didn't count.

You put a lot of time in on him; you were very clever. And these are really what were making the pc well and climbing uphill and changing his case and everything else. Never notice those. You got off the should-haveknowns. Boy, are you a good auditor. You're a smart bunny. "That fellow is real clever. I don't know how he got that out of me. But he's certainly a smart auditor. He's really clever."

How did the auditor get it out of him? The auditor said, "All right, who are you having trouble with in life?"

"Well, I mostly have trouble with my family."

"Good. Well, what should your family have found out about you that it didn't?"

"Oh, that. Oh, really nothing. Yeah, well, well, if you insist, yeah. Well, there are a couple of little things. I used to throw my shirt studs – I used to throw them carelessly in the drawer. You won't – you won't buy that? All right. Let's see, uh – uh . . ." And all of a sudden, why, you find out what his family should have found out about him.

Now, you know, you know life. You know life. You know. You know. You know what life consists of. I think that's the test that must be run on practically everybody as to whether or not they have intelligence or not. I think this is the IQ test administered by everybody on everybody. It's can they find out about me? If they can find out about me, man, they're a clever person.

So therefore, should-have-known does not dispense with but outranks all rudiments. Does not dispense with withholds but is much deeper and more profound than a mere withhold. It is a type of withhold in that it's a past withhold which has been restimulated. You've restimulated something and haven't pulled it. Well, you're in trouble right now. You've restimulated a withhold and now the person halfway knows about it and then you don't know about it. Well, now you're the most stupid person on Earth and preclears will gratuitously tell you you are.

Now, a lot of you – a lot of you and a lot of people who hear this tape will have at one time or another had their auditing mauled, damaged, pounded in the head, they've been scolded, screamed at, howled, decried, had their auditing confidence shaken and so forth, by ARC broken pcs. This is the lot of an auditor to a large degree.

I want to call something to your attention, is your auditing was never that bad. It was pretty bad, but it was never that bad. The thing that was out during every one of those ARC break things and that caused this cascade of criticism of your auditing was a should-have-known. That was what was out in that session where you got reamed out. Your auditing skill has not been at fault. It was that little piece of technology that was sitting in there.

Now, knowing that, you should be able to come forward and do a much better job of auditing because you won't be going up against that unknown of “When is this pc going to ARC break?” and “What is going to happen in this session?” or “Can I steer this session right?” or “This person is a pretty mean sort of a pc to handle,” or anything else that comes in, in that category. You can just jump that over.

Go ahead and improve your technology, your presence and your ability to audit. By all means, you should. But skill of auditing is basically speed of gain. This is what you measure skill of auditing on. The more a pc can be held into session, the more gain a pc is going to make in that session.

The better you are as an auditor, the more rapid your advance is going to be on the pc and the fewer things you'll have to patch up and so forth. And this can get down to a point of where your auditing skill is so poor that your pc makes no advance because, of course the frog is climbing two inches up the well and falling back two inches or three inches sometimes. You see, and climbs up two inches and falls back two inches and climbs up two inches and falls back two inches. You never make any case gain because the auditing skill is so monkeyed up and wooden headed and double-fisted, you see? It's just poor.

We're not talking about skill, not what you run on the pc. We're talking about your use of Model Session, your ability to hold the pc in-session, your ability to handle your tools, your ability to get something done in a session, your ability to avoid corny mistakes of one kind or another. See, all of those – just auditing ability. Now, the better those things are, the better you are, you see, at handling all these things, why, the more gain the pc's going to make.



Now, over and above this, if you can hold cancelled and nullified all of your pc's jolts and no progresses and rudiments and so forth and particularly this button which goes back of the rudiments, what are you going to wind up with? Your pcs are going to fly. That's all.

I'm still sitting here waiting for you to make your pcs fly, you know. I don't settle for anything less than a sixty-five foot wingspread on a pc. And that's what I'm trying to get you to do, you see, is audit with such smoothness, such command of your tools and so forth, that you just go right ahead and make progress along the line. That's what I'm interested in your doing.

But now technically, we suddenly turn up this other tool that inhibits – doesn't wipe them out forever but it certainly inhibits ARC breaks. It keeps them from happening It keeps your Sec Check sessions from turning out totally sour.

You've got this kind of a situation now. In this particular class before anybody is on 3D Criss Cross, there are certain basic preparatory things which should be done with the student. This is not necessarily retroactive, but we'll be working in this particular fashion.

We pick up all the missed withholds, the should-have-knowns, get those out of the road, get the last two pages of the Joburg and the shortened Form 6 – 6A. We square the person around on a flows process, get them flying in that particular line and then put them on to 3D Criss Cross and that's about the way cases are going to be graduated up here. There'll be some variation on what's done to them after their last two pages of the Joburg and their Form 6A – the little period in there. But this was – would be what is expected of a case. Not necessarily the auditing skill or what we're trying to train. Those things might be different, but that would be expected of a case. We expect him to make that particular line of progress.

Now, you see, that's enormously shortened the moment that you put the missed withhold ahead of the lot. So you tack missed withholds on to your rudiments, your beginning rudiments. Tack it on to the end rudiments in the form of “I – have I missed a withhold on you during this session?” you see. Now that's in addition to, you know, “Did you withhold anything?” or “Are you withholding anything” or something like that. And square up the whole of your middle difficulties with should-have-knowns of one character or another and get agile in the use of this. Understand what it is and what you're asking for. And let me assure you that you will have a very smooth run of it with pcs.

I think all of you are getting some reality on this already.

Those cases which have a reputation for being rough to audit, out of session, disinterested or upset or anything else that you consider wrong with a case, the first thing you should try on such a case is to find some area of should-have-known .

I don't care whether it's familial, some other practice, medicine, we don't care what. Anyplace we could find a should-have-known, well, let's shoot it full of holes. And then let's

take Scientology and let's shoot the should-haveknown's full of holes with regard to Scientology and auditing sessions there.

And you'll find this person will straighten out. You'll find out this is quite remarkable.

And it's a weapon which I hope we don't lose sight of. We lose sight of even such things as Havingness for two years at a crack. So I can expect in 1965, why, we're sitting here and we've got five, six class members that are all ARC breaky and they're all upset, we can't figure out what's wrong with them. And somebody's combing back through the archives and they come up against this particular lecture and say, "Well, that's been dropped out since 1964. Something else came up that was far more important."

Let's hope that doesn't happen. But if we do get this kind of a condition rolling, let's hope somebody does break out this lecture.

Thank you very much.