

SEMINAR: WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on
14 June 1961

Thank you.

All right. This is the 14th of June 1961. I have to be careful with these dates, you see. I get stuck on Cause, you see, on the Prehav Scale, and I would say it was the 15th of June, you see, it might become the 15th of June. And it'd cost everybody a day's pay, you see? But for a certain fee from some large corporation . . . Okay. Very good.

I'm sure that you have a lot of very highly integrated questions of one kind or another that are springing full-armed, ready to shed light in all directions. In short, any questions?

Female voice: Yes.

Yes.

Female voice: What would happen if you are giving a Security Check to a preclear and you tell him that you will destroy the paper afterwards with the . . . with his answers on it. And does he get benefit solely from having been made free to talk to the auditor. . .

All right.

Female voice: . . . or are you taking away from him . . . ?

All right. Here we are. You've asked whether or not if we destroyed the paper, or told the pc . . . If we destroyed the paper of a Security Check immediately after we gave him the Security Check, we would destroy the value of the Security Check, period. We have told him at the same moment and the same instant that we are going to withhold for him. And all we've done is just do a vague, little, one-stage Release.

You will see a difference . . . if you care to make the experiment some time, waste some time: assure somebody that you will never tell a soul that wild horses would never drag any part of these withholds away from you, that you will destroy all record of it and get brainwashed immediately after you've given the session. And watch the fact that he doesn't even get tone arm reaction. Got it?

You see, there are eight dynamics. And in auditing you are actually only concentrating on the third dynamic. Auditing is a third dynamic activity.

Now, the third dynamic is good enough because his withholds are mainly on the third dynamic. But someday you're going to run into somebody who is a real loop, who is busy withholding from God. And oddly enough, he will tell you about the withholds, perhaps, in some kind of a sotto voce that is designed not to be overheard by the gods lurking in the various chairs and furniture, you see, or on the naked pedestal or something of that sort. Or he won't tell you at all because God might overhear him, and God, as we all know, is everywhere including the sewer pipes. Well, it's true. If God was everywhere, he'd also be in the sewer pipes.

And . . . I'm sorry to make nothing out of this situation, but I'm afraid somebody beat me to the draw. I think a couple of thousand years ago somebody made nothing out of religion in a grand way. They invented a totally invisible religion. And it's very interesting. Everybody, of course, has had trouble with it ever since. The general point about a Security Check is the fact that you have not stressed this.

Now, you should understand that when you are doing a Joburg Security Check, you are not doing failed withhold . . . you're not running failed withhold on the person at all. You should understand what the

character is. As long as you've opened up this whole subject, I'll give you a digression, okay? I've answered the other question. The answer is "Ix nay."

The fellow says, "Well, I don't dare tell you because you might tell somebody else."

You say, "That's so. I might."

"Uuuuuudududududu. Well, I can't tell you then." And you would just instantly see the fact that it is withhold on more than one dynamic.

All right. Let's go into this. Why are you giving Security Checks? What is the exact process you are running in giving Security Checks? It probably occurred to you before now that you were running failed withhold on the pc. That would be your first conclusion, that you were actually running a failed withhold.

Actually, these . . . the individual is withholding these things, isn't he? So making him give them up, of course, would give him a failed withhold, right? Well, you could look at it this way.

That isn't the process you're running at all. The process you're running is the old, old, old, Native State, not-know-know cycle. We have achieved, as I was telling Peter a little while ago, the level of complexity and the level of simplicity necessary to resolve a case.

Now, I'm not telling you it's perfect. Absolutes are unobtainable. But I think you'll find it'll move all cases. I don't think you'll have any real difficulty with it. You won't go home sweating over some pc all night long. You'll know very well that when you audit him the next morning on whatever you're doing, you'll get whatever it is. That type of confidence and relaxation has already moved in on me.

You see, I've been straining for eleven years trying to achieve some sort of a . . . something that auditors could and would do. And we were never short on theory, and we were never short on what was wrong with the preclears. I brought you up with a dull yank the other day. I told you we were addressing the reactive mind, and you better not go on auditing analytical minds because there's nothing wrong with them. Nothing wrong with them, except they can be influenced by the reactive mind. Well, you say, "Well, you can short-circuit this and fix the guy up so he can't be influenced at all by the reactive mind."

Well, that's fine. Get your pc in a state of no-effect. And that is how the lamaists and so forth achieve serenity. You put the pc in a no-effect; total no-effect, total serenity. Jam those two levels up and you have a lama . . . not the kind that's bleating back and forth over the Andes and causing so much trouble to the authorities down there, and the sanitation authorities, but the other type.

Now, here is your . . . your plow-in on the basis: The individual must be able . . . the individual must be able . . . to get some kind of response. He must be able to experience. If a person cannot experience, a person cannot live. And that's why you look at these abbots of monasteries and they look like dried up mummies. This is why, when you finally collide with the Pope Piuses and so forth of this world, they have myopia. See, they're educated into a total no analytical effect from the appetites and horrors of the soul. Huh-huh-huh. See?

Now, this is the generality. It is possible to plow somebody in on a level and make them look good. Don't desert that datum. Know that datum well. It is possible to plow somebody in, absolutely fix them on a level and make them look good. Do you understand? You could plow some radio announcer in on communication so that he would never do anything but communicate. You know, narrow the whole Prehav Scale down to one thing: communicate. He's got to communicate . . . talk . . . communicate, and he'd be a good radio announcer until he dropped dead, which would be in a short period of time. But that's all right. People are expendable. That's the way they've looked at it, don't you see? It's what's known as education . . . education by fixation.

On the other hand, the fellow actually couldn't communicate if you did that. Why? Because his communication, thereafter, would be harmful because it's too fixated. He's too concentrated on this one

thing. No. He has to be able to do everything on the Prehav Scale. You're not trying to fix him up so he can do nothing on the Prehav Scale. You're trying to fix him up so that he could do anything on the Prehav Scale.

Now, the fact that his ethic repairs by reason of processing: you, of course, have done away with the impulses to do very vicious things on the eight dynamics, you see? And having done away with these vicious things, he nevertheless can relax on the whole situation. In other words, you have restored fluidity and action as a result of inspection, not action as a result of inhibition. The whole world right now is running on action as a result of inhibition, and you've got crime and wars and religion. You got all kinds of things going on.

All right. Now, action as a result of inspection by a person who is ethical gives you an entirely new view . . . completely, entirely new view of human conduct; because it's no longer human conduct. It's more the conduct of a . . . of an able being. That's what you're doing when you get up to the level of Clear. And oddly enough, what you're doing with a Security Check does not appear, as such, anywhere on the Prehav Scale . . . except "want to know," but that is the closest shadow to it and it really is not the same thing at all, because that's curiosity.

All right. Therefore, there is some kind of rationale or theory which stands out and beyond the Prehav Scale. And we have run it ragged and we have done everything necessary to resolve the case with it. And we have put it in the hands of auditors and they have gotten nowhere with it. It is a level of simplicity which cannot be achieved in the practical world.

It is a perfect theory. There's nothing wrong with the theory of Native State. There are four stages. There's a lot of literature on this, by the.. . When is it? 1958, isn't it? Fifty ?

Male voice: Two.

Female voice: Nineteen fifty-three, fifty-two.

Well, that's way . . . fifty-two, fifty-three. It's back that far.

Male voice: Yes, sir.

Well, we were practicing it like mad and did an awful lot of processing with it in 57 and 58, if I remember rightly. And we did a lot of work with that. We ran it on an awful lot of cases and so forth, and it was over here in England, probably in 57, 68. You remember it. The Native State is a total knowingness. And the Native State deteriorates by the person postulating that he won't know. And then this becomes a necessity to know. In other words, he has to know, because, well, he's postulated that he doesn't know. You got the idea?

There are actually about four stages. They harmonic. "Forget" is part of this harmonic scale, see. That's a don't-know. That's a can't-know, see. That's a withhold from self . . . "Forget" is. So all. . . And remember, by the way, is a know. And now you're down on the harmonics. And I think their levels . . . I've forgotten what they are . . . five or six or something like this.

Anyway, these are the Native State harmonies, and we . . . There's a terrific simplicity to all this.

But look-a-here. We have simplicities that nobody has been able to make work because they were so simple and their generality was so expansive, that as long as they were in this terribly simple state, they were nonfunctional. Do you realize all you have to do is run on a preclear, theoretically, "Tell me an intention that failed." "Tell me an intention that succeeded." "Thank you." "Tell me an intention that failed." "Tell me an intention that succeeded." "Thank you." And theoretically, you'd clear him all the way along the line. So much for your one-buttons. Theoretically.

I told you yesterday there was no such thing as a one-button. Well, that's as close as there is to it, because it's right up there at the top of the Axioms, see? And it is! It is. If a person could run this, he runs like a startled gazelle. But it's something like an OT process, you see?

It is too complicated for anybody to plumb the reactive mind with. It is something like trying to take a wand of light and stir a mud pool. And you put the wand of light... Where did it go? No. It takes a certain level of complexity to do anything with the case at all.

Now, we have been resolving cases since the end of January 1961 with considerable ease. But we had to attain a necessary level of complexity, and I have been trying to attain a level of complexity that is acceptable ever since January of 1961. In other words, you have to attain the optimum simplicity and the optimum complexity at the same time. You see that? The complexity is a very necessary part of the entire operation.

So there's no sense in going off, swinging into the high theory of it all and running on nothing but total high theory. Because we've been there, we have lived there, we furnished a house there, and we sure didn't collect any rent. And we didn't pay any and nothing happened. Why?

It is a level of simplicity which exceeds the difficulties of the individual. You'll find a person . . . the worse off a person is or the more Clear they are . . . you know, the bottom harmonic or the top, see . . . the more you have to go into the Secondary Scale. And in the middle band, you can just run the Primary Scale. A person is getting along fine and his needle is pretty loose . . . good, Secondary Scale: the hell with it. Just take it straight, you see? But if they're having a bad time in any way about anything, you better assess the Secondary, or if they're coming Clear you'd certainly better assess the Secondary, because these little particularities are still hung up. And do you know how many buttons there are?

Well, there's all the buttons of beingness, which are infinite. There's every verb that man has ever used or any being has ever used on the whole track . . . that's your doingness. And that's pretty near an infinity. That's lots.

And then there's anything anybody could have or not have. Now, that's how many buttons there are, and if you want to get yourself . . . If I had that calculator, I'd probably be able to rack up enough numbers to represent it by saying that they were binary digits and by saying that they were powers. They were this many binary digit powers of 10, or powers of a billion or something, see? And there'd be that many buttons. Now, that's a lot of buttons.

In other words, they're in three categories: beingness, doingness and havingness. And each one of those categories has a near infinity. When an individual gets fixated on one of these things, there isn't anything else; there isn't anything else anyplace. There is nothing else to be inspected. So you try to tell him that this is part of a generality called intention. So therefore you say, "Well, you silly fool. You say you want to make your wife happy. You keep saying this. Or you want to make your cat eat more cream. Now, you . . . you just keep saying this. All right. Now, we're just going to run 'When has one of your intentions failed to influence your wife?' 'When has one of your intentions failed to influence your cat?' And we'll just run this up, and of course it'll straighten up the whole track because you're obviously fixated on it."

And he'll say to you, "All right. Seems reasonable."

Trouble with it is, it's reasonable. It isn't. It isn't in the reactive mind that way. It doesn't stack up that way.

Intention doesn't stack up anyplace in the reactive mind, but the cat doesn't even stack up to cream. The cat stacks up to gateposts. And that's why the mind is reactive. All horses sleep in beds, you see? Now, you're trying to force an association upon the fellow that he cannot grasp reactively even though he can grasp it intellectually, and so it doesn't do anything for the case at all. So analytically we can say, "Well, that's very easy. All I have to do is run intentions on this fellow . . . run failed intentions, successful intentions, and that sort of thing; even run brackets of intention and he'd be Clear. There's nothing to it. One button. And Ron's all wrong, and that's it, blehbleh-bleh." Oh, man, we've been there.

The trouble with mental research from this point on is sort of this way: Every time you get to a brand-new frontier, you find our footprints all over the plate. It's like members of the Explorer's Club have occasionally remarked on this. They get in the darkest reaches of Borneo, you see, at the end of a most horrendous trek that was surrounded with heroic deeds in all directions. And when they finally get to this little-known hamlet in the middle of the extinct and forbidden volcano where there's . . . headhunters still abound, and so forth, a Chinese merchant comes out and offers to sell them some coffee. I'm afraid we're now in the category of the Chinese merchant because, boy, we sure covered some ground here in the . . . in the last . . . well, actually the last thirty years, and certainly in the last eleven.

And this is one of the conclusions about it: that there is a certain complexity necessary to a process. And if that complexity doesn't exist in the process, it becomes nonfunctional at a reactive level even though it might be theoretically feasible at an analytical level. Understand that? So the process must be complicated enough to work on the reactive mind and simple enough to be administered. And that . . . you can describe the optimum state of a necessary routine or a regimen. And you've got them in Routine 1, Routine 2 and Routine 3. And you've got the whole package. There is nothing outstanding from that.

That's how complicated you've got to get and that's how simple you can become. And it's just hung right there in space at that level of complexity or that level of simplicity. Of course, it looks terribly simple compared to somebody that had to know a thousand processes, to only have to know about eight different operations. And pooh, you can do that.

And if he's using the right one of the operations to match the case, his judgment isn't too much assaulted these days because it's done by graph. It doesn't even have to be done by E-Meter. You don't even have to judge the case by it. You can pick up a graph and say, "Well, that case has to be run on so-and-so." You'll be right. And furthermore, it leaves a margin for error.

You can use all three routines on all types of cases with only the difference that they . . . some work faster than others. So this is quite a remarkable piece of complexity that we've achieved here. Do you see that? Now, do you see why it is that way?

The CCHs: We made the CCHs much more complex. You'll find old lists of processes called the CCHs and you'll find . . . oh, I don't know how many there were of them. And there were A, B, C, D versions of each CCH, and so forth. An unnecessary complexity. CCHs ceased to work when they got that complicated. But the original CCHs . . . 1, 2, 3, 4 . . . with the exact method of application which is by Clause 13 of the Auditor's Code: Don't run a process that is not producing change and run a process as long as it produces change. And as long as you've got that one in and run the CCHs like that in sequence . . . 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4, 1, 2, 3, 4 . . . it'll always work.

You'll find some cases, by the way, run this way in the CCHs: They apparently are flat, all of them; none of them apparently working because the change is so microscopic; you're not getting any change. Remember the beginning of the process on the tone arm. At the beginning of a process on the tone arm in a case that's stuck up a bit . . . sticky on the needle and so on at the beginning of the case . . . you get no tone arm motion. And if you leave the thing, saying, "Well, it's twenty minutes; it hasn't moved." Hadn't moved? Hell! It hadn't started. But it started a little bit. And it started so slightly, you don't even notice the difference. But it has started slightly. And now all of a sudden you can expect this case, probably, somewhere up the line to be terribly unflat and uneven on the CCHs. You see that? They'd go from apparently nothing happening at the beginning of the CCHs, as you run through the line. They run to more happening and more happening and more happening and more happening. And then they . . . you get up to a point where they all bite . . . 1, 2, 3 and 4 . . . although they are flattening more rapidly; they're all biting now and they're biting hard. And then gradually they'll start dropping out again, and then you'll suddenly notice an entirely different aspect in the pc.

It's just like an E-Meter. You see, you flatten them. They can go from a no-change, to a change, to a no-change, and that is the cycle of motion that you ordinarily run into. You see this, by the way, on every level that you start. Be a moment or two, even if it's only a tenth of a second, when there's no change of the process, and then it starts to change, you see? Well, that tenth of a second could also be ten hours. See, it's the right level and you're running it. And you know it's the right level and it's producing no

great shift of the tone arm. You'll notice, however, that the tone arm is . . . shifts slightly more and more and more, even though it apparently isn't really shifting very much at all.

Then all of a sudden it shifts more and more and more and more. And now you've got really what you'd consider good tone arm motion. And then that gradually fades out less and less and less and less and less and less and stop. Now it's flat. To run it any longer than this produces no change on the case.

All right. Now, I'm talking about these simplicities, I'm talking about these complexities, for the reason that I notice a tendency in general in the world . . . not necessarily . . . not with you, to chase after an identification which peculiarly fits an individual case. They want a total identification of everything to one button.

Well, look on it as an identification. As close as you can get to an identification is Axioms 1 and 2. You go to a little less dense an identification, you get 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10, because that's a total agreement. We all agree on those things? so it must be a hell of a roaring identification, you see? So we all agree on those things; it's quite normal, you know, like gravity. Gravity . . . gravity is normal. Well, gravity to somebody that didn't have the thing wrong with him called gravity, and wasn't having any trouble with gravity and wasn't flying off planets either, would think that your ideas of gravity were quite psychotic.

You can take somebody who is in fairly good shape, he'd have looked at even Einstein and said the man is a raving lunatic. Look at the things this fellow believes in. Well, just look him over. He believes water runs downhill. It's not necessarily true, but everybody agrees, you see. Even the water does.

The most fantastic things happen, by the way, to MEST when you violate its laws. I'm not now talking about find some way where it will do something different. No. Water is trying to run downhill and you say, "What's this?" you know? Pthooh! The water does the funniest thing . . . it becomes solidly gluey, becomes pflop. It looks like big globs of gelatin suddenly. You get the idea? I mean, you've violated any basics on which it was running, and it changes the characteristic of the mass, because it believes that it is no longer it, although there is no ability to believe in it. But the basic intentions that are built into it have been invalidated. And the second they are, it changes characteristic. Quite interesting

All right. Now, what are we getting at here. We're still talking about the security, even if circuitously, but this data is necessary to you. Very.

The Security Check is running the not-know off the case that it has run on everybody and everything for God knows how long And when you're doing a Security Check, you're running the Native State cycle of sequences. You're not running withhold at all.

You're saying to this character, "Hey, bud, let's find the overt acts you have committed in inhibiting other people's knowingness."

Let's look at a typical withhold: The guy says, "Well, I robbed a store once." He admits to this. Do you know what lies behind that? It isn't that he stole something or disobeyed the law or did something like this . . . has nothing to do with it, whatsoever. The overt act consists of putting a not-know, a violent and vicious not-know, into the third dynamic. Clank!

All right. He says he robbed the store. Let's see what happened. Let's see what really happened. Let's forget about the pc now. Let's find out what happened on the third dynamic. The next morning the storekeeper comes in and finds his premises knocked apart. Now, he doesn't really know what happened, and he tries to scout it out, and he looks for the jimmy-marks on the door and a few things of this character, but he can't really make it out because he's no expert. And he doesn't know what's happened, and he's kind of in a state of shock about all this. Furthermore, his survival has been threatened, and so forth, but he doesn't know what has happened. That's the thing. He doesn't know what has happened to his store. And also, another thing has been entered in on it. He doesn't know when it's going to happen again! There's the third dynamic overt, see?

All right. In addition to that, he goes and he calls up the police, and he says, "Is this Sergeant Doakes? All right. Very good, Sergeant Doakes. I have a robbery down . . . I'm . . . what did you say? Well, yeah. Oh, you were yawning there. We have a robbery down here."

And the police say, "Oh, God, and we have to get up and we'll lose our swivel-chair spread and..." And they say, "Well, the taxpayer." And they come down, and they don't care anything about it just now. They've been leading a perfectly good, smooth police existence, you know? Do nothing, see nothing, you know, be ineffective, to hell with the crime. They've been doing all right. And they get down to the store and now they get a not-know run on them.

Instantly, they say to the shopkeeper, "What happened?"

And the shopkeeper says, "I don't know."

So the police go tearing around looking all over by rules of evidence for the jimmy marks, and measuring the footprints and taking the hired girl's plaster casts of her finger marks, or whatever they do. And they accumulate this vast store of useless bric-a-brac called evidence. And then they don't know either. And it goes into the police files that somewhere in the third dynamic in this particular area there is somebody who robs stores, but we don't know who it is. And an invented not-know, you see, has occurred in that particular area. And these accumulate, and they eventually wind up to become the aberration of a society which can't trust each other, which can't produce, which can't do anything. And there's where it's broken down. It's broken down on vicious, violent and dangerous not-knows. Do you see that?

All right. So you got this pc sitting in the chair, and the first time you go over this . . . you go over this Security Check . . . he'll get to all these realizations eventually, see . . . and the first time you go over the Security Check, you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever burgled and entered?" At first, he'd stolen anything? . . . he didn't get anything on it. Burgled and entered . . . all of a sudden, about the third Security Check you give him, this thing goes tick!

You say, "Well, what was that?"

"Uhrrr. . . I robbed a store once."

"All right. Well now, have you ever burgled and entered?"

"No, that's it. I robbed a store once."

In some mysterious way he can't account for, he feels better. Why does he feel better? He's gotten off an overt known as creating ignorance. So as he goes up the line . . .

You're not through with that question yet. No, no. Several Security Checks later, if your processing is really biting like mad, you hit this thing and you say, "Have you ever burgled and entered anything?" And you get plong! And you say, "Where on earth did this come from? Now, let's see. He's told me about robbing the store." And you . . . so you say, "Well, what was that?"

"Yeah, I probably worried those people. Yeah. That probably wasn't so good, you know?"

All of a sudden, what's he finally come up to? He's finally coming up to realize that he entered a not-know into the society. But he expresses it now as worrying somebody.

Well, time goes on and in the process of processing other things happen, and you come to this question again somewhere up the line in a new Security

Check, and you say to the individual, "Have you ever burgled and entered anything?"

You say, "Well, he's told me about robbing the store and he's told me about worrying people. There certainly can be nothing left on this. You know, this man is getting to be near Clear."

Right about that time, "You know, I've just been preventing people from finding anything out for years. They never did catch up on me. I bet that's still down in those police records. Yeah, I guess they just wouldn't know."

He will tell you at the same time that his memory is improving. Isn't that an odd thing? You give a man a Security Check and his memory improves. Well, naturally it improves because you've got the overts of running don't-know, can't-know off. And you've run the overts of him making people stupid, so eventually he got to be stupid. So his IQ goes up and his memory gets better, because forget is an harmonic of not-know. You get how this thing works out?

All right. You say, well, why don't you just run on the fellow directly, "What could you not know?" "Thank you." "What could you not know?" "Thank you." "What could you not know?" We have people by the ton who have been run on this and never got any better. See? Empirically, it has actually worked out. It's a matter of record. They didn't get any better. Their graphs didn't shift around enough. And yet we run a Security Check, and all of a sudden the needle loosens up and the person starts feeling better and wham!

I remember an Air Force major who all of a sudden turned up on my front doorstep and wouldn't tell me his name. It was very weird. I did . . . I went along with this just as a gag almost. But I processed him every afternoon for an hour, and at the end of the hour . . . because he couldn't give me his name and address, you see, and it was all not-know anyhow, and everybody . . . why, he'd hand me a fifty-dollar bill. Which is kind of . . . very amusing . . . handing me money anyhow . . . because I don't . . . normally will take the money, because it's curious and wondering what the reactions are with regard to giving and separating the money.

For instance, I charged somebody one time . . . I told somebody I'd cure his stuttering. And he was bugging around, boggling and yapping about curing it, and so forth. So I said, well, it would cost him five hundred dollars. Well, this made it worthwhile, but he couldn't possibly give me five hundred dollars. You see, how this thing works out? This was . . . he was incapable of doing this. So to cure his stuttering, five hundred dollars . . . You see, if I'd cured his stuttering, he knew he would feel obligated to pay me something even though I didn't ask for anything. You got the idea? This was the way it added up in his mind, anyway.

So I charged him Five hundred dollars, but now he couldn't have any processing, because the next item on the agenda was that he couldn't separate from five hundred dollars. He had five hundred dollars. He had lots of Five-hundred-dollars, but he couldn't separate from this. So what I did was process him, and I cured his inability to have or give money. And then he . . . then he paid me the five hundred dollars, and I cured his stammering and then gave him the five hundred dollars back again. (I never told anybody this whole story.) And he started to stammer instantly. I didn't care about the five hundred dollars, you see? Very amusing.

Same guy, I pulled the same gag . . . another gag on him. I hypnotized him . . . this was early in research . . . and turned his stuttering off like that. Hypnotists do this rather well. The guy goes around in a total fog after this, you see, but he can talk just fine. Of course, he can't think of anything to say, but . . . And I said he would cease to stutter until I said the word boggleboo or something to him. It was very funny. I called him up on the phone. And he was at work; he worked in a shipyard. And I called him up on the phone, and he answered the phone. And cheerily, cheerily, he was saying, "Well, well, well. How are you today, Ron? Yes. Oh, I'm getting along fine. Everything is going along fine."

I said, "Boggleboo."

And he said, "Bu-bu-bu-bu-bu-bu. Wha . . . what did you ssss-sss-ssssss-sssa-ssss-sss-sss-say?" Interesting. Ideas of posthypnotic suggestion, and so forth. Actually, he felt much better after he didn't have to not stutter. There's no telling what he might say if he had to go on talking. It's very interesting. And later on, this five hundred dollar gag came up. Anyway, he got along fine. He won in the long run.

But this Air Force major with his fifty dollars at the end of every session . . . not knowing the man's name, not knowing anything about him, who had been sent in from someplace or another . . . I'd give him an hour's session. All of a sudden, I pulled off this tremendous overt. He was talking motivator, motivator, father, motivator. And all of a sudden, I pulled this tremendous, fantastic overt. He had come in, and his old man evidently had had a couple of drinks, and he had just . . . This had been just a few years before. He had just rolled up his sleeves and beaten the old guy to a pulp. Just plastered the blood all over the walls. And at the moment he did this, why, it was just phesseew. Boy, the relief just fell off of him and lay in pools in the auditing room, you know? You could just feel it. Wow, man. And that was the end of that.

I'd really done something. He knew that. And he gave me this fifty dollar bill. I used to throw them in an ash tray along there. And I added it to the pile. And he disappeared. And I never saw him. Interesting thing

That was the first time, although we'd been working with overts rather continuously, that I actually got into a case that experienced a 100 percent total recovery on having gotten rid of one overt. These cases are rare, but they happen often enough to make the Freuds of the world and the Roman Catholic Church hopeful. So anytime you do anything wrong, you can always go whisper it into a secret confessional which guarantees to destroy the confession.

You know, they have these little private boxes. And the priest sits in the middle box, actually, and the person sits on one box and the other person sits on the other box, and they both talk in. And they don't know whether the priest is listening or not. You get the not-know? You get how the church has Qed-and-Aed with the not-know of the withhold of the confessional. Got the idea? So it's very easy to Q-and-A with the not-know of a not-know. See, it's very easy.

He says . . . he's right away thinking, "Look at all the not-know I've run on everybody. I want everybody to not-know this." So he'll ask you to destroy it or hold it secret or something. He's saying not-know. And you're saying, all right, not-know. Now he tells you. Of course, you haven't run a not-know, because you've still got a not-know. That's the end of that. There isn't any . . . any argument further.

But there is your levels of simplicity, your levels of complexity, and there is your basic purpose and rationale lying behind the Johannesburg Security Check. I have found by experience that auditors could not and do not run Pre-session 37 as a whole effectively. They do not run it. They try. Their hearts are in it, but bless them, there is one thing they won't do: they just won't imagine there's that much evil in the world. And you actually have to tailor up the questions, and that's all it amounts to. So Pre-session 37 is put into the complexity called a Johannesburg Security Check or a Processing Check. Now auditors will run those like a dream. They're fine. You understand?

In the first place, it's much better to run it on a list of questions because you're not-knowing a not-know on yourself all the time. You're sitting looking at the pc and you're saying, "Well, let's see. What do I not know about this person?" You have to keep creating the not-knows that you not know about the person. Now, why do that to everybody? Give them a list of all of the mean, nasty, vicious not-knows that they ever could possibly have run on the world at large, and let's go down that list with a horrrdrdr on the idea and leave nothing left to the imagination. Therefore, you're not running a not know on the auditor, because he knows what he's going to ask, you see?

Now, he doesn't immediately know what he's going to find out. But he can sure guess, but he doesn't have to worry about it, don't you see? So he can audit, then, something like Pre-session 37 in its virgin simplicity, he can actually audit in a more complex form, which is far easier for him to do. And he will do this, and they do a good job of this. So there is your Security Check.

Now, I don't guarantee that I won't add some questions to this check or change the form of the check. I don't guarantee that at all. But I also guarantee I'm not going to change the existence of the check or the type of question in it. And you're liable to get short Security Checks in processing. How short they should be for optimum, I don't know, but it'd be something like a page, and on that page there is a sample rundown which would also include each time . . . You see, actually, it's the ten-page Joburg in

ten pages, but each one has a few more questions added on to it that gives you the generalities . . . like the end questions of the Joburg are on every one of these pages, don't you see?

Now, you've got a stack of Security Check Form 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. And you could give a person one or two of them. And if you were covering the lot, which you would have to do . . . you'd have to cover the lot eventually . . . you nevertheless can give them a section of the lot. So, actually, these would be put out in little booklets of all pages, and you mark the pc's name on your mimeograph or your booklet, and then you could give them a page of it at a crack. And this is very good for CCHs, see? You flatten a CCH and you give them a page of Security Check, and you flatten a CCH and give them a page of the Security Check, and you flatten a CCH and give them a page of the Security Check. You see, it speeds up the amount.

But in not knowing right now what the optimum administering factor is . . . not knowing exactly what is the optimum of the situation . . . you haven't got the form yet. And you probably won't have until I've done enough experimentation with it to find out what is an optimum or average situation between processing and the other . . . You also might eventually get the complexity of different kinds of Security Checks for different routines, so that you might have a Security Check for Routine 2, and a different Security Check for Routine 3, and a Security Check for Routine 1.

We are already running into trouble because we haven't got them. The Security Check for Routine 3 is finding entirely different withholds as the person runs on a goals terminal . . . entirely different types of withholds . . . than you will pull off somebody who is running on Routine 1. They're entirely different types. And if you don't, somewhere halfway up through running SOP Goals, start asking for . . . somebody for full track withholds? the case just absolutely goes berserk. He just practically goes out of his mind. Because he remembers clearly, mysteriously, in his little lonely self, going into an enemy town and setting the torch to the whole thing, and nobody ever knew who did it. He remembers this all of a sudden. And he can't tell the auditor about it because it's a withhold. So you ask him, and then you keep saying, "Well, is it in this lifetime?" "All right. What withhold have you got in this lifetime?" "In this lifetime? Have you ever burned anything down in this lifetime?"

"No," he says rather doggedly, "but there was this town, and it was about two or three thousand years ago, and we were camped outside this town, and I went in and thought it'd be a good idea . . ."

And you say, "Now, was that in this lifetime?"

And the fellow says, "Nope. HUUUUUU!" So what have you done to him? You've made it impossible for him to get off his whole track withholds at a time he starts remembering them, so his memory on the whole track then becomes occluded. And it's only the not-know he has run on everybody by picking up bodies and by murder, rape, arson and sudden death back along the whole track that has got his whole track shut off. This is the answer to a whole track memory. Whole track memory depends upon some gradient scale of whole track Security Checking Got it? So it'd be another kind of Security Check coming out. But it'd be administered the same way; the directions on it would be what type of Security Check it was and when you gave it, and that sort of thing; under what conditions, so that you'd probably wind up with a little battery of tests of one character or another, you see, that fits the immediate occasion. And so you gave the wrong one. All right. No damage is done. Got the notion now?

And you see what this Security Check is all about. You're not running failed withhold; you're running the not-knows off of the case. And these are the ones that matter.

This also should answer the mystery which will come up sooner or later to you . . . this other mystery: why when they give you some withholds they feel better, and why when they give you others, they don't. And what is a withhold?

Well, a withhold is running a don't-know or can't-know on others or on oneself, see? On some dynamic, you've run a don't-know, can't-know, mustn't-know. And those withholds, when they come off . . . when the overt act has been overtly a can't-know or don't-know on anybody else, don't you see, . . . boy, that thing hangs up like fire drill! And when it comes off, the case does a terrific resurgence.

You see, it wasn't that this Air Force major beat up his father that caused the Air Force major to be aberrated. His father didn't know why he was being beaten up. The Air Force major never informed any of the neighbors or any in the family why the old man was in this kind of condition. The old man was so ashamed of the thing that he never told anybody who beat him up. You get the idea?

This thing was sown from one end to the other with can't-know. So when it released, it released like a Conger rocket. And yet you got this fellow in wartime, maiming, shooting, killing, burning, having a ball, getting medals in wartime for what he would have gone to jail for in a second in peacetime.

It's so funny. It's no wonder people get confused. You know, there are times when things are noble and times when the same action is a crime and ignoble. So you get mixed up in the good and bad of it all, and the individual is liable to be so plowed in about the good and bad of all of his actions, that when you ask him this, you'll get this mystery hitting you in the face, unless you know the basic answer to it: Why, when they are released, do some withholds cause a case to improve so markedly, and why do other withholds, when released, don't . . . why they don't do a thing for the case? And the answer is, is really not who is he withholding it from? The answer is, who is he not-knowing with it? You see? It's not even really a withhold. He's doing something quite overt. He's making a not-know occur in his vicinity, and as he's making a not know occur in his vicinity, he of course gets damned stupid about it.

Now, you get your other phenomenon of new questions appearing all the time. Of course, as the person can take more responsibility for things, he is less unwilling to prevent everybody from knowing. So as he comes up the line he includes himself in the dynamics, so he finds out about the things he has done. And you get whole track memory being recovered. But as his responsibility comes up, then, he of course begins to realize something about what not-knows he's run on everybody.

And there is your machinery that whirs and clanks back of the Joburg Security Check, which is apparently at first glance merely a police interrogation of some kind or another. And it's very, very complex machinery. And it's based on this terrible simplicity that doesn't work . . . as a simplicity. That doesn't work. Audited on people, they never fall through on it at all. In the first place, they never get off their don't-knows and can't-knows and all that sort of thing They just won't audit that way, that's all. I know. We've tried it . . . no case gains.

Okay. So much for that. That make any sense to you?

Audience voices: Yes. Sure does.

All right. We haven't got any time for it, but give me one more question. Yes?

Male voice: The guy . . . the guy that puts in substitute false knowingness like me . . . you know, one of the world's worst liars.

Yeah, yeah, well, that isn't the same breed of cat.

Male voice: What happens to him?

That is only making time mess up. You're only messing up time. Some editor one time said I was a professional liar . . . as a writer, you know? Perfectly true, perfectly true. When one is writing fiction stories, one is lying, if you want to look at it that way.

But let's take a look at this strained situation. That editor was rather bad off, by the way. Let's take a look at it. You weren't at all; you were creating. And that would make all of life a lie if it were wrong to tell a romanticized episode. Do you see that?

Male voice: I feel better already.

Yeah. But all life would instantly be a lie because what is it but an invented, romanticized episode. Your whole life is an invented episode. You're sitting way back there someplace with some little gears going one kind or another: "Now I will invent the next chapter in the history of George."

All right. Now what you do? What do you do here? Yeah. That's right.

Male voice: Well, I arrived at that, but it's small comfort to me.

Yeah. Actually, I suppose to some degree . . . to some degree an individual . . . I'm sure our aesthetics are ordinarily dismayed because he does such a terribly bad job of writing sometimes. The script through which he is walking is so soap opera that it just offends our aesthetics. And if you looked at auditing . . . if auditing is an overt act, it is really just a literary criticism of the life this fellow was authoring for himself day by day. And he's just going to get worse and worse as a writer. We know that, too. So this we cannot contemplate, you see? So the literary quality of it is what's under the gun. Of course, speaking very, very fatuously, but you could look at it with this idiotic side panel.

No, I looked this over when he told . . . this man told me I was a professional liar. I looked this over. Years afterwards I remembered this one way or the other. And I wondered what button here was awry? Was time being messed up? Or was what being messed up? Or was anything being messed up? Was there anything wrong, in other words, with writing a fiction story? Well, let's get the intentions behind it.

The intention is to amuse and to inform. It doesn't look to me like that's very aberrative. And it isn't. And it isn't. And the only thing you could find in it that is slightly awry, in writing a fiction story, is you're preventing the reader, to intrigue him, from knowing the end of the story throughout it . . . whereas you do. And that is the only not-know that you are running on a situation. But the intention is so far from being vicious that the aberrative quality of it is zero. Is there anything wrong, then, with romanticizing in writing? Well, if there's anything wrong at all, it's because you're creating. And the action of creating sometimes can wind you up a bit in the soup. You see? Your . . . the effort to create, the effort to produce, and . . . sometimes can be traced back along the create line to being aberrative, just like people apparently can't run Step 6.

But I call something to your attention. I must, myself, have had no idea whatsoever that there was any difficulties with creation on the part of anybody. Yet you find people who were sitting square at create on the Prehav Scale . . . the very few of them . . . made it necessary to withdraw all of Step 6. It is not inevitable that the person goes into the soup because he makes something. If it were, why would hobby therapy make people so happy? You got the idea?

And why is it that you're so miserable when you aren't doing something or making something. You see? All these things add up to a different key. But it does mean that people can have the create button on the Prehav Scale badly out and actually get terrible masses accumulating in their vicinity the second they get the idea of creating, you see? And this is not necessarily true that this happens to everybody.

You can . . . think of the number of people on whom Creative Processing . . . mock-up processing . . . was run, and think of the remarkable results that you can get with the stuff. We've cured alcoholism with it, and we've done all kinds of weird things with it. Do you understand?

But there are enough people around who just go mnuuuuh. You know, their whole bank gets tough. Now, you can actually make a bank pretty up, and you can make a bank get tough, and you can do it wrong, and you can give the tests of the thing, and you can do various things with it to move it in. But it isn't necessarily wrong.

If you tell a lie to obscure your own guilt . . . ahh . . . we're talking about something else now. Now we're talking about running one catastrophic not-know: not only do we rob the store but we tell people that somebody else did it. So a not-know is compounded with a false knowingness, and the individual who has done this particular type of operation eventually winds up with a horrible feeling of unreality. He feels he's a fraud or he feels he's . . . he feels he's in a pretense. He feels "All life is really a pretense, isn't it?" And what he's tried to do . . . the only thing he's tried to do . . . is deny his own responsibility, don't you see, by . . . First, he's run a big not-know on everybody so they couldn't find out what it is, and then he's compounded this and gone right in on top of it by giving them a false knowingness that assigns a piece of knowingness that doesn't exist which obscures the other knowingness. And boy, is he

getting complicated by this time. And when you pull that on the Security Check, you'll get a whoooooew! Wow!

Thankyou.