

## SEC CHECK AND WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on  
13 September 1961

Okay, well, how are you doing today, huh?

Audience: Fine. All right.

All right. It's apparently the what? The 13th?

Audience: 13th.

September AD 11.

All right. Now, you're well immersed into the idea, and one or two of you into the practicalities, of running an engram. I don't know how you got away with it or how good it was or wasn't, but did it run all the way out? Is it still reacting on the needle? This engram. Speak.

Female voice: Evelyn, she had one.

Another female voice: Well, I ran several.

How long did each one take?

Female voice: Well, they certainly took. Unfortunately, I had to watch the time of the next preclear coming, so that got in the way a bit, but we flattened off quite a bit. And one did go completely flat.

That was the first one?

Female voice: Well, I had two preclears running, you see. First one didn't, because his session came to an end, so I popped him out of it. But the second preclear ran one flat, and there's another one still sparking on.

How many. . . ?

Another female voice: She's auditing two people.

Well, I'm talking about one pc. Now, did one engram get run on one pc? Female voice: Yes.

And did one engram get partially run on one pc but not flattened?

Female voice: That's right. Oh, yeah.

When's it going to get flattened?

Female voice: Next session, I hope.

All right. Who's the pc that's got the unflattened engram? Oh, you!

Female voice: Yeah.

Ah, well. That accounts for you not speaking up, I suppose. All right, well, so much for that.

The routine I've been talking to you about, a plan of clearing, is a very important thing. I have been very leery, you see, of putting too many sawed-off shotguns in your hands. But there is no way to walk around this. And we have to just front up to it, and realize that you've got to use all the weapons and tools

that are at your command in order to do the job. you can't fool with it. Apparently there is no shortcut to clearing, any more than there is a royal road to geometry.

Well now, the only way that you can front up to the fact of Clears, is to clear people, and apparently there is no short road by which this is done.

There is a fast road in terms of exactly what you do, and I gave it to you in yesterday's lecture. But there is no circuitous, easy road. Do you get the idea . . . the difference here?

There could possibly be some milder, more in keeping with repetitive, command . . . less demand on the auditor is what I'm talking about. There could be.

I've been looking for something like that all summer and have been testing with it and trying to do something about it. And cases make progress, but I will tell you that this is a final conclusion and I don't care to make any further conclusions on the matter.

Unless you have found the pc's goal and terminal, you're auditing a hodgepodge and they get better, they don't get better, and they go up, and they go down, and they . . . you know, and so on, etc., blah.

If you find their goal, and find the pc's terminal, why, they're on the road. And if you run the terminal on the Prehav Scale, you can only run it just so far, and the person runs into a certain series of engrams and gets well into a chain of engrams, and these engrams then are available to be run. And they have to be run and that's that. Because a pc all by himself, puttering around, is going to play . . . I don't know whether they do schottisches on the outskirts of these engrams, or what, but they certainly don't do anything in the engram. It requires an auditor's skill to push them in.

There is no substitute for Security Check. A Security Check has to be well done. But again, a Security Check done on any other version than just a straight Security Check form runs into this other phenomena of just running random engrams and stirring up the bank and that sort of thing. And although you get off more withholds, and although there are very tricky ways to run Security Checks, just on the straight things, the best Security Check is the straight Security Check, for my money.

There are various things you have to do sometimes, because not all the questions are present on the Security Check, and pcs can think of a great many random things to do with a Security Check.

There is no question on it that says, for instance, "Well, have you ever made a pc guilty for giving you a withhold?" We just ran into that one. And that was hotter than a pistol, wasn't it? And the Security Check wasn't working. Wasn't working on this person, and finally Mary Sue, with a large, long, blue spark . . . I think her sparks are usually tinged with slight pink . . . said, "Well, let's see if he's done anything unusual with the pc's withholds." And he had done something unusual with the pc's withholds, and was keeping the Security Check from working. In other words, you have to be smart to run a Security Check, but the best and fastest Security Check is just a straightforward check. All right.

In running engrams, you again have to have a good subjective reality on what an engram is all about in order to run an engram well. But that doesn't say that you cannot run an engram without any subjective reality because that is going to have to be done, and remember that I have run engrams with no subjective reality of any kind whatsoever. 1947. Never been through birth, and I'd run people through birth, and so forth. So this can be done, you see.

Now, as we look on the pros and cons, and the pluses and minuses on this type of an approach, it is a very blunt approach, and it demanded certain tools. And . . . the Instructors of the Washington course, by the way, are . . . I just smell it . . . they're just being a little bit sparky. They don't believe that the goals possibly could have occurred in the first 150, because none of the thirty people on the course were able to find a goal on the 150 given by the pc, you see. They didn't believe their rudiments were out. They just didn't believe their rudiments were out. They can't believe it. They can't face up to it.

Yet, on that course, they were not cross-checking rudiments. In other words, student A on the course was not taking student B's pc and checking to find out if the rudiments were out, and then telling student B.

you see. That routine was missing. And the most Clears were made in the South African course where that was done. Cross-checks of rudiments.

So rudiments are not always out for the auditor. See, it isn't that the auditor is being careless. They're not always out for the pc's particular auditor. The pc gets into a frame of mind where he believes that this auditor is skilled or confident, and he swears by this auditor, and therefore doesn't feel ill at ease at all, you see. And knows that if he gave up a withhold, that the auditor isn't going to chew him up with the withhold, you see, and he gets into this state of somnolence with regard to rudiments. They're wildly out. He's got present time problems and everything else, but he has confidence in his auditor and so he doesn't register. You get the idea? He'd just as soon go into session for this auditor, apparently, but in actuality the rudiments are out.

Another auditor checks the rudiments on that particular pc and they are wildly out. They're not necessarily now wildly out for an auditor or another auditor, they're just out. It's the fact that the pc's confidence or attitude toward his auditor or lack of confidence in the auditor or something else, has put him to a point where he just doesn't have present time problems and withholds while being audited by Joe, don't you see? He just doesn't have them. They are affecting the living daylights out of his case. It's just a peculiarity.

Now, we haven't even really gotten to the bottom of the peculiarity, and probably there are a great deal of odds and ends of mechanisms involved in this that haven't been brought to view.

One of the mechanisms I did bring to view on it, however, is that an auditor-pc, as a team, get withholds. You see, they get withholds on the rest of the world. So that anything given off by the pc to the auditor is looked upon as a further confidence. See, it's not being given up. It's just being passed to one person carefully, so as not to be passed to anybody else, don't you see?

So eventually they get a whole bunch of, "withholds off," but how far off are they? They're off on the understanding that they won't go any further. And just to satisfy and placate the American Psychotic Association, we put that "keep the secrets of your pc," you see, in the Auditor's Code. Well, it's a good idea, everybody's been doing it, and so forth. But that's the only part of the Code of a Scientologist or the Auditor's Code which I just wouldn't, myself, much believe in. Because right away it's defeating, isn't it? It says, "Well, this withhold can go one person, and that's it."

Or on the other hand, you start making hay with somebody's withholds, and another evil develops, so on, so ma . . . because a person is being punished for his withholds by the society which is all triggered to punish people for their withholds.

Now, a little bit more further than that, several times in research we have found this to be the case, but I don't know if you're aware of the fact that pcs quite often get off withholds which are total lies. And they go on reacting because they are lies. And they get all messed up because they've told a lie.

And there are some people around who get off withholds to get other people in trouble. (Quote) Get off withholds (unquote). It's quite interesting. I mean you . . . some auditor is guilelessly auditing this pc and this pc says, "Well, yesterday Joe stopped me in the hall and kissed me and slapped me on the gluteus maximus and told me something or other, something or other." And the auditor says, "What do you know!" you know?

Well, he can't quite get it to clear, and he thinks there's more to it, and it goes on and on, and then it finally just sags out of view somehow or another, and he isn't reading his meter carefully, you know. And he goes around with the complete idea that this has occurred.

Well, of course the pc has now put himself out of session by miscommunicating to the auditor. And the auditor unfortunately will very often go around and say, "Well, that Joe, he's really a character, you know? He makes passes at women in halls." Nothing like this ever occurred.

I mean, there are withholds, (quote) (unquote) circulating around in Scientology which have never occurred.

It is used by some pcs to spread entheta which isn't true. I'll tell you where this is most prevalent. I'll tell you how to spot this. you get a pc who never tells what they've done, but always says what somebody else has done. "Did you ever rob a bank?" "No, but my father robbed a bank." you know, that kind of thing, you know. And you watch this going on any length of time with a pc, and if it's consistent, you can be fairly sure that some of that pc's withholds that he gives you are just lies. And you want to cross-check on withholds for lies. And you can just put it down as a little rule. Because a case can hang up by having given you a false withhold. That's something to know, you see? And you say, "Well, have you lied to me about any of these withholds you've given me today?"

Well, we have a little, pint-size pc. He's about as big as a suitcase. And so help me Pete, if he didn't give his auditor . . . I don't know how many withholds he passed out the first day that he was being given a children's Security Check, but it was something on the order of fifteen, twenty, maybe something like that. Comes back in the next day, he's more honest than most, and he says, "Well, I . . . huh-huh, huh-huh. Two of those withholds I gave you yesterday are lies." He woke up to it.

So you want to cross-check on this sort of thing. Be particularly leery of anybody who's always giving withholds about somebody else. See?

"No, I have never held up a bank, but my last auditor uh..." I'd be particularly alert to this one. In the first place, that's not a withhold. A withhold is what the pc himself did. That is a withhold. Plus, the pc being an accessory to a fact. That is a withhold. Now, the pc being the accessory to the fact does not include the pc passing on all the bad data and all the rumors, and so forth, the pc has ever heard, because of course the pc's not an accessory to the fact of any part of these things. No, the pc didn't rob the bank, the pc stood out on the corner and made sure the police weren't coming while the bank was being robbed, don't you see? All right, that's an accessory-to-the-fact withhold, and which is part of the withhold. It's quite a valid withhold.

But it is something the pc did, isn't it? See, the pc did stand on the corner. The pc didn't rob the bank, but the pc stood on the corner. You'll get this sort of thing. You'll get as a withhold occasionally, "Well, I sat and listened to some violent criticism of. . ." And that the pc considers an overt . . . and it was. Pc didn't speak up and shut it off or put anybody straight or anything; they just sat and agreed with it all, you see, and all of a sudden, why, this turns up as a withhold, but remember that was something the pc did. The pc accepted tamely, or agreed with, you see, or didn't do anything about, a situation. But again, it's something the pc did, don't you see? It isn't the information that was given the pc. That had nothing to do with it.

So you . . . and then you always want to check as I have said. Check the Security Check for lies.

"Have you told me any lies during this session of Security Checking? Are any of these things lies? Have you misrepresented the facts in any way while I have been security checking you?" Well, of course, let the pc take umbrage. But the harder the pc umbrages, why, the harder I push. Pc says, "What, no such thing! I've never told a lie in my life."

I said, "Well, all right, which one of these withholds was a lie?"

"Well, but I've never said anything like that. I . . . oh, I never! Well, I've never been so insulted in my life!"

"All right, well let's check them over. Now, let's take the first question. Did you lie on that one?"

"Well, not much."

That's the usual routine, one, two, three, four. The more upset a person gets about a Security Check, up to the point of refusing to take one, which is the ultimate upset with a Security Check, the more withholds the person has. It is a proportionate scale. It is directly proportional. The more protest, the more withholds. Right up to refusal to have any check of any kind whatsoever that's up . . .

Now, listen, that's not some punishment mechanism I'm thinking of. I have never had it fail, now, in much more than . . . well, it's two years and more experience now with Security Checks, I have never had it fail, that the person who refused . . . I don't care if that person was straight off the street . . . the person who has refused to have anything to do with a Security Check was the most loaded of the lot.

You say, well, how do you find this out? Well, that's not necessarily a secret. You take a non-Scientology staff, or a non-Scientology personnel, don't you see . . . we've had a lot of experience with these, not just here . . . and they're pretty wild. The person who has got a fairly clean slate or a halfway clean slate will come in and sit down and have a Security Check. But the person that you can't even see the black for the chalk, you know, and they say, "No, well, that's against my rights. We have rights here. you might not understand it, but we have rights. Rights!?"

Now, at first I sort of bought this. But as time went on, and I got crosschecks on these people, I found out the more rights the more crime. Soon as somebody tells me something like that anymore, I just, "Well, what do you know! So that's where the sugar has been going." In fact I'd be perfectly liable to say that right out loud to them. "What else have you done around here that I don't know about?" And oddly enough, they'll start breaking down, drrrrrrr, boom!

"Ah, I didn't mean it," and so forth. "And the spoons just leaped off the sideboard and into my pocket. And what do you mean by having spoons that do this?"

That is something to know. That is something to know.

Now, the general mechanism of the Security Check . . . in that withholds can be abused: A person has the horrible choice of remaining static as a case from there on out or getting them off, and taking the chance that it ruins his reputation, that he'll be hanged, and so forth. Well, in two years of experience I have never seen anybody hanged for getting rid of a withhold. I have noticed, occasionally, on staffs, and so forth, an HCO Sec or somebody reading down a sheet of withholds and finding one that's so damn contrary to organizational regulations or what we're supposed to be doing or something of the sort, that the person just goes up like a small skyrocket and lands on the person's head in a gigantic atomic explosion, and the person is rather taken aback by all this.

"What do you mean, stealing mimeograph paper? Don't you know that stuff costs money? No wonder I've never had any mimeograph paper around here," you know?

Well, that's actually bad. They're abusing a withhold. But why do anything about it? Why do anything about it?

Another thing that happens with regard to withholds is very, very funny, and it was happening to us down in South Africa. I'm looking at a student right now who was very baffled on two or three occasions, but I think he came in on at least one occasion that I know of, maybe two occasions, and found his desk as Director of Materiel, Johannesburg, practically covered with unidentifiable, nonsource items. All kinds of weird things. Organization property, don't you see? And I think this one thing was terribly mysterious, awfully mysterious, was that his office was locked and nobody had a key to it except two or three top executives. And yet, he came in in the morning, the office still locked and desk covered with all kinds of litter, bric-a-brac, you know, missing tapes and missing books and missing this and that.

And somebody, you see, trying to get out from underneath it . . . being found on the Security Check, or something. I don't know what all that wound up on, but sooner or later of course somebody would collide with it anyway.

But when it comes to health, or case advances or a decent society, and so forth, actually a society which makes it impossible for a person to take any road out, of course, is a doomed society. That society can kiss itself goodbye. It will go along with Chaldea, Babylon and Egypt any day.

And, of course, this society, the present society, is absolutely boobytrapped. Well, goodness gracious, the police are running around in circles up here right now, I'm sure, trying to solve some vast crime or another, and get back some property or something. And there's probably some thief sitting someplace

saying, "Good heavens, why on Earth and what possessed me to steal a Queen Victoria hat? I'm sure I don't know, you see, and all this other junk. And what am I going to do with it? And the fences will have nothing to do with it, and I'd happily give the stuff back," but he can't. The police couldn't accept it back, and . . . oh, they've got a big ridge going of some kind or another.

I'd pull a different deal if I were figuring out which way to go on such a thing. I wouldn't let people off scot-free on such things, but I would sure send them someplace where they could get straightened out. In other words I would make a road out. But in the existing society there is no road out.

Well, handling Security Checks in a society of this particular character, then, runs into a little bit of heavy weather. And you very often run into some heavy weather. Somebody's sitting there and, good God, they're the fellow who did it, you know, and what are you going to do as the auditor, you know? Well, one of the things that occurs to you at once is they're the one who did it, and so forth. They, therefore, are guilty and they're a criminal involved in the situation, and what is your responsibility as an auditor?

Well, it's . . . your responsibility as an auditor is first and foremost as an auditor, is get the person out of it. You're not the police force. Don't you see? And then you actually are not honor bound from that point there on to be under a stamp and seal of total secrecy with regard to the fact that the First National Bank was robbed by Joe, you see.

But don't go calling up the police. They're on the wrong road. Cops never get a society anyplace. Cops are a short-term proposition, strictly. The more cops, the more crime. Not the more crime there is the more cops. See, it's the reverse. Quite the reverse. If you had a totally lawful society, all you'd have to do is look around and hire a thousand police, and you'd have criminals. Well, these fellows have to have something to do, don't they? There's a game called cops and robbers. And if there aren't any criminals, we're going to make some. And they don't protect the society.

Various times on the track when I've done police work, always operated on one basic mechanism: that the responsibility of a provost marshal or a military governor or something like that was to public security, public safety. First and foremost, public security. That was the target. Not criminals, you don't have anything to do with criminals, you had to do with public security.

Of course, that makes kind of a vigorous kind of law if you look it over. And you find somebody standing on the crossroads with three people in the held up coach with bullets in them, and he's got bloody jewels in his hands right at that moment, well, you don't bother the courts, you think of public security. And of course if you think of public security you also think of public economy. That's a sort of a vigorous kind of justice. But nevertheless is a much more positive kind of justice than hire a thousand cops in a lawful society . . .

Oh, somebody has sent me a whole series of clippings on this, by the way. This had escaped my memory. And there's some town in Texas that had a jail, and they had two or three police officers. And they finally cut the police force down and they noticed that the crime disappeared to some degree, so they chopped the police force out entirely and haven't had a crime since. A whole series of clippings on this. Quite amusing.

But you're not in the business of justice with a Security Check, is all I'm trying to impress you with. You're not in the business of justice, you are totally and completely in the business of straightening somebody out. Now, if you later on are in the business of justice, you have to reconcile with your fact you've used an auditing confidence or something that you forced the fellow to give you. And if you use this later on, wearing some other hat, well, you just have to reconcile it somehow or another, or figure out whether you should or shouldn't. But it would be while wearing another hat that something like this occurred, don't you see?

This society is rather goofy. Along one line, it believes second dynamic withholds are far more valuable and more important, you see, than other types of withholds. And the second dynamic is one of eight. And I don't know that second dynamic withholds have any vast importance. Of course, sex is a little bit closer to creativeness, and creativeness is a little bit closer to reactivity than other things. But I'd say that a man who created bad machinery on the third dynamic, don't you see, or sold bad machinery or something like

that on the third dynamic . . he was . . this shouldn't have any . . should have about the same weight as somebody who is doing some weird second dynamic activity. What's all this emphasis?

Well, the society gets this from Papa Freud. And Freud brought this up and said the single source of human aberration was the libido theory. You didn't get that joke. Wasn't sex, it was Freud's theory. And they've been playing it on their zithers and guitars ever since. That was just what the Victorian age needed to top itself off with and finish itself off And they bought it, and that's it. But you find a great deal more freedom being expressed along in these lines.

And if you think the case is going to get better suddenly by getting off some bad second dynamic withhold, be prepared to often be disappointed. Case gives up a second dynamic withhold and doesn't get any better. According to Freudian theory, you see, once you found the childhood sexual abnormality . . . Penis envy, I think, was one of the greatest crimes of the whole setup, you know, that kind of thing Terrific, awful. And you get this off, you know, and you say, "Well, gee," you know, "that ought to really make a difference with this case. This case really ought to run now," you know? Case doesn't run any better. Wrong target.

You find one fine day that the case had an unkind thought about a pc in session. And you get that one off, you know, and the case all of a sudden starts to run. And if you don't recognize . . recognize that the value of a withhold is the value assigned to it by the pc; and the value of releasing it . . is the degree it assists auditing . . the way it assists his life or something. And if you recognize those principles, why, you won't get carted astray with all this nonsense and so forth.

Now, I suspect that in some group or another they could start vying with one another about the meatiness of the second dynamic withholds that they could get off, and I . . about the time I saw some of these things, I would say, "Oh, hell, why don't you people stop lying and start auditing, you know." Because, poeey! it's not that important.

The whole world, its perpetuity as far as bodies are concerned, is based on certain now-I'm-supposed-to's, all of which are self-protective. And if you're trying to hold a unit together like a family or something like this, there should be now-I'm-supposed-to's, and they should hold together. And if that is the game that's being played, it should be played by the rules.

But as far as the total aberration of man . . you got off a second dynamic withhold off of somebody, like he was the fellow who set up the perpetuity of bodies for any given planet, and he's been sort of feeling guilty about that ever since, of course he'd be the source of all second dynamic withholds or upsets or aberrations from there on out, wouldn't he? And yet that would be a social activity in the field of science. It's not a second dynamic activity at all. It'd be a fifth and sixth dynamic activity.

Well, it can't be very aberrative. I was a party to something like that once.

But the upshot of it is, the withholds that you get off are what they are, not what the pc embroiders them into, and they are as good as they assist auditing to take place. You're just trying to put the pc in-session, that's all you're trying to do with withholds. And you could overvalue this.

As a matter of fact, they have, here and there, you get a tremendous resurge when you're doing Security Checks. You find out some mechanism or another, and you release this thing, and you get a big case resurge. And it is a good thing to have happen to the case. There is no doubt about this. But remember, he won't go Clear on withholds. And that's all we're interested in.

You get off of . . all of his withholds off the length and breadth of the track, the whole distance, and you wouldn't have a Clear. Isn't that interesting? You'd just have somebody that audited better. So look at your relative values.

Now, a case will not progress unless a certain proportion of the withholds are off the case. And you'll find any case that is holding on to withholds, hard to audit and hard to clear. Getting off withholds does not make a Clear, but having withholds can prevent clearing from occurring Now, do you follow that? You see, it's just like building barricades across roadways, and the person's trying to travel on this road.

Well, actually removing the barricade doesn't get him much further on the road, it just permits him to travel on it.

Therefore you have to know how to do these things, and you have to know how to do them well. And it is a subject . . . I won't mince around with it . . . it is a subject which requires cleverness. You have to be clever to be a good Security Checker. You have to be clever. You can't sit there and run over and over and over like a wound-up phonograph and say, "Well, have you ever cooked a company's books? Thank you. Have you ever cooked a company's books? Thank you. Have you ever cooked a company's books? Thank you." That's not going to get anyplace. You read the question, "Have you ever falsified a company's accounts?" And the person, well, looks a little tense, and the meter might or might not have reacted, and you say, "Well, what do you know. Well, have you ever juggled a company's books? You ever juggled any accounts?" Bing! "All right, when was that?" you see.

A security question sheet can never be put together to answer up to all human beings at all times and all places. Just skip it, you can't do it. Couldn't be done. You've got to ask the question 90 that it applies to the pc.

Now, supposing you did a Security Check in Oxfordian English with polysyllabic address at all corners? And then you were checking a Bantu? Right away, of course, your Security Check breaks down because all these beautiful words go over his head and that's it. Of course you don't get any reactions, he's innocent of everything including being a Bantu. Doesn't think of himself as a Bantu; he's a Zulu. See, so, "Are you a Zulu?" He'd fall on that, but not on "Are you a Bantu?" You got the idea?

Has to be adapted to the person. And when you give a Security Check, you have to give a Security Check to the person you are giving the Security Check to. And the list of questions are never to have any omissions. Always ask them all the questions on this sheet and any others you think it would be good to ask them.

Auditors are always adding Well, let me open the gates right there; let me open the gates wide. you can add all the questions you want to to a Security Check as long as you ask all the questions that are on the sheet. So your "prolixity for additivity," can be given a free and complete rein. I don't care how many security questions you interlard into a Security Check. I just don't care.

And you're going down the line, and you say, "You know, I bet this fellow has an awful lot of Security Check questions on the subject of horses. I bet you he's been stealing horses, and beating horses. I just . . . cause . . . because every time he blows his nose he goes 'Hyn-hyn-hyn-hyn-hyn!' " Good lead. All right. Do a bunch of little questions about horses. Next time you open up the session on a Form 3, why, just sail into your questions about horses. And get them cleaned up and go on with Form 3, you get the idea. you can throw questions into a Security Check anyplace.

Very ordinarily in handling cases, why, I will dream up a series of Security Check questions that'd exactly fit that case and ask the auditor to run them, and usually there's pay dirt on them that would have made the forty-niners look pale. Well, I'll give you an example. Well, let's say cigarettes are disappearing around upstairs . . . you know, packages of cigarettes are disappearing . . . and I read an employment Security Check to a staff member. Only I'm worried about cigarettes. I don't say "Have you stolen anything?" I say, "Well, have you stolen any cigarettes around here?" Get the idea? In other words, Security Check is being given against a series of known circumstances. So those known circumstances which are current, of course, are interlarded into a standard Security Check.

There's one exception to this, and that is Form . . . HCO WW Security Check Form 7. Because that is so deadly, it mustn't be added to. The Security Checker there is taking the fellow's life in his hands. He can deny him a job or he can suspend him from staff just from failing one question, whether the question is cleared or not. So you start adding a bunch of questions to that thing and, of course, you close the gates in all directions. Because there isn't a human being alive, nor a doll on some other planet, or any human beings on some other planets, that could pass a Security Check from beginning to end without . . . well, Security Form 3 . . . without about a 30 percent casualty. There isn't anybody alive who hasn't got about a 30 percent casualty on that thing . . . you know, flunk, that. And if you're just giving the Security Check, you see, de-de-de da da, ba-da, da da, and just flunking just because they had a needle reaction, an instant



read reaction, of course you'd flunk everybody. Everybody in the universe would become unemployable at once.

So don't mess up a Form 7, but you might . . . somebody might pass a Form 7, and then you still aren't sure. Well, if you're still not sure, why you, after they've passed the Form 7, why, you get somebody else to do something about it, or tip off their auditor or something of this sort. You're not sure. But if they didn't really give an instant read on Form 7, Versions A or B, you can't do anything about it. And those are read verbatim, and they are read just that many checks. But of course, that is a Security Check for the purpose of security. And we're talking about Security Checks for the purpose of processing. And purpose of processing, that's another reason. You're much more cognizant with Security Checks from the basis of processing. And that's the viewpoint from which we're looking at it.

Now, if you were doing a Security Check from the standpoint of police work, of course, you would know exactly what questions you were looking for, because you were asking from a set of known conditions. And therefore the Security Check should be dreamed up for whatever activity you're engaged in that way. You're trying to find a thief or something of the sort. Well, ask the questions necessary to find the thief.

There's another rationale about Security Checks that I should say something about; and that is, that rights shouldn't be invaded. Now, of course you get that from the people with all the withholds. But you should have this datum, if somebody ever argues with you consistently and continually on a broad public front, like a meeting or something like that about the Security Checks and invasion of privacy, and so forth. The answer to that is contained in, in an essay I wrote in a bulletin, HONEST PEOPLE HAVE RIGHTS. That has been so neglected on this planet that only the crook now has rights. Honest people have rights. There is no doubt about that. And that is not part of any police curriculum, rule book or mores on this planet today.

I was very amused. I followed for some weeks newspaper stories about crimes, and I found in each case . . . I was out in Arizona . . . and I found in each case the total interrogation was of the person who had been robbed. Fellow had had his car stolen; they'd have him right down to the police station, being . . . interrogating him under the lights. It started out a fellow had parked his car momentarily alongside of a road, and a couple of tough guys had come up and beaten him up. And I think, drove off with the car or something like that. And the police came along very shortly afterwards and they shadowed this fellow who'd had his car stolen. They interrogated him, they took him down to the police station, and then thereafter shadowed him, cross-questioned him, had his name in all the papers, until reading the stories you would have been absolutely certain that there was something very wrong with this man that he had committed the crime of being beaten up by two toughs. You see how it gets bent around?

I wanted to see if things were going that way, so I followed the press rather rigorously for a while on just that one theme. Honest people have rights.

Now, give you a consequence of that. Any domestic difficulties there have been at Saint Hill amongst domestic staff, which of course are non-Scientology staff, have been occasioned by people who had fantastic withholds. This was a long time ago. And it worked like this: They immediately got rid of good staff members. You can always count on a staff member who has a great many withholds and who is doing criminal things, getting rid of good staff members. You can always count on it. When you see good staff members disappearing, look for the guy with the withholds. Because they will tell lies about them. They will try to get rid of them. Because they can't bend them down to their level.

And a person, for instance, in some large British company right at the . . . this instant, you see, who has a criminal background, who has lots of withholds of one character or another, is a terrible liability to the rest of the staff. He's a terrible liability to them.

The situation is not a faint one. They let these boys ram around inside of a . . . the perfectly good employees, and that sort of thing, and the next thing you know the place is a dog's breakfast. And it isn't that management should be suspicious and mean, but management that is going to protect their working people and their employed people, must use security measures. They must. They must not employ

criminals. They just mustn't do it. Because they are victimizing the people they are supposed to be protecting.

Well, I'll give you an idea. I imagine there's a student or two that was given a fancy story around here not too long ago about how horrible Saint Hill was thought of from the region of East Grinstead. You know, the people in East Grinstead are . . . boarding houses or people in East Grinstead thought that Saint Hill was terrible and Hubbard was terrible and this was an awful place and that sort of thing. Well, this type of story had been current mostly around here, and some staff members had been upset by this. And if you remember the "death lesson" gag . . . that piece of nonsense. Well, I finally turned a private eye loose in East Grinstead for a period of about ten days to interrogate one and all to find out if there was any slightest libelous or slanderous things taking place, and whether or not any of the parents of those children were still upset, and see if we could get down and find out if there was . . . anything had developed along in this line.

Well, you know, a private eye who gets on a hot lead (actually they don't have too many clients; their pockets are always wide open for the next five-pound note, you know) and you give a private eye carte blanche and tell him to carry on, and he'll sure carry on as long as he can find out anything. But after ten days this fellow had been totally overwhelmed. And that was the maximum that he would put in on it, and he quit. He was overwhelmed. Everybody in East Grinstead . . . he contacted everybody he could think of: trades people and boarding houses and hotels and restaurants and everything you could possibly think of. And all he got was, "Saint Hill? That's a wonderful place. They do very good work. Doctor Hubbard? I know him. He's a fine man. Oh, yes, oh, they're nice people. Yeah, that's fine, Saint Hill is lovely." I can show you the report. It goes on page after page after page. And this poor fellow, you see, looking for slander and libel, you see, is getting overwhelmed by all of this good opinion, and it finally just drove him out. Too much theta on the line.

So we find out that the rumors were coming from just one person who happened to be on staff here. These rumors never came from East Grinstead, they just came from an insecure person. That's what we have to assume from this, don't we? We put it to the total test. That person isn't here now and there are no rumors. Isn't that fascinating?

Yes, but what is the end product of this sort of thing? Well, good staff members are made nervous, upset; they think they're working for a place that is not worthwhile; they think they're liable to be under criticism from this; they get nervous; they don't know quite what's going to be said about them. And all of a sudden they lose a job, something like this. Or, factually, they will be lied about to a point where they're falsely accused and do lose their jobs. But inevitably you will find this kind of thing taking place in the absence of Security Checking.

Honest people have rights. And if I were working . . . knowing what I know about Security Checks, and so forth, if I were working for some large office of some kind or another which had no security system of any kind whatsoever, I'd sabotage the joint. I mean I'd sabotage it. I'd go to the top and find out why. why there was no security program. Just as bluntly as that. And fellow would say, "Security program? What are you talking about?"

And I would say, "Well," I'd say, "got a contract with me to hire me, and keep me on the job, and let me do my work, and I can't do work without a security program. Can't be done."

"Well, how is this?"

"Oh, well, people come around all the time and say you've just swindled a quarter of a million pounds, and people drifting around by the water cooler, and giving you all the hot dope about all the wrong contracts that didn't get signed, got thrown out the window. And nobody ever types my letters, and so forth. And you've got some sour apples in here, man, you expect me to associate with this scum? To hell with it." I'd tell him bluntly, "Get them processed. Get a security system in here. you . . . maybe you got something running Maybe it might even work out that your ulcers wouldn't be bothering you so much."

It isn't that . . . it isn't that it's a nice thing to have. you can't work without it. That's as . . . it's just as blunt as that. I've proven it time and time again. I've just proven it over and over and over. There'll be one,

two, three characters who are just so damned aberrated that they should be inside looking out someplace, and they'll just be tearing the place to pieces. And they can have twenty, thirty people just going in a circle, just bum data, bum data, bum data, bum data, alter-is, alter-is, bum data. Oh, plooeey! Everything is in a commotion all the time.

Well, all of a sudden you have to wear the wrong hats. All of a sudden you're wearing a police hat or you're wearing the management's hat. And under these circumstances you'll get so uneasy about management that you feel you don't have any direction, so you feel you don't trust the direction, and so you don't have any orders. And whether you're doing right or wrong you don't know. What the hell, nobody can work under those circumstances.

If I want to fight a war, I like to fight a war with machine guns and mortars . . . honest tools. Not lies. Not lies. I just don't like to fight wars with lies. Or fight wars with covert investigations or fight wars with other back slaps or figure-figures, or intelligence services at work or something like that. I like an honest war. Of course, honest war has gotten discredited. I don't know why it's gotten discredited. I suppose the munitions makers discredited it or something of the sort. But they got in there, too. If two guys want to stand up and kill each other, well, what the hell. who are you to tell them they can't? Well, that's a point. But just the point of them standing up and killing each other shouldn't enturbulate the rest of the world.

There's all kinds of sides and general descriptions about this sort of thing that rather escape the eye. On a broader look, there's nothing more fun to hunt than submarines. They're the biggest fish there are, and they can shoot back. But some guy down here is hunting . . . fishing for some perfectly good marlin. I have a little bit better than a fourth dynamic attitude toward these things, you see. And somebody's fishing for marlin, and they take this perfectly good marlin and they yank him around in the sea, and sink pieces of steel into his mouth and they drag him up and knock him over the head so they can mount him on a wall to show how big and tough they were. Well, he was being a good marlin. Well, what the hell? What more can you ask of him? He's being a good marlin, so they punish him. That's silly, you know? It's a deeper significance than you would first glimpse.

Well, what's all this? What's all this about? Well, that seems to be all right, but it's apparently . . . it's only all right because the marlin can't shoot back. I think it's much more fun to hunt submarines. You can get in real trouble hunting them. You've put up as big a stake as they have, don't you see?

Aircraft, too. I like ducks. I have absolutely just gotten more disgust from duck hunters, you know. My father still tells a wild tale about me being in a duck blind when I was about twelve, and they said "You have the first shot," you know, and I was supposed to put up this big double-barreled shotgun with smokeless powder and projectiles made by Remington under vast scientific process. And a couple of teal were coming in and one came in and suddenly saw me in the blind.

I was just standing there with a gun; I was supposed to be holding it. And this teal was a very pretty teal, and he turned around and . . . He misinterprets the whole thing. I merely said, "That's a pretty teal," you see.

And he said, "Well," he said, "why don't you shoot?" (The way he tells the story.) "Why didn't you shoot?"

And I said, "Well, he's too pretty."

That isn't what I said at all. I just said he was a pretty teal, you know, meaning "What am I supposed to be doing shooting teal," you know? In the first place, I don't like duck to eat, and that's it. They raise plenty in Long Island that are dedicated to dying for humanity.

I admit, this is a little bit too broad a view, don't you see? But airplanes, that's different. The guy's out there to kill you. Well, if you can kill him first, well, fine, that's a game. That's a game of comparable odds. And if you're going in for sports, you notice you always have to have comparable odds and that's it. He loses a body, you lose a body, you know, and the government loses some property.

I'm not holding any brief for war, but you notice that war has been just stamped on as being a most terrible activity, you see, and it's been not-ised and not as-ised to such a point now that the little baby in his crib up in London is going to fight the next one. It's not going to be troops any more.

All right. This all comes out from the basis of withholds and individuation. And people get individuated, and they back up further and further and further, and they become more and more individuated, and they become more and more and more individuated. Well, how do they get this way? They get so individuated they're eventually not even themselves. How do they get this way? Just withholds and overts. Overts and they withhold, and overts and they withhold, and overts and they withhold, and eventually you got a guy who can't be a duck. See? He shoots ducks so he can't be a duck. So therefore, that's the reason he should shoot ducks. Proves itself, doesn't it? Self-proving proposition. If you have enough overts on something, you can't be it, then you should shoot it. Silly, isn't it?

So you get this superindividuation. And the more individuation that occurs, the less likely a person is ever to be able to walk out of anywhere. It's just like he's backing up down a long corridor. And the corridor has . . . is actually not so much a corridor but an endless succession of isolation rooms. And it's further and further and further from communication, and it's further and further and further from being anyplace. And the way he gets there is a very simple route. He has overts which he then withholds. That puts him in room one. Now, while in room one he commits another overt which he then withholds, he goes to room two. you get the idea? Now, while in room two he commits more overts, because now it's the best reason in the world he should commit overts, you see . . . because he's in room two. And he commits another overt, withholds that, and moves to room three.

And he's just going on, not necessarily apart from the human race, but apart from life. A person to be in some kind of shape must be able to be almost anything. He must be able to be almost anything. And the degree that you can't be things is the degree that you have overts on them that you are withholding. And that is the whole equation. There isn't anything more significant about it than that.

Now, you find out that if you've wrecked enough cars that you find it damn near impossible to be a car. you can drive one and run it off the road and run it into the bus, but you can't be a car. It's as simple as that. Therefore cars seem to go to pieces around you. you get this mysterious thing.

Motorcycles, which are much more touchy, are noted for this. In the motorcycle world, rather, this fact is very well known, terribly well known. You get certain guys and the sequence and how they got that way, is overt against a motorcycle, then they can be the motorcycle less, and then overts against the motorcycle, and they can less be the motorcycle, and they're totally individuated from the motorcycle and they've withdrawn. It gets to a point of where to touch a motorcycle is to have an overt against the motorcycle, and then you . . . you do that by dumping it in the nearest ditch or something of that sort.

All the automobile accidents that are the subject of the diffident interest of road safety committees . . . all automobile accidents occur just through this mechanism. Because you can stop a person from having automobile accidents by making them run Reach and Withdraw from a car. It proves itself backwards, you see. you just make him run Reach and Withdraw, Reach and Withdraw and Reach and Withdraw and Reach and Withdraw from various parts of a car, and the next thing you know he not only can drive the car but he won't have accidents with the car and the car will run. It's quite interesting

Person want to cure this sort of thing up . . . he might feel like he looked like a silly ass doing it, but he ought to just stand alongside of a motorcycle and run Reach and Withdraw on the motorcycle, and then take and drive the motorcycle and actually consciously run SCS on the motorcycle. While riding the motorcycle, you run SCS on the motorcycle. It's a very interesting activity. Do it very slowly, and so on, and the next thing you know you get horrible feelings like you don't want to ride a motorcycle anymore, and you get somatics and you get all kinds of things. Well, what you've actually done is put a motorcycle back under control and the mechanism by which it goes back under control is the overts start blowing. You start blowing overts.

Well, there are many ways to blow overts, but the best way to blow overts is the Security Check. Because the overt only remains bad if it is withheld.

All right. It's an overt to go to war in this society, so-called, that we have today. It's an overt to go to war. So therefore, one must withhold going to war. All kinds of nasty words: "jingoist," "warmonger." Oh, there's a whole dictionary of these things, you see, of anybody who thinks of going to war.

Do you see what's happening? Commit an overt called war, and then they withhold another one. you see, so therefore they commit another one, so therefore they withhold that, and so forth. And they're more and more individuated so therefore they can less and less control war, until you get leaders that get up and bleat from over the radio and microphones to the nation, "I hate war." And he's building up a war situation. Year by year, he's just building up a worse and worse war situation. He's not doing anything at all that'd avert war. He's just telling people how much he hates it.

I remember the marines on Guadalcanal had that down, boy, they had that down to a very fine point. They could give that speech from one end to the other. "Eleanor hates war, James hates war," they had it all down, taped. See some guy . . . all you had to do for a laugh is just start giving this speech; it was the standard humor. The US was involved in one of the nastiest wars it had ever fought under the leadership of somebody who hated war.

Now, it's quite interesting, isn't it? International peace and the destruction of this particular playing field is at stake against this exact mechanism. You see, war is so terrible it cannot be fought. Yeah, what's that make? What's the next immediate step? Fight it! Because it's on automatic. Nobody can stop a war.

You know, you sit back, and after a while you don't know whether to laugh or cry, you know? This Berlin thing, Berlin. All right, so the Russians wanted to fight about Berlin. Of course they'd want the city, and so forth, because somebody's free in it and they can't stand that. And so there's this pawn sitting out there. Well, it was set up by somebody who hated war, so he set Berlin up there so that it would create a war. That was the way they divided Germany, you see. Start another war, inevitably.

And has anybody all through the years that Berlin has been sitting there as a crisis . . . potential crisis, has he ever gotten a counterpaw? All you'd have to do is say, well, Budapest, actually, or Vienna, or something like that. Start agitating for the Russians to give up Vienna, you see, or . . . after the Hungarian thing, and so forth. Just start treaty talks at once with them: How far they withdrew beyond the Hungarian border, not how much Hungary they could have, you see, but just a reverse, you see.

"How much of Russia are you going to give up beyond Hungary? Now, that is the point." Well, it's a counterplay, don't you see?

And the Russian says, "Berlin."

And you say, "Well, we're not too interested in Berlin. How about this Hungarian border? This Hungarian border? You see, there's an old treaty, the treaty of Budapest, that was made by the early Huns, which were your people." You get the idea? And everybody's just all built up on this idea, and the Russians start worrying, and they say, "Well, better talk about Berlin, you know. Dangerous thing to talk about. What the hell will these people think up next?" Just counterplays.

Has anybody bothered to pick up a pawn? No. So we must decide then that they are heading for war. They're not playing the game, so the game is going to occur. And it won't be a game. Interesting viewpoint.

But that's individuation from a subject which then no longer becomes controlled.

And that is true in all life. That is true in all life. When a person totally individuates, he can no longer control anything. A good garbageman sure has to be able to be garbage, let me tell you, man. But the idea of being able to be garbage immediately wipes out any possibility of his ever becoming garbage. Isn't that interesting

Now, way to make little kids have accidents is just keep telling them they mustn't have accidents. Simple. Simple mechanism. Just say, don't touch this, don't touch that, don't touch something else. What would happen to a pc if you stood around saying, "All right now, we're going to run a little process on you.

Now, stand in the middle of the room. Good enough. Now, don't touch that wall, and don't touch the ceiling, and don't touch the floor. . ." What's going to happen? Well, yet parents run this on little kids all the time and they fall down, bark their shins and that sort of thing.

What's very interesting is our kids around here don't get much of this run on them, and, well, they haven't to date had very many accidents. They don't have the usual childhood accidents, and so forth. But I see people worrying about them every once in a while. Little Arthur or something will be walking along a high wall, you see, with disaster on both sides of him, and I've seen somebody go "Ughhh," you know, like that. why suggest it to him? He doesn't think he's going to fall off. He won't. He doesn't either.

So there's the basis of individuation. The basis of individuation. If you're going to make beer, you've got to be able to be beer, you know? All right, you've got overts on beer and withholds on the subject of beer, why, you of course aren't going to make any good beer. Now, another mechanism takes place . . . to give you a broad view of this; although this sounds very chatty, Security Checks are a very vital thing to understand in their full panoply . . . and that is, that after you have gotten to the end of the corridor, room one, room two, room three, room four, room five . . . what do you know? You can't stay out of the place you left. It is impossible. Having backed up to the end of the corridor, you now find yourself at the entrance to the corridor but unable to leave.

In other words, you snap terminals and obsessively become the thing of which you have overts against. And that is what is a valence closure. And as a result, the individual gets stuck in various things, obsessed with various things, you know?

Now, you take one of these dear old ladies that's protecting cats. Brother, man, I've seen them around, and after they've talked to me about. . . Well, you got to realize the reality of a cat. In the first place, to have much to do with cats you've got to know cats. And cats are a package of a certain I'm . . . series of I-am-supposed-to's. And these are neither bad nor good, they're just the I'm-supposed-to's of a cat. And cats have a whale of a time playing with half-dead mice, and half-dead birds, and they kill certain things (they're supposed to), and they have certain habits which are not necessarily very endearing habits at all.

And on the other hand, they have certain admirable qualities, and so on. And this is a cat. And it isn't a "Poor dear little pussy."

Well, how does a cat's I'm-supposed-to's suddenly become this poor abused little thing which must be superprotected from life. How does it get that way? Well, the person who did this must have been hanging cats, shooting cats, beating cats, and then not telling anybody about cats. And then as a child in some life, you see, he strangled cats as a pastime and then kept saying that it was done by the boy next door, don't you see? Had to be withholds on this thing every time. And we just keep going like this, and after a while, why, "De poor dear little pussy," you know. And you look at this lady who's telling you that, you notice the way she's wearing her hair, and you look her over. she won't buy a fur coat made of anything but cat fur. But it mustn't be of cat fur, you see, so therefore it's even synthetic cat fur, but it's very con . . . involved.

But what she has done is back up the whole corridor, don't you see, and then found herself in nothing but a cat. See, she . . . you can only get only so far, and then it snaps back. That is the mechanism which actually takes place, and that is a very general mechanism of life.

The police officer who is an honest cop and resists criminals and then gets withholds . . . the withhold is an absolute necessity to individuation. And he gets overts on criminals and then withholds and then goes a little bit wrong and withholds that. And life after life, why, this thing goes, and next thing you know you've got a criminal police officer. And in the next life or two you'll find him being a thoroughgoing criminal. See? He . . . overts on criminals and he becomes a criminal. That's the mechanism.

You look at some fellow who is a criminal, trace it back to a time he was a police officer and you won't always be wrong. You won't always be right, but you won't always be wrong either. But it's a cop who went crooked by starting to withhold. He's been withholding. And of course that's one of the best things police forces do.

I've been very hard on cops in this particular lecture and I could be accused then of having something against cops. But I don't have what I . . . people usually have against cops. I am just running a supposed-to-be, a bit of an ought-to-be, on a cop. I think in a society that has any order to it, this kind of a situation should exist: that the people who are being what they are being should be what they are being, you know? That's an awfully innocently crude look at things, you know? If the fellow's the mayor of the town, he ought to be the mayor of the town and he ought to be a mayor of a town, see. You shouldn't have police who are criminals, you see? All kinds of weird mishmashes. I believe in the simplicity and purity of it all. All I'm saying is I'm against pretence.

But anyway, where you have a pc who is loaded with withholds on a Security Check, you have a pc who is very individuated. Got the idea? So therefore you have somebody who can't be. And you're trying to find valences. And of course you can't find valences easily on somebody who can't be. But you can pick out and find the fixed valence the person is in. Because it's been this mechanism which has led up to his becoming that valence.

So you could find a person's terminal without completing his Security Check. But you will find that where a person's individuation . . . forced on him or actual and so on to such a great degree that he's loaded with withholds . . . you'll find he's very hard to get into session. He ARC breaks, he gets very upset in sessions, and so forth. Well, he can't be a preclear.

Well, now there are two routes by which he could approach this point of beingness. You find it in that he's critical of the auditor. This means he has withholds. It also . . . that also means then that he is having beingness trouble. And he can't be this thing called a preclear. And you have your first rudiments process on that, which I choose . . . I believe you have by now, which is the Shakespearian approach: "To be or not to be. That is the question." What's he willing to be and what he'd rather not be.

Now, you'll find out that will walk forward but if you run much of that, two things will occur. One of them beneficial and one of them harmful. The first of them is that it'll soften him up on a Security Check. You'll find out all of a sudden he'll be able to do a Security Check better if you run that process, see. Because beingness and withholds, these things are counteropposed and one tends to solve the other, see. All right.

And the not-so-beneficial part of it is, is of course it walks him into his valence chain without the valence chain being identified. You don't know that this fellow is being a beermaker. You don't know that he's . . . that is his terminal. But because you've run an awful lot of this process, you have walked him into the engrams on that chain. And that process walks people into engrams. So don't make any mistake about it and be alert. That isn't any reason why you shouldn't use it. But you can get to a point of running where the person is not ready to run an engram. He's not ready to run the engram. You haven't got his terminal; you haven't done any Prehav runs; it's not sorted out at all. Yet there's your pc sitting in an engram.

Well, at the moment, call it one of the risks of the business. Because man, you're going to turn on some fancy somatics if you don't watch it. Thing to remember is, the somatic that the pc has, is where it is on the track, and it is only at that place on the track, and won't release from any other place. So you can walk him away from that place on the track, which keys it out, or you can walk him into that place on the track and as-is it. And these are the two things, the only two things, that processes do with regard to somatics. They either walk him away from it by getting in closer to PT and in other channels, or they walk him into it, where he anises it. And of course of the two there's no choice. The second one is easily the best solution.

Now, withholds will very often soften up and knock out present time somatics by walking the person away from the area, and maybe that's a good thing, see? The person could be tightly into an engram . . . in life, you see. The engram is just keyed in a hundred percent and there he is in life, in an engram. So that means he has very harsh somatics. He's got arthritis. He's got what you commonly call psychosomatic illness of some kind or another. Well, he's right in an engram.

All right, well you can walk him out of that engram, by moving him off so that you can then, when you've found his terminal, move him back into the engram. You got the idea? You might say the fellow's

so close to it he can't see it. Well, you couldn't see it either and the possibilities of getting him there . . of course, you find his goal and find his terminal and then run him for a while on the Prehav Scale, you'll find him landed in that section of the track, that's for sure.

But he might be so tightly in that section of the track that he couldn't even put his attention on the auditing session. See, that would be an interesting state, wouldn't it? I mean you'd find a pc then who's unauditible. Well, let me tell you the best approach to this, until others are found, the best approach to this is simply a Security Check.

Now, you can even run a Security Check on the basis of the chronic somatic that is making the person unauditible. Person's got so much eye trouble that you can't possibly . . well, you just, see, all he does is talk about these eyes. And it's just a chronic present time problem. He talks about eyes and he talks about eyes and . . his eyes. And you run into it, and you try to run a session and you run into eyes, and so on.

Well, that's boring. Because the truth of the matter is you've got to have his goal, and you've got to have his terminal, and you've got to run him on the Prehav Scale and then the engram will eventually turn up where his eyes are loused up. See, it's one, two, three. That's the way the thing stacks. And there he is sitting with bad eyes with a present time problem. And it's a present time problem so his case is not going to make any progress, and you can't find anything because he's got a present time problem. You see the knotty mess that this makes, see. you can't get it because he's got it.

And a very excellent way of getting at this and making him auditible, is to security check him. And you give him Security Checks and then he walks off from all this because you've knocked out this obsessive individuation, see. And he can walk off from the track then to where his eyes are being butchered and he'll tell you. Don't be taken in by this. He'll say, "Oh, my eyes are cured. They're well. I mean I've never been so well before in my life. Everything is fine, and so forth." Well, take it with a grain of salt. pat yourself on the back for having temporarily relieved it.

Don't bother to tell him that he's not going to experience permanent this and that. Maybe it never will get that good or that bad again. Nobody . . who knows? But for sure, when you get his goal, and you get his terminal, and you run him on the Prehav Scale, and you're running him on the track, why, one fine day you're going to do an assessment of the engrams he's run into, and there he is with those red-hot pokers in both eyes. And the somatics come off right there in that exact incident and that is the end of it. you see?

So up to that time you've done an assist, an alleviation. Which means you've walked him away from the valence in which he was obsessively stuck. But don't kid yourself that you cured him, because you haven't. And that would be the history of all chronic somatics we've run into in Dianetics and Scientology. They key out, they key in, they key out, they key in. And we sweat ourselves to death keying them out. And then after a while they key in. And then sometimes we're lucky and we key them out and they stay out. Marvelous. Now, somebody's going to get ahold of that person one fine day, is going to find his goal and his terminal. And even before he has a chance to do a Prehav run or anything else, bang! All the somatics around again in a thud. Disheartening, huh?

Well, the thing to do if that kind of thing happens, Security Check. Knock out the individuation and you'll knock out the chronic stuck in the engram. Why? Because he's backed up to the end of the corridor until he is at the front of the corridor, you see? Well, if you can at least get him to the back of the corridor and up . . halfway up the corridor again, toward it again, see, you can do it with a Security Check. And he can be audited halfway back up the corridor again. You got the idea?

Of course, he's always got the chronic somatic on the chain of the valence which will be his terminal. That's why you must always have it correct. That's why you must always have a correct goal and correct terminal. Because there's only one valence chain in which he's stuck. And that is the way the cookie crumbles.

So the use of a Security Check is what it is, and don't be bemused into thinking a Security Check is more so. By rendering tremendous numbers of Security Checks, of course, you put the person into better communication; of course, you put the person into feeling better about life; yes, he isn't going to get that bad again; he's going to feel good about a lot of other things, and that sort of thing, but basically you've



made him auditable. Because after you've gone all the way around, give him the Security Check, straightened him all out; you find his goal; you find his terminal; run it on the Prehav Scale; assess the engrams that he has run into where he was in valence; you run one of those engrams; and bang, you run right back into the chronic somatic he was running from. Only now it's on full and will run out.

So you get the circuitous routes here by which you can take to alleviate chronic somatics or banish chronic somatics. And you sometimes have to alleviate chronic somatics in order to get the case into auditing condition so that you can banish a chronic somatic. Now, does that make more sense?

We have all these years of experience behind us about all the various routes, and I'm talking to you now about a route, and throwing it into your lap and saying, "Well, you better be good at these things."

Now, I could have told you a great deal about how to do a Security Check. But there have been lectures on that sort of thing, you've got textbooks on it, you've got bulletins on it. What I'm trying to tell you today is simply why you should do a Security Check, what a Security Check will produce, what to expect of a Security Check, and, more or less, its general use in auditing

I don't think you could do the type of auditing you're doing smoothly now without Security Checks. I think it'd be impossible. So the Security Check is very, very valuable. But don't overrate it, and don't underrate it. And don't, for heaven's sakes, go riding a hobbyhorse that if everybody in God's green earth confessed, it would be a paradise. I think it'd be a mess.

The end product of no withholds is good communication. The end product of no withholds is not Clear. It's just good communication.

So you use Security Check to set somebody up for auditing. Person's difficult to audit, think of Security Checks. That's one of your best ways out. Trying to resolve all the present time problems and all the rudiments of the pc and all of that sort of thing and going on over this is absolutely necessary. You've got to do this. But there's one positive tool that does do this. We have tested some other tools and they're nowhere near as positive as Security Checks. So that is its value.

A Security Check well done keeps rudiments in. A Security Check badly done and rudiments will be consistently out. The Security Check can be tailored to represent the area of the person's present time problem so as to key it out so that you can get him back down and actually get at the source of what his difficulty is.

Those are its uses, and I hope you will find what I've told you of some value.

Thank you.