PREPCLEARING

A lecture given on
13 February 1962

Thank you.

Thank you.

And this is the 13th of Feb. AD 12, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

What do you know? Got it right, without telling me a word.

All right, now, listen here. You've just heard or seen a demonstration of what happens with an incomplete list. Did you begin to realize that was the case? Did you? Did any of you realize that was the case?

Audience: Yes.

The liability of letting a pc go ahead and write a list themselves without bleeding it down.

All right. But that doesn't matter. But the symptom—I just learned something, you could probably tell. You know, every time I said one was in or out, you know, I got the same fall. Did you notice that?

Audience: hm-hmm.

I said it was in or out, and then the fall would interrupt the next read. So I couldn't tear along on the thing the way I ordinarily do at all. I was having a slow go of it.

And then, of course, I had a pc who was helping She was helping with the session. And of course, she very badly wanted to get an item to show you how good that was, you see.

And then she tells me afterwards that well, she thought, "a data gatherer," or what was it, "a knowledge gatherer," was it. And actually, when she talked to me about the list one morning at breakfast, I blurted it out quite automatically. She was counting on my item. Now, that's an incomplete list. But I learned something there myself. And that was you probably get a surge of that particular type if you got an incomplete list. I mean I—that's not equivocal because we haven't proven the list is incomplete. But would seem that was likely. Interesting, wasn't it, huh? Yeah.

Of course, you realize giving a demonstration like that under pressure is a little bit hard on the pc. But I was quite fascinated just from the standpoint of—all of a sudden what was I looking at here, you know. Well, I was looking at something that wasn't usual or ordinary. Well, I was looking at an incomplete list was what I was looking at.

Because you ask her, "Are any of those—is the item on that list?"

Female voice: No, I don't think so.

Well, is it or isn't it? Do you know that it was? Did you have the feeling that it was at any time?"

Female voice: Not really.

Not really.

Female voice: I can't wrap my wits around the enforced inflow myself?

How do you like that? See? I think that's pretty good. That's a good example. When I first asked her, if you remember, the other day, she said the list was complete. But now she doesn't believe that she could enforce her wits around the enforce of the inflow on self.

Of course, it's been invalidated now to the degree that I've nulled it all out. But that is not a vanished list because of rudiments out. That you should realize. Rudiments were in. If the item had been on the list, it would have showed.

What I'm showing you is it was heavily charged. The subject was charged. See that? We had a bzzz every time we charged the subject. Okay? All right.

Well, now you see that if I can miss them occasionally on completing a list, why, you needn't feel so blushing sometimes. And don't you ever fake one just because, see, you want to make the pc look good or something like that. Don't ever fake one, you know, say, "Well, it was reading a little bit, you know, it was the last one in," something like that. Doesn't work that way. If you don't find an item, don't find an item. You hear me?

It would have been very simple for me simply to have kicked it with my thumb and said it's in. Of course, that's very embarrassing, you know, in front of all of you experts, you know?

I thought that was quite fascinating just from the standpoint—I've— about halfway through the session I suddenly realized I was looking at a charged subject—that the subject was charged—but that I wasn't getting any action on any item like that surge that I was getting every time I said one was in or out.

Now, the toss-up is this: Do you stop and invalidate the pc across the boards and say, "Well, this list is no good, we're gonna have to do another list," or do you null it out to nothing and add some items and so forth? It'd just be what made the pc unhappy. Well, you wouldn't do that. You'd do what the pc is happy on, and so on.

Pc is not upset, I don't think, because we didn't find an item.

Female voice: No, I'd rather have the right item.

Yeah, she wasn't saying that just for your benefit. But the fact that she'd rather have the right item rather tends to indicate that she knew there wasn't one on the list. See? Tends to indicate it.

Well, all that, 3D Criss Cross to the contrary, let us get into something that is very vital to you. Let's get into Security Checking disappears, and Prepchecking rises newly born.

In the first place, the word Security Checking has never been very popular with the public and it renders itself very bad to understanding We're not checking people because of security, see? We're actually preparing cases for clearing. And so if you called it Prepchecking, it sounds slightly onomatic— onomatopoetic. That will be a shilling apiece, please, for that one. Slightly onomatopoetic—you didn't think I could say it twice, did you? So we'll call it Prepchecking if that's all right with you. What do you think about that?

Audience: I agree.

All right. And then we will call the operation of—not the operation covered in this bulletin. The subject matter that I'm taking up in this lecture is HCO Bulletin of February 12th, 1962, which I believe you have. But not because it isn't covered in this bulletin yet, but because I haven't given you all the dope on it and won't give you the dope in this particular lecture on

how you do it. We've got a whole subject here, and we could call this Prepclearing Prepchecking, Prepclearing. We got a whole subject here. It's a subject that'll take a lot of the snarls out of your wits on how you do this.

Now, I've been trying to teach you here and across the world for a very long time, how to do Security Checking. And auditors have been missing withholds and auditors haven't learned it very well, so we have to understand that this is probably something that is very, very hard to do.

Now, instead of blaming everybody and trying to make you all guilty—see, that's usual, you see, the fellow who's standing up with his thumbs in his braces, you know, and saying, "I'm the big I am, and I know it all," will naturally try to make you guilty and say, "Well, you're just ignorant and stupid."

Well, there must have been something missing in Security Checking Must have been something missing, and it's some element or another missing So instead of blaming you across the boards, I have been working since the first of the year, very hard on this subject. Now, of course, I've worked on this subject of overts for more than a decade. But there must have been something, something missing in the whole subject of pulling withholds, and there must have been something missing about withholds. There must have been something unknown about the subject, otherwise, one could have articulated it well enough so that you could do it easily.

Now, I've done some remarkable things in pulling withholds. And I've caused some cases to have some fantastic gains in pulling withholds here and there and now and then. But I might not have been doing it all. You know, there might be a better way to pull withholds, and there might be more to the mechanism of what withholds are all about and all of that sort of thing.

Well, anyway, I've been working very intensely here for a period of about well, since the first of the year, certainly.

And since the first of the year, I've been aware of the fact that if I couldn't teach you how to do this so that you'd get a resurgent gain every session and every time you did, that there must be a bug. There must be a bug here someplace. Either it is hard to relay or it's hard to do or there's some accidental—there must be something here because there's a variable. And so I made up my mind to get rid of the variable. And the first time you saw that was when I started jawing at you about missed withholds.

And apparently if you restimulate somebody's withholds, if you restimulate a withhold and then you don't pull it, you have the sole source of ARC breaks. Now, for God's sakes, when I learned that, when I looked at it, when I proved it out—and I had it proved out by about ten days, two weeks ago, totally to my satisfaction—you have the source of all of your ARC breaks, of all of the yap-yap against the organizations, of all the yap-yap against Scientology, of all of the nya-yak-nyak-nyak-nya-nya-nya-nya, of all the pcs that are going into propitiation and anger and upset, and so forth—you've got the lot in a missed withhold. It restimulates the withhold, you don't pull it, your pc gets mad at you, you know?

A pc in the HGC goes out into the field and all of a sudden goes nya-nya-nya-nya-nya-nya-nya. Well, somebody missed a withhold on that pc, that's all. Because listen, this is the proof. You get a hold of them, and you bring them in, and you set them down, and don't do a blessed thing with them but ask them what withhold has been missed on them, in some fashion or another. Ask them effectively. And they give it to you—you'll find it—and they say the organization is fine, and you're wonderful, and they go off, and all of a sudden they get a case resurgence and a case gain that they didn't have at the time they left. Interesting, isn't it? Ha-ha-ha.

Now, there's something to be known about this. There's a lot to be known about this. And somehow or another I've got to get you to get a good reality on this. But I made two tests

right here. We had two auditor blowups. Two auditor-pc blowups, see. Two pcs blew up and the auditor kind of blew up. one auditor didn't blow up. The auditor grabbed the pc around the legs and hung on like grim death. And you know that both of those incidents were traced back to having missed withholds. And we went ahead and we got them afterwards.

The auditor had missed a withhold and you had a big pc blowup. Now, I don't know how many times I have to tell you this, but you might as well accept it because I'm just going to keep on telling you this. This thing is, this thing is not one of these variables. It's not a variable. This is not susceptible to difficulty.

It isn't true that every time you miss a withhold you get an ARC break. That is not necessarily true at all. But it is true that every time you have an ARC break you've had a missed withhold. Now, that's what's true. See, so you've gotten away with it for years without recognizing what you were getting away with.

So some pcs had ARC breaks, and some pcs didn't, you see. And on both of them you could have missed withholds. It's not invariable that because you miss a withhold the pc is going to blow up to the roof. But it is invariable that if the pc blows up to the roof, you've missed a withhold.

Now, as Scientologists, for God's sakes, get a reality on this. Mamie Gulch from Sad Bottom is saying, "Oh, the Central Organization is terrible and it chews everybody up, and it ruins everybody, and it's just a death trap because if you go near the place, and so forth. And you know that I heard and so forth and so on. Nya-nya-nya." And they come around and they're talking to you like this, and if I catch one of you explaining to them that that is not what the Central Organization is about, I'll—I'll—I'll—I'll—I'll revoke a portion of your thetan. Now, listen, the effective thing to do is just reach for an E-Meter, because listen, there's nothing under the sun, moon or stars you can do but reach for an E-Meter. Now, let me tell you this. It's a fact. It's a fact. Please get some reality on it.

This character is going on and on and on, saying, "Central Organizations charge too much money. Besides, besides I had a brother once and so on and so on and so on. And the Registrar wrote me a letter and do you know what it said? You've got no nya-nya." business whatsoever trying to explain it to them or trying to heal the ARC break. Honest. Honest, I've tried, and it just doesn't work. It just doesn't work. They just go on. You can overwhelm them. You can shoot them. You can—there's various things you can do, but look, man has been overwhelming them and man has been shooting them, and man has been trying to punish them into line now for the last 200 trillion years. And it hasn't worked. That is the unworkable phenomena. So all of your controlpunishment phenomena stems from this one fact. That man did not have the technology to pull the missed withhold.

So why should we keep on punishing them if we know what's wrong with them? Now, this is what's turned up in the last few weeks—a very intensive study on this. I've been burning the midnight Ron and I finally got this thing sorted out as an invariable.

No, it isn't true that every time you miss a withhold, somebody's going to blow up the universe. You can have lots of withholds missed on you and on somebody else, and nothing much might happen. But where dynamite has begun to explode, where the fuses are burning, where this and that is happening, that is what happened. A withhold has been missed.

Now, this means this. That you haven't any business whatsoever, sitting in an auditing chair letting a pc chew you up, trying to handle the ARC break or be nice about it. You just haven't any business doing that.

The pc is chewing you up. You should immediately equate what has happened because nothing else has happened. You missed a withhold. That's all. What are you sitting there letting the pc yap-yap for, see? Because they're going to yap-yap from there till the end of session one way or the other. And you're just going to blow the session up.

No. Look at a pc's ARC break and think in terms of missed withholds, that's all. Don't think in terms of criticism of your own auditing and criticism of what you're doing and that sort of thing because you're doing all right. You understand this?

Now, the withhold that you missed is most likely to have been right in the session you're running That's the most likely thing because it's much more important to a person that he dropped a match on his toe a minute ago than to have an elephant step on his head a trillion years ago, you understand? Present time things are much more important than past time things. So it's—the probability is it's right in the session you're running. You're looking right at it.

And if that's not the case, it must have been in one of the recent sessions you ran on the pc, and it took that long to blow up. And if that's not the case, it's back down earlier on the auditing track, probably with some other auditor, as far as sessions go, or somebody should have known something about them in the last day or two. You know, it's an out of session thing that you're looking at. But, by the way, that isn't really going to make them mad at you. That's just going to give them a PT problem.

Now, where the missed withhold occurs monitors, or what it's composed of monitors what rudiment goes out. Now, all rudiments go out because of missed withholds. All rudiments go out because of missed withholds. Now, all the rudiments processes are true and everything is fine about rudiments. And you've got, now, I think, about ten rudiments—could have processes connected with them—beginning and end rudiments. And all those things are perfectly true, and you could handle them all with the rudiment that is right there that you're reading. But the truth of the matter is, is back of each rudiment, if you look back of each rudiment, you'll find a missed withhold.

So out-rudiments are caused by missed withholds. And I'm going to make a further study on it and find out just what type of missed withhold causes what rudiment to go out. But each one of them is traceable, and I've been tracing back out-rudiments to missed withholds here until I don't know why we're processing problems. I don't know why we're processing ARC breaks. I don't know why we're processing any of these other things.

See, all you have to do is find the missed withhold. Present time problem is a missed withhold in life, not in the session. An ARC break is a withhold in the session. Invalidation of the E-Meter or something like that is a withhold, a missed withhold on the subject of the meter. There's something going here, you see? There's a missed withhold back of each one of these ten rudiments.

All right. So we look down the rack of these things and we find out that there's different types of missed withholds. And these missed withholds are all very intriguing but they're all missed.

Now, a missed withhold is a special thing It is not a withhold. It's a "should-have-known." And if we stop calling them missed withholds, we might get over the semantic mess that we get into when we say—well, we walk into this staff, see, walk into the HGC, and the auditors there—perfectly good auditors, everything's fine, and we say, "All right, now pick up the missed withholds on this pc." And so the auditor goes into the auditing session and he knows what he's supposed to do, and he says to the pc, "Are you withholding anything?"

Oh, no. And you say, "Now look, I mean missed withholds, see. Get the missed withholds," and so forth.

And he says, "Okay, yeah. Well, all right. That's what I was doing, you know." And he goes back into session, and he says, "And what are you withholding? What are you withholding? What are you withholding?"

And you'll get hold of him and you just back him up against in the hall, and you say, "Now look, son, look. We're talking about missed withholds. The withholds that have been missed. That's what we're talking about. The withholds that have been restimulated and missed."

And he says, "Okay. Okay. I—you needn't get so mad about it. I'll go back in and do something about it."

So he goes back in and he says to the pc, he says, "Now, what are you withholding?"

Well, you can go round and round on this mess. You see, semantically, the thing is disoriented. Yes, it means missed withhold, but a missed withhold is not a withhold.

And he says, "Oh, well, you don't have to pull withholds anymore. You can miss them or. . ." Lord knows what kind of a scramble you're liable to get into, but it's not going to be pleasant. No, call them "should-have-knowns." Now, I'm not going to keep calling them should-have-knowns. I'll keep calling them missed withholds. I'm giving you the explanatory thing, you know? You say, "Well, what I mean by a missed withhold is the should-have-knowns."

You find out what you should have known, and what the organization should have known, and what his auditor should have known, and what Ron should have known, and what other people should have known about him at various times.

Now you pick up all those should-have-knowns, you understand? The fellow isn't on the subject of withholds now, is he. He completely moved off it. Actually, what he's picking up is missed withholds. See, you've explained this by should-have-knowns—the auditing command. You understand?

It doesn't communicate well, so in an Academy talk to students about should-have-knowns and so forth, as your side explanation. You can call them "should-have-knowns" if you want to. I will continue to call them missed withholds because there's no more direct appellation that you could possibly assign to it than a withhold that has been missed. Just because this is hard to relay at first is no reason why we should abandon the whole thing. The fellow's withholding something, and somebody didn't find out, and that's the whole study.

Now, right along with this, right along with this discovery, I found out that you had gone into quantitative—quantitative thinking.

Have I mixed you up some way when I say missed withholds and no missed withholds, and so on? You understand what I mean?

Audience: Yes.

We'll go on and call them missed withholds. I'm just showing you, oh my God, you explain this to some new auditor on the subject, you'd better say, "Now, what I mean by a missed withhold is a should-have-known," you see, and it explains quickly. You say, "Just go in and find out from that pc what you should have known about him."

"What he should have known? What I should have—should have—he should have known about me? Doesn't seem to make any sense to me, but I'll go in. 'Well, what should you have known about me? No, I mean what should, should I have known about you?'"

And the pc says, "Well, well, you should have realized, you should have realized that I've always been a pervert, and you didn't find it out. Ha-ha-haha. And you should have known . . . Well, you should have just known lots of things. You should have known I didn't want to be here. And you should have known processing wasn't doing me any good and I was just pretending that it was doing me some good and . . ."

This auditor has all of a sudden become a citizen right on the spot. He's been sitting there processing this pc and all of a sudden there's this whole bank of mystery that has been going on that he didn't know anything about. And he realizes something.

Now, let's look a little bit further on this. Let's look further. A should-have-known simply is an unknown. And we're back to unknown Sec Checking—the Sec Checking of the unknown. And I've pulled out of that quick as a bunny because auditors were putting people into engrams and trying to run the engrams with them and it wasn't running well. They were running "unknown" on engram, and although people were getting their first glimpses of backtrack and that sort of thing, it was too much and I wasn't about to teach auditors at this stage of the game—all auditors who come along—how to run engrams with "not-know." You see? So I pulled out of that, even though that was very successful. That was a few months ago, remember? That was a very successful process. You really could turn the bank upside down.

That's all you're doing when you're pulling a withhold, is you're curing an unknownness. The whole subject of withholds equates into not-know and unknown. It's just a missed withhold is a half-known, half-unknown. So you get a half-know, half-unknow, and evidently there's enough charge just in having everybody not-know while you know, or in you knowing only half, and your reactive bank is an unknow of the other half, don't you see, that it causes a polarity of some kind or another that sets up a God-awful agitation in the bank.

So things that are half known—known to me but not to you, known to you but not to me, known to you analytically partially, but half unknown to you analytically, you see, so that you've got an unknown reactive and a known analytical, and it raises all the devil with you and that tells you all that is wrong with the reactive mind. It's an unknown area.

Now, you'll greet this head-on when you start processing these items you're finding so happily with 3D Criss Cross. We won't go into that just now but unknow plays a very, very heavy role in this.

Now, the not-know that is most important is the should-have-known. That is what is the most important aspect. It—that is the tense that is the most important. I've been looking for that for a long time. It's should-have-known. That itself is regret and that is what bunches the bank. I refer you to a tremendous amount of material on the subject of regret of many years ago. And that's very good material.

But should-have-known is what gives you regret. See, you didn't know it then, you know it now, so that you've got the time track now with the upper part of the track is know and the lower part of the track is not-know. And you've got these two things, not-know and know, and they come into a Godawful disagreement and collision. Do you see how that would be?

So you get your distress in the bank and your distress from elements, and so forth, from this half-known, half-unknown factor. However this traces down electronically, we're not as interested as we might be, because it certainly is observable.

A half-known fact is about the wildest thing that anybody ever had to do anything with. We hear a twig fall in the quiet and hostile forest. We hear this twig, you know, we hear it go clatter, and then we hear it go snap. And then we—there's maybe a little thud immediately afterwards. And a person just freezes. Where is the bear? See, we half know there is a bear there, but we don't know there's a bear there. We know something is going on, but we don't know what is going on, and it's a freezer, you see? So that is a very good example of your half know, half not-know, you see?

Now, this mechanism of regret is what turns a 3D Criss Cross valence into a ball. This is what loops the time track. Now, the mechanism of the looped time track is totally due to just one thing and that is should-have-known. And that is the swan song that the thetan is singing

If he only knew then what he knew now. And you get as a result of this, you get a looped track.

So that's what makes a black ball, bunches all the pictures up and smashes everything into one time zone of a valence. That's how a valence gets in to be a round ball circuit. That's the exact mechanic of it. It's the regret. It's the should-have-known. Regret isn't a strong enough word. Should-have-known.

We don't care what he should have known. He should have known better. He should have known about her. He, you know, he should have known about parents. If he'd only known about the outcome of the battle he wouldn't have engaged in it in the first place. And of course, all this thing adds up to is a feeling that one shouldn't have confronted. One shouldn't have done, one shouldn't have confronted, one shouldn't have experienced. So the prior pictures of having experienced are invalidated at once. So he just tries to say they never happened.

And then we get the occlusion of the whole track. See, nothing happened is what the final analysis is. He should have known. He didn't know. You see, what he's saying about the past all the time is that he didn't know, didn't know, didn't know. You know? He's saying at the same time that he should have known, should have known, should have known, didn't know, didn't know, didn't know, should have known, should have known, should have known.

"We didn't realize when we took off that morning for Germany that . . ." You know, here we go, here we go.

"When I walked up the aisle with that brute, I did not realize that. . ." And of course, the storybooks of life are filled with nothing but what follows.

In view of the fact that it—most of it's invented and created, we then get all kinds of loopy factors going on in valences and dub-ins and all sorts, and you can explain all other—all types of phenomena with this. Should-have-known. Now, that's apparently the most important button in the bank because it's the only one that out of hand can . . . But look, an ARC break is the only thing that can prevent a pc from getting results. Yet that not only prevents him from getting results but reduces his profile. That reduces his gain. And the only thing that creates an ARC break in the final analysis is a should-have-known. So add it up yourself.

If the ARC break is so deadly that auditing can't even—not only can't exist but shouldn't have existed, you see, the not have—the should-have-known must be more powerful than the ARC break, because you can remedy ARC breaks by running should-have-known. Do you see this? Well, that's the equation by which we've worked this out and by which we can demonstrate these phenomena at any time.

But it's the should-have-known. That is the main thing that you're knocking on the door of.

Now, at the same time I worked that out—some time ago, articulated it a little bit better in the last few days so I can tell you what I was thinking about—but another thing came up. Your quantitative thinking on the subject of withholds is just this quantitative button that this universe has. It isn't the number of withholds you get. Nor is it the bigness of the withhold you get. Nor it—is it the gruesomeness or the antisocialness or the newspaperheadlineness of the withhold you get. It is just the thoroughness with which you get a withhold. It's the quality of your auditing and the thoroughness of pulling a withhold. One withhold well, thoroughly pulled will give you tremendous case gain. And a thousand withholds indifferently pulled, will give you a case retardation. Now, what's the answer?

Well, right up there in that auditing room where you see the thing—I've started to audit in that room just to get practice on it and so on. I turn on all the screens and everything, and go

ahead and audit the pc. I ran a session the other night that old papa Freud would have been standing around with his eyes bugged. You could have knocked them off with cricket bats.

He was always looking for tremendous resurges, you see, on the part of pcs. He was a—pretty much of a one-button man. I respect this guy but he was pretty much of a one-button man. If he could just get this one thing on the bank, you see, you'd get this tremendous resurgence, the drop out of the psychosomatic illness, and so on. He must have done it two or three times. He actually must have or he wouldn't have had such faith in it.

And if he could just, just hit that one thing, that, just that little hidden something there, if he could just get a—fingers on that something and produce this, well, he couldn't do it invariably, and he never taught anybody to do it, by the way. He must have done it himself a few times. And he never taught anybody how to do it. But he must have had some success with it.

He was looking for a withhold. That's all he was looking for. And you can cover the whole of Freudian analysis on the looking for a withhold. And in his particular case, because he was operating to a large degree with Jewish patients, he had tended to follow that mores pattern. Nothing wrong with that. It's just that it colored his work by having grouped too tightly. So he was looking for that particular type of aberration. And he was looking for it to have occurred in childhood.

And so he circumscribed the dynamic and he circumscribed the area of the track so seriously that he must have made a mess out of things here and there. He kept looking in childhood when it was a, the seventy-year-old man, you see, and the incident happened when he was sixty-eight. He's been nuts ever since, you know. And so he would not look in that area so much. He would look back in childhood all the time, you know. And maybe there was nothing there.

What he was looking for was a withhold of some kind or another. And he didn't quite know what he was looking for. But the few times that this had happened was sufficient to give psychoanalysis the springboard which pushed it out across the world. And that it happened occasionally, accidentally elsewhere—you know, other psychoanalysts had accidentally pulled a withhold one day and not quite known what they'd pulled, and then they'd go over the hills and far away. That was what put Freudian analysis up in lights. Just that one little factor. Look how—what a tiny amount is known about it. I mean you read Freudian analysis, you find there's very little known. They don't know very much. They didn't know—even know how to pull one. And yet they could get resurgences once in a blue moon, and Freud must have had pretty good luck at it.

Now, what was he doing Well, I'll tell you one thing he was doing—he was restimulating enough withholds to make a lot of patients commit suicide and kill Freudian analysis—analysts, or try to, because you've never heard so many people get so mad at Freudian analysts as patients do. And the only way they handle this is by overwhelming the patient. Don't ever adopt those tactics because all you have to do—now that you've got the technology, there's no reason to punish the person. Just find the should-have-known. Just find out what should-have-known you've restimulated, you see? Pull it and he'll cease to be angry with you.

It's very funny. When you get very expert at doing this it's a very quick trick. It's just a bing-bing to keep a pc from having an ARC break. The pc has an ARC break, "What should I have known about you?"

"Well," he says, "Well, you should have known I've been uncomfortable for the last ten minutes."

You say, "Thank you very much. Do you have an ARC break?" You've got no ARC break.

You can have a pc raving at you, telling, "Your auditing yap-yap-yap-yapyap-yap-yap-yap. And you should have . . . And wow-wow-wow-wow-wow-wow

wow."

Just say, "Has somebody missed a withhold on you?"

And he says, "As a matter of fact, they have."

"All right." And it's liable to pull that quickly.

But, on the other hand, on the other hand, there are many of them that won't pull that quickly. You can get the moment that they weren't pulled and flip it, and knock out the ARC break. But then it gets flipped again and once more you've got a missed withhold because the basic withhold has not been pulled.

So there would be two ways you could handle this situation. One, is with the dress parade, the Queen's guard riding down holding up all the traffic outside of Buckingham Palace. Everything, you know. And let's really break it out, see. Let's troop the colors and the lot, you know. Let's spread this thing all over the place, you see? Let's do with the whole thing. Or you're—let's just knock out the key-in.

See, you've got two choices that you can go. Either you can knock out all the should-have-knowns on that subject in this lifetime, or you can—and this lifetime is just a key-in—or you can knock out the last key-in that happened.

Now, when you want to get a rudiment in fast, knock out the last key-in and then don't take the rest of it. And you knock that out with a lightly should-have-known—just a light two-way comm, should-have-known. Bang! If that doesn't work, you've got a dress parade to go on.

Now, when we talk about this dress parade, we're talking about HCOB of February 12, 1962. And we're talking about a specific system called the "Withhold System." And we're talking about something which runs off just about like you pull the levers on the slot machine and it comes out, except in this particular case if you pull the levers on the slot machine often enough, it empties.

That's not true of all slot machines, you know. I don't know if you've ever had that experience. I like to own slot machines myself, you see. And when I play them I go around to the back of them, you know, and fix the number of give and take, you see, on the thing. Fix that up so that it's 110 percent, you know. That gives me a great deal of satisfaction. But after a while I have to put more money in it so I can keep winning.

Well, you can almost run with a terrific regular—you can with this Withhold System, you just pull the levers of the slot machine and the money keeps pouring out. I mean, that's as far as that's concerned.

Now, the reason I mentioned Papa Freud is because if you work this system—that has nothing to do with it, this is just your added bonus, you see—if you work this system, you'd be absolutely fascinated to discover that all the basic buttons that you and everybody else have been searching for on this case, and the things the case had been worried about, and so forth, are just going to roll out on the rug. That's your added gain.

Now, in Prepchecking, the only thing you're trying to do—and that's the whole system—is you're trying to get in the rudiments so that they never go out during 3D Criss Cross. And that is the mission of Prepchecking Now, we go into that later.

But you do this Withhold System, and something very funny happens. If you do this thing exactly according to the book, by the numbers, and don't get fancy with it and don't get

careless with it, and you be very careful with it and handle every withhold that comes up with this, with this little system, all of a sudden the pc's bum ear and other things of this particular type, are all of a sudden going to straighten out. You're going to get yourself some fantastic gains. People will look at you like you are a wizard or something.

Well, of course, this is nothing compared to what you can do with 3D Criss Cross, but it's fantastic. It is darn well worth doing. And that's what's most fascinating about it is you straighten up the case so the rudiments will stay in while you do 3D Criss Cross. Voilà! Marvelous! Good-oh!

And at the same time you get all these extra bonuses, you see, of the person's arthritis and that sort of thing tends to disappear. Don't get too hopeful. It'll all come back on again while you're doing 3D Criss Cross. But it'll make life livable for the person. It's not an impermanent gain because it straightens up their present time environment for them to a very marked and marvelous degree.

And you get all these resurgences that Papa Freud got two or three times so remarkably—oh, maybe more than that, certainly more than that— and that Freudian practitioners get maybe twice in their career. See? And you get these things as routine about every five hours of processing, if you're doing this thing hot and right, see. The pc really knows he's going someplace. And all you're doing is straightening out the person so he can be run on 3D Criss Cross. That's the only thing you're interested in.

Now, Prepchecking is the system of getting each rudiment in with a crunch. That gets each rudiment in so it's more or less permanently in during the auditing in 3D Criss Cross. And that's Prepchecking. That is a different system than the one we're taking up here in HCOB of February 12th, but it uses exactly the same elements. So this Withhold System is applicable to any and all withholds, and it has very broad application—this exact system. We're going to use it in the narrow confines of Prepchecking

Now, you could do a Joburg, Form 3, with one of these things and I'll give you just a rapid-fire example of how you would do a Form 3 question.

We have five parts in this system. Now, the Zero is the difficulty you're handling. That's your Zero. Now, the reason it's Zero is that's what you're trying to tape in, that's from what you are departing so it doesn't have a 1 because it's the place you're departing from. And that would be any question, any question that appeared in the Form 3 on a broad thing. "Have you ever robbed a bank?" That's not even a Form 3 question, but, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" see. That's giving you an example.

That's what you're trying to clear on this pc, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" so you would write that in for your Zero.

All right. You've got a fall on that, so you say, "All right. What's that?"

And he says, "Well, I broke open a piggy bank once and took the money out of it."

All right. That's what his withhold was, you see. Now, you can write that down or not. That doesn't matter. You've got your What. Now, your What, "What about that piggy bank?" Now, for God's sakes, write that on the auditor's report. "What about that piggy bank?"

If you were doing a Form 3 this way, you would just take this other question. That's the question you're working on, and you just work off the form. But this number 1, you've got to write down because that is your test question.

"What about that piggy bank?" Or, "What about robbing that piggy bank?" We don't care what the wording of it was, but it's a wording that matches up to the withhold.

Now, the pc says, "I robbed a piggy bank once. I broke it."

And your question then would be the most close approximation you could get to this with a What. "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" And that's what you'd write down in your auditor's report. Now, that's your number 1. That is your What.

Now, the way to handle this system is to memorize it on this basis of—it's, "What, When, All, Who."

All right. Now, you say, "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" And it gives you a reaction, of course. He can say something else, but we don't care what he says. We frankly, really don't care for what he says from here on, as long as he keeps talking and giving us data.

Now, I call to your attention that a pc never refuses to talk to the auditor. He never refuses to give up the withhold. But he often doesn't know what it is. And it's the auditor's job to get him to look. And I don't care how harsh an auditor has to be to get a pc to look, but I don't want to ever see an auditor harsh because the pc won't tell him. That is idiocy. The pc will tell him. If the pc is even basically, even vaguely in-session, he can think of the gummiest, slimiest, horriblest, most anti-survival data, and he'll tell the auditor. But he very often can't find out what it is. So your job is to keep him looking, because it may be so frightening and so horrifying and so charged that he won't go on looking

You know, he doesn't want to look—he, and so on. No, you can be as histrionic as you like from that point on, but get him to look. And never start chopping the pc up because the pc won't tell you, because you've told him he's out of session.

No, the only thing you want the pc to do is look. The pc says, "Oh, I don't know anything more about that, and I'm going . . ." And you get a fall on the meter.

"Ah," you say, "there's a great deal more about this. Now look at it. Now just look at it and give me some more about this."

I don't care how positive you get about it. The only mistake you can make is telling the pc "Well, now, you've got to tell me. You know that you know all about it."

Oh, that would be a horrible mistake, because you're admitting the pc won't talk to you, and of course he goes out of session, the games condition enters at once, and the whole thing goes up the spout, and you don't get any further, and so forth. So you never admit that point. That point never comes into the session. The pc will always tell you if the pc can find out. And your job is to get the pc to look and the pc to find out.

And the pc's sitting there all fugged up one way or the other and, "Blooey," he says, "blooey, blah. Oh, that's just all there is to it. There's— that's all—I just know that must be all there is to it, because there isn't anything else to it." And so on, you see.

"All right. Now look, it's still falling on the meter here. Now, is it falling because of an ARC break? No, I don't get any reaction from that. I tell you there's more to it. Look! What is there? You tell me what's there now. You just look."

"Oh, well, it's so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and well, huh."

You say, "Good. Fine."

But in this particular system, we can be insistent. But we take anything the pc gave us as the answer to the question. You're getting data the whole while.

So you say, "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?"

Of course, that's going to fall. He just told you, and it is not going to be released. That's for sure. But if you say it, and it now doesn't react, you haven't got a number 1, have you?

So you'll have to ask him for another one, won't you, to get a number 1.

You say, "Well, have you ever robbed a bank?" And that doesn't react now. You've cleared the question. That was it. So he broke a piggy bank once, so robbing banks registered and he phrased it, and he gave it to you, and you can't get any more read, and you've had it. You understand?

That's why number 1, the whole system is dependent on number 1 must be cleared. And eventually, number Zero must be cleared. But the 1's must all be cleared, and eventually, Zero will be cleared.

All right. Now let's say, "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" And it fell.

All right. We immediately go into when. "When was that?" Now, you don't have to hit that very precisely the first time. The more times you hit it, and the more times you go over it, the more precise you're going to get, until you could finally take a meter and spot it into within a fifteen second interval in the middle of some precise day and month and year and so forth, and the position of the planets, you know. I mean you could really zero that thing in with an E-Meter if you had to. But ordinarily, "When was it?" You see?

But the more often you have to ask that—go over it the first time you say, "When was it?"

He says, "Well, that was when I was a little boy."

That's perfectly good enough. Next time you go over it, well, "How old were you?" See, "When was it?" See?

"Well, I mmm-mmm." Get it down to the year, you know.

Next time you have to go over it again, you'd better be suspicious that there must be something wrong with the When if it's not cleared yet. So you've—it's very, very precise. So the more times you go across When the more precise you get on spotting it. You see the idea?

If you had to cross it once, you can do it loosely. Twice, a little more precisely. Three times, a little more precisely. Four times, man, you better start zeroing that thing in. You better be getting on the E-Meter by this time and really finding out if it was earlier than 1936 or later than 1936, you see? Let's spot it in.

All right. And of course, 1 fell, or we wouldn't be going on with it, you see. "What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?" So we're going to do 2, 3, and 4 in rotation every time that we find 1 reacting. We don't do a thing about 1 but run 2, 3 and 4. That's all we do about 1 is run 2, 3 and 4 until 1 no longer registers. And at that moment, we go back to our Zero and see if it's registering. And if it's registering, we get another What.

Well, we could get another little withhold. We don't care what the withhold is as long as he gives us a withhold. And whatever he gives us a withhold on, we run back to it. But right now we're involved in clearing up this piggy bank.

All right. "When it occurred, is that all of it? Is there any more to it?"

Now, we find out, well, he says, "I was—I was just a little kid"—the answer he gave us. We don't care, by the way, what 2, 3 and 4 do on the meter. We're not really very close to a meter here.

We only care about Zero and 1 on the meter unless we're dating for 2. And we can actually pull our head out of the meter and talk to the pc on 2, 3 and 4 straight, every time. And he'll much more tend to hold in-session that we don't care what the meter reactions are—2, 3 or 4—we're always going to cover them, regardless of whether they react or don't react. We don't care. We only want to care if 1 reacts. So when we get back—when we've done 4, then we get our nose back into the meter again, and we say, "All right. What about robbing and breaking that piggy bank?"

And we don't got much reaction here. Except we might get something on "robbing" because it's still hot. But we don't get anything on the whole question. The whole question is not reacting. So we desert it, and we go back to the Zero, and we say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?"

You always leave these things with the same line that you get into them, which is why you wrote this What question down on your auditor's report. We'd much rather have the What question on the auditor's report than all the gruesome details.

So as long as we get 1 reacting, as a whole question of course, we keep on doing 2, 3 and 4, and 2, 3 and 4, and 2, 3 and 4. As long as we got it reacting, we always do . . . If we've done 2—if 1 reacts, we do 2. If we do 2, we do 3. If we've done 3, we do 4, you see? And then if we've done 4, we test. So it's a matter of 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4,test; 2, 3, 4, test. Test. It's clean. Cheers!

All right. Now we go back. "Have you ever robbed a bank?"

That's the difficulty, see. "Have you ever robbed a bank? It's clean." And we find another withhold difficulty to monkey with. We can't get any more reaction on that one. We go elsewhere. We get another difficulty.

You see how this works now? It's very precise, by the way. And it is not any strain to amount to anything on you. And it's quite magical. Because a 2, 3, 4 are the three elements necessary to blow a withhold from here to Halifax so nobody will ever hear of it again.

All right. Let me give you a very rapid, little rundown example of this robbing the bank. All right?

We say to the pc, "Have you ever robbed a bank?"

We got a reaction. You say, "All right. Come on, give." The pc has had a chance to answer before we start plaguing him.

And he says, "Wha—heh-ha yuh-uh huh-hmm. I robbed, robbed and broke a piggy bank once."

And you say, "Good. What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" That is your What, and you write that down on your auditor's report—what about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?

Now, here we go. You say, "When was that? Is that all there is to it? And who should have known about it? Who didn't find out about it? Who should have found out about it and didn't?" Of course, you remember that "should" is much more important than the "didn't." But you can play this for variation, you see.

And so he says, "Well, so-and-so." It doesn't matter what the pc says. The pc's talking to you. That's all a part of the session, see. Pc's giving you dope.

And you can run back up here to 1. And you say, "What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?"

And it goes, "What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank? Clank! You say, "Good. Now just exactly when was that? Oh, how old were you?"

"I was six."

"All right. Good enough. Is that all of it?"

"Well, no. Actually, as a matter of fact, I hid the pieces afterwards, and so forth, and so on."

And you say, "Well, who should have known about that?"

And he tells you.

And you go back, and you say, "What about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" Clank!

And you say, "All right. Now, how old were you at that time?"

"Well, I was six. No, no, no, my little brother was six. No, I was twelve. I was twelve."

And you say, "Well, is that all of it?"

"Well, no, it was my little brother's piggy bank."

"Well, all right. Good. Now, who should have known about it and didn't find out?"

"Well, my mother and father should have. I've been saying before that they should have known about my robbing the piggy bank. But they should have known about the fact that I beat my little brother up when he said he'd tell them. Ha-ha-ha-ha. I prevented them from finding out about it."

"Well, good. Good. All right. Fine. Now, what about robbing and breaking that piggy bank? Click. All right."

"Now, just exactly when was that?"

"Now, you say that was—you say you were twelve. Let's see, what year would that be?" And let's just ride it right in on the E-Meter. As a matter of fact, we find out he was sixteen, and his little brother was eight. Heh-heh heh-heh. And it's beginning to put a greater and greater complexion on this thing That would be a horrible thing to have happen to him, you see.

"Now, all right. That's good. Now, let's find out, well, now, is that all of it?"

"No, not all. Well, no, as a matter of fact. They found the pieces later and I said my little brother had done it, and they beat him. And I said, I said I'd seen him do it."

"Oh, all right. Thank you. All right. Now, who should have known about that?"

"Well, they should have known I was lying because all I did when I was a little kid was lie, lie, lie, morning, noon and night, you know. I never told them the truth. I never told them the truth from the day I was born practically, and so forth, and made a liar out of my little brother, too."

"All right. That's fine." And you say, "Good. Now, what about robbing and breaking a piggy bank?" And the thing is just as quiet as it can be.

So we go back to—we say, "All right. Have you ever robbed a bank?" Now, if "have you ever robbed a bank" still falls, we might compartment the question into, "Have you ever

robbed?" "Have you?" "Have you ever robbed? A bank?" And suddenly find out that, "robbed," is still hot.

Now, we might have found in the What question that "robbed" was hot, so we just dropped that, you see. So it just went at robbed, but it didn't go on the whole question, you understand?

So we drop here back to, and we say, "Well, have you ever robbed anything?" But remember, remember if we've done that, that the question, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" is now null, and we are working on a new difficulty derived from a compartment, and our Zero Question is now, "Have you ever robbed anything?"

And he says, "Well, nothing much. Filling station once." you see?

"All right. Now, what about robbing a filling station? That got a reaction. All right." And you write that on your auditor's report, and then you just go 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test; 2, 3, 4, test. Test is null. Go back to your difficulty, "Have you ever robbed anything?" Null. We got it. Scrub it. Get something new to clear. Okay?

Now, that's that Withhold System. And I think you will find it works like a dream. But it's more important—now get this—it is more important to handle one little, cotton-picking withhold well, than to handle thousands indifferently. It is not the quality of the withhold that counts. It is how much of it is submerged. How much of it has dropped out of sight. That's what counts.

It isn't that the pc has blown up the whole southwest quarter of the universe. If he knows he's done that, and there's no more to it, and the 2, 3, 4s produce no reaction on that whatsoever, that isn't what's wrong with the pc, no matter how inviting it is to blame his condition on having blown up things.

And we find out one day he was walking down the street and he kicked a parson in the shins. And out of this little, stupid incident, we suddenly run back a wild dissertation of stuff—of things the pc actually did that you really recover recollections on that is all gone now. You bring them back to view. We plow them all out. We square them around. The pc confronts that fact, and there we go. And the way you get him to do all these things is just your—the Zero difficulty that you're trying to clear, which at the moment to you would be called any Sec Check question.

It'd be a very good thing for you to pick up any Sec Check question that a person has given you recurrently. He has given the same withhold to several pcs [auditors]. Just put that down as your difficulty and get your What from thereon, because your What will probably be the same as your difficulty in that case. And clean the living daylights out of it, and you're going to find something that will practically blow your head off. It's only half known or it wouldn't be recurrent. See? And it must be a missed withhold. That's all.

And any difficulty could be handled that way. It's a fundamental. It's a fundamental question. Well, let's say this way. The guy's got a bad head. Let's just go into it. Let's clear up a difficulty. Pc's got a bad head. Well, you say— "Have you"—this is our difficulty—"Have you ever done anything to a head?" Our terminology at that point might be better. But the question, the fundamental question was "Have you ever done anything to a head?" Not "What have you done to a head?" That's our fundamental. That's what we're trying to clear up. That's his difficulty, and we've got to put it in some kind of an overt tense.

So he says, "Well, no, not really, except, well, there was punching a little boy in the head once."

You say, "What about punching a little boy in the head?" and you've got your 1. Now, you treat it from there on out. You could treat psychosomatic— you could do all sorts of wild things with this. It has enormously wide application.

What I want you to learn—and those that are leaving here on Friday certainly have very little time to learn this—what I want you to learn is just the simplicity of the little drill and what it produces.

Now, the fact that you don't have to read, except when you're dating, 2, 3 and 4 on the meter, you give your undivided attention to the pc. The pc can really talk to you. He can really tell you things. He tends to stay in-session and so forth. And you only go back and test that, see. Bang! If it's still alive, well, you just got 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 4 and you'd be surprised what you will plow up.

Now, for a little while on any one of these lines, you're liable to be—find that you're somewhat plowing bum ground. That is to say there's no cognition. There's nothing much happening. You clear withhold and nothing happens at all. And you go back to your difficulty and you find the difficulty is still alive, and you get another withhold, and you get another What, and you clear all that up arduously and arduously and you clear it all up, and it didn't amount to anything.

And you go back, and your difficulty is still registering, your Zero is still registering so you find another withhold on this subject, and you clear all that up with great ardure and arduousness and so forth.

And you do your 2, 3, 4, 2, 3, 4 and it doesn't amount to anything. And it comes out noplace, and the pc is looking gray and beaten, no cognitions or anything And you go back to your difficulty, and you get another withhold on this particular subject, and all of a sudden the pc says, "D-a-a-a-aahhhhh. I didn't know that. You know it did, you know. It's true."

And you go through your 2, 3, 4 and wow! What do you know, wow! And your 2, 3, 4 and your 2, 3, 4 and you can just see your difficulty—your Zero— blow. You can see the whole thing blow out as a charge.

Nothing will fall on an E-Meter that is not significantly charged. And nothing will fall on an E-Meter that is not unknown in part to the pc. Interesting, eh? And if you get an E-Meter registry, there must be something unknown. You saw a session today which tended to demonstrate that there was an unknown item on the list, because every time we said one was in or out, we got a surge. So there must be something unknown about the list. see how easy it is to read an E-Meter?

If you said an E-Meter registers every time the pc only knows in part or not at all about something—he only partially—it's an unknown. The E-Meter registers unknowns, that's all. As long as an E-Meter registers, there's something unknown about it.

All right. It becomes very simple if you handle it that way. I want you to become very adept at this Zero, 1, 2, 3, 4. And the only thing you're going to get into difficulty with seriously, is converting the Zero to the What, and then holding the What constant for test. Now, you're not going to have any difficulty with it because I have already gotten ahead of you. You didn't show me this difficulty. I showed you. All right, see, it's no victory for you on it.

You don't vary 1. You don't vary 1. You don't vary Zero. You can become a little bit yappy on 2, 3, 4, but try to stay somewhere close to the wording Stay close to the spirit of the thing. You could actually do it by rote but you won't hold your pc very well in-session.

But the variation I'm asking for is, "Well, is there anybody else who didn't know anything about it at all. Well, should they have known about it?" You see? That's a variation of

wording. "Well, now, are you sure you've told me all about that? Have you recalled all there is to know about that?"

"Well, there's this little scrap."

"All right. That's fine."

So what you're actually doing is using the E-Meter just to test Zero and 1, and you don't vary 1. And what we call varying the question is a point you have never been able to cope with easily. We've always had difficulty. Some of you can cope with it quite well. But on the majority, they don't cope with it, in varying the Sec Check question so as to get it out. Well, this gives you the system by which you vary the Sec Check question. So there is no further difficulty about varying the question because the question is the same question on 1 every time just for test, and the variation on 2, 3 and 4 is practically microscopic. It's just so as not to get monotonous.

Well, it's just, "Have you thought of anything more about that? Have you remembered anything else about it now? Is that all there is to it?" You get that as a variation.

"All right. Just about when did that occur?" That's a variation on when, see?

See, your variation is microscopic. You have to stay on that sense. You try this, you work with it and I think you're going to produce some interesting looking miracles. I think they will be very minor.

Now, there's one thing I must tell you, even though it is very late, there's one thing I must tell you—is you go out of this lifetime with this thing and you accept a past life answer from anybody using this system and I'll have the other part of your thetan.

No past lives at all. Nothing to do with past lives. We're not invalidating past lives. Pc says, "Ooooooh. All this stems from the fact, it stems from the fact when I was a pogo dancer on the top of a southwest pyramid."

And you say, "Good! Thank you. I'm very glad about that. Now, in this lifetime . . ."

You hold him in this lifetime because pcs will duck into the unreality of yesterday to avoid the withhold in this lifetime or, or they're trying to run the whole bank on it and this process won't run the whole bank. So whether they're just trying to duck or trying to audit the whole bank with this Withhold System, we don't care. You'll find it will all register in this lifetime. If you've got a registry it's in this lifetime. Now, what you're doing is keying out. The time to take up past life is with 3D Criss Cross, not with the Withhold System. And you'll find out that if you let them go into a past life, you'll miss all the gain of the Withhold System.

They duck back, and they start to clean it up. Well, they don't know enough about it, and frankly you couldn't even reach it with this system. This system does not have the strength or power to reach back into the past and that much occlusion and that much unknown. It just isn't that, isn't that strong a system. Terrific system for this lifetime. It's the greatest system ever developed for this lifetime as far as that's concerned. So it would be valueless on past track.

What you need on past track is 3D Criss Cross, and all your Withhold System does is put the pc into some kind of shape so that you can run 3D Criss Cross on him and then is the time to take up the past track. Okay?

So there's the limitations of the system. There are its purposes, and there is its use.

Now, anytime you strike a withhold, if you're going for the dress parade, if you're going to do it lightly find out who should have known about it, see? That's just the light punch, that's

to get the rudiment in or something like that. But if you're going to clean up withholds, and you're straightening up the case, you break out the Queen's guards, drawn sabers, troop the colors, you got it. And that's the system. That's all. Brrrrrp-brrrrp-brrrrp-brrrrrp. Grind it out. And you'll find out you'll get there.

Now, undoubtedly, you're going to find some holes in this system, but I don't think you will find any holes in the system itself. I think you will find that by doing some additives, you can make it clumsy or unworkable. Now, that's between you and your conscience and your use of it.

I want you to get good reality on this, not just a good reality on missed withholds because this, of course, takes care of missed withholds from the word go. Okay?

All right. That's it. Sorry we were late tonight.

Thank you very much.