

SEC CHECKS IN PROCESSING

A lecture given on
12 December 1961

Hey! What do you know? There's two or three live people in here today. Hey! What do you know? That's pretty good, huh?

All right. This is what? The 12th of Dec.? Still the nautical month, AD 11, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And if I were in a fine fettle, boy, would you get it.

I've heard it said that there are states beyond despair. Your Instructors have reached them.

Well, by and large, I think you're all doing fine. And if you improve five or six hundred percent in the next twenty-four hours, it'll be all right.

Okay, well, I want to talk to you today about security checking and some other things but first I would like to make a mention of what an auditor who can really audit should have. I'd just like to mention this in passing

He should have a good security on his ability to audit. He should have a British Mark IV E-Meter. He should have somebody to take care of appointments, receptions and do those nasty things connected with money and he ought to have at least two understudies: two auditors who have had good HPA training and who need some real brush-ups up to Class II. That's what he ought to have. I would consider that an absolute minimum for an auditor auditing—an absolute minimum. Why?

Well, he's not going to get any auditing done unless he has these things. Let's look at the present setup. Let's look at the way it is.

Are you—the only person in your immediate area who can do a 3D Assessment accurately—are you going to spend all of your time, upwards to seventy-five hours a case, getting all the Security Checks in line, getting this person up to a point where he'll respond on a meter and so forth? Because you're not going to do it. That's the answer to that. You're not going to do it. You're going to go in and you're going to try to get a 3D and you're going to fall on your heads, and then you're going to get in and try to get a 3D and then you're going to fall on your heads, and then you're going in and you're going to try to get a 3D and you're going to fall on your heads. Why? Because you haven't got time to set a case up properly. And so you're going to make a lot of bulls. That's about the way it is. You're going to make a lot of flubs. I can just see it on the wall.

Now, you better get a couple of people by the scruff of the neck who have some good Central Organization Academy training and you better gun them up to being good Class IIs that can do a reliable Security Check to set up cases for you to assess. And it takes about two to one minimum, more opportunely about five. That'd be a better number. But it takes at least two to one.

In other words, you can run a 3D accurately off in perhaps half the time that it takes to set a case up if the case has been set up. So you would be auditing one for one with two auditors doing Class II skills.

Now, what about this other? What about this other? All right. A couple of very good auditors left here and they went down to an area, and they've written some letters about technical matters since, but no administrative matters. Boy, are they off the lines! Are they in a mess administratively. Somebody comes up apparently and waves some money under their nose and they shove it in a vest pocket or something of the sort. And then they audit this person

one way or the other and try to keep their appointments straight and are going straight out of communication. Their administrative records must look like a cow's dinner.

And they're going to get so lost in all this mess that they will feel that they are terribly pressed and confused. Why do they—why would they feel they are pressed and confused? Why? They're not being pressed and confused by auditing. They're being pressed and confused by administration. They're being pressed and confused by Mrs. Glutz who is calling up who must have their appointment changed on Thursday. And they are all mixed up because they haven't got time to sit down and do their income tax because they can't have an accountant do their income tax, because they themselves don't have any records, so they have to do the records before the accountants can pick up the income tax in order to do the income tax. you get the idea?

So you're going to get all mixed up about how arduous it is to be an auditor, when as a matter of fact you will not even vaguely be concerned with auditing. It'll be terrible. It'll be absolutely awful trying to keep up with the administrative end of it and auditing at the same time. And the next thing you know, everything will look all confused, and you won't know which way you're going; whether you're going or coming. That's what it amounts to. And that's what anybody who has an advanced skill in society ought to be doing

Now, I hope you're high enough on the level of Help to be able to be effective in this particular direction. Can you accept help to this degree? Yes, we know you can help people, but can you accept help to this degree?

All right. Now, I can give you something that if you put it in a newspaper, would get you preclears. It's something on the order a Central Organization should put it in: "You can always talk to a Scientologist about your difficulties." Interesting, isn't it? And that I think you'd.... Not been tested, but I'm sure you'd find that about the hottest response button that you could possibly get.

"We will talk for you to anyone about anything." That had an interesting run wherever it was done, but I would think you will find that this will enormously exceed that one.

Just—it's on this basic theory, "You can always talk to a Scientologist about your difficulties." You want to say, "Well, you can always talk to me about your difficulties." You've got about the same thing, with your address and phone number. You get pcs.

Now as far as that's concerned, there are plenty of pcs in any district, just in the field of Scientology itself. And you've got—you yourself know of a bunch of cases that have fallen on their heads or haven't quite made it or this or that or know some situations that you could straighten out.

All right. If you've got somebody that could handle money for you, you can always say—you can always say to this person, "Well, I'll straighten it out," and this other person plucks their sleeve and says, "For so much." But if there's nobody there to say, "For so much," then you go ahead and you help people ragged. And let me tell you that the world is full of people who have to be helped; have to be helped. And they never outflow anything at all. So you could rapidly put yourself in a position where you couldn't help people—very rapidly put yourself in a position economically where you couldn't afford to help people by simply having no administrative person who would take money off people so that you could help people.

Now, starting up practices and that sort of thing isn't so much the question. Most of you people are known one way or the other or you're going back to a Central Organization, but I'm just giving you a piece of advice off of the—off of the bat here: Don't go plowing yourself in and feeling how confused it all is simply because you lack a basic ingredient, which is a little tiny bit of organization.

Now, you're so used to thinking of yourself as you, so used to thinking of yourself as one person—perhaps, perhaps standing alone and dauntless against the world—that you don't realize that all you have to do is just say to somebody, "You can help me," and you immediately have all the help you want.

The only reason you don't get personnel is nobody is telling people that you need help, see, and so on. one of the basic things that—one of the basic things that has been difficult in my experience in the last eleven years—I won't say it's too much help. No, that isn't true. But I will say it's trying to adequately handle people who want to help so that they are not dead-ending with their offers of help. That has been my main problem. It hasn't been the problem of getting help. It's been the problem of making very sure that if help was offered some way or another, it could be utilized if at all possible. And this has been a very tough problem to solve. Now, if you can get yourself into that category, you're all set.

As far as economics are concerned, you've got the world. What more do you want? It goes from pole to pole, from a Sunday-Monday line straight around to the Sunday-Monday line. There are several pounds of earth here; it weighs quite a few pounds. There's quite a bit of distance around it. Of course, I realize it's a twelfth-rate sun and a second-rate planet around a twelfth-rate sun. Nevertheless, it is a planet, and the truth—truthfully speaking as of this moment—it is yours. There is no doubt about that at all.

You let any advanced technology forward which can accomplish its ends in a finite period of time and can predict its accomplishment, and you have the area you are in. That is all there is to it. I mean, that's it. If you went into this technical society and you could just make better screwdrivers than anybody else, why, if you had any acumen at all, you eventually would make some kind of a minor success of the situation. But we're not talking now about screwdrivers. We're talking about the stuff of which life is made: life itself. And any time you get a technology of that character going forward, and you have a grasp of that technology, you cannot help but win. you don't even have to try to win. People will come ahead and present you with large sections of Earth. That is all. I mean, it can't help it.

For instance, right now I've told them occasionally, from time to time, they'd never get into space without us. I've told them that from time to time. Well, what do you know? Cape Canaveral just sent for a Scientologist. They won't get into space without us.

And then some psyrologist is going to try to copy all this, and some psychiatrist you d . Can you imagine any of these boys being able to do a 3D Assessment or even a reliable Security Check? Look at the state our technology is in at the present time. It happens to be a self-protecting mechanism.

I, as a matter of fact, occasionally held my breath and said supposing it came out so simple at the other end, and all you said was, "woof-woof," and somebody was Clear. Wouldn't that be nice? And you've all said, "Wouldn't that be nice?" But let me point out something else: If you let this much technology that can be that easily done, loose, you're in for trouble.

Technology which does not require a skilled applicator is what the world and this universe mainly suffers from.

You put out an atom bomb that any government official can press the button of, and what have you got? See, you've got it all set. All you have to have is one button. You push the button. They got a button up here at Brize-Norton. Very interesting. It's a big thingamabob-shielded area, and I think one key is held by a British officer and one key is held by an American officer, and frankly, the front-piece on the thing says "war and peace." And when they turn the key, it turns to war. And all they do is, they both insert their keys and they go click, and there goes the A-bombs and the H-bombs. There it is. That's all they have to do is—is that. That's it. It's that easy. Of course, it takes some airplanes to deliver them maybe or something like that, but I think they're even cutting that down to a zero.

Now, there's what happens when technology of a very powerful nature requires no special skill, because you can never build an ethic into it. Then it can be used for anything.

Let me tell you that an A-bomb release button or an H-bomb release button does not ask whether the presser is a communist, a democrat, a Kennedyite, a Presbyterian, a member of the Bach-Bach we Kill Them All Society of Southern Jungleosis. Doesn't care who, see? Doesn't care who presses it at all. And you have an irresponsibility of some magnitude.

That's what happens when the technology.... I may exceed your grasp of this thing very often. And you say, "What? You mean, it's a good thing that we have to sit here at Saint Hill and shiver out in the—in cold rooms, and—and—and—and get up in the dark and go home in the dark? You mean, it's a good thing we have to sit here and sweat?" Yes, ladies and gentlemen, it's a good thing. It's a good thing you do.

All right. For one moment, then, with that one out of the road, let's take an—look at something else. Let's look at the—at what we're walking into forwardly.

The broad program on which we are operating is a very broad and a very concise program. We have Central Organizations and offices all over Earth. It's no exaggeration they are functioning; ways and means are always being implemented to make them function better to get up their units and that sort of thing.

What they suffer from mainly is lack of technology. As soon as that technology is secure, why, you'll be in a very fine position. Supposing I were in a position now to tell somebody in northern Quebec—and I said, "Now all you have to do is go down to the New York office and get yourself a Class II rating and go home. You'll be able to take care of your wife all right." And supposing I could say that with fantastic security. Supposing I could say that with such security, that I knew very well that the message passed on to the New York office would actually pull the person in when they got there; would they be adequately and rapidly trained to the exact degree of skill or audited to that exact degree of skill and rundown, which would produce that exact result. Be fabulous; be utterly fabulous.

All right. Now, therefore, we're working right now on establishing a technical superiority and security in every one of these Central Organizations. And it's proceeding with considerable speed. I mean, we're doing all right with this.

It's going rapidly enough so that right up till two weeks ago one Central Organization was falling on its head; didn't know whether it was going or coming or what to do with its property, or who was fighting it or otherwise. It had been enturbulated for about two or three years with rather poor handling and all of a sudden got all of its organizational rudiments in and got things pretty well squared away, and suddenly got the idea that our business is Scientology; started doing Scientology and had their first thousand-pound week since February. Just bang; just got their house in order and started making money again and everything seems to be falling off.

Now, that's because it was running on a pattern. It went back to running on pattern. It's never been on pattern before—that particular Central Organization. Interesting.

My policy with regard to Central Organizations and City Offices is to build in self-reliance. Self-reliance, initiative, the ability to act and operate under a fixed pattern with considerable aplomb so that they can take care of what goes on in their area.

We don't want a situation where every time they want to buy a new teacup, they have to send a cable to Saint Hill. You get the idea? Nah, that doesn't ever work.

Well, it depends to a large degree—having an organizational setup of that type—on the technical accuracy and results of the application of technology. If you can do these things—if

you can train people well and you can process people well and if you follow a set pattern—people know what they're doing, you can't help but win.

All right. Now an extension of that, we have franchise holders. And these people routinely and regularly are trying to put up a standard and it falls in on them, and they try to put it up and it falls in on them, and they try to put it up and it stays up for a while, and then it falls in, and then they try to put it up and it stays in for quite a while, and it falls in. And they'll—that's about the cycle they've been going on. But remember, that they have been much less accurate on an average—field auditor auditing results—have been much less accurate and much less high than Central Organization on an average.

Most field auditors don't believe that, and I myself might not believe that if I myself had not long examined the records. Now, of course, there have been exceptions in the field. There have been exceptions and these people have all—have all done very well, but I'm talking of the broad average.

Do you know why an HGC was ever started in the first place? What was the genus of the Hubbard Guidance Center? What was it? It's because field auditors could not audit pcs to results. They couldn't. So we had to set up some kind of a unit that took care of this. Up to that time we were only interested in training. But that was why an HGC got set up and that happened right here in England. And the results were too chaotic. And we got better results in the HGC than were normally gotten elsewhere.

Well, there's various reasons for that, but the basic reason—let me put your attention on this for a moment. The basic reason is because there is a more severe discipline in operation in an HGC, and that's just about all there is to that.

Even though I may lead them over hill and dale occasionally and get them onto this and get them onto that and so forth, and try to get some results in spite of it all, nevertheless, they do get better results with all that.

Now, the Central Organization, as long as it's impoverished or feeling bad or feeling upset or something like this, tends to combat other activities. It tends to go into a games condition with other activities.

You get two Central Organizations on either side of one continent, they'll go into a games condition with each other; or on two different continents, they will. And they do tend to go into games condition with, let us say, field auditors. And the field auditor goes in games condition with the Central Organization.

Do you know what this is? This is simply lack of success. That's all.

It's very funny. When pcs are scarce and everything is scarce and it's all running on a high scarcity, you'll get a games condition. The havingness is inadequate. And so the Central Organization tries to pull in all the pcs and keep the field auditor from having any pcs, and the field auditor tries to pull in all Central Organization's pcs, and so forth. Well, what is this? This is just scarcity.

Scarcity is repaired by technical excellence. The better job you do, the less scarcity there will be. That is all there is to that. And I always look at a Central Organization or a field auditor who has gotten into a games condition as an organization or a person who aren't getting results. That's just as simple as that. It just goes one, two. If they're in games condition with everybody in sight, they're not getting results; that's all.

All right. This course here at Saint Hill was instituted and instigated for one purpose only. It wasn't because I didn't have enough to do. If you'll look over my roster, you'll find it has—I have a couple of odd jobs. This was all in the direction of getting the highest possible level of technology which was attainable.

Now, I've tried to stabilize the technology which was in use and we have stabilized it, remarkably well. It is stabilized right up to a point of—well, I think about the last third of 3D is possibly subject to variation right now. There may be some method of running a case off faster after the case has run a lot of levels. I've already informed you of this.

But let's take what is basic. There are going to be some little changes in beginning and end rudiments, but otherwise you've already had those changes and most of you are using them right this minute.

Model Session is stable; the Auditor's Code is stable; the Code of a Scientologist, the Axioms are stable. The basic processes of rudiments actually exist in too great a number at the present moment. There are too many effective processes and I'll have to shake that down so that we have a few less processes that you can do rudiments with, and then we won't make any mistakes on this and we'll get the rudiments in better. That's a little point of variation. You always expect those points.

Security Checking: Man, that is stable like the Rock of Gibraltar. That is the way you security check.

Reading a meter: Boy, I don't know. Every time I go into researching anything about advanced meters, I always come back and say what a marvelous instrument this Mark IV is. It's just marvelous. Because advanced meters of various kinds tend to do something else. They tend to read too much body action. And the body reactions become too great, and this becomes too great, and that becomes too great. And every time you increase the sensitivity of the meter, you double the response of body action and get what—a one-third gain on the mental action. In other words, when you increase the sensitivity of your meter, your mental action increases just that much, and your body action increases that much. So, of course, the responses of the meter then are lost in those body reactions.

I'm talking now about advanced experimental meters of one kind or another. No, that's a very stable meter. And I work hard to hold it stable and to continue it that way. you might be interested that the reason other meters which have been built from one time to another—why, I invalidate these meters now—is not because you might not have a good one. you might have a good one. you might be lucky, you see? You might have a good squirrel meter. But—you might have a good American meter. But on the assembly-lineing of these things, some of them were built with cheap parts and some of them expensive parts, and some of them were finished by electricians who knew nothing of Scientology, who protected the action by putting in damping mechanisms. But it isn't just a damping mechanism; because they put in the damping mechanism, they changed other parts of the circuit and that was right there on the assembly line as meter number 15, and 16 was all right, and then 17 and 18 are damped, and then 19—somebody found some cheaper component some place or another—so 19 is built out of cheaper components.

You get what's variable about these meters? It is not that you yourself—in having a meter that was built somewhere in the field or was an old American meter or something like that—it isn't that that meter is necessarily a bad meter. It may be that that meter has an instant response; that meter has a proper gradient; its linear curve for the potentiometer is all good—maybe that's all right. But the one right after that, that isn't all right. And the one right after that is probably in the hands of some poor Joe down in Tucson that is trying to clear somebody and he gets nothing but lags, and he hears about instant response and of course he can't get one and that sort of thing

So this is all in the—in under the heading of stability. Security Checking is very stable. The construction of meters is tremendously stable. The various parts and things which you are using are very stable. I don't think the TRs have been changed for years (you haven't learned them either). And the. . . Now, I packed up on a Problems Intensive. We're not asking anybody to do Problems Intensives here to amount to anything, but nevertheless it came out in

a bulletin, it's all just brrrrt, and that's the way you do a Problems Intensive. And I don't think there is any other way to do a Problems Intensive.

So these are stability, stability, stability, stabilities. The assessments, processing on 3D, Assessment by Elimination, how you find the parts of this thing: There aren't new answers to these things. The old answers followed, give you the result.

Maybe one day I will get extremely bright and I will find out some way some—and I will because we need it—I'll find out some way to figure out which is the pc's term and which is the oppterm, absolutely reliably, bangbang, so that you never make the slightest quiver on this thing. And that'd be a good thing to know. That'd be a good thing to know before you start running a lot of pcs backwards, because on some of them, unless I myself sat down on—with an E-Meter, I wouldn't know whether they were running frontwards or backwards. I frankly wouldn't right this minute. I'd have to watch the pc for a session or two.

This is on a secondhand basis, not me auditing, you see? That's you auditing and me watching your reports. And I'm saying "Ohh, is it? Isn't it?" You know, sort of hold breath two, three sessions. Well, this is running all right and then I forget it. That's all right.

Another one—well, we don't know. We don't know. Well, all I can tell from your session is at least the pc isn't getting into trouble; but at any moment, prepared to shift over the opposite way to. So we need a better—a better gimmick, a better test right there.

Now, all of these things—the form of a session—these things are all stable as the devil. And we're ready, we're ready just now to push off. I'll show you some of the things that have defeated us in the past. Remember old Step 6? Well, do you know Step 6 would work today? It was never done, and that is very true of practically, well, 99 percent of the stuff. Step 6 was never done. Do you know what you had to do with an object before you had the pc make it bigger and make it smaller, and solider and all that sort of thing? Do you know what you had to do with one? You had to find a null object on the E-Meter. It had to be a null object, and wherever it beefed up the banks, you didn't find a null object.

Well, let's look at that with relationship to the Goals Problem Mass. Of course, if you had any object that quivered, you'd be onto the Goals Problem Mass and wouldn't dare do anything with it.

But you could take something not associated with it, which wouldn't register, and you could do something with that. And therefore you could exercise the pc—it's an interesting idea, you see—you could exercise the pc on creating and mocking up without antagonizing or messing up, particularly the Goals Problem Mass. And you could stay off of that and come off of that theoretically, and then the pc with some of the automaticity—this is theoretical—some of the automaticities of mocking things up off, of course, could then have had the Goals Problem Mass evaporate. That's theoretical. That's theoretical. If he wasn't close to it, it could have been knocked out by exercises in creatingness.

We have one pc right now, whose auditor is quite concerned, who is running Create on a level. I think you're the only one in the whole unit anyplace that has hit Create as a Prehav level. And of course, this is giving this pc fits because it fits the terminal perfectly and it's just about to run forever.

Well, why is it about to run forever? Well, it's the basic button of the reactive bank, of course. What else could it do but run forever? It's going to go on and on and on. Of course, the more he creates, why, the more—the less bank. And it's doing something to the Goals Problem Mass all the time, so he isn't running into it. you say, "Well, that'd be a good idea. Then we ought to run all pcs on their terminals on Create." Go ahead. You'll spin them in. It was just a fluke that this pc hit it.

And if you'll notice, your pc is running for a long time on the level that exactly fits the terminal. You notice that? If you get the exact level, see, that just fit that thing just marvelously, see.

Well, here's—here's a terminal. Let's take a terminal, "a little boy" and if we had a level, Play. Now, how long do you think that would run, see? It would go on and on and on—if it were hot on the case, which it might very well not be, see?

But you'd run level one, level two, level three, and all of a sudden you'd hit this one Play, see? (This is a cross-example because nobody has hit it.) But there it is, see, and you're running this one. Well, of course, it'll run and run and run and run. And you say, "Where's the case, where's the case, where's the case? And it—this one won't pile up the Goals Problem Mass because the Goals Problem Mass is practically totally made out of that level.

So every time you start to rattle with the Goals Problem Mass, it thins out and pieces fly off of it again, see. So up goes the tone arm and down goes the tone arm and up goes the tone arm. So instead of a lot of levels pulling the Goals Problem Mass apart, you have one level pulling it apart, because it's a basic level that fits the terminal. You could expect that to happen.

But there's something else you can expect to happen with regard to the Goals Problem Mass, is any time you're running a pc with the rudiments out, you're going to run forever. And the way to test it, is test the terminal when you're in the rudiments stage of the session. Just ask. Just say the terminal and see if you get a needle response. If you get a needle response on the terminals, your rudiments are sufficiently in to run it.

Of course, you go through the rudiments and clean them up. But if you don't get a terminal response, don't run the level. In other words, run rudiments till you get a terminal response on the needle and that is the sure test. That means rudiments are in.

Now, I'm quite interested in this other factor. You are running a double command, particularly on the 7 December, thirty-command bracket. You're running a double command. Did it ever strike you that it could run forever on the odd-numbered commands, without the level being introduced?

And later in a run—I can add this to your know-how—if you can't get it to flatten, realize please that it is running only because of the odd-numbered commands. And the even-numbered commands which contain the level on them, are ineffective. And the first chance that you would notice of this is the pc starts telling you that the level doesn't fit the problem he has just thought up. He starts telling you this.

Oh, he can tell you once, he can tell you twice during a run. That's normal. He'll hit one or two that don't match. But all of a sudden he starts saying, "Oh, well, let's see now. Here's a waterbuck and uhm—problem about a waterbuck. Well, how to get some water."

All right. And the Prehav level is Devastate. All right. And you say, "Well, how might Devastate solve that confusion?"

And he says, "Well, it wouldn't. It doesn't."

Well, it has previously. He's hit similar problems. "Devastate. Oh, well yeah—oh, a waterbuck would just devastate the surrounding countryside and the rivers would all run, and he'd get water, you know, before going on.... Devastate, ah...."

Hm. Well, you have no choice but to have him contrive some way it would do so. And he goes on to the next one, and "How might Devastate resolve that problem?"

"Devastate. Who ever heard of that word?"

You see, what you're doing, you're getting your motion on the case—the motion on the case is occurring—purely and entirely because you're asking him for confusions which would give you tone arm motion.

You're saying, "Tell me a confusion. Thank you. Tell me . . ." or problem, or whatever word you're using "Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble. Tell me a trouble." You're getting tone arm motion, but no longer is the odd-number—the even-numbered command functional.

And the way you do that is—one of the symptoms would be—it suddenly doesn't fit anymore. Oh, you got tone arm action, and previously this case has been going up and sticking, you know, and everything's fine. Now, it goes up and sticks and falls off and it goes up and sticks and falls off, and the pc can't answer that—those even-numbered commands.

You had better ask the magic crystal ball—the E-Meter—whether or not that level still has any action on it. So you say, "Devastate. Devastate." It's not a prayer. It's a faintly rising needle, you know, and you say, "Devastate. Devastate." It doesn't stop it. There's no quiver. "Devastate, Devastate? Devastate? Oooooooooo-ooh, all right. Very good. Thank you very much. We're going to do another Prehav Assessment." Be about the end of that. "Give you two more commands and end this process then. Is that all right with you?" (After you've done it.) you see how that would be?

You can actually get tone arm action on the odd-numbered commands independent of the even-numbered commands—and you should look at that. Because a case starts going bluuurew.

Now, it is true that if the level is right on the case's button, that is that case, you see? "Waterbuck. Swimmer." See? Swim. Swim. Swim. You see, it just runs on and on and on and on and on. "Swim, swim, swim, swim. Swim solves everything. Everything is solved by swimming. Swimming. If you get into trouble, you swim. If you get out of trouble, you swim. If you want to have some fun, you swim. If you want to get even with somebody, you swim. Swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim, swim." And then all of a sudden after he's run from this maybe two or three days, he's very fit, you know. You've already done a lot to the Goals Problem Mass with this thing, you see. you chewed it up enormously.

And then all of a sudden you ask him, "All right. Tell me a problem about a waterbuck."

And he says, "O-o-o-h, a waterbuck getting across some trees. Getting cross some downed timber. How to get across some downed timber."

And you say, "How might 'swim' have resolved that problem?"

He says, "Swim? Swim? Who ever heard of swimming?"

And you say, "Well, think of a way." you know, just to get the question answered. I've used this myself. "Well, give me an answer just so we won't have an unanswered question, please?"

And the pc'll answer it some way.

Try it again, see, because it might have been a fluke, you know?

And you say, "All right. Tell me a problem a waterbuck might have with a tiger."

And he says, "How to escape a forest fire and a tiger at the same time."

And you say, "Good. Now, how might 'swim' have resolved that problem?"

“Swim? Swim have resolved the problem? Let’s see, swim. Swim. Do waterbucks ever swim?”

What you’ve done is run the top of the automaticity. Don’t you see?

And then’s about the time you ought to say, “Swim, swim, swim, swim.” Not a quiver.

You say, “Well, that’s very fine.” But this is only after a level has been run long and the tone arm has stuck usually on other levels, and a lot of action has been going on on this particular case, and you have gotten the rise-stick phenomenon to occur. You get the idea. That has occurred, and so forth.

Well, you got this other phenomenon. So remember that it can occur that a pc can be absolutely flat on the level and be getting tone arm action like mad on the odd-numbered commands, “Tell me a problem.” And as I say, the remedy is to check the level for reaction. The level no longer reacts: get off of it.

It’s things of that character, little points of that character that you run in.... You’ll still be getting points of this particular type clarified as people run into difficulties. You’re not going to run into peculiar cases. Don’t worry about that, man. I’ve audited too many cases. I know how they’re put together, but you are going to get into peculiar questions. Usually these stem out of an irregularity of technology. You should realize that your peculiar question ordinarily stems out of some additive or omission you have made from a routine lineup. That’s something to remember, and that’s really something to remember if you’re ever teaching auditors in an Academy. Because, man, a new auditor can think of more things to do wrong than you can catch up with all morning and all afternoon.

And if you were to take this verbal from them—meets you out in the hall and says, “Well, this case doesn’t get any tone arm action of any kind whatsoever on Security Check Form 4,” your immediate response is—you’ve assumed you see, that this auditor is actually auditing and that it’s all set and all square, and so you say, “Well, your rudiments are probably out. Check your rudiments.”

He goes in. He comes back in a little while, he said, “The rudiments— the rudiments—there’s no reaction on the rudiments.”

Well, extraordinary solution, if you were inexperienced, would be your next step, and you’d say, “Well, change the Security Check to a Child’s Security Check.”

Next day there’s no tone arm action on a Child’s Security Check of any kind whatsoever. And the rudiments are in because there is no response of any kind on the meter. Now, you could really get an extraordinary solution. “Well, try the CCHs.” Well, probably this would be better because a close examination demonstrates that the student does not know that this pin goes in this side of the can.

You’d be amazed! You’ll be amazed. You’ll be absolutely amazed.

Now, the other one is.... I know you don’t believe that. That that can happen. That can happen. It’s the weird things like that—well, they hadn’t got the meter turned on or something stupid like that. There—that’s what can throw you. It’s wild departures that you couldn’t even envision. You sit back, and you sit back and you think and you think and you think and you think, “What could they be doing? Now what are they doing? I’ll bet.... you don’t suppose they never go to session?” And that would be closer to the actual answer than the one you will think up with your own background of training. It’ll be that—it’ll be that type of thing. It won’t be the type of thing that their Model Session wasn’t perfect and their TR 4s weren’t perfect, and so on. It’ll be the fact they don’t know the E-Meter plugs in or that they read only body motion. They read only body motion.

I saw some experimental shots taken of a—of an E-Meter, just as an experimental film basis, and the person making them had used nothing but body motion. And any trained Scientologist—they look at this and they say, “Well, all right. So the pc’s moving,” you know. Just a picture of the meter. “So the pc is moving” See, they were trying to make a rock slam look like a rock slam. Didn’t look like a rock slam to anybody that was trained. So the pc was moving is about all that particular shot would have taught anybody.

But these little distinctions are not present at a lower training level, so you really have to reach for it.

Now, I was going to say some more about Security Checking, and I am. You should be terribly, terribly interested, then, with the material which I have been giving you here or talking to you about. You should be terribly interested in getting people up to Class II. Not only will your life become livable, but your pcs will make gains if you are terribly interested in making Class II Auditors—if you’re terribly interested in that. And your life will be as peaceful as—as far as technology is concerned—will be as peaceful as the person who is turned over to you for assessment has had a perfectly accurate Class II job done on them, and then your assessment is possible, and accurate and swift.

I
now you don’t think you can ever do a two-and-a-half-hour assessment, but one has just been done. Two and a half hours of assessment was done in Cape Town. This, by the way, was a patch-up, one of these patch-up assessments, you know. Two elements had already been found and run. There wasn’t enough action left on the meter to bother with. yet the person found the other elements of the 3D in two and a half hours. That doesn’t seem believable to you at this stage of the game.

Let me tell you though that people leaving here find this rather easy. Why? Because you’re operating from an altitude. Here, you’re a bunch of schnooks. There’s nobody going to.... Who’d respond to his command value? For the last two weeks he’s only had two passes a week. You’re used to reading 3D with a microscope, you know.

And you ask Miss Glutz of upper Burbank, “What terminal would oppose this?”

“That could only—only represent a cat.” Half-dial drop. Your reaction is a half-dial drop. “Cat” drops a half a dial for you from there on out. you ask her—she had no choice but to tell you because you were you.

Yeah, but some student—nyah. “Give him a list of 442 terminals. Let him sweat.” Big difference in attitude then.

So you should get terribly, terribly interested—not in just becoming a good Security Checker—but in what it takes to make a Security Checker. In the first place, we probably should stop calling it “Security Checking” and start calling it what I’ve started to call it several times, which is “Processing Checks.” Those are much more easily explainable and we will—you’ll see “Processing Check” in literature going out, so don’t let it throw you. I’m talking about Security Checks. But anyway....

But you go ahead and reap the whirlwind by taking some person who has had some HPA training three years ago, and you’re going to make a Class II Auditor out of him. you indifferently say, “Well, they can sit there and hold the E-Meter balanced well on their lap, they look appreciative and alert, and so therefore we’ll classify them as Class II,” and after that go blow your own brains out because that’s just about what you’re doing.

You’re going to be assessing a 3D after this person someday, or you’re going to be patching a case together after this someday, or you’re going to be holding the hand of some fellow auditor someday who has just been trying to— or this person himself feeling this cocky about

it all, has now done an assessment and what is worse, run it. He knew how to run it: If it didn't react on the meter at all, he knew he had the right one, see. He read Step 6. That's what we're doing, isn't it. you know?

No, you're just setting up trouble for yourself. And when you carelessly rate an auditor, you basically set up trouble in your area today—or in an organization or wherever you're operating—if you carelessly rate an auditor, you're setting up grief. There will be trouble from there on. Make this classification amount to something and you won't have much trouble with regard to it.

And I'd classify people Class III away from Saint Hill when they had a beard—even the girls—down to their toes. Oh, man, I'd really make them come through for a Class III, man. I mean, I'd really make them sweat. But certainly, make a good Class II. And then you have protected yourself.

Now, a Class II must be able to security check so that no Security Checks are muffed. That's the first thing No questions are muffed. No withholds are missed. And that is your criteria.

Now, if the rudiments are in, in the session, of course the person will get the withholds. But if you come along with greater altitude after this fellow and get an additional withhold, don't think it's because the case improved. It was because that Class II Auditor didn't have altitude enough to run the case with rudiments out, and you will have, so rudiments were out for him but in for you. They knew better than to tell you a lie, but they knew they could lie to him. See? This is the difference. So actually your criteria has to be very high to get around that sort of thing so that they will get all of the withhold; so they will get everything.

Now, the fastest way in the world to upset a case and reap the whirlwind is to miss a withhold. Take it from me; that's the fastest way. I've had more trouble with this single item. What trouble I have had—actual, out in the field, and here and there trouble, in the last three months—than with any other single activity anywhere: missed Sec Check questions. That has been way up on the graph.

Nearest approach to it . . . Well, it just didn't approach it. It's something like the order of measuring a grain of sand and the sun. They just were not of comparable magnitude. I've traced every single upset I've had back to missed Sec Check questions. Initial withhold setup, one kind or another, caused a randomness in the area. But where the randomness was tamed down by somebody and they missed a Sec Check question, the randomness doubled. It wasn't so bad before that, but the whole roof was falling in now, you see?

So that can really cause an upset. So I better tell you just two or three very brief little facts of life about this sort of thing

When a pc starts to curse you out—these are little maxims that you could use—when a pc starts to curse you out, find the missed withhold. That is rule of thumb that you will never, never, never, never miss on. When the pc starts to curse you out, find the missed withhold.

Where did this pc miss? There is a half-truth or a completely missed setup there. You won't believe this until you've got a good subjective reality on it as an auditor. And one of these fine days as an auditor, you're going to run into this—right here on this unit. And the pc's going to be sitting there saying, “Well, what ther-rrr! Why don't you rraoww! Wow-wow! And I want too much to do with that anyhow, and so on. And why don't you study your TRs a little bit? Your TR 4 is certainly terrible, and so forth.”

Well, maybe it is, but they would never have commented on it if it weren't for a missed withhold.

Now, of course, you chop into all of this suddenly. “Now, what was the missed withhold question?” You see? You throw your rudiments out at the same time. So you've got to go into

it smoothly. But you can always find it. You could always find it. And there is something here which has not been aired to the bright, fresh sunlight. There is something still floating along in the stygian dark. That's an interesting one.

And until you solve one like this, you won't believe how much fury can come out of it. It's as though you've suddenly charged up the machine with a pressure pellet of some kind or another. Like you've suddenly thrown ether into a petrol engine. This thing is really going to go on a higher roar and tear, and finally it's going to fall apart. Then you suddenly get bright all of a sudden and say, "You don't suppose there could be a missed withhold here? Well, let's just check it out to see."

And we breeze over what we were doing, and we bridge it in, and we get it into a position where we can do a little bit of withhold asking, and we just ask for any withholds we've missed, or any half-truths they've told us—which is the same thing. And all of a sudden, why, there you've got it. The pc is just sweetness and light. And at the end session, end rudiment—you're getting in your end rudiments—and you say, "All right. Are there any ARC breaks or upset in the session?"

The pc sits there, "No."

"Well, how do you feel about that mess that we had at the beginning of the session?"

"What mess? Oh, oh, oh, that. Oh, well, that's nothing I was probably being very hard on you. No." This is really goofy, you know.

Well, the liabilities of Sec Checking.... The reason Sec Checks are difficult lie in the 3D items. So a Sec Checker is always sec checking over the unknown identities of the 3D items. He doesn't know what mores the pc would violate if the pc had a withhold. See, the mores of the terminal—the oppterm—these various combinations are what established the moral caliber of the pc which gives you the mores on which the pc will or will not operate. So a Sec Checker is always able to do a much better job after a 3D has been found. And then you don't have to do any. Isn't that interesting?

Just the time you've got all the data to do a perfect Sec Check, you don't have to do it anymore. I think that's something or other.

But isn't it odd that if you don't do a very fine quality series of Sec Checks before you assess, you don't get the 3D at all. So the Sec Checker actually has to be tremendously skilled because he's going up against an unknown. And this unknown won't become known until the pc is assessed, and the pc can't be assessed until some Sec Checks are done. Now, how do you like that? You always enter the case at the hard end. The longer you audit a case well, the easier a case is to audit.

The best auditing must always be at the beginning of the case. The most skilled auditing is always at the start of a case. So don't get any ideas that a Class II Auditor should be a bum; that you can get away with something as a Class II. You can't. Because it requires the smoothest TRs and the smoothest metering and the smoothest Model Session that will be performed on the case are needed at the beginning of the case while those first critical Sec Checks and so forth are being run. If any upset occurs during that period, you of course, are messed up on an assessment later on or the case just never gets up to being assessed. So the person at the open gate is actually the Class II Auditor. He's the seneschal because he can shut people out entirely and completely. Until they get past him, they're never going to be assessed.

And all he has to do is miss some Sec Checks questions. All he has to do is ARC break the pc. All he has to do is run the wrong preparatory processes. All he has to do is muck the case up, and of course he's finished the case because the case won't come through to assessment. Case will blow, leave for Alaska, get a job with the United Nations—which is the most suicidal

activity I can think of right at the present moment. Pc's liable to do anything, in other words—any low thing. So that's not an unimportant zone. That's not an unimportant zone.

And I'll give you another maxim, is: A Q and A puts the withhold in to stay.

Now, let me give you a very precise thing; a very precise example of Q and A:

"Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

"Yes, I stole my father's once."

Auditor: "How did you come to do that?"

At that point, an Instructor should set up a mitruche on the one side and a rocket launcher on the other side and pull both triggers. That is Q and A of magnitude. Changed the subject, didn't it?

You ask for a withhold, the guy gives you a withhold and now you ask him about the withhold. No, you asked for a withhold. It is enough that he got off the withhold. Now the only question is, does that withhold still register? If it still registers, there's another withhold.

So, here's a maxim: Any additional registry that you get on a withhold question stems from fresh, undisclosed withholds—not from the withhold he has given you.

That'll keep you from doing any Q-and-Aing, and it'll do—it'll keep an awful lot of auditors you train from Q-and-Aing. That's quite important.

This is proper:

Auditor: "Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

Pc: "I stole my father's once."

"Okay. Thank you. Have you ever stolen any other umbrellas?"

"Well, no. No, no, no."

"All right. Thank you."

Now, look at your meter and say, "Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?" Instant read. So you look at the pc and you say, "All right. When is the first time you ever stole an umbrella?"

"Oh, well, I'd forgotten that one. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Just slipped my mind. Yes, as a matter of fact, I was two years old and we were out at a garden party, and I saw an umbrella with a silver handle, and I dragged it out on the lawn—and they teased me about it for a very long time afterwards—but I really didn't mean to take it."

"All right. Okay. Well, have you stolen any other umbrellas?"

"No, no. That's all."

"Okay. Thank you."

Get a hold of your meter. "Have you ever stolen an umbrella?" Remember, that was the auditing question. That was the question that made it fall. Well, that's the question you're trying to clear! You're not trying to clear whether or not this person is related to umbrella manufacturers in the Marcab Confederacy! You're just trying to clear whether or not they ever stole any umbrellas. That's all you want to know and any other material to that is simply

assistive. Any other questions you have is assistive to clearing that exact question. That's the only question you want to clear. That's the only thing you have any interest in.

Now, the reason you vary the question is just to get more withholds and that's where you go astray.

The Instructor says, "Well, vary the question. Don't keep saying, 'Have you ever stolen an umbrella? Thank you. Have you ever stolen an umbrella? Thank you'. " Because he won't get anyplace.

You have to ask him, "Well, did you ever—did you ever pinch one? In restaurants? Did you ever take umbrellas accidentally in a restaurant?"

You know, you're helping out the pc.

"Did you ever—did you ever take any out of offices? Did you ever take any out of homes? Did you ever take any out of shops? Shops, shops"—watching the E-Meter. "Did you ever take any umbrellas out of shops?"

"I'd completely forgotten that. Ha-ha-ha. As a matter of fact, me and a pal ra—robbed an umbrella store one time when I was sixteen."

"Oh," you say, "Good. All right. Now, have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

That's the question you're trying to clear. That question must follow immediately after, see. "Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

"No."

There's no instant read and you're off of it like a startled deer and on to the next question.

Now, providing you routinely check up to find out if there are any withhold questions that have been missed, and providing this always occurs as a question in your end rudiments of any Security Check-type session, "Have I missed any withholds on you?" you will never miss. And you'll find it all goes off like hot butter.

Now, let me give you another horrible example of this.

"Have you ever been mean to a pc?"

"Oh, yes, as a matter of fact, I was mean to a pc. Yep, I was mean to Eleanor when I was auditing her."

"All right. Where was that?"

This is just—from here on, see, we.... This is the blow-the-brains-out type of an approach.

"Oh, that was in Washington."

"Mm-hm. Well, what were you doing in Washington at that time?"

"Uhm...."

"Is that so? Mm. Did you ever ride any horses? Do you like cats? How've you been feeling today? Do you think it's going to rain?" I mean, all of these questions are equally relevant to what you're doing "Do you happen to know the exact figure of gold production in the Rand area during the past fortnight?" would just be about as pertinent to the case, you see, as any of this other bunk, you see.

You want to know if this pc has ever been mean to any pcs or mean to an auditor, or whatever the question is, see. That's all you want to know. And you set out to find this exact package fact, and that package fact is the only fact that you were trying to find out.

Now, if you suspect that this question may be related to some other questions, which are also withhold questions, you add these as though they were also Security Check questions. And you clean each one of those, and the proper way to do it is not sit there and clip them off the end of your bat. The proper way to do is sit down and write them down and clear them as though they were a complete list. Otherwise, you're going to wind up missing some withholds.

Now, that is the severely proper way to do it. But don't ever monkey with these Qs and As. That is a Q and A. The pc says something, so the auditor says something, so the pc says something, so the auditor says something "And what is the price of gold do you suppose in upper Tibet or was it on March the 9th, 1913?" That has just as much to do with auditing of the case, don't you see? "How many photons fall per minute on the head of a pin in latitude 0, 9 minutes, 11 seconds, north, longitude 167, west? Well, that had nothing to do with it. See?"

So in Sec Checking, be pertinent to what you are doing. Be pertinent to what you're doing. If that's what you're doing, do it. Don't wander around about it.

Now, if a burst of misemotion occurs on the part of a pc during a Security Check or a Class II activity, it is turned off by what turned it on. And that is true of all secondaries. Now, that's particularly true of an assessment, running Havingness, or a Security Check question. What turned it on, will turn it off.

Well, what turned it on? Getting a withhold turned it on. What's the withhold that's still keeping it powered up? That's the mistake you make, you see, is taking up the secondary. You don't take up the misemotion in any other way than what turned it on. you get what I'm talking about? I mean, you turned it on with a waterspout, you'll turn it off with a waterspout. That's all there is to that. It's the same thing. Otherwise, you're guilty of mopery and dopery and misdemeanors on the high seas. The point I'm making here is you're running Havingness on this pc and you're saying, "Point out something. Thank you. Point out something Thank you. Point out something Thank you."

And the pc says, "Whaaaaooo, terrible and so forth."

"Point out something Thank you."

"Ooooooh, it was terrible."

You say, "Thank you. Point out something. Thank you."

"Wooooooooowwowwow. "

You want to ask him what's wrong, you say, "What's happening?"

And when he says, "Ooooo-hooo, I just remembered. Oh, it's terrible, and so forth," you say, "Thank you very much. Good. Point out something Thank you. Point out something" Why?

It is complete cruelty to stop the process that turned it on and say, "Oh, poor Bill. What are you crying about, Bill? Well, let's run that as a secondary."

You idiot, you're running it as a secondary. The process that's running it is "Point out something" Do I make my point clear about this? See? It's a cruelty to do it otherwise.

Even though the pc just begs you to be sympathetic, you can go ahead and be kind and half-kill the pc. Because you will.

All right. Let's take the middle of a 3D run. "Think of something, or—Tell me something—Tell me a problem you have had with a waterbuck."

"Well, woowow! My God. Oh, gee. Ooooh-ooh, terrible."

Now, this is dead wrong; this is utterly dead wrong, see: "What happened? Oh? Oh. Well, what happened just before that? Well, what was the waterbuck doing just then? Mm. Oh, yes. When do you suppose that was?"

You're going to park him. You're going to park him just sure as hell. He goes wow! Crash! Terrible! And so forth.

Well, what made it go wow, crash, terrible? It was thinking of a problem that a waterbuck had. All right. What'll settle it down is, "How might swimming have resolved that problem?"

The pc all of a sudden says, "Oh-ho-ho, ho-ho. That's a—ho-ho-ho—that's a wonderful idea. How about swimming Boy, swimming—that really gets a lot. Whew! Boy, you got me out of that. Thank you very much."

And you say, "All right. Tell me a problem a waterbuck might have had with a tiger."

"Oh, well, so-and-so and so-and-so." You get all around it and you come back to it again.

And you say, "All right. Now, tell me a problem you might have had with a waterbuck."

"Wow!"

It's the same problem. He gives you the same answer, see. Still charged.

You get another level. It's not going to flatten on that level. I'll let you in on something He's got several million incidents of that type. Only you just happened to have hit one that he was expressing. The way to handle it is to go on auditing the pc. you will be tempted, on many occasions . . .

Now, on a Security Check question, you say, "All right. Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?"

"Woowow! Oh! Gee, why have you brought that up? That's terrible, and so on and so on."

"Well, have you?"

"Yes."

"All right. How many?"

"Oh, lots of them, lots of them, lots of them."

"How many times have you stolen umbrellas?"

"Oh, lots of times. Oh-ho, lots of times. Think of all those poor people out there in the rain—umbrellas stolen. How mean of me to do this."

"Okay. Thank you. Now, have you ever stolen an umbrella?"

"Ooooh. Gee, you keep asking that question. My God!"

“Good. Have you stolen any other umbrellas?”

“Well, yeah. you put it that way—yes. Yes. I used to collect them out of the whole faculty at my prep school.”

Now, that’s what the grief is coming from. The grief was coming from a withhold. See? Because the withhold had the incident charged up.

Now, if the incident remains charged up, there must be another withhold.

See, if you can set off an incident by simply getting off a withhold, you must realize that if it keeps running, it’s only half set off. so there must be something else there, so there’s another pin to pull. An unkind thing to do is to run it.

I can tell you this because I’ve watched this over quite a period of time now and the only safe thing to do is remember vividly that what turns it on turned it off. If you want to turn something off, with what we’re using today, well, just keep on running some of the same, and you’ll get it off—but that’s the only way you’ll get it off. Because the other processes of Two-way Comm and this sort of thing are so much weaker than any other process you happen to be running now, that they don’t come up in order of magnitude.

So you’re running Sec Check question, Sec Check question, Sec Check question. My God! I’ve seen the—practically the dead get up and walk if you ask the right Sec Check question! And you’re going to all of a sudden run, “All right. Think of a time you were happy. Thank you. Think of a time you were happy.” Well, think of how many times you’ve run some such inane process on a pc and nothing happened to the pc. you sat there and sweated for an hour or two. you knew it was the exact process to fit the case. you knew he should get up and walk, but by golly, he never did. Have you ever had that experience? You run some mild process.

All right. Well consider it as though you were all of a sudden running a 155 millimeter process, you see, and it’s going boom! you know, in salvo. Boom! And then you all of a sudden—the pc says, “Oh, thud. I’ve been bracketed.”

And then you suddenly say, “BB gun, BB gun, BB gun, BB gun, BB gun.” You—of course, you leave the pc right in the middle of the woooooouh. The only thing that could possibly boot him through it was what you were running

3D Process? Absolutely fantastically powerful, that process is. Sec Checking? Very, very powerful process. Extremely well done, a Sec Check can do almost anything with a pc. Havingness? Tremendously powerful process. You think you’re going to get processes all of a sudden out of a—out of your hip pocket that are suddenly going to outrank these three processes? No, you’re not.

So if they turn something on, believe me, you’re not going to get it off by getting a Kleenex and wiping the pc’s fingernails or something. It’s going to take more of the same. See? So that’s something for you to realize.

Now, in training Sec Check people—in training people to sec check—you should recognize that their first tendency will be to be-kind, and in that lies their greatest cruelty. In auditing, in kindness lies the greatest cruelty always. You’re being kind. And by that I mean the pc is crying, so you say, “Well, we better not keep the session going because it’s getting the pc too upset.” Huh-huh-huh. Slit your throat; you just did.

Another instance of being kind: “Well, the pc was too upset in the session yesterday, so I’ll let him get rested up a little bit, and we won’t have a session today.” Cut your throat; you just did.

Pc is always getting angry every time you approach Sec Check questions in the rudiments, so avoid them. That's the kind thing to do because it makes a nice, smooth session in which nothing ever happens, ever.

You could audit him for thousands of hours and nothing would ever happen with the case. Case has obviously got withholds.

All right. "Because the pc might get upset pulling the withholds, we won't approach Sec Checking on this particular pc because it's very kind. The best thing we can do for this pc is to run a 3D Assessment very, very rapidly—without any Security Checking, without any Problems Intensive— and just get it very, very rapidly, and hang it all together again, and so forth, and then run him immediately and rapidly on a 3D level. That'd be nice, because he wouldn't then be upset at all that Sec Checking and all that wasted time, and it'd be the nice thing to do." cut your throat; you just did.

Case is in no—might have been in shape to be assessed. You might even with altitude have gotten by and through and finished with an assessment, but let me tell you something You'll never—never get him through alive at the other end of a 3D run. See, even if you did do the assessment, you would never—they—they'd just probably wind up practically three-quarters of the way dead at the other side of it.

If you haven't noticed—I think some of you have noticed 3D runs are a bit tough. They have a tendency to have some somatics connected with them. Have you noticed that? You noticed there was something to a 3D run. Indeed.

Well, how would you like to go into a 3D run with the entirety of a Joburg loaded and undisclosed? Isn't that kind of gruesome? Completely out of communication with the auditor and liable to ARC break with the auditor at any moment and go out of session so the 3D run is left half flat. Oh, that'd be great, wouldn't it? Wouldn't that be ducky? That's just exactly what the doctor didn't order. That's what the doctor would order.

I ran a pc one time—I learned my first lesson on this. I ran a pc halfway through an incident. Pc turned on an actual, registrable temperature of a 102. Medical doctor observing, took the patient's temperature and instantly stood up with great heroic gestures and said, "The pc must at once go to bed because the man is obviously very, very ill."

And I said, "The doctor must at once sit down because I am in charge here. You're not."

He sat down looking somewhat cowed. And I ran it through at the other end and in a incredulous fashion—it was only fifteen minutes later—he takes out his thermometer and puts it in the pc's mouth, and by God, the pc's temperature was normal. It had gone from normal to 102 to normal in the matter of a half an hour.

I said, "You want to see it go up and down again, Doc?"

"No," he said, "No. No." He said, "That's all I want to see now."

His whole concept, you see, of what turned on temperatures had been turned upside down.

All right. Seeing somebody suddenly in duress and agony, the doctor's response was, of course, to do something heroic and different. And that would have been the one thing that would have dished the pc. That would apparently have been the professional or the kind thing to do, but for a Scientologist that is neither professional nor kind—very cruel.

Pc gets upset and we don't drive the pc through to the other end of it—it's cruel. Never kid yourself otherwise. It's a cruel thing to do to a pc. No matter how a pc is upset, we know how he got upset and we know why he's upset, and I'd straighten it out.

If we had a Sec Check question half-flat in the last session and we approach this session, we can't get the rudiments in, do we spend the rest of this session getting the rudiments in? No, we do not!

We get the rudiments in somewhat in this fashion: "Room, auditor, withhold, PTP? Thank you very much. Now, the question is: 'Have you ever stolen any umbrellas?'" See, pc's all upset. Well, that's where we left the pc. That must be what he's upset about. And you'll find out it'll usually work out that's exactly what the pc is upset about. Now, the pc goes out of session reading at 3.0 and comes back in session reading at 5.0 on the tone arm, we ought to notice this. Something has happened in the interim. It might be—not considered socially marvelous to go around and inquiring after everybody's private life. And it might not be the accepted thing, but it's a cruel thing to start a session without having noticed that. Tone arm's gone up two divisions? What did this pc do between sessions?

Now, we're going to try to get the rudiments in. Ah, well, it's going to be a very rough job—unless we're terribly specific. We say, "What have you been doing?" We don't even get a session started. You look at this and it's on the E-Meter, and you just got him on the E-Meter. "All right. Start of session. Thank you. Now, what have you been doing since yesterday afternoon? What has happened?"

"Oh, well. We don't want to go into that."

"Well, I'm afraid we do. Now, what's happened? What happened?"

"Oh. Well, I've got a . . ."

"Well, that, that—that you see right there. What—what has happened? What—what happened?"

"Well, I don't want to tell you, and so forth. My third wife arrived. You see, I've never—I've never bothered to get divorces from my first two wives. And she just got into town. And I didn't mean to tell you, and . . ."

Tone arm goes down, clank! Now, you spend the rest of the session discussing this? No, not unless it shows up as a PTP.

You say, "Do you have a present time problem?"

Pc is very often—is trying to sponge a session off of you or something of the sort. You're getting registries, see. You're getting registries on the meter, so the meter isn't null because of an ARC break, see. If you can get registry on a meter, you know, the pc hasn't got ARC breaks to the point where you don't get a registry. You recognize that—that some people are not going to.

All right. And your registry is right there, and very nice. Everything is fine, and you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" You don't get any response of any kind whatsoever. You couldn't read it with a microscope, you know.

The pc says, "Oh, well, yes. I mean I have terrible worries. And I'm awfully worried about Aunt Agatha and Aunt Bessie and all of that sort of thing"

And you say, "Well, all right. Now, how do you feel about that now?"

"Well, I feel terrible about it."

"Well, all right. Good. Good. Thank you very much. Okay. Now, is it all right if I . . ." You're off of it.

Sometimes it'll ARC break the pc, but it'd only ARC break the pc if you missed the withhold question that went immediately ahead of it.

So if bypassing a PTP upsets the pc, you go back to the withhold question. That's the mechanics of the situation. Pc has been trying to tell you something, and he circuitously wants a present time problem run or something like this. The pc wants something else done in the session. Well, the way you keep the pc from dictating what's going to be done in the session is return to the earlier rudiment. That just mechanically is good sense, but it's also Scientologically good sense because the pc didn't get upset about this unless he had a withhold of some kind that you missed when you went by the withhold question.

All right. There are these little maxims of one character or another, and I could go on about these things for some time, but I've given you the principal ones right here.

It is actually not a very difficult job to do a Class II, but it is sometimes very, very, very difficult to get somebody to do only a Class II. They want to do eighteen other things, too. You've got to blow a lot of confusion off somebody.

The person is sitting there and he doesn't know whether you're supposed to look into the top of the case or the bottom of the E-Meter or the pc's shoes simultaneously while... And how can you possibly read the question off because at the moment you're reading the question off, of course, the E-Meter might be moving on the instant read. But at the same time you have to do TR 0, but your TR 2, you see—that might be poor, and the pc might not quite be getting that either, and—and it just looks like a big mess to the person.

Now, if it looks that confused to the auditor, the pc of course, will get very upset. So, actually, the pc is sort of trying to stay in-session and make a session out of it and is eight times as hard to audit. See? So, a confused auditor—a pc is much harder to audit. In actuality, the pc does not behave properly for a session because the pc is reacting to the confusion of the auditor. So therefore an unskilled auditor has much tougher pcs than anybody else. That's—that's the—that's the horrors of the—of the truth of the matter.

Now, your next point is: that because it is all so complicated—the auditor who's learning this routine—of course, doesn't see anything wrong with throwing five or six more complications in on top of it. So he starts doing all kinds of additives. And it's frankly not so much a job of teaching somebody something; is trying to teach them some “only” things. See, it's not so much trying to cram all this stuff down their throats, is keep them from imbibing all of this useless gutter water along with the drink of wine, you see. And it's sort of you go on “onlys” on this type of training and you will win. you know, “onlys.” Figure out something very simple. Figure out something very simple.

How do you hold an E-Meter on your lap? And get them to do that one well. And then for a while, just get them to read an E-Meter on body responses or something. And then get them to do something else like read a Security Check question. You know, no meter around, you know. Get some dummy Security Check question, and let them fire that.

“Have you ever been a horrible person?” you know. Something like that. Something you would never miss. “Have you ever been a horrible person? Thank you. Have you ever been a horrible person? Thank you. Have you ever been a horrible person? Thank you.”

You say, that isn't the way you audit a Security Check question. You ask the person pointedly, “Have you ever been a horrible person?” And, admitting that they have said, yes, they have been a horrible person, now let's ask them if they'd been a horrible person any other time than that. And let's just keep plugging the idea of a Sec Check question on a horrible person on this thing until the person runs out of answers on it. And let's do it that way.

All right. Now, let's get registry on the meter of these things and let's see if these things register on the meter.

In

other words, any way you want to plot it up. I'm not giving you the ideal combination. I'm just giving you an idea that you teach them they can do these things, and it's not really a matter of upending a bucketful of facts over their heads. It's trying to keep them from upending a bucketful of facts over their heads. You know?

See, they're thinking all the time, "Let's see, the potentiometer, and I wonder if one tone arm—do you supposed to get a tone arm motion while the needle bops. . . Is—is—is there any data in here about—about rock slamming If it rock slams, if the sensitivity is high, maybe—maybe as the rock slam turns on if the sensitivity's too high, maybe if you turn down the sensitivity, wouldn't have a rock slam. Maybe that has something to do with it. I wonder what—if you have to read the proper name of the Security Check off to the pc before you start giving the Security Check. That seems to me to be awfully important.

"Uh—let's see. This is a Form 3. Uh—I don't know why it's called a Joburg Uh—that's—that's not very good auditing presence, but—and so forth. Oh, I have to remember I have to keep my TR 0 in." Keeping your TR 0 in is going silent and motionless like a cigar store Indian for forty-five seconds with nothing happening

When a person starts to learn these things, he looks like a juggler, you know, with fifteen Indian clubs and eight cubes in the air and all of them about to hit him on the head.

The thing to do is to show him there's one Indian club, and that is an Indian club, and really get him to a point where he'll actually go out and tell people, "This is an Indian club," and think of himself as a great authority on the subject.

Now, if he can do that, he eventually gets this one thing. You know, I learned this from a psycho girl one time. she was really crazy. And I saw her turn sane—just like that. And she was never crazy afterwards. It was "Look around here and find something real." you know? "Something that's really real to you" is, I think, the wording of the old one. And this girl picked up one sugar bowl and all of a sudden clutched the sugar bowl to her bosom and said, "It's real! It really is! It exists!" I couldn't get the sugar bowl away from her. I never did get to flatten the process.

And that happened to other auditors, too. All of a sudden, somebody would "No!" you know. And then the process didn't seem to work anymore after that. They'd made all the gain that the process was capable of making. Well, that's kind of the way training is. If you went over. . . You could actually train a person on an E-Meter this way. you could name off all of the parts of a Class II Auditor until you got a fall. That one would be real to them. Get them to learn that one. Sounds weird. And get them to learn that one real well, and you'd find in practically no time at all, they'd become a complete authority on it.

Now, go over all the remaining parts of Class II on the E-Meter until one fell and then get them to learn that one. you could do it this way—I'm just reduotio ad absurdum—but I'm trying to give you the idea that if you can teach them an "only," not an "all"—the "only" approach, not the "all" approach is what wins in this, because the pc is already snowed under with the "allness" on it. "Oh, my God, here I am actually sitting here tampering with somebody's mind and didn't I learn 5,685,000 years ago that tampering with somebody's mind was my downfall? And I wasn't supposed to do that— and oh—I must keep my TR 0 in.

"Yeah, now let's get on to the E-Meter and so forth here. I wonder if you reduce the sensitivity if the rock slam comes off. Mm, TR 0."

So it's rough, man. I mean, you can practically hear the brains wheel when you're doing this kind of thing so it seems very easy to you after you've done it a lot. It seems very simple to you. You'd say, "Oh, well, I can do this. Why should anybody else ever have any trouble at any time" and so forth.

And now I come in and tell you that as soon as you get back to where you're going in a Central Organization or otherwise, you should tap two people on the shoulder and you say, "Many are called, few are chosen."

And one of them says to you sneeringly, "Oh, I've passed Class II skills. I've already been passed on it. Huh-huh. I've already passed on it."

Check them out. They won't get to the first paragraph of the examination without falling on their heads. Then you start in from scratch and make a Class II Auditor out of them. After that, if you've got to assess somebody, you can always send somebody to that auditor. You've always got that auditor to lean back on.

You better do that—because you're going to need help. You're going to need it, but not in the way you think—not in the way you think you will need help. The way you need help is to keep an assembly line going, to keep people getting audited with the skill that only you can provide. Other people can provide the more basic skills, but of course, you have to know those basic skills much more perfectly than anybody you will ever teach. So get busy.

Thank you.