

DIRECTING ATTENTION

A lecture given on
14 February 1962

Now, what date do we have? What date do you have?

Audience: 14th of February.

14th of February, Valentine's Day. Will you be my valentine?

I didn't hear any volunteers.

Audience: Yeah!

All right. All right.

(I didn't put the year on it. A.D. 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.)

We just had a good example of distracting the PC out of session and collapsing the bank on the face. Did you notice that?

Audience: Hm-mm. Hm-mm.

Wasn't that an interesting example? And do you notice that it dropped the havingness right out. Hm? Interesting, isn't it? The PC's attention—flick, bang!

Of course, the patch-up is to get the ARC break off fast. If you can't get the ARC break off, run some havingness and get the ARC break off. Got it?

If you can't easily release an ARC break or easily get a rudiment in, it's always safe to assume that havingness is out. I don't know if you noticed that example. Just the flick of some paper and bang!—the PC's attention is out of session.

The gimmick you saw about illustration. I should mention something about that. It'll probably be a part of your flows. You see, your 3D Criss Cross—how you get a list and that sort of thing—originally was designed before we had flows. So it'd be only a special gimmick for flows. But we could broaden it and say, well, you get the PC to define what you're going to get the list from so that the PC understands it. And that way you wouldn't run into the trouble you've run into earlier on "like and dislike" lists.

So you don't know whether the PC likes it or dislikes it or . . . you know, and the PC finally says, "Well, I don't dislike anything actually. I hate everything!" you know?

And right away you say, "Well, let's have a hate list," see?

But let's be sure that the PC understands what we're going to list from as an additional step. We would do a Prehav assessment or a flows assessment or take an arbitrary item. And in any event, let's make sure that the PC understands thoroughly what we are listing from before we start to list. Okay?

Another sign that is very interesting is, if you have the right flow you will get some tone arm action. And when you have ceased to get tone arm action on the list, you don't have any more items. If you leave the PC on the meter during a listing, if you're on the right track you've got some tone arm action. It'll be anywhere up to about the one tone arm division—3.0 to 4.0, 2.5 to 3.5, or something like that. It'll be at least that. You'll have that area. And the tone arm

will wander around, and as long as you have tone arm motion your list is incomplete. I had to do some work on this because we needed some additional indicators. Slight change: leave the PC on while listing.

Now, if you leave the PC on while listing and leave the PC on while differentiation, you will see the item itself discharge. And you hit the hot item on a list, you may get a discharge of two to three dial drops. The item which you will eventually assess, by the time you begin to null, has already been discharged. It's quite interesting, if the item is hot, that you will get a two or three dial drop. It'll just go zooooom, zooooom, zooooom. And you all of a sudden—the way you'll probably notice it on differentiation is that your tone arm suddenly is way out. Your needle is hanging over here on the side of the meter; you possibly won't see it go at all, you see, and you—because you aren't watching the meter very heavily—and you'll suddenly notice that after we read that item, we'll have to move the tone arm down about a division or two.

You decide that the one you just did must have been a very, very hot item indeed if you don't see the needle go. You got the idea? Because nobody expects you to watch the needle, you know, like the cat to the mouse hole, while you're doing listing and differentiation. Just keep it centered. Try to keep your needle up to set. Keep a very low sensitivity setting, because it doesn't matter much.

See, the lower the sensitivity setting, the more your needle stays somewhere on the dial, the less adjustment you have to make of the tone arm. Of course, doing rudiments oh man, that needle is just all over the place with rudiments, all over the place. Get that thing set at sensitivity 16, you know, and rwoow! I don't care how corny you sound. You notice that I'd rather you sound corny and careless or something and be careful, than to be imprecise. Don't ever neglect to say the rudiment twice, see? Always be sure. Always be sure.

There's probably some characteristic in my auditing that you've been picking up, because there's a terrific amount of carefulness with regard to reads and that sort of thing. If I don't get them the first time, I'll ask them the second time. You never invite an ARC break, because you're interested in the PC's case, of course. And if you don't get them the second time - you're still not sure - why, get it back there and . . . Of course, at sensitivity 16 your needle is flying at such a wild rate across the dial that it sometimes gets to the left-hand side of the meter, you see, before you've finished the question. And you're left with the great embarrassment of having uttered your question and come to the end of it, and your needle is sitting over there parked and unreadable.

Don't worry about things like that happening. Don't strain at that sort of thing. What I want you to strain at is being awful careful.

It looked like the thing did a slight acceleration. You know, it looked like right after you said it, there was a slight acceleration, but you couldn't quite tell, you know, it was so indefinable. Ask it again and see if there was something there.

Then you look at it, and the needle just is—you're asking on a fall or something like that. Work a flying needle—it's perfectly all right—but work it carefully.

One of the things is, please, as an auditor, don't put looking good over above being a good auditor. Please. You know, you can make yourself look awful good sometimes, you know? PC is very happy because you've found an item, and you haven't found one. Don't tell him you've got an item unless you've got one, you see? Don't give him any hope, because there must be something wrong. There must be something wrong there that needs patching up. And your PC will just ARC break on it, that's all. You say, "Oh, yes. Well, we're very happy. We got an item," and so forth.

But be very careful and always put accuracy above looking good. And if you fumble, fumble, for God's sakes. I don't care how hard you fumble, but just: do a good job. Do a good,

thorough job on it. Don't try to look good. Because the only person who loses, you see, is the PC. The PC really loses.

You can err in several ways in auditing, all in the direction of reputation, of looking good, being kind—that is the main thing. There was a lecture last summer about being kind, which is as bitter as I think I'd care to state it. You can kill people with kindness, man, you can kill them dead.

Failure to direct the PC's attention, letting a PC run on and on and on—being kind, you know? “Let's be careful that we don't have any ARC break.” Well, I'll tell you what causes an ARC break: It's no auditing. That's what causes the ARC break.

As long as you're interested, as long as you're doing your job and as long as you keep clearing up the should-have knowns, you're not going to have any ARC breaks with the PC. But the way to have ARC breaks with the PC is to be kind and then not do your job because you might upset the PC or something like that.

You haven't seen this yet in my demonstrations, but I have been known to tell PCs to “shut up—that is it.”

Oh, you did see some. No, no, you didn't see this. No, because this was a demonstration that wasn't on the air. Got fooled for a second because I remember all the sets were on.

I turn all the sets on up there and get used to auditing under those circumstances. It's a little bit rough because the meter is never in the position I ordinarily use a meter, and so forth, and I'm having to adjust myself to exactly that auditing circumstance.

And the PC said, “You know, this goes back to a past life of . . . and uh . . . I know this has its foundation in a past life.”

And we were looking for a withhold, see, in this lifetime.

And I said, “Good. You just leave that alone for the moment and we'll get around to that later. Come on now.” And so forth.

And the PC cheered right up and smiled. PC knew when she was getting away with something. And sure enough, there was a hot withhold right there. Boo-boo-boom! We had it practically in the next twenty words. But we were going to get all about this past life, you know?

You look up Sec Checks—old Sec Check forms—and at the point where the person just about connected, but the auditor didn't make him connect it, they immediately went into a past life. It is not a dodge mechanism so much as the fact that that withhold is connected, but it is restimulating the past life. So the closest thing available is the past life. You don't want it. All you wanted to do is key it out.

And you look it over, and it's very, very amusing. You look it over and you'll see the missed withhold, the question which you're now going to have to clean up with the withhold system, can be found on these old forms by just locating where the auditor noted down the PC dived into a past life. You take that question and you clean it for this life, and you'll have the hottest firecracker withhold you ever wanted to meet. That's an interesting little trick of the trade.

Now, it is perfectly true that withholds in past lives are causing all the PC's real difficulties, see? So you don't want to invalidate this and come down on it with a crash and say, “We don't care about past lives. We're not auditing past lives. To hell with your past lives.” That'd be the wrong way to go about this, you see?

The right way to go about it is to say to the PC, “All right. That in its place and this in thar [its] place. And what I’m looking for right now is what you did to the cat, now, in this life. We’ll take the other up later in 3D Criss Cross. But right now we want to know what you did to the cat in this life, the cat named Joe—whatever it was.”

All right. Now, that is what we’re interested in. Now, if you can keep the PC from diving, you can control a PC’s attention. If you can control a PC’s attention, you can keep them from diving. And if you’re controlling a PC’s attention, the PC is uhrrr, crank, crank, hrrmm-hrrmm. And he’s “No, no. I don’t want to look over there.”

And the auditor says, “There it is. There it is. Look.”

And the PC says, “No, no! Really, it’s w . . .”

And the auditor says, “Uh-uh [no].”

And the PC says, “But that’s much more attractive right now.”

And the auditor says, “Hm-mm.”

And the PC all of a sudden blows fifteen megatons of charge on this thing, see?

And the PC never forgives you if you let his attention go out of it. It’s not kind, it’s suicidal! The PC never forgives you if you let him give up or let her give up.

I don’t care what the PC says in the session. I don’t care what argument the PC advances. It is read right at the bottom of your right-hand column on the auditor’s report: Goals and Gains. And if you didn’t direct the PC’s attention, you’ll see “Goals made: No. Gains: No.” Every time. You’ve got to get the PC’s attention directed.

Now, if you let the PC wander into a lot of overts. . . This sounds like a generalized lecture; it’s not a generalized lecture. I’m telling you how to run a PC on Prepchecking, how to handle a PC’s attention in pulling overts and so forth—what’s expected of you.

You think that you’re going to get an ARC break, you see, if you’re mean to the PC. You actually would believe this on first inspection—that if you’re mean to the PC, you’ll get an ARC break.

Now, listen. It has nothing to do with being nice to or mean to the PC. That does not have any monitor of the session. That does not monitor the gains of the session or the attitude after the session of the PC toward you. See? That has nothing to do with it. Just discount niceness and kindness, being mean to the PC, being kind to the PC, your attitude toward the PC—just pretty well cancel it out. See, you can’t wipe it out entirely, but you can—whether you’re mean or kind to the PC has nowhere near the bearing on the situation as whether or not you’re effective with the PC. You can have that PC screaming at high C in the middle of a session, apparently all ARC broke, chewing you out like mad, and you’re saying not, “Oh, well, I’m sorry we got into it.” And you are saying, “All right. Now, what withhold did I miss?”

And the PC says, “Well, you’re the lousiest auditor I ever had anything to do with!”

You say, “Come on now: What withhold did I miss? When?”

And the PC says, “Well, that’s something else. You needn’t be cross about it and so forth.”

Well, you say, “Well, I’m not being cross about it. I want to know! What withhold did I miss?”

“Oh, well, in the beginning of the session, of course, you failed to find out that I have an engagement at three o’clock and it’s now three-thirty.”

“Oh, all right. Let’s continue with the session.”

And that PC will go out and he’ll just swear by you as an auditor. “Oh man, that—that’s my auditor, you know? A terrific auditor. Oh, terrific. Won’t let me get away with a thing! Hm-hm-hm.”

But the auditor who’s nice and doesn’t direct the PC’s attention, the PC goes out of the session and says, “Natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter. Well, he’s all right. He tries.”

You’d be surprised. You could be the most gentlemanly or ladylike auditor in the world, you know, and never have gain on the PC, because that isn’t what makes the gain. It’s whether or not you control that PC’s attention.

Now, you’d just be amazed how far you would get. Now, I’m not asking you to overwhelm the PC, because you actually don’t overwhelm the PC with mood. What you overwhelm the PC with is evaluation and invalidation: the fact of invalidation, the fact of evaluation.

You say, “Well, I don’t think that’s the list. I don’t think that has anything to do with it. That item doesn’t belong on the list. What your item is, actually, is ‘a spendthrift.’ I’ve watched you for days and I know that.” And that overwhelms a PC, see?

And, “Well, you actually don’t know what you’re thinking about, actually. That’s what’s the trouble with the session. If you just knew what you were thinking about . . .”—you know, invalidation of some kind or another. That’s what ruins a PC.

Mood doesn’t ruin a PC. I’ve had a PC fly out of an auditing chair, and I’ve taken that PC and slammed that PC down into the auditing chair and say, “Damn it. Sit there and get audited.”

PC after the session: “Wonderful session.” Didn’t even clean it up as an ARC break. See, it’s very fascinating. That’s the one thing you should learn. Yeah, be nice, be your cheerful self and so forth, but direct the PC’s attention. But I’m not teaching you to be a mean auditor—I’m teaching you not to pay any attention to that factor.

If you’re an effective auditor, and you do what has to be done, and you direct the PC’s attention, you will get further by directing it crudely and badly and misemotionally than by not directing it at all. I assure you of this. Naturally, after a while, you get to be an old smoothie. You see that PC start out in session, go somewhere or the other—just go zing-bang, thud, and you do the effective thing and so forth, and there it is.

But even then, now and then, you will get caught out in a storm. You say, “Where the hell did this come from, you know?” And that’s going to happen to you on this withhold system, Prepchecking, time and time again, because every time the PC comes close to the key withhold, the PC is apt to get cross with the auditor. Now, that’s the liability of Prepchecking and this withhold system.

You start sailing down the line . . . It’s an indicator. It’s an indicator. The PC, right there at that crucial moment, gets some kind of—it’s the missed withhold mechanism, but it’s a little bit in reverse. Just got a little more curve on it. And you say to the PC quite innocently—you say, “Well, who didn’t know about that? Who should have known about it?”

Anything you’re saying for that third question—you can, you know, you can say, “Who didn’t know about it?” just to salt the thing down. You can say, “Who did you make sure wouldn’t find out about it?” That puts it in the future, you see? You can play it on the three

tenses if you want to. I'll give you a list of the permissibles, you see? Down at that end you can ask any one of these. The standard one is just "should have known" and "failed to find out," see? But you can vary this song anything you want to in the same breath, you know? And you'll just manage to pull it off.

But anyhow, you'll be sailing down along about the thing and you'll be getting to the "Well, is that all of it?"

"Oh, pity's sakes, it certainly is all of it. As a matter of fact, I am getting sick of it. Aren't you?"

Oh man, you're standing right on the threshold. You're getting right there. That's all that is. Doesn't mean ARC break; doesn't mean anything at all. PC is going misemotional.

All right, got the PC headed right down that alley. And if you don't head the PC down that alley, the PC will wind up saying you're the worst, lousiest, bummeat auditor he ever heard of, see?

Well, of course, you didn't torture him to death by . . . He's got to be made to face that withhold, and that's your whole job.

Now, the PC is sitting there . . . Let me tell you some of the primary and early withhold flubs.

PC said, "Well, I don't think very much of Joe. Joe . . . Joe will never . . . never has anything much to do with me and so forth, and uh . . . I really don't think very much of him. Matter of fact, one day he dropped me out of his car and so forth. Didn't even . . . didn't even accompany me to the door."

Auditor: "What else did Joe do to you?"

"Well, he was insulting. Often. Very insulting."

On and on, see? Buy a motivator, buy a motivator, buy a motivator. And by the time that session ends, your goals and gains—my God, the poor PC is just plowed into the ground. What you've done is run up a bunch of new overts, and the session was used just to run up new overts. So that is the broad classification of a bad withhold-pulling session. It's just permitting the PC to go on and run up brand-new overts on the thing. In other words, he's giving motivators, he's making damaging statements, or she is making damaging statements, and that sort of thing He'll run up at the other end, you know? Well, that was a common thing.

Pulling other people's withholds. Now, that's the one you will face every time you try to train a Class II auditor. Sooner or later, as he starts into this thing, you will find him sitting there pulling other people's withholds off the PC: because it's so intriguing; it's so interesting; it's like reading a scandal sheet, you know? And "all so true."

And amongst those is running you down covertly, you see, by saying what they have heard about you, what the PC has heard about you. So that's other people's withholds, you see?

And the PC has heard from Pete about how you so forth. And that's a withhold from you—heh-heh-heh-heh-heh—and that's a withhold from you. Brother, I just wouldn't spend three seconds' worth of auditing time on it, you know? I just wouldn't spend any time on it at all. Because if you permit the auditor to go on and pull other people's withholds, including withholds he has heard about the auditor, any brand of this, you wind up with that right-hand column right at the bottom: "Goals: None. Gains: None." Every time. It's just a wasted session. It's ineffective. So that is one of the old-time common errors.

And the other one there's another one on this now—is the critical thought mechanism. Now, that was too thoroughly banished, because I will use critical thoughts—ho-ho-ho—in old-time-style Sec Checking. You give me a string of critical thoughts and I'll show you the prettiest array of overts you ever heard of.

It's just an indicator. So you say to somebody, "Now, have you had . . ." It's a trap, you know? It's a great, big, dirty trap that you've laid right in the middle of the boulevard. And they're going down this boulevard at seventy miles an hour and they're going to go right on by and they're not going to get any goals and gains by session end.

Well, one of the ways to stop this is to ask them a leader, such as, “Have you ever had any critical thoughts about anyone?” And they merely tell you, at once, about all the critical thoughts they have had about Angela. And the only critical thought you listen to about Angela is enough to let them groove—get them grooved in on Angela. It’s something on the order of about—I’d say fifteen to twenty seconds’ worth is adequate. And you let them get grooved in well on Angela and then say calmly and coolly, “Well, what have you done to Angela?” And you’ll find one every time. You’ll find a withhold every time. You’ll find an overt that is being withheld from you.

Now, this is not trickery that we're using particularly today, but you should know that. That's a good little piece of stuff. And it also should be known to you because in trying to train somebody on what is an overt and what is a withhold, they're going to run into critical thoughts and they're going to waste hours.

Now, listen. I have seen five hours of auditing time, pulling critical thoughts, go up in smoke—absolutely no goal, gain, nothing. No gain at all—just go up in smoke on pulling critical thoughts. That in one minute—five hours versus one minute, see?—the auditor said, “What did you do to . . .” and here, this critical-thought channel just explodes at this point.

"Uh . . . no! I've done nothing. Uh . . . uhuuuuuuua!" Horrors. Caught. And they go right off the pavement into the trap. Oh, there we are. Oh, well. We didn't even know there was anything there. "Oh, they . . . yeah, well, actually, I didn't do anything to him. Didn't really do anything to him Stole his car and wrecked it and never told him. Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha."

Now, with your present withhold system, it would probably turn down - that his wife was also in it at the time, see? I mean, this would unveil further, you see? It'll go on and on and on and on and on with the withhold system, but you're pulling on real overts.

Now, the reason that isn't as important today is you're every now and then going to get a critical. And we've already taken care of it in the mechanism of the withhold system. So you know now that it will do no good—this is a good indicator; this is just a piece of something you should know—that it will do no good to go on and pull all these critical thoughts, but it's perfectly all right to accept it for your number one 'What'.

“Well . . .” (You’re pulling something or other; half-revealed withholds or something.) “Well, I thought a critical thought about the auditor and the auditor didn’t pull it.”

You'd say, "All right." And you got what auditor it is. And "What about thinking a critical thought about the auditor and not pulling it?" is your One question, see?

Now, you're going to go to town with this because you're going to say, "When?" And then you're going to say, "Is that all of it?" And of course that is the trap inside the trap on this highway because the . . .

“Well, is that all of it? Of course, it’s perfectly justified, me thinking a critical thought of the auditor, after all the auditor has done to me,” and so forth.

Well, you should remember at this stage of the game that nobody has told you in the withhold system that you mustn't coax the PC to give all, see? You can do it by just sitting there and practically saying nothing to the PC, but at what expenditure of time.

So all these little tricks fit into the system, too, you see?

You say, "Well, is that all of it? Did you do anything else to him?"

See, that's a good one to slide in on the end of that thing. "Did you do anything else to him?"

"HMMMMMM. (Do anything else to him?) Hm. No. I mean, no..." (Needle is falling off the pin.) "Well, I wrecked his—took his car without his permission."

And you say, "Good. All right. You took his car without his per..... Very good Fine. Fine. Fine. And who didn't find out about it?"

"Well, he didn't find out about it, of course. Heh-heh-heh-heh."

"All right. Very good."

And why test it? Why test it? You're going to town here. And you just say, "Well..." (just form's sake, you know), "Well, what about thinking that critical thought about the auditor?" and so forth.

"Well, I . . ."

And "When was it?"

"(sigh) Well, it was . . . not 1954, it was 1958."

"Oh, all right. Well, is that all of it?" and so forth. "You said you did something to him again?"

"Well, yes. There's something about . . . more about the car. I didn't tell you about the car. But . . . I wrecked it. Ha-ha."

Now, if you want to keep your Two-Three-Four going on some allied thing, where you set it up with a One with a critical thought, then that critical-thought thing is not really going to clear until you've got the other material from it. Do you see the difficulty which you've set up? It's an internal difficulty. Now having pulled the critical thought, you get a real withhold.

All right. Your Two-Three-Four is actually working on the real withhold, and your critical-thought One is working on a critical thought. But actually, your critical-thought One will not totally clear until you've cleared the other one.

So you have to be smart enough to realize that you're really not working on the critical-thought One; You're really not working on it. It's simply a test item. You really are never working too thoroughly on One. One is your tester. But other material will come up after One, and if One is of the variation or variety of a critical thought, you should know that there's a real overt behind it. And when you get to "all of it:" throw the "done" on the end of it.

Well, that's the commonest waste of time. But the failure to direct the PC's attention can come out along something like this: The PC goes on and on and on, and they tell you, so on, and you go into a stenographic audit—totally stenographic audit. If you don't direct the PC's attention during a Sec Check at all, he just winds up with no goals and gains, because he's talked all of his havingness down, he's upset, he's upset with you. You've talked him into a

hole, that's all. And you've let the PC run up a bunch of new overts of one kind or another. The PC has actually probably damaged someone in the session.

You have to really sit there and control that PC's attention; you have to control it hard.

Now, your withhold system does that to a marked degree for you: That controls the PC's attention by putting the PC's attention on what the PC's attention ought to be on. Now, that's your Two-Three-Four. Your PC's attention is on this withhold and it didn't clear, it continues to fall: Therefore, your Two-Three-Four situation on the thing is the right order of questions, see? You don't have to go out into a bunch of other random things. But these questions still have to be asked intelligently.

You can't just say, "Well, stole Joe's car. All right. When was that? All right. Is that all of it? All right. All right. When didn't . . . who didn't find out about that?"

"Joe."

"Okay. You stole Joe's car. Good. When? Good. Is that all of it? Good. Who didn't find out about it?"

"Joe."

"Good. All right."

"Did you steal Joe's car?"

You know, it will almost work that way. What is fascinating is, it almost works that way, see? But you're working here where there's a little more bonus to be gotten on the thing, see?

Now, if you're paying not much attention to the E-Meter, except to see out of the corner of your eye if it starts to surge like mad, or something like this, on your Two-Three-Four, well, you know you're working something hot, and your interest is on the PC and you're looking at the PC, you're talking to the PC—you're not squinted over a meter, you see? You're asking the PC. Well, please, put a little bit of invitation in it to give, huh? Put a little bit of coax, a little assist. And add to that a little insistence that he look at it.

I have been known to say "It's perfectly all right to sit here the rest of the night, because, of course, until we get this particular withhold, we're not going home. But that's perfectly all right. But I think it would be much faster if you simply looked and tried to see what it was."

- The person says, "Sitting here all night . . ." And they look at me and they say, "By George, he would be willing to sit there, the b—. He would be willing to sit there all night until I spilled this withhold."

"Well . . ." in desperation, you know, "Well, let's get working on it! Let's get working on it!"

"All right. I'll look. Hey!"

But you can let any session go to sleep, see? You can let any session go to sleep, so that it's just daw-nah-nah. See, everybody went to sleep in the session. And I don't advocate this as good auditing.

What you want to do is you've got your What and you're trying to clear that What, and when you come to-Two, well, "When was it? Just about when was that?" Well, get interested! "When was it?"

This is the difference, you see? If you want to know when it was—that's what we're asking you to do, you see? You want to know when it was Don't just ask it because of a form.

Decide you want to know when it was, you know? Well, let's find out when it was. Hasn't cleared up with two runs on Two-Three-Four, well, there must be something wrong with the date. There was something here unknown someplace, and so forth.

Well, let's get awful interested by that time. Let's date it down to a fraction of a second on a meter. Oh, I haven't showed you how to do that? Well, just go ahead and learn it. People have known how to do it for years. Don't expect me to teach you everything.

It's the over-and-under system, actually. "Was it before 1936 or after 1936? All right. It was after 1936"—biggest needle reaction: you know, the trace down.

PC all of a sudden finds out that things which happened in 1936, he has thought happened in 1957. And they tend to get their track scrambled because withholds group the track. So you're apt to get almost any date out of one.

But if this is also done in the spirit of helping the PC to look, you'll find that you'll get a lot further. And your rancor ought to be only directed in the direction (if you ever employ it at all) of making the PC look. Don't ever direct with the idea of "Damn it, you better tell me or I'm going to be real upset with you!" No. The PC doesn't know, you see?

You can say that perfectly well. You say, "Well, damn it. Will you please look and find out?" See? And you get away with that.

But the other one, you see, is untruthful. There's a lie connected with it. Frankly, the meter is reacting but the PC doesn't know. Now, you can bung the PC right out of a session into a games condition at a heck of a rate of speed by insisting he tell you something that he doesn't know. And he winds up in apathy.

No, what you use the withhold system for is to get him to look. And any spare chatter that you handle there should be in the direction of directing his attention so that he will find out more. Persuade his attention there. Direct it with an ax, direct it with honey, direct it with gypsy music. But damn it, direct it! I don't care how you do it. Particularly some of you girls have enormous skill on the direction of attention. Terrific skill. Employ every bit of it.

Well, there might be some little salacious bit there that might be interesting to hear. "Why don't you see if there's something a little more interesting there?"

PC says, "You know, that's true. There might be something interesting in this."

I don't care what trickery you use. You can use any trickery that anybody has ever employed. You can use any persuasion anybody ever employed. But don't let me catch you not directing a PC's attention.

If I see reams of withholds written out, not sequitur, not one after the other that have to do with the same thing, I know definitely the auditor is not directing the PC's attention. You want to clean up what you want to clean up. That's what you want to clean up. And you better decide the thing is cleaned up or is not cleaned up, and you better continue to direct the PC's attention till you decide the thing is clean keep directing his attention.

You're still getting a reaction on the meter. Well, I check every once in a while to find out if there's an ARC break. That's about the only time I ever use an ARC break or the phrase "ARC break" anymore, you know? Just ask the PC, "All right. Is a repetition of this question causing an ARC break?" I use that fairly often when I see an irregular bang on the needle and I can't get anyplace with it. And I'll ask the PC, "Is this question causing an ARC break?"

In 3D Criss Cross, use it the same way as this: "I've asked you for more items, is that causing an ARC break?" I don't get the same response. Then I don't get any response at all on the

ARC break question, I must assume, you see? But the E-Meter can confuse those two things. It can confuse data in the bank with an ARC break. And it does have a confusion point, so you must straighten out that confusion point.

You ask for more about the withhold, and you actually can be so insistent on it—get a PC half out of session—that an ARC break is created, and you get a fall or a rock slam or something starts up. And you say, “Oh well, on this third question here, he hasn’t told me all of it.” And yes, he has. That’s just the trouble. He has told you all of it and you haven’t bought it. So you actually are building in a missed knowingness, you know? So that’s what you get as your ARC break. It’s just your missed knowingness.

So you say, “All right. Have I failed to find out something here?” And you get the same reaction that you were getting on “Is there any more to this withhold?”

And the PC says, “Oh well, yes, there is.”

“Well, when did I miss that?”

“Well, several minutes ago,” and so forth.

And you say, “That’s fine. All right. Do we have an ARC break?” and now there’s no reaction on the thing, and so on.

Now, you ask the same question. You say, “You don’t mind if I ask it again just to make sure if it’s clear? Is that all of it?”

You’re getting there’s no reaction on it at all. Just be clean as a wolf’s tooth. More people ran terminals and goals lists up to the hundreds and thousands mark because by the time they ask “E there another goal or is there another terminal?” don’t you see, the PC was so ARC broke and so out of session on it that you’d get a needle reaction. And so they’d say, “Well, of course there’s more items.?”

So we learned that one the hard way. If you think there is any suspicion at all that your question itself—it’s always a repeated question, by the way, a demand of more—has created an ARC break, you always try to clear that up, just drrrrrr. Just rapidly clear it up just to make sure that your reaction is not an ARC-break reaction. And then you get a true reaction.

The usual thing about it is that the ARC break shows up, blows off and then there is more of it. Now, that’s more to the point. That’s far, far, far more to the point in this withhold system.

PC has an ARC break and more data too. Because there’s where you get over this little hump. The PC becomes misemotional when approaching a real hot spot in the bank. Has nothing to do with the goodness of the auditing. As a matter of fact, the better the auditing is, the more certain it is that the PC is going to hit an ARC-break attitude—not an ARC-break attitude, it’s a misemotional attitude.

He starts to get cross with the auditor, because the auditor at that moment is a substitute for all the people who should have known about it and didn’t. Of course? you’re asking for a should-have-known-about-it and you’ll see that rekindle. And it won’t be much. It’ll just be a little bit of “Myngmyng-my-mu-m-m-mo-on,” and so on and so on, and there it is. Everything is beautiful and shining, you see?

It’ll be there somewhat, even if terribly faintly. And it can come up to a roaring storm You’ve asked for the thing. You’ve said, “All right. What don’t I know?” or “What haven’t I found out about you in this session?”—you ask this perfectly innocently—and the PC says, “Rooooo-ow, rooo-oo. Clack!”

And you say, “Now, what don’t I know about you? What did I fail to find out about you? What anything? What went on here? What part of the session . . . ?” And just cut through somehow all of this chop and get that question answered.

And you’ll find out that that will become a sign of a routine action in doing the withhold system So you might as well learn to buck up to it and do it well. Don’t ever back off from it.

PC is upset with you: pull the withhold Pull the missed withhold. Pull the should-have-known. That would be ordinarily. But in the withhold system, just be sure that you just better go right on doing the withhold system, because in the next question or two it’s going to drop out of the hamper.

And the PC, “Well, I don’t see why you’re asking that. You’ve covered that. You’ve covered it and gone over it and over it. No, I can’t think of ally more of it. There’s nothing more to it. I knew the guy! So what? So what? I knew the guy. I told you several times I—I knew him! Isn’t that enough? (sigh) Of course I omitted to tell you that also I lived with him for five years without marrying him. You know, I never realized that?”

You watch this, and you’ll find that it’s a fairly patterned curve for the PC. If it didn’t happen at all and become worried about the PC. You know? Say, well, we’re getting no place with this PC. Couldn’t possibly be getting anyplace with the PC. Why aren’t we getting anyplace with the PC? Well, we couldn’t possibly be getting anyplace with the PC because the PC has never gotten mad at us once during the entire session, so we have never gotten anywhere near anything the PC never found out before.

We must be mining a mine that was mined out several hundred auditing sessions ago. And that mine must have been completely mined out to the bottom The PC will sit there; they give you all the withholds, they would let you publish them in the newspaper—they’re perfectly all right. Withholds, who cares about withholds? What’s this? All right. They give them to you. They tell them all to you again. PC never gets mad at you, PC is perfectly happy with you, PC doesn’t change, tone arm doesn’t shift.

You could go on like that, you see, for hundreds of hours probably. That means you must be mining a mine which has been dug up. There couldn’t possibly be another speck of nothing in the bottom of it.

But that is not the state of a PC that does have something at the bottom of the mine, you know? That PC is “Rrrrrrr” He feels “Uuuuhhhh.” And the PC is starting to get gray, the PC is starting to get hollows under their eyes. They’re starting to waste away in the auditing chair. They look it over, they finally come near it, they finally look at you, decide you must be the withhold or something. And they finally say, “Well, I was the usual girl and . . . Zzaahh, I know nothing about it. Zzaahh, I know nothing about it at all. Huuuuhhhh. Zt-zt. Damn. And, of course, um . . . had five children by him. Never mentioned to anybody—and by God, I never thought of that either!”

Well, that would be a pretty obscured withhold, but . . . All of a sudden they brighten up and, “Heh-heh! What do you know,” you know? “Heh-heh. Heh-heh-heh. Well, you know, I never thought of that. You know, that’s the most amazing thing. Known it all the time, you know? But I was sure I knew it, but I—I didn’t know it. (deep sigh) Well, that’s pretty clever of you. Ha-ha-haha. That’s pretty clever of you. You’re an awful clever auditor. My God, that was real smart of you to find that. How did you find that? Ah . . . pretty darn smart. Ha-ha.”

You look at them: the hollows are gone, the circles are missing, their skin texture changes, their eye color shifts, the gauntness which they inherited all of a sudden pads out very mysteriously. You watch it. And they suddenly get a cognition.

“You know - say, I wonder. I wonder if losing all of my teeth, which I had forgotten—ha!—I wonder if knocking all of his teeth down his throat had anything to do with my dental trouble. Say, do you know, I think it does. You know?”

And they just start cogniting all over the place. And of course you can milk these cognition's down just by running more withhold system on them. You just run some more on the same thing and all of a sudden they'll blow some more off, because their intense interest means that there's just a little speck or two.

That will bleed off usually, if they come up to that state, in the next twenty-four hours. They'll think of it as they go to bed that night or something of the sort, but you can actually take it all off with this withhold system. It's quite amusing to watch. But if you don't see that kind of a cycle going on, you know the withhold system isn't working or something's going on.

PC is sitting there: PC is bright colored, everything is fine, there isn't anything wrong, you as the auditor are wonderful, they're answering the questions, they're very happy to do anything, there's no change of the tone arm.

They get to the end of the thing, in the right-hand column they write “Goals: No. No goals. Didn't make any of them. Heh-heh-heh. Huuh.” And their ARC break comes after the session. After you've said end of session they go out in the hall and they say, “Well, that was a wasted mess.”

It must be that the auditor had never directed their attention during the entire session, see?

You can actually have a very happy PC who, four hours after the session, is liable to go get a shotgun and shoot you. You know? PC was not disturbed by the session at all. It's just something about the mechanics of what you're doing, you see?

Now, you should not expect, in doing the withhold system—you should not expect for a moment—that your PC goes on a gradient scale of getting better. Your PC does not go on a gradient scale of getting better. Your PC goes on a gradient scale of getting worse. They look worse. They look grayer. They are more worried. Things are grimmer. Life has suddenly started to loom as a serious proposition, not to be trifled with by amateurs. Life is grim.

And they may go into that curve and come out of it with a fast cognition, or they may go into it for three or four consecutive sessions. They may go into it and out of it in twenty minutes. They may go into it and out of it over this cycle of four sessions. It all depends on what you're shooting for.

And if you do the withhold system using your Zero question—your Zero question is well chosen—and if that is a very beefy question, very ornery sort of question on the subject of . . . You've all of a sudden connected with something there that is a very hot button of some kind or another, and it fell off the pin, and your Zero question as a whole question has been very much avoided by the PC, then it's some one of these four-session propositions.

In other words, the hotter the question, the longer the cycle of action of the run, see? The hotter the question, the longer the cycle of action of the run. That's, of course, there's that much more charge to be bled off the thing before they come to grips with it. Now, the milder the charge, the shorter the cycle of action.

Now, the cycle of action is not our cycle of action. It's a different cycle of action for the withhold system. And that is: is alerted, slowly perishes, goes to the bottom for the third time, and then on no graph curve but total vertical— see, it comes down like this and down and down, and then just total vertical and goes way up above it. Goes way higher than the beginning of the cycle. It's a funny looking curve, but that is the response of a PC who is having his withholds properly pulled.

They don't get cheerfuller and cheerfuller and cheerfuller and better and better and better. And if the PC is sitting there looking cheerfuller and cheerfuller and you're not getting any tone arm action or anything, you know that at the end of the session it'll be "Gains: No. Goals: No. Nothing. Ha-ha. That's it. What a lousy auditor you are.?? Be the truth, too, once you got that low. Because the PC's attention has not been directed into anything the PC's attention should have been directed to.

Now, the entire force of an aberration is devoted to pulling the attention in while buffing it off. You actually haven't got to pull the PC's attention into the middle of any aberration because it's fixed there. But every aberration has a buffer. And that is to say, while the PC has his attention fixed on A, the last thing in the world he'll admit to is having his attention on A.

In other words, he's looking both ways at once. To look is to bounce, you see? The reason the tennis ball is on the ground is because it's in the tree. You know, that sort of thing. The reason the bomb is falling down is because it is rising. See? It's a fixed thing.

In other words, he hasn't got an inflow or an outflow on this point. It's not a clean outflow; it's not a clean inflow. But he'll bounce off of this thing. And you get into those things, you get into the zone areas, and the PC will go bouncy, bouncy, bouncy. And if you don't keep him pushed on in to that, you're not doing what the mind is doing, which is concentrating on that 100 percent.

Actually, the mind is totally, 100 percent concentrated on it. The closer he gets to it, the paler he's liable to look. That's one of your maxims. The more ARC breaky he's liable to look.

I don't want your expectancy to measure up to "You pull withholds, and the person has a little withhold pulled and they feel a little better. And they have another little withhold pulled and they feel a little better. And then they have a big withhold pulled and they feel a lot better. And they have another withhold pulled and they feel a lot better." And it is not that cycle at all.

But you get a hot question, they instantly start to get sick. And it just gets worse and worse and worse. And then they really . . . I've seen a PC sit there in the most baffled stage on something—I knew all about the PC.

You know? "But could this have been me, you know? I mean, but there couldn't have been anything about it. See, we lived at Fordham and we . . . All right. When was it? and so on. It was at Fordham, and so on. No. No. No. Man, nothing happened at Fordham. Just nothing. I could have . . . Nothing could have happened at Fordham. I didn't know anybody at Fordham. In fact, I don't remember anybody at Fordham. There wasn't anybody at Fordham."

And this is all out of something. The fellow says, "Well, I . . . I stole a cricket bat once, you know?"

And, "Well, when was it?"

"Well, it was when we lived at Fordham."

"Well, is that all there is to it?"

And you're liable to get some fantastic—"Well, look—who could I... I . . . I stole a cricket bat, but from whom? Fordham, Fordham, Fordham. Who? No, it couldn't have been at Fordham. Couldn't have been. (sigh) Oh well, this doesn't amount to anything."

You run into the not-is, you know? “It doesn’t amount to any... cricket bat is very cheap, and so forth. And it’s very ridiculous of me to do so, and I undoubtedly gave it back the next day.” Dub-in, dub-in, dub-in, dub-in. “No, no. That’s not right either. Fordham. It must have happened at Fordham....”

“But nothing could have happened at Fordham. Look, I only lived at Fordham between the ages of seven and eight. And I couldn’t possibly have. See?”

Get an answer. You got to get an answer to your auditing question. That’s one of your basic maxims of the auditor. But your PC starts to go into these things . . . Oh, no! Well help him out all that you can. Don’t suggest things to him—don’t be that helpful. But ask him pertinent questions about it.

“Well, was it a big bat or a little bat?” you know? “What kind of a cricket bat? A cricket cricket bat?”

“Well . . . Well, it was a . . . just a little cricket bat. I mean, it was just . . . it was a toy cricket bat, you know?”

And you’d say, “All right. Good.”

Well, that’s enough. See, don’t beat him to death at that stage. Keep the withhold system rolling.

“All right. Well, who didn’t find out about that?”

“Well, I . . . I didn’t. I completely forgot it was a little cricket bat. It wasn’t a big cricket bat at all.” ‘

“All right. That’s fine. Good enough. Good enough.” Don’t bother to do anything about it. “Well, how about stealing this? What about stealing this cricket bat?” and so on, you know?

“I really can’t tell you. It’s . . . it’s very funny. It’s very hazy because it must have been at . . . Fordham? Fordham? It couldn’t have been at Fordham. It must have been at South Chichester, but at South Chichester . . . It couldn’t have been at Fordham ‘ and so forth.

Well, help him out. And you say, “Well, when was it? When was it? When was it?”

“Well, it was in 1957. But it couldn’t have been in 1957 because it must have been in 1932. No, I wasn’t alive in 1932. It must have been 1941. Well, that would have been during the war, and they limited the cricket bats,” and so forth.

And you say, “Well, just give me an approximation of when it was.”

“I really can’t tell.”

“All right. Well, you just sit there for a moment; we’ll date this thing on the meter, see if we can zero it in a little closer.” And you get the idea? Help him out. Help him out. Help him out. Lead that withhold to its doom. Help it out of existence. And then “All right. Now, is that all of it?”

“All of it? I don’t know anything about it at all. We’ve now dated the thing as having happened in 1945 and I was in the armed services in 1945.... Oh, my God! Oh, yes! Heh-heh.” And you hit something—“Oh, no! No. Well, no. No.” And then you’re liable to get a resurgence.

Well, when you start down that steep trail toward those last few fragments, you really got to help the PC out because he’s stoned. He just can’t force his own attention into it.

So letting the PC's attention ride all over the place, you see, is actually letting the PC be the effect of this withhold and this charge. And he never forgives you. See? You've got to get the PC's attention and you got to hold it in there, and you got to hold it in there harder. But he says, "Well, can't we take up something else? There are a lot of nice juicy withholds. I've got some on sexy . . . I've got a couple of sexy withholds here that are very good. Let's get over on to those. I was a mermaid once. I could give you a withhold from that." You know, anything. You know, anything—"Oh, this cricket bat..." you know? "Oh, me."

He gets to the "Oh, my God!" stage. The closer he gets to the "Oh, my God! Oh, not that!" or "That'd be terrible!" or "What do you know, you know? I never remembered that." Any time that this—the cognition stage is approached, attention is harder to get in.

And he finally finds out that it was a cricket bat that he carved personally for a little Italian boy in an Italian village, and then that was all that was left of the village was the cricket bat. Because he failed to order his platoon out of there, and the Germans shelled it to bits and killed every inhabitant in it. And he'd hold himself responsible for this, and all ever since, he's had this all figured out that it must have happened to him in his youth. And the only tag he's got is a cricket bat, see?

But a cricket bat, of course, fits with "when one was young." So he's logicalized this. He hasn't remembered any part of it. He's got a beautiful script here. It has nothing to do with reality.

And of course, he just can't face that because he couldn't face it at the time, so he just occluded it, just like that. And he said, "Well, that's it! (sigh)" Now he can live. See?

He's been figuring ever since down someplace in his mind, though, "If I'd just ordered the platoon out of the village that morning; the Germans came in the next morning, they would never have bombarded and they would have left them alive. As a matter of fact, I should have left the old area there earlier. I shouldn't have dragged anybody into it because there was no sense in it. There was no point in it. The Germans retreated the next day anyhow. It was all in a day. And I couldn't possibly have pulled an overt like that. It must have been due to the high command and it must have been due . . . And it must have been a cricket bat in childhood." See?

He just backs out of all responsibility for it, and of course there isn't anything left there. He can't face having caused the death of 150 noncombatants, and fzzz. Something he doesn't look into.

You see how it is? So as his attention comes in, his attention comes off. And a part of that coming off is getting mad at the auditor, looking ARC breaky, being upset and that sort of thing.

But you must differentiate between a PC who is really ARC broken because you've gone into a games condition with him and a PC who is simply introvertedly ARC broke and is snapping at everything. They look different, by the way. They look quite different, one from the other.

Direction of the PC's attention. And if you use this withhold system, you direct his—you help him to direct his attention; if you're on a hot subject, why, you'll get yourself some fantastic resurgences. Nobody has ever put their fingers on buttons like this in this fellow's mind. Nobody has ever freed up attention off it the way you have.

But reversely, reversely, if you don't direct his attention, he's being put into misery because his whole bank is kicking him in the head because there's nobody there helping him hold it down, don't you see?

Well, you've got to work hard on this particular basis. And you actually don't have to slave over it or sweat over it. What you have to keep your eye out for is the tendency of the PC to go general on the whole thing—generalize things and never come up with anything specific and never give you any kind of data, and just keep glossing over the top of everything and so forth.

After a while, why, wake up and say, "Well, see here. There's apparently something here. We keep going over this ground. Let's look, shall we? Heh-heh. Let's look. Let's look. Now, I said, is that all of it? Now, that's what I mean. I mean, is there any more to this at all? Just look at it and see if there isn't."

No, the only thing we've missed here is a Bedford truck. You know, something of that size. Because as sure as he gets in toward one of these things he starts to go—generalize, sweep on the thing. And you start crowding him to it; he gets kind of grrrrr. Well, I don't know if rd like the look of this Bedford truck. I don't know right now." That works out with any withhold "Well, you needn't be so cross about it. You needn't be so insistent about it. I'll look. I'm a perfectly cooperative PC. Hm. No. No. Hr-psss-sst-sst . there's nothing there. But there's nothing there. There's no . . . there's nothing more. That is all there is to it. That is all there is to it"—needle falling off the pin—"That is all there is to it."

And you say, "Good. Good. What more is there to the "all?"

"Nothing here but the Second Army Corps."

Some little detail like this just slipped his mind, you know? You got to get him to look.

The job of the auditor is not to get the PC to tell. Yes, the PC will talk to you and the PC better be talking to you. And don't misinterpret that to this effect: that the auditor doesn't have to be told the withhold by the PC. Don't misinterpret that. But just frankly and overtly and directly, if the PC knows about it, the PC will tell you. And that is what you must realize and make up your mind to.

The reluctance of the PC to tell you all stems from his not knowing about it. And your PC will have a very easy time of it if you grasp this one point of the withhold system, because after that you will assist him to find out and you will help him find out things.

If he says, "Well, I just don't know," you say, "Well, let's find out."

See, he says, "Well, I just don't know."

Don't say, "Well, tell me." See, that's the wrong response. Get your responses different. He says, "I just don't know." You say—the wrong response —"Well, tell me about it," see?

The right response is: He says, "Well, I just don't know and there doesn't seem to be any more," and so forth, and you say, "Well, look. Let's look at it. Come on, let's dig it up a little bit more. There must be some pieces showing someplace. Aren't there an old pair of winged-foot heels showing out of this rubble here someplace? Where is this? Let's dig it up. Come on, now. Dig it up."

And he says, "Oh, yeah, there's a couple of very nice people there. I didn't realize that. Yeah, well, there's some...."

Well, I take that as an answer. Buy the PC's data and keep the system going. See?

Slow, the mistakes that you can make is thinking the PC isn't going to tell you. The PC is going to tell you. If the PC knows, he will tell you.

And the other mistake you can make is thinking that the PC is really upset with you when he starts getting upset with the bank, and start chopping the PC.

Another mistake that you can make is failure to handle the PC's attention—to cut off the PC. The PC is going on and on and on and saving, "I had this dog, and his . . . his name was Rover. And the dog used to run up and down the street all the time and he used to jump on and off the hedge, and so forth. And I used to teach him to jump on and off the hedge, and he had a big collar. Uh . . . and he had a wonderful collar and uh . . . so forth. And one day one of the boys stole the collar, and I beat him up. And I got the collar back and we put it back on this dog Rover. Well, as I was telling you, this dog Rover, uh . . . we used to keep him in the garage because he's such a big dog. We had a big garage there, so we'd keep him in the big ga—big dog in the big garage, you see?—and we had this thing . . ."

Oh, man! If you want a PC to get upset with you, let him do that—let him go on and on and on. How do you shut a PC off? Well, if you can't think of anything else, say, "Shut up." I mean, that will upset him less, see? That will upset him less.

If you learn that, if you learn those little points and you put-those points into practice, your Security Checking will become a song. I guarantee it.

There's nothing much to this. Now, we're calling it Security Checking loosely. It's actually Prepchecking now. You're going to get the rest of your materials for this—the little checks and so forth that you run for your Zero questions. Right now, as I've said before, the most fruitful source is to find—if you get any old form, any old form anyplace, the PC has been sec checked on, you find one of its items is loaded (there's one question on there was loaded), use that for your Zero and just go over that and over it and over it.

And if you haven't got the form from the PC, because you're auditing a field PC and so forth, and you haven't got the records, you can say, "What withhold did you keep telling an auditor? What withhold have you continued to tell an auditor for a long time?" And then try to find out what question got this withhold and try to rephrase that question. And then you've got your Zero and you can take off from there. And, of course, you'll just mine the mine, because it'll go from there on out. And that's one when you're operating on HGC PCs that have been audited by a field auditor and you don't know quite where to start on something like this, you could start there very fruitfully if you didn't have a standard check form.

But this person had received a lot of auditing and appeared to be very ARC breaky and so forth. Well, somebody has headed him into one of these things and they haven't gotten him off of it. So the most profit that you could make on the whole transaction would be to say, "What withhold have you told several auditors?" or "What withhold have you told auditors several times" That's a good one. All right. That's fine. Now, what question would elicit this withhold? What question had been asked that did it?" And try to put some kind of a question together that would have gotten that withhold, and then mine this question.

And boy, oh boy, you'll see the bank roar. Because people have sec checked this person straight into the middle of a dead stop. They got him right there. They've restimulated something and they haven't pulled it. And that's what's known as your recurrent withholds. Your recurring withhold.

And a recurring withhold is very, very, very well plowed because it's already as though somebody has just set up a radar screen and a couple of compasses and some geophysical markers and the American flag with the eagle on top of it ten feet tall, see, and saying "Under this is an item the PC does not know anything about." And that's your recurring withhold as a sign or a symptom.

The other one is a recurring complaint. You know, "Who have you complained about most? What have you complained about most?" And you finally zero that in and you find out

they've complained consistently and continually about their family. Well, you could use it as a withhold question.

But there is one little word of warning on that. Knowing 3D Criss Cross, you will be very cautious about sailing in toward targets. And you don't sail in toward targets that you don't know whether they are terminals, oppters or whether they are on the 3D package at all, because you know that you can beef up the whole Prehav Scale by running a wrong terminal.

So one of the poor ways to go about it: This girl has always had trouble with her husband, so we immediately say, "Well without any questioning at all, she must have withholds from her husband. So therefore, bang!—let's just sail in on this and let's use the Zero question 'What have you done to your husband?'" or something stupid like this, you see?

Let's use this. Husband, see? Husband. Oh, oh, Oh wait a minute. She's always had trouble with the husband. The husband is either in the bank or not in the bank or should be in the bank, but there's something 3D Criss Cross wrong with this terminal a husband." So you of course don't follow that up at all.

Your generalized questions, your Zero questions, should be very general on the subject of doingness or knowingness, but they shouldn't have too much to do with beingness. They could have something to do with havingness. But you leave beingness alone in those Zero questions and you'll be all right, because this stuff is all being run—usually being run—prior to 3D Criss Cross, and you wouldn't know anything about it.

By the way, any 3D Criss Cross item—this is not advised—but any 3D Criss Cross item that proved out as the PC's terminal could probably be moved in as a Zero question of the withhold system. Now, whether it would blow up part of the universe or part of the PC's head or not, I don't guarantee because it's not been tested.

It's probably too much and it's probably too unreal. But just give you an idea that if you were going to do beingnesses, those are the beingnesses that you would do on the withhold system, and you leave other beingnesses alone.

You can take up the whole subject—you could take up any subject, you know? But be careful with the beingness aspect of it, see? You could take up a subject of marriage. But God help us, let's not take up the subject of husbands and wives, you got the idea? Or families. You see, that's beingness. We can take up the subject of being broke, but we can't take up any other. Okay?

Thank you.