

## HOW TO SECURITY CHECK

A lecture given on  
2 November 1961

Well, here we are at what date?

Female voices: November the 2nd.

2 Nov. A.D. 11. It's a 1.1 year. We're being very covert this year.

All right. I'm going to talk to you today about Class II skills in Security Checking and several new developments in this particular level and line that you ought to know about. And if you're not up to the point at this stage of the game where you know how to read an E-Meter, why, there used to be an old gallows—this was a Norman keep, you know? We'll have to build it again and hang you. But you've got time during the building to learn.

The worst thing about E-Meters is of course TR 0. TR 0 goes out; if you haven't had any TR 0, it's not fairly flat, you have trouble with E-Meters.

Now, an E-Meter is a deadly weapon, and you can slaughter a PC with one by misreading it. It's not like a rifle. The only way you can do any damage with a rifle is use it with great accuracy.

Well, of course, you can also have a backfiring sort of rifle and you can also look down the barrel and put your toe on the trigger experimentally. But an E-Meter is not deadly at all unless it's misused. And if your TR 0 is out and you're looking at the PC and looking at the E-Meter and looking at the question, and you've only got two eyes, you see, and you need three, you can actually miss reads.

The only read that is important is an instant read; you're never worried about latent reads. So you said the question and then you waited for a while, and then it finally sagged. Well, you just better go on to the next question because the thing is not there. All you want is an instant read. You ask the question: within a tenth of a second you get that needle reacting. If you've got an instant read, you've got a read on the E-Meter. If you haven't got an instant read, if it takes a half a second, a second or something like that, providing of course you're using a standard E-Meter of an approved pattern . . .

There are meters around, by the way—they're corny stuff that has been brought around—which have brought E-Meters into bad repute because they have a second lag built into them.

Have you ever seen one of these? They used to be quite prevalent in England. Somebody would go down to the dime store and buy bits of old tinware and hang it together with some electric-light cord. And they actually built a lag into the meter, so when you asked the question it wouldn't react for a second. We have some of them in here in the electrical shop. I have to show you sometime. It's how an electronics man can fix it up so that you don't get any results. Well, that is an unexpected one, and we cut that one out by saying you use an approved E-Meter and we know that E-Meter will react instantly and behave properly. It's not a light thing to do work with a bad E-Meter.

The British Mark IV is the best of these meters. It is not the least indestructible; it is a little tenderer. It's a better meter but it is more tender than the American meter. The American meter can be dropped three floors and go on working. The British meter can be dropped one airmail flight and arrive at the other end with somebody having to look into it. We've got most of those bugs out. When we were originally sending these around the world, by the way, the extreme temperatures in a cargo hold would crack the transistors. Quite interesting. But we got that licked.

Anyway, with an approved meter you get an instant read and that's the only read you're interested in. And you're not interested in a latent read. If you follow up latent reads, your PC will start telling you what the other fellow did and what they have heard and that their aunt Mamie had a cat once that they think was stolen. Very "valuable." It does a great deal for the case!

Now, the danger is, you take too many of these things off the case . . . You know, I mean, you get a latent read and he says, "Well, uh . . . Aunt Mamie had a cat and this cat was in a decayed state and I think it was stolen and I heard that and I thought at the time . . ." yap, yap, yap.

And if you go on like this, you're going to wind up with a needle getting more and more sluggish, and more and more sluggish and more and more sluggish. And don't you be puzzled after you've let somebody get off an awful lot of "I-heards" and an awful lot of unkind thoughts and an awful lot of that sort of thing, that you wind up at the other end of an E-Meter session with a tone arm not moving and the needle stuck and everything gummed up and the PC feeling like hell. How come?

Well, you let him sit there and get off nothing but overts. The session was an overt. See? I mean, you let the man sit there, or let the girl sit there, and commit overts for an hour. All right. So now they've got all these new overts. Isn't that what it amounts to?

But your latent read, when pursued, winds you up in the middle of nowhere. That works on all types of assessments. Whatever you're assessing, pay no attention to a latent read, a read which takes place—well, be on the safe side takes place after a half a second.

Now, there's a borderline in there. The borderline in there: some PCs have got sort of a delayed-bank effect. And you'll notice working on some PCs the sound itself takes a moment to go through the circuit. And if you really wanted to be absolutely safe, you could space it out to three quarters of a second, but don't go any further than that.

Comprehension is landing on the reactive bank, which is instantaneous. And those reads which are latent are landing on the analytical mind and the PC is figuring it out. That works for all types of assessments.

So I say again, if you want to be a successful E-Meterer, have your TR 0 flat so that you know what you're looking at, you know? Don't watch the ceiling and watch the floor and then look back at the E-Meter to find out if it's reacted, because your instant read is the only important read and it is the one which, of course, you are going to miss. Naturally, you'll miss it.

You look at the PC and you say, "Now, have you stolen any lollipops today?" And then you look down at your E-Meter. Well, it's read and gone. The reading is gone.

Now, this is why the E-Meter can be dangerous: because we have learned that if you miss a Sec Check question on somebody, you can wind them up in a ball. Not every time you miss a Sec Check question does the PC burn down the house. That is a commentary on the psychoanalyst who says, "Every time a kleptomaniac fails to steal something, he burns down the house." I love that "every time," you see? It classifies as a type of a remark of "jewelers never go anyplace." It's just about as nonsensical.

It is not a universal phenomenon that when an E-Meter read is missed and you miss the Sec Check and you leave the question and go on to the next Sec Check question with the last one unflat, that the PC always burns down the house, shoots the Director of Training or does something desperate. This is not always true. It's just 99 percent. There is still 1 percent of the time the PC does not do it.

Your PC comes in to session next time—natter, natter, natter, natter, unkind thought. “Voo-roo-ah-nyap-yap-yap-yap. I wonder if Scientology works, and so forth.” And they go on and on and on and on and on and on and on.

You sit and listen to all this stuff. When are you going to get smart enough to put them on the meter and say, “Who missed a Sec Check question on you?” and find out what it was and clean it up?

And the person says, “Oh, well.”

This is a very fascinating phenomenon—that the fact of missing a Sec Check question is apparently a cross-invalidation of everything that is going on. If you couldn't nail them, they now doubt. It's very funny. I don't care how long or how often the fellow has been Sec Checked. You miss a Sec Check question on him, he gets unhappy.

Now, that's a very important thing, because there resides the easiest way to get rid of new Scientologists known. So I'll just lay it down there. If anybody wants to go out on a program of getting rid of every person they connect with that wants to have anything to do with Scientology, why, the program would be to either audit with a broken meter or a squirrel meter or something that didn't react, or to use a type of TR 0 which confronts the back wall or your own eyeballs while you should be reading the E-Meter, and miss Sec Check questions. That's the first and foremost way of getting rid of people. They'll blow. They'll be very unhappy. It messes them up.

I think some of you have a little reality on that. Now and then, why, somebody has missed a Sec Check question on you wildly. And then you have found yourself sort of chewing your fingernails and nattering to yourself, and not quite know what was wrong. And then somebody fortunately comes along and says, “Who missed a Sec Check question?” or something like that. And you get it off and straighten it out, and all of a sudden you feel better. It's quite mysterious. It's quite mysterious.

I'm not going into the mechanics of how this happens. I can tell you the mechanics of how a bank beeps up, now. I've studied that for two or three days and finally got the answer to that. When you run the terminal which is not the terminal of the PC, his attention is too bound up in his own terminal and goal to as-is the collapsing mass. So the auditor, being more in control of the PC's bank than the PC, can of course push masses in on the PC. But the PC's attention is so bound up in his own goal terminal that this new terminal, which is being pushed in on him, does not get as-ised. And that is all there is to it. In other words, he hasn't enough attention to as-” anything but the goals terminal which he is stuck in. Do you see that? So his bank beeps up.

Similarly, your E-Meter starts up to the degree that the person is not as-ising what you're throwing in on him. So you get a high arm, high arm, high arm—an arm goes way up, his arm sticks. The person's attention is too bound up in something else to as-is what is being thrown in on him. Do you see this? So you could Sec Check a person into a high arm as well as Sec Check a person down from a high arm.

Now, how would you Sec Check a person into a high arm? Well you'd make sure all the rudiments were out. You'd very carefully make sure that all the rudiments were out before the Security Check was entered in on. You'd make sure that the PC was unhappy in the room, had a present time problem, didn't want you to audit him, had an ARC break and had several withholds right in present time, and then start Security Checking him on heavy questions. And the PC can't confront the question, can't give you the answer. Do you see the struggle which now ensues? And he can't get his attention out of present time, he can't remember the past, and you actually could plunge him around until the arm would go high.

Now, it is not true that every arm going high during a run must be avoided, but you should understand why an arm is going high and why an arm hangs high during a Sec Check or

during any other kind of run. An arm, a tone arm, goes high and stays high if more is being thrown in on the PC than the PC can handle or as-is. Period. That is all there is to it.

Let us say, if a PC were a coal burner and he were able to generate enough flame to burn one piece, one small cubic inch, of coke per hour, and you emptied the hod into the furnace, you're going to get a rising tone arm which, of course, is measuring the additional mass entered in on the PC which the PC isn't as-ising. That make sense to you? I studied it out the last couple of days to see what the mechanism exactly was here and what was happening. And it becomes valuable.

So when a PC's arm is high—you can just make a little side rule to go along with it that will serve you in good stead—be very careful to do one of two things: Audit with the rudiments very well in or find where the PC's attention is stuck and audit that. Now, that doesn't say that you should run an engram, because the engram might have been the thing which was the hod of coal. You see, that might have been the upended coal hod.

The PC's attention was busily stuck, gorgeously impinged, upon a flower. You've been running a process, "What flowers have you failed to withhold?" or something. And all of a sudden an-engram comes up. And you can ask too many questions about the engram, and that's the same as throwing the mass in on the PC, you see?

You can say, "What's the largest object in that engram? All right. Now, what's some other object in that engram? Now, is there any masses in that engram of any character?"

Well, of course, that is understandably throwing heavy mass in on the PC, but you know, you can get the PC into the engram so the PC can't easily extricate himself simply by asking the PC too pointed and too direct a question about the engram.

I'll give you the right-wrong example of this.

This is the right: PC says, "Woo! What an awfully big mountain. I wonder what's going on here?" and so forth.

And the right thing to do is to say, "Oh. All right. Okay. Here's the next question."

And here s the wrong thing to do: "Oh? Well, what is going on around there?" See, that's the same as upending the coal hod.

Now, don't be too surprised if the tone arm starts up right at the point you asked that question and stays up thereafter. The auditor can push mass, pictures, circuits, track in on the PC and move that track more easily than the PC.

This is one of the hardest I things—over the last eleven years, this has been the hardest single point of instruction: that the auditor can move the bank more easily than the PC can move the bank.

I've even given demonstrations and told the bank to go north, east, south, west. And somebody who was totally stuck on the track and couldn't possibly move on the track and all that sort of thing, and I just said—not even to the PC—I said, "All right. Now, it will change to the picture of a theater." It did.

You know, the PC irrevocably stuck in this incident and can't possibly get out of it. Well, "All right. The incident will now become the picture of a theater." Bang! It did. He was no longer stuck in the incident. You can do things like this. You can move the bank around more easily than the PC.

So your interrogation—your interrogation of the PC can itself pin the PC's attention at various parts of the track where maybe it shouldn't be pinned. It's all right to get curious; it's

all right to find out what's going on. But there are times when you should restrain yourself just a little bit.

The PC all of a sudden starts looking very sad. And you say, "What are you looking at?"

"Well, these pictures of these pyramids. They're very interesting pyramids."

And you say, "Oh, all right," and give him the next question. That's real smart, you see?

PC starting to look slow and comm-laggy, you know? All right. All you'd have to say is, "What about the pyramids? When did they come up?" When did they come up isn't so bad. But, "What about the pyramids? Do they have big tops? Do they have small bottoms? Is there anything going on around the base of the pyramid? What is happening on the other side of the pyramid? Are there any ditches dug or anything like that around it?" You're writing script now, you see, so that'd probably give him a good ARC break right at this point.

Now, you can go on and audit the process you've been auditing for another half an hour, and you say, "What are you looking at?"

"Oh," he'll say, "these damn pyramids, of course."

You gave him the pyramids. Now, don't be so alarmed about it because all you'd have to do is take them away from him.

Well, how would you take them away from him? The easiest way to take the pyramids away from him, the easiest way, is simply to tell the bank to do something else. You know? Say, "Well, what happened toward the end of that life?" You know? The bank will shift.

And you say, "What happened a couple of lives later? Is there anything that happened in a subsequent life to that, that answers the auditing question?"

"Oh, there is. Oh, well, what do you know?" You won't hear any more about pyramids.

You can move the bank around. One of the primary reasons auditors have trouble auditing engrams is they kept expecting the PC to move the bank. They would sit there and they would say, "All right. What are you looking at?" and be perfectly willing for the PC to go on and go through the incident, but nobody was moving through any incident. Why? Because nobody was moving the incident. PC was incapable of moving the incident, and the auditor wouldn't.

All the auditor would have to say is, "Well, the end of the incident will now appear. One year has now gone by. The picture of that incident, whatever is there, will appear."

It's very weird, you know. The PC says, "Well, you see, I was a beggar. I'm a beggar, and I see all this. And it's a horrible marketplace, and I'm a beggar, I'm sitting down there and I got leprosy," and so forth. And it's just not running, don't you see? And you say so on and so on.

He keeps saying, "Well, and this leprosy, and I . . . I've been leprotic for a long time," and he's getting more and more into the dramatization of the thing, and so forth.

And, you say, "Well, was there a life later than that when you didn't have leprosy?"

He'll say, "Well, uh . . . since you've asked me that way . . . Yes. Yes, as a matter of fact I haven't had any leprosy since..."

"Well, what are you looking at now?"

“Well, I’m looking at a small boy.”

“All right. That’s good.”

Wrong: “Well, does the small boy have leprosy?”

You can move the bank around just by the most innocent questions. You can audit, actually, by moving the bank by innuendo. Not anything direct— north, east, south and west—just ask some PC about this and that part of their Life.

Now, you expect a PC to cycle through an ARC question; you just expect him to. He cycles through an ARC-type process, you see? He goes out of present time, he goes back into the past and back into present time again.

All right. If you depend forever on that automaticity, you’re going to get lost somewhere, because he’s going to get into something he’s not going to get out of.

You can always say to him—you’re trying to get him back up to present time “Well was there an ARC break later than that?” or, let’s say ARC processing, “Well, did you communicate to anybody after that?”

“Oh, yeah? Yeah.”

“Well, the following year did you communicate to anybody?”

And he’ll have to say “Let’s see, what year was that?” and so forth. And you figure it out for him, you know? And he figures it out.

And he says, “Oh yeah, well, that was 1942. Yeah.”

“Well, all right. Good. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1942? Oh? All right, all right. Okay. You did. All right. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1950? Oh, all right. Good. Now, did you communicate to anybody in 1955?”

“Oh yes, yeah. I . . . I did.”

“Anybody communicate to you in that year?”

“Oh, I’ll say they did.”

“All right. Has anybody been communicating to you in the last few days?”

“Oh yes, yes, yes.”

Well, have you communicated to anybody today?”

“And anybody communicated to you?”

“Oh, yeah. As a matter of fact, you just did.”

Well, you’ve moved the person up to present time by just interrogation. Interrogation with dates. You just asked him questions about dates. You didn’t directly say “The bank will now shift 1.89 years north.” But you could do that.

The reactive mind is always keyed to other determinism and never to self determinism. And one of its common denominators is other determinism. So, of course, the auditor can always move the bank.

Now, in Sec Checking you very often get somebody into some kind of a situation, and by your pressure and your demands . . . You're saying, "Well, have you ever stolen anything?"

And the person says, "No, I haven't."

Or "Have you ever stolen anything at all? Now, stolen. Have you ever stolen anything?"

And the person says, "No, I haven't"—you're not getting any read on the meter because you're not looking at it and you aren't getting any anyhow.

"Well, you mean to tell me in the last two hundred years you've never stolen anything?"

"Well, uh. . ."

"Now, I'm going to—when I snap my fingers something you've stolen will appear. (snap!) Well, all right. All right. When I snap my fingers something bigger you have stolen will appear. (snap!)" All right.

Well, don't be too startled if the tone arm goes up. It isn't an ARC break. You could probably get away with it, but you've just given him more and more mass that he is not prepared to accept. He isn't about to as is it. And then if you just walk off at that point and don't do anything else about it, you leave these things right there. So make things vanish that you made appear. A good magician, when he makes a girl disappear on a stage, particularly at these straight laced times of police and all that sort of thing, usually shows her again to the audience, you see? Well, that's a good principle. Good principle to follow. It's the decent thing to do.

Of course, in tougher, rougher, ancient times, we didn't do that. We showed the audience this brand new trick: You put the girl in the box and you put flaming torches in at every corner of the box, and you opened up the box and there was no girl. And they thought this was marvelous. And it was a marvelous trick. Of course, she'd burned up.

But I call to your attention that you're auditing in milder times than that. So when you say "All right. Take a look at those pyramids ' remember to say "Take a look at something else."

All right. Now, the auditor who is sitting there doing TR 0 on the auditing sheet only—no TR 0 for the meter, no TR 0, you see, for the preclear, no TR 0 for the room, and so forth; he's got TR 0 advanced as far as the point of a ballpoint pencil, you see, and he can write, and he sometimes can even read an auditing command off a sheet but doesn't pay much attention. Boy, the man's dangerous. Do you see why he's dangerous?

He not only never finds out what's going on with the PC, but he never sees these instant reads in answers to his question. He never clears these things. He never finds out what's going on. If something did go on, he wouldn't do anything about it because he wouldn't think anything was going on. All very fascinating.

But the high arm is often, not always, but is often cleared with withholds. You get a withhold off the case—any old cotton picking withhold, it doesn't matter at all, any withhold—and you'll see the arm start down a little bit if it is a withhold to the PC.

Now, what makes it a withhold to the PC? Whether or not it is against the mores that the PC has subscribed to. That is what makes it a withhold. We can broaden this definition. We used to say, well it was a withhold if the PC thought it was a withhold.

All right. That's fine. But that's not technically usable. Let's take a more usable statement: A withhold is a withhold if it is a violation of a mores the PC has subscribed to and knows about.

In other words, you get a violation of a mores and you got a withhold. In other words, if the withhold is a violation of a mores it'll register on the meter, the PC will consider it a withhold, he will give it to you as a withhold and he will feel better.

All right. Let's get down a little bit closer here. Why do some people feel so wonderful when you get off some withholds and others don't notice anything?

Why is this? Why is this apparently spotty? You sit down and you say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" And PC A—you say, "Have you ever robbed a bank?" and he gets a tremendous fall, and you say to him, "All right. When was that?"

Ha ha ha ha ha ha! And he says, "Well, that was Chicago, 1931. We robbed a bank There was uh . . . La . . ., Louie the Pits and a few of us uh . . . guys, and we robbed the bank and we . . . we got away wit da loot. And uh . . . oh, as a matter of fact, we shot each other afterwards and threw da money in da . . . Lake Michigan and then I was killed. Yes, I robbed a bank. I—I got a recollection on it," and so forth. And that's fine. And you expect the PC to grow wings at this moment, you see, and so forth. He's gotten off a withhold. Oh, he wasn't withholding it. Nothing happens with the PC.

He did get a fall. We don't know what the fall is traceable to. We ask him now, "Did you ever rob a bank?"

And he says, "Nah," he says, "I never robbed any banks. Not any other banks than that."

And you don't get any more reaction on the needle and you say, "Well now, the PC should feel wonderful." But he doesn't. Well, it did fall. So he should feel wonderful. Well, no, you see, robbing banks is not against the mores of bank robbers. And there being so very few citizens who subscribe to law and order in Chicago, you see they're in the minority—that it doesn't make a mores. Quite the contrary.

Now, he might very well get a terrific relief on the thing. You say, "well is there anything you've ever reported to the police? Ha ha ha ha ha ha. Have you ever reported anything to the police? Ha ha ha ha! Hm? Hm? Hey? Have you ever reported anything to the police?"

"Ooo o oh," he says, that's pretty bad."

You got an instant read here. "Come on. Come on. Come forth. What's this you reported to the police?" You know, good, smooth ARC here.

And he says, "well I—I reported once my dog had been lost " And the fall comes off the meter, and he feels wonderful.

You say, "What on earth is this? How come?" Same fellow, you see?

He: robs the bank, they shoot each other up, they throw the loot—they don't even get the money—they throw the loot into Lake Michigan, and so on. And this has been a terrific withhold and a great unsolved crime of all time, and here it is. And he gets no relief. But he reports a dog to the police and he says, "My, I'm certainly glad you're auditing me. I'm getting such terrific results."

Well, that's because you're operating from one mores, and he's operating from another, as I've already talked to you about. Fantastic, isn't it?

Now, supposing we find out something about the PC's past and we guess at what the mores of the various groups and societies he's belonged to might have been And we do a Security Check from this particular level. We are always going to get some kind of a result. But this is a rather stunt proposition. Is there a faster way to do this? Yes.

It's called Security Checking by Dynamic Assessment. There is the most available body of life or segment of life the most available segment of life on which he has a reality—against which he can be security checked. And you will miss, miss, miss, miss, miss if it all still seems reasonable to you that he is sitting there in a body, part of a race, and so forth and so on, and all these I'm supposed to be all taking place, and this is a social world and so forth. And you think this is all ordinary and reasonable.

You forget. You forget that it's very unusual: A thetan is sitting in a meat body in a culture of some kind or another that is doing some weird, odd things of some kind. It is not usual. And you know, the whole thing can be security checked out? Let's look at it from that weird angle.

All right. Do a Dynamic Assessment. Here's the way you do it. Dynamic Assessment is done, of course, to find the most needle change of any one dynamic amongst the rest of them. It is done, really, by change of pattern rather than largest fall or something like that. It is done the same way you assess anything else.

Now, you can do a Dynamic Assessment by elimination—brand new news for you. That improves Dynamic Assessment a bit. You can assess by elimination. It'll leave you sitting there with one dynamic on which he has some reality.

All right. What are the parts of that dynamic? And we DOW are confronted with the task of composing a great many new Security Checks. They will be the teen series. There will be check number 11, check number 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 17 and 18. And each one of those is subdivided, as necessary, let us say, second dynamic would be Form 12, family. That would be A. So Form 12 B would be something on the order of children. You see, you already have a Child Security Check, but that should be its number.

And Form 12 C, which would have to do with marital sexual relations and what is—commonly passes for—mores in the present society. I think that's the total moral code, is contained in that narrow sphere.

12 D would have to do with unusual practices on the second dynamic. In other words, you can get a number of Security Checks plotted out here. Of course, they go by the number of the dynamic. So your 18, naturally, is a bunch of Security Check questions on the subject of God. They're just religious Security Checks of some character or another. So you have a whole bunch of these things: "Have you ever blasphemed?" Okay? That kind of a Security Check. "Have you ever used paraphernalia for other purposes?" "Have you ever used a church for any other purpose than was intended?" You get the idea. You just dream up all of the possibilities of misuse abuse crimes that fitted into innumerable areas.

Of course, number 14 would be your species checks. And that's pretty easy, but it probably subdivides.

And a Dynamic Assessment could be done for the subdivision so that you could get not only the dynamic but you could also get the subdivision of the dynamic and you could wind up with a proper Security Check. But no exact form Security Check is ever going to do the whole job. You're going to have to add your own questions to it as they may appear.

Your Dynamic Assessment directs you to that zone of life of which the PC has most reality and therefore would consider he would have the most crimes as it exists. You will find a PC all messed up on seven dynamics and able to be security checked on the remaining dynamic. He's got some reality on it, so he's done something to it. He knows, you see, it's his withhold.

Now, of course, Sec Check Form 11 . . . None of these are written. You're going to write them. Any time you're doing this and you're asking questions, now, by golly, you write the question you ask down. And I don't care how much little side time that you spend going off

and grabbing off somebody's folder and find out what you're supposed to run on them next week and actually dream up a Security Check.

Make sure it stays in the folder, and then we can go back over these things and we will get some horrendous thinking on the subject. Okay? And it makes a good show. As a matter of fact, some of you who are not Sec Checking this week but who will be Sec Checking next week have in these folders, right this minute out here, you have this type of Security Check to do. And those which are Security Checking—will be Security Checking tonight—you just run into it like a truck hitting a wall. You're going to open up the folder and there it is, and you're going to see, "Well do an eighth dynamic Security Check Dream up the questions," it'll say. All right Well, dream them up.

And you will find that you're getting off the case the withholds that come nearest to this PC's "locus aberratus." And there he sits.

In doing Security Checking—let's get out to a higher generality here on the subject itself—the trouble with Security Checking is that the auditor is usually security checking from his viewpoint rather than from the PC's viewpoint.

The auditor is Security Checking against what he thinks would be a crime in his own view. And it is not a crime to the PC. So the auditor gets all upset because this question should have worked, and he's got this bright, sweet, innocent little thing sitting across from him—a little high school girl. And she's sitting there and she's saying, "Oh, yes. Well, I was raped in the third grade, the fourth grade. As a matter of fact, raped several boys in the fifth grade. Yeah, as a matter of fact, I'm having clandestine relations at the present moment with my uncle, except when I'm down at the firehouse."

So he says, "Man, you know, when I get all this off, when I get all this off and get all this straightened up, this girl going to be flying right, you know?"

About three, four weeks after he's finished this laborious task of Security Checking, he walks by the firehouse and she in her negligee waves from the window. What he missed—what he missed was this, what he missed was this: her dynamic was the eighth dynamic, and she was a renegade from the Temple of Astarte. And of course, it would have been an awful break of mores for her to have done anything else.

Now, if he'd asked her questions such as "Have you ever been leaning out a window and have not whistled to somebody?" he would have gotten a fall, and she would have gotten this off, maybe with considerable grief. She meant to do right.

Now, the odd thing about thetans is they are thetans. That is the oddest thing about a thetan. And a thetan is not natively a member of any culture. There aren't just natural born eighth dynamic thetans and natural born second dynamic thetans, and so forth. They are just thetans. And they've come down the track by their own devious routes, accumulating, in their own peculiar way, civilizations, cultures, mores, group ideas and so on. And some of them have come a long way down the track without finding out any groups exist. And all sorts of wild things have gone on, you see? It's quite weird, you see?

It isn't that everybody has the same body of aberration at all. They're thetans. And in view of the fact that all the rest of this stuff is collected . . . Oh, it's just what do they collect? Some collect stamps, some collect blondes, some collect debts, some collect executions sort of a hobby.

But the various mores in which they operate are registered very clearly and cleanly on the dynamics. And as soon as you start doing this, why, you're going to see some interesting renewed upsurge results out of Security Checking.

Of course, I'm put to it right now. I have to have a zone and level of auditing which is a comprehensible, highly usable, highly workable level of auditing prior to finding the PC's goal and terminal. And I have to do that fairly rapidly, because you have a Class II auditor, and he has to have a body of skills. So I'm not just busy inventing them, I'm busy throwing them together.

It's like the other day, I looked up in horror and realization that we had no co-audit processes of any kind whatsoever that could be trusted in a co-audit. By the new safety table, you look it over from a viewpoint of the co-audit, why, you're in a hole. That's a bad spot. But there's an old one, 1951, that could be run in a co-audit: Rising Scale Processing. Probably be gorgeous! Probably be gorgeous. You can probably even do an assessment on the people as they walk in. You know, I mean you could take the old Chart of Attitudes and kind of work it out. What did this fellow want? He tells the co-audit instructor what his goals are. All you had to do is pick out the column. That's the rising scale he runs. He'll make it.

It's quite a remarkable thing what you can do with concepts and that sort of thing, leaving terminals alone—the gains you can get.

Now, in this body of Security Checking, here is a whole zone of activity—a very simple zone. There will be forms developed for this particular thing and all the Security Checks. We haven't got them all now, but that's no reason why I can't show you what it is or we can't use it, don't you see? You, after all, don't have to be led down the road with your feet being picked up one at a time and set down on the cobbles by somebody else.

Do a Dynamic Assessment, take the most active dynamic, preferably by elimination, take the parts of existence which might be the subdivisions of that dynamic, look those over and take the most active one of those or the most fruitful one of those—just dream up a Security Check that has to do with it.

Security check the PC on that particular zone and area. You will be asking him things he never dreamed of were an overt. He's doing them all the time. And all of a sudden, "It's horrible! Oh, God!" He feels terrible about that. And he is so relieved.

A vegetarian, for instance, that is also on the fifth dynamic—she has other reasons that she could be a vegetarian—it might be on the seventh or eighth dynamic. It's something they should be doing, you know, because of some religious action or something of that sort.

But when a PC is on the fifth dynamic and vegetarian, and we security check him—here's where your reasonableness will get assaulted, you see? You're going to ask this person such things: "Have you ever eaten an animal?" and the needle is going to fall off the pin. And you'll find out he's been withholding every dinner he ever ate that had any meat connected with it, and so on. All sorts of wild things here.

You ask somebody along this line that falls on the fifth, "Well, have you ever walked on the grass?" Needle falls off the pin He's liable to explain to you that he had to. There wasn't any way you could go around the grass. Of course, he realizes he smashed up a lot of grass in his day.

You see, you look on this as being so ordinary, you know, for people to walk on grass or kills plants or eat animals or something of this sort, or chop trees or do various things on the fifth. This is all so routine that you wouldn't think—bang! like that—that it would have any effect on a case, because it's too ordinary and "shouldn't" have any effect on the case. Well, that doesn't follow at all.

What has an effect on a case is what has an effect on a case, you see? It's what the thetan thinks is a withhold. And that goes back to what group mores are you operating against?

Well, any member of the old biological survey that was operating around here about six hundred million years ago has his hair stand on end, whether he knows it or not, every time a new species becomes extinct on earth or every time man plows up another thousand square miles and plants it in cute cottages at contractor prices, you see? That's grim. And his hair stands on end! He knows it's very usual and he ought to be doing it. He knows he should be doing it, you see, because it's a usual thing to do. And that's okay. And nobody else thinks it's bat.

But he looks at this or doing something like that and he kind of—oh, it's just not quite right. He doesn't quite integrate why it isn't quite right. He doesn't think the thought through. He just sort of snarls a little bit to himself quietly, or he thinks of it as an overt or something and he's disturbed by it. Well, it's against the mores of the biological survey. That's all.

“Thou shalt plant and populate planets, pard.” They kept the life cycle going and balanced. Also, I imagine any one of them that ever gets in a schoolroom, and the teacher says, “Now we re going to talk about the balance of nature,” you see? And they go back into the current biological nonsense about how there was a spontaneous explosion of an atom somewhere in some sea of ammonia that got there by accident, and then, by natural selection, and quite by accident, everything got planned out this way, you see?

Well, a person that's been on that line is—somewhere back in his bank, you know, things kind of go whirr, whirr. Well, it's an awful invalidation: the time he spent on computers figuring out how many petals there should be on a delphinium! And of course, then they wog him. He finally doesn't like this explanation, so goes over to the church and they tell him God did it. And suddenly he begins to feel sort of megalomaniac, you know? “I wonder if I did create all these thetans.” He didn't do anything but run the computers that planned the posies on this particular type of planet.

But you'll find these are overts. When they register on that dynamic, then you have to plot out what the overts would be on that particular line. And you ask those questions, you'll find out the fellow has got overts, he's got withholds, and there he is. And he'll all of a sudden feel much better. And some odd and peculiar things that he has been doing in his life suddenly come straight. And he remembers things, and so forth.

You see, men are very often so busy being ordinary that they don't recognize that every one of them is slightly, somewhere, extraordinary. And this professional ordinariness that we get, particularly in these socialistic times, is a great repressor. It not-ises the differences. And unless you can reestablish difference, you can never reestablish differentiation. You see, it's very easy to establish similarities ant identities. This is fairly easy to do. Man does this very well.

He just dismisses all problems by saying “Everything is alike.” You ever hear a girl that's had a bad love affair? She says—inevitably she says, “All men are alike” That's her next statement. They walk around, ant she's liable to be saying something on this order for some days—or, well, hours anyway. And . . .

But she's done the easy way out. The way to solve all of mankind is simply and ordinarily and only to say that they are just all alike and that's it.

So you don't have to worry about it. And then the next thing to do is if you want to—don't want to have to go any further or exercise your wits any, all you have to do is say “Well, they're all bad.” So the easy way to do is to say they're all alike and then all bad, and therefore you're safe. And this is apparently a safe thing to do. You say, “Well, they're all alike and all bad and, therefore, after this I will be warned. And now I'm perfectly safe. Of course, I'm miserable but I'm perfectly safe.”

And a person will then try to justify this kind of reasoning. Well, that kind of reasoning is so idiotic and so simple and so stupid and not-ises so many things that it's no wonder that

countries cycle down into the great melting pot togetherness of it all. “Pigs are more equal than others ‘ you know? This kind of a—this kind of an attitude.

It isn’t that thetans are unequal, but it isn’t that they’re equal either. Perhaps at the beginning of track this might have been true. But they’ve been gathering inequalities for some time and then masking them by pretended equalities until they’re very hard to separate out.

Well, if you go ahead and look this over in Security Checking, you’ll find out that the Dynamic Assessment is a very marvelous way to get a zone of life on which the person has overts and withholds. And you’ll find that that works fine and will produce some rather interesting results.

All right. There is another thing called the Problems Intensive that we have been working on, and I’ll tell you how to do this Problems Intensive. It’s a simple thing to do—nothing much to it.

It’s a form. And you fill out the form. And the only differences that you find from this and the first time I told you about it is you don’t run the problem. You fill out the form. You get all the self determined changes of the PC’s lifetime. Then you assess those self determined changes, you find the one that reacts the most and then you ask for the problem immediately earlier than that change. They give you a problem. If it’s the right change, they will give you a problem which is a tremendous overwhelming problem that they have had for many, many years, and that is their present time problem of long duration. And they would recognize that as such, and that gets out of the road very nicely. The statement of it, of course, makes it easier. But now there’s a faster way of auditing it than running the problem. A problem is too close to still to be audited swiftly. It isn’t that a problem can’t be audited. A problem can be audited, but it audits more slowly than approaching it through motion.

In other words, it’s close to a still, a problem is. You ever notice a workman when he runs into two pieces of timber that are going the wrong way in the structure: he stands back and looks at it. Yeah, he inevitably stops. And problems are associated with stops.

So what you do is take it as a still point on the track and find the area of prior confusion and then you Sec Check that area of prior confusion. Find out what the person was doing at that time, find out what he withheld and from whom, and how he did it and what he did and why he said it. And you know that, you just find out all of the things and stuff in that particular area which preceded the problem. And all the change in the problem—all you do with the change he made in life and the problem is use them as a milepost in time, behind which you look for the confusion. And then you Sec Check the confusion. And you’ll find out, then, the problem will blow unless it’s gone back fifty thousand years and you’re actually trying to Sec Check his life as a student barbarian or something—which you can run into.

You get that area of confusion unraveled and you’ll find the problem blows, the change blows. And what do you know? It’s usually accompanied by a somatic of some kind, and it’ll be some kind of a chronic somatic, and that will lessen somewhat or sometimes even blow entirely. Don’t be disheartened after you’ve got the person a goals terminal, and you are running him on the line, to have the somatic reappear where it really occurred on the track. And it’ll reappear and blow.

Now, Sec Checking, however, will alleviate and get it out of the road, and it usually stays out of the road—it stays lessened anyway.

And so, doing a Problems Intensive, then, merely consists of finding all of the self determined changes a person has made in a lifetime, listing those, assessing those, finding that change which gives the most reaction, finding the problem stated by the PC which existed immediately prior to that change and then finding the area of prior confusion to the problem. Find that area and Sec Check the living daylight out of that area.

What was he doing at that time? and who'd he know? and all this sort of thing. And basically and principally, what did he do and what did he withhold from whom?

Now, you don't have to do it person by person. You actually can delete the assessment of the people in the list. You needn't do that, there is no real point in it at all. You needn't make a list of people on a Problems Intensive and then assess that list of people, because it's a violation of a goals terminal.

What you should do is just go in on the basis of an area of confusion, find out who was present in it and then find out to whom he did what and from whom he withheld what. And all of a sudden the problem in a majority of cases will blow. Now, you call that a Problems Intensive, you see?

Sec Checking by Dynamics is an entirely different activity and it is an isolated activity of its own. And a Problems Intensive is an isolated activity of its own. These things are distinctly different activities.

Sec Checking usually depends for its workability on the ability of the auditor to ask the right question at the right time. Now, when we're making the basic class of a very functional type of auditor—I mean, an auditor that we would depend on the skill of, that basic Class II auditor—we're not going to say that the Class II auditor is a muzzled auditor, and so on and so on, you see, the way we used to say there was a class. Class u is above that. This person has got to have enough imagination to ask the right questions and put together the right questions in order to knock apart this mess. That'll give him enough to think about. And you have to be very good at it. As a matter of fact, several members of this particular class are extremely good at this. I'm very interested in watching it occur. So we found the hidden confusion and that was the end of the problem. You know? Bang. Bang. You're doing it very well.

Now, what's interesting is, is that you could Sec Check out of existence every out rudiment. Isn't that interesting? You could take the room and you could take the present time problem, you could take the auditor, you could take the ARC break and naturally the withhold, and you could Sec Check out of existence all of these out rudiments by just asking for the prior confusion. You find the rudiments out, so you find out what went on before it.

You see, a rudiment can't hang up unless there's an unknown in it, and an unknown can't exist unless there is a withhold.

These people who walk around being fond of being stupid should get wise to themselves because all they're doing is declaring that they have withholds. Here we have a class of thing which is all of a piece: unknowingness, forgettingness, withholdingness and stupidity. These all go together. These are all of a class They are not the same thing, but each one interdepends on another. It's kind of another triangle like we used to have in ARC, and still have But unknown and stupidity and withholds go up and down accompanying one another They are hand in glove. The more withholds a person has, the more stupid he'd be, the more unknowns he will have. And you've got these three things just marching up and down beside each other. And as you improve a person's withholds, if they're actually withholds, of course he will get brighter.

But if you think you're going to take a member of the Bank Robbers Security League and Sec Check him on a churchman's moral code and wind up with an increased IQ, of course you're quite mistaken. This will not occur.

What you've got to do is Sec Check within the reality of what the PC is and what the PC has done You have to Sec Check within that reality.

Well, there is one method of finding the zone by dynamics, and another method: zones of action by change. That is the Problems Intensive.

Well, the hidden confusion was when he was in school. All right. Now, that is not anything but a school mores. It couldn't be anything but school mores. It is not familial mores, particularly; it's school mores. The confusion immediately before this change that you assessed out was going to school. So therefore it's a school mores. It's a schoolboy's attitude toward the parents; a schoolboy's attitude, you see, toward teachers; a schoolboy's attitude toward all the other aspects of existence. Well what are these? What are these? And what's the morals? What's the mores of the school? "Thou shalt not give the headmaster an even break" you know? It's the thousand odd commandments of the schoolboy: "Thou mustn't preach. Thou mustn't inform on thy worst enemy." All kinds of weird moral codes of one kind or another. "Thou shalt take revenge." It's quite weird, you know? Somebody was mean, so therefore all the other boys enforce the fact that there must be a fight.

You know, it's quite weird. But so is any of these moral codes. And if you're living comfortably, ensconced in a sort of an even, easy go sort of a society, and you'd say, "Well, I know what's moral 'Thou shalt not uh . . . Thou shalt not uh . . . And thou shalt not uh . . . And thou shalt not,' and that's about all there is to it. And, of course, I am a moral person." That is the emptiest remark that anybody ever made. "I am a moral person." There isn't any other kind.

It doesn't make him a well behaved person, except in one group: the group that happens to have the same morals. And then he's a well behaved person only in that group. It's very interesting. The auditor's viewpoint can be thrown out. The auditor can Sec Check securely from the fact of the Presbyterian Church, and then with what amazement discover that nobody but Presbyterians ever lives by the Presbyterian Church. Always discovers this with some shock. And never under any circumstances realizes there's a moral code amongst marijuana addicts. See, so that is immoral.

Well, look, it's only immoral to those groups that have a moral code that says what the other side is doing is bad.

I'm not now trying to tear down and rip to pieces every single moral code that has ever been developed anywhere. As a matter of fact, we have the only means that has ever been discovered of straightening them out. I don't know how anybody can be a Presbyterian after having been a Roman Catholic for fifteen hundred years. If the Presbyterian Church was smart, if it was very, very clever, why, it would come around and find a bunch of us auditors and get us to sit down with our E-Meters and put the congregation up the line out of the moral area that they are stuck in so that then they will hear something of what the preacher is saying. I think it's a waste of air and church heat and a few other things. He's standing up there and he's ranting and pounding the pulpit and telling them they must not sin. And just think of this fellow who is totally stuck in the Never Give a Planet an Even Break Space Jockeys Protective Association

And here's this preacher ranting at him, "Thou shalt not sin. You must learn to become a moral person."

And something in the back of his mind says, "You know, I don't want to kill any more women. And this fellow is standing up there demanding that I kill women. And that is why I left the Space Jockey Protective Association, because it was just too much—just one too many women. Now, why does the Presbyterian Church want me to kill women?" This is what goes in crosswise, you see, in the reactive bank. And the fellow is very puzzled about Presbyterianism. And he can't articulate what it is and he can't understand about it. He just thinks that, well, it's not quite for him.

And if you ask him about it, almost on a flash response, "What does a Presbyterian Church want you to do?"

“They want me to steal ships and kill women.” And even he at this point looking at that would say, “You know, that’s peculiar.” Because they don’t want him to commit sin.

If you raved and ranted at a large group of people with great force and decibels of sound that they must not sin, that they must be moral people, and never at any time held up what you were talking about or defined morals or showed them any moral code or anything—you just collect them at random and then just start screaming at them that they mustn’t sin, they mustn’t be immoral, so on—people would walk out of there and do some of the weirdest things.

You should realize that there is no act pronounced immoral in any one part of earth which cannot be found to be moral in some other part of earth. So remember that when you’re doing Security Checking. Security check against the moral code of the prior confusion.

And well, if your prior confusion, let us say, is a period after the person has been an auditor for years, and it’s a big confusion and it has something to do with auditing in an organization or something like this—there was a big confusion at this time, and after that he changed something or other, and that’s the confusion you assessed, and that is the confusion that you are Security Checking—and you’ve learned that in his early life he was a Presbyterian or something—you know he’s probably crossed up one way or the other. But probably the code he has gone against is the code he understands to be the code of a Scientologist—not the written Code of the Scientologist. The written Code of the Scientologist is not the code of a Scientologist, oddly enough. It is simply something that is held up as some kind of a model of action to keep us from getting our heads kicked in. But we have developed quite a structure of morality, you know? “Thou shalt not audit badly.” That’s one of the foremost of them.

“Thou shalt not audit a PC with a PT problem”—it goes off into technical things, don’t you see? And it—so on. A person, actually, is getting into a moral structure. He’s not into a technical structure; he’s also into a moral structure. And by Security Checking him, you will find out that he thought of it as a moral structure. That was a moral structure to him. You look on it as a technical structure, but no, it’s a moral structure.

He knew very well—he knew doggone good and well—that he shouldn’t keep auditing this person badly after 3:30 A.M. He just knew he shouldn’t ought to be doing that because it was against all of his principles: what he wanted to do and what anybody else wanted him to do, and so forth—it was just bad. PC was getting tireder and tireder and tireder and practically finally spun in. This gets to be a hell of an overt.

Somebody walks into the front room and swears and damns and screams and raises the devil about something or other and practically unmocks this person’s lease to pieces, don’t you see? And you get that as an overt amongst Scientologists? You don’t get it as an overt—until they find out that they disturbed an auditing session that was going OK. You see? All right. They disturbed this auditing session. Well, that’s an overt. Something they shouldn’t have done.

So gradually out of technical lines and out of behavior actions and group associations, Scientologists are building a moral code of what they consider proper behavior. And it’s built exactly and entirely against their experience, not what they’ve been told or what they’ve been dictated to. It’s built against the experience of what they know to be survival and what they know to be non survival. So you see, you check against that moral code one way or the other.

Now, you have a Security Check for an auditor. Now, whether it embraces all those points or not is debatable at the moment; I haven’t got the thing to hand. Possibly it doesn’t.

But you see, you’re in the driver’s seat if you’re Security Checking a Scientologist. You see, that’s easy. That’s—nothing to it. Just, all you have to do is say, “Well, what would I consider wrong?” You see, “As an auditor, what would I consider wrong? Well, all right. I’ll ask him if he’s done it.

“You ever disturbed an auditing session?” You ever done this? You ever done that? “You ever written a nasty letter to Ron and couldn’t get it back out of the post?” See, anything, anything, you just bang! bang! And think those up, just bang! bang! bang! That’s because, you see, you’re auditing in the same sphere of the moral code.

Now, let’s move it just one out. You’re Security Checking a person who is your fellow countryman and who has gone to similar schools to you and so forth. Well, this is pretty easy. You know what you’d consider wrong so you can ask him what’s wrong, and bang—you’ll get all kinds of withholds and so forth, and that’s dandy.

All right. Let’s move it out just a little bit further. You’re a member of the human race and you’re Security Checking a member of the human race. Well, you get past the language difficulties; you could dream up a security thing. You know, you know enough about it—vaguely, other races and things—and you could dream up something. Even if it was only “Have you ever done something that a China man would consider immoral?” You know, you had to be that stupid about it, but you could still brace it in somehow or another here and get it through.

All right. Now, let’s security check a monkey. Well, what do monkeys consider moral? What do they consider immoral? I don’t know. I haven’t talked to one lately. But they go on a monkey code. They must have one, because they all behave alike as a species. Don’t they? Well, they must have a moral code of some kind or another which is a racial code of some kind.

All right. How about Security Checking a blade of grass? I can show you that a tomato will register. I can show you that a cabbage will register on an E-Meter. Well, the only problem there is not just how to get in communication with the cabbage. See, that’s not the major problem. That’s not the only major problem. The other major problem would be, well, what does a cabbage consider immoral? That’s from a Security Checker’s viewpoint. I imagine “not to be eaten,” or something. You never know about these things.

The basis off which you operate must be the viewpoint of the PC, not the viewpoint of the auditor—the only point I’m trying to make here. You must security check from the viewpoint of the PC, always. Doesn’t mean you’ve got to be in his ‘ead, but it means you’ve got to do some dream up.

All right. If this person was a WRAC, was a WRAC for years, and the incidents you’re Security Checking and the zone of confusion—the prior confusion that you’re Security Checking—finds that she has been a WRAC for some years. What is the moral code of a WRAC? Who knows? Well, you could ask some questions about it. You could dream it up.

“Have you ever spoken pleasantly to your commanding officer? Have you ever failed or refused to make catty remarks about a sergeant?” See? Who knows what their moral code is? But it might be immoral. See, it might be immoral to apparently be on good terms with your sergeant. See, it might be. All kinds of wild things might be going on. You’re not sure, because there are different standards of survival. And the standards of survival can be so different that—there it is. It’s laid out in front of you. Your work is cut out for you.

But you always—the rule is, you always security check within the moral structure of the PC, not the auditor. You never security check within the moral structure of the auditor. You just make a damn fool of yourself if you do that. You sound like a parson yapping. You’ve got a moral code: Well, what’s so moral about it? I don’t know. But there it is. You got a moral code.

Now, all moral codes tend to propagate themselves, and people try to force other people into a moral code within a group, and so on. So an auditor does have a latent impulse to force some old moral code of his off on the PC while he is Security Checking. It’s perfectly all

right to force any moral code you want to on anybody, but not while you're security checking. You security check by the moral code the PC has violated and you'll get some terrific case gains. You'll get that tone arm coming down, and so on.

Well, I've given you two excellent methods of doing this; they are very, very good: your Problems Intensive to find areas of confusion; your Dynamics Assessment followed by a Security Check along that particular dynamic line. I think you will find these things are quite productive of interesting results.

The question very often comes up—extremely—”Well, aren't you just running perpetual withholds, withholds, withholds, withholds? Aren't you running withhold on the Prehav Scale?” No. It never flattens; it's one of these total duration. If you've asked somebody “Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George? Have you withheld anything from George?” yes, that will flatten and that will run out. But “Have you ever in the last two hundred trillion years restrained a communication or restrained a reach or restrained anything? Have you ever done this?” I'm afraid would take a long time to flatten .

Now, it is much more rapidly flattened if you say “Have you ever overtly acted against or withheld yourself from some moral code that. . . ?” so on. Now we've got what his real withholds are. We can get those out. So it flattens as fast as you've cleaned up all the moral codes which he has violated.

How many groups has he belonged to? I don't know. It's an inexhaustible amount. Fortunately, you don't have to do it that particularly to get a good result.

Now, there's one thing more here, and that is the subject of the use of “blame,” the use of “make guilty,” in Security Checking, and the ways of doing that. And there's one more item: is the use of critical thoughts in Security Checking. ∴ ...

Blame has nothing to do with a Security Check. Just forget it. It's just a part of the Prehav Scale. It comes under the heading of irresponsibility, by the way, not under the heading of overts and withholds. To “make guilty”—I notice there's a tendency to ask people if they have ever blamed anybody as a Security Check and so forth. And this doesn't exist. It isn't anything. It's nowhere. . .

Now, if you ask somebody “Have you ever made anybody guilty of . . . ?” and Security Check question—if you ask that bluntly just like that—your chances of getting a factual answer are something on the order of a roulette wheel in Las Vegas. There it is. Because the thing that is wrong with your PC is that he or she has never really succeeded in making anybody guilty of anything, anytime, and they are still trying. And the basis of their aberration is the effort to make others guilty, not the fact of accomplished guilt. You always use “tried to make guilty,” “attempted to make guilty.” Such words as that must modify this “made guilty.”

“Have you ever attempted to make anybody guilty of rape?” That's a perfectly proper Security Check question.

“Have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?” Well, this is Las Vegas. This girl and—I don't know, she's been raped by the firemen, the police; she's been raped by most anybody and everybody, and just been raped for years. And all during this period of time, she has been saying, “You beast! You dog. Get thee hence. Take thy dark shadow away from my doorstep,” and other equivalent remarks, less ladylike, in an effort to make fellows guilty. And she has never succeeded in doing it.

And you ask her, “Have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?”

Well, this is nonsense. No, she never has. That is the answer and that's the reaction you'll get on the needle. No, she never has. Tried for years. Never succeeded yet.

But you ask, “Have you ever tried to make anybody guilty?”—ahhh, well. Now, that’s a guilt of another hue. And you’ll find your tone arm is reacting to that one. It can go up and down and back and forth. Do you realize that the only reason anybody has a victimish, motivatorish attitude is just an effort to make somebody guilty. But remember, it’s only an effort to make somebody guilty. It is not successfully having done so.

Now, you can actually produce a considerable change of mental attitude on the part of a PC by saying, ‘Now, all right, get the ideo of your mother and father standing in front of you and saying they’re so sorry, and then have them fall away and die. Thank you.’ And the person will just cheer up.

There’s a tremendous effort to accomplish that exact end. There’s a tremendous effort. Everybody has it. It’s not singular. They’ve got something they wanted to make somebody guilty about and they haven’t ever made it. And it’s still hung on the track.

So it’s always “try to make guilty,” it is always “attempted to make guilty.” It is always a modifying word of that character and it is never “Have you ever made so and so guilty?”

You ask a judge in session: You take him and you say, “All right, judge,” and you put him on the E-Meter. And you say, “All right. Now, judge, we’re going to find out if you ever made a prisoner guilty.” And it gets no fall. Man, he has been sentencing them to be hanged, he has been sentencing them to prison, he’s been banishing them out of the society, he’s been shooting them from guns for years and years and years. Why, they’ve been sent to Old Bailey and Wormwood Scrubs, and here they go. And he’s never, in his estimation, succeeded in making one feel guilty. They always have the insouciance, as they walk out the door, “Well, I really didn’t do it,” you see? “And he’s just a dog. And somehow or another, I will bear up with all this,” see?

He’s always got this as his image: He didn’t succeed in making the fellow guilty. He pronounced sentence. You say, “Have you ever pronounced sentence?”

He will also say, “Yes. Oh yes, I’ve pronounced sentence . . . pronounced sent . . .” You probably won’t get any fall on the meter either. That’s what he’s supposed to do. Pronounce sentence.

But you say, “Have you ever tried to make a prisoner guilty?” The thing will fall off its pin.

Just run by the hour: “Well, how many prisoners do you want? Just one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight—oh, Joe and Pete and Roy...” and masses, masses and masses of prisoners. Because every time one of these ones would come up accused of some very hideous crime, he didn’t think his punishment was adequate half the time, or he didn’t think the person would experience it in any way, and he’s busy pounding with the gavel and screaming at the fellow, “Hang him by the neck until he’s dead, dead, dead!” And the prisoner looks at him, you know, and goes kind of white and walks away. All the judge gets is a reaction after that, that somebody won’t speak to him now.

See, the fact of making the other fellow guilty may have been accomplished, but the person seldom finds out about it—may have been accomplished. But what he does know for sure is that he attempted to.

You could get a great deal of response, but it’s always “try” and “attempt.”

Now, another little point rd like to bring up about Security Checking is a debatable one. This isn’t a clear cut point: whether or not you should ever take an unkind thought as an overt.

I say it’s debatable just for this reason: that sometimes it’s the only thing that is available on the PC. Apparently you can find nothing else, but they thought an unkind thought about

somebody and that was an overt and they withheld it, and it sort of frees up. And a few of these gotten off will make the person feel more friendly and so on. Yes, there is some reaction to it.

But apparently—and this is not on my own observation—but apparently, there is evidence to the effect that a person with a body of unkind thoughts against something or somebody has an actual overt which he or she is withholding underneath those unkind thoughts. And just like you see a little flag waving above the powder mine, you go along and flutter at the flag, you see, and you don't pay any attention to the mine, you just don't get anything done about it, you know? You just monkey with the flag, you know? "Well, I had an unkind thought." So you make the flag wave a little bit more, you know? And factually, there's a powder mine there.

And you say, "What have you got underneath this here critical, unkind thought?"

"Nothing. I have been a pure, honest, good Samaritan, washing my feet properly morning, noon and night, and drying it in my wife's hair. I've been doing all the moral things I should be doing" (you'd be surprised how many moral things there are), "and I have never done anything in my whole life to that person and I have no withholds of any kind."

Well, there's little plumes—there's a couple little openings we're going to have to put in up here when we start this type of Security Checking to let the smoke out of the E-Meter, because it's going to react.

So there is evidence to the effect that if you get some unkind thoughts, you ought to whistle up for the bulldozers and the cranes and the big grab hooks to reach in and find out what the devil the overt h, because the unkind thought is apparently the indicator which shows that an overt and a withhold exist. And if you audit unkind thoughts in Security Checking as themselves, you are doing the same thing as leaving a Security Check question unflat.

So this is another reason, apparently, why a PC can be given a Security Check, and they get off a lot of unkind thoughts, unkind thoughts, and then all of a sudden, why, the needle gets all gummy, and they just don't feel so good and they aren't so good, and so forth. !

Well, actually, the unkind thoughts were indicators. The little flag was waving in the breeze, and the auditor never really asked a comprehensive question such as "What have you done to William?"

"Nothing"—thooong.

"What was that? What are you withholding from William?"

"Nothing. Nothing but his inheritance and his wife. and uh . . . all of his baggage and uh . . . a few things like that," you see?

But it comes up as "Well, I thought William's tie wasn't so nice today, so that's a big overt." Actually, those things are not sufficiently important. They are not adequate to aberrate anybody. They won't do much for a case. But they are indicators. And there are several things in life which are these little indicators, and something big lies under them.

Now, it isn't necessarily true, though, that the PC can get to it at his state of case now. It's something that you could kind of—you may not even get a reaction on it on the meter. It's too unreal to the individual, see? But a little X across over in the border on the Security Check indicates to you that sometime, someday this PC is going to come up the line and then you're going to find out, "Well, William . . ."

Well, actually, he didn't do anything to William, really. But when William was dead broke and didn't have any train fare, he made him walk from London to East Grinstead. And when

he got to East Grinstead, and so forth, had made sure that the place that was going to employ him had a bad reference on him. Yet he hadn't done anything to him, you know? And it was in the rain. And he got pneumonia and died. Otherwise, he's done nothing to William. But PCs are not good at facing up to overts, so they miss them in that particular character.

All right. Well, there you are, and I hope this gives you some more data, some more interesting insights in Security Checking. But remember that Security Checking belongs in the category of metering. And unless you operate the meter, Security Checking is a very dangerous pastime. And I wouldn't attempt it if I couldn't run a meter.

Thank you very much.