

SEC CHECKING - TYPES OF WITHHOLDS

A lecture given on the
5 October 1961

Okay. This is the 5th of October, 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill. And I'm going to talk to you today about Security Checking. And boy, do you need a talk about Security Checking. Because what you don't know about Security Checking would fill volumes.

Now, of course, I am a very bad authority on Security Checking from a subjective point of view, because you realize that if anybody went into my crimes it would just be too grim! No auditor would be able to stand up to that. We realize that you see? These crimes are so innumerable because they cover such a long period of time. That's the main thing.

So I'm not talking to you from the viewpoint of sinlessness. And you must get your point of view oriented there. If I were talking to you from the point of view of total sinlessness . . . This is an optimum state which, religiously, people get into. They somehow or another lay the right pennies on the right altar and at that moment they become totally sinless. Then they can condemn everyone. And this gives them the right to condemn everyone, you see? And they can't approach this subject objectively. Unlike various people of the past who have said "Repent ye. Repent ye. Ye Kingdom of Heaven is at ye hand," something of that sort, people who do have sins, you see, find it much easier to talk about the subject. They have some reality on the subject. And let me assure you that from my point of view, if I had it all to do all over again, I would probably do the same things.

So I don't want to give you the false impression that I give you any lecture on the subject of Security Checking from the basis that my security, unlike yours, has been pure for two hundred trillion years. That would make a very great unreality. No, amongst us boys, us girls, what we have all been up to only could not bear the light of day because we think it couldn't bear the light of day.

Now, it's funny that every group that has sought to enforce sinlessness on one and all, with the stake vast punishment, condemnation, assignment to hell—that is the primary mechanism: they give you a ticket straight to hell.

Doesn't work sometimes, by the way. There was a rash of murders—I've told you this story before, I'm sure but there was a rash of murders up in the Eskimo tribes. And the Royal Northwest Mounted Police went up there to get their man, and they found out that there had been a missionary in the area. And the missionary had told all the Eskimos what was right and what was wrong and had convinced them, of course, that if they murdered anyone, they would go straight to hell and burn forever. And the idea of being warm enough for any length of time

So, you see, lecturing from the high platform of sinlessness, you very often run into the creation of more sin than you get rid of. And what's interesting is that any group which wishes to blow itself to flinders simply has to engage upon an activity of making everybody guilty of their sins. It'll hang together for a little while, and everybody will be miserable while it does, but it'll eventually blow up.

Why? Because it now gives people a complete map on how to accumulate withholds. The group mores defines what is a withhold. It says you must not be guilty of such sins and such sins and such sins, and therefore and thereby blows itself to pieces, of course, because it says everybody that has committed these sins should withhold them, even though they are saying at the same time "You must confess them." But they make confession, you see, rather rigorous.

Now, we have to understand this at the outset of Security Checking. Thou, the auditor, are not sinless. That's what we have to understand about it. And thou art not an enforcer of a public mores while thou art being an auditor. Thou art simply a Security Checker, period. You got it?

You're not the avenging angels of the Mormon church or something like this, see, while you're security checking. You're simply a person who is skilled in certain technology to attain a better frame of mind and actually a much greater honesty and decency on the part of somebody else.

You have the weapon in your hands with which to attain a greater decency, a greater state of health, a greater efficiency, a greater ability, higher ability for ARC. You've got the weapon in your hands with which to do this. There is the E-Meter and there is the Security Check, and there is you and your technology. So you are going to be able to accomplish what groups have been trying to accomplish for a long time. You are going to be able to make an honest man or an honest woman. You have the weapon with which to do this. That's very important for you to realize, because all of these other mechanisms—such as “make the person guilty,” “show the person the right way,” you see, “and the error of his ways,” and frowning upon him and punishing him in some fashion or other because he's just gotten off a withhold—are mechanisms of older groups by which they sought to enforce their mores. Because they had no way to make honest people that was positive and lasting, then they used these very poor mechanisms of “make them good and guilty,” “punish them ‘ “show them what will happen to them if they do that again.” -All of these other things are added in. But what are those?

- Those are the security mechanisms of yesteryear. Those are yesterday's tools. So you don't combine Scientology with other therapies. And that is all that you would be doing if you were trying to make somebody guilty and so forth, and doing something else with a Security Check rather than just getting off withholds.

So let us get down to a simplicity. You, the auditor, may have successfully waded through innumerable Sec Checks and be in good shape, and so forth. That doesn't necessarily mean that “thou hast been without sin all the days of thy life.” That hasn't anything to do with it, you see? It simply means that technically you've gotten up on the step. You were lucky. You came two hundred trillion years along the track with red hands and black heads, and finally got out anyhow.

Well, that's beside the point. This point is important because if you, the auditor, are still worried about your own withholds, or if you are trying to put up the presence of being—because you are a Scientologist and an auditor and maybe a Release or something like that—if you're trying to put up the attitude, you see, that you yourself are sinless, then you will sometimes Q-and-A and avoid the other fellow's withholds.

In other words, you let the public sell you the idea that because you are a Scientologist, you should never have any sins. You get the idea? What have they done, in essence? They have managed to bottle you up just like putting a cork in a bottle. Now you don't ever dare get off any withholds, you think, maybe, you see?

You can get into all kinds of odd cull-de-sacs, because we are still crossed up with the older therapy of condemnation and punishment. And that was unworkable. Let me point out that there are several people in prisons in the world. There are lots of people still doing penance in religious groups in the world. And if we add this up and recognize it clearly, we won't put ourselves in the same category. The old processes haven't worked. & don't let them work on you in reverse.

Don't ever get into a state where, because you are in a district or an area where you are holding the fort and keeping the torches burning, you never dare get off any withholds. You've permitted yourself to be sent on the road to hell. Do you see that? And your Security Checking would deteriorate. Inevitably your Security Checking would deteriorate. You would be afraid to ask people questions. You would start tacit consent. You'd start mutual avoidance of certain subjects. You get what I'm talking about, don't you?

The most serious barrier that an auditor has to overcome in Security Checking is not necessarily his own case, but a courage to ask the questions. You know, that's kind of a raw, mean, brassy sort of a thing to do.

You sit down: Here's this nice young girl. Everybody knows she's a virgin —everybody knows this. And you're in very good ARC with her, and everything is going to go along One. And then you say to her, crassly and meanly, "Have you ever committed any carnal sins of any character or another? Have you ever been to bed in the wrong place at the wrong time with the wrong man?" And put it mildly, this is a startling question. But since I've started Security Checking, I haven't found any virgins.

Well now, it requires a certain amount of brass, it requires a certain amount of nerve, to sit there and ask all these fantastic questions, you know? "Have you ever: rob, murder, burn, slain, gutted, lied?" You see? And yet it sounds like you must be sitting there running off a catalog of the penal codes of French Guyana or something, you know? And here you go! Well, that's rough enough. If all of your withholds are off, that's rough enough. You sit down—perfectly inoffensive person—and you all of a sudden start asking him this sort of thing, you know?

Well, if you've got a whole bunch of withholds that you yourself are very afraid somebody is going to get nest to, you will back straight off of the whole subject of Security Checking. And that is the only thing I see in the future of Scientology that could happen: is all auditors become "without sin"—they have never had any sin—and because they are Releases or Scientologists or something, you see, then they never dare get off their withholds because the students in the Academy might hear about it and all sorts of catastrophic actions might occur, and their reputation is utterly smashed and ruined, you see? So therefore, the best thing to do, you know, is just kind of avoid the whole subject. And that's what they'll finish up doing, too—avoiding the whole subject.

They won't have that additional élan necessary to ask this poor little innocent girl "Have you ever raped your baby brother?" you see? You know, it's just something that they would not bring themselves to be able to do, providing they themselves were actually withholding withholds. Do you see the point I'm trying to make with you here?

So you could get a broad and general disintegration if you permitted the public at large to insist that because a person was a skilled Scientologist and in good case shape, he had never done anything wrong. You see how that could be added up on you?

Now, you'll find some instructor in an Academy here and there, and he's thinking to himself, "Uuughh, if the students ever heard about this . . ." And you think—somebody in the HGC, and he's saying, "Well, I don't know. I don't know. I don't know. Last year . . . Here here's this whole subject of Security Checking coming up again, and if they found out last year that after I audited that girl, why, that happened . . ." And he sits there and he starts sweating over this thing: "What would the D of P think? What would other auditors think? What would the organization think?" So on. And the next thing you know, he's sitting in session and the question comes up. He has to make the decision whether to security check this person or go on running the level. Oh, he will go on running the level every time. He'll avoid Security Checking.

That person who is avoiding Security Checking in his own life will avoid Security Checking of other people. And you can just mark it down that if you find somebody who is ducking Security Checks in all direction, you have somebody who will not Security Check.

You would be amazed how your Security Checking improves to the degree that you yourself have gotten through the Security Checks. It is absolutely fabulous. You can almost tell whether an auditor has withholds to the degree of skill that he security checks. And the worse his Security Checking is, the more certain you become that he has withholds. That's an interesting coordination, isn't it? And yet it's a visible one.

So that going up the line and on the long haul in Scientology, you actually could get to a point where the public insists that those people who are carrying along . . . ; Because Scientology is

getting more and more important, more and more- important,. you could actually get people running an operation on you: They just start running this old therapy, you see? Because you're the leading auditor in an area, or something of the sort, you therefore must never have done anything in your whole life. Doesn't follow. But what it operates as is an ought-to-be. And you could surrender to this ought-to-be and therefore never permit yourself to be security checked because somebody might talk.

Do you realize that that action alone would slow down the whole forward impulse of Scientology by putting in lousy case shape every important auditor and person in Scientology? It could be done. And that is the Achilles' heel of Scientology. That is it. That we become so important that we must therefore— it follows in some peculiar way—be without sin, without mishap, without ever taking our finger off our number in life, and without ever forgiving it if somebody has. If we ever got into that state, we'd be finished. We'd be finished.

But we don't have to get into that state because we've got the tools which keeps a group together without the whip. See, the whip has become a useless and antiquated object. Like the electric-shock machine, it can be dedicated to the museums of tomorrow. Someday we're going to take one of these prisons here and set it up with dummies just as a showpiece of what man used to do. That's the only use you'll have for it.

You know, I think I ought to at this moment probably make you all members of a very secret society. Speaking of withholds, there is a very secret society. It doesn't do much withholding, but it is very secret, mostly because nobody recognizes it as an actual society. They all think it's a joke, see?

The society is the SPG. And the SPG. And I'm now going to make you all members of the SPG. It's the Society for the Prevention of Government. An interesting society. All you have to do to be a member of it is say you are. You know, I don't think a single revolutionary charge of any kind whatsoever could be filed against a member of this organization, because everybody prevents government to some degree, you see? It'd just be to what degree are we preventing government? The only thing governments get upset about is the overthrow of government by force, which means, of course, the setting up of another government on top of an existing government. And we aren't interested in doing that. We're just interested in preventing government.

But anyway, the mechanisms by which man has been governed had in it the idea that man was evil and therefore had to be held in line by evil practices. And if man was evil, then he had to be held in line with evil. And they never noticed that the evil in the world stemmed totally from holding man in line. That was the fascinating part of it.

You have to have been a member of a police force to recognize that the police create crime. They do it quite unintentionally, but they do create crime. They get a game caller cops and robbers going. And this game— every criminal busily plays this game. If there wasn't that much to it, why, there they'd be.

Well, for instance, there's some young fellow was walking down the street one day, and he suddenly read his name in the newspapers and reported to the police. And for the next six or eight days he was sitting under the hot lights, and they were questioning him and throwing him into cells and being mean to him and so forth. Actually, he hadn't done a thing. He hadn't even been there. He hadn't even been present. And they turned him loose after a while. He's very relieved to have been turned loose.

What do you think his ideas are going to be on the subject of police now?

Now, we start building it up from there. A society without ARC is a society which inevitably will have crime. Man is good, but he is only good to the degree that he's in ARC with existence. And when you throw him out of ARC with sections of society or whole governments at one fell swoop, he gives the appearance of being very bad. Actually, all he's

trying to do is survive and protect himself and keep the thing from going all to hell. He has his own peculiar notions about how he does this, and the primary mechanism he uses is withhold. That's how he thinks he can hold everything together—by withholding everything. The primary mechanism.

So the police are dedicated to making everybody withhold, till the mores of the criminal mainly consists of “You must not talk to the police.” Well, that's quite interesting. “You mustn't talk to the forces of law and order.”- Ah, well, that's interesting. Well, that necessarily forces somebody further out of communication with law and order.

And if you think criminals are without government, you're mistaken. They have their own government. And a very wild, gruesome government it is, too.

But the society is forced apart to the degree that people are made guilty.

Now, why does a man wind up as a murderer? Well, he has long since resigned from the human race. Long since. If you want to prevent a murder, you don't hang murderers. You make it unnecessary to resign from the human race. That's easy.

I'll give you a murder where the law was definitely at fault. Washington, D.C., a taxicab driver—if I remember the story right—had a wife and this wife kept going off with another man. And he had a hard time of it because he tried to take the matter to court, he tried to get a divorce, he tried to quiet it down, he tried to hold the home together—he took every measure he could possibly take, but of course there was no law that would back him up. You see, he didn't have any “evidence,” and he didn't have vast sums of money, you see, to buy detectives to accumulate this and that, you know? And there was nobody he could go to. And he got more and more and more seething about this, because he was basically out of communication, and he finally killed both of them.

But what was interesting to me about this particular case is that for two years this fellow had had some sort of a grievance, and there was no agency in society to remedy any part of that grievance. There was nothing he could do about it. So he finally did the last desperate jump.

Now, of course, he himself had various withholds, but were these withholds actual or unintentional? And now we get to a very interesting subject: the unintentional withhold.

This is where you get your new ARC break process, by the way, in the rudiments—is the unintentional withhold. So it's quite important, this unintentional withhold. I mentioned to you yesterday that a person very often finds himself in a position and then considers he's guilty because he's in that position. He finds himself outside the group, so therefore he feels he must have done something to be expelled from the group, which is quite remarkable.

Well, this unintentional withhold is the same thing. The person is not able to tell anybody. Now, it might be that there is nobody there to tell it to. He's not able to tell anybody. It's not that he wouldn't tell anybody if he could, but he can't tell anybody because there isn't anybody to tell it to or nobody will listen. And you'll find these all over insane asylums. You'll find people sitting around with unintentional withholds because nobody will listen to them.

They say, “Well, these bugs, they just keep crawling all over me,” and the psychiatrist and everybody says, “Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes. We know, we know, we know. Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes.” And the person just knows he isn't reaching anybody, and he just gets more and more fixed and obsessed with his idea of these bugs crawling over him, because it's an unintentional withhold. He doesn't intend to withhold it, but he finds himself in the position of doing so because nobody will listen. -

So you must take into account this as a factor. It is a very important Actor or r wouldn't have put it in your rudiments processes. “What weren't you able to tell an auditor?” Well, that makes

a withhold. Well, you weren't unwilling to tell the auditor you see? You were trying desperately to tell the auditor, but the auditor never listened.

And when you run this ARC break process, you are really knocking out unintentional withholds. And the results that you get from that particular ARC break process are quite similar to the results of a Security Check. But in this we're addressing some other subject. The Security Check is addressed to the more or less intentional withhold. But that ARC break process is addressed to an unintentional withhold. It is a withhold.

Now, there's many a criminal has walked in and said, "I've just murdered my wife," and the desk sergeant has swatted a couple of more flies and paid no attention to him. And he's walked outside, and he's gone up to the cop on the beat and he said, "I just murdered my wife," and so forth. And nobody paid any attention to him and nobody ever found the wife. And he was perfectly willing to take the penalties of society, but nobody believed him. And you get the most peculiar kind of withhold there is. You mustn't overlook this as a withhold in Security Checking. The unintentional withhold.

So that is, you might say, about the lowest rung of withholds. It's unintentional, he- didn't mean to withhold it, but nobody will listen.

All right Now we get the intentional withhold, which is a withhold because he would be punished if he admitted it And we get a different type of withhold, although it has the same mechanism and produces the same actions.

And then there is another withhold: He must withhold it because it will damage his beingness—in other words, his reputation. Those are reputational withholds. He's got an idea of what people think his beingness should be, and he's upholding his beingness by not admitting to certain withholds because other people might get another notion of him than the notion which he is trying

to broadcast. So therefore he mustn't have reputational rumors and gossips and things of this character. So therefore and thereby it's a reputational withhold. He hasn't really done anything. Well, actually, his family came from the lower marshlands of the Thames or something, down in the mud flats of Southampton or something. you know? And he just—well, he just wouldn't rather this be known, you know? His family, by advertisement, always came from Upper Berkshire. It's quite interesting.

Nova, familial connections aren't the least of it, you see? People are always trying to represent themselves as a little bit better. Well, that's fine. There's nothing wrong with that, but it results in a bunch of reputational withholds.

Now, between the last two categories there's a borderline category of things which, if they were out, people would think much less of him—you know, that kind of thing. He really wouldn't be punished, he isn't worried about it on account of beingness; he's just thinking, well, people wouldn't talk to him or something like that if they knew this sort of thing.

Well, if you'll notice, all these things add up to cut communication. And a group is based basically on communication. So a group falls apart to the degree that there is no communication, and these are the three broad categories: the unintentional withhold, the withhold for fear of punishment, and the withhold in its various grades that protect beingness. And these three things, of course, are all shattering to groups. They knock a group apart in a hurry, but in fact, up to a certain point, appear to cohere a group.

I don't know if you've ever been on Fifth Avenue or upper Fifth Avenue or in Hollywood or something like that and listened to what went on in lieu of reputation. It runs on something on the order of fifteen or twenty lies a minute when they're talking, you see? It's almost impossible to keep up with. And there's the most fantastic unreality about those particular groups. They are very unreal. And you get near those people, you see, and around in those groups, and you think, "Oooooo, I don't know," you know? It's... You don't quite know

what's going on. You're just not quite sure what is wrong there. But there just is something wrong. Well, what is wrong is that it's a group with totally cut communication lines.

Well, how can you have a group with totally cut communication lines? Well, I guess they're the only people who will listen to each other's lies, so they stay together. Something on this order.

Now, a Security Check, or any method by which you are overcoming withholds, is dedicated to the restoration of communication. And it happens that if communication is totally restored, you see—if man knew what he was doing when he made people withhold slightly—with communications totally restored in any past group of which the fellow is no longer part, he will no longer be hung up in that group. See, if you just restore his communication—it's just the ability to communicate; that's all you're restoring—why, you'll get this phenomenon of him no longer being parked on the track with that group. And that's the only thing you're basically doing. And those things, which exist in present time of course, prevent him from becoming a part of any group to which he is attached and so give him a basic isolation.

And, of course, the basic group with which you are working is not necessarily the group called Scientologists—which in itself is a powerful enough group and it has enough group to it, by far. But the group in which you are doing the withhold is a group called a session: auditor and PC. You see, now, that is a group.

And when the individual is too individuated and when he develops an unintentional withhold in that group, or the auditor conducts himself in such a way as to bring about punishment because of a withhold or a crime, or the auditor demands specious reactions from the PC, the auditor has shot the group. It is a group. It's a group of two. Auditing is a third-dynamic activity—even though sometimes it deteriorates into a second. And now and then deteriorates into a first. You burn your finger, and there's nobody around and you stand there and run it out.

Now, there, all three of these things must be pretty well patched up before you get a good group called a session. You've got to have the unintentional withholds off, that's for sure.

Do you know, the only thing that can deteriorate a profile, in twenty-five hours, is ARC breaks? Now, if you're interpreting profiles—you find a profile and here it is, there it is, and the profile has dropped. Now, it is true that profiles move and they are pictures of valences, and they do come on at the bottom and go to the top—all of that is also true. But the particularity we're speaking of now is, where the person didn't do well and dropped, you can assume the PC was being operated with an ARC break.

Now, the basis of an ARC break is being made to have an unintentional withhold from that immediate group. And that, actually, apparently, from the immediate empirical results which one observes, is more serious than an actual withhold, intentional. An unintentional withhold in an auditing session reflects more seriously on the auditing group and on the results of processing than an intentional withhold. This is very interesting.

And now we move into another category. It hardly dignify the person with the title of auditor who pulled this one, but we have an enforced withhold on the basis of improved state. And you'll find this happens every once in a while. Some person who is pretending to audit gets no results whatsoever, and then he shakes his finger in the PC's face and seeks to convince the PC that the PC has been much bettered by it all and is now Clear or something. And the PC thinks he had better not say anything to the contrary of this, and you've got that third grade of withhold. You've got something there which is protecting beingness.

You see, he's now got a withhold. His withhold is he really didn't get any improvement, and yet the auditor has forced him to admit that he got improvement. But actually what he's withholding is the fact that he didn't get any improvement, and if he said he didn't get any improvement, this would hurt his new status.

Well, you just finish auditing the fellow, and you take him out in front of the PE and you say, "He's Clear." So now the fellow doesn't dare break down and say he's abetted as hell, and so you get one of these reputational withholds.

So all three kinds of withholds can occur in an auditing session. The unintentional, the intentional and the reputational. These three things can all occur as a result of an auditing session.

You very, very seldom find the third one occurring, because very few auditors are that bad. But you sometimes find a PC who is trying to propitiate, and who is trying to tell the auditor that he feels much better now—while his head is falling off—because he doesn't want to make the auditor feel bad. You know the mechanism. So, they don't want to make the auditor feel bad so they say they feel better, and they don't. Well, now they're sort of protecting their beingness in some fashion or other by a projection. They're protecting the auditor's beingness by not feeling any worse.

You'll find all of these mechanisms can be present in an auditing session

So where you get the idea of Security Checking—and very odd, we very often develop a word in one field, you see, in one field of endeavor; and then we, because we have an agreement on that word, we develop a special term which is thereafter more or less meaningless to one and all. But we all know what a Security Check is. A Security Check is something you do in processing to make the PC better.

Well now, how did that happen? Well, basically a Security Check was developed in order to weed out personnel and keep randomness from occurring in Central Organizations. And then Area Secretaries and Association Secretaries began to find that this made people much better. And the Area Secretary would be busy spending morning, noon and night and all the weekend trying to catch up with his Security Checking, because sometimes they took, for one Security Check, twenty hours—that we'd get down to the reductio ad absurdum that Smokey told me about the other day: somebody actually turned in a whole bunch of overts, on a written questionnaire, against the Area Secretary in order to get another Security Check.

So I would say that at that point the idea of creating security with a Security Check was a—not a very useful nor workable activity. And yet we have this word. And I've two or three times halfheartedly started to change it over to the idea of "processing check," and started to call it a processing check, and so forth. But it still remains a Security Check.

Now we do have a Security Check, which is Form 7. There is an actual Security Check now in existence. So what do we call this Security Check? And I find myself, in writing a bulletin, getting into the interesting state of—I write: "Now, you should security check all . . ." "The Area Sec should security check. . ." And then, well, how do I say this? So, the best way to say it is underscore secants So you have a Security Check and you have a Security Check. So anyway, we'll let it ride, let it ride. Won't pull anything down if it stays that way.

So here we have—here we have this thing called B Security Check. Well, basically, it's trying to establish a group which ~ engage in assistance. And no assistance can occur if there is no group there on the auditor to PC. So you have right in your rudiments there a method of getting around this. And you are asking the PC for all of his unintentional withholds when you say, "His there something that you haven't been able to tell an auditor?" And you are really running a Security Check right at that point.

Now, of course the basic reply to it is "What didn't an auditor do?" which would be the games-condition response that occurred at that moment. So these two questions go together rather powerfully. One of them is asking for an unintentional withhold, and the other is asking for an auditor in a games condition. And they go bing, bing, bing, bing. And I think you'll find that since I dreamed up these new rudiments and tested them out, that you're doing much better.

I'll make a remark in passing about those new rudiments. There is an assessment that has to be done for the present time problem. I never bothered to remark on it. I thought you'd latch that as you went by.

It says, "What is unknown about that..." (or some such wording) "... problem with (blank)?" Now, you can't run a condition as the blank.

The PC says, "Oh well, I'm terribly worried. I'm terribly worried about the airiness of everything."

Well now, the auditor then can't put the thing together as "What is unknown about that problem with the airiness of everything?" You'll find this is non-functional.

What you've got to do is do a little assessment and get him to state the problem more exactly. And you do the assessment on the meter. And you try to find the terminal that is airy or the terminal that is everything. And you shake that down and you do a little bit of a terminal assessment, and he suddenly comes up and he says, "Well, the airiness of the room ' or something of that sort, or "The airiness of any car. It hasn't any hood anymore."

And you would run it—if you had to, by that time . . . You see, you only run those things which you can't get rid of with two-way comm or assessment. You realize that, don't you—that running is the way you take care of the things that didn't blow. So you always be prepared to have an ARC break, a present time problem or anything else blow before you had to run it. You just start doing an assessment on one of these undifferentiated problems, and you'll find it doesn't react anymore.

You repeat the question, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" you see? You had some enormous surges on the meter and so forth. And you say, "Well, do you have a present time problem now?" before you settle down to run the thing and you can't even get a quiver on it, see? You've blown it by assessment.

All right. Now, the PC who has a present time problem that the auditor will not take up is being given a withhold. So there is another source of withholds that cross at the present time problem level. But at the same time, the PC will very often try to withhold present time problems because he's afraid the auditor will take them up and waste session time. Because auditing is very valuable. All PCs consider auditing time very, very, very, very, very, very, very valuable. There just isn't enough auditing. That's it.

And this gets so catastrophic that a PC will force auditing where it shouldn't occur in some direction: He wants the auditing that is necessary to resolve his case, not the auditing which is just fooling around with those fool rudiments, you see, and will actually sometimes attempt to withhold a present time problem for fear that the auditor will take it up.

All right. Now, the action of running a Security Check is a relatively simple action. It requires a high degree of familiarity with the meter so that you aren't fumbling with the meter. It requires a very definite, positive knowledge of the E-Meter. It requires, in addition to that, a knowledge of whether or not the needle is reacting on the question or on the parts of the question. You have to know how to compartment a question. You have to know how to make the E-Meter tell the truth. And that is sort of high-school E-Metering.

People who didn't know much about E-Meters . . . I think there was somebody in—I think it was almost into Canada (someplace in the United States; they were just about as close to not being in the United States as they could be), got the idea that everybody had been PDHed throughout the United States by everybody else. And this became ridiculous in the extreme. And they were going all over telling everybody how everybody was PDHing everybody, and they were just having a marvelous time. And they were getting out magazines about the subject, and so on.

And the most awful quiet ensued. There was a quiet where you could have heard an engram drop, you know? Because after I explained compartmentation in an article in Ability magazine, you know, we've never heard another word. It is the most profound silence. It is a sort of a negative silence. It has texture.

Well, that's because of this. That whole nonsense took place because somebody couldn't really handle an E-Meter, they didn't know how to compartment questions. So if you ask anybody if he had ever been the victim of pain-drug-hypnosis, well, of course you were going to get a fall, a fall, a fall and a fall, because you get falls on just the word victim you get falls on just the word pain, you get falls on just the word drug, and you will occasionally get falls on just the word hypnosis. And if a person has withholds on somebody else, you will get a fall on that other person's name if you got withholds and overts on some particular line. So there's a source of five falls in one question..

"Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis from President Eisenhower?" Five falls. You see, it's falling on the words of the question. It isn't falling on the question. And the way you do that is you take the question apart. You knock out—just say the word, "Victim," and you get a fall. You say, "What was that?"

"Well, victim. Well, what not?"

"Well," you say, "what about victim?"

"Well, I always hate to be a victim.;"

"Well, what the heck? Have you ever made any victims? Have you ever accused anybody of being a victim?"

"Oh, yes, my wife. She's being a victim all the time, all the time, all the time. Always a victim. Yes, yes, yes, yes, always a victim. And she says so, what's more."

"Oh, is that so? Victim." No reaction. Ah, we got that word cooled. "All right. Pain." Clang! goes the needle, you see? You say, "Well, what about pain?"

"Oh, I've always been afraid of pain."

"Well, what about the word pain?"

"Well, oh, the word pain. Oh-ho. Oh, you mean the word pain."

"Yeah. Well, what about the word pain?" No reaction. Okay. Drug. Have you ever taken drugs? You ever give anybody drugs? Are you afraid of drugs? Anything wrong with drugs? Have you ever given anybody any drugs illegally?" Clang! "When did that happen?"

"Oh, well. My mother was very sick and I forged a prescription."

"Oh, is that so? Oh, how interesting. All right. Now, when was that?"

"Oh, such and such a time."

"All right. Thank you very much. Drug." No reaction. See?

"President Eisenhower." Clang, clang, clang, clang, clang. What about President Eisenhower?"

"Oh, nothing. I was part of a ban-the-bomb march, and we said we'd dance on his grave. Yeah. That's what that was. Yeah."

“Is that all there is to that?”

“Well, yes. I've been violently opposed to that particular activity. Oh, yeah.”

“All right. How often have you done that?”

“Oh, lots of times. Lots of times.”

“All right. How about President Eisenhower? Okay.” No fall.

“Now, have you ever been the victim of pain-drug-hypnosis from President Eisenhower?”
Now, if the person has, you will now get a fall on the question. And if you want to be absolutely sure, go back all through all the words again and compartment them.

Now, there is more to it than this on compartmentation. I noticed the other day one of the boys didn't have it quite straight. And that is, you compartment the phrases in addition to the words. You take the words and get the charge off them. And then you take the phrases and read the phrases out and see if each phrase is clean. And then when you read the whole question, let me assure you that if there is a fall, it is true. There is no withhold or charge on it unless it is true. And there won't be a single needle quiver. And that is the proper way of compartmenting a Security Check question. And you'll find you very often have to compartment them quite painfully. Otherwise you'll make some fantastic error.

Now, the first and foremost method of preventing yourself from making an error is to forget all about two needle phenomena. One of the needle phenomena you should forget about is the latent read. Just ignore all latent reads. Have nothing to do with a latent read. If the read occurred more than half a second after you finished the question read, ignore it. Just ignore it. Just drop it. Because it'll be on somebody else or is on another Security Check question. It isn't on the same question or it didn't happen to them.

Now, that's how come you sometimes wind up getting off other people's withholds. Other people's withholds will give you a latent read. So you are buying latent reads. You ask somebody, “Well, did you ever drown a cat?”

“Well, my aunt Mamie drowned a cat once.”

This would be the response. Now, that would be a latent read. You would get that as a latent read. And every time you pick up a latent read on a Security Check question, you can expect that you haven't got a withhold, you've got a red herring. And you can go chasing all over the bank looking for this red herring. And you waste more time on latent reads than any other single action in auditing.

That read—if the person has a withhold on it, let me assure you the question does not wear out. If the person is still holding on to a withhold on that question, and it's not on one of the words of the question, it's not on one of the phrases of the question—nothing of that sort—but is on the question, the more you ask it and the more he withholds, the more instant the read. It gets so that he just realizes you're going to ask the question again, you get the read. There isn't a tenth of a second lag.

You read the question—pang! It's acting. You read the question—bang! It's acting. Read the question—bang! It's acting. You see, the reactive mind is an instantaneous mind. All time is now. And if it's a really reactive mind, of course, the closer it is to reactivity, the more rapid and instant the read will be. And it's as simple as that. It is very simple. And if it is not reactive, the read will be latent. It will wait before it falls. It'll wait for half a second. It'll wait for a second. >

And an auditor who sits there and asks the question “Have you ever drowned a cat?” watching the E-Meter, and then gets a reaction, and then says “What was that?.” is going to find Aunt

Mamie drowning a cat. And it was something the PC didn't do, and it was something the PC never has withheld. You can just count on that.

One of the tricks of reading—one of the bad tricks of reading—on latent reads, is to look at the meter, then look at the question, then read the question, then look at the PC, then look at the meter. You'll catch more latent reads that way, and boy, will you miss more instant reads. You will just miss them left and right. Why? Because your eye isn't on the E-Meter at the moment you ended the question. And your eye must be on the meter needle the instant that you end that question. Otherwise, you're going to miss the twitch. So what you do is, the sequence is always: question, look at the meter and speak the question, and then look at the PC. Paper, meter, PC.

Paper: you see that the question is about rape. You don't care whether the question is exact or not. That is to say, "Have you ever raped anybody?"—you can ask that in a thousand different ways. "Have you ever contemplated rape?" "Have you ever had ideas of rape?" "Have you ever remembered anything odd about rape as something odd to you like this?" And you're going to get down to some kind of a withhold if there is one. So you look at the question, and then you look at the meter and you say the question, and then you can look at the PC all you care to. And you won't get into this nonsense about latent reads.

The way I see auditors doing this is they look at the paper and they read the question, and then they look over at the E-Meter and then they wait, and they wait, and they wait, and they wait, and they wait, and they wait, and they wait.

And the question is, what the hell are they waiting for? Because it would have occurred in a tenth of a second. If you're going to follow it through, it would have occurred in a tenth of a second. And that's the way you security check. Man, you can really tear down the line if you do that. Yeah. You can really rip up a Security Check—whammity, whammity, whammity, wham. PC doesn't even have to speak. You look at the paper: "Have you ever raped anybody?" "Nothing. That's all.

Now, if you want to go at this a little more academically, you never look at the meter at all until the PC says no. The Security Check can be totally without the meter right up to the point where he says no, at which time you repeat the question looking at the meter. And that makes for very good sessioning. When you find you're doing this easily, oh man, it just goes on and on and on.

Why are you looking at the meter if you're not trying to catch him out? See? You're trying to find out if something is reactive. That's why you're looking at the meter. Well, if the guy is going to tell you his withholds, why are you looking at the meter? That's what it amounts to.

You say, "Well, have you ever robbed a bank?"

And the PC says, "Well, if you put it that way, yes. I uh . . . uugh, yes, I robbed a bank," and so forth.

And you say, "When was that?" and so on, so on, 80 on, so on, so on. You can go a little further. "Who you been withholding it from?"

"Oh, I've been withholding it from everybody ' and so forth. "My fellow bank robbers. I didn't want them to know that . n SO forth, and then, et cetera, yap-yap, and so on. They got it all—they get it squared around. Good.

You say, "All right. Now, have you ever robbed any other banks?"

- "Uh . . . yes, I did," and so forth. "And that was pretty bad," and uh .-. . and so forth, and et cetera. ~ -

; And you say, Okay. Well, have you ever robbed a bank's?"

PC says, "Aside from those, no."

You say, "Good. Have you ever robbed a bank? Yes, what's that? What's that nest one?"

"Oh, well, that's just that little old bank down in Joliet. That'd hardly count." Got the idea?

Then you finally ask him again, "All right. Have you ever robbed any other banks?"

"cost."

You look back at the meter, you say, "Well, have you ever robbed any other banks?" Meter's quiet. Go on to the next question.

You never look at the meter until he says no. You'll find out that really holds them in session, man. That's very good sessioning when you can do it this way.

Now, the only bug that occurs when you do this is that you're repeating the question and apparently calling him a liar slightly. But you'll find out this isn't very damaging. He's already told you no, and so you confirm it.

Now, leaving a question hot is another very damaging action on an E-Meter. That's a very damaging thing to a session. Oh, that is something you mustn't do—leave a question with reaction on it. Don't ever go to the next question as long as a question is reacting. And don't ever go on to the next question unless you're absolutely sure that the question you are on has no further instant actions in it. Remember, we care nothing about the latent action.

If there's no instant action left in a question, you can go on. And if there is, don't you dare! Because if anything is calculated to throw a PC out of session from there on out, man, let me tell you, it is leaving a question hot.

You know, there's been considerable randomness occurred because of this occasionally. HGC PC, and end of session comes along and. . . One girl ran all over town telling everybody how Scientologists were all frauds and they were bums, and how they were all trying to rape her and shoot her and so forth. And she actually blew the HGC, and wrote letters to everybody that night before they could finally get hold of her. And finally they trailed her down. And they heard the rumors going around, and they wondered what all this was about, so they traced them back down and they found this one girl. And they got her down, and the question was something like "Have you ever committed adultery?" And boy, it was just falling off the pin. It wasn't an instant read. It was just—it was blowing up before the auditor could open his mouth, you know? Bang! Bang! And they got these fantastic withholds off of her, and that was it.

"Oh," she said, "I guess I committed an awful series of overts," and she hurriedly did a volte-vis and tried to straighten up everything she'd been doing.

But look at that. Isn't that interesting? It just—one question, and I think it was an end-of-intensive question. And the auditor just foolishly said, "Well, it's the end of the intensive, and that's it." Never flattened the question. I haven't got that particular particularity, but I do know that the rest of it did happen. They had about ten people running all around trying to round up what all this was about. It was just an unflat Security Check question. And you just mustn't leave questions unflat. Sure, take them up in the next session—you've got to sometimes, because one question can go five hours—has done so.

The fellow is the father of eight children. And you ask him the question "Have you ever spanked a child?" And he already feels awfully guilty about this, and he's left his family, and this is a great point of disturbance with him, and the punishment of children is a very hot

subject and so forth. And, man, you can just go on and on and on and on with this particular subject

He's just getting off withholds and getting off withholds and getting off withholds. No one cares how long it takes to clear a question as long as the auditor is working on the clearance of a question, not getting off somebody else's withholds through the PC, not trying to find out what the PC thought or heard or did about somebody else. We're interested in the PC's withholds. And as long as the auditor is getting actual withholds off the PC on instant reads, continue with the question.

The only way you can waste auditing time on the thing is to just wait there for the latent read and then take that latent read. Read occurs two and a half, three seconds after you've read the question. You read the question . . . fall. You say, "What was that?" You knucklehead!

You're immediately going to get something like this: "Well, I just thought it was getting awfully late." That's true. That's what it fell on. Didn't have anything to do with the question. Or, "Oh well, yes. That made me think of a book I read once that I wasn't supposed to read."

Look, this is a question about stealing, see? "Have you ever stolen anything?" See? Wait, wait, wait, wait—clang. "Well, what was that?" you say on the latent read.

"Oh, well, that was a book, I guess. I—I was thinking about this book."

"What about this book?"

"Well, I read this book. Uh . . . well, it would . . . it talked about stealing."

"Uh . . . well, what about that?"

Well, look, knucklehead, nothing about that, you see? I mean, there just isn't anything. It doesn't have anything to do with it except the PC's mind was out of gear for the moment. It's like finding the gear wheels disengaged, you see? And you sit there and wait, and eventually the PC is going to think about something, isn't he? And if you wait long enough, you'll always get a reaction, even if it's just on the ARC break of "Why are you so damn

quiet?" - -

It's factual, and it follows through. Serious withholds or withholds that should be gotten off the case, or that have anything to do with a case, and all the things that the person himself has done, are as a result of an instant read. And you must follow through on that particular basis.

All right. The next thing that you should pay attention to, besides clearing every question as it goes on down the line—the next thing you should pay attention to is selecting the type of Security Check. This is very important.

There is no sense in security checking somebody on something he has nothing to do with. That is rather frightful. Let's say that we have a special Security Check on the subject of boilermakers, see? So we get this girl who is a milliner. And we run a Security Check on boilermakers on this milliner. And we say, "Well, she's got clean hands because she didn't have a single fall." Well, that's for sure.

Similarly, it is equally an error to take a generalized Security Check when you know very well your PC has a particularized professional or action area. If this PC is living by some particular framework of mores... Well, let's say you're security checking a person who professionally, this life, right now, is a bank teller. Well, all right. That might go along all right and so forth. But you just never seem to get around to writing up some additional questions to give him as a Security Check. And, of course, you'll miss it every time. You just give him the generalized form of the check, and it only hits banks on about three questions.

Nov. you yourself have to be able to project your imagination and initiative with regard to that situation. You'd say, "What would be the withholds of a bank teller? What would they be?"

And, of course, it turns up at once what they would be. We're liable to find something like this: he has to stand in back of this cage all the time and he hates people. And the word of the bank is that you must be pleasant to all the customers as you take in the money. And you must stand there with a smile on your face, you see, and take in the money and pay out the money. You just can't figure out what's wrong with this guy's job, see? He's unhappy and he isn't doing well and nothing is going on and so we give him a general Security Check and it goes on and on, but it never takes into account what the man does in life. You get the idea? That is a boob. That is—comes under the classification of a boob.

We do put one together around what we think a bank teller might possibly have as withholds, and we find all sorts of very interesting things. He has held a deposit for twenty minutes so one of his customers, you see, wouldn't be overdrawn. Interesting thing. Nothing very much, but it was something to him, because, man, are you supposed to have those deposits right into the drawer, and they're supposed to pass down the endless belt and go into the machines and so forth, and so on.

And he actually has, on his own initiative, which is just—that's pretty adventurous—has actually put his fist into the machinery of the bank, and he has held it for twenty minutes. And that is a withhold to him.

And then you find maybe he's standing there with all kinds every time a customer comes up he has a game that he plays on—something on the order of an unkind thought. And he just has nothing but long streams of unkind thoughts. Every time somebody comes up—bzzzzzzz, got this long thing.

And you ask him the right question—you say, bank teller. Well, all right, bank teller—he must have customers. And you say, "Well, have you ever had an unkind thought about a bank customer?" And you're liable to run into an avalanche.

And it'd just sit on that case till the end of time unless you yourself security checked against the reality of the PC. That you must always do.

Whatever else you do with Security Checks, also security check against the reality of the PC. And that takes into account the moral codes by which he lives.

Now, you security check a Catholic sometime, or you security check a Baptist, and you'd have two different Security Checks. They'd be different. You security check an Afrikaner and security check a Zulu. You're going to have two different Security Checks, man. And they're almost vis-a-vis different Security Checks. Almost everything one thinks is right, the other thinks is wrong.

Who's to say who's right or who's wrong? That hasn't anything to do with it, which is why I gave you a little bit about the moral note at the beginning of it. The rights and wrongnesses of things are what groups have determined on in order to perpetuate survival. And that's the rightnesses and wrongnesses of things. It's what is survival to the group, not whether you are enforcing the mores of a group because you are so sinless. So you have to actually be able to security check both sides of the fence.

Now, security checking a cop would be quite different than security checking a criminal, of course. Security checking a soldier would be quite different than security checking a chambermaid. It would be different.

So if you omit specialized Security Checking and putting together a list of questions that concern the activities of the person—if you omit this entirely— you've boobed.

Another thing that you do, that you mustn't do, is read a Security Check as a repetitive question. "Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Go Have you ever raped anybody? Good Have you ever raped anybody? Goods Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Have you ever raped anybody? Good. Ever raped . . .?" Who are you auditing?

Your job is not to run a repetitive question at all, but to get off withholds. The auditing consists of getting off withholds.

Well, how do you get off withholds on the subject of rape? Well, some fellow says, "Well now, I just don't want to answer any questions about that at all. No, I just don't think you'd better be asking me any question. Let's go on to the next one. We'll still be friends. But we'd better go on to the next question."

Well, how are you going to get around that? You can still ask the question "What have you got against rape?"

"Oh," he'll say, "well, it isn't what I have against rape, it's what other people have against rape."

"Well, who has things against rape?"

"Well! My mother and my father and the public and the preacher and the parson and—and the state," and so forth.

"Well, when did all these come down on you on the subject of rape?"

"Well, that was when I got in the newspapers on the subject."

"Oh, when was that?"

That is what is known by pulling a withhold from the back door.

Now, the next thing you must remember is that a withhold is generally a withhold of an overt act against the mores of the group. Now, actually, the enforcement of the mores of the group to make other people withhold is the overt act of withholds. You get the idea? You're enforcing the mores of the group against another person to make them withhold. It's the overt act of making people withhold, see? So you err whenever you don't ask the make-guilty question.

You can take every Security Check you've got and simply add an additional question below each level on "Well, have you ever made anybody guilty of rape?"

You get this girl. She keeps telling you, "I have been aped. It isn't that I am withholding raping somebody; I have been raped." And the question is still hot.

And you say, "How in the name of common sense am I ever going to clear this question? How am I going to clear this question? How could I possibly clear the question? Because she just says—and of course she's an offended member—no, she hasn't raped anybody. She's been raped." Well, if you Q-and-A and just go off and say, "Well, we're not security checking now. She has a bad engram, and vie might as well run this engram and find out all about all of this rape, and when she was raped and so forth," are you still security checking or are you doing something else? You're doing something else. You are auditing processes, you are running engrams, but you're doing something else. You're not security checking.

So you don't stop security checking and start doing something else. You go on security checking. In other words, get off the withholds. But, of course, the overt act of a withhold is making somebody else withhold. And, of course, the moment you ask the question "Well, whom have you made guilty of rape?"

“Oh, well,” you get a nice big meter reaction, and “Him, of course, and him and him, and them and them and them, and them and them and them, and them and them,” and so forth.

“Well, have you made anybody else guilty of rape?”

“Yes. Well, them and them and them.”

“All right. Anybody else you made guilty of rape?”

“Uh . . . well, no.”

“Anybody else you made guilty of rape? What was that?”

“Well, it’s just—I’m just restimulated by the whole thing.”

“Well, have you—have you ever raped anybody?”

“Yes.”

In other words, the make-guilties all lay on top of an actual fact; She been raped all right, but Shakespeare’s statement “Methinks the lady protest too much” can be Hobson-Jobsoned over: “Methinks the PC protest too much.” And whenever the PC “protest too much,” you are looking at the boiling broth. And you might as well pick the pot up and look under it, because you’re going to find fire.

“You shouldn’t be asking me that question. It is insulting.” Oh, man. Why don’t they run up a signal halyard and By fifteen flags from it, you know; get blinking lights going in your face? Because that is the one question that is hot.

And of course a person who has fantastic motivators which just keep rocking and rocking and rocking... The person says “Well, I haven’t ever raped anybody; I have been raped. And that is why it is falling.”

No, remember your original question was “Have you ever raped anybody?” and you got an instant read. And the facts of the case are that the PC has, but the PC has tried to make other people guilty to such an extent that this lies on the top of it as the overt from the withhold motivator. You see? So there’s what you got.

So you ask the made-guilty questions any way you want to phrase it. “Have you ever protested against . . . ?” “Have you ever accused . . . ?” Do you see? This type of questioning for each subject matter of a Security Check will be found to be very, very beneficial in freeing up a whole security question. Because, of course, it is making other people withhold, and when you get the overt off, then the PC gives up his withhold. It’s not actually, you see, an additional question. It is another way of asking the same question.

And then you come back and you always leave a Security Check question that has fell [fallen]—you always leave it with the same wording that you ask it in the first place that produced the fall. Never miss that. And that is usually, for your ease, the way it is written on the paper.

You’ve been asking all sorts of things about rape. You said, “Well, have you ever made anybody guilty of rape? Have you ever . . . rape?” and so forth and 90 on. And “All right. Have you ever had unkind thoughts about rapists? What have you done? Have you ever wished you were raped?” It doesn’t matter, whatever you were asking, you see? What produced the reaction—the reason you’re asking these questions—is “Have you ever been raped?” And the question you’re trying to clear is the one that produced the reaction. So you always repeat that question in the same wording to see if there’s any additional reaction before you leave it. And

then you're sure that that question is clean. No matter how many other variations you ask—and you should ask variations in order to get the thing cleaned up—you go back to the same question again before you leave it.

In other words, always go out by the same door you entered. Don't go ducking out the side door. You've cleared up "Have they ever made anybody guilty of rape?" see? So you say, "Well, that's it. We'll go on to the next question."

Oh, you missed, and you will leave a question hot if you do that.

All right. I've tried to cover here some of the elements of Security Checking. You can tailor up Security Checks any way you want to. You can always add to a Security Check. You can always add to a Security Check. You may never subtract from one. The reason why we lay that injunction down is that somebody who has a withhold on a subject who runs into it on a list will then not be tempted to avoid it.

And you would be fascinated at some of the Security Check questions being made up by people who have buttons on the subject. You never quite read as much of an avoidance as you get when you do that. You take somebody who's sitting down here in Dartmoor Scrubs and have him write a Security Check up on the subject of criminals, and you get a three-question check

But you ask him to write—he has never been a soldier, and you ask him to write a Security Check question on the subject of soldiers, and he writes you eighteen pages. It's quite interesting.

But people subtract from Security Checks where they have withholds. So you lay down this injunction; you say, "Always give the standard Security Check; add anything to it you please. Write up any special check you care to, as long as you give a standard check too."

And then that keeps anybody from ever indulging in tacit consent and avoiding Question because "We know, of course, that this person has never stolen anything from the organization. Of course we know that, so we just won't ask that question." And sometimes a person does this in all innocence. It just seems to him like the question would not produce any particular result. That's all there is to it. And then somebody asks him the question and it goes hotter than a pistol.

And he says, "But I never have! I just never have." And you go tracing it down, and he has. He actually doesn't remember having done so. But the meter knows.

And the one final injunction on this is please believe the instant read of the meter. A person who is telling you a lie, a person who has a withhold, gets an instant read on the question. And if they're getting a read, a needle reaction, there is a withhold. And never buy anything else.

I have seen a slug of hours of duration with the needle continuing to react and the PC saying no and almost in tears over it, because the PC cannot remember, the PC cannot differentiate it, the PC cannot tell what that withhold is. It just doesn't seem to elude anybody. And for the auditor to leave it is a serious error, because at the end of those hours, so help me Pete, it was found, and it dad clear.

Now, I've had people with some pretty nasty withholds, on the meter. And I've never failed to have the meter react when the question was charged, 80 long as it was against the moral code of the person I was checking. That was the important point. And it's quite interesting to watch it. It will not wear out. The question will not wear it out. That is what is fascinating. You can ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it, and ask it—and it won't wear out. It'll just produce, if anything, a little faster reaction. Until the withhold is given up, the action occurs.

So don't ever think your meter is busted. Make sure that your meter isn't, before you start the session. That's the time to make sure the meter is all right, not in the middle of the session, thinking, "Well, it's just reacting. This rock slam must be because some dust has gotten into it." No, the rock slam is coming from a withhold if you're on a Security Check. Okay?

Audience: Right.

All right. Well, I hope this clarifies a few points for you OD the subject of Security Checking, because you're going to find this is a very, very important subject. It's going to be with us for a very, very long time. It's one of the basic skills of the auditor and is the first thing that an auditor should know how to do very, very well. He should know how to security check well. Because you can do anything under the sun, moon and stars with a Security Check. You can do anything with it. And the better you are at handling the basics and fundamentals of Security Checks, then the better you will be at making them work.

Thank you.