

E-METER

A lecture given on
19 May 1961

Thank you.

Well now, we've gotten ourselves a few cases moving along, and every time I see you, why, you're less plowed in. This is "Operation Reverse the Furrowing."

Okay, let's see, what is this? This is the 19th of May 1961. This is Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Now, once upon a time there was a knucklehead . . . once upon a time. And he kept doing things to people . . . kept doing things to people. And then a few trillion years later, he said they'd all been done to him. I'll give you an example of this . . . in a moment. But right now I want to talk to you something about E-Meters and assessments. This is very, very important. Then I'll tell you more about this knucklehead.

The E-Meter is a very peculiar instrument. It is absolutely accurate. But when somebody is so knuckleheaded as not to ask the right questions, of course, it apparently gives wrong answers. An E-Meter is as accurate as the auditor asks the right questions. It itself is totally accurate. But you have to find out what it is talking about. And it is not necessarily talking about what you are talking about as the auditor. But it is talking about something, and the probability is that it is very close to what you're talking about, when it's talking sporadically, but not quite it.

And when you ask the right question, the E-Meter then reads, hard and consistently. But the near-right question reads inconsistently. So when you get inconsistent reads, your question is not quite right. That is a general rule . . . not quite right. But when you ask the right question, the E-Meter will then tell you it's the right question by reading consistently.

You can ask for a withhold . . . something on this order: You can say, "Well, are you withholding anything about your house?" And he returns: "You burn them down when they're full of stock! Always produces a hell of an ARC break in the vicinity when you do that sort of thing. Leave the house alone but burn the stock up. Ugh-hu! That's best."

And nothing is going to happen either way because they haven't learned this rule: The E-Meter reacts and clears on the exact right question. That's what it reacts and clears on. But it will give you an indicator. It is nice enough to tell you "you're getting warm." But when you don't get a consistent read on an E-Meter, you are just warm; you're not red hot. When you're right on it, it will read consistently and it will clear at once that the pc comes up with what it is. That is, on a Security Check.

And if it is the chain on which the pc is totally plowed in on from one end of the track to the other, it will just go on reading and reading and reading until it's audited. The rule is, you have to audit the things that don't clear on a question. That is the rule . . . a general rule . . . where it comes to auditing, or where it comes to clearing rudiments.

You say to the pc, "Something or other, something or other," and you get a fall on the rudiments. And you say, "Well, do you have a withhold? Is this what that's falling on? You withholding anything?"

And the pc says, "No." The E-Meter goes clink-clank. It'll go falling on just about what it's falling on . . . on just exactly what it's falling on.

And you start probing for this thing and all of a sudden you say, "Well, is it something about me?" Your fall becomes steadier and more consistent.

And then the pc says, "Well, yes, last night I told somebody you were a bad auditor." The fall disappears.

But the knucklehead then audits it. Having cleared the meter, he now goes into “What have you done? What have you withheld?” You got the meter clear on rudiments; why are you trying to do anything else?

The rule about rudiments is simply this: Rudiments are there not to run the case, but they are there solely and only to set up the pc so that he can be audited and will stay in-session . . definition of which is “willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case.” And that is what you’re trying to get him to do. and if the rudiments are too flagrantly out, it won’t happen.

But setting the meter on a third-of-a-dial drop and going over the rudiments . . if you do not get a wild or significant fall, you just leave them alone. You know, with a third-of-a-dial drop you can’t see some of the meter reactions, so you just blind yourself to that much meter reaction. That is, that meter reaction which you cannot see at a third-of-a-dial drop will not get the pc out of session. Have you got that? It will not take the pc out of session.

So advancing the sensitivity knob to a point where you get a sixteen-dial drop on a can squeeze, and then clearing the rudiments of every flick on that enormously expanded scale: You’re just wasting auditing, because clearing them all up, you’re running the case with rudiments.

But if you clear rudiments on a third-of-a-dial drop . . and mind you, do that carefully. When you set the meter with a third-of-a-dial drop, why, you don’t see any fall, any theta bop or anything. Mind you, there’ll be falls and theta bops . . are there but they’re obscured by the fact that you’re reading from the still needle. You follow me?

You told the guy to squeeze the cans. Cans squeezed . . you got a third-of-a-dial drop. You just leave the sensitivity knob right there. Ask for the rudiments; it doesn’t move. Now, a little flick while you got it set at a third-of-a-dial drop, you’d investigate. If it did move it, you would investigate it. But usually a little flick like this just blows up.

I mean, “Do you have a present time problem?”

“Yes, I have a present time problem. I’m worried about going out and putting in a pound note into the parking meter.” (Or whatever the police are demanding these days.)

“Well, do you have to do that now?”

“Well, no. I don’t have to do it for half an hour.”

“Well, would it be all right if at a half an hour, I remember it and send you down there?”

“Yes, that’ll be fine.” Drop disappears.

“Do you have a withhold?”

“Yeah . . no, no, no, no-o-o-o, no, no.” You get a fall, get a flick, get a theta bop. Ah, you better find out what it is. But that’s on the sensitivity knob set at a third-of-a-dial drop.

Now, if your sensitivity knob was set at 16 and you got the equivalent of . . you know, the can squeeze drives the needle across and it bounces off the pin, you know? Well, that’s actually probably set for about five or ten dials of drop on one can squeeze, see? Now you ask him “Do you have a withhold?” . . why, hell, you can even read his heart beating! See?

It’ll register this closely: “Are you withholding anything?” And 42 trillion years ago he shot down a pilot in flames and was very careful not to let his own body drop or get burned up. So he was withholding his own body, you see? So, “Are you withholding anything?” Yes, you’d get a reaction on the needle.

But, look, that reaction is his case, and it is not adequate to stop a pc from going into session. You got it? The purpose of the rudiments . . . 100 percent, the purpose of the rudiments are only these: to set up the case so that it can be audited. The purpose of the rudiment is not this: to run the case. That's not the purpose of the rudiment.

There are numberless things I could tell you about rudiments. But ordinarily, in ordinary auditing, it totally suffices to make sure you get all of the falling or observable ARC breaks, problems, withholds off . . . and objections to the room. You see, that's totally adequate. They fall, get them off . . . with the sensitivity now set for a third of a dial.

Oh well, how about the E-Meter that can't be retreated on its sensitivity? I'm afraid you've got a rebuild coming. There isn't anything you can do to the meter apparently (I was experimenting with it last night) but put a new sensitivity rheostat in it. That can be done rather cheaply. HCO will do it for you.

But after a person gets about halfway Clear, a can squeeze on old meters at zero . . . old British meters is what it mainly is . . . when the sensitivity knob is set way down, all . . . as low as it can be set, you get a dial drop. And you're running somebody like that? Now what are you going to do? Now what are you going to do? This rule no longer is observable. Well, what you're going to do is get a new rheostat put in the E-Meter that can be turned down to a third-of-a-dial drop, okay? Simple, huh?

And meanwhile, before you do that, if it falls on a rudiment, sigh and clean it up. Because you're not going to be sure whether it needs cleaning up or not. So you have to use judgment as to whether or not it needs much cleaning up

In the first place, people who fall well on a can squeeze . . . they aren't bothered as much as some other people by ARC breaks, unless they're being audited by some auditor on whom they have a lot of charge. Then they'll ARC break.

But the usual cotton-picking ARC breaks that don't amount to anything . . . ah, they don't really, terribly disturb them. The better off a case gets the less it's disturbed by the environment. Definition of a Clear is he can handle the environment and isn't disturbed by it. So of course, as you start progressing toward Clear, the can squeeze gives you a greater and greater fall for the test. And the nearer a person gets to Clear, why, the more drop you will see on a can squeeze with the sensitivity knob set as it used to be.

Originally, the fellow comes in and you turn the sensitivity knob up to 16, you put the cans in his hands and he gives a can squeeze, and it falls a thirty-second of a dial. Well, this fellow is going to endure; he's obviously built out of solid oak.

The same setting, if you care to observe a meter, running SOP Goals . . . supposing you did a long and thorough assessment. You wouldn't do a thorough assessment on this guy. You wouldn't do an assessment at all. You would do a Joburg Security Check and then you would give him a general run on the Prehav Scale, and you'd clear up some levels on the Prehav Scale . . . just general, you see? And then when you got it so it was looking much better, and the tone arm was reading much better, and you knew you weren't reading a dead thetan, and you did get a little bit of a drop on the can squeeze, and so forth; you could go ahead and assess him.

So you go ahead and you complete your assessment, and you'll notice suddenly that it's sitting at a fairly low sensitivity setting and the third-of-a-dial drop occurs very easily. The case is much looser. The needle is much looser. You follow this?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

That's the way you handle rudiments and handle an E-Meter. But Mr. E-Meter will tell you that you are close, if it's answering sporadically. But if you're answering dead on you'll have this interesting experience: You are running a Joburg Security Check, and you ask the level . . . you ask the precise level "Have you ever raped anyone?" And the needle falls in response to that question . . . that Joburg Security

question falls . . something on the order of about quarter of a dial, and the pc says, “No,” and it falls a quarter of a dial. And you say to him, “Well, have you ever really raped anyone?” and it falls a quarter of a dial.

Now listen, you can go down the list of all the things he might possibly have raped, or done sexually that might be considered rape or anything of the sort, and if it’s not exactly on, the exact same fall will continue.

On a withhold you’ve got a reversal of the rule. The E-Meter falls in response to the question. In this case, it continues to fall if the question isn’t asked.

So there are two phenomena in which you’re involved here: One is you have to ask the right question to get the fall . . the exact, right question to produce the consistent fall . . and the other one is to get rid of the fall, you understand. And that requires communication from the pc. And in failure to communicate, it won’t go away.

Don’t think your meter is busted because you were asking this question and hours later he just never seemed to get through a Joburg Security Check. He will always get the same fall. Always, always, always, forever, practically till the end of the world, would he get the same question, “Have you ever raped anyone?” You can ask him, “Is it this lifetime?” and you get the fall. “Did you rape somebody in this lifetime?” You get the fall. “Did you rape somebody in your family?” You get the fall. You understand? He has raped somebody. That is it. You have asked the right question.

Now, having asked the right question, you see, is one part of this comment. The only way you’ll get rid of the fall is for the thing to be answered.

So first, there’s the right question that produces the fall, and the second phase of it is the answer that eradicates the fall. And it must be . . surprise, surprise . . the exact answer.

The precision instrument called the E-Meter depends, then, upon the exact question to get the response and the exact answer to clear it. Now do you follow me?

Now, the individual who continues to fall on a certain terminal is so involved in electrical masses . . exchanges, energies, and so forth . . in the mind, that that terminal has to be audited. Only then do you get rid of it. So it is not, in that case, just the one right answered; it’s enough thousand right answers to clear it.

Therefore, when the preclear does not give you the exact answer to the auditing command every time, you will continue to get it to read and auditing will continue to infinity.

You must get an answer for every auditing question, and it must be the answer to the question you asked. Otherwise, it continues to read on the meter. Well, you’re not fighting the meter. The meter only indicates what’s still banging in the fellow’s mind.

In other words, a preclear could be audited for ten thousand hours without ever answering the auditor’s question, and still be reading the same way on an E-Meter. How do you like that? You got that?

So that a case that hangs fire, falls into just these categories: A present time problem is there consistently and forever. This is what you call a hidden standard sort of a thing. The guy’s got a long duration present time problem, and he knows when he will get better: It’s when his hair stops standing up when he sees a horse. And he waits for this endlessly to start happening. He tests out his auditing results. He has an intensive, and he goes and he finds a horse. And he very carefully puts his hand back here, and he looks at the horse. And if his hair doesn’t stand up, he says, “I got some progress,” and if his hair does stand up, he says, “Well, that auditor’s a bum.”

You think I’m joking, but that is true of every case that walks the street that is having a rough time . . it’s by a hidden standard. So part of your Goals Assessment must always get out these hidden standards into view.

Hidden standard is our technical term. The pc will call them “problems of long duration” if they’re fairly sane, but they also respond to things of “difficulties in life.” A word I commend to you as very useful . . . “Are you having any difficulties in life?” “Now, what difficulty would have to change for you to know that the auditing was working?” Or more broadly, “What difficulty would you no longer have if Scientology worked on you?” “What difficulty would have to happen in order for you to know that auditing was working?” You got that? This is the hidden standard.

I’ll show you what happens when you don’t address the hidden standard. The individual very nicely goes through a whole auditing session, gets along just dandy through the auditing session, gets along splendidly, seems to be making progress; and at the end of session said, “I didn’t make any part of my goals.”

Well, maybe the goal that he gave you at the beginning of session was just to sit there throughout the session. And you look at this in utter amazement. He did sit there throughout the session. He must have made his goal for the session, but he tells you he didn’t make any part of his goals. Well, you’re an utter knucklehead if you don’t consult your E-Meter and say, “Do you have any particular gains that you will have to make or establish in order to know that auditing is working? And if so, what would they be?”

“Oh!” the fellow would say, “Oh, well, yeah, if you ask me that. Yes, as a matter of fact. Yes, yes I do have. You see, every time I look at a horse my hair stands up on end, and I feel right now, actually, that if I did look at a horse, my hair would still be standing up on end when I looked at the horse.”

He’s got every single auditing command you have given him circuited this way. He audits women so that he will correct his relationship with horses. He puts a via on every command answer.

One man we found had actually . . . for something on the order of five or six hundred hours, at least, of auditing he addressed every auditing command through this electronic engram, in the firm and utter and complete belief that it would change him from being a man to a woman. And what was the answer to this question: “What would have to happen in order for auditing to work?” This fellow’s answer was “I would have to become a woman.”

Now, that’s what you’re going up against when you ask the pc, “Are you making any progress?” And don’t let me catch any of you going out of here and auditing anybody after this, up against a bunch of hidden standards that are utterly unknown to you. Just don’t let that happen because that is silly! It means that the pc violates this E-Meter thing. He is not giving an answer to the auditing command. He is taking the auditing command, fitting it to something else and then answering his impressions.

Of course, your needle doesn’t clear. Not only does your needle . . . doesn’t clear, your tone arm doesn’t move. The case does not progress. The dead thetan reading at 2.0 never reads any place else than 2.0. Your E-Meter characteristics don’t change. Your needle does not get looser. Your sensitivity knob does not have to be set lower.

If your E-Meter isn’t shifting during the course of auditing, the first thing to suspect is that you yourself have got the wrong curve on this. See? There’s something wrong; you’ve goofed somehow. You did a Prehav Assessment, said “Well, the fellow is obviously resisting everything so the obvious level is ‘resist,’ “ and you just went on by . . . knew it was barns . . . and you went right on by and ran “resist” and the tone arm didn’t change, and nothing changed and . . . wrong level. Bum assessment. You get the idea? Bum assessment will give you that. You aren’t asking the right questions. Or the individual has one of these hidden standards of long duration, and so forth, and he addresses everything around it.

A pc will not improve if he has a present time problem of long or short duration which is absorbing all of his attention. He will not improve in auditing. So you might as well take care of it and get it out of the way right now. He will not improve if he has withholds. Poetically, God ‘elp him, he will not, not, not, not, not, not, exclamation point, improve if he has overts on his auditor he is not disclosing, if he has overts on Scientology he’s not disclosing, if he has overts on the principals of Scientology.

For some reason . . . not because we dreamed it up, because it happens to be true. I scouted this out the first time, many, many years ago, about 1954. Most of the returns were in for the people who had attacked Dianetics. There were about twenty-one of them in the United States who had . . . well, a lot of them had actually taken money to do us in and were still with us. With the exception of seventeen who were either in jail or dead. And as they made up a primary death list for that particular time, and a primary difficulty list, I looked for some common denominator amongst them to find out what this was all about. And it was only one common denominator: Some of them had literally had, in the period of four years, hundreds and hundreds of hours of auditing. In the case of Joe Winter, over a thousand hours I'm sure . . . maybe even two thousand hours of auditing. And the common denominator of all those people is they'd never made a single case gain in all their auditing.

That was the first time this one showed up. It's a grim and ghastly thing. It's a built-in, automatic protective mechanism in Dianetics and Scientology. The fellow who accepts money or goes out of his way to injure auditors, organizations, the subject, principals in it, has just plain condemned himself to eternity. That's all. He's just condemned himself to an eternity of there he is, going on down. Honest, sometimes it makes me gasp because I've gotten so much data on this by this time, at the actual adventurousness of how some of these characters will swap a couple of quick sixpences for the next two hundred trillion. Doesn't look to me like a good bargain.

Now, oddly enough . . . strangely enough, a primary fault I have is honesty. I will tell you what I know, or what I think I know, when I know it. And if I find out it isn't true, I will tell you it isn't true. And if it happens to be discreditable along the line, I'm afraid I will tell you.

Along with that goes the necessity . . . I would say better "has gone the necessity" . . . to keep enough hope going to get the job rounded up. That has been part of the responsibility. To have not done so would have been an overt act.

Now, I frankly tell you, I would not tell you that there was a self-protective mechanism in Dianetics and Scientology out of an anxiety to protect Scientologists, organizations and the principles of Scientology and the people at the top of it. I just wouldn't tell you that, that's all. In the first place, I don't believe I'm so weak that I would need such a mechanism to protect it or to protect you, you see? And for this other thing to be built up as an inside, built-up, completely arranged, booby-trapped mechanism is always filling me with a little surprise. I think if you listen to a lot of tapes, you'll hear me being surprised about this in other lectures. It's the darnedest thing I ever saw. It's just horrible. It's utterly horrible.

Gracey Zilch goes out and does in an auditor . . . busts up his marriage and spoils his reputation . . . and for the next thousand hours of auditing, Gracey Zilch is right where she is or worse. And nobody seems to be able to do a single thing for Gracey Zilch. Isn't that remarkable? It is just fantastic.

Now, religious organizations have tried desperately to protect themselves with things like blasphemy, and protect themselves with other you-must-nots and thou-shalt-nots. You know, everybody talks about the Ten Commandments. Have you ever counted them? In an actual, original Old Testament there aren't ten commandments . . . columns of them: Thou shalt not eat pork that has been uncleanly raised, or something of the sort. Thou shalt sell it to a traveler instead.

What it amounts to is you can't look for help from a quarter on which you have tremendous overts. Even though the help were given you, no matter how gratuitously, it wouldn't be accepted by you because it's always looked on as a betrayal. Why is it looked on as a betrayal? Because one has betrayed that help. So of course, when one is audited under these conditions, he has this remarkable frame of mind: that everything anybody is saying or doing to him is calculated to betray and destroy him. So the more he is treated the worse he gets. Now, that happens to be our little, built-in self-protective mechanism.

Now, because we are the only science of mind that has ever come up the line and sat back on its haunches and proved itself across the board, we can also undo that. If we want to take enough trouble we can also save Gracey Zilch.

One auditor sits on her head and the other straps the cans to her feet and a third, as she's being held down, locates what she has been doing on an E-Meter, you see . . something like a Joburg or something like this, you see . . and actually gets the thing taped out and then finally says, "Well, Gracey, we've got the goods on you. And now why don't you go off someplace and realize that if you don't do something decent about this, you're sunk." And I don't care it might take two hours, two years or two lifetimes; sooner or later she's going to come in and tell all. Fascinating, huh?

We can undo it. So, in a little, tiny, microscopic way, not accepting a half a million dollars from the Communist Party of America to do in a Central Organization; that of course killed a man. I bet you right now he's tagging around in a schoolroom someplace or another, wondering what is wrong with him and why he feels so spinny. Fellow by the name of Don Purcell. He died. He did this, and for three years he just went on a toboggan and died. One of the reasons was is nobody was interested enough to even try to do anything for him. And the other thing was he had made it impossible to arrive at that data earlier by causing such a tremendous disturbance that he slowed up research.

I felt like telling him one time . . I just sort of felt it in my bones . . I felt like telling him once or twice, "Look, maybe someday your wife is going to get sick or your kids are going to get sick or something is going to go really wrong in your existence and you're going to need us like mad, you see? And here you are, doing nothing but getting us so upset and disturbed that we actually can't do very much in the way of research, and you're slowing us down. Maybe someday we will know something that you really need to know desperately."

And sure enough, it happened to work out. Of course, there is this . . there is this: I would say that it wasn't totally, probably, the overt-withhold mechanism, I think Suzie's postulates had something to do with it. Because if she ever wanted to see a man dead, it was that man.

Anyway, let's get over to . . let's get over to some more about this E-Meter now. Do you see that if this on a much more dramatic basis can exist, your failure to find out your auditor has . . pardon me, your pc has been nattering about his auditor between sessions . . your failure to find this out while running rudiments . . is to throw away a session. Do you see that? Because just as it isn't very terribly important, so it isn't very hard to pick up, but it is important enough to knock a whole session out or maybe a whole intensive out.

So when they've got withholds in life in general which separates them from the human race and all livingness, or in particular when they have withholds on the auditor, auditors, Central Organizations, people in the Central Organizations, you see, there goes the case, there goes the intensive, there goes the session. You want to do something for this guy; this guy will give you a failure. Why? Not because of anything that you did to him particularly, but because he just goes around nattering about it.

When people are not Clear, if they know this perfectly, they actually go around sort of holding themselves in a frozen "don't think anything bad," "don't think any bad thoughts," you know? And then when they get a little bit better they relax, and they think real vicious thoughts. And then they give them up as withholds; that's a sort of a revenge in itself. And then later on, if they happen to have done something that they found out the auditor . . you know, and realized suddenly that the auditor wouldn't like it or something like this, why, you ask him for it and they give it to you.

So overts are more difficult to clean up . . that is, withholds; overts which are withheld . . are more difficult to clean up the worse off a case is. It's proportional. They go down into not realizing what an overt is and they will go out and do some of the wildest things. The psycho band will go out and do some of the most incredible things and not consider them overts at all. They won't fall on a meter.

So here's a modification on your third-of-a-dial drop. You set it for a third-of-a-dial drop and run the rudiments but your third-of-a-dial drop only goes for those rudiments and the assessment, which don't consist of getting off withholds. So when you get that withhold, reach over here, crank up your sensitivity, ask for the withhold and strip it good, you see?

But if it is too active on withholds and it's going bang, bang, bang, bang and you don't clear it right away by asking what it is: Joburg Security Check. You don't run anything further than the rudiments and that. In other words, run the rudiments and then enter into Joburg Security Check.

By the way, a Joburg Security Check is done in Model Session form. It's not done outside of Model Session form; nothing is these days. There isn't anything done outside of Model Session these days . . . nothing So your rule about the sensitivity knob is that the only exception to a third-of-a-dial drop . . . and I tell you this very advisedly . . . the only exception in running SOP Goals and its preparatory steps to the third-of-a-dial-drop setting is when you are after withholds. And of course, that includes at once the Joburg Security Check and it includes the withholds in the rudiments. You got it? Hm? That makes it very easy, doesn't it? Magnify your read when you're after withholds. If you're not after withholds and you're just generally assessing: third-of-a-dial drop. If you're auditing and running: third-of-a-dial drop. If your meter insists on dropping more than a third-of-a-dial drop, get a new sensitivity rheostat installed in it. I'm afraid there is no other answer.

I am going to be in very, very hot communication with our manufacturers, making sure that it can be cut down to where it would almost read in reverse on a bad-off case. You know, just read in reverse.

You know, by the way, it's because you can't get your sensitivity up high enough that you get the reverse can squeezes. That is the usual action. It reads backwards. Did you ever see a guy rise when you squeeze the cans? Well, you just haven't got enough sensitivity on it. You can get the sensitivity up, up, and if the sensitivity can't be gotten up high enough he will still reverse. Get the sensitivity up high enough . . . I think now; I suppose . . . you'll get rid of that one. All right.

Now, in assessing for goals, Assessment by Elimination, you of course, then, set the meter for a third-of-a-dial drop. Why is this? If it is set for more than a third-of-a-dial drop you are auditing the case, not assessing him. You are auditing a process known as erasing goals by repeater technique. You see that? It'd be erasing goals by repeater technique, and it's not a very good process. Isn't necessarily harmful. As a matter of fact it'll benefit a case, but it's very lengthy and it can go on for a very long time.

Now, what you're trying to do in Assessment by Elimination is get them so they don't read with the meter set for a third-of-a-dial fall. Once more, if your meter can't be retarded far enough on the sensitivity knob, why, you'll just have to get your meter fixed so it will. Because an Assessment by Elimination is not a process by which you seek to reduce the goal to no electronic reaction in the mind. It is only this: It seeks to null the goal so that it only does not act on an E-Meter which is set for a third-of-a-dial drop. You got it? And it permits you then to get the goal which will fall and fall and continue to fall and go on and fall, that has to be addressed by auditing. The only thing you're trying to do is that.

Now, we have proved out this fact: That if you erase all of a person's goals, the person still has a goal which falls . . . still one goal that falls . . . if it's erased! You see, that's a valuable datum. Let's not lose it. If you erased by repeater technique every goal the person came up with the person would still have one goal. That's interesting, isn't it?

All right, you don't have to erase them all to have just one goal. You have to null them on a meter set with a third-of-a-dial drop and if you do you will still have the goal . . . the one goal. You understand? See, it's different. It isn't actually erasing them. It is actually erasing them as far as the meter is concerned. You see, you just take the edge off so they don't fall. Well, that's it. And it gives you a fast assessment . . . rapid assessment. This is mainly in the interest of speed. That's all it's in the interest of

I imagine if this were 1325 when people had a great deal more time, or something like this, or on some planets like Jupiter, we'd probably be trying to find out how could assessment take more time?

If the psycho-analysts were doing this, of course, at sixty pounds the hour, or something like that, they'd try to figure out how to stretch the assessment.

Well, the way you stretch the assessment is very simple. All you have to do is turn up your sensitivity knob to about 16, and every time the person comes up with a goal or every time you ask for any more

goals, you of course get a read, see? You go over the goal, and with the thing set up very high, why, you say, "All right, you wanted a set of paper dolls," and the thing falls quite well.

But if you turn the sensitivity knob down for a third-of-a-dial drop, you're reading from a still needle. And the impact in the mind on the subject of acquiring paper dolls is inadequate to move that from a still needle. So for your assessment purposes it is null. You got it?

So you can go over . . . in that wise, you can go over literally dozens and dozens and dozens and dozens of goals. Now, part of the . . . I mean, in one session. You get lots of them. And you get down to the end, and because your sensitivity set is low, you say, "Do you have any more goals?" Well obviously, for God's sakes, if the person has any more goals, realize that it's a limited question. It's limited in its application. It's not a true question. "Do you have any more goals." Well now, look! This person has been around for the trillennia. Every life they had several hundred goals. Well, all right. What are you going to do? Multiply five hundred times two hundred trillion and what is that? That's your goals list. All you're after is a no-fall at the end of the list with the sensitivity knob set for a third-of-a-dial drop. That's the only thing you're after.

You can go over the various kinds of goals. You say, "Got any childhood goals? Are there any more childhood goals? Are there any more withheld goals? Secret goals? Are there any more antisocial goals? Have you thought of anything that would have to happen for you to know that Scientology worked? Are there any difficulties you haven't mentioned to me?" And look, by the time you got all of those that I just gave you, practically in order, listed, and you get down to the end of the list and you ask all those categories again and you get no fall to your naked eye . . . you see no twitch.

And don't tell me that if the needle rises you go on because that's getting to be a very sore point. Keeps coming in over the lines and so forth, "The needle was rising so I had to continue to run the rudiments." And somebody just today spotted that. It's because it's in the TRs. The E-Meter TR has in it "rise" as a reaction. "How many reactions there are to a needle?" and rise is one of them. And then you say, "If you run the rudiments and you get a needle reaction, you must flatten the rudiments," and the auditor applies these two things just bing, bing. When we say a reaction for the rudiments or a reaction for an assessment, we mean a rock slam, a theta bop or a fall. In order of importance it is a rock slam, a fall or a theta bop. A theta bop is the least important, a fall is the most ordinary and if you're getting rock slams, watch out because the whole bank is grouped.

Remember the old Dianetic grouper? Well, the old Dianetic grouper, if we'd had people on E-Meters in those days, would always have registered as rock slam. It's just a grouper in time and a grouper in place and a grouper in mass and a grouper in this and that, and so you get a rock slam.

In passing, just while I'm thinking about it, I better tell you something about running a rock slam.

If you're assessing and getting rock slams on the Prehav Scale for a terminal . . . let's say the goal rock slammed . . . You know what a rock slam is, now: it's an irregular, wobbly, large or small shiver and shake across the thing. A theta bop is a very regular one, of any width. But a rock slam is a shiver and shake and it dances around and it's very jerky and it's quite unmistakable. Once you've seen a rock slam . . . they are . . . they're quite weird when you see these things turn on. You say, "What in the name of God is that?"

These little, tiny needle shivers that you see are probably microscopic rock slams. I don't really think they are a different read.

There's a point of adjudication here: Do you just run the rock slams off? Do you assess it as long as you don't have a rock slam? And run it as long as you don't have a rock slam? Assess it for the rock slam? Run it until you don't have the rock slam? You could do that, you know? This is not a hard and fast point because the rock slam is going to turn into a fall; it's going to turn into a theta bop; it's probably going to go null. The liabilities of doing that is you've got a rock slam left someplace else on your Prehav Scale.

There's a matter of adjudication; we'll have more data on this someday . . . in the very near future. But I would say, knowing the nature of a rock slam, that if you just followed rock slam and ran the rock slam off so that you didn't get a rock slam in twenty minutes, or something like that, the case might make better progress. But we'll find out more about that. That's not a hard and fast rule at this time.

It's just this: When you're running a rock slam, remember you're running, probably, a very short duration. If you could hold a rock slam with your tone arm so that the needle continued to sit solidly at set, what would the tone arm be doing? Yeah, it'd be quite a wild tone arm, wouldn't it? Huh? Well, that would be the one thing you can't read on a tone arm. You have to read it over on the needle because . . . just because you can't do that with a tone arm.

You see, theoretically, when I say process by the tone arm, I mean keeping the needle somewhere in the vicinity of set, and that gives you your tone arm motion. Well, a rock slam, you can't keep the needle in the vicinity of set, you see? The tone arm would be slamming.

Well, certainly you're going to run a tone-arm slam. You can't set a meter for a tone-arm slam. So that's what you'd run flat. You got the idea? You could run the tone-arm slam flat, and if you assessed again you'd find the rock slam has now gone elsewhere. It's a matter of adjudication, it's a matter to be proved out, it's a matter to be settled, but that is a point. And I'd better tell you what points really don't exist in clear-cut silhouette relief.

Now, what do we get into here when we ask the wrong question on an E-Meter? We're asking the fellow for goals and it's the wrong goal. Well, therefore, it's the wrong question and you get a sporadic read, and the goal seems to peel off and disappear. A meter, actually, will react only as long as things are bunched up. And as you're assessing for goals, when you first grab ahold of the pc, the goals are all in one terrific, mauled-up ball, you see? And so any goal is doing a dance.

But, as you repeat these goals, with the thing set for a third-of-a-dial fall, the goal peels off the main mess. It comes free and becomes itself.

And as you go over a goals list over and over . . . and later, same way with terminals; a terminals list over and over . . . you're going to find this is a persistent and continuing manifestation: That the wrong questions peel off and the right question remains. So that is true of an E-Meter.

If you always knew the right question to ask, you would always get the same fall. But, at the same time, the assessment has therapeutic value. Something for you to remember.

If you just assess somebody . . . maybe he's in lousy condition and really isn't ready for assessment and so forth . . . if you just assess him and you do a good job of assessment on him, you're going to get an improved case and he's going to feel better about things.

An assessment cannot, then, be classified as something which must be done to set up an intensive. Similarly, a Joburg Security Check, if run well by the auditor, with a nice, gunned-up sensitivity knob, is terrifically therapeutic . . . terrific . . . and once more could not be considered something by which you set up a case to audit it. These things all fall within the perimeter of auditing because they are therapeutic, they are beneficial. They advance cases.

Let me tell you that just this one thing of a Joburg Security Check has advanced cases that have never before moved. Why did they never before move? They were sitting there holding on to their cotton-picking withholds! And their withholds were so heavy that they couldn't communicate to the auditor, so they were never in-session, so auditing never worked.

So you can't call a Joburg Security Check, then, something that occurs outside of intensives or outside of auditing unless it is being used for purposes of security. And then, of course, you don't do it in Model Session form. You're just finding out whether this guy is safe to have around, that's all. And if the questions all clear up, voilá! He's safe to have around, providing you know how to do a Joburg Security Check. That's the other little proviso that you must be awfully sure of. Some of you, or maybe all of you, will someday have the experience in Scientology of you got a new HGC Admin, or you've

got a clerk or something like that, and you've taught them the this's and that-a's of things, and you're too busy to give this new applicant a Security Check yourself, or everybody else is too busy, and you can't turn him over to a good auditor to do this Security Check. And you say, "Well, you know the rudiments and you know how to do this, so you just go ahead and give him a Security Check."

And you're going to find out where my viewpoint sometimes is: in total bafflement of how anybody can invent as many ways of doing something wrong. And my viewpoint is very often on that total bafflement. I know why it happens, so that it doesn't continue to baffle me very long and it doesn't upset me, but it is still something to marvel about.

If you were to take somebody and give them an hour's instruction on the E-Meter, show them about the needle and then turn over some raw meat off the street and tell them to give this person a Security Check so you'd know whether the person could be hired or not, your usual response is not "The person is all right." The usual response is "He couldn't possibly be hired." If inept people were running E-Meters at all sides to do Security Checks for the purpose of employment, you could guarantee this: The whole world would at once be out of work.

Various things happen but the category of them are utterly in the thousands. And there's no sense in going over the number of things they can do wrong, except those things which are rather common errors or which can be used to clarify the right way. Then you can go over things that are wrong. But otherwise, if you list all the things that are wrong or could be done wrong with an E-Meter, you'd probably be up around ten, fifteen thousand items. It's colossal.

For instance, simple error like this: The person they're checking breathes. This is rather strange and peculiar amongst the human race, particularly people in London; they know better. But they breathe, so every time they take a breath . . . the meter isn't set right probably . . . and every time they take a breath or a deep breath (or even if the meter is set right, every time they sigh), you're going to get a fall. And if the person were doing it, they wouldn't even realize they had to repeat the question again or anything like that, and they would be saying at that time, "Have you ever embezzled the funds of an employer?" you see, or some such thing. And the person says . . . he's getting kind of bored with this you know . . . and he says, "Aheww!" you know? It falls. And they'd write down "Embezzled funds of employer" and go on to the next question.

Now, an idiocy of this character . . . let me tell you some more about this instrument . . . an idiocy of this character is going on in the United States at this moment. If it weren't so sad and tragic, one could laugh about it, and you will laugh too. You probably won't laugh so well until you yourself conduct this experiment. And this is what is known as compartmenting questions and something you will have to know in doing Goals Assessments: the compartmentation of questions.

The fellow turns in a goal: "I would like to be a fireman and crawl up ladders and rescue beautiful women." That's the goal. So you come to it on the goals list . . . and by the way, these goals are always put down in the fellow's own words. He'll amend them, but when he wants to amend them, you amend them and add that amendment as a new goal.

So you are reading along his goals list to him and you come down to this one. You come down the list and you've covered now maybe seventy-five goals and twenty of them are still registering after a brief repetitive read. And you've gone on and the remainder, the fifty-five, have sort of dropped out and you're just feeling fine. You come to this one: "You want to be a fireman, and crawl up ladders, and rescue beautiful women." Only you read it this way: "You want to be a fireman, crawl up ladders and rescue beautiful women," and you get a fall. And you say it again: "You want to be a fireman, and crawl up ladders, and rescue beautiful women," fall!

You say, "Well, that one stays in. Give it a slant mark. That one's in." You read it a few more times, you see? But it looked like it was getting a stronger read. Let's say it . . . after you read it two or three times, it was getting pretty . . . it was getting tougher! More reaction, more fall, more theta bop, more rock slam, more something. So you just left it in, and you said that was it, and you went on to the next goal. And the next time you come by this thing you read it, and by George, it's still in!

And you go tell somebody. You say, "You know what his goal is, is to be a fireman." Nuh-uh. The way you handle these category goals is you pull them apart and you go over them like this: You've read the whole goal, you see? You do read that . . . the whole goal . . . a couple three times. Thing continues to read; now let's find out what's wrong with this thing.

You say, "You want to be a fireman. You want to be a fireman. You want to be a fi . . ." That's the end of that. That's the end of that read it just disappeared. You say, "Good. To crawl up ladders. You want to crawl up ladders, crawl up ladders, crawl up ladders." That's the end of that one. That's the end of that one. "Rescue beautiful women, rescue beautiful women, rescue beautiful women. Ah, that's what we were falling on. You want to rescue beautiful women. Ah, that's good. That's good." Now, because it fell apart otherwise, let's be just a little cleverer and let's say, "To rescue, to rescue, to rescue." That disappears. And what was he falling on? "Beautiful women, beautiful women, beautiful women, beautiful women." As what healthy male wouldn't!

So this whole goal disintegrated except beautiful women. Now, usually the pc will now volunteer, "Yes, I'd sure like to know some beautiful women." You put that down as a new goal. Got it? That's getting rid of them by compartmentation. Got it?

Now, some real . . . I wouldn't even dignify them by calling them knuckleheads . . . wogs, drifting around in various places, have been let loose with an E-Meter over in the United States, and they've got it all figured out now that everybody has been PDHed and that everybody has PDHed everybody and they're spreading it all over the place and telling everybody that everybody has been PDHed. And they prove it this way: They put the person on a meter and they say, "Have you ever been a victim of PDH?"

And the person says, "What's that?"

"Well, have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" And you had a nice fall "Wwahoo-haho-o-ahoo-wahoo-wahoo! Here we go!!"

"Well, who did it? Who did it? Who did it? Was it Ron? Was it Di Diego? Was it Dick Halpern? Peter Hemery do it?" All of a sudden they say, "Frank Sullivan do it?" . . . get a big fall! "Ah, we've got a PDH here by Frank Sullivan, ho-ho-ho-ho." Well, believe me, we might have!

Teaching is not implanting, but teaching on the whole track often came to implanting. You never had time to teach somebody where all the leads were in a tube room of a spaceship. And there were eight hundred thousand different leads and connectors to all the electronic equipment. So you said zip! with the needle, and you turned on the super tape recorders, and it went off at a high whine. And you played it over to them hard. And after you'd done it a few times, what do you know, they'd be able to go up and hit lead this and lead that, and they'd be so on and so on, and fix up this and put it in that.

And actually there are people around who've gotten so used to being trained that way that we have today a thing called Dormaphone . . . which, by the way, doesn't work on anybody who didn't ever teach anybody this way. Doesn't work. "Learn the Spanish language overnight." Well now, if I know all about this, why don't I sock some sodium pentathol in my arm, or something of the sort, or take a couple of Nembutol sleeping tablets, and put a pair of earphones on, and turn on a record that repeats how to speak the Spanish language when I do this.

It happens right now . . . because there's a ship down at Las Palmas I'll have to repair using the Spanish language . . . that I picked up some linguaphone records, and I happened to be listening to them wide awake. I'm brushing up my Spanish. When I first listened to the records they were a terrible blur; I couldn't tell one word from another. Now it's getting so that I actually can differentiate the difference between the alumno and the professor. Trouble with me and Spanish is I have enough overts against the Spanish people that I have a hard time hearing them. That's true. Any young Roman officer back in the old days had a hard time this way. Anyhow, I don't mean to restimulate anybody.

All right, well, why don't I use this type of education? Well, I just never got used to it. Why don't we use this type of education in Scientology? Well, nobody . . . it . . . Scientology is an education of reason, not an education of location. Auditing is a practice of understanding, judgment and application. It is not

a practice of locating and repairing a bunch of leads. You understand? It isn't teaching some soldier the gun parts. It leaves him with the initiative to handle weapons. Big difference there, you see?

So all somnolent education is limited to the pat solutions or locations to the questions. Now, if they were all pat solutions and everything was all pat in all directions, it was mostly locational nomenclature and category and where found, you can do it. Thetans have been doing it on the whole track forever. I mean, as long as we've had time this process has been going on.

But some people have become very specialized in doing only this. And those people set up a machine that furnish an implant for any given situation and will answer with name, rank and serial number, exact date, time, location, situation and text.

Five or six times over the last nine years, there have been big fads going around with this and anybody who has used this as a consistent and continual means of education . . . nothing vicious about it; they've just used it as a means and method of education, that's all . . . can set up a machine that'll respond. It'll give an implant for any given situation. But that is much rarer.

Let's go back to how you use an E-Meter on this other thing and this will amuse you far more. If I've stepped on any toes while I've been saying this, I am very sorry. But it is simply usually used for educational purposes. You got a new crew aboard the spaceship and not a single, cotton-picking one of them knows anything about space flight. What is the best way to handle this crew? You shove them underneath the proper speakers, and you give them the proper drug, and it all runs off at high roar, and all of a sudden you have a totally educated spacecraft crew.

Do you know that a lot of young girls walking around right now, you say, "Well, get a mental image picture of your father," and they get a hairy ape or they get something else, see? In other words, they got a machine that'll dub in fathers. Well, so there are machines that'll dub in PDHs.

But that isn't really what I'm talking to you about because that's more advanced curiosa. And that isn't really what I'm talking about at this particular time . . . the advanced curiosas. I'm talking about E-Meters and this single question: "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis? Who did it?" "Frank Sullivan."

Listen, if you're an auditor and you know your business, you know there's such a thing as O/W. And you know this: That an E-Meter reacts to the auditor's questions. And any question that is near the truth of anything will cause a reaction on the machine. And it is up to you to get a consistent read. You have to ask the smarter question. You have to ask the varied question to polish that read up. And all of a sudden, it's reading like mad and you know exactly what it's reading on and everything else that it might have been reading on disappears.

All right. Victim? How many people do you think will get a reaction on the word victim? How many people do you think will get a reaction on the word pain? How many people will get a reaction on the word drugs? How many people will get a reaction on the word hypnosis or hypnotism or hypnotists? And if they've had a few overts or if they've read some of his literature, how many people do you think would get a reaction on Frank Sullivan?

No, all a question proves, when it reacts on an E-Meter, is that it or some part of it has charge on it, or the question is near some question which will have charge on it. Got the idea? Now, by varying your question you can smooth out the reads and as you become used to the instrument, you'll notice that it reacts sporadically and occasionally on something. Well, you just shape your questions around and change it around until you get it consistent, consistent, consistent, always the same read, always the same read.

You can only keep it reading the same, however, if you practically muzzle the pc. The second he starts imparting information the read blows up. Because if he answers the right auditing question, the read blows up. But of course, because he answered it and the read blew up entirely, you also know what you were asking. Don't you see? You know what was right.

So with the pc totally gagged, you could by questioning . . pc not permitted to talk, actually with a gag on . . and you have to gag pc if you want to carry this thing out to its extremities. It's a good drill and . . they get too interested.

My favorite mechanism for newspaper reporters these days, by the way, is to find an automobile accident they've been in . . they evidently they've all been in automobile accidents . . where the accident occurred, who was hurt in the accident, where they were hurt in the accident; and find out the whole lot, such as the make of the car, and all this sort of thing, without letting the reporter say a word to me. And man does it make citizens out of them. The somatics turn on and everything turns on and they say, "Well, how did you know?"

But actually you can't get much further than them being hurt, or someone in the car being hurt, than they all of a sudden start going off like small firecrackers, you know? And they say, "Well, yes! Well, how did you know that?" Well, you haven't actually had a chance to prove that you were a total wizard. They're now convinced of it, see? "How did you prove that? Well, what do you know. Yes, as a matter of fact, it was an old Rolls-Royce. And it went off the edge of a cliff down in Devonshire. And uh . . uh . . that's right. There were other people in the car all right. Girls they were, and uh . . s-Meter will go flick.

And now this fellow, who comes down the track all these trillennia . . having burned houses, massacred the inhabitants of houses, having chewed up the landscape of houses in general, in many wars, in many lives . . knows very well that it's a house. And he becomes completely fixated on the idea that he must ask the question about the house, the house, the house. And the E-Meter goes flick-flew, flick-flew, no read, read, no read.

"All right, what about this house are you withholding?" And theo forth. And I . . I didn't ever realize this before, but I must have gotten jammed under the dashboard, you know? I've got a terrible pain here. Uh . . yeah, and I must have been jammed under the dashboard. I never realized that before," you know, and they go limping out.

Of course, such a thing dies out in the course of about three days, but they don't go back to the office and write that story that the editor told them to write to clobber Scientology, mostly because they can't now sit down comfortably. It restimulates them.

This is a very effective way of handling reporters, by the way. It's a . . it's a real convincer. Similarly this other drill is a marvelous convincer to somebody who believes he has been PDHed.

"Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" Well now, just as you would in goals compartmentation, you say the word "victim" . . "You ever been a victim? You ever been . . .?"

"Well," he says, "Ah . . ha-ha . . yeah . . ha-ha, I've been a victim."

Yeah, well, that's the end of that read. "How do you feel about pain?"

"Oh, no, I don't want anything to do with pain." Read, read, read, read, read. And they say, "I don't want anything to do with pain. I'm having an awful lot of trouble. And during my early youth I was in agony most of the time. They had my teeth in braces," and so forth, and that one drops out.

And then say, "Well, how do you feel about drugs?"

"Oh God! Eh-e-ptuh! Every time you see a medico they never treat anything; they just shoot you full of drugs and you stagger around. And if they'd only have gone away in the first place, or you never called them, why, you probably could have died peaceably or gotten well or something of the sort. Yeah, I don't care much for drugs." That's gone.

"All right, hypnotism. You ever been hypnotized?" There wasn't any change on it in the first plate and it's dead. Now say the question: "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnosis?" The needle is . . needle is totally motionless.

Now you say, "Frank Sullivan," and it falls. You say, "Have you ever had any overts on Frank Sullivan? You ever thought any unkind thoughts?"

And they say, "Well, who wouldn't! Yes, yes, yes, I have, because as a matter of fact Frank Sullivan has been talking about being PDHed from the 1st ACC. He was telling me all about PDHs. And he goes around and talks to people about PDHs. And upsets people. And they don't like to get their own PDHs terribly restimulated, only he's so convincing about it. But his message is 'You have been PDHed! You have been. The reason you are being selfdetermined right this minute is because you have been PDHed.'" So with this kind of a thing, of course a guy gets unkind thoughts. He says, "This guy is nuts!" you know, although he might continue to be pleasant.

And the person says, "Yes, I've got lots of overts in that line. I've thought a lot of unkind thoughts in that particular line."

And you say, "Well, how do you feel about Frank Sullivan?" You get no motion to amount to anything on the needle. You've kind of blown it. Now you say, "Well, has Frank Sullivan ever PDHed you?" Now you'll get another surge. "Well, have you ever thought anything bad about Sullivan going around telling everybody that you've been PDHed?"

"Well, yes I have."

"Well, has Frank Sullivan PDHed you?" and that's now null.

Now you say to the person . . . now you say to the person, "Have you ever been a victim of pain-drug-hypnotism?" . . . null. "Have you ever been given a pain-drug-hypnotic implant by Frank Sullivan?" and it's null. What was it falling on? It was falling on connected restimulators and as soon as you blew off, and the pc actually answered directly what you were talking about . . .

Now, supposing he had been PDHed, and he told you an awful lot of stuff . . . "Well, yes. . ." and he answered all these things: "Yes, I've been worried about those things," and that sort of thing . . . and the fall cancelled off on all of them. And you said, "Well, have you ever been PDHed by Frank Sullivan?" and you got a hell of a fall. You know you'd never be able to clear that fall . . . never be able to clear that fall at all . . . if the person had no recollection of ever having been PDHed by Frank Sullivan, if he had been. It would continue to fall. That would be that.

Now, this becomes a case for auditing. How do you audit it? You put Frank Sullivan on the general Prehav Scale and you simply run him flat. You assess him for level, just as you would an SOP Goals terminal. You find out where that level . . . it falls. You put together an auditing command on Frank Sullivan, and you just run that out. And then when that tone arm stops moving, as it very well might after about four or five waggles . . . See, it might only be a few dozen commands, see? You find your new level and you flatten that. And you find your new level and flatten that. And all of a sudden you can't get any reaction of any kind either on being PDHed or anything else; it will have blown. That is the magic of the Prehav Scale.

Marital Scientology . . . just going from the ridiculous to the sublime . . .

As I said before, this thing about PDH would be amusing if it weren't so kind of sad. It's kind of knuckleheaded, you know? It's kind of terrible thinking of some people running around madly trying to tell everybody and convince everybody that they have been PDHed because they're simply dramatizing their own overts, whether now in this life or on the backtrack. And they are worried about them, don't you see? And when they've got to sell a bill of goods of this particular character and make it their life work, they might as well be writing out a confession and putting it in the hands of every Scientologist they talk to.

The guy says, "I've been PDHed! I've been PDHed! I've been PDHed! And yap, yap, yap! And you've got to believe me," and all this sort of thing. If he's making this . . . he's not telling an auditor this; he's not going and getting auditing; he's just telling everybody this . . . he's all the same as writing out

confessions and signing them and putting them in Scientologists' hands. "I have PDHed the living Christ out of people for ages. You see? I'm pro." That's what he's doing. That's what he's doing.

Well, that's all right. But people who have done PDHs, ordinarily on the whole track in the best of . . . thought that was the best possible thing to do at the particular place and time. So as a result, if they've got a machine that will produce PDHs, so what? It'll all come out in running SOP Goals. Why worry about it?

Furthermore, if some guy did PDH somebody . . . Let's say. Let's say that Sullivan did go ahead and hold down somebody and slap him and cuff him and put him under drugs and shock him and put in hypnotic commands and run some patched together tape to him that told him to go and take HCA Courses. That wouldn't be a bad implant by the way. And if he did this . . .

Ah, look, look, look. Nothing can happen to you in one lifetime . . . not even a PDH of . . . not even an electric shock from a psychiatrist and so forth . . . that you can't handle now. All you got to do is find out-locate the fellow who did it and run him on the Prehav Scale and flatten the various levels, and that's the end of the PDH. Interesting, huh? Or just in the course of running SOP Goals, clear the guy and it'll blow off. It's nothing to worry about.

And I'm sure that no smart Scientologist . . . now that we've got clearing going and we've got cases running so well . . . would waste his time PDHing anybody. Look at all that hard effort that would just blow off in a short auditing session. We're actually getting faster today than they can be laid in. Used to be that we took them out much more slowly than . . . you know, an engram in general was erased much more slowly than it was laid in. Well, you look at the number of engrams, just count the number of engrams, that must blow in the process of clearing a person, and it is some binary-digit factor. The factor . . . you could start at . . . up on this wall here and write 1 and then 0s, column after column after column, the whole length of that wall, and so forth, clear down to the bottom of it, and you would not have stated a number large enough to give the person the number of engrams that he'd have; that number would not be large enough. And when you can take and blow this up in the course of, ah, at the outside, a couple of hundred hours of auditing; holy cats, how many engrams is that per minute of auditing-of actual effective auditing? It's some fantastic number. It must be billions and billions of engrams in fact. So who would waste their time?

But once more, going from the ridiculous to the sublime, what I'm about to give you is the birth of marital Scientology. Not really its birth, but it's grown up and got some pants and skirts on it.

We had marital Scientology the day we had the husband and wife sit down across from each other with an auditor auditing both of them and getting off their overts and withholds against each other. That did an enormous amount to patch up marriages and actually could be considered its birth. Now you can put pants and skirts on marital Scientology and some auditor setting himself up this way could do absolute marvelous things. All you do is take the husband by name and run him on the Prehav Scale; take the wife by name and run her on the Prehav Scale; and that's the end of the difficulties of that marriage.

Of course, if the fellow doesn't want to be married, that's his idea and he doesn't have to be run this way. At the same time, if he wanted to get unmarried, this would also be the smoothest way to get him unmarried. Got the idea? Either way. Either way.

But it would certainly patch up the marriage. You got the idea? It'd take the difficulties off the lineup. Because in the course of running it would run the O/Ws off. And what do you know, it's such a tiny, tiny, tiny, short track. What is it, they've been married for ten years. Wow! Ten years against two hundred trillion. Doesn't sound like much. So it's no track. And what you're doing is, instead of getting these little tiny, two and a half horsepower outboard motors and attaching them to the Queen Mary-that used to be auditing, see . . . and these little, tiny outboard motors are running mad and heating their bearings and so forth, to push the Queen Mary. Instead of doing that now, we have a ten-thousand horse Mercedes Benz pushing a rowboat. One of the precautions we have to take is it doesn't crush the rowboat. The precaution we take is do a technically perfect job of auditing and keep your rudiments cleaned up the way I've been talking to you about.

All right. How long do you think it'd take to clear up that much track on a couple? Damn short period of time. With a little experience and knowing your business, you could absolutely guarantee to set up somebody as far as this is concerned. You could absolutely guarantee. You'd say, "Lead-pipe cinch." What would you do? You'd take the husband's name or the wife's name or something like that. Now you could assess this out one way or the other, but now you'd be getting into another project. No, all we're going to do is a nonassess on the terminal, beyond just the identity of the terminal. You got the idea? See, this is the light brushoff.

Husband's name is Joe Thompson. All right. We just take Joe Thompson, and we assess Joe Thompson up on the Prehav Scale and down on the Prehav Scale. And going up and down the level "failed endure" knocked both times. We make up an auditing command about the failed endurance of Joe Thompson and our pc's relationship to him. It may flatten in ten commands. It may flatten in ten or twenty commands. But as soon as the motion goes out of the tone arm, reassess. And then take the motion out of that tone arm. And then reassess it on the Prehav Scale. We're not talking about very much auditing, are we?

Of course, the case has got to be in the kind of a shape where they will talk to the auditor and interested in their own case before you do that. You can do that too. You can run them general Prehav Scale and make them do a Joburg Security Check, and they'll be talking to you.

You know, doing a Joburg Security Check is not an overt. Some people will look on it as such. It's about the nicest thing you can do to anybody. All you're giving him is his life.

Now, let's take a little, brief summary of this. Mr. E-Meter is a precision instrument. Mr. Auditor is sometimes imprecise. Mr. E-Meter registers on anything the pc hears. The auditor sometimes doesn't adjudicate what the pc has heard. The E-Meter clears on everything the pc answers absolutely right. And it remains muddled on everything the pc doesn't answer absolutely right. It's as clear as that; the E-Meter is a precision instrument, but auditors and preclears are prone to error.

Now you, in your study of cases and E-Meters and so forth, have certain drills which you must undertake even though they seem to be silly drills. They may seem to be silly, but I want you here to make sure that you do these.

All right.