

## E-METER ACTIONS, ERRORS IN AUDITING

A lecture given on  
12 June 1961

Thank you.

Wuff! Well, thank you for giving me an opportunity to have a little rest and relaxation. You know, what . . . what most people consider work, I don't. And when I get cases running off the rails, far off on administrative lines, trying to prove conclusively that the organization cannot possibly survive, it seems an awful long way to have to audit, and that's just about what it amounts to. Somebody presents me with the fait accompli of "Auditing is absolutely vital and necessary twelve thousand miles away or eight thousand miles away."

That's generally what administrative things break down to, by the way. People do odd things to you. They present you with emergencies; enormous emergencies. And they think I don't know yet that they're just trying to reach me. That's their idea of reaching me. If I appeared on the ground it would be very, very simple to straighten out the thing. It's almost the heroic effort necessary to keep things running wrong. It's almost fantastic. It's almost fantastic. I just think the people in these governments just absolutely must be just sweating, just sweating blood, day and night. I mean, how can they manage it, you know?

They just . . . I can see them up now, at 10 Downing Street, and State Department, seventeen hundred-and-something Pennsylvania Avenue. I can just see those poor fellows, you know? Trying to hold things in disorder. Because you'd be surprised the ease with which things will snap into order. It isn't an automaticity, particularly, but order is always easier to achieve than disorder. You have to work at disorder.

And yet the world at large is so in disagreement with this principle that I wrote a story one time about a fellow who went ashore trying to sin, under a hellfire and brimstone Captain. And he went ashore in China trying to sin and the Captain had given him a big lecture about the ease it was, you know, to drift into the ways of wrong and all of that; and how easy this was and how simple this was for a young man to have all this happen, you know. And the fellow goes ashore, and he just overtly, you see, tries desperately to get into some trouble or have some excitement, you see, and it's all a complete flop.

Well, what is this? This is June the 12th? Sesenta y uno. All right. If any student has any question he cannot live without being answered, speak up. You mean all of your questions have been answered?

Female voice: No. They aren't coming up till I start auditing.

What was that again? Got one coming up?

Female voice: I said mine are going to come up when I start auditing.

Oh, I see. All right. Yes, Mike?

Male voice: I don't know if it's off the point, but one of the questions we were asked was "PHD." I have no idea what that is.

Hm?

Male voice: "PHD"!

You don't know what "PHD" is? Well, now let's see, who was here when Mary Sue gave the very adequate demonstration of that. All right, Madge, would you be good enough to show him how, conclusively, you can demonstrate that the cat has PDHed him? Will you do that for him? That'll tell

you all about it. That's the easiest one. That's easier to demonstrate than talk about. Nobody would believe it until they see it. you see, everybody has been PDHed according to the meter, if you don't know how to ask questions. It's a wonderful example in how to get wrong information.

I want to repeat something, speaking about a meter, just mentioning it in passing. Now, are you having better luck using instant read than latent read?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

Is there anybody still in a flat one about this? Whether you use . . . Yes?

Male voice: I have a problem, Ron. Uh, when the pc answers, say, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" you don't get any motion on the meter, whether the pc says no or yes. And then . . say he says yes . . and then you get a drop after he says yes. This is the latent read that you're referring to?

That's a latent read.

Male voice: Latent read.

That is a latent read. A meter reading on the pc's reply or response is a latent read.

Male voice: Do you exploit it?

Hm?

Male voice: Do you exploit this one? Try to find out what it is?

Brother, I'd drop that one so hard it goes plop. you know, I'd just pay no attention to it.

Male voice: Okay. Now, that's what I want to know.

Just no attention to it. He didn't know from nothing Your meter knew. So he says it isn't all right. Now, I won't act on it, but I'm still in two-way communication with the pc. you see, it's a code break not to be. So I handle this thing two ways. (1) I'm not going to handle it, and (2) I make the pc feel all right about it.

I usually handle these things somewhat on this order: "Is it all right to audit in this room?" Pc: long comm lag, looks around. Nothing's happening, you know. Meter dead calm at the instant I asked the question.

Pc says, "No, I'm not so sure."

And I say, "Well, we'll probably get more used to it as we go on. Thank you."

Doesn't create an ARC break, the pc kind of perks up, and says, "Well, all right, you're gonna be overbearing"

Now, this latent read is licking a lot of organizations right now, and a lot of auditors in the field. It's licking them. They don't dig this one and their Security Checks are going up toward the hundred-hour mark. We had been very successful in handling people in Johannesburg in the course and we had a terrific course and it was fine. And when Peter Williams went back down to Australia, he was utterly stunned at the length of time it was going to take to do anything in the way of an assessment or a Security Check or anything else.

Now, this was the dog datum that had slid in unnoticed. It had just crept in under the door. Everybody was reading latent reads. See, that was the difference. Nobody was getting the show on the road, and he hadn't actually noticed this essential fact. I didn't notice it myself until I'd been sitting around here for about a month watching what you were doing. And it suddenly occurred to me, "They're doing

something wrong, but I can't put my finger on it," and Mary Sue, in watching what you were doing and in giving checks and that sort of thing and trying to demonstrate it, suddenly came up with the datum. She said, "Auditors are reading an E-Meter that falls after the fact." She didn't say it that precisely, but that was it. She had a lot of other things to say about it, but this is the way this thing goes, you see?

If you don't get a response on the E-Meter within something on the order of a tenth of a second of your question, everything thereafter is a no-response. You got it? It's a no-response now. We don't care if it whistles Dixie. It's a no-response.

In the first place, you are not auditing the analytical mind. And if all that was wrong with people was the analytical mind then you'd have it made, you see, because a guy could think his way straight so fast it'd make his head swim. He is responding to the reactivity of the reactive mind, and therefore all the auditor is interested in is the reactive mind. And the only thing which responds instantly on the meter is the reactive mind. That's all. Anything else . . . his blood pressure's responding or his sudden memory that he didn't put out the cat (oh, my God!) and there's the cat home all day in the apartment. This kind of thing, you see, gets in.

Now, we have another order of read of this character and these two things are similar. We have to give this other one a name, now. We got several orders of magnitude of read that are really high school E-Meter reading. One of those is the rise. You don't pay any attention to a rise.

Now, we have some new students here and I'm very happy with you and you're all welcome and nobody is going to be cross with you. We'll try to teach you everything we know how to teach you until you report to us that somebody's needle rose. Why don't you report that there is air on Earth? Or some other astonishing fact? Why not send a telegram to the prime minister concerning the fact that farms in Sussex are covered with dirt? I mean, it's just the same thing. So it rose!

Well, why do you ignore this phenomenon of a rising needle and say nothing about it? You cannot establish what started it rising because the preclear did not observe what it was, started it rising, and you might have had five words in your sentence, and any one of them may have started it rising. Or the fact that a bee just buzzed past the window could start it rising. It's anything the pc would be unwilling to confront.

But to establish what it was would require perhaps fifteen minutes to a half an hour search of going over every possible element. All to what event? To find out that the pc can't confront. Well man, everybody knows that! If he could confront everything, he wouldn't in the least bit be having any trouble in existence anywhere at all. So all the rising needle has said is that the pc is not Clear. And you know that and I know that, so why should we research it? See?

What triggers the rise of the needle? And there's some old nursery rhymes and so forth that go along with this thing that I don't remember very well, but they have a . . . oh, yeah, I think there's some character by the name of Chaucer, wrote one about it. So what? I mean, you're not announcing a knowable factor. See, you're announcing an unknowable factor, so there's no point in it.

Now, what stops a needle from rising you can establish. This fellow is able to confront cats, and something, Lord knows what . . . an electronic circuit going off at the North Pole causing a difference in the variation of the intensity of Earth . . . could start a needle rising. So what? He can confront cats, so we say to him, "cats" and the needle stops rising. And we stop saying "cats," the needle keeps on rising. So we know "cats" stops the needle.

Now similarly, in giving a Security Check, if you ask a question and the fellow has a rising needle, you're not reading the rising needle, you're reading a change of characteristic.

And you ask him, "Have you ever illicitly diamond-bought?" you say, and the needle stops. Ah, but that's a change of characteristic. It didn't fall, it didn't theta bop, it didn't rock slam. But if you've got an instant read on "Did you ever illicit-diamonds-bought?" you press it.

You see, the instant read is, instantly it stops . . if just for a second, see? It's going up very nicely and all of a sudden you say, "Did you ever illicitly diamond-bought?" Man, that's a change of characteristic. Get your jackrabbit ears flapping. That means he has illicitly diamonds-bought at some time or another. Probably in this lifetime. Probably got them in his pocket right now.

But you'll find a pc who is having a very rough time, who reads on a very, very high sensitivity knob here, will very often just rise and rise, and rise and rise, and rise and rise, and rise and rise, and up goes the needle. And you just ask them Security Checks. And you know that they've done practically every question in the Security Check, they have a major crime on for which they're being looked for by Interpol, see? And you sit there in fascinated amazement!

Irresponsibility on all dynamics is so low that they have no reality on an overt or a withhold. So you of course get no needle reaction of any kind whatsoever, because the individual must to some degree connect with the reactive mind to spark it off, you see? There must be a connection between the individual and that area of the reactive mind.

That's why you can't take somebody who has a bad neck, and all of a sudden say, "Well I'm going to cure your bad neck," and you work on him for days, and then you happen accidentally to ask the question of "How's your neck?"

And he says, 'How would I know?'

And you say, "Well, isn't your bad neck getting any better?"

He says, "Well, it's never been bad." See, his head's always over this way, you see. "Never been bad. There's nothing wrong with my neck!" It's a fact! I mean, the guy has no reality on it. It's out of his reach.

So you can only reach those things in the reactive mind that the individual himself is capable at that time of becoming responsible for or aware of. And the E-Meter tells you what he is capable of becoming responsible for or aware of. It spots this responsibility factor for you, which gives you a reality factor. Therefore, you can audit, find, exploit things that appear on the E-Meter. But you cannot audit, find or exploit things that won't appear on the E-Meter because they're beyond the zone of responsibility of the pc. Completely beyond it.

Do you . . if you were to go down here to Dartmoor Scrubs and fish out the warden or somebody else and put him on the E-Meter, and you say, "Well have you ever beaten up any prisoners? Have you ever been mean to any prisoners?" and so forth.

And he'd say, "No, we just do the best in this best of all possible worlds." And so help me, look at his knuckles, you know, and they're bleeding!

Well, you say, "How about those knuckles bleeding? Well, what about that? Have you done anything with any prisoner lately?"

"Oh, well, no, no. Fellow got in my road coming up here to see you, but of course, he was in my road and he shouldn't have been there, you see. It was his fault, and I didn't do anything to him at all."

This becomes utterly fascinating. There's the evidence. The evidence is right there, and the fellow has no reality on it. So don't be dismayed, because it's this responsibility factor. He's incapable of taking responsibility for the action, even potentially. The E-Meter only reads on what an individual is responsible of taking the reaction for, and that's all. That . . it'll only read on that. If he's potentially responsible for taking responsibility . . if he's potentially responsible . . then and only then, you're going to get an action on the meter.

So it doesn't, you see, read a catalog of crime like an IBM machine. You know, every crime he has on the whole track between now and the beginning of track are not all cataloged, and will not all fall out with certain degrees of read. If you have an idea that an E-Meter is going to do that kind of thing, then

disabuse yourself of it. The E-Meter will eventually do it, but just as the E-Meter reads the reactive mind, and reads reactivity and nothing but reactivity, so it also, ergo, perforce, must read what the individual can be potentially responsible for.

Therefore, when you give repetitively a Security Check of an individual, when you potentially have that individual capable of being responsible for certain of the crimes on the Security Check, he'll come up with withholds on them, suddenly and mysteriously, that he never came up with before.

So this is an instant and immediate test of whether or not you are advancing the responsibility factor of the pc by auditing. If the pc has become more capable of taking responsibility, then and only then are you making progress in auditing, and then and only then will you get new withholds.

So don't be surprised when the meter starts reacting on a Security Check that you just finished giving. Ten hours of auditing before you finished a Security Check. Now you've been auditing a person and now all of a sudden he's got a whole new set of withholds. And you say, "Well, what a fool I am that I didn't catch these in the first place." This might be an amateur's response. "Why didn't I catch all those withholds in the first place?"

Well, you know the guy has to be potentially responsible for withholding on those exact things before they register. See, he doesn't even consider them an overt. And as you process a preclear who is going motivator, motivator, motivator, "How mean they all were to me," "How mean they all were to me," motivator, motivator, motivator . . . when they're going along this line, don't be amazed that they have never done anything to anybody, and that you can't find it on the E-Meter that they ever have done anything to anybody anyplace ever. Don't be surprised. See?

It's simply an index of the responsibility of the pc, and it's terribly bad. You process him for a little while on the Prehav Scale, one way or the other, and what happens when you process him? He gains in responsibility and as soon as his responsibility is up, any way, shape or form, all of a sudden it isn't motivator, motivator, motivator. The pc did something Amazing! You don't hear about the husband beating them day and night, just standing there wearing his arm out. The pc at least comes up to the point of where "Well, it must be very tiring. I must have worn the man out," and so forth. They've come up that high. And eventually . . . after you've been auditing them for hours and hours, and running general Prehav levels or SOP Goals or something . . . you give them another Security Check of one kind or another, and you find the astonishing fact that the way these fights start is she usually takes a hot iron and takes his best shirt or any of his clothes, and starts pressing them and then leaves the iron on, you see. And that's usually the way these fights start.

Now, we get it going a little further, and we . . . there's more hours of auditing, and we give a Security Check, and we find this astonishing development: that the person calculatedly plotted to make the husband mad! It wasn't an accident. The person has become aware of the mechanical processes and is taking responsibility for the mechanical processes which make them turn an iron on and put it on a new shirt, or something like that, and burn straight through it. They're getting even with him, and now they will begin to wonder what's wrong with them that they're doing something like this.

And there you're really seeing a case start operating. And when you don't see a case start operating at least that much, watch out, because you're not making progress.

If somebody is going motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator . . . fifty hours of processing later, motivator, motivator, motivator, motivator; no good. You're not making any advance. Now if a case, for instance, is given a Security Check, and then given a general run, just Routine 2, and then given another Security Check and you don't now find new withholds on the Security Check, watch it, because something happened there. You goofed. There's something wrong with that general run. The case didn't make advance. That means you're running the pc with the rudiments out. That's what it means.

There's something you can do about it. Yeah, well, run through your Security Check on the basis of instant read and when you get to the end of the run it's just, you know, give it a lick and a promise. Look for instant reads; that's about it. It's almost as fast as you can read a Security Check, by the way.

you aren't going to find very much on it. When you get an instant read, clear it up and go on to the next question.

Get right back to auditing. And now, what is the present time problem? What is the ARC break? What external activity is the pc engaging in that is countering the auditing? Let's get real curious. You know these great big fruit horns, that they sometimes display. You know, there's one up in the Monkey Room, by the way. There's a monkey sitting there with a Mexican hat on with one of these horns of plenty.

Well, it's just like turning one of those things upside down, only the fruit squashes all over the floor. Crash! Yeah, well, outside of the fact they've been getting drunk every night before they came in to auditing sessions, and outside of the fact they've been trying to ruin your reputation while you're auditing them, and outside of the fact that they had already had a bet with somebody that they wouldn't get any gain in processing, the case is good. The case is making progress, see, aside from that! And it's gross! Don't look for little, tiny things. It will be a gross error.

All auditing errors which can suspend a case today are gross. And what do I mean by gross auditing error? Complete, stupid, stumbling, unfamiliarity with the TRs and Model Session and the E-Meter. It really has to be bad.

Next- complete and utter disregard of the rudiments. Just whole-hog. Not paying any attention whatsoever to tone arm reads when the person leaves the session and tone arm reads when they come back into the session. Not . . . not even being vaguely curious about it.

Assessing the Prehav Scale, for instance, by only assessing the level for "Compete." Well, they read in a bulletin that when you assess the level on the Primary Scale, why then you go over into the Secondary Scale and that is one level. So you just . . . what you do of course is just take every word in the Secondary Scale. And not only that; if a person would do that that stupidly, they would also do this: Well, you just run one leg of the bracket. Like, "What has your husband done to you? Thank you. What has your husband done to you? Thank you. What has your husband done to you? Thank you."

Now, when you get errors of auditing adding up like that you get no gain. And I'm telling you, and you're going to learn it, and you're going to get a subjective reality on it, just like I had: the blunders which prevent cases from advancing are so gross as to stagger you. They are so gross that you won't believe them; therefore, you don't look for them when you're training auditors or something. You just don't look, in an HGC or something like that, for errors this gross!

You're taking it for granted that the errors are minor. That the pc had a little ARC break at the beginning of session with the auditor and therefore didn't advance in the session, and that's what this is all about.

No. You ask about this, and you try to clean up this little ARC break, and everything is ooooh! somehow or another. Pc doesn't still make any gains. And you go along, and you just flounder and fumble, and you wonder where you're going and what you're doing. No, the error there is the auditor never shows up for sessions. You think I'm kidding, but that's the order of magnitude of error!

It's big, you see. I mean, it'll be big! It'll be something on the order of, well, every night after the auditing day, the auditor has a date with the preclear's wife. See?

You take my tip. You look for gross errors. Just as we're running at ten-thousand-horsepower today, plus, so it takes a ten-thousand-horsepower error to combat it. And don't you go looking . . . when you're training auditors or supervising processing, or trying to look a . . . don't you go around trying to find that little, tiny, little thing that would've held it all up. Because you're asking the same silly question as "How can you put a matchstick in front of the Twentieth Century Limited and stop the train?" Well, you can't. It has to be another Twentieth Century Limited. And it will be, too.

But you'd be amazed. I've done some cross-checking of this character that is . . . just would stoney you. Just gone over it and over it and over it, trying to find out why we weren't making a gain, why we

weren't making gain. And I just got one the other day. We had an auditor who just wasn't getting good results, that's all. Wasn't getting good results. And look: What he learned about running an E-Meter was the totality of running an E-Meter a few days ago, and he thanked me very carefully. Look, the guy's been assessing on the Prehav Scale. He has been running Security Checks. But he didn't know anything about setting up a meter. What he had learned is the third-of-a-dial-drop test. He learned several things about a meter. And he told me what these things were that he'd learned about a meter. He'd learned how to set up a meter. He'd learned to set it up and he knew now that you read by the needle . . .

You talk about gross error? I mean, how could the guy have gotten any gains at all running assessments when he couldn't read a meter? You get the idea? So this is as gross as the errors are, that's all. They're just horrendous! I . . . I see that you really don't probably believe me; you don't have much reality on what I'm saying there, but you will have. you will have. It's grim! And you, sweating your brains out.

You know, the worst thing that a person who is supervising auditing can do is start inventing unusual and gargantuan solutions because the auditor he's giving them to just can't seem to make a gain on the case. So the auditor keeps coming in and saying, "That didn't work." Well actually, this is the old whizzeroo on the California response. There's a thing called the California maturity test, and the California this and California that. Well actually, there's an . . . in Dianetics there was the California response. Inevitably, if you said something about a new process, when I was working out there, somebody would say, "Oh, yes, that's very interesting, I was using that last year."

Sounds strange, you see. you said, "Well, there's this new scale and there's the . . ." "Well, I was using it last year." They always used it last year, you see? Now I listened to this for over a year before I finally got a proper response to it. And that was . . . became the California response. And that is "What were you using a year ago?" Well, that's a cooker! They've even forgotten what you said practically, see. They don't remember anything that you said and they come out with some wild rendition and you've just told them about the No-Effect Scale, you see? All right.

And they say, "Well, yes."

"Well, what were you using a year ago? Exactly what was it?"

And they say, "Well, just what you're talking about."

"No, no, no, no. What exactly were you using a year ago?"

And they say, "Well . . . well, we put these phonograph records on a phonograph, and we clamp the earphones on the pc you see? And we'd say 'Be calm. Be calm. Be calm.' That's what we were doing a year ago, and it was just exactly what you said."

You try to get any sequitur out of this, you see! That's the way to handle those characters.

Anyway. Similarly, the most common failure that you have in managing several cases at the same time is this one: Person comes in and says, "You know that . . . that you told me to do yesterday?"

And you say, "Yes. Uh . . . well . . . uh..." (That was your mistake, right there, you see?)

They say, "Well . . ." triumphantly, see. "Well, it didn't work!"

And you say, "Well, I don't know. What is it doing?" And they give you a big rundown. You think up a new and extraordinary solution, you see, and you give them that.

And they go away, and they come back the next day, they say, "It didn't work! Oh-ho! No! It didn't work!"

For God sakes, get bright enough sooner or later to say to them, directly and positively, "What didn't work?" And you inevitably get some outpouring of sewage that has nothing to do with anything you

have ever been talking about! “Well, I keep standing the pc on his head in the corner, and he . . the blood keeps rushing to his head.” “And it’s obvious that he isn’t Clear, because he can experience a physical effect.” I mean, it’ll be some gross nonsense of this character. And you have been pounding your brains out, trying to get this case moving, you see, thinking . . putting it on automatic . . that your instructions and advice’s were all going to be followed. And if you get that type of repetitive action, that is one of your gross errors that you must be alert to, that you must wake up to.

Listen, if you’ve figured out a case from A to Izzard, knowing Scientology, and you ask somebody to run this on the case, I’ll see. I’ll promise you something is going to happen. It isn’t going to be “Well it didn’t work!” See?

So obviously it’s a gross error. You keep looking for something that works on the pc when the first order or instruction you gave, which is “Take the pc up to the auditing room,” hasn’t been followed yet!

I’m not getting 1.5 on the subject of auditors. I’m talking about auditing failures. And auditing failures always stem from gross, very gross, errors. And they are so gross that you will overlook them. And when you start giving extraordinary solutions on top of these gross auditing errors, of course, you’re just getting no place at a hell of a rate. The thing for you to do is pick up a bulletin and say, “Now, let’s see. It says something here about Routine 1. Now, describe to me in a few words what Routine 1 is.”

And the person says, “Well, that’s tell a person to be three feet back of his head, isn’t it?” Yeah, well, he has never read that bulletin. And you’ve been telling him to put it into effect; and he’s never read it.

I’ve got a wonderful example of that right now on the administrative lines I was just making a crack about. I have a report through the lines that a certain area was utterly disregarding all bulletins, because they were so busy in the middle of an emergency they couldn’t put any of them into an effect, you see, because of the emergency they were having with finances and other things, you see. I got that report through from an independent source, that they just didn’t know anything about any bulletins.

And sure enough, about three days later, I get a total 1.1 piece of nonsense about how everything is going broke and it’s all a big emergency. It’s just a total glee of insanity all the way through this report. How do you like that? Just glee of insanity. Backing up the hearse, telling you how bad it all is and so forth. Well look, if these characters have never followed any instructions of any kind whatsoever, I can guarantee you they’ll be in trouble. See, they’ll just be in over their heads. Particularly if they had carefully reversed every instruction they had heard a rumor of. You see how that goes hand in glove?

So it happens on administrative lines, and it’s something for a man in business to know. If somebody’s department is going all wrong, and you just can’t seem to put it right, and you just can’t seem to issue orders that put it right, and you just can’t seem to do anything to put it right; it’s about time you looked for the gross error. Because it’s not a little error of he has one too many motions in feeding the stuff to the accounts machine, see. It’s not that at all.

It’s the fact that every time he receives the mail he dumps it in the waste basket. See, it’s that kind of an error. And this is . . goes hand in glove with he feeds you bad news and he says he can’t do the job and there isn’t any way possible to get the show on the road, and usually goes along with he needs more appropriation for his department and more help. All these things sort of fit in, in a package, see.

All right. You say, “Well, the poor guy. He’s struggling there and maybe he isn’t very bright,” and you are being very, very kind, patient, and so forth, about this. And so you try to give him help by giving him instructions. And he keeps coming back and telling you the instructions didn’t work. And the department doesn’t get any better.

Well, the whole thing about it is, you never gave instructions that had anything to do with what was wrong in the department. What you should do about the time something really starts to run real wrong is to go look for the gross error. And just keep looking for the gross error, because you’ll find so many minor errors that they will trap your attention. And so you never see the gross error. Get the idea?



You look at these little errors . . . Naturally, such a person in auditing a case would have all of his rudiments out, or something like this, naturally. But look . . look for the gross error. What is the error here, when you've got a case that just doesn't advance, or things just aren't going. What is the error? It . . it's big. Be something like the order of he just hasn't a clue. you might discover it by looking at him to find out he holds the E-Meter upside down. I mean, it'll be something weird like this, you know?

And it almost exceeds your imagination. But it also comes out of the impulse to make nothing out of something. They've got to make nothing out of something, and this comes back to a subject known as productivity, which businessmen are very interested in, and which Russia's going to pieces on, and which England can do much better with, and the United States is going down for the third time on.

The effort to produce is one-half of the dichotomy. And all strikes and everything else are on a single button, and the . . that is the effort not to produce. And you've got people all over the place who are totally dedicated to non production, totally dedicated to no results. I'm afraid that's a fact. Totally dedicated to the no-survival of a situation. Well, it comes about naturally. You come . . it's as half the dichotomy. You keep telling them "All right, the organization has got to survive." The organization, the state, the nation, the group, mankind, got to survive, got to survive. And it just runs, it gets into a stuck flow, and you develop a bunch of people that quite automatically go on the basis of the organization must not survive and are just thinking day and night how to put it out of business, thinking day and night how to put the government out of business.

There's one department in the United States that just must sit up all night long just trying to figure out ways and means how to stop the United States from surviving. If they just sat back and relaxed or they all went home or all went and played golf or drowned themselves in the Potomac, or something like that, you'd be surprised. Probably United States' international relations would right themselves instantly. Because there's an enormous amount of guys doing business all over the world who probably are far, far more competent than anybody in the State Department.

Similarly, we look down here in the Treasury Department or we look down here at the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and we find him all the time trying to figure out something new, extraordinary and strange and different. And the only time when it really got to going good in the last few years is when I think he got sick or something. And it was just going dandy there for a while. And there were a whole bunch of graphs published showing during the period of minimal restriction that everybody's savings increased, the purchasing power of the country almost doubled and so forth, until they all got active on financial planning. The plan balanced economy thing

By the way, they get that from Marcab. Marcab always had plan balanced economies. Everybody was broke and starving all the time. And so, what happened? They put on a bunch of restrictions, because all of a sudden everybody got into a panic.

Now Jersey, right now, is a little tiny dot of rock over here, and Jersey had a lot of hot money coming in. It was tax money, and if you had the money in Jersey, you didn't have to pay income tax on it. So here was this flood of hot money coming into Jersey. Jersey's broke, it's poor, it doesn't have very much to do with, has nothing much to build with. All of a sudden people borrowed this hot money, and started building hotels, and doing other things around, and right away, everybody in Jersey, almost without exception, got around and started to complain, and groups started to form to stop this hot money, because it was somehow or another bad . . because the balloon might suddenly be pricked and there might be a tremendous crash.

Now, did they sit around and think how to employ that money? Did they sit around and think how to fix up a community here, with all the available capital they needed, so that everybody had a good show and they were all nicely employed and it was all running off gorgeously? Did they put in a moment of time doing this? They sure didn't! No, they just said, "How can we stop this flow? We've got to make this prosperity stop, man. Or we've had it. We've had it." But what's had it? The ambition not to produce has had it. And that ambition would cease to exist and therefore would die and perish. You see how this could be?

So you get strikes. And never kid yourself much about strikes. Strikes will eventually slaughter free enterprise. Strike in the last half-century has drifted these nations over into greater and greater socialism's. Oh, I'm sure there was a . . . there was some recourse to low wages and working twenty-four hours a day and all this sort of thing . . . I'm sure. But I'm equally sure that nobody found the remedy yet. That I'm equally sure of. I'm sure communism isn't the remedy, socialism isn't the remedy, none of these things are. That I'm sure of.

Because all it is, is this button of "no-produce." It is a hot button. It's no production. You will find it there on your Create Scale. If it isn't in your Secondary Scale, which I haven't looked over, finalized yet, or checked against everything, it certainly is a wide hole missing on your Secondary Scale. So you ought to put this button, "produce" in there, and you ought to put "non produce" right in alongside of it. And that one I know isn't in the scale. I've just been exploring this.

"Non production. Our goal is non production. If we can just keep everybody fooled enough, we'll have it." Now, the goal can also be "no results." "If anybody obtains any results around here, it'll be over my dead body, personally. My primary goal and ambition will have utterly ceased, and that will be the end of it if anybody ever makes a gain." You got the idea?

Well, that could be a psychotic state of mind. And when you see errors of gross magnitude, continually occurring . . . We all make mistakes. I can make mistakes, you can make mistakes, everybody can make mistakes. The trick is to be right a majority of the time. Most of the time, be right. Don't ever try to be 100 percent perfect. Just try to be right most of the time; and boy, you're batting so high above the national average that you really succeed, see.

A lot of people go around with total perfection, you know? They can't get anything done because, well, it wouldn't exactly be right. I had a guy like this on board a yacht one time. And he managed to try to burn the boat down a couple of times and I finally decided I'd better send him ashore. I wasn't around. He was just a boat guard, see. But he would start monkeying around with washing a bulkhead, and he would get into a frantic state about the bulkhead, you know? And you'd go into the yacht and you would find this bulkhead has been washed. And he'd say, "Well, no. No, not yet. I'm not finished with it." And you'd happen to come back a couple of days later and this bulkhead is still in the process of being washed. And a week later the bulkhead is still in the process of being washed.

And you say, "What in the name of common sense is going on here? You're washing one bulkhead!"

He said, "Yeah, but it's not clean yet." you see, his idea that if he did anything it had to be absolutely perfect. And if it wasn't absolutely perfect, why, then he couldn't just leave it.

You'll find artists down in Greenwich Village . . . they've got canvases around that are two-inches thick with paint, because they're trying to paint the perfect picture. And they're trying so hard to paint the perfect picture that they never paint a picture!

It's good discipline sometimes for yourself, that after you've done a sketch of something or after you've planned something out . . . It's actually good discipline . . . sounds weird, sounds anti any training you have . . . of just say abruptly, "That's . . . that's finished and that's complete, and that's the way we're going to do it," and never work out the final details. You know, and say, "Well, we'll do it that way." Just to teach yourself that not everything in the world perishes because you left out one little tiny detail on something.

Now, people get too panic-stricken at making a mistake. And they get so panic-stricken at making a mistake they become unreasonably tense and unreasonably upset about learning the right way to do something and they can't relax. You understand? So if they figure anything is worrying them this hard, then it's very easy for them to go over the borderline and just start insisting nothing get done. And there's a very thin line between total perfectionism and accomplish-nothing. That's a very thin boundary. And it is very, very easily crossed.

I'll tell you that sitting back with a cigar in your mouth, one of you girls, with your feet on the . . . on the other chair, reading an E-Meter occasionally but perfectly willing to sit there and audit, actually could

get results on a pc. Actually! You could actually do it. That's an interesting view of it, isn't it? In view of the fact we're talking about perfection, perfection, you've got to do them absolutely perfect . . the TRs and all that sort of thing.

It's only after you can do them all perfect that you can relax and put your feet on a chair and smoke a cigar and get results on the pc. you got the idea? Because your anxiety is no longer present. Your anxiety is no longer present and is no longer communicating to the pc. Les resultats! You are in the clear, so what you say counts.

As a matter of fact I can audit with tremendously precise formality and I can do Tone 40s with great, precise formality. But I can also, with my pen still in my hand, midway toward writing a letter someplace or another, pick an E-Meter up, stand it on its edge, at the desk, make somebody sit down and pick up the cans and do a good job of assessing them. And then turn the E-Meter off and thank them very much and tell them I'm not assessing them, and I'll go back to writing a letter.

But that's because they haven't got any feeling of anxiety about it and I haven't got any feeling of anxiety about it and I can do the job and they know it and there isn't any monkey business about it. Get the idea? But this tremendous strain of to get everything right, get everything absolutely right, "If I can just get this absolutely . . . If I can just get my little finger held just right as I'm gripping the E-Meter, you see, and I look at the pc just, just right, and I don't make any mistakes of any kind whatsoever, why, maybe I'll get a result." No, you won't get any result. Because the gross thing about auditing is missing. You don't have any confidence. You don't exude any confidence. And what's the primary thing in Dianetics? The old thing. The one thing that you could always do. You can give people hope and you, with all this tension, have given them no hope at all.

Now, I'm not trying to make a big bunch of nonsense here and build up this idea of gross auditing error and then tell you a lot of minor auditing errors and tell you they're gross. But look, being one of the fundamental purposes in dissemination or one of the fundamental actions which you can undertake to make anybody well, how about omitting it from the sessions, huh?

Now, let's just omit it, totally. Pc comes in, sits down. We don't pay any attention to what he's doing and so forth, and we make sure that our feet are planted right on the floor, and we're getting all set to do TR 0. We aren't even aware of who the pc is or their trouble or anything else. They sit down in the chair and you say, "Is it all right...? Let's see, where's my paper? Yeah, well... Is it all right with you if I begin . . uhm . . this . . uhm . . the session? This session? The session! No, no, that's not right . . ."

See, the fundamental has been neglected. The fundamental is simply that you are there to make somebody better. In view of the fact that goal is all out, then the results you receive from there on are quite minor. Because you're not trying to do anything for them. See, what you're doing is trying to be perfect.

So if I can teach you how to do all these things perfectly and get you to a point of insouciant confidence, so that you could put your feet on the chair and a cigar in your mouth and balance the E-Meter and wiggle the tone arm with your big toe and still get results and not have the pc feel that this is the least bit strange. You get the difference of frame of mind? The pc wouldn't feel this was strange if you really knew your business. "Why," he'd say, "that's the way he audits."

Of course, now he makes his fatal error. He goes out, he asks you covertly, "What brand of cigars do you smoke?" The same old gag, you see?

The fundamental error you can make, of course, is not wanting to help the pc and not helping the pc. That would be the fundamental error, isn't it? Well, you . . you can get over worrying at all about your technology, see, worrying at all about Model Session. Just do it standing on your head. You know, TRs . . pang! TRs . . you can do them. Man when you can confront somebody leaning over a rail on a ferry boat, and do a better job of confronting than anybody else on that ferry boat, you could audit in that position.

See, in order to break the rules you have to be able to be acquainted with all of them. And then you can go ahead and break all the rules you want to. As long as you don't commit any one of these fundamental errors like not being present at the auditing session, you see. Or auditing with a dead meter. Or auditing with one that's got one of these grains of dust into its pot so that it does nothing but rock slam, and you just go on auditing the rock slam out of the pc . . and of course, the pc hasn't been rock slamming on anything . . and then justify it all by saying "Well, Ron says that rock slams persist often . . ."

And did you know one of these meters will rock slam if it gets a grain of dust in its pot? Mm-hm. You know, the way to cure it is just to shake the tone arm around a little bit. And if that doesn't cure it, drop a little bit of lighter fluid in it, and shake it around a couple of times, and it won't do it anymore.

All right. I've given you a very random discourse, but I hope I've given you something to operate with.

Instant reads. If right now you can get accustomed to this instant read, that's another brand of confidence. And you'll get this brand of confidence. Sooner or later, you'll get it straight. You right now are, I'm sure, in a slightly leery frame of mind about "Well, let's see, did he say one-tenth of a second? Let's see, was that one-tenth of a second or one-twentieth of a second? Or was it really a half a second? How long did it take the needle to react? Well, we'll - we'll spread it out to three seconds, and we'll call that "instant", and then we'll be safe." No, you won't.

And then you'll feel very funny about going across a question, and you read this question and there's no reaction on the meter, and you'll feel very funny about leaving the question. You'll say, "Well, that's being very unthorough.", so you read the question again, you get a latent response. Well, maybe your latent response is something on this order: You read the question. This restimulated something in the pc that really isn't on the subject of the question but is a borderline, you got the idea? All right, you restimulate the borderline when you read the question. Now you read the question again just to be sure, because you're unconfident, you see. And the moment you do that . . you wait for it for a moment . . and all of a sudden it reacts.

You have not got an answer to the question. What you've got is some allied activity of some kind or another. You got it way over in left field. And you'll get that when you get to it. See, your Security Check is thorough enough, now. You'll get it, someplace, on the Security Check, you'll get it as an instant response. Got the idea?

But you could spend hours cleaning off all the fringes of the chicken house without ever getting the chicken to eat. you could! Just spend hours and hours and hours, cleaning off these latent responses. They're all else where.

All right. You just have to give yourself some experience of watching that meter, and if it doesn't go pang, you just skip it. That works with Goals Assessments too, you know. you read off the goal, and then you say, "And one, and two, and three, and four, and fall!" And you say, "Well, that one is still hot."

I don't know whether that one is hot or China is hot or anything else. It's the same question as "What did the needle start to rise on?" Your latent response is "What did the needle start to fall on?" You cannot answer the question, so therefore you might as well neglect it. You're not sure. You're liable to leave the pc in a total flub and fog. "Why is that needle falling?" he will say. And you'll still get latent responses. If you've got the question, he always gets an instant response.

It works like this: You say, "Well, did you ever illicit diamonds-buy?" and he illicit diamonds-bought. Believe me, you haven't got "buy", out of your mouth "bu . ." you got a fall. "Okay, that's it." And until he gives you that one, on a Joburg, it will just keep falling-instant response. You ask the question, get an instant response. You ask the question, you get an instant response. It won't erase. It'll just stay there. It doesn't matter how many times he thinks of it. He's actively withholding it from you. But you'll get these latent responses on and on and on and on.

Now, I want to point this out as a gross error, not only in auditing generally but in my communication of auditing. And that gross error is simply this and only this: You were auditing the analytical mind and I hadn't noticed it. You weren't auditing the reactive mind; you were auditing the analytical mind. Therefore your auditing target was off. And that all by itself could explain no Clears, see. Instantly.

I don't know how fast you can do an assessment now, how fast you can do an assessment now using only instant responses and erasing only instant responses. You do it the same way, by elimination. I don't know how fast you can do it. But it's probably something on the order of a hundredth of the time you have been using to do it, okay?

That was the main thing I came down to tell you today. Don't immediately think I'm trying to blame you or giving you a bunch of stuff here and saying, "Well, he's proving us all wrong." No, no. It hasn't done any harm to take off all the fringes. It hasn't done any harm. It's advanced the case, sort of the hard way. It hasn't done any harm to assess a case the long way, you understand, and take all the ramifications and all the latent responses off it. That has not done anything at all that is bad. It has wasted less auditing time than you think, because you were trying to run the whole case on the instant response and the latent response. And you were trying to run the reactive mind and the analytical mind. And it's only that time which you devoted to straightening out the analytical mind, which was all right anyhow, that you wasted.

So it hasn't been any vast catastrophe. But on the contrary, has been a considerable win, because I know now what you're trying to do. see. And it was different than what I was trying to do.

I'm trying to knock out of the reactive bank those held-down fives which a person can't think about and which add themselves into every equation. And if you just knock out those held-down fives, the case will get all right fast. See, and if you go on worrying with the pc about why the fives are held down, but never under any circumstances really go looking for a held-down five, of course you're going to get minimal results and minimal recoveries, and minimal profile gains and all the rest of it.

So it's all to the good. I mean, we've speeded up auditing right now a thousand for one again. If we keep doing this, we'll have to watch it because a person will write us a letter, but two days before that, he got Clear.

They know when they were going to write us a letter because they went Clear suddenly! Okay?

All right. I've held you rather overlong. There were some things I wanted to cover with you. I hope you think they were important enough to stay for.

Thank you.