READING E-METER REACTIONS

A lecture given on
9 June 1961

Thank you.

Okay, let's see. This is the 9th of June 1961, Saint Hill Briefing Course and you have had a bulletin today, or you should have had. Says something to the effect, I think sarcastic, snide, asking you if you're waiting for the E-Meter to play "Dixie" and I expect almost anybody at any minute to say, "No, we're waiting it to play 'God Save the Queen.'

But I'm quite happy about it, actually, in a and in a fairly exuberant frame of mind with regard to it, because I found out what's taking you so confounded long to clear people. And there's a general misconcept abroad.

And it although it's taken up in this bulletin which is what? The 8th, HCOB 8 June 61 you're auditing people's analytical minds out! That's right! I mean, this sounds incredible, but that's what you're trying to do!

And you know, you're not going to shoot any ducks if you keep going around shooting at crows. Well, it's true isn't it, huh? I know I've left you in a little bit of a mystery, but that is what you are doing.

Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health 1950. We change all the time. We change all the time, except we're always dealing with the same fundamentals.

All we're doing is changing an approach to the same fundamentals. But what is that but Book One? And we've got all kinds of ramifications on the same fundamentals.

So here's this mind without inspection. All right. It's pretty good, you know? It doesn't have to make an inspection. See, that's the first thing that's wrong with the situation. So therefore, it reacts on anything it inspects. Got the idea? So the inspections are kind of accidental. Because it's based to work without inspection.

Of course, everybody knows that this is the safest thing to do. A thetan is trying to survive, who doesn't find any necessity for trying to survive at all . . which is the first idiocy.

You couldn't possibly kill a thetan. You could degrade him, submerge him, make him unable and do various things like this, or he could do these things to himself. But he couldn't possibly not survive.

So, the first thing it is doing is trying to solve a problem which doesn't exist: the survival of a thetan. Doesn't exist!

So therefore, it immediately relegates itself to the survival of form or the perpetuity of an existing state. If you can't keep a thetan from surviving, you certainly, however, could keep a form surviving, couldn't you? But if you kept a form surviving, what you would have is a perpetuation of existing state . . which would, of course, take out all the time, all the matter, all the energy and all the space in a sensible arrangement and garblize them. Why?

All right. The reactive mind is the accumulated goals of survival of the individual . . for forms. And that is exactly what the reactive mind is. That's . . it's no more complicated than that. Its goal is survival in each case, you see?

Now, the reason it destroys is because it's trying to get something to survive. You got the idea? See? Trying to get self to survive so it destroys other, see? But it's still survival. It creates something in order to get a form to survive.

Even though you've got create and destroy, and even though you have a cycle of action, the reactive mind is that part of the cycle of action which is never going to move, and never has, according to any understanding or activity in which man has engaged, in all the time he has been on this planet. Why?

Because the keynote of it is survive . . survival of a form. There's no question about the survival of a thetan.

Oh, there's a question of the survival of his capabilities. There's a question of survival of his happiness. There's a question of survival of whether or not he's interested. There's a question of all these things, but these are significance's.

As far as his actual survival is concerned, he'll be here till the universe fades out, even though he's only a crumb of a Sullivan . . I mean sand! Got to be careful of who I have overts on here!

Anyhow. Now, here then is this enigma. You have a mind that is trying to make something survive which is already dead. It's gone, man, it's gone! The body you had back there on the galaxy of Gee Whizzes, that, that hadn't been, that form hasn't been around for a long time. Go back and look. Dig up the old scrap heap where they threw the factory workers and you won't find anything there anymore, except a memory. Touching, isn't it?

But the reactive mind, because it was trying desperately, you see, to make that form survive once, has never forgotten the impulse. That's pretty good. Because the impulse is survive, then the reactive mind's impulse regarding that action is surviving, you see? And it hasn't any more use to you. You could remember this, don't you see, if you didn't have to make it survive. But by remembering it, because of the impulse of survival being so great in that particular area, you get a restimulation as though you're still in the period, as though you're still there. Why? Because all the impulse of survival is trapped into that period and area, but it has been riding on up to the present time.

Here's the great game of make-believe. The form has lived forever and is still here. What a game of pretense, you see?

Well, the accumulation of these pretenses, with all of their attendant recordings and nostalgia, wind up in present time having nothing to do with the situation anywhere. But in order to guarantee the survival of this doll you lost back in the galaxy of Gee Whizzes, it is perfectly obvious that you have to do something about gorillas.

Well, this is difficult, because there just don't happen to be but about 450 of them left. They're the United Nations officials now. Anyway, they - that's something on that order. There are very few gorillas left and so the reactive mind has a great starvation for gorillas, which can make this thing survive.

So a woman walks down the street with a fur coat and a fellow has a feeling in his head of small machinery going around. Only, because it's all by no inspection . . . You see, the safe thing to do is to act without thinking, because you never know what's going to happen to a form. The surprises have been multitudinous. So if you just act quick enough, the datum is, if you just act quick enough, why, the form goes on surviving.

But if you, well, if you could just duck bullets, give you an idea, see, an ambition of this character. Every time somebody fired a bullet at you, in a war or something like that, if you acted quickly enough, of course, you would never be hit. I know that's idiotic, but so is the reactive mind.

Yet sometime or another, you've had an ambition of that character. You've said, "I wouldn't ever have airplanes run into me if I ducked every time I thought there might be an airplane in my vicinity." Well, this gets embarrassing, particularly when you're in basements.

See, it's a - if you're going to get a form to survive, you mustn't wait until you look over the name, rank and serial number of the aircraft, you see. The thing to do is duck.

Actually, I knew a naval officer, he has only one creditable action in his whole existence and that was, he actually did identify an American fighter craft that was coming back in over the fleet. And it had been mauled up and it was making it all right. It was trailing smoke. And he did identify it, and he did restrain at the last instant, his people from firing at that aircraft. He did restrain them.

The aircraft was shot down by the next ship in line. But that was a creditable action, and I . . I wish to assign it to him. It shows you that not all men are all bad.

But this was very unusual for him to do such a thing, which is why it stands out in my mind. It's almost incredible for the man to ever have inspected anything, yet he did in this particular case. But the safe thing, reactively, to do is of course, shoot at an aircraft without inspection.

Well, when fellows get all gingered up by war, they're liable to do things like this. Actually, the only thing wrong with wars is, you put weapons in the hands of men and get them marching around, some of those guns will go off and somebody's liable to get hurt. And that's the only thing wrong with war. Otherwise, they're fine.

So, there was a little Dutch corvette, and it had escaped from Java when it was abandoned by the Associated Allied Admirals Union and . . they had to work overtime, so they abandoned it. Anyway, this little corvette escaped.

Well, I myself was in a sort of a gingery frame of mind and had very often gone clang when, in approaching American harbors, the local fighter command or torpedo boats would use you for target practice and they all were under orders, that in view of the fact there were no ships around of the enemy, that they should fight ours.

And they would take practice dummy runs on every ship that was coming in and they were under orders to do this. It was almost enough for a ship to be coming down the fairway for the fighter command to leap into their cockpits, tie their girl's stockings . . or was that another war . . and go screaming off down the runway and go dummy runs on you, you know?

And you'd have to hold your cap on, on the bridge, you see and the funnel would go eeuengh! and so on. And I used to object to this rather considerably, because I'd been over in . . in the South Pacific, early in the war and it made me nervous. And I was getting reactive on the subject, you see?

Not as reactive as a bunch of officers I went down to meet one day, who had just come in from that area. An aircraft passed over their landed aircraft on the airport . . and, they were on American soil, you see . . and every one of them threw himself face down on the concrete alongside of the airplane. Of course, there were . . all the people at the airport thought this was silly, which it was because it was in the wrong time and place. But it was just a reaction, you see.

Well, anyway, this little Dutch corvette comes steaming up the line in Miami and a whole squadron of American torpedo bombers say, "Well, that's what we're supposed to do." And they jump in their cockpits and tie their girl's stockings around their necks, or whatever it is and go screaming down the runway, up into the sky and start a practice run on this Dutch corvette. And of course, they got met right in the teeth with everything the Dutch corvette had. Well, at least part of the Air Force had a baptism of fire.

By the way, the United States government couldn't do anything about it at all. They spoke to the Dutch corvette and the Dutch corvette said . . captain said, "Ve have jus' come out of a war. Uns you go running against us, you gonna get shot at. That's it!"

And the corvette was provided with air cover all the way up the Atlantic seaboard, clear to New York, to warn off torpedo bombers and things that might make runs on it. They kept it spotted, much more carefully than they were looking for the Deutschland. It was dangerous!

Now their reactivity of course has come up to a total insistence. It's come up to a total identification of all aircraft with enemy aircraft, you see? Because the safe thing to do is not inspect.

Obviously, if you sat around in enemy waters, you know, and the lookout, he sees an aircraft in the distance and he walks back to the phone and he picks up the phone and he said, "Give me the Captain's orderly." And the orderly comes to the phone. He said, "I'd like to speak to the Captain if he isn't busy."

"Captain, I don't wish to disturb you, but I have spotted something up in the sky. I'm not sure what it is. Would you like to come out and have a look?"

Captain says, "Well, I'm going to finish a cup of tea here and I'll be up." Of course, they would have been dead by that time. Never would have had a chance.

So instead of that, they jam time. You get the idea? And the jam of the time finally results in a no-inspection. See what happens?

So any aircraft in the distance gets shot at, until . . . I think I was the first one across the Pacific after the declaration of war in WW II, in an unarmed merchant man and we were running like a hare before the wolves. And one day . . one day there was a terrible alarm and we'd managed to haul some antitank guns out of the hold and mount them in sandbags. And I don't know what they could have done, but it was very interesting anyway and kept the morale up and we had a couple of Lewis guns that I'd put in action. Nobody on board knew how to operate the things and it was quite . . it was quite good.

And all of a sudden, there was a tremendous, screaming rush up on the boat deck and everybody was gesticulating at the sky, and the Lewis gun goes off with a low snarl and antitank guns start banging.

So I went up to find out what was happening, and they point up at the sky and the bridge, meantime, is madly trying to communicate with the boat deck . . out of communication totally. Nobody would listen to the bridge and finally, I spot this thing. I couldn't figure out what they were shooting at!

They knew. They were shooting at an enemy aircraft and they'd seen it circle and it was circling. The only difficulty was, in the tropics, Venus is totally visible in daylight. And they were shooting madly at the planet Venus!

And the bridge had already figured out what they were doing and was trying to tell them madly that that was Venus. Being seamen, they have their own goddesses. Here was a totally reactive situation. Of course, the safe thing to do was shoot, obviously.

Well, that's how far off it can go.

So one day, this part of the reactive mind which has been trying to keep a doll surviving on the Galaxy Gee Whizzes, from being destroyed by gorillas, gets a whiff of a fur coat and goes into total action. Takes over, right as out of that moment. You've got an emergency situation, instantly. You've got gorillas in the vicinity and it's better not to inspect, even. People who turn around and really inspect things are very often amongst the wounded and dead. So what . . what are you going to do?

It means, that when you speed up things in the universe to too great a degree, on the false basis that you are "prone to non survival," but in the interest of keeping something surviving, you are then going to run into this timeless reactivity of action without inspection. Infinite dedications to the survival of forms and patterns.

This is why Goals SOP works so beautifully and why, when you start to take goals off somebody, they start nulling You think offhand, "Well, gee whiz, I'm taking all this fellow's goals away from him," you see, or something of that sort. Well, you're auditing the wrong target. You're auditing the guy.

Now, of course, you're actually auditing toward the guy in order to free him up from reactivity. So there . . actually your auditing target is the reactive mind. That is your auditing target, not the pc.

And as long as you go on busily auditing a thetan, called a pc, exclusively . . as the thing which monitors what you're doing . . you're going to continue to make mistakes and not clear people. That's all.

Because you never look at what's wrong with him. You're only auditing what he knows. The only thing wrong with him is what he doesn't know and what he doesn't know is totally contained in the reactive mind and there is no inspection involved. So he can't see what is wrong with him and if he could see what was wrong with him, it wouldn't be wrong, would it?

All right. A lot of things stem out of this. First and foremost, you think that a reaction, probably, to your question may take place in the next several minutes. You sit and look at an E-Meter and wait for it to react. And, of course, the reaction which you have to wait for is something the pc knows. And the reaction which you get instantly is in the reactive mind. And it'll occur in something on the order of a tenth or even a hundredth of a second.

It starts to occur instantly that you enunciate it. Because you're more in control and more able to restimulate the reactive mind than the thetan whose reactive mind it is. Why? Because every time it's restimulated, it blanks something out. The no-inspection factor arises.

Well, you're not being blanked out by his reactive mind. So therefore, you can think on these subjects, and he can't. Unless you have a total case duplicate between the auditor and the pc, the auditor can always see more of what is going on than the pc can.

You take in a pc's adjudication or what a pc thinks about something as any indicator of what you ought to do . . at any time . . and you, of course, are always going to waste auditing time and you're always going to do the wrong thing. Inevitably and invariably, it'll be the wrong thing.

If you want to do all the wrong things, then listen to the pc. Because he's under a tyrannical dictatorship, known as the reactive mind, which knows best because it now has in it all the individualities which he has tried to make survive and all of them know best. So one of his basic goals, although he knows it's very bad for him, is to make his reactive mind survive.

So even though this fellow will sit down and be audited, this is peculiar and the peculiarity which resolves around this. He won't let you near any part of the reactive mind that ought to be audited . . gluah-gluah-gluahgluah . . because those parts are the survivals. So it dictates that he let them survive. So, he'll always throw you red herring.

And after you've accumulated several warehouses full of red herring, you have also wasted an enormous amount of auditing time, because you've never audited anything that should have been audited on the case and you've permitted to survive everything that should have been audited out of the case, don't you see?

You listen to the pc, you listen to the pc, about what's flat or what should be run, or what he thinks about the situation and that's just . . write it over here in the loss column of auditing, for you. Got nothing to do with the case. Nothing!

You can almost go on the basis, if he says this is what the score is, your immediate reaction can be that is certainly what it isn't, aside from this basis of goals and checks against the E-Meter.

Now, the E-Meter can read the case. Why? Because everything that is surviving madly, to be computed and go into action without inspection, even though it doesn't apply anymore . . . You see, things like this can go into action: If you go around and inspect things and turn around and look when you're running from a stricken field, you normally get speared. So therefore, it's very, very bad to look at the things that are pursuing you. So you mustn't look at the things which are pursuing you. So you had better prevent the auditor from equally getting in danger by looking at the things that are pursuing you. Something of that sort comes up. There are all sorts of crisscross computations involved here.

But you're going on avoiding what is wrong with the pc quite unintentionally. What's wrong with him registers on the meter, but not on the person. It'll register on him secondarily.

Now, you can actually get something to register on the meter, which then the person finds out about. And then you get another reaction on the machine.

Have you seen this happen? You say "gooseberries," and the machine says "tick," and then you get a surge of some kind or another. What's that all about? Well, the tick; you found it in the reactive mind. The surge; the pc found out about it.

Well, you go on assessing for surges and running surges, of course, you're just going on auditing what's already known. See, you're just wasting time.

Now, if the pc doesn't find out about it after the tick, you better audit it. Got it?

Now, there's another thing which makes this difficult and which has obscured your clear view of it and that is just this one little terrible factor. Withholdingness is important in auditing today because it happens to be the comm bridge between the reactive mind and the pc. And when a withhold comes out of the reactive mind, the pc momentarily . . or rather continuously . . withholds, too.

In other words, he does what the reactive mind tells him to do. So therefore, if the reactive mind is withholding something, it comes to the surface, the pc will instantly withhold it.

So you ask somebody, "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" And the thing goes "tick." Only you didn't really see the first tick to amount to anything and then it goes wha-a-m!

And then you say, "Well, did you ever steal any chickens?" and it now goes wha-a-m, and will continue going wham. He's now under orders from the reactive mind to withhold.

Well now, withholdingness is part and parcel of survival. All agencies of the law, everybody else, dramatize this rather astonishing fact. What is the fellow doing when he is trying to protect himself by running from a stricken field? He is withholding a body from the enemy, isn't he? He's withholding a form.

Now, the withhold of the form, the withhold of the form, the withhold of the form, from destruction, don't you see, is a non duplication. You kill somebody, they're dead, but the form you've got isn't dead. So therefore, you have to withhold the form you've got from duplicating the form that is dead, don't you see?

So, similarly, somebody threatens to kill you, you are very likely to threaten to kill them. Duplication is quite active, you see? But if somebody tried to kill you and you killed them, during that whole period of your killing them, you'd have to hold your form from being killed . . do you see this? . . which, of course, sets the mechanics going for survival. And that, actually, is prior to the actual idea of surviving, is withholding a form. Or you could say surviving is coincident with it . . whichever way you want to figure it out. But withholding a form and surviving are blood brothers. So withhold a form . . you find the pc then withholding thought.

And the common denominator of the actions of the reactive mind are withhold, which we see as only-one, chronic individuation. There are just factors, factors, factors, factors that we've added up through Scientology. All of which amount to withholding oneself, withholding one's thoughts, withholding one's actions, and all of these things add up. Why?

Because they're a dictate from the matter of survival and are probably . . they're probably prior to survival and with survival and after survival. And there's that little comm bridge and the comm bridge between the reactive mind and the pc is withhold. So what the reactive mind is withholding, if you click it, the pc now withholds. He dramatizes the reactive mind.

When he decides to give this up, he has conquered the reactive mind to that degree in that he's not following its orders. He ceases to be controlled by the reactive mind and starts to be controlled by a living being. So therefore, he feels better when he gets withholds off. This is the mechanics of it, don't you see. Because the withholds add up to keeping him separated from the human race and when he gets the withhold off, he rejoins it to that degree. See how it stacks up?

So, the pc can always be counted upon to dramatize the withhold after it's been dredged out of the reactive mind. Even for an instant, if only for an instant, he'll still dramatize it. So you get a click and then you get a fall. And if you're not being terribly observant, you will see only the hard, large fall. That's when the pc knew about it, don't you see? Actually, the click was there instantly. But now the pc knows about it.

Well, the secondary action is not to get the withhold off the pc but to keep the pc from dramatizing his reactive mind. So we say, "What was that?" and if he doesn't tell us, why, he just is going on dramatizing this "withhold it, withhold it, withhold it." And eventually he says, "Well, maybe I'll take a very adventurous step and not do what I am always told to do and I will tell this auditor what it is," and pow, then it goes clean on the meter.

So at the state of withhold, you've got a pc who is reactive. The pc himself, as an analytical being, is being reactive. But that is the crossroads and that's the only point where he is being. You got that? Otherwise, he's talking to you fairly straight, or at the dictates of the reactive mind.

Early in a case, particularly, if you kept on auditing the pc, you would be something like auditing a light bulb because you wanted to fix the generators in a power station.

Now, you can go on auditing this light bulb and it'll blink and flicker, and you'll say, "Gee, look what all I'm doing." Then all of a sudden there's a horrendous crash someplace, and it goes out; and you say, "Well, I failed."

Well, naturally, you're going to fail. You're auditing a light bulb and you're trying to fix the generators in the main power plant. Well, the thing to do is to go down to the main power plant and fix the generators. And this tells you the name and address, not only of the power plant, but it also tells you very distinctly which generator and it tells you every part on the generator and its means of propulsion.

As long as you fly with your E-Meter flat, you're all right and if you start flying with the pc flat, you're just going on auditing light bulbs. So, it's just going to take forever to clear somebody. That's all.

I'll give you an example. Now, all of this is highly theoretical up to this point, but let me give you a very practical example.

Now, we're running this Prehav Scale assessment. All right. I'll show you how to waste time in auditing, see, real good. This is the way you can burn it up and audit those light bulbs and everything is wonderful. See?

And you say, "Well, do you have faith in things? Thank you."

You get how much time that consumes, just watching the E-Meter, just watching the E-Meter, watching the E-Meter? What are you looking for? Are you waiting for it to play "Dixie?" Because there isn't anything else going to happen.

No. You look here at your list, and you see "Faith." You don't say "Faith." You take your eyeballs and you fix them on the needle, very closely, because it's going to happen fast.

And you say, not "Is the square root of the common denominator of the differential of faith?" You don't waste all that time. You say, "Now, I'm going to say some lines here, some levels. And maybe ask you some questions about them and you don't have to answer me. You don't have to say a thing Just sit there and be comfortable. All right. That's fine. Thank you very much. Now we're going ahead with this assessment. Okay."

"Faith. Cause. No Effect. Effect. Obsessive can't-have. Create. Think. Peculiar interest."

Now look, if you're sitting here doing this: "Uh . . Faith . . ." Well, you remind me of a small boy the day after the race, waiting for the horses to go by, you know.

It's not only that. It's . . I'm not talking to you just about missing the flick on the needle. I'm talking to you about expecting a significant flick on the needle after you've asked the thing, a half a second later. If there's not going to be any flick on the needle, there is

Now you're going to see this kind of a thing occasionally. There's a flick on the needle and then . . clong! . . there's a drop. Well, the flick on the needle is the reactivity, that's what you're looking for. So there's a clong. Okay.

In a Joburg Security Check, you'd better say, "What was that?" Because you've got another activity going now. You're not doing an assessment by the Joburg. You've got that . . "Have you ever stolen chickens?"

And you ask them, "Have you ever stolen chickens?" And nothing happens. And you say, "Well, okay, have you ever stolen chickens?" You suspected maybe there was a flick there, the first time. Maybe it was . . couldn't see it, maybe. You ask him a second time, you get click and then, surge! And you say, "What was that?" He knows about it now. The click-surge routine has put it from the reactivity into the analytical sphere.

Now, to keep the pc himself from dramatizing reactivity, you've got to get him to tell it to you. But it hasn't anything to do with the assessment of the question as to whether or not the question's hot.

Now, you get something that's actively being withheld from you and it doesn't wait after you say, "What was that?" to go click again. You say, "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! "Have you ever stolen any chickens?" Wham! And you say, "Brother, you'd better tell me about that." Of course, you are actually assuming that, by this time, he knows about it. Well, really, he does.

Of course, I conduct Security Checks much differently than you do. You're very happy to go along and buy garbage. You ask a guy a question. You say to him, "Have you ever raped any chickens?" And . . whatever the question is.

And he says, "Well . . ," and you notice there's a flick on the meter, and all of a sudden it does a surge. You say, "What was that?" See, he knows by now; the surge says he does.

You're no longer assessing the reactivity of the question. Now you're assessing the knowingness of the pc. But you've got to get it off. It's another operation. Now that you've got it out of the reactive mind to him, now you've got to get it from him to you.

So you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, I remember my father killing chickens when I was a little boy."

And you say, "All right. All right." You say, "Have you ever raped any chickens?"

But I don't say that. That's your notion. I believe these things. I believe these meters, see. I've used them long enough to be made very, very tame by the whole thing, you know? I know what to say, and when to say so.

I say, "Well, did you ever rape any chickens?" Click. Boom. I say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, my father . . uh . . my father uh . . uh . . used to kill a lot of chickens . . used to kill a lot of chicken."

I say, "No, no." I'd say, "You didn't hear the question. Did you . . you . . ever rape any chickens?"

"Oh, well," he says, "Yes. If you put it that way, yes. I used to when I was a little boy."

You don't do it that way. you haven't been doing it that way at all. you say, "Did you ever rape any chickens?"

He says, "My father killed some chickens one time."

"Well, good, did you ever rape any chickens?" and the meter falls and you say, "Well, what was that?"

And he says, "Well, I was just thinking about chickens hanging up in the market and that was what that was."

In other words, you keep buying this, buying this, buying this, buying this, buying this, buying this. you get the idea? You're actually building the pc's belief up that he can withhold things from you.

So I say . . I say very meanly . . . I don't necessarily advise you to do this because you can get into a lot of trouble this way. You've got to have terrific control of the pc in order to do this kind of thing. He's really got to be grooved in. Otherwise, you create ARC breaks, and the rest of the session is all messed up and you get nothing done anyplace, anywhere, at any time.

So that's your adjudicative idea. How much control have you got of this pc and how much control have you got of the session? And if your control is terrific, and your ARC with the pc is very good and the pc knows what you're trying to do and he knows he can't fool you, you eventually get a Security Check going like this:

You've started in this way. you said, "Well, did you ever rape any chickens?"

And he said, "Well, no. My father killed some once. And uh . . well, I saw a dog jump on a chicken."

The next time you ask him, you know, "Did you ever kill any chickens?"

And he says, "Well, I . . I . . no."

"Did you ever rape any chickens?"

And "Where . . wuh . . I dunno. Uh, yes. Uh, yes, I remember something about chickens. It was little boys talking about chickens one time."

And you say, "Good. Good. Fine. Good. Did you ever rape any chickens?"

And he says, "Well, I thought about it once."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. Fine." Your meter's falling, falling, falling. You're just wasting time, wasting time, wasting time.

Well, if you're real good, you don't go at it this way at all. You say, "Did you ever rape any chickens?" And you get a click-fall! Surge!

And you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, I was just thinking about, uh . . mmmm . . I was just thinking about . . uh . . I was thinking about my father used to kill some chickens."

You say, "No, no, no, no. I asked you, 'Did you ever rape any chickens?' "

"Well, actually, my little sister . . ."

"No, no, come on, come on, come on, come on, did you, you, you ever rape any chickens? That's what I'm trying to find out here."

He says, "Yeah, yes. I used to when I was a little boy."

You say, "Good. Did you ever rape any chickens? All right, it's clear now. Good. Next question." Get the idea?

And he all of a sudden has got the horrifying notion that there . . you just aren't going to buy dodges, that's all. Coo! He has met a tartar and the reactive mind after that is no longer as powerful.

The reactive mind says, "Protect it." Says, "It's a withhold. It's valuable. You're in danger. Give him an equivocation." Got the idea? "Feed him some muck over here, and throw him a red herring and protect me."

So I just say, "It says here that rape of chickens . . ." I think . . I think even Suzie has heard me say questions like this. "It says here that rape of chickens has occurred. Now supposing you tell me about it, huh?"

"Yes." That's the end of that security question. Got the idea?

So it goes off: Boom! Question . . bang! Question . . bang! Question . . bang! You see? Get the idea? You ask the question, see the fall. You notice there's a secondary surge. Now you do the other thing. Say, "Tell me."

The reactive mind says, "Under no circumstances tell him. Withhold, withhold, withhold, withhold." And I say . . I say, "All right, but you can tell me."

And all of a sudden, the pc says, "He believes in me, one way or the other and I'll tell him right here, right now." Bang! And he tells you and the needle clears. And you ask the question again just to make sure. And then you ask the next question and then you're sailing, you understand?

Goals . . you don't ask a goal . . . "I want to pick gooseberries" is the goal that you're checking. You come down the line, find this thing and you say, "Well, now I'm going to ask you about a goal here." (You've already run through 200 goals, see.) "I'm going to ask you about a goal here and I don't want you to think I'm terribly personal, but I want to know if this goal is . . I want to know if this goal is still active.

"The goal is . . is it all right if I read it to you? All right . . uh, okay. Well, I'm going to read it to you now. You want to pick gooseberries. How's that? Now, let's see. Now let's see what it's saying over here on the meter."

Boy, that's the way to burn auditing time man. You're going down the list. No preliminaries. No nothing. You just say, "I want to pick gooseberries. I want to ride horses." You got the idea? You got the list over here. You've got the meter in front of you. What you really do is you look at the goals list. It says, "I want to pick gooseberries." You don't read it there. You delay your own read of it. you look over here at the meter and you say, "I want to pick gooseberries," and it goes flamp.

You say, "Good. I want to pick gooseberries" . . flamp. "Good. I want to pick gooseberries" . . it's going more now. you say, "Good. Thank you." Mark it here. Two divisions. Go to the next goal.

"I want to ride horses." Nothing there. "I want to ride horses." Nothing there. No. Next goal. Got the idea?

If you watched me doing this stuff, you'd think you were looking at a sausage grinder. You just chew right up, see, right on down the line.

Well, the longer you suppose that a pc is going to be adjudicative . . it . . about it at all or his adjudicativity proves only that he reacts according to the dictates of a tyrant known as the reactive mind in order to protect and not disclose the valences in other activities which exist without his inspection, so that he, as a form, can survive and it doesn't work out. you can't go at it that way at all.

No, I . . I talk with the E-Meter about the fellow's circuits and if he wants to chip in once in a while, that's all right with me. That's . . it's okay . . I won't chop him. He'll say, "Well, I just . . I just remembered something. I just remembered about riding a horse across a field as a little boy, and the horse picked up a stone . . ." And I say, well, here we go and I say, "Gee, is that so? Thank you."

And at first he begins to believe I couldn't possibly be auditing him. Well, I'm not. I'm finding out what's . . what's holding the show up here. I'm finding out what he's reacting to. I'm finding out what is there to react in terms of matter, energy, space, time and thoughts . . which are all crisscrossed in one way or the other and suspended in time . . so that a thought two billion years old is still being violently thought in this person's mind. Why?

This person is perfectly capable of inspecting. This person can't do otherwise than survive. This person is capable of being totally able. This person can get the show on the road. This person can actually make form survive. But because he's got all these dependent mechanisms and goo-gahs and things of this character and a reactive mind to help him out and pat him on the back and make it unnecessary; he acts like a nut and he destroys everything he lays his hands on. Well, don't you think it's about time you straightened it out?

Well, all right. It'd be easy to straighten it out. All you have to do is validate the pc. That's for sure. After you've cut him to ribbons, why, look up and say, "Well, you're doing all right. Thank you very much," you know?

But you can saw into these assessments with a whir and a clank, with your eye pinned right there to the needle and away you go; and you go right on down the line, bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang It's like telegraph poles passing by when you're riding in a train, you know?

And it isn't, "Well, here we are. Well, well. Isn't this unusual? Now I'm going to consult with you all about your reactive mind. Now what do you think you possibly might be having to run now? What do you think that might be?" Well, you're talking to the wrong telephone line. You've got it hooked into the wrong . . you might have it in the right switchboard, but you sure got it in the wrong corner of the building

Now, there's an example in this bulletin of a . . of an assessment that could have been bought, merely because the pc believed it and you were getting cognition curves . . surges off of it, see? It could have been bought. I didn't say that the auditor would have bought it or anything of the sort. But there was another one that was alive. And these were "order," "command" and "conquer," and that "conquer" was alive, man; and that's what I was looking for on the case. I said, we've missed something here, someplace. Somewhere along the line we have missed one and that's why I wanted to assess the case.

And this person was perfectly agreeable and knew completely that it was "order" or "command." But these were the little red tabs that were hanging out and they cleared up. And it was one the pc didn't mention.

Now the pc did report . . because he's in pretty good shape . . as I was doing the assessment (which I was still taking just the E-Meter). He said, "I just keep thinking about control. I keep thinking about control."

I said, "That's fine. That's fine." That's cooperative data. You're being helped by the pc, but I bought the E-Meter. I went over everything and settled everything down and it was "Control" so I bought it. You got the idea? I didn't buy it because he said so. But he helped me out by saying that.

He could just as easily have been throwing a great big red herring across the path, too. It . . it . . he might have said, "My . . you know, sort of down deep someplace, the one thing I don't want to have anything to do with is Failed Importance."

See, a reactivity, you know? So, he just as likely would have said, "Well, it's 'Connect.' I'm sure it's 'Connect.' " Got the idea? "If I can just tell him convincingly enough that it's 'Connect' . . ."

You don't find pcs doing this when they're in better condition, but when they're in worse condition, they will do this continually. "It's 'Connect'! It obviously is 'Connect'!" He's trying desperately, reactively, not to get anywhere near Failed Importance.

When a pc starts getting too insistent that it is something and is practically screaming that it is something, I know very well what's happening. The mechanics and the . . all of the various little wheels and so forth, that are going around are adding up just this: There is something here that we had better not put our number-tens in, because it's quicksand, and it'll go straight through.

Somebody tells me, "Well, I don't want to run this level anymore. This level's boring and I don't want anything more to do with this level" and . . and all of that kind of thing. I say, "How interesting! Isn't that fascinating!"

Of course, I'm perfectly reasonable about it. I don't get militant on the subject. I say, "Has the pc got a withhold?" which is very likely running these things these days. As I told you the withhold is the bridge between the reactive mind and the analytical mind. So of course, pc picks up a withhold; half an hour later, you find the pc with an ARC break.

That's, by the way, the way it goes. They get the withhold on the auditor and the auditor misses it and then they'll pick up an ARC break; and then the auditor will try to cure up the ARC break when in fact, it's this withhold back here half an hour earlier.

All ARC breaks, by the way, for your information, usually occur a half an hour before they're expressed by the pc. If you're sharp, you can always see that an ARC break has occurred.

But earlier than that, if you're very sharp, you can see that a withhold occurs and you just bust into your auditing command and say, "Now how are you doing? How's it going? How's it going now? All right. Haven't got any ARC breaks?" (You're not looking for an ARC break, see?) "Withholding anything?" Clang!

You say, "What was that?"

"Well, I haven't answered the auditing question for ten commands."

"Oh," you say, "all right. Give me ten answers." You don't necessarily say that, but you sure as hell could and I've been known to do things like that. Anyhow.

What you're trying to do is keep the pc from being fooled about himself and if you are in a continuous, consecutive, forever and ever avoidance of the reactive mind, you're just Q-and-Aing with the pc.

You'll eventually wind up doing something like this; and this is the ne plus ultra of Q-and-A: You're doing a Joburg All right. You say, "Now, have you ever thrown any rings around chimneys?" And the pc says . . you've gotten your click and then your surge.

See, very often on an assessment you get a good read, which then disappears. Well, actually it was just the cognition surge. When the energy released, you know, that was withholding it from the pc and the pc found out about it and so on, of course, you get a needle response. But it's usually after the fact of the needle reaction on the reactive mind. That "after the fact" is the pc finding out, see? So these latent surges that you get on the E-Meter are analytical, ordinarily.

All right. He says, "Well, yes, yes. Mm-hm, I've thrown some rings around chimneys. I threw a ring around a chimney when I was a little girl. Uhm . . I . . I did. I . . I did that. And um . . my grandmother was very cross with me about it."

I'm showing you a Q-and-A now, see? And you say, "Good. Why exactly was your grandmother cross with you?"

And she says, "Well, I'd been very bad and I treated my grandmother very badly," or something like this.

And the auditor says, "Well, just where was that? Where did you live at the time?"

What the hell does this have to do with a Joburg, see? It's got nothing to do with a Joburg It's trying to run an incident with using the excuse of the Joburg. The Joburg is totally dedicated to withholds. And that's everything it's dedicated to. And there isn't anything else it's dedicated to. And you want to know if he threw any rings around chimneys.

And he finally . . you . . you said, "You throw any ring around chimneys?" You get a clink, surge! You say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, I . . as a matter of fact I did. I . . I did. I did, yes. I . . I just remembered. I . . I did. I threw some rings around chimneys when I was a little boy."

And you say, "Good. Throw any other rings around chimneys?" Clang! And you say, "Good. Well, what was that?"

"Well, when I was a young man I used to do it all the time."

And you say, "Good. Now, did you ever throw any rings around chimneys?" Clink. Just a little clink on it that time and then a surge. And you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Wheww! Well, I actually didn't mean to get down to this, but every night about midnight I have to go up and throw a ring around the chimney. And I . . that's it."

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much. Good. Now, did you ever throw any rings around chimneys?" Deader than mackerel. Next question.

See, you're just interested in withholds and you're just interested in that question.

Now, you'll get some oddball ramifications on questions. You get some oddball ones where he's got everything connected with everything connected with everything. You understand?

If you don't get any instantaneous response, you're not getting a response on that question. Why are you fooling with the question?

Now the order is, clear the E-Meter. But what is the E-Meter and what is the E-Meter doing that you must clear? Well, the E-Meter is responding. What is the E-Meter responding on? The E-Meter is responding on a reactivity. If you haven't got a reactivity, to hell with it. Because the second time you ask the question, if the pc now knows it analytically, you'll have it reactive anyhow. It'll be an instant read.

If you're not getting instant reads, or something . . the pc is dawdling around and walking over the hills and so forth . . of course, I will go ahead and clean up a meter on a question rather thoroughly. But it isn't necessarily falling on the question, if you're getting a latent surge all the time.

You say, "Did you ever throw any ring around chimneys?" And 2 and 3 and 4 and 5 and 6 and 7 and 8 and 9 and surge. You say, "What was that?"

"Well, I don't know. It's sort of escaped my mind now."

Oh! This is not the time to say, "What has escaped your mind? Did your grandmother spank you that day? What was the color of your brother's hair?"

No, this is not the time. The time to say that is the original question. It turned on and will become kind of a response after a while, so let's ask the original question, whatever it was. "You ever done any illicit diamond buying?"

And watch that meter. And if it doesn't go snap, that isn't . . it isn't falling on that. In other words, your E-Meter actions are as instantaneous as the reactive mind is batty. You got it? They're fast! See? They're right now!

Of course, if you get any kind of a fall of any kind whatsoever, even a latent fall, you had better find out what it is by asking, "What was that?" But that is pursued by asking the question again and if you don't get a fall on the question, why are you interested in the latent fall?

You can go ahead and clear it up if you want to . . it's a good workmanlike job if you do . . but that isn't necessarily what's going on here at all. There's something else going on someplace.

Well, you're doing the thing of trying to read the question to the pc and then trying to clear the rest of the Security Check as a sideline. It clears one question at a time and if it doesn't fall on that question, it doesn't fall on the question.

When is the fall going to occur on that question? Well, it might not occur on your first read, but that's beside the point. It'll certainly occur instantly on your second read. Instantaneous. Within a tenth of a second of your having uttered the question, there will be a reaction on the meter; and if there's not a reaction on the meter, but a latent reaction that is finally going bthooong, after several seconds or something like this, yeah, the pc is withholding something of some kind or another about something. But look-a-here, it's not necessarily on that question at all. And that's the mistake you're making. You see?

You can actually read a Joburg off . . brtrtrtrtrtrt . . right on down through all ten pages, you see and take instantaneous falls. Plang! "What was that?"

"Nuhhhh, yes, I did."

You say, "Good. Thank you." Repeat the question. No reaction.

Now, if you sat there and waited for the E-Meter to play "Dixie," you might get a fall on almost anything, see. you might get a fall on the fact that he was getting bored, that he was getting tired, that he hopes he doesn't find out. He knows the Joburg. He's had it about four times and he knows there's a question coming right up on the next page that is hotter than a pistol and he's guilty as sin.

Actually, he's never thought of it before, but it just suddenly occurred to him that it wasn't quite the right thing to do to hit his father and mother on the head with an axe and it's just occurred to him, like a flash of lightning on the head and the question that has to do with this is on the next page!

So you've read the question. Now, the pc gets to worrying about the next page and you get an answer in the meter here, which is reading the surge of the pc. you got the idea? It isn't on that question.

The law is, if you don't get an instantaneous reaction on the meter, there's something wrong with the question. It isn't the answer to that question.

If you get any kind of a reaction on the meter at all, you ask the question again, of course. If you don't get a reaction on the second time, it still isn't it. Don't sit there and wait for it to play "Dixie." You don't have to hang around on the street corners, leaning up against the lamppost, hoping something is going to happen! The town you're operating in isn't that one-horse. If you want things to happen in

auditing, do them rapidly so that you do get something happening and you'll get something happening, with speed.

So your assessments do not take in the zone and area of the pc's analytical mind, unless, of course the pc is being very resistive. Now, he's being very resistive about a withhold; well, that's between you and the pc. you got the idea? That's another operation. Has nothing to do with finding it on the meter or anything of the sort. It's still on the meter. You've found it. Now it is reacting on the pc. Well, you just say, "Stand and deliver. What is it?"

And you could go on and clear eighty-nine other questions with the pc, of one character or another, but it isn't falling on the one you're asking. You got the idea? So clear what you're doing.

Now similarly, on an assessment, it requires no cooperation on the part of the pc at all. Actually, the pc could be walking around the room, if he could do that and hold on to the electrodes and if you were speaking loud enough, the pc would hear, reactively, what you were saying, because it's dangerous, and you'd get a reaction on the meter.

And you think you have to wait for the pc to think about it or the pc to rationalize about it. That's not true. you don't want anything to do with that. It's very . . it's a very happy fact that he can still think. We're glad he's still alive. Cheerio! But that's about all it has anything to do with it and nothing else has anything to do with it.

All right. I've given you a very long lecture today as I am prone to do, and should start them earlier on Fridays. But I've been studying for some time why it takes so long for something to happen and I've now done enough observation that I can tell you, that it isn't a slight thing of speeding you up so that your actions are more coordinated or something. It's gross! You're auditing the wrong target.

See you're auditing the pc's analytical sphere of action and that isn't what you should be auditing at all. You're supposed to be auditing the reactive sphere. As long as you're auditing the reactive sphere, it shows up only on the meter and it shows up instantaneously; and that's what you bite. Right away . . pang! And you get the job done.

Now, I'm not asking you to rush. I don't care how leisurely you go about the job of auditing, but just audit the right target, which is the reactive bank of the pc . . Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, published May 9th, 1950.

Thank you.