QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: AUDITOR EFFECT ON METER

A lecture given on
19 July 1961

Thank you. this is the what?

Audience voices: July 18th. 19th.

Eighteenth?

Audience: 19th.

I thought you were wrong! I just got one of my motorcycles back out in the garage out there and so I didn't know the date. That's sufficiently non sequitur. Nineteen July 1961, AD 11. All right.

Now, I've been giving you a lot of information but I haven't given you any opportunity to ask any questions. We always assume at times like these, that you've gotten up to a point where you've found out you don't know something. This is, of course, a rare and strange occasion when this occurs. But is there anything that I could help you out with? Any questions? Yes?

Female voice: Why does a stage four needle do what . . .

What is a stage four needle?

Female voice: No, not what is it. why does it do that particular thing instead of just sitting at Clear, or doing something else?

Instead of just sitting at Clear?

Female voice: Yes, or doing just so long Why is it, that in every case with a person in that condition has exactly the same sort of movement?

Why does he always have this stage four needle? Is that right?

Female voice: No. Why is the . . why is the movement constant?

Yeah. Why is that movement constant? That's what I meant, yeah.

Well, now, of course, you're asking me for a surmise. Now, I can only give you a surmise. A stage four needle, of course, is one which is unmistakable. The tone arm setting has nothing to do with it. Usually, however, a stage four needle will sit around Clear read and therefore you should beware, beware, beware, beware, beware because the person is below Clear. It's something like, if he got a long ladder and climbed for a long time, he'd reach bottom. This is the dead thetan case, but the dead thetan case doesn't always have a stage four needle.

The stage four needle is something that when you encounter it, sometime or other, will plague the living daylights out of you. you don't see them too often, but when you do run into them they are marvelous.

Now, the standard stage four needle that I have observed has about a two-and-a-half inch swing and it goes from . . well, if you've got the tone arm get right, it'll sweep up from, as you're looking at it, the right side of the dial on the needle and it'll sweep up here, and it will stick. there is a stick. That's what makes this quite different than a free needle. It sweeps up here and it sticks and then it drops back, falling again to your right as you look at the thing. And it just keeps doing that. At just about this speed. And that's all it ever does. It just goes through that repetitive swing. U-u-up, stick, fall. U-u-up, stick, fall.

And that is the darndest thing you ever want to see. Because no matter what you ask this pc, no matter if you hit him over the head with a brickbat, he'll still have a stage four needle. In old times, he comes under the heading of an unsolvable case. you have so many things now that will resolve his case that it's not particularly a worrisome thing. It's just something that you shouldn't ever be in any illusion about.

You put somebody on an E-Meter . . here's where you'll get into trouble: you put him on an E-Meter and start to security check him. Ha-ha! "Have you ever raped your mother?" You know? Bang! No action. "Have you ever put slugs in a parking meter?" No action. "Have you ever breathed?" No action. It's just that stage four needle. Just that stage four needle. It just seems like it will go on forever.

It's an electronic transfer . . what it is . . of energy in the mind and it is a repetitive cycle and what you might call a machine reaction. And . . it is . . this person is not himself, but is being a machine . . always, always. They are not themselves at all. That is to say, they're totally backed out of being human. They distrust themselves to such a degree that it is much safer to be a machine.

Now, the oddity is, is they're so far down on this that the machine has an individual read, not a 2.5 tone arm read; it's liable to have any kind of a read. But as a result machines are run by energy and what you're looking at is some kind of a fancy doodad like an AC motor and it's feeding its current on a surge and then it's reversing its flow; and it's feeding its current on a surge, and it's reversing its flow, and there's nothing going to disturb that except auditing. Anything in life could happen to this person and this machine will still go on, on this charge line.

Now, that is a surmise as . . that its current is running that way and reversing. I myself have not observed this closely, but I would say it's a very safe surmise because you can also get an alternating current read on a pc. If you ran Black and White Processing fast enough on a pc, you'd get sixty-cycle AC. And . . you would. Over here in England . . fifty cycle.

But this is . . is just a machine read, a machine facing. It's just . . the person isn't there. He has no responsibility for being there. No responsibility for his case. Doesn't have any responsibility for answering the auditing questions and whatever he thinks produces no reaction at all upon his bank. That he thinks a thought has nothing to do with his bank. He knows he can have no effect on anything.

Well, there are too many ways to take this apart, nowadays. But the CCHs if . . will always undercut it to some degree or another. You can run one of these stage four cases on the CCHs and get further than any other activity if in doubt.

But remember the common denominator of all cases as they worsen is less and less effect upon the bank and the bank has more and more effect upon them. So, getting them to think a thought, you see, by an auditing command . . you say, "Do this" or "Do that" . . well, they think a thought. This then produces no reaction upon the bank and they drive you sparky, you know. It doesn't matter how many auditing commands you think up. you are not going to get any action, even if the pc complies with them because, of course, the pc has no effect upon his bank. His thinkingness does not effect his bank.

The common denominator of all cases is the amount of effect the thetan has on his bank; and that is a gradient scale which runs from "no slightest effect" all the way up to "total, easy effect" on the bank. And what you see at the bottom of the scale . . the reason you have a Clear read, of course, is the thetan has no effect of any kind on the bank. Nothing disturbs anything. there it sits. Of course, you're just reading a dead body and as you go up the scale by gradient, he has more and more effect on the bank. Well now, sooner or later he's going . . as you audit him, he's going to start changing around the bank by the reason of what he's thinking.

And about this time you'll see energy lines, you will see ridges. Those generally show up before pictures and then they kind of pass out, and he has lots of pictures. And then you run into more energy masses and energy lines and the tone arm starts acting up like mad. Well, what you're watching there is he has more effect on his bank now, don't you see. And eventually he's got enough effect on his bank that he can as-is it. And it gets up to a point of no bank and no disturbing bank . . which is what you mean by Clear.

All right. Now, the stage four needle is a retreat from bottom and when encountered, your safest bet is always the CCHs run exactly the way you're supposed to run them and so forth . . not a thinkingness thing, but an action thing

However, there are many other ways to take this apart. And you will find that there are some buttons which are still open and the modern processes which you are doing in these three routines . . you always find some hole in the fence. It's problems. It's confusions. It's motion. It's leaving. It's something other, you know. There's something going to be open there someplace and you could keep tickling this spot in the fence and all of a sudden you've got an entrance. And that's about all it is.

You know, on a low case, all you have to do is trigger an automaticity and then, of course, the case is undone because the automaticity is being run off by the auditor; and the automaticity is what prevents the pc from having an effect on his own bank. you as the auditor, through triggering the automaticity, are not ever actually asking the pc to do anything, you see. Except not retreat; that's the only thing you want him to do. you want him to come to sessions and so forth.

And stage four is no exception to these particular lines. But if you were to open up on a case and do a case assessment on somebody and notice there was nothing on the meter whatsoever but this odd phenomenon of it rises, the needle. . . Down here from where you'd see on this old meter dial about 3.5, it goes back on up toward set, sticks somewhere in there vicin that vicinity, falls on down to 3.5, comes up, sticks around set, just about at the speed I'm talking

Now, there is another spook stage four needle that I probably have never made any remarks about at all. But that is turned on by the auditor's statement and sometimes it's very small and sometimes it's large, but it only occurs when the auditor says something Actually, you're turning it on and turning it off, see, by saying something or not saying something and it just doesn't matter what you say. And you see this all the time. This is very common. This is a third of the pcs that sits down in front of you have this ghost of a stage four needle.

You say to him butter and you get a little rise or a little fall and a rise and a stick and a fall, or some combination of this sort. You've got . . every time you speak, you liven up the needle. Well, that's you energizing the bank. Remember you're an electric eel. And you can actually have on pcs more effect on the bank than the pc can. Something you have never learned, something I have never been able to teach anybody. They are always so sold on the idea the pc's totally responsible for it all that they don't realize that the auditor can just sit there and just actually push that bank around anyplace, you know.

Say, "Be in the Roman arena. Thank you. Now, don't be in the Roman arena, be in the twentieth century. Thank you very much." And the bank will just move.

Because they can't see it, they don't believe it. See, they're not there then sitting, looking at the picture of the Roman arena which results. And then maybe the pc is so occluded he doesn't see the picture of the Roman arena that results. But you . . an auditor can say something like that. "A spear is now entering your right side," and the pc gets a somatic . . because it's a cinch someplace on the track a spear has entered his right side and you say, "The somatic strip will now move to that part of the track where a spear entered your right side," and you get a somatic. You're very much in control of the situation.

And this other phenomenon will baffle you sometimes when you're doing a Security Check. And you open up the paper and do your Security Check and everything is fine, and you start right in and you say to the person, "Now, are you on the moon?" something like that, and you get a boomp, boomp, tine And just for fun throw a total non sequitur into the situation, you see. "Are bananas hot?" you see. you get pzoomp, tine . . get the same kind of a reaction. You say, "Is the sky blue?" Hmmm, tink. "Is your name George?" Hmmm, tink.

It's you, you see, you are actually turning the reaction on. It is the impact of your thinkingness and speakingness against the pc. The pc isn't doing anything, it's just the fact that you are energizing the bank and then the E-Meter will read that energizing.

Now, I better clear up something here that hasn't been cleared up for quite a while, and that is: What about these null questions to find out if there's a needle reaction? Do you use these null questions today and do you pay any attention to them at all? And the answer is no. you don't even have to ask them. It's always nice to know that the pc actually does respond and have a lie reaction because it's a good case index.

You set some pcs down, and when they say . . you say, "Are you sitting in that chair?" And they say no, you get a lie reaction. Well, you know this pc's in pretty good shape. Well, you say, "You're on the moon . . are you on the moon?" He says, "No," and you get a lie reaction. Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh, oh. It's a way of indexing a case, don't you see. It's whether the case has any reaction or has a reverse reaction or has a proper lie reaction.

Now, of these the lowest reaction is when the pc is energized every time the auditor speaks and if you're seeing a needle that every time you say something goes weir plunk, you know, or does something, don't get an idea the pc's getting a fall on it. you just say, "Are bananas hot?" and the needle does whirr, clunk. And you say, "Are you on the moon?" and the pc says, "No," and so on. But that has nothing to do with what the pc's saying has nothing whatsoever to do with it. you just say, "Well now, you shut up for a moment, and I'm just going to ask you a few questions just to read it out on the meter." And then you say, "Well, are bananas hot? Are you on the moon? Do automobiles have motors? Cheesecake." Each time you've said something, you get the whir, clink, clink. It's nothing he's thinking. In other words, you're not reading the pc's reaction.

Now, if the pc is in a Security Check, the moment that you start to security check a pc, his level of interest rises and creates an emergency level and thereafter, your needle rides straight. So don't avoid a reaction on an E-Meter needle just because the pc has one of these automatic response things on the needle at first because the second you're asking him meaty questions that he feels he might be caught out on, he no longer has that reaction. He's right there pitching, I don't care how low toned he is, you see?

"Te-thu-ooh, ooh."

"Have you ever stolen any money?"

"Wah, well, let's see, I . . mm-mm!"

And you've got him in session and so that any reaction on a security question that might be meaningful is always taken by the auditor as factual. And you will never go wrong, providing it's an instant read.

So your null questions are just some kind of a goofball case index and that's all they serve as anymore. But any time you start asking a whole series of questions that are non sequitur, and have nothing to do with the case, of course, you're liable to get some kind of a . . well, you're liable to get an impulse reaction. Because, you see, the pc knows it has nothing to do with the case. It seems silly to him and he's not taking any responsibility for the answer. And if he's at a level where the moment he just thinks of irresponsibility or it has nothing to do with me . . the moment this is triggered . . why then, after that you are moving the E-Meter around. You got the idea? But the second you're on something that's meaningful, that might have something to do with him, why, it will behave just like any other E-Meter.

Now, I'm not sure that a stage four needle, at this time, will behave that way or not. But I tell you that it's a high probability that it will behave any time you hit the button because they've got withholds by the avalanche. Got it?

So any reaction on an E-Meter . . Mary Sue has had a little bit of a hard time pushing this across occasionally, so I'll help her out here . . any reaction on an E-Meter when a meaningful question is asked and that's any question on a Security Check that might have (might have) something to do with the pc, not just null nonsense questions . . is taken by the auditor as factual, providing it is an instant read. And an instant read is immediately, factually, instantly followed up by the auditor; and a latent read or a latent reaction is totally ignored.

The only thing you're interested in is "Did the meter react instantly when I asked the question?" In spite of this other oddball phenomena, you'll find out that you won't go wrong if you'll always investigate that instant read.

An instant read must occur within one-tenth of a second of asking the question. Anything that occurs later than that is neglected by the auditor.

Now, is there any judgment involved there? Well, yes, there is. Yes, there is. Because I cannot guarantee the meter on which you are working, unless it's a British Mark IV or an American. I can't guarantee the meter. And a lot of these meters . . squirrel meters and so forth . . have a lag. I'm not trying to sell meters or run down meters or anything. I'm just warning you that they do have a lag.

Some of the early organization meters, circa 1954-55, had a lag built into them which made me think that battery meters were no good and then 1 found out everybody had been working day and night to build this lag into the meter. And the meter did not respond for from one-half to one second after the question was asked. And if you're foolish enough to audit on some old decrepit affair that was made by the buggy-whip companies or something, you had better establish whether or not it has a lag in its read. And of course, that would throw out this instant-read law at once because the lag is in the meter, not in the pc. All right.

Now, what about three quarters of a second? Well, let's not get picky about this, shall we? Three quarters of a second. Well, that's an instant read, see. Because the lag is introduced by the length of the question. You got the idea? The length of the question and the difficulty in digesting the sense of the question. And the sense of the question sometimes doesn't come home for a half a second after you've stopped talking. Got the idea? That's got to come home before it can be even acted on in the bank. But it's just about as close to instant as you can get, don't you see?

Now, definitely, from a second on and up, let it drop, man! Skip it! Get away from that horse because it has nothing to do with the question, and so forth.

You can do a great deal for the pc. you can clear up enormous sections of his life. you can clear up all of his relatives. You can give a Security Check to all the teachers he's ever had. you can do all sorts of oddball things, but you're not giving this pc a Security Check. That's what the main criteria is. Do you understand?

So by latent read we mean anything . . we don't mean anything after a tenth of a second. By latent read we mean from one second, plus. That's one second plus and that would even apply to an old buggy-whip meter. If there's . . takes a second or more for that needle to react in response to your question, ho-hum, brother, ho-hum.

And I think you've been using that rather consistently, most of you here and you've been getting along just dandy with it, haven't you?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

And before, when you were using latent reads, you were just having one awful time. Right?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

It took 139 hours to clear question 18, you know. Every time you ask, "Have you stolen anything?" you would get a long silence on the part of the pc and then a little motion with the needle and you say, "What was that?"

And he says, "Well, let me see. What could that have been? Well, I thought actually of my Aunt Grace. My Aunt Grace once kept rats and I think once she stole a rat. I am not sure."

So you say, "Well, all right. That's fine. All right. Have you ever stolen anything?" Three, four seconds go by and then . . fall. "What was that?"

"Well, it actually wasn't stealing, I guess. But I was on a bus one time and the conductor gave me too much change and there were a lot of people and so I gave him the change back and corrected the change and gave him the right change, even though he'd given me. . ." oh, what the hell are we doing? See. What is all this about, man? Well, it's not situate in the reactive mind and the basic characteristic of the reactive mind is instantaneousness.

The reactive mind has no time in it. And as a result, if you ask a question that is going to be real to the pc . . that is to say, if he can see that deep into his reactive mind and so that response can be energized . . you will get it instantly; and that's the difference between an instant and a latent read and not knowing this difference can louse you up on doing a Security Check just from here on out. You'll have a hundred-hour Security Check every time you turn around. You just don't ever get any security checking done. It's got to be an instant read.

Well, I've told you an awful lot about meters there, extraneous to a stage four needle, but there it is. Okay.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, what has the velocity of fall got to do with it? In other words, the needle just rides . . .

Nothing

Male voice: . . . slowly?

Nothing.

Male voice: oh, okay.

Velocity of fall has nothing to do with nothing Don't worry about velocities of falls or recoveries or the square root of the God . . of the God Ohm. I'm not making fun of your question, Bob.

Male voice: No. No.

It has nothing to do with it. I'm glad you brought it up, because this rumor is always brooding about. And we're always hearing this . . that something about velocities of fall, or repetitiveness of fall or "thises" of falls or that of reaction, and so on and they don't have anything to do with it. A pc who is situated and has been living in glue for the last hundred trillennia is for sure going to get a slow fall. But velocity of fall can't be watched . . I'll tell you more precisely why it can't have anything to do with it . . is because it can be altered by the setting of the meter. So the second you can alter something by the setting of the meter, then you can't calibrate anything against it, so the devil with it. Okay?

Male voice: Right. Thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: What's the purpose of the "What represents" and "How could you help" questions in the Joburg, and do you have to null them? You know, "What represents yourself?" "How could you help your family?" Questions like that.

Is that still in Form 3?

Female voice: That's still in Form 3.

Well, now, what's the question?

Male voice: Well, what's the purpose of them in a Security Check?

What's the purpose of them in the Security Check? Nothing.

Male voice: Do you have to null them?

It's something like . . there are a lot of people have nerves that go back underneath their lungs. I'll tell you where this comes from. And this nerve channel passes actually underneath the lung and according to Darwin, this is all a hangover. Got it? I'm not making fun of your question. I'm telling you . . this is fact, this is fact.

And you'll find a lot of bric-a-brac of structure . . . Well, like boats. I was quite interested to recognize the other day on the subject of boats that the first boat was a log and I'll be a son of a gun if the Queen Mary isn't still dragging a log. It's now the keelson. They have never moved off of this log. The first boat was a log, of course, with this caveman straddling the thing and paddling it. And so help me, Pete, it's still in the Queen Mary. Another thing is a raft is three logs at least and so help me, Pete, they've still got three logs in them. They're chines and the keelson. There are eight-thousand million ways of hanging a boat together that have nothing to do with these logs, but they're still there. I was . . I was quite interested in it. That's Darwin, too; he talks about these things.

And this check originally was an employment check. And it was one of these things that was going to do everything and all in one package. One of the things it was going to do was select out executives.

Male voice: Well, I know how it got there, I put it in there but I was wondering . . .

I wondered how long it would take him to realize that! Well now, why did you build the Queen Mary out of a log? Thank you, Jack. You can strike them, you don't have to null them. They have nothing to do with the price of fish or apples. But that is basically, remember now, Jack, a Security Check. That is still a Security Check, even though it is used for processing. It still serves organizations for various purposes and until there's a proper organizational check and until purely processing checks are written, that one will have to do. But it's just a stopgap. Okay?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

All right. That's a good Security Check, by the way. Yes?

Male voice: Yesterday, you said that . . you told us that a person can't have, he creates. Then now, is that a prerequisite of creation?

No. That's the reactivity of creation.

Male voice: I understand.

Now, we're only talking about unknowing creation and most of our discussions here concern the reactive mind and the unknowingness of it all. This is some of the laws which have gotten submerged and which are out of ken. And those are the only laws we're interested in digging up.

Nearly everybody who has studied the mind has studied analytical reactions only and I sometimes err in not telling you, "Well, this is not an analytical reaction," or something of the sort. That's not an analytical reaction. It is totally a reactive action and the statement here that a can't-have is a prerequisite to creativeness is only a reactive response. Of course, at one time it was an analytical response and all reactive responses were at one time analytical, but this is now no longer analytical and so is a hidden law.

Right now, let's get an idea out here. We've got some very, very terrific workmen here at Saint Hill. I mean they're marvelous people. There's Mr. Weller and Mr. Jenner. These guys are really marvelous. And those birds aren't under any such delusion. They can really build in concrete, and wood, and do various things. They're quite good, you know. But they just go on the simple postulate of "Well, I think I will build up this stone wall out here and we'll make a curb around the thing and that's all there is to it." And it doesn't fit with Weller because everybody was giving him a workshop. He could have all the workshops he wanted, but when he got around to moving his workshop, well, he built himself one.

Well, there he could have a workshop and he did build a workshop. All right, that's a totally analytical response. A fellow decides he's going to fix up a wall, he decides to build a wall.

You . . you're walking down the beach one day and you say, "Well, I would certainly . . dearly love to have a house on the beach." You very likely would simply call up a couple of your friends and tell them to build a house on the beach. See, nobody has even inferred that you couldn't have one. And you up and built one. But then you're doing it knowingly. See, you know what you're doing You know you want a house on the beach.

Now, this other law comes up along this wise: One day you have a picture of a rhinoceros in front of you. Where the hell did that come from? Well if . . you know that somebody somewhere along the line has forbidden you to have rhinoceroses. I mean it's as stupid as that and of course, that's getting real stupid to have a picture of a rhinoceros because you don't even want a rhinoceros! You got the idea? You're not aware of ever having wanted one . . at no time.

The truth of the matter is it could get keyed in very well and very easily because of an interest in wildlife back along the track somewhere and regulating life on planets . . something of this sort . . and you've read in the paper how there are only 250 rhinoceroses left in the world or something like this and a couple of days later . . you've forgotten that, see . . couple of days later, why, you got a picture of a rhinoceros. Now, where the devil did this picture of a rhinoceros come from? And you trace it back. you see now, this is the reaction of the unexplained appearance of a mental image picture.

Now, we go back in the history of Dianetics and Scientology, we didn't even know we were making them at first, see. This is how far we've progressed. All right. If you sort it back carefully, knowing this law, somewhere fairly recently, some part of rhinocerodom has been run as a can't-have on you. Just like that. And you get this automatic response. But it's totally an unknowing response which is what makes it utterly incredible. But just creating, oh well, pooey.

You can always trace back a desire to create something You can always find and link up some period when somebody told you not to have one. you can always cross these things up, but then actually you're the one that's crossing them up. They're not crossed up already, see.

The Freudians moved all sorts of rationale on the backtrack to explain what was happening in the present time. you see, they'd even invent backtrack rationale to explain what was happening in present time. But the mysterious appearance of a creation somewhere in your vicinity or a wild and incredible impulse of something you don't even really want . . and for some reason or other, you've just got to make up this tune. You've got to make up this tune. Just got to, you know. "I got to write this piece. But I don't know how to write music. But I got to write this . . no, I don't know how to . . ." and so on. That kind of a bling-blong well, somebody's run a can't-have on you on music. And you've gotten the immediate back response from it, see.

I know Mary Sue used to get the ideas all the time that she had to write a book. All right. In spite of past track, which she could have added up very easily into something like that, it was true that a member of her family used to run a can't-have on her on books. But it wasn't a can't-have that was that easily explained. It was another type of can't-have entirely, because people didn't want her to read. See? So somebody didn't want her to read wound her up in the necessity to create a book which had nothing to do with the price of fish. Got the idea? So this is how you can track one back.

It's a reactive law, not a knowing law. All creativeness, fortunately, was not a necessity-driven affair. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the creativeness that goes on is totally spontaneous. It has no connective action. But a spontaneous creativeness, of course, is usually an able creativeness and a reactive creativeness is usually for the birds. It is terrible. Have you seen any cubist paintings lately, man? That answered?

Male voice: Thank you, Ron.

Good enough. Okay?

Male voice: What's the purpose, and when do you run a negative Sec Check ?

What's the purpose and when do you run a negative Sec Check? Ah, I'm glad you brought up that point. I've been meaning to tell you about them. I neglected to issue a bulletin. Nobody's run can't-haves on me lately on bulletins, so I'm not writing them anymore. Last time . . .

Negative Sec Check . . may I just cover the whole subject?

Male voice: Yes.

What is the reason why your pc advances in auditing and gets new answers on the Sec Check? He's gone over them before, he hasn't remembered that he did anything on these Sec Checks. You see, he hasn't remembered stealing anything and now he gets some advance in his responsibility in auditing and you can tell whether or not he's had any advance because now you ask him if he's stolen anything, he suddenly remembers something and it's rough to clear the question. Don't think that you missed the question before. You have raised his responsibility level so that he does remember.

Well, by raising his responsibility level, you have also made him braver and he doesn't hold everything as not-ised as before. Now, on negative Sec Checking, I refer you to the lecture of a few days ago on the subject of not-isness. You should know how to do this trick. It's a brand-new trick. I just whipped it up to speed up the withhold situation. It's just speedup. If you'll notice, that's about all we're working on right now. We're working on speedup. We're working on more cases reached and reached faster.

All right. Now, this is part of it. why sit around and wait for this withhold to come up? Why not just knock it into existence? Well, how would you knock it into existence? Well, you'd as-is the not-is. You ask him the not . . a couple of not-is questions.

See, this is processing check. This isn't a Security Check, but I suppose you could use it as a Security Check for employment or something of the sort and it would be much more reliable. But this is plain murder. You say to the fellow "When haven't you stolen something?" Well, he has to spot something on the time track, you see, and he has to spot another one on the time track and if you've got any needle response, I certainly wouldn't bother to clear it with that question. But I might run the question longer. Got the idea?

If I were getting needle response, that would only tell me to ask the question a couple of more times. It's a little auditing process that you run in there with the question, don't you see. "When haven't you stolen something? Very good."

Now, you pop the question to him, "Have you ever stolen anything?" "Uhhiuckieoglkiougluh." You've practically got it all answered. In other words, you scraped the not-is off the top of the question and of course you got to the meat under it almost at once. And although it is . . there are more questions and more processes and more statements involved, you will find this will speed a Security Check.

Now, your question of "When should you use this?" is quite important. You should use this on any Security Check which promises to have a long duration. Do you know we've had some forty-three hour and thirty-six hour Security Checks around here? One time through Joburg HCO WW Security Form 3. Thirty-six, forty-three. Ka-wow, man, I mean that's a long time through a Security Check.

Well now, why? Why did it take this long? Well, actually the poor pc was just being tortured to death, because they didn't remember and yet the needle was falling. Now, everything was trembling right on the verge of memory. But not sufficiently on the verge of memory that the pc could find out about any part of it.

All right. If you're going to get a tall, it must be a terribly thin crust you see, that you have to penetrate. So, if you're going to get a fall, you say, "Well, have you stolen anything" you get a read. And you say, "What was that?"

And the pc says, "I haven't got the faintest notion. Let me see. Could it be this? Could it be that? Could it be something or other?"

And you say, "Well, have you ever stolen . . . Good. Have you ever stolen anything?"

"Let's see, it might be this, it might be that."

And, "Have you ever stolen anything?"

"Oh, could . . oh, I can't . . ." Just comm lag. They don't remember.

When you run into that kind of a phenomenon, just treat every question with a negative check. Just take the crust off of it and let it explode.

What you're doing is "Not-is stealing Not-is stealing Not-is stealing Okay. Thank you very much. Now, have you ever stolen anything?" Bowwww! If the answer is there, he's going to know about it. Got it? And that's why you would use it, and that's on what you would use it and actually that is how to use it.

Now, there's one little question there I haven't answered completely and that is how many times do you ask this question? Well, this would be a gradient scale of how rough is it to get a withhold off this pc. If your pc is running easily on a Security Check, you don't use it at all. If the pc is having a little trouble, use it once or twice. If the pc is having a lot of trouble, use it five or six times. And that's how you would establish it and it is unfortunately a matter of judgment. That answer your question?

Male voice: Yes, very much so. Thank you.

Okay. You bet.

Female voice: so one point on that . . it's make a point of "When." They ask "When haven't you stolen anything? When haven't you looked at pornography?"

Yeah. You mustn't ask this question: "Have you never?" That's for the birds, man.

Male voice: Thank you.

Kawow, kawow, kawow, because the guy's telling a lie, of course, if he's got a reaction on it, isn't he? You must always ask an auditing question that can be answered. That's one of the laws of commands. It must be answered.

Another law of command is: that you mustn't ask a question which if answered would be a lie. And "Have you never" is a lie. you see. Because right away you've invalidated the pc, so you've disobeyed the Auditor's Code. You say, "Have you never stolen anything" and the pc says . . well, he doesn't know whether to answer yes or no or right or wrong, and he finally in desperation says no. And then you say, "Well, have you ever stolen anything" If you said that right afterwards, and so forth and he said yes, this would make him look like a liar.

It's one of these legal questions, something on the basis of "Now, answer the following question yes or no," the prosecuting attorney says, "Do you still beat your wife?" Of course, you can't answer that yes or no and you're hung, you see! And that's another. So it must be "When haven't you?" and then make them recall an actual time. And it'll seem to the fellow like . . . on some of these cases where the question is real live, it looks real funny, by the way. It just looks like they must have been doing it day and night all of their lives, because they can't find a moment on the track when they weren't doing it!

It has several side effects too. It knocks into reality the fact that the guy does have charge on it. We're, of course, adapting the negative processes of old SOP 8-C. In its fullest sense, in some of these respects. The moment we move into games condition, we're right back to SOP 8-C, 1953-54.

Okay. Any other question? Yes?

Female voice: Since Routine 1A has come out, does this mean that now 1 is not good for half the Scientologists in the world ?

Oh, that doesn't mean so. It does mean this: that it's a speedup.

Female voice: Mm-hm.

1A is a speedup, and I . . you want to know if Routine 1A, since Routine 1A comes out . . does that say that Routine . . cancels the statement that Routine 1 is necessary on about half the Scientologists in the world. Yes, I'd say it modified this statement, because it's showing itself up as being a very beefy process.

Running . . you see now it's further refined. We're getting it into real dynamite now. you have . . you've got any Problems Process, you've got any Games Condition Process addressed to problems, confusions or motions . . that all comes under the same routine. You've got a negative Security Check plus your positive Security Check and this is something on the order of this poor little suffering pc was doing all right and we were making good headway with him and then we started bringing up shotguns and rifles, decided that wasn't good enough and brought up a little bit of antitank armor and you know, here it went. So that actually, the processes are so beefed up along this line that a tremendous number of these cases now that would have been included in that one-half are reachable, without running Routine 1. Okay?

Female voice: Okay.

Thank you for asking. Any other questions?

Well, I'm glad you all know it! I'm glad you all know it.

Now, the new students are, of course . . . Let's see, what day is this? This is Wednesday, isn't it?

This is Wednesday and a couple of students got here Tuesday. They've been here now twenty-four hours or forty-eight hours. They've been here really forty-eight hours and they've passed all of their examinations.

Female voice: Yeah.

Ah, that's pretty slow! We're dead serious about that though, dead serious.

Actually, the beginning of learning is a discovery that there is zones of not-knowingness. Up to that time you're liable to go along like the old-time pilot that was . . he was never taught to fly, he just got into an "airyplane" and he just flew it, you know and the wings kept brushing the trees and he always flew with the left wing low and a few things like that, but he never paid much attention to that because he was still alive and it was still flying, wasn't it? Well, that's enough answer to him, you see.

Now, you take a hold of this guy and you try to correct any of his errors or retrain him on any of his mistakes and he doesn't pay a cotton-picking bit of attention to you because he doesn't think there's anything that he doesn't know. And of course, right now you're in a position where you can catch the tips of your wings in more bushes and trees; you're flying lower and slower and . . higher and faster than you've ever flown before. Actually, it's marvelous how few upsets occur.

Now, of course, this is invalidative of training and one's past training and all of that sort of thing to insist so suddenly on it. But let me point out this horrible thing: If your past training was real good, why worry about taking an examination? E-Meter for instance . . E-Meter has just been codified for the first time. That's why that becomes very important . . with E-Meter Essentials. And 1 swear, 1 don't think there was anybody m the whole world could run an E-Meter. It is completely fantastic, but I don't think anybody was. E-Meters were telling lies to people and so forth.

I'm certain that none of these poor people in the States that were getting all swamped up in PDHs and that sort of thing . . I am sure that there wasn't a single one of them knew the top of a meter from the bottom of a meter, you know. And you didn't even have to know the refinements of compartmenting questions. I don't know, I think they thought the tone arm wobbled when you asked a question, you know? Tone arm never wobbled, the E-Meter didn't work. say "Do fish swim?" No motion on the tone arm. one time, no motion. You point out to them, "Look, you have to reach over and take hold of the tone arm and move it before the tone arm moves." And they say, "Oh, is that right?" I'm sure being snide today.

Okay. All right. Are there any other questions?

Female voice: Would you just say a word about these obsessive people who talk about how they must, you know, react on the E-Meter and how, when they think about something, well, then it doesn't react, but other times they think about something, and it does, and you know, they're in real competition with the E-Meter.

Well, that's a dodge of withholds, when you see that worry. Now, you . . don't mistake me. I will not tell you a lie. You're talking about people who say they can push around E-Meters and so forth. Well, I will not kid you. An E-Meter can be pushed around.

But I'll tell you frankly, I can't counterfeit a reaction when I push around an E-Meter. It does not look like any reaction I ever saw come off of a pc. I'm just not smooth enough. My touch isn't sufficiently delicate. But I can move a needle back and forth by just putting a beam on it and moving it back and forth. You know, I hit it, knock it on the side and it looks like body motion. I know I can't make one read. I can make a Beep Meter play "Yankee Doodle," or push that thing around, but I can't make one read in any kind of a read that is sensible. It's jerky. It'd look like a body motion. If you did see it read, you wouldn't even mistake it for a reading because it would be zz-zz, you know? And you'd say well, the pc shifted his head or something, you know, moved his hands on the cans.

And the first thing you'd say about a pc who was worried about pushing around the meter is that he was not in-session. That would be the first thing you'd say, if he was worried about the meter. The second thing you'd say is that he's got withholds and he's afraid of the meter or the meter disturbs him or the meter is showing him up in some fashion or he's afraid it might show him up. Or you would say, well, he's trying to put up some sort of a pretense of some kind or another that is making . . he's trying to impress the auditor, and the effort to impress the auditor gets into the road of the session because he's not there to impress the auditor; he is there to get audited. So that tells you he's not in-session. So I'd say the common denominator of all this is the pc had never been put in-session.

And I could say a lot about this, but I don't mean to condemn anybody because I've heard an awful lot of people talk about this meter and how they could do this and that. But the point I'm making is it doesn't look like anything an auditor would ever mistake for a read. You'd say, well the battery has hit a rut or something of the sort. It would come over and it would go clank, one way or the other, and it would just be too jerky to pay any attention to. Yo?

Male voice: Well, Ron, I may have contributed to a little bit of that contusion. A couple of weeds ago while I was being audited, I was getting great big twangs on the body that weren't showing on the meter and then all of a sudden something would happen on the meter that I had absolutely no idea about it. It's gone now apparently.

All right. But that would be ordinary that you wouldn't know what was happening on the meter. I know I find a great deal of trouble predicting whether the thing fell or not. Because what it's falling on is the unknown. It's what the pc doesn't know about that causes the meter to react. No, I wouldn't worry about that, Wing, whether you did or didn't contribute to it. I'd just like to put the facts straight.

I'm certainly not going to tell anybody that they cannot move an E-Meter needle. I'm not going to tell anybody that. I'm not going to say that a person who is Clear couldn't mock up a mass and read the tone arm high, make the tone arm go high. I couldn't say that either because I could undoubtedly myself sit and think about some juicy organizational problems and then be very careful not to look at any of them. you know, think of a problem and then very carefully not confront it. Think of a problem, not confront it.

Think of a problem, not confront it. Think of a problem, not confront it and start to get this tone arm going up. you see, there are various dodges that you could resort to, but this wouldn't have anything to do with auditing That's the point I'm making. It doesn't have a thing to do with auditing and it rather tells a person that the person is not in-session or is upset in some fashion.

Now, all of the things that keep a pc out of session are being handled pretty well these days. Those are present time problems, withholds and ARC breaks. Talking to the auditor and interested in their own case: That is being in-session. Now, obviously, part of that is violated when the pc is more interested in the E-Meter reaction than his own case. Or interested in what the E-Meter is saying about his case rather than what his case is all about. His attention is already too extended to fit this thing of "in-session." And I would say offhand . . for the benefit of pcs, not their condemnation in any way . . that if a pc starts talking about moving the meter or starts worrying about the meter, that the pc has gone out of session and one of the rudiments is out

And my first action, as a practical action, would simply be to close off the process I was running, smoothly, with my Model Session and do end rudiments and just knock the spots off of those end rudiments; and I would every time find something was wrong. Well, this is not, then, the pc's fault if the rudiments are out. It's the auditor's fault.

All right. So therefore . . that's enough about this particular phenomena.

I've got an O-Meter we're busy developing these days. Reg loaned me a couple of great big, powerful scopes. One was streamlined. It was powered with Cadillac engine, I think, and it was extremely easy to push a beam around. It registered mass more easily than it registered thinking. And it was so easy to push a beam around that it was utterly fantastic. I was sitting there with Mary Sue and Dick Halpern, and so forth; I don't think they were even noticing this thing. But I gave up on the thing at once. I found all you had to do was put a beam on the electrodes and it instantly got a different read. It jumped. Well, that is too darned critical. It's almost as if all you do is look at the electrode and the E-Meter reads. So you see, I can't say that it doesn't happen. I can only say that when a pc's doing it, he's not in-session. And the rudiments are out. Okay? All right.

I've spoken about this O-Meter. There is one. It does exist. It could be put into production now. But the top zones of this thing have not been exhausted by most people and we needn't worry about that. We would right now only have a couple of dozen people on Earth that could be audited on it, so skip it. Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: I'm so vague about this, I don't know really how to say it. Perhaps you'll help me. I read someplace or heard someplace that at sometime Flaringness plus Confront Processes were used in rudiments. Is there anything . . .

You say you heard someplace that Havingness plus Confront Processes were used in rudiments. No, this would not be true.

Female voice: At the beginning of the session.

Ah, yes. This is where the confusion has arisen. After you've done the rudiments and when you begin to audit the pc . . .

Female voice: Maxim.

When you begin to audit the pc, this is not, "Is it all right to audit in this room?" You've actually started a session. You can run the Havingness and Confront Process to get the pc even more thoroughly in-session, but it's not a rudiment. It's not a rudiment because its purposes are different. The rudiments' purposes have totally to do with the outer environment. You're trying to reorient a pc in his bank when you're running Havingness and Confront Processes and it's totally attached to processing. And just before you finish, it is a very kind thing to straighten out the pc's bank. It's like, you leave an auditing room, it's a very nice thing to put the chairs back in the proper place and empty the ashtray or something like that, you know. Well, similarly, a pc will get along and actually go right on through to Clear, but you

can actually leave him parked in the middle of what you were just running and Havingness and Confront Processes move him into PT.

Another thing. You can be running a terminal which it doesn't exist in this life. It just doesn't exist. There hasn't been any. And, all right.

So therefore, all of your Prehav processes on an SOP Goals Routine 3 run would be addressed to past lives . . every single command! How is the pc ever going to get up through and scan up to this present life? How's he ever going to get back up to this life, unless you run some Confront? This has strictly to do with a subjective phenomena. Rudiments are basically objective, having to do with the environment to break it down in an effort to get the pc's main things that keep him out of session off, so that he will get into session.

Now, you set up the bank for auditing and you can set up the bank for auditing with the Havingness and Confront Processes. It's a very nice point and one can be much too picky about the thing. But they couldn't possibly be part of rudiments because if they were part of rudiments, then you would only run them at beginning and end of a session and this is not what you do with them. you can run them at the end of every process.

Let's say you are going to shift processes in the middle of the session without going through a whole bunch of rudiments or something of the sort. Well, a beautiful way to shift processes is to end this process, run some Havingness and Confront and reassess. That's a preliminary to a reassessment. The pc isn't answering the auditing commands too well, seems to be struggling and bungling and flobbling along. You don't seem to be getting anyplace and the tone arm action sort of died out. Well, there's two things you can do. one is go back and cover the rudiments and end the session; which is a rather time-consuming activity if, usually, a very beneficial one. Or you can simply give him a kick with Havingness and (confront and continue on with the process and the thing now gets active. You understand their purpose and use a little better?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Okay.

Female voice: I think where I heard it, it was not stated that it was in the rudiments. I think in my confusion I put it there. It was in the beginning of the process, so instead of in the process I put it in the rudiments, in my thoughts. That's why I asked you about it.

Second female voice: Mm-mm. She just was explaining why she was confused. Mentally she made a mistake, is all I'm saying

All right. Okay. Good enough. Good enough. All right. Any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: I would like to ask what vitamins or what composition of vitamins would be taken in an intensive and if they were allowed vitamin B

and C and iron and nicotinic acid.

Oh, well, you're talking about an interesting subject. You want to know what vitamins could be taken to what? What is your exact question?

Female voice: It is usually advice to take in a longer intensive or how do you . . .

Good advice to take these things in a longer intensive and so on. All this is perfectly true. You're talking about Guk is its oldest phrase. More politely, latterly, Dianazene and other such mixtures. All of them, however, directed at different targets.

The target of the atomic bomb is what gave us Dianazene and that is the one which has the iron and everything else in it. Now, let's see, what is the formula for a Dianazene? I think it's 100 milligrams of

B1 . . something on the order of this; this would be a workable formula anyhow . . 15 grains of dicalcium phosphate (or calcium), 250 milligrams of ascorbic acid (vitamin C). Now, that all by itself is Guk. That isn't the original Guk, but that's the component parts of the original Guk that worked. Folic acid and several other items . . iron and so on . . had nothing to do with the original Guk and its performance. So those three items were the original Guk. And that is vitamin B1, 100 milligrams, 15 grains of dicalcium phosphate and 250 milligrams of vitamin C (ascorbic acid). Now, that was Guk.

And to this, if you add iron and 100 milligrams of nicotinic acid . . not niacinamide (that has no reaction at all). It's nicotinic acid; it's that vitamin which goes under that heading. And if you add a 100 milligrams of that and a few grains of iron . . it doesn't much matter how many grains of iron . . you'll start running off all of the sunburns, all atomic blast flushes. You'll have a ball, man. You'll be on fire one moment and getting cold the next and it's hotter than a pistol. It feels like bathing in mustard.

And in addition to that, its basics have something to do with skin cancer because once in a while some brave soul taking this stuff has turned on . . or this has happened now and then . . has turned on skin cancer per se (itself) in person. And it has run right straight on through and turned off again, providing he persisted. So we can assume that radiation and so forth has something to do with cancer. We can probably expect more cancer in the world now with atomic bombs around or something of the sort.

All right. The reason why this rationale came about is very simple; is nicotinic acid is listed in the "pharmaceticopeia" . . I'll bet you can't say that . . anyway, is listed as a . . a drug which produces a drug rash and this doesn't happen to be correct.

So I thought that it might be a good thing to know in event of atomic war that we would get . . we might have some chemical assist so that maybe the people who were only slightly frazzled and so forth, could . . could come out of it. And it would have to be very simple. It would have to be some common drug, some common pill.

Well, there are societies in England that are having an awfully good time fighting the cigarette. They can't do anything else, so they fight cigarettes. And they say that the cigarette causes lung cancer. And they've . . you've been hearing something of this, I'm sure. Yeah. Not smoking enough will cause lung cancer. Not smoking enough will cause lung cancer! If anybody is getting a cancerous activity in the lung, the probabilities are that it's radiation dosage coupled with the fact that he smokes. And what it does is start to run out the radiation dosage, don't you see. But I'd say that would be better than not running out any of the radiation dosage at all and the number of lung cancer cases which exist, of course, that don't smoke are just forgotten by these societies, but they are very numerous.

Anyway, there's nicotinic acid in that cigarette. Inevitably, on inhalation of tobacco, you will get some of this phenomena of face flush, but in view of the fact that a cigarette isn't pushing its smoke over the outside of the body but on the inside, of course, you run it out internally.

But if you will notice . . if you've had many sunburns, that a . . that cigarette smoke stings. You can hold cigarette smoke up close to your face for quite a little while and you'll get it stinging. Or all of a sudden you get some kind of a lip upset or it'll start burning or something of that sort. Well, it's the same phenomenon. The same phenomena. It's the same stuff.

Anyway, we gratuitously were going to help out the tobacco companies and then found out that they had appointed a Committee for the Defense of tobacco Companies, and this committee is in the research business. And some guy goes around, and he's got a lot of letters after his name and he gets everybody to contribute a lot of money so that he's then permitted to sit at a desk and shuffle papers. And then he takes all the papers that are issued him and he writes new reports, you see; and then they go to some other society, and they take all those papers, and then they write new reports on his papers, you see. And then, they have another society, and they write new reports on these two societies' reports, you see; and then the first guy has still got a job because he can still rewrite the papers of the third society, you see. And they get this circle going and that is what is called research. Never . . never be bumbled as to why they don't get anyplace much with research in this society because that is . . I'm not even being sarcastic . . that is the way they do it. They grab all of the funds for appropriation and then run a can't-have of knowledge on everybody, see, by circulating these papers. You've seen them do it.

The US government has gone insane on this subject. My God, you could walk into the US Government and you could set a spaceship down in the middle of the Pentagon, fully equipped with crews, oxygen supplies, and call all the generals out and say, "All right now, boys. We're going to go up to the moon and bring you back a sample of the stuff . . whatever's up there." Take off, go to the moon, bring them back a sample, present them with a sample, give them all the photographs; they've had you on radar all the way and so forth and they would turn around to their research department to find out whether or not it was possible to build such a spaceship! And of course, the research department has only been reading their own papers, so of course, they say, "No, it is not possible to build a spaceship" and you would have had it.

They're really going to lay one terrific egg on research one of these days because it's getting more and more the old school tie and it's all tied in and it's all this and it's all that; and they are just rewriting papers. And this Committee for the Defense of Tobacco Manufacturers is one of these outfits. See, we've had enough correspondence with them to know what the old school tie is all about, you see and we've just been trying to tell them that probably it is because people don't smoke enough cigarettes. And we can prove that you can actually get rid of the effects of atomic fission using the ingredients of a cigarette. Which of course, what would this do to this anti-tobacco campaign which is now upsetting the income of tobacco companies. But that is a solution, and they're only in the business of problems, so they don't want anything to do with it at all.

I've detoured, but I thought I might tell you something about that because I found it rather amusing when it was happening. I knew definitely what was happening.

That's why we get research done, is because we research. We look. We observe and then we don't spend the rest of our lives getting into arguments with people about what we wrote about it. you see, it's the basis of whether or not it works, not the basis of whether or not we are qualified to judge. Does it work or doesn't it work and that's the whole criterion and that makes us kind of new and strange. All right.

Dianazene is the whole mixture of the ancient Guk plus nicotinic acid and is used only for the purpose of the discharge of radiation and is an experimental drug but does do some remarkable things. So much for that.

Guk, on the other hand, for fifty-seven minutes after a dose of Guk is taken, a pc runs at a much accelerated rate because of the chemical boost, by actual test . . by E-Meter, and so on. It does speed auditing for the first fifty-seven minutes after the dose is taken, for that exact period of time. This was very carefully researched.

Female voice: That would be Guk only?

That's the old Guk. That's the first three-item formula which I gave you. If you have nightmares, you should take some Guk. That's right. If you're having nightmares during auditing or something, you've simply drifted out on B1 and you want to drop off and take some Guk. It's a chemical assist. That's what it is.

Furthermore, it will run engrams through all by itself, too, which is quite interesting When you start taking this stuff periodically day after day . . you take a dose of it every day regularly as a clock, and a somatic will progressively go on through and move . . you'll move through an engram. Nutrilite, and some of these other substances, have this same basis, but not in these proportions.

And these proportions are so alarming to a chemist that they just don't know what they're looking at. And yet with great aplomb they will give 100 milligrams of B1 to people, without the calcium and without the ascorbic acid and it sets them up to lose all their bones and teeth, because B1 will find ascorbic acid from the teeth and gums and will find calcium from the bones and teeth if you start feeding somebody with it. It'll find it in the body. And so you better put it there m the stomach for it to discover real fast. otherwise it softens up all of the bone structure of the body, which is quite interesting

Shows you the irresponsibility of some of the drug companies like Abbot, Parke, Lilly, Menninger and some of these other drug companies. These characters are uniformly having a happy time pushing out into the hands of doctors and psychiatrists, heavy enormous doses of B1 which are given by the needle and given by oral, and so on. They just give enormous doses of this stuff, and it's just knocking people to pieces. They never even bothered to find out if there was any supplementary vitamin had to be given with it.

I think we're the only ones that ever did any research on it, probably because we didn't have any profit motive. Of course, that's a snide remark. I know that Abbott, Lilly and Parke and Davis and all the rest of them . . I know they have no profit motive at all. No, they never invest any money in fighting 3cientology or drugless healing either. They . . never, never, never a penny. They invest it strictly in the American Medical Association and tell them to do it!

By the way, there's no Pure Food and Drug Act in England, for which you an be very devoutly thankful. But you can buy a bottle of medicine in England and it doesn't have any of its ingredients on it and in America all the ingredients have to be on the thing But then to make sure, they get the Food and Drug administration which is totally supported and subsidized by the drug people . . and if one of the big companies comes in with a new drug . . doesn't matter what it does, you know . . why, if they're a big company, they get an automatic okay. It's automatic. "Well," they say, "that's Parke-Davis; must be all right."

So they have a sterility pill now in America which was okayed by the Food and Drug Administration, despite the fact that it has about one hundred percent side effects and practically no action on virility. It's almost a hundred percent side effects. It just tears a person to pieces. But because Parke and Menninger or somebody put it out, see, why it was automatically okayed, and they have started actually now, reversing the flow . . a good example of flow reverse . . and they've actually started okaying only things that are harmful.

They okay the electric shock machines of the psychiatrists even if they are going to short out and kill patients. That's okay. But they won't okay an E-Meter. That's a harmless device so it can't be okayed. They wouldn't okay somebody selling bread pills which are totally harmless, but they would okay somebody selling a sterility pill. I think these sterility pills are the biggest racket anybody ever heard. They are about fifty cents apiece, and you have to take one a day, and that's fifteen dollars a month, and the net security of them involves with upsetting the entire menstrual cycle, blood upsets; I think it makes people dizzy, huh?

Female Voice: Sick at their stomach.

Makes people violently sick at their stomachs and consistently dizzy and . . and fixes them so they can't eat, and so forth and so that's the very thing we ought to do.

Every time you get a government bureau set up to guarantee purity, you see, they run a can't-have on impurities on everybody until they finally become totally impure. A wonderful example of a games condition. Just gorgeous.

Well, I've talked to you quite a while here, and you're way overdue and probably anxious to get home so that you can get back in time!

I'm very happy with the case results which you have been resulting. Doing a good job of auditing. All except those, of course, who have just come Lately and we can't expect anything more than that and we're not going to worry about it particularly. We won't worry about it till Friday!

Saint Hill, by the way, doesn't have any dungeons. There are no dungeons at Saint Hill. There's only the remains of some. And down here there's m old wine cellar looks like a dungeon and the electric door on it has nothing to do with the fact that atomic fission has been used in there or anything. find the actual entrance to the dungeons has been sealed. And there was an entrance in there. If you go in and inspect the bricks very carefully you will rind out where the dungeons are. They were right back under the terrace

flack there. It was an old Norman castle sat on this site before 1733 and its dungeons are still there. The boys discovered them the other day and we're lot going to use them before Friday.