

E METER DATA: INSTANT READS PART I

A lecture given on
24 May 1962

Thank you.

Well, I'm glad to be in your midst. Actually, I enjoy lecturing to you. I do.

And last night enjoyed giving a session. I thought that was the most, you know? You saw me lay a couple of eggs with this pc here earlier, you know, and remember, the earlier sessions were not particularly productive of any vast gain; pc didn't go downhill or anything. And last night, why, you see, I just got the idea that I'd better show you how to do some fishing and fumbling, and you might not have noticed what it did. It might have been all something or other.

All I did was let the meter wave until it ticked, and I just steered the pc on to a double tick. I just set out to clean up a dirty needle and actually, in that hour, made a stage of cleaning it up, and we got some of the stuff cleaned off it. And what do you know, it was right on his goal line (you don't mind my mentioning it). It was right on his goal line and everything was fine. And you notice, I didn't go out of this lifetime. I didn't even go back into his childhood, nothing. I held him securely anchored in the last three years. Remember? See that? Well, that's steering the pc. That's just fish and fumble. You can clear up some of the most remarkable things, particularly if you're aided and assisted by the fact that the pc has a meter pattern to start with.

But there was something very tricky last night that you might have missed—and that was just this and nothing more: was the handling of the stuck picture. Pc has a stuck picture; pc complains about stuck picture; you find session in which picture was first found; get the missed withhold off of that session. See? Don't you go running that engram, because it's a stuck picture, so obviously it won't run.

Well, enough of that. I'm going to talk about the meter.

Now, what's the date? 25th?

Audience: 24th.

Fourth?

Audience: 24th.

Well, what are you doing in the 24th? I was in the 25th. Well, I'll come back to the 24th. All right. It's the first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 24th May, '62.

We have a lecture about the E-Meter. Once there was a cat, and he went sniffing along corridors in the open cracks below auditing-room doors. Heh, heh, heh. And after being baffled for a very long time, he became a very wise cat. And out of all this we have a single plea: Use the E-Meter. I know that seems like a lot to ask, but if you use it, it'll treat you right, and if you misuse it, wrong.

Once again we have a complete breakdown in progress that occurred here in September of 1961 whereby everybody fashionably was reading the E-Meter cross-eyed with the rudiments wildly out and everybody was plowing into the ground. And we have come again into that particular period.

Now, till recently I have talked to you scoldishly and I've said, "Why don't you make your pcs look good?" Remember? Well, I'll tell you, your pcs don't look good because you're not reading an E-Meter. That's all. It's a gross auditing error~imple, factual, horrible to contemplate, but true. It isn't the way you are holding your little finger in a session. It isn't the fact that your thumb is insufficiently callused on the tone arm. It isn't any one of a thousand things. It isn't because you don't have a command of Model Session. It isn't because of something weird or wonderful in the pc. It's just that you're not reading an E-Meter. That's all.

Now, that sounds horrible, but I don't think this applies to all of you. It couldn't. But it must apply in some degree to all of you because I don't see anybody listening to this lecture three feet off his chair.

Today all you have to do is just exactly what you have to do. You don't have to do anything fancy. And that is a very, very rough thing to get through to you. We actually are there, as far as technology is concerned—been there for some time, but been improving, improving, improving, little bits, little bits, little bits. But, do you know, I don't know a thing today that you could audit on somebody that wouldn't produce a remarkable gain. See? I don't know anything we're using that wouldn't produce a remarkable gain on the pc.

And I caught you out this way: I audit a pc with exactly what you're using, he shines. You audit a pc, and I get an instructor to check it and your rudiments are all out. How could your rudiments be out? It isn't that you're not asking the exact, proper question. Oh, you're asking the right question. But the needle goes over, hits the pin, bends; blue smoke comes out of the meter connection, the sensitivity knob becomes incandescent, and you say, "That's clear," and go on to the next question. And that's all that's happening. Honest. Honest. I plead with you.

Now, I know you think you aren't doing it. But Fred was telling me in the break up there, he says, "You know," he said, "I had to practice quite a while in practical, and I've suddenly realized I was just not seeing instant reads. And all of a sudden I started to see them."

There is some kind of an oddball phenomenon that goes this way: Your eyesight shuts off. That's the only way I can explain it. Now, what shuts off your ruddy eyesight? What shuts it off?

So I had to ask myself this embarrassing question: Did we know what made an auditor turn off when he turned the meter on? Do we know that? And up till last night, we didn't.

So I had to figure out what happened. Well, of course, I had the data, but I had to assemble it. And so I can give you this cheerful information. You can stop looking as though I have just beaten you, because I haven't just beaten you. You see, if I hadn't confidence in you, why, I wouldn't even try. But a few weeks ago I took a look at you all, and I realized that the gray sunken cheek, the thick and muddy eye, the dragging of oneself up the stairs, was not being caused by your late hours or lack of food or anything else, but must somehow or another be caused by the auditing. And I started on a campaign, at that time, to locate what was wrong.

Now, actually I wasn't trying to look for anything I was just looking to see what was there. This is always a good idea. When you are looking for something, don't make up your mind, like the psychologist, that you know the something you are looking for before you look. It's very remarkable. You can look across a whole beach of white pebbles for a white pebble, don't you see, and never find one, if you've already specified that in order to find a white pebble, it has to be black, you see, or something

odd like this. No, the thing to do is just to go down to the beach and look, and not even look for a white pebble. Just look and see what's there.

That's always very good in research. The Ford Foundation, I think it's 100 million dollars a month—I think that's the value of the research as done by the Ford Foundation. About 100 million dollars—oh, well, that's an exaggeration; it's actually 100 million dollars worth a minute, because of course they get no place. If the Ford Foundation's research along these various lines was to be chalked up in value, why, it couldn't be, you see, because they haven't gotten anyplace.

Actually, the Ford Foundation was founded at the—exactly the same day (did you know this?) of the first Hubbard Dianetic Research Foundation for exactly the same purposes: to discover the basics of human life and the mind. It's fascinating. And there they are. And it's cost them, since that time, several billion dollars. And they recently, a few years ago, just after they investigated a HASI in Phoenix, Arizona—they sent a representative down, and he gave a report of some kind or another—they wrote a letter to an enquirer that they had ceased to investigate in that particular field. Now, out of that we didn't know quite what to imply, but we whipped them.

But the idea is that fantastic sums can be spent in research by taking records and compiling records and comparing records to records; and the next thing, when you get through, you've got some records. They make nice bonfires; you can toast weenies over them.

But to date, this type of research which does all the lookingness on a via through symbols . . . You know? We're going to mathematically compute it all. See, we've got a white tree in front of us, so we're going to mathematically compute as to whether or not a white tree can exist. And then we figure out that it can't, and we walk away. See? And that's very commonly the fate of research.

Who was it? Hegel or Hume, or . . . Hegel, I think it was. It was some such bird. Somebody or other had up and looked through a telescope and had found the eighth or ninth planet or—eighth planet, that's it—and somebody like Hegel, I think it was, said, "Couldn't exist because the perfect number was seven!" And for several years nobody would admit that it existed. All they had to do was train a telescope on it, but it couldn't exist because the perfect number-was seven. Therefore, there couldn't be more than seven planets in this system. That's what's known as looking at the figures, you see, not looking at anything else.

So all of this kind of thing, I start narrowing it down. Now, the first observation was you didn't glow, see? I'm always looking, and this one I found. See, you didn't glow. That was obviously a fact. There was nobody glowing. To prove it: you're in the basement, aren't you, here? We're still using coal. See? That's enough, see? Proves itself, doesn't it! So . . . If you want some mathematical computation to go along with it, I'll just throw that one in, you see?

So from that, I made a couple of assignments. Not necessarily sneakily. I really did just make these assignments. You see? And the assignments I made was (1) I gave an auditor a list of questions—Prepcheck questions to be cleaned on a pc—and I gave another auditor a list of questions that had already been asked, to check over whether or not they were live. The best way to repair a case, you see, on a Prepcheck is to pick up all the questions left alive and clean them. That's the best thing to do. Ho-ho-ho, ho-ho-ho.

I also got some rudiments checked by your auditing supervisor, and I was coordinating tone arm against out rudiments. And one of the earlier discoveries on this: when the rudiment is out, the tone arm, she don't move. Important fact. That's a new fact. If the rudiments are out, no tone arm action. That applies to anything.

All right. I went ahead, then, and you saw the results last night of one of these people I checked out. This is not necessarily derogatory to the auditors who did this. There's no point in you going out and blowing your brains out, because we'll just have to pick you up in the next life and clear you again, see? Nobody is being condemnatory on this particular line. But it is indicative of something, and the thing it's indicative of is somebody wasn't reading the meter, because I'm absolutely sure—absolutely sure—that the auditor checked those questions but they didn't read right—something. Something, see?

Now, a further discovery of this: I find out that the auditor believed the meter did not react, and that there was some belief present that TR 1 must be out—that the auditor isn't delivering the question hard enough, you see, to the pc, or hasn't enough control over the pc to make the meter register. See, that could enter in, you see? And a lot of other things. You can explain this a dozen ways.

I actually don't buy any of that. I think the meter reacted and it wasn't observed. That was just as simple as that. Let's take the gross auditing error just as a gross auditing error, not a lot of mathematical figure-figure over alongside of the thing. Let's not try to figure out why, particularly, on that basis. Let's not say the meter didn't operate and the pc didn't operate because look, this has been several widely scattered pcs, which picked up immediately afterwards—one of them by an instructor he could cheerfully strangle (the pc could: that instructor couldn't possibly have anything with that pc but an ARC break)—and every single one of them reacted.

But we can't attribute it to some other mechanism except just this: He was a-lookin' at the meter, and the meter wobbled—the needle went bap!— and the auditor didn't do a thing about it. The auditor didn't see it. That's the only available explanation. Because other people hostile to the pc, in the pc's estimation, found the meter operating for them.

Do you think it's easy to sit up in front of that TV camera? It isn't, man. Not for a pc. Not easy at all. Takes quite a bit as an auditor to hold him in. And you saw those questions falling off the pin, but those questions had just been checked over, and some statement was made that they were mostly clear. Now, afterwards we found out, although they'd been stated mostly clear at first, the auditor said that not all of them were. However, there was one there that the auditor had said was clear that was not clear on my test, see? Well, that wipes it out. The things were reacting, in other words. In other words, something was happening with the meter and it was not observed.

And listen to me! You see me crossing this bridge right now. You're going to cross this bridge. Hm? There's hardly a one here that isn't going to cross this bridge sooner or later. You're going to stand there speechless, whether in the HGC or an Academy, or with somebody who's helping you out as an auditor or something of the sort. I don't care where it's going to be, you're going to cross this same barrier, and you're going to say, "Mrs. Glutz is not doing better. Did you notice the blood dripping out of both her eyes when she left the session today?"

And the auditor will say—whether student or staff auditor or whoever it'll be, see—will say, "Well yes, but she's just a very difficult pc. She's very difficult." And if you don't know what to do at that point, you yourself will go figure it all out mathematically.

The thing to do is to get ahold of the pc and take a look at the pc. That's your first thing. And the pc isn't better. See? That's good enough with modern processes. The pc isn't better. The pc does not look better. Therefore, somebody isn't reading the meter. Bing, bing—something. You wait! You'll be on this hot seat. And you'll get Mrs. Glutz and you'll put her down in a chair and you will hand her the cans, and you will say, "Well, now, let's see, now. Now, let me see. You just had a session. Now, in that

session did you tell any half-truth? Untruth?” Tone arm action! “Did you try to impress the auditor?” “Did you try to damage anyone?” There’s no sense going on checking it because the tone arm is now at 7.0. And you’ll turn around to this auditor and you will say, “Hey, Mike. Hey, hey, hey, bud. What the hell? What goes on?”

He’ll say, “Well, they were all in when she left the session.”

And you, you idiot, may fall for it. And you’re liable to say, “But then what might it have been? Might it be that his TR 1 is bad? Or actually that the pc is so ARC broke that it doesn’t read on the meter for that auditor? Or is it the fact that they were clear at that moment for him but not for me? Or do they have mutual withholds between themselves which are then coming out because I am checking . . . ?” You know, you can just figure yourself crazy.

Now, this is the one you want to figure: The meter wobbled and the auditor was looking out the window. Don’t figure it any other way, because if you do figure it any other way, you will miss its cure. Thing to cure is not necessarily the auditor’s eyesight.

How can an auditor get in that condition? By invalidating the meter, of course. An auditor can go stone-blind on a meter.

Now, how does this come about? The auditor is audited by an auditor who is stone-blind. Just exactly how do we get this chain reaction, see? He’s sitting there early in his career, minding his own business, and his auditor says to hiIn, “Do you have a present time problem?”

And he thinks, “Oh, my God, if I don’t pay the rent by two o’clock, I’m going to be thrown out,” you see? And he can just feel this thing seethe, you know? And the other auditor—the auditor who’s across from him says, “Thank you. That’s clear.”

“Huh,” he says. “You know, that says that didn’t register.” You understand, he couldn’t see the dial so he doesn’t know whether it doesn’t register or not. He makes the assumption that it didn’t register. “Didn’t register, see? Feels like a present time problem to me. I guess the Ineter is . . . Well, all right. And I’ll just. . .” He just kind of suppresses it and goes through the session gritting his teeth.

Next session: The night before, see, he was on a drinking bout with this guy’s girlfriend, see, or something like that—whatever it was, it doesn’t matter. “Since the last session, have you done anything,” or something like this, “that you’re withholding?” See?

“Oh boy,” he says. “Man, when he gets this . . . I don’t know whether I can get this withhold off or not. Think . . . Ohooooor. I can just imagine him going out and buying a sound truck and driving up and down the streets, you see, with this particular withhold, because that’s what they always do with hot withholds, you see? Well therefore, at no time will I . . .” you know? “But if I sit here real quietly and don’t breathe at this moment as he asks the question, be all right.”

And the auditor looks at him and says, “That’s clear.”

And the guy says, “ Whooh! boy. That was lucky. Man. Whooh! Got away with that.”

And this happens often enough to a point where a guy gets the idea that meters don’t read. See, all it requires is for one auditor, auditing another auditor, to make one error—be looking elsewhere when the meter bangs. Just requires one of these, and you start this chain going. You think the meter didn’t read. And this is very invalidative to the meter. You think meters don’t read. That’s where that comes in.

Well, of course, that happens while you're in session and you're kind of non compos mentis at the time or too interested in withholding what you're withholding or something like that, you see, to go into this thing deeply, and so you close that one out. That's a total suppression. You forget it, and it lays the most beautiful chain in you ever heard of.

You know it should have read and it didn't read. Therefore, the meter is no good. But your assumption is the incorrect assumption, so it lasts in space, which is "meter didn't read." That is a lie. The meter read. And as any lie, it'll hang up. And it builds a whole chain up with somebody who is audited this way—builds an enormous chain.

The way you clear that chain is you just prepcheck the question "Has any auditor ever failed to find a meter read on you that you thought should have reacted?" That gets the unknowns out of it because that's the most likely area of unknown, even though it's kind of motivatorish. It's actually neither an overt nor motivator; it's just hanging in space. But it's quite unknown because it happened in the middle of the session while the pc was very interested in other things, see? So it's a quick one.

One of the ways the ancient medicine man operated . . . I actually, at one time or another, have studied in this particular field. I remember about 1930 I was very disgusted; I did some study in North America on the subject of becoming an Indian medicine man. One of the fine ways to go about it is to learn how to scream. And if you can let off a good scream, see, that's got sawtoothed edges, that is twice as loud as any psycho's scream, see?—just a good, totalvolume scream—you can stand close to somebody, scream suddenly, utter a command phrase, and then continue your scream. It'll go in as a total implant. That is a crude and savage way of implanting, but very effective. This is your old medicine man. Make a terrific amount of noise, no noise for a second and utter a command phrase like "You are a pig," see, interrupt the scream at that point, and then start it again at exactly the same pitch that you stopped it, and go on and finish the scream.

The person who heard this scream is unaware of its ever having been interrupted and after the session will look at you attentively and say, "Oink." Really will. I mean, this is quite effective—quite effective.

There would be many ways to go about it. You could take a pistol and put somebody in sudden terror and shoot past his face, and then stop shooting for a moment and say something to him, and then shoot the other three shots, you see? He'd never have any idea that you ever said anything. It goes into an unknownness and makes a compulsion.

This is probably how the ancient magician enchanted things. Possibly princes have turned into deer in the forest. If you took a period in the magic universe when thetans were still capable of mocking up their own bodies, and you pulled some shocking stunt on the person and sandwiched them in there that "You are now a deer," why, he'd cease to mock up the prince and start mocking up a deer, don't you see, and he would be an enchanted deer. That would be how enchantments were accomplished. I mean, the mechanism of enchantment is no cruder than that.

So when you lay something in like a hellish invalidation of the meter, the person is so involved in their own think-think and worried, you see, about something or other, already very submerged and very withholdy—they get a further withhold on top of the darn thing, just as though they were being screamed at. You see, they're with . . . "Meter doesn't work," and then "Meter doesn't work." But they don't know that. E:cept they can't read meters. See how you could do it to somebody?

But actually it wouldn't be just that motivator that made this thing come true. I'm afraid, for any prince to get enchanted, I'm afraid in the former life when he was a magician,

he ran into a prince and committed an overt which was actually a motivator. And I think that's how it all got mixed up. He did the enchantment and somebody in front of him turned into a deer to hang the guy with his own enchantment. And then, of course, walked around the other side of the tree and became 8 prince again. See, you'd have to haste an incident of that particular kind—the guy commits an overt that he thinks is an overt that is actually a motivator, but he doesn't know it is—in order to get some such goofiness started.

In other words, a pc is to some degree at an auditor's mercy. And when an auditor does something weird, makes some evaluative remark, the pc might be fogged up at that kind of an instant, and if it's too bad—poohie! It isn't that your auditing, on a long range, is going to do anything, providing you eventually get rid of the person's GPM. Because all of this hangs up on the GPM. When you eventually blow the GPM, it'll blow all the rest of it, don't you see?

So therefore, you have to audit in such a way as to not impede the pc from getting Clear. It isn't that you can actually hurt a pc, you understand? But the stuff is laying in against the aberrations and the GPM, see? And you got to audit a pc so that the GPM is not thoroughly restimulated, and so at the other end he goes Clear and the GPM blows to pieces. Got it? And then all the auditing and everything else comes off.

But in the meantime, if you do a rough job of auditing, because the pc is in a rough state, why, of course, you get these implantations inadvertently—quite inadvertent. You have to be careful what you say to a pc who is in session, as you know very well. Psychiatry, by the way—we find psychiatry hard to understand because the psychiatrist is always doing something on a goal line that we don't understand. We say we have a goal line. I ask all of you about this: what your private opinion of why you audit a pc is concerned. But it's uniformly to do something for the pc, help him out, something like that, you see? You all had that idea. Actually, psychiatry doesn't have that idea in treating a patient. They are not trying to make the patient better or cure insanity or anything like that. They have entirely different goal lines. So you find them incomprehensible.

By the way, in doing a 3GA, all the people who are incomprehensible are the people who would not want your goal. Those are the true incomprehensibles of this universe. You just can't understand them. And of course, you stop and think of a president of the United States who wants to be a piccolo player, or something like that; you'd have a hard time understanding his foreign policy. You'd think he was being inefficient in running the nation, whereas he knows he's being efficient in running the nation. He is handing out enormous sums of money to disabled piccolo players, you see, or something like this. So he knows how to mn a nation. He is president so he can go to concerts, see, and that helps out—it's comprehensible.

This would be the way most nations are run. Supposing, by the way, you got all the heads of state there are in the world that cause all this upset and misery and got them down the line and actually did a Goals Assessment on each one of them. I imagine it would be terribly revelatory. It would be a kick, man. I mean, you wouldn't believe it. God! The reasons they want to be president or king or commissar, generalissimo . . .

Well, this goal line that the individual has is quite important. He's trying to get Clear, and things that cross against it are all those things which we classify as auditing errors. You see, he's apparently being batted back on the subject of his goal. Well actually, smooth auditing is designed not to bat his goal back. See? And that's the definition of what's right and wrong in an auditing session. Now, that doesn't mean specifically we have to know what his goal is or anything else. We just don't impede him on going forward. See? So the things that impede him we delete from the session.

And we get some incomprehensible, like “Do you have a present time problem?” Yes, the individual does have a present time problem. Oh, my God! you know. It’s an antisocial present time problem, or something of the sort, and he really doesn’t want to fess up to it, and he’s right in the line of having to make a horrible admission of some kind or another, and the auditor says, “That’s clear.”

Well, of course, he wanted to get rid of his present time problem, was his basic goal, and he didn’t get a chance to get rid of it so you’ve gone across his goal line, and you’ve laid one in, and that one that comes in is “The meter doesn’t work.” And he inevitably will make that conclusion at that moment. It’s actually very upsetting if you go back and analyze the thing and go over this. You sit there very upset. You’re saying to yourself, “My God! It’s a good thing I got away with that withhold. Thank God I didn’t have to get off that withhold.” It’s what you’re thinking, kind of analytically, you know? “Whoa, oh boy! would that have been embarrassing. This girl auditor and . . . oh, gee. So happy I didn’t get off—have to get off the withhold, you know? She said it was clear.... I don’t think it was clear.”

Hour and a half later—he’s getting audited all this time, you see—”What the hell was the matter with the E-Meter?” you know? Well, he has to come to the conclusion it didn’t work. See, the conclusion is—automatically, the response is “The E-Meter doesn’t work.” That’s what’s laid in. FHe knows it should react; it didn’t react. So therefore what should react doesn’t react, so therefore it doesn’t react. And there’s quite an upset about that.

I’ve seen this myself. I’ve had an ARC break—something like this—and the auditor wouldn’t register, but I would, on the meter. In other words, I could ask myself the question, “Do I have a present time problem?”—the meter would go plang! you see? And the auditor would ask me, “Do you have a present time problem?”—it would sit there absolutely motionless. It was quite interesting. I’ve actually seen a meter myself, see? Now, with the auditor I said, “Well now, come on now, let’s look at this. Let’s look at this damn thing, you see? Here’s a weird phenomenon.” The auditor asked me the question—no reaction I asked the question—reaction. See, I was holding the cans. Fantastic!

So the meter can be ARC broke out of existence. But even so, the shock in not seeing the meter operate was quite something—a considerable shock involved in that operation. You know? She asked me a question: “Do you have a present time . . . ?”—doesn’t operate. I ask the question “Do I have a present time problem?”—it operates. “What the hell is going on here?” See? I just couldn’t believe it, you know? Just stoney-eyed disbelief. Dahhhh. Already have a good subjective reality on it—quite a shock. Patched up the ARC break, of course the meter operated for the auditor. Wasn’t anything more to it than that.

I even remember the time and date of this, because I studied this a little bit further and then found out that a meter could be inoperative in the process of an ARC break. But you’d have to ARC break the living daylight out of the pc before you got to this phenomena, and I don’t believe we really reached this phenomena.

That meter, by the way, I don’t think was tuned to sensitivity 16. I think it was at a low sensitivity. I think it still would have read, one way or the other. But it was quite a shock to me.

Meter gets invalidated. At the same time the pc is ARC broke. Now, the next time this person is auditing, it sweeps, it reacts—perhaps minorly because his rudiments are already kind of queasy and the pc is halfway ARC broke. He gets a reaction; he doesn’t believe it when he sees it. You could stack these up to a point where an auditor would simply be stone-blind on the meter. He’d just never see a reaction, that’s all. Or he’d try to explain the reaction, which is the same thing, you see?

You got one going right now which is very laughable. You know all about this, and yet I've had a despatch about it, and somebody else has had a despatch about it today. And that is, do you take the reading during the sentence? Ahh, this is just silly! If you ask yourself, what the hell? What is a reading which you get during the sentence? It's reading on the various words in the sentence, not on the sense of the sentence, so of course you ignore it. There's a prior read; you ignore it. There's a latent read; you ignore it. The only read you read is the instant read. Bang! If you don't get an instant read and you want to be sure, try it again. You saw one last night when I was auditing. You saw a prior read. Now, you didn't see me buy it. I said, "Well, we'll check it," and there it went that time—it fired. But we were getting some kind of a random read. Random needles are apt to read almost anyplace, but they won't ordinarily read two times running accidentally. Do you see?

Now, you only buy an instant read. Just lay that in with iron, man— instant read. Actually, there is actually no time period at all between the receipt of your question and the response from the reactive mind. If there's any time period, it is consumed electronically. Might be an electronic lag. I've said a half, and a fifth, and a tenth, and I'm just trying to give you an idea of a small amount of time.

I was studying it the other day and I found out it was zero time. It's actually zero time plus the electronic lag. That electronic lag is pretty darn— pretty darn instantaneous unless your meter is damped. And to your eye, you can't really detect any lag. That's the only thing you pay any attention to.

There's only one other time when you use any other kind of read. You never use a prior read. You never use a late read, except this one. There is one exception, and that is when you're helping the pc by steering. You're steering the pc's thinkingness. You saw me do it last night on a very broad scale, fish and fumble—very, very broad. I was practically sitting there waiting for the needle to hit on something so I could ask the pc what he was thinking about, you see? And then you've asked a question, you've got an instant read, you've asked him what it is, and a moment later you see that instant read repeated, but this time as a needle pattern. You see, you see the same read so you say, "What was that?" see, "What's that?" and so on. That's steering. See?

So it doesn't matter whether you steer it in a fish and fumble—just sit there and wait for the guy to react on something and say "What were you looking at, at that moment," you see? "That . . . that . . . that." That's just steering. It doesn't matter whether you do it after you've got the instant read or without any instant read. You could use a meter in that fashion. It doesn't tell you anything. You just want to steer the pc's attention to something. And he, "Oh, well, that. That . . . oh, well, I keep seeing this stuck picture. Uh . . . that's what that is." It wouldn't matter what the "that" was or what his withhold was. It's just steering. It's the only time you ever use anything but an instant read.

Your instant read is never prior. It never happens before the end of the sentence. These must be single-clause sentences. It never happens except at the end of the sentence, the end of the word. Now, you can say, "Have you ever damaged anyone?" and get a "you have"—and the person is all ARC broke on havingness, see? "Have," clink. "You"—do you know, "you" nearly reacts on all pcs?~link. "Damaged," clank! See? "Someone," tick.

Oh, you could say to yourself, "Where the hell am I?" Well, just ignore all that earlier stuff, see? Just ignore the lot, see? Just . . . And if you're not sure, say, "I'll repeat that. Have you ever damaged someone?" and clang, you'll get your instant read right on the end of "someone " It's right exactly—it's just as the tail of the e comes up, you'll get the instant read. Particularly on a second repeat, because you kind of have worn a groove, see? You want to take a question apart—you'll get "have." "What about 'have'?" You'd be a real idiot to do this, see, but "What about 'have'?"

“Oh, I don’t know.”

“Well, what was that?”

“Oh, well, that was the havingness session I had today. The auditor said it was my process because it kept tightening the needle.”

“All right. ‘You.’ All right. What’s that . . . that . . . that . . . that . . . that . . .”

“Well, I don’t know. It must be listing. We keep putting ‘you’ down on the list.”

“All right. Fine. Fine. ‘Damaged.’ Yeah, what’s that . . . that . . . that . . .”

“Well, I don’t know what that is.”

“That. . . that. . .”

“Well, what am I supposed to be answering?”

“Just that. Uh . . . that!”

“But what am I supposed to be answering?”

“Well, just that! That’s all.”

Idiocy reigns, don’t you see? That’s—this is your prior read. Just ignore the basketful, see? To hell with them. Same as latent. You wouldn’t do anything with a latent read; well, don’t do anything with a prior read.

When does a read become prior? Well, I would say anything up to a non-instantaneousness before you ended the sentence. And when does a read become latent? Any non-instantaneousness after you have ended the sentence. I mean it’s just as idiotic as that. I means we’re actually defining a cheese knife, or something like that. Crazy. I mean that, it’s so easy to read that you could keep missing it, you see? You don’t have to compartment the question any more to amount to a hill of beans. Ask it two or three times if you’re not sure what it is. It all of a sudden will straighten out and read.

You see, you’re actually talking to a thought to the reactive bank. Most of you make this fantastic mistake: you think the pc analytically can influence the meter, and he cannot! Absolutely impossible! He can do it on a via by thinking of something that he knows auditors always call on him. See, he remembers a session in which he had a missed withhold that nobody has ever pulled, see? So he could actually go about this kind of a weird one: Every time they ask him about something, he could think of that session, you see, and he’d get a reaction. But there must have been an unknown in the session. See, he could not-know enough about it, you see, so that he’d get a reaction by thinking of something that he knew he didn’t know anything about. He could get a reaction. That’s as close as he can get to it. And do you know, it always has a lag? You know, it will always give you a latent read? Because the guy has to sit there and think about the session, and the time it takes-him to think analytically about the session gives you a latent read.

Now, an instant read can’t ever go through the analytical mind and doesn’t. It Roes strai rht to the reactive mind. str.a.ght as a bullet. See, the reactive mind by definition is something that has never been timed, something that is still happening, something that is always now. And its always-nowless deletes all time, and that is why you get an instant read. There’s no time in the reactive mind, which is what is wrong with it. So of course it reads reactively nOIV. And you think the pc knows the answer to what just

flicked the needle. Now, look: he can't move the needle analytically, so how the hell could he know it? See, there must be an unknown on anything that goes flick. I don't care whether it's a dirty needle or anything else.

Of course, you ask him if he has a present time problem, and he knows he's got a present time problem; he got reminded of it, you see, just at that moment. Terrific unknowns in this present time problem. It's the unknowns that fire. See? If something is not unknown to the pc, it won't fire, which is the other denominator of the reactive mind. It is a caldron of unknowns which exist in "now" always.

So, you ask the pc something—it's because you only get a reactive response—the needle will not react. You sit there prepchecking somebody. You could get very impatient about it. But it sure makes the pc think if he sees his auditor getting a little bit—crowding him. And he kind of runs, and he thinks and grinds, and he looks and that sort of thin. The auditor can steer him around and say, "What's that?" Why does the auditor have to steer him? It's because he doesn't know what it is.

Try this on a pc someday, if you don't like him, if you've just been given a bad session by him yourself, or something like that; try this on him: "Say, uh . . . have I missed a withhold on you in this session?" And the pc suddenly feels funny because, you see, he feels the surge just as you get, electronically, the surge on the meter, you see? So he feels this surge, and he kind of knows yes, you know?

You say, "Well, what was it?" you know? "What was it?" Don't help him out. Just sit there.

And he finally says, "Well, I can't find—I don't know what it is. Uh . . ." and so forth.

You say, "You know what it is. Tell me." Don't help him out. Don't steer him. You can go on like this for hours.

But the pc is kind of looking around, you know, and you see a flick, you say, "That. . . that."

He's looking at a table. He's looking at a picture of a table. Where the hell did that come from, you know? "Hah-hah-hah . . ."

"That," the auditor says.

"It's a picture of a table." Well, of course, it develops a little bit. He sees a little bit more of it. "Oh, oh, oh, the missed withhold. Oh, oh, oh, yes! I was—that. . ." He recognizes what the table is. It's the table on which the E-Meter sits. He was thinking that the thing was awfully creaky, and he didn't say anything about it to the auditor, and it springs to view and all of a sudden you haven't got a reaction anymore. Why haven't you got a reaction? Because it's known.

So the more unknown underpinnings you have on something, the less reaction—I mean, the more reaction you've got, you understand? And the less unknown there is there, the less reaction. So magnitude of action . . . I beg your pardon, consistency of action—not really magnitude, but consistency of action—is determined by consistency of unknown and its immediacy in present time, so of course you can get a goal, and the goal will go bang, bang, bang, bang.

Well, you don't know what the hell the goal is sitting in. That's how that goal fires. We don't know the mass that surrounds it. How's it stay in place? What is all of it? What life did we lead? How come we got into that? You know, all kinds of questions like this. And yet the thing will still fire on the E-Meter. You say the goal—bing. See the

goal—bing, bing, bing. Say it every time, bing, bing, bing. You say, ‘what is the goal?’ to the pc, and the pc can tell you what the goal is? Of course, that ought to wash out, shouldn’t it? Uh-uh. Bing, bing, bing-bing. That’s why you have to audit them. See, it’s a firing proposition.

All right. Now, this unknownness can get buried in. You can bury unknownness in the middle of an auditing session. You can sandwich it in just like the screaming witch doctor. They got one down in South Africa, yeah— or mostly Central Africa. They walk around . . . Not having seen it in South Africa; they kind of chased it out underneath the brush, I guess. But get a horsetail switch for flies, fill it full of fleas, shake it all over somebody, and while he’s trying to brush them off, say something to him. That’s a version of that. That’s implantation magic.

The Russians, being rather Asiatic, do this consistently and continually. Guy is enroute to a questioning chamber, and a woman dentist with forceps and so forth steps out of a hidden door in the hall and examines his teeth and disappears through the same door. Shatters him! “Where the hell was she from? You know? What is going on?” Typical modern Russian tactic. Boy, these Russians, they go around this way, you know? This was what Pavlov taught them. I don’t think he had to teach them very hard, for some of them.

I notice they made a terrific bid for popularity tonight. Fifteen-year-old boy swam across the river to get into West Berlin tonight, so they put, from the commie side, seven bullets in him. Mobs of people watching this, and they took him to the hospital with a bullet in his lungs and in a critical condition. Their bids for popularity are really marvelous to behold. They probably think it’s the thing to do, you know?

But they do these surprising things. See? They do a sudden surprise in the middle of an action; that makes an implant. Don’t give them credit for being smart on this. It’s probably a dramatization, because they don’t do anything with it. You see?

You, knowing that, figuring out “And let’s see, how could we use this politically? Oh, well, easy. We’ll have this guy—we’ll play some Beethoven, and we’ll have some soft perfume in the room, and lying on a soft couch, and we’ll play some Beethoven, see? And under the table, out of sight, why, we will have the Moscow air-raid-warning siren, the biggest one. And just as he’s all relaxed and listening to this thing, you see, we will press this button, stop pressing the button and say ‘You are a communist,’ and start pressing the button again.” Guy would walk out; he’d tell everybody he was a communist. We’d have done the trick, since a communist is more or less a robot anyhow.

I mean, you could apply these things intelligently. The Russians don’t. You know, it takes them seventy days to brainwash, and they only get 22 percent. Isn’t that interesting? You know, they only get 22 percent? I think this is marvelous, you know? Why do they try? Why do they try?

But this all comes under the heading of that sort of thing. Something that is invalidated secretly or privately—bang, like that—in a guy’s mind. What is it? It’s sort of interesting. You go over this. It’ll make more sense when you get these things checked off, because it wouldn’t take very long to check these things off.

You can go on and check it over, of course, on more of an overt proposition, just talking about getting rid of this meter blindness. “As an auditor, have you ever deliberately ignored a significant meter response?” When I first looked at that question, I thought, “My God!” I just had E-Meters all over in front of my face. I wrote the question down. All of a sudden this morning, I was sitting there looking at E-Meters. And I was willing to swear that I must have done it just every session. For just a moment, just having thought the thought: I must have done this every session, you

know? I just must have ignored significant meter responses. So I just sat there, forced myself to remember exactly when they were. They amounted to exactly three.

One of them on you. I said r would take up the rudiments question in the middle of the Prepcheck session. In other words, I said, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" So r said, "We won't bother with it now because we're gonna take it . . ."

Another guy I checked out a criminal, and I couldn't clear it and didn't believe the meter. And the guy ran away with the crown jewels afterwards—you know, some such comparable action. And an early one, I asked somebody a question, and I got a response—an immediate and direct response on the question—and couldn't and didn't follow it up, and never developed it. And boy, was that fraught with havoc.

And there are only three. Think of the thousands of hours I've audited. There were three, and they had stacked up enough to give me an automaticity of meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters, meters.... My God, I saw meters going this way and that way. Get the idea? I mean, they had it stacked right in, see?

Of course, the obvious one: "Have you ever invalidated an E-Meter?" And then another obvious one: "As a preclear have you ever successfully persuaded an auditor the meter was wrong?" That's more hazarding it, but I know there are a few who have. And then: "Have you ever attempted to invalidate a meter read in order to keep something secret?" And I know some pcs have done that, but you notice in each case it says, "or any version thereof, or any version thereof, or any version thereof," and so forth. So you'd have to fool around with it and get the thing clear.

I don't mean to invalidate or make you believe that you are going blind and can't see anymore, or something like that, but the alternative is, is you're just plain wicked. And you aren't that either. The mistakes which could be made are you're just not seeing the meter bang. See? You think that it's swinging all the time anyway, and you don't quite see the change of pace. Your eye isn't educated to seeing the change of pace, that's all. That would be one.

Another thing: Before you investigate this thing and before you investigate your pc, you've already got him so ARC broke that the meter won't read at all. See, it's your TR I just is not responding on the pc because of the ARC break.

And the other one would be some confusion about what is an instant read. Just what is one? Well, of course, you see one, you see one.

Last night Suzie was calling off for you just any read that came along, naturally. She was giving you read practice, and some of you took it that she was calling them all reads and thought she should have only been calling the instant read. I'll stop that. Why, she can call just instant reads next time. You will see these things read. It's the educated eye.

This is the grossest auditing error there is. It is the hardest one to put across. Nobody is trying to make you guilty, particularly. Well, I have got some ways and means by which you can feel easier about it. And I don't say that all of you are doing it, and I don't say that all of you are doing it always, but there's enough of it being done so that those pcs which I have checked out, or had checked out, in the last few weeks have been found to not—they weren't clean on whatever was being asked. Not only weren't clean on the meter but weren't clean physiologically on the questions.

You see, there are other ways to watch . . . You ask a pc a question, and he goes zuuhmm, nyah and uhh and huh-huh and blushes and squirms and . . . Honest, it's as

good as an instant read. You get all those reactions of one kind or another. Of course you add it up.

Observation. Observation: that's the whole thing. The ability to look. I have always been trying to teach you how to look, here is a direction to look; here is an instrument with which to look. And if I ever will just teach you just to look and to see what you are looking at, without any interference or interpretation or anything else, well, I probably would have made a greater philosophic splash than any philosopher we've had on this planet, don't you see? So this is the toughest one to get anybody to do, is just to observe. That's the tough one, see? Don't feel too bad. Just work on it. Get practiced up. All of a sudden you'll be right in there pitching. Okay?

Remember, once upon a time somebody delivered me a thing, and they said it was an electropsychometer, and Jim and I sat up most of the night trying to find out what it did. And it was actually a week or two before I found out that it read on the needle. So you're in good company.

Thank you.