

## E-METER READS AND ARC BREAKS

A lecture given on  
17 July 1962

Thank you.

Well, I just gave all the instructors infraction sheets so you should be very cheerful. They get on this stuck flow, you know? And they keep giving them out and giving them out, you know? And they get to a point where they, if you don't give them a few, why, they'll snap terminals, you know?

Well, good to see you. A few of you look like you'll survive. No great percentage.

And this is what? This is the 17th?

*Audience: 17th.*

17th July, AD 12, first lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Okay. Well, nothing much to talk to you about tonight. You're all straightened out on everything and got it all taped. And I'm glad to see that. I'm glad to see that. As soon as you get some glasses and some magnifying glasses—there's some possibility—there's some possibility—that your focal distance can coincide with the point of the needle; so don't despair. Don't despair.

Mary Sue had a speed flash system going. They teach them how to read in the United States these days with a flash system. You throw a shutter and it gives you a hundredth of a second—two words at a hundredth of a second. And you're supposed to be able to read those in that hundredth of a second, and so forth. And everybody flunked it.

So, we're making some progress. We're making some progress. At least we know now people can't see. That's development.

All right. Let's look at something very banal; something you know all about. You can relax your mind. Let's look at the subject of E-Meter reading and ARC breaks, relationship between.

Model Session, June 23rd, AD 12, as amended (amended by the Havingness being dropped out of the beginning rud), gives us a weapon which exposes all else. As soon as we use that Model Session and repetitive rudiments—repetitive beginning rudiments—and repetitive Prepchecking, we've actually stripped the technology down to a very easy and very positive performance. It's very easy to do these things. They're not involved, you're not worrying about having to form. What questions, you're not worrying about this and that. Actually, there are plenty of forms around to give you Zero questions for this pc and that. And you yourself, dreaming up what might be wrong with the pc, can also dream up lists of Zero questions for some particular pc, which you should be able to do.

And the culmination of all that is the eradication of technical variables. And there's nothing there in the Model Session or its procedure or anything connected with what you are doing verbally, and so forth, with the pc, that is open to very much question. Oh, you can argue around as to whether or not you get in the end—the middle ruds by repetitive check or by fast check before you check the Zero. And you can contend that if the middle ruds were clean, then you shouldn't have to recheck the Zero—which you should do. You should recheck the Zero always.

A lot of questions can come up, but frankly none of these things are capable or susceptible to ARC breaks—capable of ARC breaking a pc or susceptible to creating ARC breaks. It's smoothed out to such a point that a performance done—oh, relatively indifferently—would leave a pc improving, gaining, coming on up the line.

And it exposes the simplicity of this existing technology—also the simplicity of Routine 3GA; there's nothing complicated about 3GA—exposes just one thing, and that's meter reading. You take all of these constants and you find out that you do them—do them fairly well.

You see, you don't have to do those perfectly to get a result. You should be able to do them perfectly. You should be able to put on a good show. But you shouldn't be able to do—have to do them perfectly, you see, in order to obtain a result. I mean, the technology is very powerful. That particular approach to auditing is very powerful!

And it leaves to view only one potential error: TR 4 in one form or another.

There's a TR 4 phenomenon connected with the meter. And the meter, if poorly read, or only once in a while read wrong, operates to throw TR 4 out in the session.

See, the pc has a present time problem, and the auditor looks straight at the needle and says—after he's said “Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem?” and it got to that point where the pc says, “No, that's it!” and then he looks at the meter and he says, “Do you have a present time problem?” and the thing falls off the pin, and the auditor says, “That's—do you agree that's clean?” See? Misses the read—out goes TR 4. See? That's out the window. Bang Gone. Why?

Well, the pc has an answer which the meter hasn't acknowledged. According—as far as he can see—and remember, he's looking at the back of the meter. And as far as he can see the meter has not acknowledged it. He then can start to get mad at the meter. But usually he isn't sufficiently clear thinking or directive enough to get mad at the meter. He doesn't quite know what he's getting mad at. And so he usually assigns the cause of his upset to something else. This assignment to something else all the time is, of course, why—what a meter does in a session, if misread, has been obscured for so long

Of course, the meter did a perfectly good TR 4, but the auditor interpretation or failure to read the meter does a bad TR 4 and you get the same thing as though the pc had originated and the auditor didn't get it. So, therefore, you've hung the pc with a missed withhold.

Similarly, the pc sits there. “Do you have a present time problem?” the auditor says. “Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem? Do you have a present time problem?”

Finally the pc says, “No, that's it. Uh, that's it.”

And the auditor looks at the meter and he says, “I'll check that on the meter,” and says, “Do you have a present time problem?”

And, honest, it's falling at an even rate, you know, that is—no disturbance of any kind whatsoever. And it just keeps on falling at this even rate. There is absolutely no change to the needle whatsoever. And the auditor says, “What's that? What's that? What was the problem? What is the problem?”

And the pc says, “Well, there isn't any problem.”

And the auditor says, “I've got a read here.” See?

Pc says, “What could it be?” And then he says, “Well, I haven't got a problem!”

And by this time the needle is reading an ARC break characteristic. So he just says, “Do you have a present time problem?” Bang! the meter goes. You see? Every time. Bang! You see? “Do you have a present time problem?” Bang! “Do you have a present time problem?” Bang! See, he cleaned a clean and the only way he’s going to get this off now is to ask if he’s missed a withhold—the random rudiment.

Sometimes the pc doesn’t interpret it just like that. If you were to say, “Has my asking this question upset you?” and he answers it and says, “Yes. Yes, it sure has,” the read would then come off, and it’d be clean again, you see?

Now, what’s this all about? What’s this all about? Basically only one thing is occurring. And it’s an old law which has been pretty well obscured, however, through the years and has not come up much with importance. The importance has never really been assigned to this. It’s been cruising around inside of Scientology technology for ages and ages and ages. And that is, you mustn’t acknowledge a lie.

Actually, you get yourself in trouble every time you acknowledge a lie. You accept a lie as the truth; that makes you a fool.

Guy rushes up to you and he says, “The whole of central downtown has just burned down, and it’s all up in smoke, and 1,655,000 people have been killed!”

And you say, “Oh, good heavens! Good heavens. Good heavens. How terrible! How awful!” or faint away or something like that, not stopping to realize that there aren’t 1,655,000 people in the town—or in the whole state for that matter.

And he says, “Ho-ho-ho-ho-ho-ho! Good joke! Good joke! You’re a fool. Ha-ha!”

Now, what’s this all about? Very simple. Prime postulate. Let’s start learning to interpret things from Routine 3GA—that makes your Clears. And there’s not much question about that. In fact, there’s no question about it.

The only time we’ve seen them held up is when the exact original specifications of Routine 3GA were not rigorously, slavishly and fantastically closely followed.

For some reason or other when I sat down to write the four lines out for Routine 3GA, I scribbled them out as the potential, and I thought this will probably have to be varied for pc after pc. And you know, the only pcs that have gone Clear are those who have exactly been run on those exact lines—the first four I wrote. You get any variation on it: your needle will stick, tone arm goes up, everything goes to hell. That’s sort of an oddity. It’s an oddity. In the first place, the goal was probably originally framed in Amharic or Lingua Spacia or something like that, you know? And to hit the semantics of it right dead on the button and have that the only one that leads to a free needle is quite remarkable.

I’ll give you the datum, although this isn’t—not a lecture about it.

It’s “Want—who or what would want (exact statement of goal)?” “Who or what would—.” (These are not in sequence.) “Who or what would not want (exact statement of goal)?” “Who or what would oppose”—what is it, the participial form?—(the i-n-g form of the goal)?” and “Who or what would not oppose (the i-n-g form of the goal)?”

And it just has to be that. It isn’t anything else. You can’t say “the goal” so-and-so: “Who or what would want to ‘the goal’ (something or other, something or other)?” That’s the way it’s working out. I mean, it’s fantastic!

And this makes it look very silly. What—let’s get the goal “not to eat pie.” “Who or what would not want not to eat pie?” is the wording of the line. There is no other wording “Who or

what would not want not to eat pie?” makes sense to the pc beautifully. And “Who or what would oppose not eating pie?” See? Them’s the words! Them’s the magic words.

And let’s take this silly shift of pronouns. “To kill myself,” let’s say, is the goal, see? “Who or what would want to kill myself?”

Auditor sits there and reads to the pc, “All right. Any more items here? Who or what would want to kill myself?” It’s fantastic. I mean, you can’t say “to kill yourself.” You can’t change the goal that much.

So you can apparently horse it around all you want to, to agree with the English professors, and miss clearing That’s apparently the magic code on this sort of thing

And it’s doubly upsetting because you miss all the right items. And they become missed withholds then. So the tone arm goes up and sticks, and everything goes up and messes up and so forth. And the session is hell to run; and can’t hold the pc in-session. You drive home in your Mercedes and feel like going off the curve.

But it’s just nothing—nothing but the slavish following in of those lines. Well, I expect someday there’ll be an—we’ll find exception to it.

It isn’t true just because I sat down and wrote those four lines as the first lines—has nothing to do with it. But nothing else has ever brought a free needle. We’re up to about nine now. And they all go free on those wordings, and on any other wording they don’t go free.

All right. I just interject that.

3GA is a demonstration of the similarity of construction between a reactive bank and a universe. And you’ve got the common denominator of the construction of something. The universe is formed by a prime postulate, which then alter-ised, makes matter, energy, space and time. Maybe someday you can amuse yourself by speculating what that prime postulate might be. If enough of you hit it, why, the earth will start getting spongy, but don’t let that scare you. Go ahead and run it out. If you get that tough and that strong, you could always mock up another one, couldn’t you?

Anyway, the pc has a basic purpose or a goal. And this is indistinguishable from prime postulate. See, he has them—he makes them at different stages of the track as he goes along, but he hasn’t made too many. And therefore, you get your prime postulate as being the basic building block of a reactive bank. It’s the goal, it’s the basic purpose and so forth.

So that if you have a section of the reactive bank of the last trillion years, or something like this, or some strata of the reactive bank—actually, it doesn’t go exactly plotted against time; it goes kind of differently. It goes fundamentally. How basic is the basic purpose, see? And that’s sort of liable the first time to skim off what looks like the basic part of the—the whole time track. In actual fact, the basic purpose has occurred before earlier track, and that’s all sort of condensed in and it’s become part of this cycle. So your basic purpose isn’t something you can plot back on the E-Meter and find and blow. You see? I won’t go into any ramifications of that particularly.

But there’s this postulate, see?

Now, the prime prime postulate would be the basic-basic of the goal or purpose on which everything else would be stacked. You’re not going to get it the first crack out of the box. So don’t worry about it. You just take what you can get on a goals list.

Now, the keynote of the formation of mass and spaces and everything else connected with the bank—that is, the reactive bank—the keynote of it is alteris. And then the alter-is suppresses down into a not-is. Now, you see, the postulate is an is, and then you get an alter-is, and then

you get a not-is, then you get the formation of matter, energy, space and time contained in the bank.

Now, that is the most succinct, brief, correct, workable, demonstrable statement of the structure of the reactive bank and man. And also, in the field of the physical sciences, it is the most direct and correct statement of the formation of the universe. It's demonstrable.

In other words, the human mind merges simultaneously with the universe. See, you've got the parallels of their construction and evolution. In other words, the field of the mind is now on a parallel—the field of the mind is now on a parallel—with your scientific sciences. Because, of course, there is the field of the mind and then there is the universe—not as everyone tends to believe: first there is the universe and then some fleas come along and light on it and develop their mental aberrations. It does not go this way. It goes quite the reverse.

You have thetans and they develop reactive banks, and then you get as a result of this the formation of universes—the old, old technical data from way back, one's own universe and the environmental universe and all that sort of thing

Now, that's quite important. That's important data. For any being to actually discover this data or start using it is fantastic. See, because it's totally in violation of mass, it's in violation of energy, it's in violation of space, in violation of time, so on. You're not supposed to do that! Slaves of the world succumb! You know?

You're not supposed to fly in the teeth of this kind of thing. You find out information like that, how would people like the pope and so forth make their coffee and cakes, see? I mean, be pretty grim. Do a lot—a lot of unemployment result, you know? Think of chain manufacturers: bankrupt them. Look at political contracts for the constructions of jails and prisons: up in smoke, no percentage for the politicians. Ruinous! Terribly revolutionary doctrines here, see?

Now, you want to know what starts the downward spiral on this sort of thing and how it gets denser and denser and denser—is the acceptance of an alter-isness as the fact! Now, that is actually and basically what a thetan knows, way down deep, that he must not do, and what every thetan that ever got himself in trouble has done. He knows he must not accept an alter-isness of the fact as the fact.

He gets nervy when he starts to suspect this. And if he accepts too many of them, he goes into an overwhelm. He's overwhelmed by lies. And, therefore, people who buy—oh, I don't know; let's take the worship of the god Wuggy-wug, or something like that. He's made out of mud and sticks in the middle of the Venusian jungles or something. And this god Muggy-mug and—if everybody—if everybody protests this god enough and protests the lie enough, and if the priesthood of Muggy-muggy is sufficiently brutal and overwhelmish, and if they can collect to themselves enough overt acts—you see, it's very, very important. They've got to collect motivators, see? Get other people to commit overt acts against the god Muggy-muggy, see? And everybody commits more and more overt acts against Muggy-muggy and after a while, of course, gets totally overwhelmed by the god Muggy-muggy, you see?

And after that you don't get a sane course of evolution from that point of acceptance of the god Muggy-muggy, see? You get zealotism, fanaticism, atheism. Everything that happens from that point tends to be chaotic. See, because they have fought an untruth—see, they've fought an alter-is of the facts. Muggy-muggy did not make the Venusian mud, see? But that's the prime declaration of the religion of Muggy-muggy.

“Oh, Muggy-muggy! Thou, who hast madeth the mudeth!” See?

These birds used to get out in the morning and storm around and wake everybody up long before they were supposed to get wakened. Developed fast days—nobody was supposed to eat, you see? Games conditions, games conditions and so forth. And before you ate dinner,

why, you were supposed to go out and heap some mud on your plate in respect to Muggy-muggy, you see?

These things thetans didn't like to do! So, of course, they would get protesting against Muggy-muggy, and then this untruth would overwhelm them.

I use that quite deliberately, because it has been religion which has been—the strongest arguments and the strongest mechanisms which have brought about an alter-isness of the mind and form have been religious mechanisms. You might even say it's a religious universe. And they get protested against most strongly and thetans get overwhelmed by them the most easily, and so on.

This just isn't my bigotry talking one way or the other. I listed it out the other day—it burned holes in the paper!—and then found out that I felt the same way about it afterwards! Very interesting.

The facts here are creation, assignment of. And you notice Muggymuggy created mud, and some and some—or you've got somebody who is the—like Kali, the goddess of destruction, or something like that. But they have something to do with a cycle of action, the great popular gods, see? And it's all an alter-is. Kali had nothing to do with creating anything and neither did Muggy-muggy.

See, that's the alter-is, is the assignment of who created it. So that, naturally, is the biggest alter-is that you could make, is the alter-is of source.

So therefore, that's what—the most powerful overwhelms succeed the most powerful protests. And, of course, they're in the field of the seventh and eighth dynamic.

And well, it's not for nothing that every year there were a hundred thousand Christians killed in Alexandria during the early days of Christianity. That sounds impossible, see, but yet the rosters and records do contain that fact. In any single year, there were more Christians killed in Alexandria by Christians than there were in all of the Roman purges. It's interesting, see?

They protested harder amongst themselves than they ever really protested against anything else. And that's because they're wrapped up in a lie! See, they're wrapped up in an alter-isness of the fact of creation.

And it's hard to talk to you about this, because even as I speak, some people hearing this are still so enthralled in their overwhelm and protest along this particular religious lines on the seventh and eighth dynamic that they say, "Oh, God! Listen to what terrible blasphemy! And that couldn't be true," you know? It starts off all the alter-is on an automaticity in their head.

And they say, "Well, he's just anti-this and anti-that."

I'm not anti anything, except like any other right-minded thetan, I'm kind of anti-alter-is.

This is your most fruitful source, then, of lies and commotion—would be anything that had to do with creation. And you introduce an erroneous assignment of creativeness, or actually, less strongly, any part of the cycle of action; introduce—misassign, see, who created it, say something else created it, and you'll get randomness all out of proportion to everything

Walk into a—here's a—here's a kick for you sometime—go into an art museum and look at Rembrandt and point out to your companions in a loud voice—particularly during an exhibition, a white tie exhibition or something like that—point out to your companions in a very loud voice the wonderful work done by Picasso. And, man, you'll have a riot on your hands. There's other people standing around. They will come over and they will correct you and they will argue with you and they will look at you with terrible contempt. They'll become very misemotional about the whole thing. The guards and that sort of thing are liable

to come up and start trying to eject you or—all kinds of unlikely things will occur, you know?

You look at *The Cavalier*, or something like that, and you say, “Now, that actually is a very excellent example of Picasso’s brown period.” And go on and hold forth in great dissertation.

Or go over to the Royal Festival Hall or some such area, the music hall, and start talking outside when you hear—oh, there’s something by Mussorgsky, you see? And you say, “Now, that’s by Stephen Foster.” You’ll get upset!

Alter-iness of the source of creation is the most fruitful source of upset and commotion because, of course, it itself is the father of all chaos. If there’s any chaos in the universe, or any lack of order, it will be found by reason of a misassignment of who created it.

We’re liable to get so little upset on the subject of founders of countries and that sort of thing: “Well,” we say, “George Washington, the founder of his country.” See? Well, nobody will much argue with you. You don’t get in much of a stink. I bet you could sit around for hours in the States in various popular and public places and say, “George Washington founded,” you know, “his country.” You could go on and do this and do this and do this, and nobody would ever do anything. They never say anything. It was generally accepted to be a fact and it more or less is a fact, you see? And you’re going to get no commotion, that’s all.

Well, if you said, “Marco Polo founded the United States of America,” people would simply think you were insane. But if you came almost on the truth, see, and said, “Alexander Hamilton founded the United States of America and was its first president,” you know, everybody’s brains would go kind of creak, creak. You see, it’s not—you know? He was at least alive at the same time, so it’s a recognizable alteration.

The truth of the matter is that probably anything wrong with the United States right now, it’s George Washington. Now, you’ll get an argument about that because it’s so much accepted to be truthful otherwise, see? The guy tore up the minutes and records of the constitutional convention! They were never published. He made sure they were burned. Nobody has been able to interpret the cockeyed Constitution since. And they keep changing it and changing it, you know, and trying to amend it and wondering what people meant by it, and so forth. And nobody can find out because they threw it all away, see? That’s a fact, do you know? There were no—you know there were no minutes of the constitutional convention ever published! And I don’t think it was until way into the nineteenth century, sometime or another, that somebody released a book on his demise, which gave something—I think he’d been the secretary of the convention and he gave some of the data.

And you got an operating machine now called a Constitution, which nobody is supervising. And it’s starting to alter-is, and itself was an alter-is, and it’s kind of going out of hand and nobody can quite make any sense out of it. And the citizens have less and less liberty, but they can’t—don’t quite know what to do about it. You see?

Back in 1905 somebody changed the Constitution, said the poll tax could not any longer be charged. That’s what it used to say. Well, they wiped that out, so now they can charge income tax. Everybody is fined for making a living. And all kinds of wild things proceed, you see, from this point. Well, of course, there were no records to say why they had this. You know? There were no—none of the arguments as to why this existed or was put in by the constitutional convention, you see, no arguments were available to anybody to refute this proposed amendment to the Constitution about 1905. See, here’s missing data of some kind or another.

And here’s George! Well, what did George stand for? What did he mean? What did he want? Everybody was perfectly happy at the time of the revolution, they were perfectly interested in him. They thought he was a nice guy, everything was fine, everybody believed him. The only reason the revolution got anyplace at all was because of George—a terrific figure of a man.

And this guy had the country in his grip. Actually, he had to protest many times against becoming king of the United States, see? Everybody wanted to make him king! He said, “No. No. No.”

We don’t know what his basic purpose was, see? We don’t know what the basic purpose agreed upon by all the founders of the United States was. We read the propaganda which issues from their writings.

To give you some kind of an idea, the United—this is not quite political—but the United States Naval Academy issues the letters of John Paul Jones. And this is the most flagrant example I know of. Their booklet on the letters of John Paul Jones is what they want every midshipman to become! And, frankly, they make a bunch of clowns out of them, because they’ve excerpted all these letters. The true letters of John Paul Jones, without anything cut out of them, show you a very lively sort of a bird who was all over the ship all the time and believed in all kinds of things and was very enterprising and fantastically energetic, and who had many opinions, and who believed naval officers should have opinions and all kinds of things, you see, that have now been carefully cut out of the letters before they’re published for the budding, young naval officer.

In return, we get the stark patriotic statement, you see? We don’t get that you ought to teach midshipmen to dance. See? That’s all missing

There’s an alteration here. See, there’s an alteration to the goal or the basics or the fundamental. Now, he was the founder of the American navy. I won’t say anything particularly against the American navy, there’s no reason to. It exists.

But if I see one more ensign become admiral, fattened on the letters of John Paul Jones excerpted, I’m afraid I’ll be impolite to him. I have been known to have been impolite to him already because he isn’t true! See? He isn’t real! There’s something missing.

No reason to analyze what’s missing, but basically the fundamentals of his education have been alter-ised. The things which he ought to know and understand aren’t there!

And that alone would break him down into a sort of an apathy. He would sort of smell the missingness in there, see? He would see there’s something he didn’t quite understand or wrap his wits around. And therefore he would never really spring full-armed into a sailor of war, you see? There’d be something restraining his going-forthness. He’d tend to solidify right in his tracks. You could expect him, then, to be rather defensive, rather unimaginative, perhaps a little frightened and very, very careful of what he did.

Where’s the bold sea dog that you normally think of as a ruler of a navy, you see? Well, he’s not to be found. He’s got a fantastic alter-is on his educational line.

Everybody thinks, well, you should teach these boys to do this and to do that, and you should teach them some more of this and you should teach them some more of that and some more of this, and alter-is it and alter-is it and alter-is it. And when we get all through, we’ll have it all alter-ised, and it’ll all be wonderful. You’ll find it’ll just get more solid, more apathetic, and more quit.

Basic purpose alter-ised creates mass. But similarly, it creates a degeneration of tone—inevitably creates a degeneration of tone.

Now, some of you think, once in a while, that I have alter-ised in Scientology and Dianetics far too much. Well, if you think that hard, you don’t recognize that we’re running independent of the sequence of time. We’re running a backwards track. In other words, we’re cutting into the most fundamental fundamental that we can cut into regardless of the continuous forward progress of time, you see? And we’re swimming against the time stream, in actual fact.



All right, we suddenly come up with this, and on isolation of importances, discover that we're back in 51, 52, you see? Basic purpose, you know? Basic postulate. What's the prime postulate of the universe? Book One, Book One— actually December 1949, not even 50, is basic purpose in Book One, see?

Isolation of important materials and shedding off the unimportant materials and occasionally going down cul-de-sacs, occasionally getting into blind turns, you know, and say, "What are we doing here?"

A wonderful example is 3D Criss Cross. I had received a cheerful despatch saying, "After we've trained all of our students here to do 3D Criss Cross, is it all right for them. . .?" Boy, they had an air letter going out of here so fast, its edges were charring. "Don't do 3D Criss Cross, man!"

Why? Well, it actually came just before I found out about prime postulate, you see? So you do a 3D Criss Cross line or anything like a Prehav line—see, that's the ridge that I ran into just before I found prime postulate, see? I thought you could go on and list. Enough interesting things happened about listing to demonstrate that listing was quite a process. But it also demonstrated that it makes a hell of a lot of difference what you list, and you mustn't list anything at random and you must never list a wrong goal, because it just adds more alter-is to the bank. So 3D Criss Cross was actually alter-ising the pc's goal unless, oh, God, a million to one chance that you would have his line—you should have his goal in one of the lines. Ten million to one.

All right. So, we've been in little cul-de-sacs and that sort of thing. But note I pull out of them in an awful hurry and cut to a more fundamental fundamental.

And you're in the happy state right now of being on a plateau of this particular character that is just the data of late spring and early summer 1962, see? And it makes a package all by itself, and you'll get this special checksheet that contains the bulk of it. And I've just issued a policy letter for staff training around in Central Organizations which, with a few more items added, is just the last few weeks of development is all that contains. And that's their staff training checksheet and nothing else, see?

And you, unfortunately, picking up a GAE, possibly think to yourself that you are being victimized by being put on this special checksheet. And it probably hasn't been pointed out to you that you all have to pass this checksheet anyhow. And naturally if you get a GAE, there's time for you to study on the checksheet. So you're not really being assigned the checksheet because you got a GAE. You've all been assigned the checksheet whether you're going on auditing or not.

That's modernization, but it's a plateau. You've hit it suddenly, and I haven't put up very many electric light bulbs and that sort of thing around, or fired off many rockets. But I'm at a point where, what am I going to write for bulletins, see? Interesting state for me to be in!

So I'm refining bulletins and reissuing the bulletins. And today did you a policy letter, 17 July, on the exact Prepcheck for listing goals or lines. Exact Prepcheck with—a nice Prepcheck. It's all for—it's all the slotted lines. And you put the pc's name at the top of it, and then you just run the Prepcheck down. You make out a form every time you do a Prepcheck, see, just line after line, slot after slot. And get each one of those nulled and turn it over and get the rest of those things nulled, and you've done a Listing Prepcheck.

And yesterday did your Goals Prepcheck—how do you check out a goal? It just does it on this form, and so forth. Oh, I suppose we'll go along a little while and find out that there's some other button we ought to add to the thing and reissue the Prepcheck. That's about where you stand, now, because you stand at the pinnacle of success. See? It is happening.

And I'm not making any allowance at this particular time, of whether you find it easy to learn how to do this or not. I'm making no allowance for this, whatsoever. I'm just saying, "Well, you can learn it!" I'm not just throwing it off, but because I don't know any other road around it! See? I know no way to proof the technology up so that you will never longer have to run an E-Meter. See, I don't know how to do this.

I'll tell you how far away we are on research. I am actually researching some sort of a technology that if you kicked off from Earth, or it billiardballed under atomic fission, or something like that, you wouldn't have to make an E-Meter in order to clear somebody, see? That's the echelon of research I have just entered into. And then improvement research, improving the thing, or this very high-flown "What the hell do you do about that?" Oh, I don't know. I might crack it and I might not.

All Scientologists have a slight anxiety of, "What if I kick the bucket? How much of the information would I pack along with me," see? They all have this. So, what I'm really trying to do is make out the information package you take along with you.

But there's about where we stand. Now, as far as alter-is is concerned, we've done this incredible thing of while going forward on the time track we've run the fundamentals back. All right, now we're at a fundamental that runs out everything we've put on the time track. You see, anything developed in Scientology or in Dianetics is now run-outable by the exact technology which you have. It runs itself out rather easily. It can be put together, in other words. All right, so much for that.

Unless you follow some such operating pattern as this, you then can't backtrack this terribly complicated thing called structure—matter, energy, space, time, whether a reactive mind or a universe—you can't backtrack this terrific complexity to a sufficient simplicity to be able to do something about it, you see? Well, that's what we've done. We've brought it back now and we find out—great surprise, surprise to me too, you see? What's wrong with it? The pc's goal. That isn't what's right with the pc, that's what's wrong with him, see?

George Washington is not what is right with the United States, it's what is wrong with the United States! See?

That's pretty weird. It's a complete whizzer. We've had a whizzer run on us, you see?

This guy goes on being loyal, being loyal, being loyal, being loyal. And he goes on being a lot of other things. And he doesn't know what he's doing wrong; he's doing something wrong. And he's caving in and falling on his head and unable to do his job and betraying everybody. And eventually we sort out his goal and we find out it's "to be loyal," you see? That was probably the goal of Benedict Arnold.

If the individual is no longer able to adequately do something, it's probably his goal—if he isn't happy about doing this thing, you see? You got a goal "to harpoon whales." Well, you'll always be thinking about harpooning whale and always missing or unable to find a boat or find whales or something. It'll be the one thing that kind of makes you sigh and that you retreat from. See, a lot of things haywire about this.

It's very dangerous to tell you this because it's slightly invalidative of your goal, you see? But nevertheless, I have to tell you; it's the truth of the thing.

Now, let us consider the goal a finite truth. Now, it isn't completely true that the goal is everything that is wrong with the person. What is really wrong is the alter-issness of that goal. If the person never alter-ised the goal, he would probably be all right, you see? Now, you can say what's wrong with him is his goal, but it's a little bit too short a statement. No, what's wrong with him is the alter-is of his goal, the alteration of his goal, the departures from his goal line, his inabilities to commit this goal to action. See? That is what gives him his bank.

But you strip the goal out from underneath all this and the bank disappears and you find out he didn't need the goal in the first place which is all quite interesting

Well, consider that goal, then, a finite truth. (You probably don't think so, but this is still a lecture on ARC breaks and TR 4.) It's a finite truth. It was truth to this pc; it was actually self-postulated truth. And it never got acknowledged. But all around him lies got acknowledged and this baffled him.

And if you listen to a thetan for a while, you'll find out, really, all he's protesting is the fact that lies get acknowledged but truth doesn't. See, if you listen to him for a while, that's really all he's talking about. Whatever else he's saying or however he's putting it—whether in the Demosthenian oratory and logic, or no matter how colorfully or how dully or how whinishly or how meanly or how grandly he is putting it—that's what he is saying! He is saying truth never gets acknowledged and lies always get acknowledged.

Some woman comes in and she says, "And I lost my husband. And there I was, a good homebody, and I was sitting there doing everything I was supposed to do, you see, and so forth. And he left me for this little flirt that would never cook and would never do anything, you see?" And you'll hear her going on and on along this particular line in some shade of gray of this argument. She, the wife, you see, was not acknowledged—and she was a true wife—but this flibbertigibbet that he ran off with, you see, well, he bestowed his whole fortune on her, and she was nothing but a cockeyed lie. See?

And you just look over these various things and you can generally trace through an argument these threads: the protest of the acknowledgment of lies and the failure to acknowledge truth. And that is the basis of a thetan's misemotion. These are the principles—above his goal, in back of his goal, and around—on which all thetans operate. There are no exceptions to this. They all operate on these same buttons. You press A chord major and you get A chord major.

And therefore, when you say to a thetan in a session, "I am not acknowledging or taking up the truth," he gets upset! And that's cleaning a clean read. And when you say to a thetan that he's got something he hasn't got, he gets upset—or, that when he hasn't got something he's got, he gets upset—because you're doing an alter-is of the facts.

He's got a present time problem, you read the meter and tell him he doesn't have one. He's upset! It's a violation of the true state of affairs. See, you're acknowledging a lie, here, and not hitting the true state of affairs. So the thetan doesn't have a present time problem and you tell him he's got one. Once more, you're acknowledging a lie and failing to acknowledge a truth. And he gets upset! And there's nothing makes a thetan get more upset than that. It's alterisness. And there you get into all kinds of wild messes with a thetan.

Now, do you see how prime postulate has a connection here and how it is definitely and intimately involved with reading the wrong meter read. See? You just hit right to the middle of his "thetanesque" soul with a dagger of betrayal. See?

He's got a present time problem, you tell him he hasn't got one. You didn't acknowledge him, did you? All right. He hasn't got a present time problem, you tell him he's got one. Everything goes to hell from there on. He gets very upset because, "thetanesquely," he now wants to convince you of the truth of the situation. He's trying to impress you with the truth of the situation from that time. He then becomes the living crusader of Truth—capital T; sword in one hand, torch in the other, you know?

You haven't got a pc from this point on. You have a crusader for Truths. And how do you get into that state? Well, it's very simple—you just miss a meter read. You clean a clean or wrong-call a reaction. You get a reaction and say there's no reaction; you get a clean and say there's a reaction. All you got to do is twist these two points and you no longer have a pc. You've thrown him right into his most turbulent areas of action. He is now demanding that

you do not acknowledge untruths. He is now crusading on the basis that “we mustn’t have more alter-is than we already got because it’s put us in the position we are in.”

You’ve stepped all over his Scientological corns, if he’s an auditor, perhaps, but you don’t have to have a trained Scientologist to have this mechanism. You go out and you get yourself some raw meat, and the fellow sits down and says, “I’ve got ulcers.”

All right. Let’s say, for fun, that he hasn’t got ulcers. Let’s say, for fun, what really is the trouble with him is every day he drinks unfermented— insufficiently fermented wine and it upsets his stomach and gives him indigestion, see? And he knows this. He doesn’t even have to know it up on the surface of his mind, you see? He’s got it all set. And he sits down and he says, “I’ve got ulcers.”

And you say, “All right. Good. Fine. Thank you very much. You got ulcers. All right. Hm-hm. Well, very good. Now, the best thing for us to do for you is to give you some Pepto-Bismol or barium meal and so forth, and we’ll treat these ulcers. And if they don’t get better, we’ll operate on them.”

He’ll be mad as hell at you! And you won’t quite be able to figure out— “Hey! What’s going on here?” see?

Guy comes in, he has one ten-thousandth of an inch of tissue left before perforation, see, of the ulcer. See, he’s just on the verge, you know—he can still walk around—and he’s got ulcers to all intents and purposes, man. And he comes down and he sits down and he says, “I haven’t got ulcers.”

And you say, “I agree with you perfectly. You haven’t got ulcers.”

And, boy, he will be mad at you!

That’s why you mustn’t treat illnesses: because they’re all lies.

Guy comes in, says, “I have a sore throat. I have a sore throat. I have a sore throat.” You run something on him and the ridge moves. Yes, his throat is sore. That is a statement of truth.

But he says, “I have a cold.” If he means by that, he is being attacked by virus or germs or something of the sort, and this is not the case, you can get yourself all involved in an ARC breaky situation by making him gargle.

Very interesting. No wonder the medical profession has to have law to support them! Do you see? This is under the heading of acknowledging the lie and ignoring the truth.

A guy comes in and says he hasn’t got ulcers, you say, “I’ll audit you.” Fine. Make sure you do so if you say so.

He comes in and he says, “I haven’t got ulcers. Actually, it is just some pains that I get from drinking too much ketchup.”

And you say, “Good. I will audit you.”

You enter into the field of what is laughingly called diagnosis, you’re in trouble. But oddly enough, as close as you can diagnose is guessing what he has done, and running it out as an overt.

And, of course, it mustn’t be forced on him that he has done it if he hasn’t, because now you’re really in trouble. You dream up a Zero question, “How about blowing up railway depots?” (he’s never been near one in his life) and then insist that he find the overt. Oh, man,

that session is going to go round and round and round. You're going to be in trouble all the way.

All right. Now, during the war he was a light-bomber-force bombardier and he was a specialist in blowing up railroad stations. In fact, he'd go out practically every night and blow up another railroad station, see? And you say, "Have you ever blown up a railroad station? That's null. We will go on to the next question."

Well, everything kind of goes whirly and wheely in his skull. The cogs start to mismatch. And boy, he gets mad, he gets upset, he gets misemotional, because of the same mechanism. He has blown up railroads. It isn't that you've failed to discover something about him. It's just that it isn't true, see?

You've said, "All right, you haven't blown up railroad stations," when he has. Or you've said, "All right, you've blown up railroad stations," when he hasn't. Either way, you're acknowledging a lie and failing to acknowledge the truth. And you're on the direct line of a thetan's favorite protest through the ages.

And this—out of this you get an ARC break. And that's what an ARC break is. It is an abandonment of truth and an acceptance of lies. And after that you got trouble.

So when you misread a meter, you've hung the pc with one or the other.

That's why you got to be able to read a meter every time and never miss. Because every time you miss you've entered into the session the thetan's favorite boogeyman: the acknowledgment of lies and the ignoring of truth. And you have just entered this into the session and after that he blows his stack and . . .

He doesn't really know why his eyeballs keep going out a foot in his face and snapping back into the sockets, you see? But he knows he's upset, and it's the most fundamental upset there can be since out of that upset comes the whole construction and, reversely, the whole destruction, not only of universes but of his own reactive bank. And you've hit right on the primary principle of construction of the reactive bank and of the universe. And you've hit right on why it is that way. And he doesn't like it being that way. And you have made the session agree with all of the slave tricks that have ever been pulled on him.

So therefore he has to protest against you. And up to that moment you were his friend that was going to get him out of all this. And now you've pulled the trick that got him into all this. You see, you've acknowledged the untruth and you have failed to acknowledge the truth. And that was the trick that got him into all this in the first place. So he doesn't want to be in there again, so he tries to get out of that session, sometimes very loudly.

So that's why meter reading has to be 100 percent. And that's why there is no substitute for good meter reading. And that's why, in procedure, you can occasionally flub, misread a question, do something like that—your TR 0 will go out, or something like that—you don't upset the session to any great degree at all. But, brother, you just miss that one read—it reacted, and you said it was clean. You have taken a bayonet and slashed clear back to the beginning of time with this pc and restimulated every protest he's had—every protest he's had for two hundred trillion years. So you get violence, of course.

You can learn how to read a meter perfectly. Don't worry about it. It is doable.

All I wanted to show you is the mechanism of what happens when you misread a meter and how that compares with 3GA and how your session and sessioning, now, is totally lined up with the actual principle of the mind. You are doing now what the mind is doing. You've got it exactly paralleled. And so therefore you can spot any error that you commit and the error is merely in that field.

But the pc protest now is the most fundamental protest that a thetan can make in a session, because you are doing exactly in a session the parallel of what the mind has been doing, and therefore you are at extreme truth. This whole session, you're running extreme truth. And that pc can feel it. He knows you're running extreme truth. And then, carelessly, you introduce the needle that didn't react and you say it did; you introduce the needle that reacted and you said it didn't. And into that extreme truth you introduce this untruth, and after that you've got hell to pay.

That's why pcs ARC break, and that's the direction that you have to take to repair sessions—you have to repair these introductions of untruth. Okay?

Thank you.