

METER READING

A lecture given on
12 July 1962

Thank you.

Okay. This is what?

Audience: The twelfth.

Twelve-twelve, huh?

Audience: It's not twelve-twelve – twelve-seven – yeah – twelve-twelve.

Twelve July, AD 12. All right.

First lecture Saint Hill Special Briefing Course having to do with meters. Meters, their importance.

With all due respect to meters, I feel I should apologize for coming a little bit late to this lecture – three, four, five minutes. But you should realize that this particular planet has a great many lures. There are all kinds of things. There's drink, you know, there's beautiful women. There are all of these various things and they lure you away and distract your attention from what you should be doing. And recently – I'd had a Lincoln for ages and – since about 54 and I traded – I sold it and got a fantastic price for it. And then I traded the – an old Humber we had out here for it, you see, and I got me a Jaguar and – a 60, 61 Jag – and came out all straight on this. And I regret to have to report to you that the Jaguar is leading me astray. I went out to take a fifteen-minute run to get some fresh air and came back three hours later. So you see, sometimes it's drink, sometimes it's women – in this particular case it's a Jaguar. You'll pardon me weaknesses. Blame it on the planet.

Well, I was actually celebrating. I felt I should go out and get some fresh air and look at the countryside and celebrate, because you don't know it yet – but we've cracked it! We've cracked it.

In scientific research one follows certain laws. Take far too long to enumerate them. You'll find some of them I've used in Dianetics and Scientology are actually developed for the first time and has made it possible to crack some problems that have been cracking people. And, nevertheless, somebody comes along and tells you we don't follow the laws of research as used, well, I'm afraid that they are adventurous in the extreme because any law of research this planet has we follow and better – to an enormous extent. See, they just don't even vaguely

have the rigor of research that has been followed in Scientology. Because we're not interested in anything but effectiveness and we've been cracking away – not at the idea that everybody was crazy – we've been going in a somewhat different plane and on a different road up. When you can get a research problem down to where you have one variable and there's only one thing you have to remedy to straighten things out, why, *voilà!* You're there, you see.

All right. Clearing people, fixing up needles and states of mind in order to sit quiet enough and find somebody's goal – we've got that sort of thing We've even got CCHs. They go tremendously far south. We've got all kinds of stuff here, you see. And I take a look at you and realize you've been audited in the last twenty-four hours and I can't figure how that possibly could have happened. Don't you see?

So there might be fifteen, twenty, thirty things wrong, you know. Might be a lot of things wrong, so during the last couple of months, having observed that auditors were not actually able to get a uniform result one way or the other, I started taking every variable out of technology that I could take out of it. And I just started stripping it down and testing what we were doing and stripping it down and testing that, and we finally got the Model Session the way you're running it right this minute. Without a single additional process, if something is wrong with the Model Session questions, you just use the question. That's quite a trick. Took all of the difficulties out of Sec Checking. You see, Sec Checking was followed by Prepchecking, was followed by Repetitive Prepchecking. Now the difficulties of Prepchecking by the Withhold System and all of the old Sec Checking difficulties are resolved – to all intents and purposes – right now with what you're using and calling Repetitive Prepchecking, you see.

Of course, tremendous background work has gone into all this which includes first a meter and then refining a meter and then refining a meter and then re – then abandoning them because no, it didn't work, and then refining a meter and refining a meter and refining a meter and we finally got the Mark IV. All of these things . . .

But still as – a pc could walk out of a session and look wobbly. See? Got everything streamlined down. Auditors are men and women of good heart. Nobody is questioning that. There must be something wrong here someplace or another.

And now I know that the variables are out of it as far as the human mind is concerned. There are no variables. You do your Model Session without any additives, your beginning rudiments and your middle rudiments and end rudiments, and you do the Prepchecking with Zero Questions which are applicable to the case and will straighten the case out. And you move through into listing goals and finding goals, and then listing the goal that is found – you're going to have a Clear on your hands. I mean, you can't help it. But, the pc could still walk out of session looking wobbly.

So I set you up last night. I said I'm going to watch three auditors, not necessarily all Class III-type auditors, very far from the worst auditors present and I'm going to look at these auditors, and I'm going to let you look at these auditors, and we're going to see what they're doing here. And I found out what they were doing. I never would have dreamed it – never would have dreamed it. We found the one variable – *the meter read*. The meter read. Now all three of these people have been reading meters for an awful long time. These three people should know a great deal about meters.

And it works out this way: All you've got to do to muck a session up is clean one read that is clean. That's all you've got to do to muck a session – to just throw it into a cocked hat. Louse it up, but good. Just clean one thing that's clean. You can check something that's clean, but don't go clean something that's clean. Pc will go into a cocked hat every time.

And the other one is: Don't *miss* cleaning something that reacts.

Those are the two crimes of meter reading. Cleaning something that is clean – and failing to note something that reacts.

There's little to choose between which is the most serious. Frankly, there's little to choose. They're equally serious.

Why is this serious? Well, basically a pc has a certain knowingness. He may be occluded – he may be all buttoned in the cotton batting and black wool – he may be packed as tight as sardines ready for shipment. He may be all of these things, and yet permeating this hard core is an instinct, an intuitiveness. See, he basically knows. You can't kid a pc and that's a very important datum. You actually cannot fool a pc.

And any auditor that's going forward on the course that the pc can be fooled is being very foolish himself. He's being quite misguided. A pc knows when a question is hot, even if he doesn't know the answer. And he knows when one is cool. See, he knows there's nothing there or he knows there's something there. He has a something-nothingness sensitivity. He can sense if there's something there. He can sense if there's nothing there. It requires help before he can tell *what is* there – or before he has a high certainty that there is nothing there. Don't you see? I mean, you're now transmitting from an intuitive feelingness to an analytical knowingness. And this intuitive feelingness is not articulate. He can't tell you. You look at the fellow and you say, “Do you have a present time problem?” and so forth; and now you're asking him to express it analytically and give you what the problem is and all of that sort of thing. Well, he's not going to be able to do that very well.

But let's take the reverse. He doesn't have a present time problem – we tell him he's got one. Now, it's not aberration that objects. It's just this intuitive feelingness. He knows he hasn't got a present time problem right here and now. He knows he isn't worrying about anything.

Now let's take the reverse. Let's take the reverse. The pc has a present time problem and you tell him he doesn't have one. Either statement, if contrary to the fact – fact merely being established by this intuitive feelingness of the pc – will cause a disagreement between you and him.

Now, what you're basically doing is invalidating the knowingness of a thetan. Oh, a thetan will put up with a lot of invalidation of this knowingness. He has put up with a lot of it and so on. He can be overwhelmed by that invalidation. All these things are true, but he doesn't have to like it. That is the final test. He just doesn't have to like it. He can walk down the cloister every day and pray before w or whatever they have in the monastery these days. Very hard for me, you know, to keep up with these various transient religions. And this situation – he can say, “Well, God is great or Moloch is great,” or something of the sort. All right.

He's used this as a pitch on others. He's used this as a control mechanism on others. Used it to overwhelm others. So inevitably, because of the overt he gets overwhelmed. Did you ever notice how unhappy they are when they are doing this? Well, what's this unhappiness? Why aren't they really relaxed about the thing?

This feeling of internal peace that you hear about every once in a while, I've investigated occasionally and found it was mostly a light in an implant which was moving across the thetan at regular intervals or something like that. He was nervous as a cat about it. Terribly nervous for fear his internal peace was going to be distorted or destroyed. But we're not off on any antisomething-or-other pitch except just truth is truth.

This fellow hasn't got a present time problem; you tell him he has one. Well now, you're auditing actually at a higher level of knowingness and awareness than human beings ever achieve. You've got his awareness and his knowingness all keyed-up here, and this intuitive feelingness of what is right and wrong is particularly present in an auditing session – far more so than out on the street or in the cloister. You've heightened this. Now you say to this heightened perception, which hasn't got a present time problem, “You've got a present time problem.” Well, he's got a long way to fall.

Perhaps snails don't mind being stepped on because they haven't very far to squash. Do you see? But I think even a snail would mind falling off the top of the Empire State Building. See, the auditing session gives him a long way to fall. See, and you talk about ARC break – I call your attention back to anatomy about downcurves. It's the steepness of the curve per unit of time. The artificial tone of the pc or the tone which he is able to attain in a session is quite ordinarily much greater than he attains in life, you see? Now you give him one of these speeded downgrades – one of these downcurves – and you let him fall twenty tones in a 20th of a millisecond, see? Well, it comes to him as a severe shock and you get an ARC break.

All right. He's got a present time problem. He's sitting there worrying about Aunt Phylia. He's just worried stiff about Aunt Phylia and all of a sudden the auditor says to him, "You haven't got any problem with Aunt Phylia. There is no problem there." Well, he's had this treatment often and he's found out that that didn't work either. You can't go around and not-is all the problems and wind up with everybody happy. So he knows that doesn't work and he knows that's wrong. But basically what he knows is he's out of agreement with the auditor. That's the first thing he knows. He's out of agreement with the auditor.

So let us say *hopefully* before the session got wheeling, he had a session. He had it mocked up he was going to have a session at least. He probably had a session at start of session, he'd maybe have a session through the first rudiment, don't you see. And, maybe the first rudiment even builds it up into more of a session, you see. Well, this guy could be likened on to somebody who is doing a high, steep fighter-plane climb, don't you see. He's going up. His awareness of his own mind, of his reactive bank, feelings – all these things are heightened.

And you get him nice and heightened and then you say, "Well, you don't have a present time problem with Aunt Phylia." And he's hauled down because he thinks he is in good agreement or rapport with the auditor. And when he finds out he is not and the degree of the finding out "not" is a horrible shock to him. And he doesn't fall the ordinary one-millionth of a tone that George falls as he is standing behind the bank window and he said, "I've got a cold" and the bank customer says, "You haven't got much of a cold. you should have seen Aunt Isabel's," see. He maybe does a little fall – about onemillionth of a tone, see. This pc does about twenty tones. Steep, steep. You've got an ARC break downcurve.

Well, all of this – all of this is the discovery of disagreement. This comes under the heading of that. He discovers that the auditor's in disagreement with him. He's in disagreement with the auditor and he thought he was in agreement with the auditor. And the degree that he thought he was in agreement to the auditor, crystallizes the degree that he suddenly realizes he is out of agreement with the auditor. All things are relative. And if you've got an agreement that's built as high as the Empire State Building, the first scrap of disagreement will appear as high as the Empire State Building.

Now, that should explain to you why a pc carries on so, when ARC broken out of a session. They aren't like that in life. They aren't like that at all.

You ought to see this fellow. In life, why, somebody walks into the store and says, "Hi, you old horse thief," you know. "You look like hell today." Doesn't change his mood any. He says, "Hello, Bob." You know, nothing to it.

In a session the auditor suddenly says, "You're a horse thief." Doesn't go, man. If the session ARC, you see, was as high as the Empire State Building, why, this disagreement erects a duplicate structure of ARC break, see.

It's pretty wild, and it's just all out of importance. The importance of it to the pc is fantastically great! It's as though he has suddenly been hanged for murder. And listening to a pc who had just been thoroughly ARC broken, you would be sure he was being unjustly accused of having too many bodies on his hands and being dragged off to the local galley – gallows, you see. You'd be absolutely sure that this was what was happening. If you listened to his tone, if you listened to the emotion involved with the thing, if you could measure out how bad he feels about it and so on. These things in the work-a-day world of hanging horse thieves would be tantamount to being betrayed by his whole family, turned in by his most trusted servant, you see and hanged for a crime, barbarously, that he did not commit. You'd think this was the circumstances.

Let's say that we were auditing in Japanese and you didn't speak Japanese, but the auditor who was auditing was auditing in Japanese – and you were to hear this ARC break come out – and you'd think, why – my God, that auditor must have broken out a knife or a samurai sword or something and taken several passes at the pc's head. But even that wouldn't have caused that much upset if you just listen to the emotional content of all this – he must have at least cut off one of his hands. There's something going on here, you know. You'd think.

You hear it in English – you understand it better, you see. you understand that it's all evolved out of the fact that the pc was told he had a present time problem reading on the meter and there hasn't been a present time . . . He – as a matter of fact he is sort of happy all afternoon. It's been the first afternoon, let us say, that he hasn't had pressing present time problems for a long time, you see. Let's just steepen the thing up, you see. And this auditor has simply said to him – nothing more than this: “Do you have a present time problem? That reads. What is it?” That's all the auditor has said. The auditor's not done another blooming thing. You've had it from that point on – if that meter really didn't read. There was no read on the meter at that point whatsoever.

The pc, at a heightened level of his awareness of his own condition, instinctively realizes that he doesn't have one. So you're foisting off an untruth. Well, here he is swimming in the direction of truth for the first time in the last couple of hundred trillennia, and he knows the cage has suddenly been unlocked and here he goes, and all of a sudden here's this fantastic falsity which has entered into his environment and he reacts accordingly.

Cleaning a read that is clean or failing to clean a read that is reacting – produce almost equal magnitude.

The first is the most mysterious because the pc can't find out what's wrong because the withhold is nothing. See, he can't find out what's wrong. Actually, it's just withholding nothingness. What is wrong is nothing. That's what is wrong. A nothingness is wrong. It isn't nothing is wrong. The language hardly even handles the sense of it.

All right. So what do we get here as the greatest order of error? I want to give this to you the way that you will find it very easy to hand it on to anybody you're instructing or anything like that. It's very simple. A very simple statement can be made, which is as follows: You can have one lousy TR 4 in a session, can't you? – without busting it all up. Pc said, "I'm sleepy," and the auditor said, "Mm-mm." The pc said, "No. I said I was sleepy!" "Oh, oh," the auditor says, "Oh, oh." Wakes up himself, you know. "Oh, oh, okay. Yeah, fine."

That doesn't downcurve the pc particularly. You can get away with it. Oh, it's not good – but you can get away with it. you don't bust your session up one side and down the other side.

You can drop a TR 1 – even occasionally a 0 or a 2 and a 3, and still get away with it. you can forget to check a question and it won't cause the whole session to cave in. In other words, you can do at least one of any of these things.

See, you can forget a rudiment without absolutely smashing up the chinawork for blocks around. Pc's liable to say, "Hey, you forgot a rudiment." No, a pc doesn't act as though he had just been disemboweled.

No, the one that you can't do – see, you can do one of anything else – but you can't do *one* clean a clean read. And you can't do *one* neglect of a read.

Now, I'm sure that as you start going along the line flawlessly in auditing with meter reads, you will soon recognize the validity of what I'm telling you.

The one thing you can't do and still have a session come out right is a flubbed meter read. Whether it was clean and you cleaned it – or it was reacting and you didn't clean it. you have one flubbed meter read and you're going to watch everything go to hell in a balloon in that session.

Now, when you're used to missing them you get an entirely erroneous idea of what a session looks like and how a pc behaves. You get an entirely erroneous idea.

Auditing isn't the same thing at all. It's a sort of a half-out-of-session: "I don't mind ARC breaks; it doesn't matter to me what he does; I can somehow or another carry it along anyhow on my own hook; and after the session even if he does flub, I can probably audit it out myself."

One has answers for these things, see. But there's not much ARC involved with it and there certainly isn't very much heightened awareness of the bank and ease of blowing and that sort of thing. The things that are supposed to be in the session aren't there.

Yeah, you go along and you get so you actually can become hardened into something called auditing that misses reads and cleans things that are clean and there are protests go along on this line and "Auditing is basically a sort of a protest," isn't it? I mean it's a "Good

pc'ing is not letting the auditor get too close to you so that he can louse you up." I mean, isn't that by definition? So naturally you really don't see fast auditing.

Now, auditing is as fast – in almost direct proportion – as a pc is in-session. Because the more he is in-session, the more easily he can blow things. And the less he's in-session, the less easily he blows things. So the length of time it takes to audit anything is bounded on all sides by the degree that the pc is in-session.

Let's clean up five Prepcheck questions. Pc's beautifully in-session; meter's reading gorgeously; the auditor has flubbed nothing; the auditor flubs nothing; everything goes along swimmingly and gorgeously, five Prepcheck Zeros. You begin to wonder what you're going to do with the rest of your time in session. See, they're all beautifully cleaned up and your session's only thirty-five minutes deep. And yet a lot of material came up on this. See? Guy feels a lot better. What are you going to do with the rest of the session?

All right. Pc not much in-session. Five Zero Prepcheck questions – five Zeros. Week – week. At the end of the week you kind of have to scant them because you can't do all that, you see. That would be the difference. Don't you see? There's how the old factor of “five to one” came about. It may be altitude to some degree. It may be the presence to some degree. It may be this and it may be that, but it's certainly – it's my meter reading that gave you the five to one. I don't miss on these things. I don't know why, but it just never occurred to me to. So, of course then it never occurred to me that you ever might.

No. Last night, Wednesday – Black Wednesday – it became very obvious. It became exceedingly obvious that there were, in the best session we saw – the best session we saw, there were read misses. See? Uncertainty – which was so great that it was actually transmitting: uncertainty. Worst one we saw there was actually miscalls, many of them. And you saw a pc moving on out of session.

Now, what is most interesting is that a pc is there to get audited and may – you may not have realized what a persistent cuss a thetan is. you may think of a thetan as somebody who can be overwhelmed and who can be crushed and who can be this and who can be that. To a limited degree that is true – to a limited degree it is true. He can get in such a position that he cannot outflow or communicate to the degree that he might. But do you know, he never stops trying That is the fantastic thing about a thetan. He never really stops trying! He's got some idea that he is going to wipe out the civilization of the continent of South America and by this time he's deleted down to being one of these crazy-looking dogs they have in Mexico. But do you know that little dog sits around and every once in a while he'll – wipe out the civilization of South America, you know? South American comes by and the little dog does what he can. He really never stops trying.

What is fantastic in child – this is particularly notable in child handling – you think this little kid is “little,” so forth. Well, it's utterly fantastic. As long as that kid feels that he is

going to get anything borne in upon him from some quarter or another, he'll keep revenging himself on that quarter. This is what you call a bad child.

I've worked this out so often and observed it so often that I'm absolutely flabbergasted at the complete accuracy of it. Nursemaid shows up. She's going to push one of the children's head in, you see. Honest, from that time on she really never has a – he really never has a calm moment. It goes from actual insolence on the part of the child and outright disobedience – to spreading rumors and scandal and covert disobedience – to apparent obedience that always seems to spill the shoe polish all over the nursemaid's bedspread. And it just goes on downhill, to being terribly ill and impossible to care for and keeping everybody up day and night, see.

But this little kid is still trying. See? You can follow this impulse, “Get even with the nurse,” you see? – right on down through a full cycle.

And although the manifestations of trying are enormously different and are hardly distinguishable as a gradient scale sometimes, you can carefully trace them all down and get all to the base of it and you'll find out, good God, this kid is still trying.

This person is coughing at the dinner table. If you trace this thing down meticulously as though you would trace down a tiny cough – because, you see, this cough the person is coughing, at best you could only trace down one tiny little portion of this cough. Don't you see. But if you want to know when it turned on and they started using it in this lifetime, it will be the end product of getting even with Father. See? Father: the harsh disciplinarian, the this, the that, the other thing. And the little kid sat at the table, got down to the point where the only action that could be taken was spasms and fits of coughing at the dinner table, because coughing was very annoying to Father. This is your pc's cough, see.

Because of the GPM and the stronger forces that are at work, these facts tend to be obscured because it's quite difficult to run them down and doesn't pay too much cash award to run them down. Because after you've got rid of this source of the cough then you pick it up in some other lifetime. They were annoying somebody else then, the cough turns back on. And then, like a fellow I backed out of his head one time, I – he finally found out *he* was coughing and the body wasn't coughing at all. That's right. He was coughing – standing there ten, fifteen feet back of his head coughing like mad. Always, ever since he started coughing, he'd always blamed his body for coughing. But the point is, he was trying to make some point good. He was trying to reach in some direction and a thetan just never stops trying, that's all. you set him up a target to reach at and he'll try. It's fabulous.

Now, when you conduct a perfect session and then suddenly set up a wild, random wrongness somewhere in the session, you catch the pc off-balance and the pc goes to – into action reactively. He actually is powerless to stop himself from going into action. He'll say things, he will be cross about things because you had the reactive bank all stretched out, and

let's say it was made out of rubber bands, you know. And it was all stretched out and it was all fine and he was busy spotting, you know, various points of it, and this is the anatomy of it, and he's got a chance to straighten out this thing, and he's doing fine. And then all of a sudden somebody lets go of all the other end of the rubber bands. He finds himself in this mess. And he gets overwhelmed at that point and he starts dramatizing whatever's handy. And actually he's just got thousands – hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of these instances of unfinished cycles of “still trying,” and they will go into action. They'll go against the auditor.

The final denouement – he'll say he didn't get any result. That would be one method of getting back at the auditor for doing this. He didn't get any result. It's actually worse than this: he gets negative results. He can actually dream up a negative result. He can get very subtle and very involved about this. What you do is convince the auditor – he can get down to this point – you can convince the auditor the auditor has gotten results and then you fix it up so somebody else knows now you haven't. But this somehow or another gets back to the auditor and we get a terrific confusion going here of one kind or another.

These are all dramatized things. These are all efforts to get back at to fill in the breach – the dramatization of all of these things.

A pc is in control of the bank. Suddenly, the auditor's force and power with which this bank is being held up for inspection – see, it's auditor plus pc is greater than the bank – auditor makes one mistake on the meter, we have deleted the auditor from the session. The bank caves in on the pc and the pc dramatizes. It's very elementary.

It's always good news when you have only one error to locate. You can't always locate what's wrong You can go on fumbling around. Supposing twelve things were wrong. See? Oh man, you could hunt and punch for those for a long time. No, the only thing that's wrong in Scientology today is meter reading – that's all. There isn't anything else wrong.

Look, if you guys in just a few days can learn to do repetitive rudiments and Repetitive Prepchecking and more or less master a new Model Session and do all that sort of thing, and – we well know that your TRs – and we've isolated what Q and A is – we know all that can be straightened out. Well, these things, then, pose no difficulty. They're actually a no-difficulty status. No difficulty involved in any of that.

Well, where is the difficulty? Where is it? Where is it that drives the auditor to use an unusual solution to patch up something that's happened wrong? See. He's got to have eighteen new middle rudiments to put the pc right. Well, how come he needs eighteen new middle rudiments to put the pc right, see? Well, the pc must have been driven wrong somewhere.

Well, I know by careful inspection you don't need any more beginning rudiments than you got. you can delete the Havingness. As a matter of fact, too often it throws the pc's attention out of session. Pc's feeling bad, you can build his havingness up with O/W. That's havingness. Sure keeps the pc's attention on his bank. you don't want a pc extroverted at the

beginning of session. How would you like to sit there and for half an hour persuade the pc – you'd never do this – but, persuade the pc to examine some locks or pictures. You know, persuade him that he should be interested in what's going on in his head. Think of that. Think of that. can you imagine yourself as the auditor sitting there saying to this person, “Well, actually you're – you should look at those pictures. You say you have a pain in your chin. Well, you should look in front of your face, there.” And the pc said, “Oh, no. I'd much rather look at these walls.”

Well, you could go on like that for quite a while. Once in a while you will find this kind of a condition. But running Havingness at the beginning of session tends in the direction of setting up that condition. Pc's all prepared to be interested in his bank and himself and his reactive mind and you say, “Be interested in the wall,” don't you see? So to that degree, to that degree – it is not a serious error, not for a long ways. But there is something in favor of dropping it even though the pc's havingness might be down. See, on the average, on the average – down havingness will wreak less havoc than taking the pc's attention off of what his attention is on.

Now, if the pc feels bad, it's because of the overt-motivator sequence. That's right. That's the only reason the pc feels bad anyhow. It's the only reason he got a GPM – is basically, he's got this all in the woof and warp of the bank already. So, here he is. He feels bad and that sort of thing, and you run O/W, his attention will get on his bank and he'll get interested and he'll go into session.

Your problem with a pc, of course, falls under the headings of every problem an auditor has ever had with a pc. Communication, control – keeping the pc's attention on what you're doing, getting your auditing questions answered: all of these things. Oddly enough, to a marked degree, you have mastered these things. And sometimes have had them deteriorate and you have been overpersuaded into unusual solutions and actions and doing something else and Q-and-A-ing and getting very anxious about the pc. you get thrown. Do you see? Why? Well, the pc apparently is out of session. This is one of the most baffling manifestations. You've carefully put the pc in-session by the best way you could and you'll find the pc is out of session somehow.

What drives the pc out of session although you're trying to put him in-session? Well, let's take Havingness out of the beginning rudiments, which we have done – just to prevent any possibility of this ever doing this. So we get good shooting all along that line. Let's patch this up anyway we can by any mechanism we can. And it's all patched up – you don't have to do anything unusual about it. But we find this pc is out of session. He was terribly interested in his ulcers a minute ago and he's not interested in his ulcers at all now. Well, what happened? You missed a meter read. That's the answer to it.

It must sound peculiar to you. I tell you all you've got to do is run two or three Havingness Prepcheck or just – pardon me, Rudiments Havingness, you know, Model Session Havingness sessions – Havingness in the body of the session, which is gorgeous. Just run two or three of those and your pc's needle smooths out. And yet there are auditors here who have run eight, ten or twenty of them and have had a rougher needle at the end of the time than they did at the beginning See? I don't know if that was true or not, but the observation I have made could have been contingent upon several errors. And it could have been this error and that error and another error and some other error. And these various errors, all combined, could bring about the situation where the guy's needle gets dirty. See? We could be hunting for the needle in the haystack, in other words.

In every auditor we could be looking very carefully around to what *is* this auditor doing wrong? Is it TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4? Is it his Model Session? Is it his – the way he snaps gum in the middle of the session? What is it? What is it? We could – it's this, it's that, it's the other thing. No, we don't have to look around like that.

The auditor is driven into looking bad by the fact he isn't getting results. And he starts looking bad. He starts getting anxious. He sees that his orderly and disciplined approach is apparently producing no good result, so he'll start doing other things to reach the pc, to produce an effect of some kind or another. His Axiom 10 is being thrown out the window and he starts breaking down his own discipline. He is – he hasn't anything to grab onto. His reality is poor.

All right, the Instructor comes along and tries to patch up this auditor. And he stands back and he gives him a terrific analysis of the thing He watches him and he says, “Well, your TR 4 is quite weak. Your TR 0 could be improved, and you do always seem to make an awful clatter there writing up your auditor's report, so we can improve that. And you really haven't got this drill down exactly right as to when you ask on the meter and when you ask the pc – you haven't got that drill quite right. We'll straighten out that.”

And we straighten out all these things meticulously and the Instructor works, you know, and his perspiration soaks into the grass – kills vast areas of grass off. And this auditor is finally all straightened out now and everything is fine and so forth. The auditor goes back into session and the pc ARC breaks and it all goes to hell. And the auditor, in his anxiety to help the pc and Axiom 10 and so forth, he starts doing unusual things and adds twelve more beginning rudiments and changes the wording of all the end rudiments and finally decides he'd better finish the session with, “Give me that hand,” you see – a Prepcheck session. It seems to work for him, you see?

The Instructor gets a lose and it's reported to me, you see. And you say, “Well, it's just something or other isn't working and we're not quite sure what it is.” And I decide once and for all what was doing it. That's what's doing it. Very hidden. Very mysterious.

The auditor in the first place wasn't actually getting the pc all this upset with his TR 4 or something like that. That wasn't really what was upsetting the pc. The auditor was missing meter reads. The auditor was insistently saying, "Well, it says right here," (as you saw last night on TV), "It says right here you have a present time problem so you – you've got a present time problem. That's all there is to it, see. you – what do you mean you haven't got a problem? Goddamnit, there it is!"

This sort of an approach... And so the pc got all frayed around the edges and the session went to pieces and the auditor lost his drill. And so the Auditing Supervisor gave him a GAE and the Instructor looked it over and he says, "Well, this could look lots better," and straightened him all up and he goes back into session again and he does the same cotton-picking error. See? He just cleans up a clean read, you know.

Everything was going swimmingly in the session. They'd gotten down to, "Have you ever raped anybody?" You see? And there was a rape, you know. The guy had a rape on the thing. And the auditor says, "All right. I'll check that on the meter." It's clean as a whistle, see? "Have you ever raped anybody?" Nothing. And the auditor says, "All right, what's that?" And the pc says, "What nothingness am I supposed to regurgitate here?" His reality breaks on the situation. First of all, he credits the thing, and so forth and so on and so on.

By this time he's got an ARC break and there is a read on the question "rape." It'd clean up instantly if the auditor simply had presence of mind enough to say, "Is there an ARC break here? That. That."

"Oh well – huh, yeah."

And then asked the rape question again and he'd find it again would be clean. But if the auditor were particularly abstruse and obtuse, the second time he asked the rape question and got no read, he would see a read.

We don't know sometimes – they read a phantom needle. Maybe they're reading them – a needle they got mocked up because they themselves have got a rape on the case, see. We don't know what this is, but they will see a read here. And then they go and thrust it down the pc's throat and the whole situation goes to pieces. And the auditor walks out of that session and says, "Well, standard drills don't work." See?

The wrongness is the imaginary read – the erroneous reading of the needle. See? And out of this – this having the one thing you can't do wrong – we get a pursuance of a tremendous number of things going wrong. And then, of course, anybody can sit around and see these things going wrong. After all, the auditor picking up his E-Meter and hitting the pc over his head with it – that anybody could observe that that was going wrong in a session. So, you see? So they say, "Well, this auditor has an antagonistic attitude toward pcs, you see. And we'll give him some auditing and we'll do a 6A and we'll clean up all this antagonism he has toward pcs."

We send him back into session and this time he just stands there and kicks the pc's shins one after the other – in rotation – one, two. We don't see what has preceded this. What's preceded this is an erroneous meter read.

Now, that's the one thing that is difficult to supervise. You don't have a Supervisor stand in back of everybody all the time seeing how they did. And at this particular stage of the game you haven't got enough coaches or Supervisors who can read a needle accurately every time to tip you off. you understand? So your situation – your situation there, it just goes unobserved – whole thing goes unobserved.

Now, we can find lots of reasons the session went wrong: The auditor came a little bit late to session; the pc was annoyed with the way the meter was set up, *clang-crash-bing-pow*, you know and the cans dropping on the floor; there's noise in the same room – there's another session going on so we can attribute it to that. The pc feels a little bit fluttery and upset and the auditor forgets the first part of his Model Session and says, “All right. In this session have you been critical of me – I mean start of session!” You see, something like that – he makes some minor boob. Well, we say that would obviously wreck a session. And we have been built into a belief that a session could be wrecked by things which actually wouldn't wreck a session. They could be patched up. They could be straightened up. No, a session is wrecked by the invisible thing. This was a hidden thing.

The auditor was sitting right there and he said, “Do you have a present time problem?” And he said, “That reads. What is it?”

And the pc said – pc tries, see? “I don't know . . . I guess it's with my own pc. Yes, I'm having trouble with my own pc. Yes. That's it.”

All right. And the auditor said, “All right. Thank you. Do you have a present time problem?”

“No. No. That's all. That's all.”

“All right. Thank you. I'll check that out on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?” See?

There's no more read than a rabbit on this meter, see. Nothing. And he says, “That reads,” he says, “What is it?”

And the pc says, “Do I have a present time problem. Well, now I have got one. It's the problem of having a present time problem.”

See? Here he goes. It's the missed withhold of nothingness. And the pc goes right down the spout. So you say, “Well, do you have a present time problem?” It falls off the pin because it's falling on ARC break, see? You get an ARC break fall.

And the auditor says, “Well, that's clear. You agree that's clean?”

Pc now knows he has an ARC break and he feels very nervous, feels very upset one way or the other. Isn't responding well. So the pc says, "Oh, yeah, yeah. I agree it's clean. Yeah."

"All right. Now, let's get into this Prepcheck. All right. In this lifetime, have you ever been mad to a pc? That's clean."

"That's clean? Me? (All right, if he says so.)"

"Have you ever taken any money and never given any auditing in return? That's clean."

"It is? Golly, you know, maybe I cleaned that off in that other session . . . I must have – somewhere . . ."

Got no meter reads practically for the next – rest of the session until another ARC break occurs, somewhere here. Now the meter starts reading all cross-eyed and crazy, see? Finish up the session. Everything's a dog's breakfast. The pc feels bad and the auditor doesn't know what's wrong. And everybody is attributing it to something else.

But nobody was standing there pointing out the fact that the very first time he tried to clean something that was clean, and maybe he committed the felony of doing it again, he set up a situation of a missed withhold – the roughest missed withhold there is – the withhold of zero. The nothingness. There it went. There went his session. And he never does spot this as a missed withhold and the pc doesn't spot it as a missed withhold or call it such and of course it never cleans up. So you've got 3 May HCOB in full bloom. Right in the session and your meter stops reading, eventually. It goes on down on a gradient and stops reading.

Now, if this happens session after session after session, you get an automatic sessioning on the part of the pc. you get a pc trained to self-audit while faced with an auditor. The pc never waits for the meter read one way or the other. He unloads to you his withholds. See, he gives you this, he gives you that. He said, "Well, I've been very careful since the last session – so on and so on. Yes, I have a present time problem with so-and-so and so-and – I also had another problem with so-and-so and so-and-so and I had another problem with so-and-so and so-and-so and I got another problem with so-and-so and so-and-so. And that's about all the problems which I have, and so forth, and those are my problems. Okay. There aren't any more."

The auditor will say, "I'll check that on the meter. Do you have a present time problem?" Gets no read and says, "That's clean." And goes on from there.

But the pc, if you'll notice, oddly enough, is beating the gun on practically every question – hardly waits for them to be asked. Here's your gopher sitting on top of the thing right up there in PT. He's keeping his own rudiments in – keeping his own rudiments in. You're nulling on a list – he keeps his own rudiments in.

Perfectly all right for a pc to say, “Hey, I just invalidated that item.” The auditor should do nothing like auditors sometimes – when a pc volunteers something, why, they do the mid ruds on nulling. Man, that's a way to shut your pc up in a hurry. But you'll find out the pc who's really been mauled around with bad meter reading who keeps them in obsessively, he'll say, “Just a minute. I want to get this Invalidation off and that Careful off, and I got that and that's all straightened out now. Okay. Carry on.” And the pc actually is running the session.

And that automatic attitude, self-auditing attitude, while in session, is borne directly and *only* from bad meter calls. Self-auditing of that particular type, right there in session, occurs only when the meter has been called upwards and backwards. Nobody is trying to say that self-auditing is no good and doesn't work and that sort of thing. There isn't anybody . . . There isn't a soul here who hasn't done some self-auditing, even if on such a mild basis as: burns his finger and there's nobody around and he stands there and touches the side of the cook stove a few times until the finger burn goes out. Auditors are always doing that sort of thing. We're talking about the thing where the guy can't have an auditor. Well, he can't have an auditor because he can't trust meter reads anymore.

Now, you find a pc that has the word “difficulty” charged and the word “problem” charged – as minor thoughts, these are terrifically charged – then use bad TR 1 on him so the whole thought doesn't register and you only get the minor-thought charge. Then try to clean the word “difficulty” while asking, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” which doesn't clean the word “difficulty.” Do you find – do you see what I'm talking about? And you'll see a session fall right straight into the wastebasket, because there are no answers.

You see, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” is not going to clean up the read on the word “difficulty.” You understand, I'm saying this guy has a charged thing called “difficulty.” He's got a button called “difficulty.” So where you – wherever you have a sentence, if you – in the absence of good TR 1 – wherever you have a sentence where the word “difficulty” occurs, even in life, why, there's an instant read at the end of “difficulty.”

All right. Now, we try to clean up this rudiment with the poor TR 1, because the word “difficulty” is reacting. You're going to be in a mess in no time at all. Do you see what I mean? Because you're trying to clean something that isn't there. Well, it isn't that subtle. It's not that subtle. You don't have to worry too much about the TR 1 and the end words.

Those catastrophes will happen to you too. you should know they exist so you can straighten them out. No, the catastrophes all occur unwittingly. The auditor doesn't think anything is happening because he's not aware of having made a mistake and the pc just goes into a total fog. The ARC breaks bloom in all directions. The pc ceases to read on the meter or starts reading backwards. Every time the auditor says anything to him, he has an ARC break, so he reads. Something wild is going on from one end to the other, and of course, we get no

auditing done. Worse than that, we get negative auditing done. If you keep this up on meter reading, you'll drop graphs.

If you want to know – really drop a graph, get an intermittent fault in the E-Meter. You know, you part one of the wires so for every ten minutes, it's out for ten minutes. Do it for twenty-five hours and look at the graph, before and after, of the pc. It'll drop.

In other words, the technique and routines and drills of auditing are not great enough or powerful enough to overcome the liability of missed reads or cleaning clean reads.

And in a session, the number of reads that you can miss is exactly none. This is something that has to be done perfectly.

It's a tolerance of zero. There is no tolerance of any kind whatsoever. You just never miss a read.

That doesn't say you can't say occasionally that one is equivocal or something of this sort. you can, and read it again. No. It's – don't – don't misread. One misread will throw a session into a cocked hat. you can ruin a whole session with one misread. What do you think happens in a session where you miss five? Interesting question, isn't it? It's a question of, sort of “My God. How are you still alive?” Even as auditors, “How are you still alive? How hasn't some pc shot you?” It's pretty wild, you see?

Now, definition of a dangerous auditor is: an auditor who might miss one read in a session.

You see what you're shooting for? Now that you know what you're shooting for, make your form look good. Do your drills right and so forth. Don't let down on that.

But what you're shooting for in absolute perfection, is meter reading. Unless you can get that down to a point where you miss *none, ever, you* will be a dangerous auditor.

Thank you.