

ROUTINE 3GA DATA

A lecture given on
26 July 1962

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: 26th.

Male voice: June 9th.

Thank you! All right. July 26, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

I'm going to talk to you about 3GA. Now, don't consider this a summary lecture about 3GA, it's a data lecture. The last two I gave you were data lectures. The basic summary lecture on 3GA was given some little time ago, and most of the data in it still applies, there have been a few changes based upon the usual reason. Yeah, it's tough!

I don't give you unusual solutions, I keep taking solutions out. *Dianetics: Modern Science* – oh, no, it was *Dianetics: Evolution of a Science*, talks about the introduction of an arbitrary. Every time you introduce an arbitrary into an action, you inevitably will develop a little confusion around that arbitrary. This is a law.

Governments basically and originally started getting in trouble with me by the number of arbitraries they can introduce. The number of government employees and that sort of thing, the tremendous expansion of units and agencies and finally, the final asininity, "the man in Whitehall knows best," all of these things come out of just one thing: People have introduced arbitrary after arbitrary after arbitrary. And it is very difficult to avoid the introduction of arbitraries, because people demand them of you, constantly and continuously.

HCA/HPA – a practice, not your type of practice but the handling of Academy courses, has just been changed. Too many arbitraries have been introduced into it, and a person couldn't get his HPA/HCA Certificate until he had done an extension course, and took him a year, and until this and until that, until the other thing, and it was sixteen weeks, and after that they retreaded, and on and on. There were all kinds of reasons why you couldn't make an auditor. That's all they added up to.

They were an effort, however, to get people to complete their courses and know their business. But why, then, did we have to start introducing regulations? It must have been that the instruction of Academy courses was deficient. So we introduced regulations, you see, to make the Academy course more efficient. And then, having introduced these, we introduce a few more. And then we have some demands from somebody for a clarification and a ruling.

So we introduce a few more regulations. And then somebody else has a problem, and we solve that for them in the line of training, or the Academy, you see. And we have a few more arbitraries introduced, until all of a sudden we can't make auditors. I mean, that's the final culmination of the introduction of that many arbitraries.

Now, let me show you exactly how this occurs as a cycle: I swept these away a few days ago by the issuance of a policy letter that said there would be no limit on the number of weeks that a person would be in an Academy course. In other words, I wanted to make auditors – that was the main thing. Let's make auditors – that was the main point. And that it wouldn't be this many weeks or that many weeks; and that there would be no extension course, you see, not make it necessary, before they get any upper-grade training, that they have to have completed their extension course or – and if they complete that, validation seal, something like that.

But let's not make that a condition for a professional certificate and then stop people from being certified, you see? Let's fix it up so that a person goes through – this was made possible, by the way, by the simplification of what we are doing these days with auditing – and a person should be able to go through and at the end of the time he knows his business, he can pass his examinations and so forth, and he is at that moment given his certificate. Yeah, that's the way it ought to be.

Well, I streamlined it all down to that, by simply saying there would be no limit on the number of weeks and no arbitraries about their certificate. The person would be examined and be issued his certificate.

Well, I said, "That's a job well done. We've got our material now, our technical material is sufficiently simple that – so forth. A person can push in some sort of a job on this, and without getting people into too much trouble; and a lot of complexities dropped out of it. That's fine."

I dusted my hands off, feeling very, very complacent about the whole thing, and I was walking around happy as a clam this afternoon. And I walked into the telex office and here sat Peter, sitting there, hair streaming down in his eyes, pounding madly away on the telex machine answering a despatch from London. Well, actually, Peter knew better than to show me this despatch, and I probably never would have known about it if I hadn't gone in and actually started looking over his shoulder wanting to see him about something else. Such as "Who has just dug up the grounds without permission?" You know, some minor thing, see. And I read this, and my teeth sort of fell apart and my jaw muscles became rather slack, and I quickly buttoned this up and discussed this in an intelligent fashion with Peter, but actually I was a bit stunned!

Because what was demanded was a clarification of this order and some ruling so that the order could be implemented. Went like this: I said, "that anybody would go on being consecutively trained unless they left the course, and leaving the course would be defined as two weeks." See, gone off the course a couple of weeks, why then if they came back on the course then they could retread the course. And this applied to all old auditors who wanted to get new material, they could retread the course for 30 percent of the cost of a professional

course without discount, you see. Just 30 percent of that, and that's a retread fee, and that's all fine and that's all very simple. I thought it was simple, anyway.

Nope! Apparently this is not a simple problem. "What if a student leaves course with the D of T's permission? Now, is that included in the order? Now, what if he's ordered to the HGC for auditing for more than two weeks? And that would cause him, if he came back, to retread, wouldn't it? And what if he blew the course and was gone for more than two weeks, you see? Does this include blows? HGC retreads? Or people given permission to leave the course for a short while?" you see. And Peter was saying, "Well, the wording may be ambiguous, however..." And he threw the whole thing off, you know; and you know, sort of – on the basis – you know Peter, he'd say it very mildly – well sort of "To hell with it." But that was exactly what should have been said. He said this very politely.

But here you had an introduction of arbitrariness into a simple order which was an effort to take out the arbitrariness. Now we're going in and put more arbitrariness in this thing, don't you see?

Now, the reason for arbitrariness is the lack of judgment and the unwillingness to assume an initiative. Wherever we have a zone or action where we have an unwillingness to assume initiative or responsibility or take terrific judgment on the thing or to use one's judgment or judgment is poor, then we get this phenomenon of the introduction of arbitrariness.

Now, games consist of freedom and barriers. And remember that a game does consist of freedom and barriers. A lot of the chaps running around saying, "Three cheers, we're going to have a revolution!" see. This revolution which is going to come up at any moment, is going to give everybody freedom – everybody freedom. They're all going to have freedom. Yes, sir! Of course most revolutions have the kind of freedom like the fellow says, "When it comes to revolution, we have strawberries, everybody eats strawberries."

And the guy in the audience says – the guy in the audience says, "But I don't like strawberries."

And the speaker on the stand says, "When it comes to revolution, you'll like strawberries!" See, in spite of the fact that the revolution is all in favor of freedom, we still seem to have a barrier sitting there.

Actually, a game cannot exist without freedom and barriers. It must be *and barriers*. You know this old principle, we've had it around for quite a while.

Now, a game ceases to exist when you have too much freedom or too many barriers. And the trick is to keep something like a practical percentage of freedom and barriers. There must be an interrelationship of these which is compatible with a game. Otherwise we never get any action at all.

You talk about M1 and fast highways and the hundred and eighty-four-pass cloverleafs that came over Telstar's broadcast the other night. They showed a cloverleaf outside of Detroit. I don't know why they picked that particular one because there are a lot of them bigger than that and they only had one car on it. I thought it was a rather poor choice of shots

but then I guess it was just the time of day, or something like that, and the placement of TV – the camera.

But if you look at those very carefully, that is a freedom of travel. And then they start putting stuff up at both sides of the road, see. And then they start putting “go slow” signs up. And then they put radar traps, see, and signs about radar traps. And then they neglect the highway and let it pit nicely, and sometimes they go so far as they did down in Texas, of putting deep dips in the road; so if anybody hit one of these dips at fifty miles an hour, or above the speed limit, you see, why all the car springs broke, and so forth. And after that the road’s impassable. And then you get the total freedom of no road at all!

All you’ve got to do is imbalance the ratio of barriers and freedom and you get a complete hotchpotch and it’s no longer a game. A country does not exist well without some laws. They form basic agreements on what they’re doing, you see? And a country exists very poorly without too many – with too many laws. And of course, although perhaps just by the nature of technology, we tend to go in the political direction of anarchy – yes, that happens to be true – but of course anarchy is always something that arrives when there is no political philosophy extant in that particular time and place which is applicable or acceptable to the problems which a – the race is meeting at that particular time.

You finally get a political setup where the political solutions, called political philosophies in light moments, these political philosophies become so overwhelming as far as the individual freedom is concerned, that eventually all one can think about in the zone and area of politics is just “Let’s be free of it. See, let’s not have any more to do with it.”

Well of course, if that took place, you would have no government at all, and by Definition that’s anarchy. But that’s not saying all Scientologists are anarchists. But it says that’s the only political philosophy that you tend to approach. But there’s quite another reason why, if you thought it out very, very carefully, you would see that anarchy was a very proper and fitting target. You see anarchy has never been possible, and if every individual had judgment and good sense, there wouldn’t be much reason to have any government. So a government, you see, is a substitute for judgment and responsibility. The more government you have, why, the heavier criticism it is of a people’s initiative, judgment and responsibility.

You’re operating in a political area which says, “The man in Whitehall knows best,” you see, that type of philosophy. Or you should have the commissar within call at any moment to know whether or not you dare talk to your neighbor across the back fence, you see, as they have in Russia. This type of philosophy rather dims out initiative and rather dims out judgment and rather ruins one’s sense of responsibility. And that’s a poor thing – extremely poor thing.

So when we – when we have an absence of this, you see, when you have an absence of restrictions, in a business or social or scientific group, and yet the people involved with that group are individually politically involved with a system which denies them responsibility and judgment, don’t you see, they start taking it out on you to some degree. So you get a telex saying “What is the meaning – what is the meaning of this policy letter which says students should be trained to become auditors and left on course until they are auditors, but what is ‘off course’?” I knew that would be asked, you see. And well, “off course” is anybody who’s gone

for two weeks, you see. And that just served then as a wide-open invitation to introduce all manner of arbitraries. We promptly got an invitation for more arbitraries. "Please give us more arbitraries."

Well, I sometimes almost explode under situations like this and I say, "All right, what have we got a D of T for?" See, "What's he doing'?"

First place, I certainly should never be expected to lay down a regulation on students who blow. What? lay a regulation down on ... Because – why? Why? God's sakes! Somebody has just goofed, man! Somebody has just missed all the withholds in the book, don't you see? And then some D of T didn't get that shepherd's crook of old, and reach, snare and yank. Well, all of this is to me quite self-evident. And I – wow! See? Wow! And – you've – I'm sure have heard me protest, somebody – I say, "Well all you do is, you just ask the guy – you just ask the guy how he's doing; how he's getting on, you know? Just ask the guy, and so forth, and that's sufficient."

And somebody always comes up, and says, "What words do you use?" You know? It leaves me speechless! See. "What words do you use?"

I don't know. And I'm sucker enough occasionally to say, "Well, say 'How are you doing?'" And, see, and after that, wow! You've had it.

You go by and somebody's running the session, and he says – and it's running like this: And he's saying, "Do birds fly?" or whatever it is, "Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do birds fly? How are you doing. Do birds fly? How are you doing" And then some people have been known to come around to me afterwards and say, "Look at this horrible thing you have just put out! See? Look at this horrible thing you are doing there. Look at that auditor, and look at what that auditor's doing!"

"What's he doing?"

"Well, he's saying, 'Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do birds fly? How are you doing? Do bird.. .'and it doesn't make any sense!"

Well, I have been in the process of stripping off arbitraries ever since we've been going forward. And to a lot of people anchored down and conditioned to a changing and a senselessly changing world, and so forth, see it as changes. It's strictly not changes; it's a continuous series of omissions. Not omissions on the standpoint of overts, but things are dropping out all the way along the line. The track of Scientology looks like some old Model T Ford has passed by. The nuts and bolts are strewn all over the highway.

You – to show you what sort of a job I'm doing in this direction – you just pick up a list of bulletins that are for four years ago. And just count the number of nuts and bolts that have been taken off the machine. And look at it that way, not "How many things have been changed?" How many nuts and bolts have been found unnecessary for the explanation and running of this machine? Because we get down to more fundamental actions. We're always working with a more fundamental action. And the more fundamental it is, the less nuts and bolts you need to hold it together. That's for sure.

Now, we've just stripped one out of the rudiments – the beginning rudiments. Get along without it fine. There it is, see. And frankly, if an auditor is having a hard time reading an E-Meter and is throwing the pc out of session, he's frankly better off to say to the pc who can't be put in-session, he's better off to say, "Start of session," you see, and start doing some action that he is doing, but only those actions which require no metering can be done this way. That's an unfortunate fact. In other words, you could say to somebody, "Start of session," you see, and just start doing what you're doing. But unfortunately no metering action can be performed in that type of session.

So you could possibly – you could list goals in that type of session, or you could list items. You couldn't do much of anything else in that type of session. Well, of course it's quite adventurous running a session without any rudiments in, but let's look at the practicalities of the thing. Instead of the rudiments going in, if we're introducing a lot of new arbitraries into the session under the guise of rudiments – you see, a misread here and cleaning a clean there and that sort of thing – if that many arbitraries are being introduced into the session left and right, of course the pc's going to go further and further out of session.

Now, actually, the more actions and the more arbitraries are introduced by the auditor into whatever he is doing, the less he gets done.

Let's take some auditor, he runs along for a very short time and then he decides the pc looks bored and so he runs some O/W, you see. And he runs a few commands of O/W, the pc looks less bored, looks kind of resentful now, and he says, "Well let's go on and list a little while longer now," and looks at the pc and then the pc's sitting there and just about getting interested in listing again, or something like that, and the auditor looks up, and he says, "I think I'd better run some Change of Space on you." And he does. And he thought the pc was getting too introverted. And then he got down toward the end of session, you see – down toward the end of session, and he says, "Well now, you've been outflowing the whole session, and I just had a good idea here, and let's inflow a little while. So I'm going to tell you everything I've been thinking about during the session." See, that's before he ends the session. So he tells him all the criticisms he thought of the pc during the session, see, and then he ends the session.

Now, the odd part of this is that you go over all of these introduced arbitraries and that's all you're going to find hanging up in the session. Isn't that interesting.? That is on a raw-meat pc too. That's not a trained pc, or somebody who's used to being audited or anything. You take your meter and you find all the places where he tends to be stuck in the session he just had, and each one of them will coincide with the introduction of an arbitrary.

Now, Model Session is designed to repetitively introduce an arbitrary so that even the arbitrary runs itself out. We always ask, "Do you have a present time problem?" exactly that same place in the session, don't you see? Well, actually just asking it every session tends to run it out. But how about sessions which have wild variations in them all over the place? Well, they don't run out that's all. You'll find the only place pcs hang up is on the introduction of an unnecessary arbitrary – unnecessary arbitrary.

Remember, games consist of freedom and barriers. There're a certain number of barriers have to be introduced, or you're not even going to get the pc to sit in the chair long enough to be audited.

For instance, some of you – not after you've been here for a little while – but some of you when you first come here and get audited in the goldfish bowl on rudiments and that sort of thing, would just love the arbitrary of a wall to keep out the sessions to the left and right. See, that would be lovely. Well, barriers have advantages, you see, as well as – frankly, you give people too many barriers and they will do nothing but fight barriers. But remember they can fight barriers to a point where they have no game of any kind – no action of any kind. There are no activities.

Now, your barriers, if kept to a minimum, and if they are stripped down to the point where they are necessary barriers, vital barriers, without which we're not going to have anything at all – if we can strip down toward that minimum, and then not expand it out toward vast numbers of unneeded arbitraries, why we will have a rather effective and efficient session. You see, that session has got to have some arbitraries, see, there's the arbitrary of knowing the English language if you're being audited in English. There's various little arbitraries set up around a session. But we start deleting too many of those arbitraries, we don't have a session, you see. Well similarly, if we add too many arbitraries we don't have a session. Same thing happens. What we're seeking in the form of a session is a rather optimum balance between the freedom of the pc and the arbitraries entered into the session. And if we can get that into a nice, balanced ratio, we're fine.

Now, I told you the other day – the other evening, that a pc got along all right, but that in – unless he was faced with an auditor who was too slavishly following rote or was neglecting it utterly, there would be three conditions. Either the auditor would so slavishly follow rote that nothing would happen, or the auditor had so much freedom that nothing got followed. Now, there's a third Condition where the auditor introduced so many arbitraries that Lord knows what the pc was now in. Any of those three conditions could obtain. We're seeking a happy balance of these conditions.

But the auditor could be far too fixed, too slavish in going ahead and doing what he's doing. Let's look at the type of impasse that an auditor could get into by being absolutely knuckleheaded. This is very important to 3GA. It's not so much a lecture on auditing as it is 3GA, because when you get into anything like 3GA, man, any weakness along the line peaks. It looks like a signboard. Before it looked like about the size of a blade of grass, but now it's one of these big gaudy signboards with a naked girl bathing on it, you know?

And here's your situation. Auditor starts his session, glances at the needle, and it's going *bzzzzzzzzzz!* Well, he says, "Well, I have to get in rudiments one, two and three." So, he asks rudiment one. And the immediate response is, on the needle, throughout the whole enunciation of "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" – rudiment one is goals, the effective rudiment – is *bzzzzzzzzzz!*

So the auditor says, "That read was equivocal."

And by God, I think he'd come around after the session and ask me – if he would go this fixedly – ask me to introduce a new arbitrary as to how many times should you ask a question when you're getting an equivocal read before abandoning it? And expect me to say “five and a half”

You see, he shouldn't have been asking it at all anyhow. That's the whole thing. He should have enough judgment to know damn well that he isn't going to be able to sort anything out on this meter. See, he – you could run into this. This would be very rare, but wow! Well, the best thing to do at a time like that, you see, best thing to do at a time like that would be to lay the meter aside – this is an unusable instrument at this moment – and let's just run some O/W. You see, you do have a solution. Let's treat the thing as the pc must be sick, see, or something like that.

And we run some O/W, and the pc says he feels better now, and – or feels disgusted, or something, we don't care what the pc said, but the pc feels different. That's what we're looking for. Let's put him back on the meter, and if this thing is still going *bzzzzzz*, which it won't be, it'll be doing something else, now. Maybe be totally stuck, or something. We can at least ask him the random rudiment because all dirty needles are basically missed withholds. But let's not be so knuckleheaded as to ask him the random rudiment if it is a random rudiment that he has never been able to answer. You get the idea? He's never been able to answer this particular random rudiment, he always has trouble with it, see. He gets into arguments with this thing, or he gives motivators all the time, well let's be smart enough to run a rudiment which still gets off the missed withhold.

I was into this situation the other night in an auditing session, and I had to phrase, before I was finally finished up – I had to phrase the missed withhold question about five different ways, treated as a rudiment in the middle of the 3GA run, until finally the penny dropped and that was it. And that needle quieted down. But the pc had a missed withhold but I just couldn't get the missed withhold question answered so that the missed withhold came off. You understand? So it was a matter of bad luck,. The first four times I asked the missed withhold question – the first four times – obviously were wrong! I got them all answered. What – I got what I asked answered, but they obviously were the wrong missed withhold questions. There was a wrong wording or the wrong phrasing or the wrong something. But let's get the slight difference here.

The old man was in here puppy to the root. He knew if he – in order to go on nailing a goals list, and go on nulling goals, he jolly well had to have a clean needle. So he wasn't saying, “All right, we'll cancel out – we'll GAE the pc.” See, we wont do that. Well just sit here, all night if necessary, and slug this needle out of the road till we get it, see. Now, I carefully settled such things as, “Is there anything you have done that people have failed to find out about?” – you couldn't read the needle anyhow – until I got a response from the pc and was able finally to check this out somehow in some haphazard fashion, and – but I wasn't letting go of any missed withholds, you see. Who had missed this withhold? That was the thing. Who had missed the withhold?

And I was cheered up by a little success, as I went along on this, by this interesting phenomenon of a half-a-dial-wide rock slam turning on occasionally, just for a moment. Brr!

“No, I don’t have any missed withhold,” no read on the meter, either, except *bzzzzz!* So finally, finally I found out it was other people and that they didn’t know. It wasn’t that they missed a withhold, see, that was different, yeah. That was different, see’ God knows why it was different, but it was! And just other people didn’t know. So that was that.

And at that moment, the needle started to sweep, up and down and around. Beautifully readable, and I went on about my business and got us some nulling done, see. But that, you might have said, was a slugfest. I was unwilling to settle for nothing, see. My job was to null a list. First to make the pc feel better, which I had to do – cured a half a dozen chronic somatics and that sort of thing, some mild job, see. Get in there, null a list. How the hell could you null a list with a dirty needle? You couldn’t. I tried, thinking it would – you know, it sometimes is just lack of auditing. All right, I got in there, thinking, “Well, we’re going to get some auditing here, and the dirty needle will clean up, you know, ha-ha.” No. No.

Then all of a sudden I said, “Well, we can’t go on with this any further.” I went through this kind of a system, and this is – be an interesting system for you and it’s quite useful. First ask the pc – now 3GA you see, has its problems. I should have told you, the problems of 3GA is reading a meter – and ask the pc, “What’s going on?” That’s number one – first action. This needle is going *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz*. “What’s going on?” you say to the pc. Something like that.

And then you get your middle rudiments in. You didn’t do anything with that, see, that’s a flop, see, he said, “Oh life is terrible and you’re doing awful things to me.”

Well, pursuing that particular course is not necessarily conducive to settling a free needle, see. First place, two-way comm may say two-way comm, but it’s a one-question proposition, see. You go more than one question and you’ve had it.

For instance, somebody today should be ashamed. They were in there running the CCHs, and they were saying to the pc, apparently, I hear, “Is there any more that you wish to tell me about that? Is there any more to that? Is there any more about that?” After the pc had originated, you see. That was TR 4. TR 4 took the shape of “Is there anything more to that?” “Would you like to tell me any more about that?” see. “Good TR 4” you know, no Q-and-A, oh, nothing like that, see. In other words, the auditor never gave the character a cheery, “Aye, aye,” and we were all set, see. But “Is there any more? Is there any more? Is there any more?” till the poor pc, you see, is bled white and trembling and then goes up in a small bundle of smoke.

Now, this action of two-way comm doesn’t work, still got a messy needle. Your next action is get in your middle rudiments; just standard middle rudiments. And you still got a messy needle. It’s hard to read through, see. Well now, you’d better roll up your sleeves and put on your judgment boots, because you can’t go on, man. Now, you’ve just cleared “Failed to Reveal,” haven’t you? Just in that many words, in the middle rudiments, as well as you could clean it. You cleared it off and it didn’t affect the dirty needle. Well, that doesn’t vary the fact that that dirty needle now must be coming from a missed withhold of some kind or another and you better find out what it is.

Now, there's sixteen versions of a missed withhold question. And there're probably several more that you could ask cats. I'm not going to give you the categories.

What you want to know from the pc is what did he do that was criminal and sinful, that people slipped up on getting wise to, see? Is it you in the session, was it during the day, was it in the last week or so, was it now? What the hell is this thing that the pc is holding on to with all of these ski ropes and so forth that's towing him all over the bay? See? What's he got hold of? That's what you want to know. Because it's a missed withhold of some kind or another. You can count your stars on that.

Now, some pcs will answer up and all of a sudden, terrific cognition, falls off the meter, everything else, the question's hot as a pistol, and so on, "What didn't they know?" see? "Is there anything people didn't know about you today?" See, or something like that, see? Oh, that's hot as a pistol. But for some reason or other, for some reason or other, you ask him, "Is there anything you didn't tell people today that you should have?" Well, there's nothing to that. That's not the question. You got the idea? I mean, peculiar reason the piano only resonates to a very, very tiny shading of meaning.

I ran somebody one time, had she ever done anything to X? Had she ever done anything to X? Had she ever done anything to X? Nothing. Nothing. Nothing. You know, "Didn't wipe the dinner dishes completely dry before putting them on the table." You know, big overts. Big overts. Man, this is colossal, see?

So I got tired of this pat-a-cake, you know, and I said, "Well, have you ever done anything that X didn't find out about?"

"Oh, well, yes. Put down things on the expense account slightly, you know, altered the household budget two cents here and there," and that's about the limpest nowhere I ever saw. I could get no needle reaction, you understand.

And finally I said, "All right. Is there anything you have done that X never knew about at the time?"

And it went bang! See?

"Oh, well yes," see, and equivalent of affairs, and you know, bank robbery, and sinking steamers on the high seas, and all of this sort of thing, and it was just that shade of question; that rang the bell. And it came under the heading of "didn't know." See. He didn't know. Well, "found out," that was different. Don't ask me why "found out" is different from "not-know," but to this pc it was that wildly different. And it was that sort of thing that finally settled up this case and got this case firing, got some tone arm action going, and that sort of thing. Case just did not respond to the exact question that one would normally would have thrown.

You'd said, "Since you have been living with X, is there anything that you have failed to reveal?" No reaction. But, "Since you have been living with X, is there anything X didn't know about?" Oh, man! Volcanic action. See, but on the same question, is there – "Since you've been living with X, is there anything that X didn't find out?" No action at all. You tell

me, you see. What you're into there is a very thin shading of semantics. And the pc in an almost childlike daze reactively hides behind some of the thinnest little excuses.

But remember, my job as the auditor was to get the needle cleaned up. That was my job as the auditor. And if everything I was supposed to do, usual, natural and normal that we're doing today, just as you are doing, didn't finally accomplish this action, then I had to assume that there was some shading of meaning, there was something we just weren't getting at here, man, and start drilling away on it.

There's something I certainly didn't know. Certainly there was something going on here I didn't know about. Now, what's going on can take in the wildest and widest of horizons. Of course, the goal you're trying to prove out may be the very, very wrongest goal you ever heard of on the pc, at which time he'll get very withholdy and his needle will go very dirty, and then you find yourself in the silly, silly position of trying to pull missed withholds from the guy – the missed withhold is something he knows reactively but does not know. It is not his goal.

And he sits right there and he says, "It's my goal," and so forth, and "Yes," they're very happy to have the thing checked out and so on. And, "But what are you doing? yak-yak." And all of a sudden natter-natter and scream-scream, and "I think I'm going to blow course tomorrow because I'm just not ever going to be audited again. Auditing is – I'm finished. There's going to be – no more. I just don't want any more of any kind," you see? And yap-yap-yap, and it doesn't matter what the auditor does, the needle's unreadable, everything's going to hell, yeah, there's a missed withhold there, but the pc doesn't know it, and you couldn't dig it up except by actually checking out a hundred percent the whole problem of goals with this pc, see. That's your answer to the situation.

But it might be – you see, this is where you're hung as an auditor and where you've got to use some judgment – it might be that during the noon hour they were mad at you at the thought that you – they were – see, you already got missed withholds, see. It's the little missed withholds – and they took your lunch kit, see, and threw it on the floor. See, it might be that one too, see? You get the idea? You see what you're into here?

You're sorting through the human jungle called the reactive mind. And in sorting through that jungle you are fortunate in having the keys, the maps, you know the blazes on the trees, but remember there are conditions here where the same white blaze occurs simultaneously on twenty different types of trees. You've got a missed withhold which is the guy's goal is wrong, but he doesn't know it, and you don't know it, and the thing is reading on an invalidation only, that the lines are wrong or that his goal has already been nulled out early on the list! He knows that reactively, see. It was his goal. There it went.

He doesn't know it! There isn't anything under the sun would tell you that was his goal! You just did a little sloppy piece of metering or something, or maybe your rudiments weren't in at the beginning of session, and the goal just before it, something like this happened: you looked up and sounded rather interested or amused on the goal just before his goal. You get the idea? It was, "to lick pots and pans of old fudge" or something like that, you know, and you looked at this and you sort of – you know, and he says, "What the hell is he doing that for?" you know? And the meter's inoperative for the next couple of goals. And the

time he wakes up on down the line someplace, he says, “I wonder what page we’re on. What page are we on?” you know, reactively sort of, “What page are we on? What. . .” He’s sort of reactively listening for “to catch catfish” and it doesn’t come up, see? Sometimes he’ll want to look through the goals list, you know? “X!” See, he’ll just see that, down deep someplace. And after that it’s chop-chop-chop, *nyat-nyat-nyat*, yap-yap-yap.

Now, he doesn’t know what happened, you don’t know what happened, you’ve got a dirty needle, and you go ahead slavishly trying to clear, “Have I missed a withhold on you?” see. “What have you done?” you are saying, see? “What have you done that I haven’t found out about?” He hasn’t done a thing! And it can’t of course be cleared. You missed his goal. Of course you don’t find that out till next month, or something like that, see, when the data does you no good whatsoever.

Well, there are several trees have the same white blaze. There is no substitute for good metering, there’s no substitute for being alert all the way along the line, and there’s also no substitute for using your ruddy ‘ead once in a while. See, I can give you – I can – I can fill your arms full of charts and stuff your pockets full of good compasses, and things like this, and give you little playing records of witty sayings for the session and ways to open the petcock and drain the oil out of the pc. Give you all sorts – give you lube charts of his mental machinery. But please, I think you’re asking too much, too much, you see, to absolve you of any sense of any kind whatsoever. And that I’ve always steadfastly refused to do. Even if my goal were – and it isn’t – to overwhump you, I wouldn’t.

Here’s the point. We’re already along a line, you see, of your doing what Ron says, you see. We’re already along that line fine, very heavily. And that became necessary through such randomness that nobody in the world was getting audited, don’t you see? But that came into being there, all right. Now, let’s not push that forward through to the final hilt of saying, “Thou must never have any initiative.” Let’s be worse than that. Let’s say, that – let’s not cook up things of “This is a sin and blasphemy since one is having an idea,” see. Let’s not get that corny, see. We’re not – these aren’t the days of Buddha.

Here’s the final word on the thing. Yes, there is a way. And frankly, if you put your very best efforts to it, and work like mad, with the sweat held – you have to have rain gutters across above your eyebrows to channel the sweat off – for years and years and years, you would eventually, possibly, have come up with just about what we’ve got. Because it’s been continuously monitored, not by my inventions, but by my observations, both of human behavior, the human mind, and the activities of people doing things with these items.

Now, I’ll probably have to run some of that out as invalidation later. But anyhow – of me! But the point, the point I’m making here, is you get too slavish an adherence and you will commit as grave a sin as introducing too many arbitraries and too many barriers. Or introducing none in some wild burst of imagined freedom, and your pc practically spins in.

Now, I’m not trying to give you a distrust of what you’re doing. I’m merely saying that in 3GA, you’re confronting a pc. You’ve got a pc in front of you, you’re auditing the pc who is in front of you. Now, there are various exact, textbook reasons why this pc misacts the way he does. These have been ferreted out, and someday you’ll come to the knowledge that these are.

You'll know that definitely. And now let's come to a further action, and we don't use our good sense in handling of this situation, believe me, you'll get no auditing done. You see, there are various directions you can go, and one of them is too fixed a fixedness, and you can become a complete idiot this way. Just completely idiotic.

We say to the pc, "Start of session." See, well that's fine, we're getting him all ready, and he's going into session and so forth. He keeps vomiting, you see, but we're not paying attention to that. And we say, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" you know, and he vomits a bit more, and so forth.

And we get very upset and cross with the pc because he won't hold still long enough to see if he's willing to talk to us about our difficulties. You get what I mean? You see it's just stupid.

All right, similarly, pc sits down, looks at us very gloweringly, and we say, "Well I shouldn't inquire too deeply into this pc's past because he looks dangerous." Now, the best thing to do with this pc is to just open up the session, not do any rudiments because they do contain this withhold question, and let's keep out of all the trouble we can keep into, and now let's go into an auditing session, and let's omit Prepchecking on this pc, because we really want to get 3GA done, you see? Well, that's way too wide. At that moment you would have had it.

In the first place, the pc isn't in-session, isn't going to give us any data, isn't going to as-is anything; it's all going up in a balloon, and you're operating across continuous piling up missed withholds, and you're lucky if you can get out of it with your life, man! You get the idea?

All right, but then, let's have this other situation – have this other situation, see. That's total freedom, the one I just gave you. And let's get the other situation of where just to make sure he's in-session, let's put in fifteen or twenty extra beginning rudiments. Let's – we know that his mother has violently opposed to his having processing. So every session before we get into the body of the session, let's ask him a rudiment about how his mother is.

Even the rawest-meat pc would begin to realize that a bunch of arbitraries were going here. Who wouldn't? But the pc wouldn't look good. Just the pc would look worse and worse, and get worse and worse, because man, he's being run into practically every present time problem he ever heard of, don't you see, before he is brought to the body of the session. He just can't quite concentrate by the time he gets to the body of the session. So you wouldn't get anything done either.

You can also startle pcs. You can decide that we should run several extra middle rudiments. See, middle rudiments are working all right, they're cleaning up things when they're used. Let's run in several extra middle rudiments. We found out that the pc has a tendency to repress a cough. So, irrespective of the pc's coughing, well, let's introduce a middle rudiment, asking specifically, a we say "careful of," that "Have you suppressed a cough in this session?" See, let's get that going, and let's get several others going, and let's have some fancy curves in here of some kind or another. And finally the whole body of the session is taken up with middle rudiments, you know? Because you never seem to be able to

clear, “Have you suppressed – in this session have you suppressed a cough?” That’s the one that’s giving us trouble, you see? Because the guy says, “Kumm...,” you see, and you say, “That read.”

Just doesn’t ever seem to clean up. And we find out when we’re auditing him on the full – the whole track that he has a button called “cough,” and you fin – you’d find out it’s funny, every time you say “cough” to him he’ll cough, you know. Cough-cough, cough-cough. It’s very interesting. Very amusing. We find out he’s also coughing as a thetan, which is very interesting. We never seem to get that one in, but we tried. Too many wild variables.

Now, it’s amongst this tangled brier patch that we walk in order to get somebody’s list of goals and get somebody’s list done on the goal that is found, and so on, it’s our job to get the auditing done. Now, the best way to get it done is the Model Session you’ve got right here, according to various findings. And your middle ruds are pretty good. But I can, and am going to, slightly change their sequence to give you just a little more of the stuff you’re asking for, don’t you see? Just slightly change that. I have no reason to publish it at the moment. But it’s just all in the interest of let’s make it nicely – let’s get it good and patterned, and then we’re not upsetting the pc by giving him something unexpected every two minutes, and let’s get it nice and patterned, and let’s adhere to that pattern, and let’s do a minimum of rudiments and a maximum of auditing in any session. But let’s not do such a minimum of rudiments that we have the pc out of session while we’re doing the auditing. Do you see the nice balance there? Well, that is only furnished by an auditor’s judgment.

There is no substitute for an auditor taking responsibility for his pc. There is no substitute whatsoever for an auditor using his initiative. And there’s also no substitute of any kind for an auditor, basically, getting results – there’s no substitute for that. And if I could invent something that you would say to a pc, and wouldn’t require any barriers of any kind whatsoever, and you just said “Boojum boojum boojum” three times to the pc like that, and the pc was instantly cleared, and you didn’t even have to say it in a sudden tone of voice or anything else, you could say one word “Boojum” and the next word “Boojum,” it wouldn’t matter, and so forth, why you’d be all set. But unfortunately this small fact stands in your road of that: is pcs don’t go Clear when you say “Boojum boojum boojum” to them. It takes a Model Session, it takes very accurate reading of the meter, and it takes a very set pattern that has been piloted through with vast ardure, and is a rather narrow road, actually. At the same time I think a narrow road can be followed so as to pitch over the edge of the nearest cliff, you see. And it can also be followed rather easily and comfortably. But even a mule has to have some judgment to go up one.

It’s bad judgment to introduce too many arbitraries, it’s bad judgment to put in too much freedom, and it’s also very bad judgment to be so damn fixed to what you’re doing that you never look up and find what has to be done in the session, see? Your auditing actually becomes a happy mean amongst those things. And if you do that well, why you’ll really get there. You’ll really make Clears.

We’ve got several people coming up to Clear this minute. And *isn’t* it interesting that the people who are coming up toward Clear and so forth are being audited by the auditors

who do the best Model Session and best reading of the meters. I don't think it's any coincidence at all. It'll inevitably be that way.

But I'm also saying that in those sessions where people are going in that direction and coming up to Clear, there must have been a little judgment sitting there in the auditor's chair. Do you follow that?

All right. So there is the razor edge we walk. And that razor edge of course spells success.

Thank you.