

DO'S AND DON'TS OF R3

A lecture given on
19 June 1962

Hi-ya!

All right. So, I'm going to talk to you now about the do's and don'ts of R3.

Now, Routine 3 is an ultimate in auditing and frankly should be regarded as such. No auditor who is unable to keep the rudiments in, handle middle rudiments or do Prepchecking has any business whatsoever doing an R3 process. You can try and you'll fail.

An auditor who doesn't know how to keep his rudiments in, keep his middle rudiments in and prepcheck just has no business whatsoever doing Routine 3 because he'll wind the pc up in a small ball and that will be that.

Some auditor—it's not terribly serious—some other auditor can come around and unwind the pc from this small ball, with just some more Routine 3 processes, but it means a very significant auditing failure. And don't mark it down as anything else—it will be an auditing failure.

Somebody trying to do Routine 3 who cannot basically audit with perfection will chalk up a failure. That is all there is to that. There is no arguing with that point. I'm not saying this point so we can have classifications or any other reason; I'm just saying this point because it's true.

If you want to be convinced of this sometime and you happen to be teaching a PE course, something like that, well, just take some Book Auditor out of the— out of the lot and set him down and say, "All right, find this person's goal and list it out to Clear." And oh, a few weeks later you are going to hear some screams, telephone calls in the middle of the night from the local spinbin, or something of the sort. God knows what will happen, but it won't be clearing.

Auditing successes are attained on a gradient. An auditor has to approach auditing on a gradient of successes. That is something you should sort of burn into the woodwork in an Academy. An auditor approaches auditing on a gradient of successes. If he does not have a gradient of successes, he will not approach auditing, he will go further and further from auditing. Oh, hell keep on (quote) auditing (unquote), but the less success you have, of course, the more likely you are to get an unusual solution.

Now, not even all here have recognized, right now, that the schoolbook solution is the solution. It doesn't need one eyedropper full of anything to make it work; as a matter of fact, will only work if you simply relax and do it.

Now, it isn't the textbook solution because I tell you it is. I've been working on auditing as a framework, and the training of auditors as an activity— completely aside from processes and technology—working on the framework of auditing—for twelve years. And you're not going to dream that up in a session. Man, you're not going to. I've had too many guys I've taught how to audit and I've had the benefit of all of their mistakes. Their mistakes are absolutely fantastic. The things that a pc can get into are absolutely fantastic. The difficulties which you can confront by omitting what we now call textbook auditing parts are absolutely numberless. And the difficulties you can now get into with additives are absolutely numberless.

Once upon a time they used to string wires down along the Niagara Falls and tightrope-walk across them. I think sometime in the 90s was the great adventure by which they used to have people walking across Niagara Falls on a tightrope. They had to balance themselves very neatly.

The wire in this case happens to be the textbook solution. There's only one other thing that I would add to the Model Session and so forth—of course, you are getting a reworked version of Model Session just in the interest of instant reads and that sort of thing—that is possibly in the end rudiments, something on the order of: “In this session have you made any decisions?” It would go in just before the withhold question. I haven't finished experimenting with it, so—but that—only thing that I have seen any reason to do anything about. And even then it would be quite unusual.

But sometimes you'll spot—could spot an ARC broken case that you wouldn't otherwise spot. And somebody has hung himself up in the auditing session who might not otherwise have been hung up.

Now, the natural impulse of the auditor is, when auditing doesn't work, to add something. For some reason or other he never subtracts; he always adds something. Now, if you see some auditor adding things, that auditor does not have a reality of the workability at the level of process he is doing. Those are also letters of firebrands on the Academy wall.

If the auditor sees fit or finds it necessary to add something to Model Session, to do something else to get a list, to do something odd or unusual in order to get Prepcheck questions, and so forth, it hasn't worked for him, see. He hasn't had any success with what he is doing, otherwise he wouldn't be doing something else. In the absence of a reality on result, then, he adds.

Now, this gets pretty wild—this gets pretty wild. Here are some of the things you have added in the last thirty-six hours on Routine 3.

Now, naturally you haven't got any reality on Routine 3 processes. You never had any wins or successes with Routine 3GA, or any wins or successes with this method of finding goals or this method of listing, so naturally you are going to add things.

Now, if you were getting good results with Prepchecking, if you got very good results with Prepchecking when you were in Prepchecking class, right this minute I'm sure you are in the frame of mind there isn't a single thing you would change about Prepchecking. That make sense to you?

And if you got good results in your rudiments and Havingness sessions—if you got good results in those—is there anything you'd change about a rudiments and Havingness session? You see? And if I were to ask any of you who got a good result on your pc—or consistently good results—in rudiments and Havingness sessions if you'd change anything about them, you'd say, “No.” And we'd watch you go through a session—we could put you on the TV and watch you straight through a session on rudiments and Havingness and you'd knock it off pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, see. Fine, fine, you wouldn't change anything. There would be nothing added.

All right. If you had good results in prepchecking a pc and so forth—we'd put you on prepchecking a pc—you are not going to add one single cockeyed thing. You'd just walk right through it, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, see.

But of course, doing Routine 3GA you are up against a brand-new unknown. And the night is dark, and the things you are adding are absolutely unbelievable. But why would you add these things? Well, you'd only add these things because you, yourself, didn't have a reality on its working. So you think that you have to do something else to make it work. In view of the fact that you are not up against what is to you a high level of reality, you fall into the area of alter-is.

Alter-is is the bigness of the bank. So you are up against a “don't know” and what keys in is alter-issness and some marvelous things happen.

Here's—listen to a few of these. Unbelievable that an auditor who just finished up Prepchecking beautifully without any additive of any kind would all of a sudden fall into this pit, or any of these.

Making up oddball goal categories to keep a pc listing rather than getting the middle rudiments in. Well, we have a few, they are the middle rudiments categories, but somebody's been making up oddball categories. You know? Just anything that came to mind, you see. The pressure of trying to get the goal. Middle rudiments wildly out, see. So the—and the pc, of course, not listing goals, so the auditor promptly moves in and gives a lot of oddball categories.

In this particular instance—the one single instance where this happened—we had a category of sacrilegious goals—I think was interesting. That arrived in another route, but it's an oddball category.

Asking the pc what his goal is or what he thinks the pc's goal is, you know. “What do you think your goal is?” I don't know, why—why not just dump a coal bucket over his head. That's what you are trying to find out. You mustn't ask the pc what he thinks it is because you are just going to restimulate the living daylights out of him. He's going to sit there, and he's go—all of a sudden go . . . He was perfectly calm a moment before, you see.

You ask him something like this, an additive and he goes “Hey, what is my goal?” see. You've asked him this similar question.

“All right. Do an assessment now. Thank you. Now, tell me the last one in. Thank you.” Same, be identically the same result. Pc can't do it and of course he goes brrrt-boom.

After that you can hear him going around muttering, “Wonder what my goal is. What is my goal? What is my goal?” Up to that time he was perfectly comfortable to list, you see. Not now, not now, now he's got to guess. So you just get a long list of wild guesses after you've done such a trick.

Asking for only this lifetime goals. “Now, we only want goals that have occurred to you in this lifetime.” I'll tell you something, if you don't get a goal that is before this lifetime you're not going to get any part of a GPM, because he's accumulated no GPM in this lifetime. The number of locks he has put on the GPM are quite slight. If you ask him only for this lifetime's goals, of course, and then you carefully made sure that he gave you nothing but this lifetime's goal, it would only accidentally get a harmonic of something he had had before. See, you've immediately almost obliterated your chances of finding the pc's goal by asking such a question.

An auditor refusing to list “To get rid of” goals or negative goals or difficulty goals. Just saying, “Well, I'm not going to list that.” This is from an old Routine 3A activity of some kind or another, just followed through in the wrong time and place. There is no such provision on 3GA of any kind whatsoever—no slightest provision. The pc gives it to you, you list it. “To get rid of this headache I got at the beginning of session.” Put it down, man, put it down.

You know why you put it down? He's giving it to you because it's charged up. It's part of the goals channel and if you don't write it down you won't bleed that much charge off of the bank. You're not listing goals to bleed charge, but you can't find the goal unless you have bled the charge.

Putting in oddball reality factors. One of the things in the TRs—this TR admittedly hasn't been issued at this time—but an evaluative R-factor put into the session is verboten. This would be a broad example: “You are such a difficult case,” see, “that . . .” And actually, an auditor did do just that here just in the last day and a half. “You are a patch-up case.” That's not an R-factor—that's a mud ball.

Now, here's another one. Scratching goals off the list when the pc wants them off after he has put them on the list. Oh, we haven't done that for ages. You never take anything off a list. I found out that the pc would take off of lists the thing it was. But you got it onto the list by a fluke and it would be the first one the pc would take off. Well, it's the most hidden thing, it's the most withheld thing, so of course he'll look at that and he'll, "Oh, well, that really isn't a goal of mine, you see, to kiss women. That, oh, that really isn't a goal of mine." See? He'd like to hide that and he will by taking it off the list. So if you are lucky enough to get anything on a list, you for God's sakes never take it off.

All right. Now, varying the tone of voice on embarrassing-type goals. Now this has been with us from the earliest goals assessments. You must not vary your voice tone or degree of loudness for any reason whatsoever.

I'll give you an idea. "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch squirrels. To catch squirrels. To run downhill. To run down . . ." And you know why you mustn't do that? Because an auditor will unconsciously evaluate as to what the pc's goal is. That's the main crime.

This actually was used to keep the pc from being embarrassed auditing in a room with other pcs. He found some embarrassing goals so he said them softly. But look-a-here, the real reason that you would never vary your voice doesn't lie in that nonsensical reason, see. The real reason lies elsewhere—is it weights the goal. And you must not weight a goal. If you permit change of loudness and change of emphasis as you are nulling a goals list, then you can throw the pc's attention or belief. You can actually do an "evaluate" with it, you understand?

And it would be like this: You may have decided unconsciously, more or less, that this pc's goal was "To fly kites," you see. He always talks about kites, and so on. You've got it all figured out, there's a lot of goals like it. Auditor is perfectly all right to figure out what your pc's goal is, as long as you follow this other rule: Read them all in the same loudness and tone of voice and the same emphasis. Don't ever emphasize one goal more than another, because you'll come down the list and you'll say, "To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," see. And then you'll get this one that you thought was real good, see, and you'll say, "To fly a kite? To fly a kite? To fly a kite? Oh, that's out." That's just doing an otherness, you see, but it'll weight the goals list for the pc. He sees you are disappointed, he sees all this sort of thing Devil with it, just do a mechanical rundown—same loudness, same pitch, same intonation.

Now, not getting middle rudiments in well. And by the way, by the way, we find out now, that because you've got good reality on them, of course, you are getting in the beginning and end rudiments very well, but you're not getting in your middle rudiments, which I think is marvelous. How possibly can you do this, you know? What are they? They're just some more rudiments, you know. They're gotten in the same way, they're the same thing. Check a session afterwards and you find the middle rudiments have been out during the session. Well, how could they be, if you've got them in, and so on. Well, true enough, the middle rudiments go out more often than the beginning and end rudiments on a Routine 3 type process. But—admittedly they do, but they couldn't be that much out, you see. If you've gotten them in four or five times in the session, something like that, how could they be out very much. And yet they have been found out.

And the next one is suggesting goals in that if the pc has done something in this life he must have had a goal to do it. You know, getting a goal surreptitiously, like, "What have you done in this lifetime?"

"Well, I was a streetcar conductor."

"Well, fine. Huh. Did you have a goal to be a streetcar conductor?"

You know why you don't evaluate for—on any goals list, and why you must shun it like mad on a Routine 3 activity? Just shun it, man, run like mad from evaluation, because the suggestion of the auditor is an alter-ness of the goal and what is wrong with the goals channel is it is alter-ised. So you alter-is the alter-is, and when you've got that, the thing will now react till your evaluation has been picked up; and you will have the wrong goal.

You can always get a (quote) "get a goal" on the pc and look good simply by—in the middle of the session, sometime toward the end of the middle— middle of a—of a late session, and so forth—just say, "I've noticed recently that you chew gum. Isn't it true that you have a goal to chew gum?"

And the pc says, "Well not—not really."

"You really do have a goal to chew gum, don't you?"

"Well."

"Look, you chew gum, don't you."

"Well, yes."

"Well, then you must have had a goal to chew gum at some time."

"Well, I guess I must have."

"Good."

So we put that on the list and it'll read now with a single tick and with every other indication that it is a goal. It'll read beautifully. It will check out as long as nobody prepchecks the middle ruds. And if you neglected to prepcheck the middle ruds on that goal, it will stay in much better than any other goal. As a matter of fact, it's the only goal that will stay in. Because, of course, as long as it's in, the rudiments are out.

Change one word in the wording of a goal and that goal will read at that point of word change. If you change the next to the last word in a goal and you're reading an E-Meter badly, so that the meter is actually reading across the last word in the goal, and you've changed the next to the last word in the goal, that goal will go on reading like that—right on, on, on, on, on. Every time you say it, it'll go, until of course you prepcheck the middle ruds in.

That one is particularly dangerous because I've seen it persist until the actual word that was alter-ised was picked up. You see how dangerous it is to suggest something to somebody, in any way.

You can say, "Have you had any suppressed goals?" Or "Are there any goals you have suppressed? Are there any goals you have invalidated? Have you had any goals that you have invalidated?" is a better question. "Have you had any goals you have failed to reveal?" and "Have you had any goals you've been careful of?" Of course, there's your middle rudiments. Naturally it would be coincidental: the same goals that would be out, would exactly parallel the middle rudiments. And you don't want any goals that have been suggested, so you wouldn't add that in, in any way.

Now, I'm not roasting you. I'm trying to get you to learn a lesson off of all this. And the lesson I want you to learn is actually in relationship to teaching other auditors, many of whom will do just that.

An auditor, actually, will do perfectly the textbook solution only so long as, having done the textbook solution, he has achieved a gain thereby. And if he has consistently been able to apply the textbook solution and achieve a gain, you wouldn't be able to blast him off the textbook solution with dynamite, TNT and atomic fission, see. He'd stick to it.

But where an auditor has not done a process to success, you can expect either he has not done the process, you understand, or he has—that is, he's never—he's never done a full cycle on the textbook solution even though he's trying to use it, or he has altered it in some way so that it didn't work, and so on. You will find that an alter-isness will very easily be introduced by the student. The student will introduce alter-isnesses all along the line, because it's not a set reality. It's something that looks very insecure to him and something that is subject to many changes, and so on. So you actually have to ride herd on those ponies. You have to ride herd on them hard.

And frankly, it takes that much supervision. And that's basically probably why nobody could pick up a bulletin out in the field and do R3 and come up with the goal and list it out without any further coaxing of any kind whatsoever, unless he had himself been utterly sold on the idea that the earlier thing he'd been doing, Prepchecking by textbook solution, was perfect and was gaining perfect results for him, then he might tend to follow through. But I even then don't think he would. I think it takes a lot of horse wrangling

I'm not trying to tell you that the textbook solution is the perfect solution. I'm only trying to tell you it's more perfect than one which will be evolved in one session by one auditor.

That's twelve years I've sweat over, not hot brains, but sweat over wet palms which- were leaning over hot brains. The students who have been auditing pcs over a long, long period of time, and the duplication is so slight that you easily go into despair. But the duplication will be as slight as it isn't working. They are directly proportional. The less it works, the less duplication you are going to get.

Now, in that we have had things that even if duplicated would have gotten a tedious result, or a long result, or occasionally would have walked you into a box that you couldn't easily have gotten out of, don't you see, old auditors knowing this already have developed an interpolative attitude toward technology which debars their use of exact technology at the time you get up to an exact technology, you see. So that itself tends to cut it out.

The textbook solution that you're using now, I don't think you have any reality, actually, on what Prepchecking will do—maybe one or two of you have—but what Prepchecking—no, I don't even—even one or two of you— what Prepchecking will actually do on raw meat addressed straight in the direction of a neurosis.

Somebody is strictly fruit cake, you know? They go out every day in their pajamas and shoot pigeons, you know? And you prepcheck them, following the various lines and rules of Prepchecking, and use as your Have question exactly what they are doing in just this variation: They are going out every day and shooting pigeons. So, you assume! that there are overts against pigeons, that there are overts against somebody who went out every day and shot pigeons, you see? You just assume the mechanics of it that they are— they have overts on whatever they have neuroses on, and you just do a landoffice business. You haven't any idea how fast this would be. Do you know how fast this would be, if you just ran it like that? Oh, something like twelve and a half hours to a complete release of a major neurosis if you went straight at it hammer and tongs.

This person can't live because they have an absolute terror, absolute terror of traffic—complete, complete terror. They can't go uptown and they can't go shopping, and so forth. Well we boil it down, we find out—they tell us—they have a terror against traffic.

Well, it's what have they done to traffic and what have they done to somebody who had an absolute terror about traffic, you see. It's what have they done to somebody who had their

exact neurosis and what have they done to the various things which compose the neurosis. And by the time you separate out all the items which might compose that particular battiness, you'll find out you've only consumed a few hours of Prepchecking. Now, they're quite interested too, by the way—I might comment on that—they're quite interested, because you're right on a center line of fixation. How could they be otherwise than interested?

No Freudian analyst could do this in a thousand hours of analysis, for what you could do now in just a few hours of Prepchecking. I mean, you could do the job, they couldn't do the job, see.

And you haven't—certainly haven't got a full reality on how far even Prepchecking goes. But I think you do know that Prepchecking on a fellow student does work and it's swept along and it was fine, and the closer it was to a textbook solution the easier it was to do. Did you notice that fact? That the difficulties that you were having you were interjecting Well, all difficulties are additive; one has added the difficulties.

So anyway, that you should be very aware of, both as an auditor learning a new procedure of some kind and as an Instructor working with students, and you're getting on the telephone... Somebody calls you from Lumbago, West Queensland, see, and they call you up and say, "I've got this pc in session and he just keeps screaming. What do I do?" you see? And you're fool enough to give him some directions. Well go ahead, by all means give him the directions. But he got the pc screaming by doing something unusual. He isn't going to tell you what that is because he doesn't spot it as unusual, see. And now you are going to give him some instructions and he is going to alter-is those. Well, give him the straight dope and hope, but don't be shocked if nothing ever came of it, because you are already dealing with somebody who's going to alter-is, because he got there by alter-ising. Oh yes, by all means give straight dope out over the telephone to West Lumbago, by all means, but don't be so damn hopeful about it.

And don't be so curious why it is—you will—you will start to get an incredulity in your area... You'll say, "Well, you want to know how—you want to know how—how to find a What question. Well, here's a bulletin, read it, you know. Here—here—here, read the bulletin. That's right. That answers your question all right. It's all taken care of." you come back in a half an hour and this guy has got a pc in session, and he's sitting there saying, "What?" then, "What?" The pc says something, he says, "Thank you. What?"

Pc says something, he says, "Thank you." He isn't stupid, it's just never worked for him so he does something else, see.

Now, there is the primary barrier which you have to cross in instruction and the primary barrier of—to getting things across. That is to say you, of course, in teaching things to somebody on a set procedure, of course, are teaching something on which they have no reality because they haven't done it. So you have to make up for that lack of reality with horse wrangling.

Just assume it's going to happen. Don't go into a decline and despair and keep your derringer oiled up to blow your brains out with. There's no point in all that. It's—just be fully prepared to be far, far more suspicious than you would ordinarily credit it ever being necessary to do.

And one of the basic things—all of a sudden this auditor suddenly starts doing a terrific job: the pcs start getting along fine, everything is along fine, and he's getting no trouble, and fine, everybody thinks, you know, you and any other Instructor around here, think he's doing fine. What magic happened? Well, he just got a reality on the process. It wasn't that his learning process got any better, see. He suddenly got a reality that what he was doing was what he should be doing and that by doing that he achieved a reality of result. So now he gets a reality on the procedure he is doing, so it's an acceptable procedure and it's something—after that, why, he'd say, "Well, why get off the M1?" See? But up to that he was on—he was on B23,

42, 7, see. It wasn't M1. And he looks up all of a sudden—it's just straightaway, a hundred and twenty miles an hour, see. Now the phenomenon that takes place is that.

Now, in spreading Routine 3 you are going to run into many difficulties in teaching somebody else to do Routine 3, and they are basically composited just on what I've been giving you.

Yes, it's an involved process. Well, you say, "Why on earth—why on earth then do we do Prepchecking and these lower processes if Routine 3GA is such a splendid process?" Well, in the first—fact that the case has to be prepared, but you've got to have some security that the fellow has got a security on auditing, see.

Teach him something that will work and then make him do it till it works and then he gets this win and then after that he is willing to do the procedure which he is going to use in Routine 3GA, you see? He's at least going to do that Model Session and the middle ruds. He knows those work. Well, that's three quarters of your battle, is bringing about a reality.

Now, instruction up to this time on this planet, of course, has consisted of simply—if they didn't learn it you shot them, see. In other words, you—if a person was unwilling to learn something or they couldn't learn something, why, you just stack up the penalties about not learning it, see. You just stack them up and stack them up and stack them up. Well, their mother and father are going to throw them out in the street. They are going to be disinherited by their grandfather, you see. The school board is going to fix it up; they give them lectures about the fact they'll be digging ditches the rest of their life, you know. They'll never have an old school tie to stir their soup with, you see. And give them all kinds of terrible things and horrible fates and threats, you see, and that sort of thing

Well, on a subject which isn't an actual subject, such as they teach on this planet, of course, that's nonsense. That is simply beating somebody's head in, and you just beat their head in and beat their head in and eventually they give up and say, "Yes, Hadrian discovered America in 1167 B.C., yes." They'll just say anything, you know.

Well, you've gotten training at the expense of judgment. You wonder why leadership amongst man gets worse and worse and why we have Nikita Kennedy and Jack Khrushchev. You wonder why these boys can't seem to make any decision that has anything to do with. . . I think a guy, the secretary of defense of the United States, yesterday or today, made a statement that everybody must now sign something or other to bomb only nonmilitary targets with atomic fission, see, and they were not to bomb cities. This is secretary of defense of the US trying to make a pact with Britain and trying to push it down the throats of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other people, you see, and trying to get them to sign that they will only bomb military objectives with atomic fission.

Well, this is very, very interesting And the British group up here told him, "Well, Britain was so small that it would be impossible to separate a military from a nonmilitary objective anyhow, so they didn't think that they had better sign the pact."

Of course, these things are bombing now at the rate of a sixty-mile radius. They are getting there up to a superbomb. Now, how do you select out of a circle a hundred and twenty miles in diameter, or something like this, the military target that's not military.

You see you have—they've invented some new protons and they're called begatrons, and a begatron, you see, avoids all nonmilitary targets and this is very simple. They finally got it all worked out, you see. You see, any other types, you see, they're attracted by military-type targets. So it's perfectly safe, you just throw a bomb with these mixed particles in it, you see, and it just sorts itself out and attacks the proper target, you see. And this is very simple because it's been stated by the secretary of defense, you see. That's why it's true.

How do you get stupidity like that? You get an educational line on subjects which were nonexistant, see. You get nonexistant subjects, you know, just dream-ups.

It's very funny, the—only the universities keep reiterating that we dream up Scientology, you see. That is their primary accusation and if you prepchecked them, they knew damn well that their subjects were all dreamed up, see.

And the medical profession, you see, says we don't know our business. It's marvelous, you know. why don't they wear a badge on their chest, man? And the psychiatrists say we're a bunch of quacks. Down in South Africa, the psychologists say that we are agin the Afrikaner. How they do confess, man.

But the university is always yapping about the fact that we're not a science. Now, they've never even defined a science. They are just loaded with imaginative subjects. One of the most imaginative subjects you ever wanted to have anything to do with is any humanity in a university, anyone of these humanitarian subjects, or even as far as economics. If you want a walking nightmare to nowhere, why, open up an economic textbook and it says, "If the demand exceeds the greater, then the supply isn't," and all kinds of things. Other rules and laws they have worked out. Marvelous.

And if somebody doesn't pass these things, he doesn't get his old school tie to stir soup with, you know. It's pretty serious—family, disgrace, never get a job in the government, nobody'd ever pay attention, nobody'd speak to him, never be able to belong to the country club, never own more than two cars. You know, life of sheer necessity and desperation stares him in the teeth, you see, unless he says, "The economics of huba-hubung are all square rooted on the bugga-bugga," you know? He does, he just sits there and he says this. Some guy got A on the subject, economics, A. And you ask his advice on an investment, boy, have you had it.

They say you never take legal advice from a modern lawyer. More business men have told me that, successful business men, legal advice, you don't take—ever take legal advice from a lawyer, and never take financial advice from an accountant or economist.

Well, what are these guys supposed to do? Well, you just—I don't know what they are supposed to do, but men who have succeeded never take advice from either one.

Pretended subjects. Well, you see you have to keep after somebody with a club and an axe on a pretended subject because he never will get a reality on its working, because it doesn't work and it doesn't go anyplace. So if he never gets a reality on it, he, of course, will never do it and you just get further variations of it, but you have to use the most fantastic duress to even keep him in a classroom going through this subject, you see?

Look at the amount of hidden and covert duress, social punishment and other things connected with education. Well, it has nothing to do with judgment, it's—you memorize the text, why, you are all set.

All right, now, we are in conflict with this because many people in Scientology have been educated this way and know the falsity of it. Now, we all of a sudden ride up alongside and we say, "You do exactly this, this, and this with no variation, goddamn it," and it looks like the same thing But look— look there is a difference—there is a difference, because all of a sudden the duress is removed. It's actually removed at that time when—it's the same thing—Instructors and I are always having the same type of conversation. "Well, can he do it?" you know. "She can do it. He can't do it yet," see. This is about the gist of these conversations. "Well, what part of it can't he do," is a secondary consideration, but we all want to know, "Can he, or she, do this final operation?" see.

Well of course, we know he or she can do the final operation because he or she has got a consistent, comfortable result and because they are not inventing all of a sudden. See, there's not a bunch of newnesses and alterisnesses coming up. It must be working for them, you see?

And then they get very comfortable about it, and they look more and more comfortable about it. You've been over the jumps—some of you—on this already and you notice there is suddenly no pressure on you.

Well, it isn't that you have been grooved into something by hypnotism or something, but your reality was substituted for the duress. Well, isn't it funny that your reality could have more power to hold you on a groove than the duress. Well, of course it could, because you're getting a result and if you're getting a result, then you are able to accomplish what an auditor is doing, and that's the way to get a result. You've already had the reality of not getting a result some other way. And so you say, "Well, that's it and that's fine," and you plow through.

This has a great deal to do with Routine 3GA, or a Routine 3 process, because I'll call something to your attention; when a person's goal has not worked, the individual has done something else. And listen, that's all the trouble there is with him. He didn't follow—he didn't do what he said he was going to do, you know? He had a goal and he—he had a goal to play a piano so he started throwing eggs. He had a goal to farm, and so forth, so he went into the city and got a job in the telephone office. That's all that happens to him and now he looks sadder and sadder, and more and more apathetic. He isn't winning in life, you see, and so forth.

It's actually very easy to make somebody's life a complete misery and disappointment. Just carefully find out what he's supposed to be doing in life, what he thinks he's supposed to be doing, carefully, and then use all of the bulldozers you possibly can to force him to do something else. And he is going to be an aberrated mutt, man.

You never quite saw as much aberration scattered around the wits of some poor kid whose parents have had great expectations. You know they do it—they do it with a smile and a kiss, you know, as they push the poniard in the back.

The child, unfortunately one day, this thetan one day picked up this body whose aunt was a successful actress. And because the aunt has the fortune of the family and everybody else, why, this kid finds that she is about to become an actress. Now, this is wild, you know. And the further they go in life—the further this person goes in life—the unhappier they get. And they might even make a third-rate actress, see, but it would be a very nutty actress.

That's all you'd have to do, you see, to produce all manner of collision and upset. That is below the level of impact, below the level of knocking people out and hypodermicizing them and electric shocking them and giving them impacts and working the love-hate cycle and betrayal and dialectic materialism and psychologosis and all other aberrated practices besides making them run through rat mazes and pick up cheeses and other human activities. Yeah, yeah, you can produce a small amount of aberration that way. But the basic method, I'll tell you right straight off the cuff, of producing a nice, big, juicy aberration, see, is this character has got a basic goal, and it goes this-a-way. And then you stand over him with a cotton-picking club for years and get all of life standing around with loaded guns making the person go that-a-way.

Not—not bunk—you know, not just say to the persons, "Your goal is wrong," and resist his goal or oppose his goal. That's not what I am talking about. No, just make him do something else. It has to be complete departure from the goal. Now, his whole life is an alter-isness. His whole life is based on a falsity. And some of you sometime or another will find out that . . . Well, we have already had a student who had a goal—I think something on the order—of "Never to be a doctor," and so forth. Here and there you will have some student with a goal which is diametrically opposed to being an auditor.

Well, it's perfectly all right in Scientology to use a club on him, man, to push him into line because if you are doing anything like a good job, the next thing you know, why, you are

doing Routine 3GA or some even more advanced routine. Naturally you've picked that up, so there is no liability to it whatsoever. You get the idea?

We are talking about the business of livingness. Let's carefully badger little Rollo until little Rollo has decided unequivocally that he is going to be a streetcar conductor. And now fix it up so he becomes a naval officer. And then wonder why it is that he drinks or wanders in and out of jail or gets this or gets that or gets the other thing and that he just keeps being on the skids all the time.

There's one for the commies. I suppose one of these days they—I doubt that they will ever use that though. They couldn't duplicate that well. They probably would duplicate it like this, that you let everybody do exactly what they want to do and that will spin them in. And if we—I guess if we convinced them of this, why, everybody would win, you see.

We probably ought to tell a psychologist, "The trouble and the real cause of aberration, you see, the real cause of aberration is letting people do exactly as they please. And if you let them do exactly as they please, you see, spin them in, ruin them, absolutely ruin them." Textbooks out, "How to do as you please," you know.

The results of duress, force, energy, smoke and all the rest of it, of existence, are expressed from—departure from a basic goal.

Now, nobody would do any auditing if he didn't have a desire to help his fellow beings. That's a rather basic and fundamental goal, not necessarily the goal, but it is certainly part of a goal. Furthermore there is sometimes in the background—there is a feeling that one doesn't deserve to be helped and one—unless one can help a bit. There are other feelings of this character. These are quite fundamental fundamentals, and factually they override—auditing overrides these rules just as it overrides human aberration.

I can think of times when I might have had a goal, "Never to be an auditor." You walk out of session, you know, and you've had—you've had everything crossed up one way or the other. Never again. Next guy that walks in the front door of the base, the easiest and best thing to do is simply put a trap gun there. And yet when the doorbell would ring, why, you say, "Hello, come in, sit down."

But therefore, you show somebody a positive channel which does help another and does bring about a realization of those more fundamental, humane goals and they will follow that channel. They will do what will help. But they actually don't want to do it as long as they feel it won't.

Now, they feel it's going up against their various goals, like it's deriding and overthrowing their individuality and it's doing this and it's doing that.

But that, in essence, is what we are trying to do in Routine 3GA. You could therefore expect an enormous amount of alter-isness on any process, and particularly on something which is straight against alter-isness, such as 3GA. So you have to be very careful in doing it, to do it very precisely and very simply without additives.

And in teaching it, you have to make awfully, awfully sure that it doesn't get altered every time you turn around, and additives are entered into it. They will be entered into it even before they are needed.

And therefore this is climbing Mont Blanc on a Sunday afternoon, you see, on the wrong side. It—people in doing it, of course, maybe going up against innumerable factors, all of which tend to compel them to alter the way they are doing it, and so forth. And all you have to do is just hold your course steadily, then you see that it did work out.

You actually finally are sitting there one day and you—every time you say a goal it goes tick. You didn't believe it could ever happen, you know. You really didn't know up to that point that you didn't believe it. And you say, "To catch catfish," tick. "To catch catfish," tick, what? "To catch catfish," tick. "To catch catfish," tick. Check it all out, get all the evaluations and invalidations and everything else off the thing "To catch catfish," tick, "To catch catfish," tick. Hey look at this, you know. You feel like getting your fellow auditors over to take a look at this thing, you know, looks pretty remarkable. And yet all the time you intellectually knew that that would happen, but you hadn't seen it.

Well, if you get at it in some circuitous route that you yourself didn't quite understand, the next time you do it you will try to duplicate your own route. And you can accidentally find one of these things about twenty out of a hundred without following the rules. Trouble is, the rules are securing to you the other eighty that you wouldn't find with an oddball procedure, you see. It isn't that you will never find one with an offball procedure, it's just eighty percent of the time you won't with an oddball procedure, you see, that's the difference.

Well, the do's and don'ts are: do the procedure, do it without alteration, run your session without additives or interjections, just relax and pilot it on through and at the other end you will all of a sudden say, "Hey, what do you know."

The little girl who doesn't believe that she can make a cake and doesn't believe the recipe will end up in one, seldom does make a cake. And if they do, it will be quite remarkable.

4 dozen eggs

3 pounds of sugar

1 cup of flour

1 bottle of vanilla

2 shakers full of salt

See, it's on the basis that you can't make a cake anyway, so how you make it isn't really necessary to know, you see.

And then you'll see some old lady with—somehow off in the Middle West on a farm or something like that. And she's apparently doing something else. And you hear something hit the bottom of a pot with a swish, swish of beating up something and something of this sort and all of a sudden there's a cake and a couple of pies on the table. They are perfect, they are absolutely delicious.

And then she is the other extreme. You say, "What's your recipe?" And she damn near goes mad trying to think of how she does it.

It will work that way with you someday. Somebody will come along and they'll say, "Well, how do you do Routine 3GA?" You see you haven't seen a bulletin on it for years. "Oh well, uh—let's see, well, it's very important— uh—to prepcheck your rudiments. That's very important to prepcheck your rudiments. That's really how you do it, and to null everything out until you get it. Yeah, now you understand. Okay? All right, thank you."

And people will sit there and look very baffled, you see. And you'll say, "What's the matter with you? What's the matter with you? Haven't I told you adequately? Haven't I told you adequately?" And then some timid soul lifts his hand, one finger, you know, "Do you use an E-Meter?"

Okay, take a ten-minute break.

Thank you.