QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD:
CCHs, 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on
29 March 1962

Thank you.

Lecture two, Mar. 29, AD 12. Lecture subject, blank. I'm giving this lecture to give you an opportunity to ask some questions. If anybody feels that they just can't help but reverse the flow, do so! Any questions, any questions? Yes Herzog.

Male voice: Ron, I'd like to know that if you have a case and you process him and the tone arm moves up . . .

Hm.

Male voice: . . . something about 3.5 or 4.0, and it stays for a long while there until suddenly he talks to you and, boom, it comes down. you know, in one fell swoop, without him necessarily making a cognition . . .

Hm.

Male voice: . . . or anything really happening. But this is a kind of a pattern.

The case always does this?

Male voice: That's right.

That's repetitive tone arm motion and is a peculiar phenomenon of where the tone arm goes to the same points and does the same thing without something happening There's a thing called a stage four needle. Well, this is the equivalent behavior on a tone arm. And it's actually a circulation between two masses. And the individual has mass one and mass two. In other words, valence one and valence two.

And you'll find out that when a case is pretty heavily pushed in, you can almost hear the click when they go through these valences. And valence two reads at 3.0, and valence one reads at 2.0, let us say, and they go *click-click, click-click, click-click.* And it hasn't anything to do with tone arm motion. It is an odd phenomenon that you – you've seen there.

You shouldn't suspect that when you see – it creeps up to 2.25 and then it goes to 2.75 and then edges up to 3.0 and then comes back to 2.5. That's not the same action. It rises up and will get to about 3.25, and sometimes it's much worse than this, sometimes it goes up to 4.5 – more usual, even, and then, *clank!* All of a sudden goes to 3.25, 4.5, 3.25, 4.5, 3.25, 4.5, 3.25. And if you see any variation, adjust your trim knob! There are – there are such cases. There are such cases.

You shouldn't confuse it with tone arm motion, because it isn't. That's just a direct read on valence one, a direct read on valence two. It's unmistakable, by the way, you – you wouldn't be wondering very long whether you had a case like this or didn't have a case like this. I mean, I've seen a case hung up in this for quite awhile, and then all of a sudden bust through and do something else.

But there are some cases, you get them in, get them on a meter, and they do nothing else but this. And the auditor sits there and happily thinks the case is moving like mad, and actually the case is going exactly no place. It's as bad as this: When the pc talks to the auditor, he's in valence one. When the auditor talks to the pc, he's in valence two. It will just go, *click-click, click-click.* And then the thing reads proportionately. Okay? Right.

Yes, Charles.

Male voice: In this bulletin on CCHs you mention you run the CCHs 1, 2, 3 and 4 until they're runnable without somatics or reasonably flat – and reasonably flat. Could you elucidate a little bit, on "reasonably flat"?

Well any CCH-type process, for instance "Notice that (room object)" is actually a CCH – it actually comes under that classification, because it's a direct havingness, straight observation process of the present time environment.

All right. If that turned on a somatic, you have to continue to run it until the somatic drops out. That is the fundamental of what you're talking about. See? The fundamental is that, in view of the fact that only a CCH will turn *off* the somatic it turns *on,* or a series of s you know, running through, maybe the somatic will hang for awhile, and then it'll finally shift down – you're honor-bound, if you start the CCHs, to run the somatics flat off of them.

Now, if you had a case that the somatics came off, but they were still ragged in spots, you would continue to audit it until the pc didn't mind any of them. So, one, be sure and run them as long as they generate somatics. That's vital. That is a must. And then we have the nice thing to do, which gets the full benefit out of the CCHs, is run them so the pc can do them all willingly and do them all well, in sequence, in rotation, and it doesn't bother them, and so forth.

Take off the gross change that you get on the CCHs – the gross change is, of course, the somatic. And then the less gross change is the raggedness or the irregularity and the little unwillingnesses and that sort of thing that you run into on that.

Does that answer that question?

Male voice: Yes, thank you.

Right, right.

Yes!

Female voice: Ron, would there be any extra value in running the CCHs with the beginning and end rudiments?

Yeah, well, I didn't mention that until I was going over it again, because it – I said I was going to mention it, I'll mention it now. Thank you for bringing it up.

If you wanted the CCHs to produce the highest possible gain with the least possible blow, on pcs who are pretty sensible anyway, you'd probably put in your beginning rudiments and do your end rudiments on a meter. And do the body of the session on the CCH. It makes a different breed of CCH, which would of course be rather understood to come about if you started using the CCHs not on very low-scale pcs exclusively, but started using the CCHs on middle-range pcs.

You could possibly have a situation like this: The pc is sitting there with a howling withhold, you see, of some kind, and that's been missed, and the pc is blowy, because of the withhold, and then you get something going on one of the CCHs that causes him to blow, and your pc tries to blow ten times as hard. In other words, by doing this, you could soften up the blow factor, and the pc at the same time would tend to stay in-session a little bit better.

But I would still rather leave this in an auditor choice proposition because it has not been done. you see? It's a fact offered without experimental background. And I ordinarily tell you when this is, and if you want to go ahead and do it, do so, and we'll rack up a few of them and we'll look it over and see how it works, and then it would be whether you did it or whether you didn't do it. But it's certain that on many cases you can't do the beginning and end rudiments on a meter in the CCHs, you see. That's impossible.

But it's also become certain that if you're going to start running people, just because their tone arms don't move because the auditor is not running the right Prepcheck, or something of this sort, well, probably the case would make a better gain if you ran beginning and end rudiments. I don't necessarily say it would. I say it's not necessary to do or unnecessary to do it this stage of the game. This is something that will require more data about. I think there would probably be an additional benefit to the CCHs if it were done that way. And I think also an auditor could get so involved with the beginning and end rudiments,

he didn't do any CCHs. So maybe the thing has blessings, and maybe it has curses. It is an idea offered, rather than otherwise. Okay? You bet.

Any other questions? Right!

Female voice: on 3D Criss Cross, is there any indication whether definitely we should oppterm each item as they come up, or get them across? You know....

Well, originally, we hit it in a sloppy way. In 3D Criss Cross we did – oh, several, and then start oppterming Get several lines, and then start oppterming. And I don't know that this isn't the best method. Once again we're on a data question mark. I do know this, I do know this, that some items are so heavily charged, and the pc gets so momentarily and so tremendously fixated on the item, that you actually couldn't do much more than oppterm them. But on a little work I have been doing recently, I still favor the first method we were using – of getting several lines, and then finding out – and then reading down the items and finding out which one of them is particularly live today, and oppterm it. you know?

There's that possibility that if you did twenty lines without a single oppterm, that you would be running the pc into nothing but sensation. And the pc would just be getting dizzier and dizzier and dizzier. And now I can give you a rule by which you can follow this. The rule is a bit sloppy, but it is still a rule. And that is, if your pc, after you've done one, three, five lines, is starting to complain of dizziness – in other words, lots of sen – or is getting continually griefy or something – anything that is under the heading of sensation, you know, misemotion or dizziness or sensation; you know, everything is going far away and coming to them again. At that stage you have gone too far without oppterming And the thing to do is to oppterm. That's when you *must* oppterm. When your pc is getting a lot of heavy sen. Then you *must* oppterm.

But I wouldn't do that just because the pc was getting heavy sensation on one line. Well, so he got heavy sensation on this line and at the end of that, and then you did another line and the pc is now *really* getting heavy sensation and between session is starting to go dizzy. Now, you've got to. Now, you've got to oppterm. The thing – the way to cure that is to oppterm.

So, within these tolerances, it doesn't much matter when you do it. But I can tell you when you *must* do it. Okay?

Female voice: Hm-mm.

All right.

Yes?

Male voice: And you do that by assessing your items, taking one which is pretty heavily charged ?

Yes. The first way we were doing this is probably the best way. That is to simply get a lot of lines, then read through several of items that you've already found – you've got maybe four, five, six lines. You read those and you find out that one is really knocking That's the one to oppterm. Yeah. And if you're going to oppterm all of them at that time, you would read through the remaining ones and find out the heaviest one and oppterm that one, until you'd opptermed them all. You'd of course would really oppterm them all. you wouldn't leave one out just because it wasn't knocking. You'd oppterm anything that you'd ever found. Even if it was wrong

Try and oppterm a wrong line sometime. That is really marvelous! That winds up back of nowhere faster than any other operation I could guess at. Because you've come up with a wrong item on an original line and now you're going to oppterm it. Pc goes way out into left field and falls in a gopher hole and that's the end of that! Okay?

Yes?

Female voice: Could you tell me, when you start doing the third line, how many lines to get to the person – oppterms – before you start to oppterm – you know, do your third oppterm.

Now . . .

Female voice: I mean when you get your one item, then you oppterm, do you go down – further down the line and oppterm again?

Oh, well, oppterm smoothly. In other words, if you're going to start opptermimg, you wouldn't get your third item until every first item had a second item.

Female voice: Yes, I know. I see.

All right, now, you get everything a third item. And, you wouldn't start getting anything a fourth item until everything had a third item. In other words, you'd fill up the lot.

It'd be perfectly all right to have – as far as I know, and from what I've seen of this – to have twenty first items with no second items at all, see, because you've got one item each, unless you run into this sensation thing I was talking about. And then your person starts going dizzy, and so forth, between session, you better start opptermimg. Well, the moment you start opptermimg, oppterm the lot, see? But take the first one that's the heaviest one. Now, don't get your third item until you've got the second item for everything. In other words, keep a balance to that degree.

The reason why, if you don't do that, is you start losing lines. You lose lines, inevitably, anyhow. Lines all start to cone in toward a limited number of items. But you start getting the third one before you've got the second one, and the bank gets all monkeyed up so that you get your second one over here as the third one and you've already – lose a line. See?

That's real heavily charged and it appears over on the wrong line. And the next thing you know you're narrowing much too fast. Okay?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

Yes, Fred.

Male voice: Would the sensation phenomena also apply to the pain phenomena if you were getting only pain? Would . . .

I'm sadistic.

Male voice: You would continue on if – you wouldn't oppterm it then?

It'd be almost impossible for the pc to maintain his terminal. You see, the mechanics of the thing, Fred, are these: that the pc *is* his terminal. And a terminal always has pain on it. And here is this terminal on which there is pain, facing outwards, always, against an enemy. So, you've given this terminal he's stuck in, an enemy, an enemy, an enemy, an enemy, and he gets dizzy because he just got too many enemies. But on the pain phenomena, he's simply being somebody else. you see? And you actually wouldn't get that kind of a phenomenon. You won't get 3D Criss Cross turning on constant pain, but you will get 3D Criss Cross turning on constant sen.

Male voice: Thank you.

You see why?

Male voice: Yes.

Yeah. All right. You bet.

Male voice: I just wondered why you left out the one side.

Yeah, well, that's – the reason why is the pc – the pc as his terminal is never opposed to the pc as his terminal. See? Now, you can give him too many enemies. He's stuck in being a cat. And you don't know what he's stuck in. You haven't found a cat yet, you see. You're finding a lot of other parts of the package. But actually all this time he's being a cat, very obsessively – you've never relieved this one, you see. And you get a lion, and you get a dog, you see, and that's real cheerful. And you get a dogcatcher and – and then you will go along a little bit further and you get a housewife, and you say, "This is interesting here. We're finally finding his female characteristics, you know." And then we get a small house, and then we get a sandbox.

You see, up to this time we haven't added up why – what we've got there, you see. And the pc can actually start stacking up, and the phenomenon that he's stacking up is, "They're all agin' a cat."

And it's looking like a mighty hostile environment to the pc by this time, and he'll go – start going zzzzz-zzzzz, *wog-wog* and actually get dizzy enough that he can't walk up and down stairs. I mean, it can get that gruesome. And also, you've occasionally heard of the pc where the room – walls of the room went out of plumb? That's all part of the same sen, by the way. That's just sen. That's too many oppterms, too many enemies. I didn't mean to beat it on the head, but it's interesting that the fact that – the second he's out of a cat, you see – so a cat has lots of enemies. Now – now he is being a warrior. That's his terminal. Well, all right, that's got lots of enemies, too. But one of its enemies is not a cat.

Male voice: Uh-uh.

Okay?

Male voice: Thank you.

Right.

The mechanics of the mind. They're very mechanical. They for sure are. Gets to be fruitless after a while to get lines when sen is on too strong, by the way. Because you're just getting opposition to the same thing, you're just getting more and more oppositions to the same terminal. Those lines are all going to disappear. So you're just overworking yourself for nothing. That's only when sen turns on.

Okay. You sure started one with that!

All right, any other questions?

Well, I'm glad you know it all! I'm peculiar in that I don't!

Yes, Jan?

Female voice: Are these two still correct from last spring? This is CCHs again. "If the pc fights you tooth and nail, steadily, for twenty minutes, that's no change."

That's correct!

Female voice: "Or weeps steadily for twenty minutes, you come off of the thing."

Yeah, that's relatively speaking correct. You can be too severe with this. Because the pc, you understand, would have to be in a very interesting state to have no change in the fighting, or no change in the crying. You know. For a pc to weep without change for twenty minutes, that'd be very peculiar. But by the definition, that is absolutely correct. The pc weeps for twenty minutes, and he weeps the same for twenty minutes, you've reached a point of no change in that CCH.

Female voice: There's another half to it, and that was, the business about you don't count a somatic which the pc simply describes to you, but you can't observe it, on his body. you can't see him twitching or clutching bodily parts in anguish . . .

That's right, if you cannot detect . . .

Female voice: . . . if he had a splitting headache you can't see it . . .

If you can't detect the somatic on the pc because of physical representations, the pc doesn't have one, as far as the auditor is concerned. The auditor never buys any statements of the pc. These are nonverbal facts about the CCHs. CCHs are nonverbal. You see that pc, and he's going this way, you know, and he, *ooooh,* and so forth, *hoooo.* All right, so there's something wrong and the pc's got some weird things going on in the cranium and it hurts. All right. Fine. Fine.

And the pc says, "Oh, I have a splitting headache, and you do this just one time longer and my head is just going to fall off and this is absolutely killing me. And I've never had anything kill me as hard as this is killing me," and so forth. It has no validity with the auditor. Just has no validity.

We've had too many pcs dream up somatics. That's where that comes from. They'll go into valences of victims and give you a long line of symptoms and so forth and they get at the motivator side of it. When that motivator thing starts running out, they give you victimization dramatizations. Of course, pain, factually speaking, is a victimization dramatization. Okay?

Female voice: Yeah.

All right. Yes?

Female voce: I wanted to add to, or to ask something about what Jan said. If the preclear, say, happens to be – I've never seen this particular thing – but if the preclear should be crying for twenty minutes solid, without change, just boo-hoo-hoo, the same type boo-hoo-hoo, but say that before you looked at your watch he began, or he or she began crying two minutes before your twenty minute period, so that in fast he had been crying twenty-two minutes, but without change – you know, I mean without any change in crying – so, on the basis of "The process that turned it on, if continued will turn it off," could you then make an exception to that twenty minute period ? You see what I mean?

No, actually you can strain at these things too hard. Because for the exact same *boo-hoo-hoo* to carry on for twenty minutes, it's not going to run out. That's all there is to it. It just isn't going to. You're not likely to see any change in it at all. But, remember, for twenty minutes of exact *boo-hoo-hoo* without ever any change of note, or – or sniffing up and saying, "Well, we'll be brave now," and nothing like that happening, is quite unusual. And if the pc started, you know, *hmm-uhh* and so on. Well, all right, and went on for two seconds, and then *boo-hoo-hoo,* and then so on and so on. Those are all changes. We've got here, actually, an ideal situation, or a theoretical situation, as opposed to a practical one. Okay?

Female voice: Thank you.

All right.

Male voice: Ron, on the subject of pain, why is the pain on the pc's terminal ?

You tell me. Come on, Peter. Tell me.

Male voice: Well, he – he – he's in the victim valence.

All right.

Male voice: But this seems to – doesn't phase with the fact that. . .

I'm not being smart with you. I really meant it. Tell me. I'm not being smart. I don't know! I just tell you that that's an empirical observation. It's the darnedest thing I ever saw in my life! Yeah, how come the pc only experiences pain when he's in a terminal? How come he experiences sensation when he's in the opposition terminal? The difference between these two things is fantastic. And reason it is so fantastic is, if you run the pc on the oppterm, you just wrap him up and put him on ice. you ruin him. And you run him on one of these painful terminals, he runs like a dream. Yeah. All right?

Male voice: There's an overt there kicking him in the head.

Huh?

Male voice: There's an overt there kicking him in the head.

Yes, yes, it must be – an overt. It possibly is in that field, you know? They possibly don't have any overts, except on what they're viciously in.

If you look this over, it doesn't seem too unreasonable that a person should experience pain as himself and sensation as being somebody else. Well, that's fairly obvious. But why is it obvious?

All right, it'd be an overt if, as his own terminal, creating pain with somebody else he would directly feel the pain only when he was in the terminal that had created the overt. That's highly probable. Highly probable. I won't go all out on the thing. It's just an empirical observation, as far as I'm concerned. And you really took the lid off, didn't you? You're sorry about it, aren't you?

Male voice: I'm feeling pain.

Now, that's strictly, strictly an empirical fact, and undoubtedly it's explainable, and that's probably the explanation that you gave. But nevertheless that is peculiar. You can always tell which is the pc's terminal. That's the only thing we could ever find that would tell the pc's terminal. You pays your money and you takes your chance, you know? You start running the oppterm as the terminal, oh man! All hell will break loose. Pc almost caves in. The case gets some advance, oddly enough.

You know, I've seen an oppterminal run flat with the terminal still totally alive. It was – didn't seem to matter how long you ran the oppterm – it didn't do anything to the terminal. Backwards situation for some reason or other.

You can take an oppterm and run it overtly, and you'll see it go flat, and the pc will feel better. Or, God help you, if it's one of the beefier ones, he'll just go into more sen and more sen and more sen and finally the room is spinning, and the Prehav Scale starts beefing up and everything starts going to hell in a balloon and you wonder "why did I ever begin this intensive?" So does the pc.

So, you need some signal. You need some signal to differentiate the terminal from the oppterm. And the oppterm gives sen and the terminal gives pn. That's as far as we went with it until you opened your face.

Okay. Yes Fred?

Male voice: You said before, don't buy any statements from the pc since the CCHs are not verbal. But CCH 3 and 4, we do handle preclear originations. Especially in 3.

Only out of courtesy.

Male voice: I see.

Ah, it's just courtesy. Keep the pc from being ARC broke. You couldn't care less. you really don't care. you don't care whether the pc talks or doesn't talk, or anything else.

Now, in ordinary auditing – in ordinary auditing you'd pay considerable attention to it as to whether the pc was advancing or not. you would monitor it to a large degree on what the pc was saying, and how the pc said he felt, and all that sort of thing. And oddly enough, you can trust none of that in the CCHs because the most fundamental and basic stuff is running off, and this fundamental stuff will cause the pc to do and say the damndest things you ever heard of and most of them are outright lies.

Now, anything – anything that will run off electric shock or Metrazol shocks, and so forth – that has as much power as that as a process – of course, will also run off all kinds of counter-creates of every description, and certainly runs off verbal counter-creates. And you're liable to get these weird statements on the part of the pc. And if an auditor wasn't fortified in advance, that they are not verbal, an auditor would change his approach to it. And the auditor's approach to the CCHs is grind on, grind on, grind on. Doesn't matter whether the pc says the moon has just become solid pink tea, he grinds on.

The pc will try every trick in the book. "I can't stand it!" because this is the thing they can't stand. Communication, control and havingness are the three things they cannot tolerate. So they'll actually think of all sorts of things to throw you red herrings and everything else. I

never trust a pc when I'm running the CCHs. I don't trust them at all. Pc says, "I feel much better now."

"I'll bet you do!"

It's almost so much so – I have an impulse to say, "All right, where does it hurt?"

Because those processes will run off a fantastic river of counter-create. For instance, if a person's had a lot of – a lot of ridicule in his life. Supposing a person has been ridiculed, ridiculed, ridiculed – raised out in the Bible Belt, something like that – ridicule, ridicule, ridicule. And you start running CCHs on him, you know the ridicule will run off. In other words, the counter-create comes off. So therefore, you're going to have somebody sitting there ridiculing you all the time. Just understand what you're looking at. You're looking at a counter-creation coming off of the pc.

And a pc doing the CCHs *never* originates. They *only dramatize.* Nothing is truer than that. you may, in having it done on yourself, get the subjective reality on it. All of a sudden you say, "What am I saying? You know. What the hell was that? Why am I doing this?"

Well, it's actually some kind of a counter-create and it's just coming off, that's all, and it comes off in the muscles. Sometimes it comes off in the vocal chords.

Yeah, yeah. Well, if it'll run off electric shock, it'll certainly run off mama's jeering. So therefore your pc will jeer.

All right. Let us suppose he was – had a parson for a father. And all his father ever said to him – he'd lie there with a broken leg – is "I'm sure everything will be all right now." See. And his father'd beat him, and say, "I'm sure everything will be all right now." And his father'd kick him down the stairs and say, "I'm sure everything will be all right now." And give him a new bicycle and say, "I'm sure everything will be all right now." you audit this pc, the pc will tell you, "I'm sure everything will be all right now."

He just can't help himself. He's going to tell you that, that's all. And you, you fool, if you believe him, you probably haven't vaguely run it out, you know? So you just don't pay any attention. You'll be on the safe side. you don't have to get into a games condition with the pc. Just ignore it and do the CCHs. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Thank you very much.

All right. You bet.

That's a point I'm glad you brought up, Fred, because it's an interesting point. The process is so heavy, you know, the CCHs are so heavy that a person goes into these dramatizations and he just can't help but dramatize the doggone things. Sometimes he feels silly. Sometimes he feels this way and that way, watching himself dramatize these things. But if the pc is aware of the fact he's dramatizing, why is the auditor paying any attention?

Okay. Yes?

Female voice: Is there any reality factor to be established in the CCHs?

Any reality?

Female voice: Factor – at start of the session or after the session, if he inquires about changes or anything Is that to be established then – talking to him? You know?

Oh, you mean get your R-factor in as to what you're going to do and that sort of thing?

Female voice: or rather inquiries after the session.

And after the session answer his questions? And so forth? It'd only be proper for an auditor to pay attention to this. That's as close as you are – must get to rudiments, is you tell the pc what you're doing, you tell the pc why you're doing it, or anything you care to. Try to get the pc's agreement to do it before the session begins. Anything you would care to do to get a session started, or anything you are able to do, and then you run the session anyway. See? And after it's over the pc wants to know this or he wants to know that, or he wants to know something or other, and so forth. Well, if you can tell him without evaluating for his case and so forth, by all means do so. And you'll find the pc will stay in a closer ARC with you.

Yes, the R-factor is established in all cases. In essence you do it by rudiments. But you notice these demonstrations I've been giving you? Usually before I start a session we'll get some kind of a rundown on an R-factor. Seldom after the session. But certainly before the session, because, just before the session ends, you have, "Is there anything you'd care to say or ask before I end this session?" See? And you get your R-factor questions at that time.

But I normally will talk about auditing to the pc or ask them how they've been doing or something of this sort, before the session begins. Give them time to catch their breath and brace up to it. Well, it's that type of R-factor that you establish in the CCHs, or you tell the pc what you're going to do.

Say, "There's a bunch of drills and I'm going to do them. We'll see if you can do them," and I'm not above leading the pc into a complete, trick on the basis, you know, tell the pc, "Well, there are a bunch of drills and very smart people can do them, and very stupid ones can't. Now, let's see if you can." Anything, it doesn't matter what.

The CCHs become most trying to me when they start in at a high scream, and it's a high scream from there on out, and you're obviously just breaking a person to pieces bit by bit and leaving the chips and punks of flesh all over the floor, and the – and it's just a wrastling match from the word go, and no R-factor of any kind can be established. I always have the feeling when I see this is happening, that an R-factor could have been established. Inevitably I have this feeling. I always wish I had established the R-factor better. Okay?

Female voice: Yes, thank you very much.

Right. Yes, Jim?

Male voice: Referring back to dramatizations that occur when a CCH is run, how closely might these be connected to terminals and oppterminals?

Oh, very closely. Yes, very closely.

Male voice: I see. I wonder if you'd like to say some more about that.

No, no, not particularly, because nothing can be read out of it. The worst that the pc is sitting in starts to discharge, because the one thing this circuit can't do is duplicate. And another thing the circuit can't do is have. And the other thing the circuit refuses, of course, is control. So you start to give a person control, communication and havingness, and inevitably they start blowing in and out of 3D Criss Cross items. And these things will bang in and out most gorgeously. But normally you'll find your pc is usually sitting in no more than one. And this thing will try to discharge. And the pc will get these heavy masses beginning to occur around him, that he's never (quote) had before (unquote). They've always been there, but he's had them totally not-ised. And the CCHs knock out the not-is.

So, weird things show up that the pc has never seen before by the simple reason of the vanishment of a not-is. The communication, control and havingness run out the not-is and start to get an "is," of course, and it shows up this valence. It's inevitably a valence. And around him some oppterms will inevitably show up. Now, they very sel – occasionally show up as actual masses that the pc has never been aware of before. And he thinks they've been turned on by the CCHs. And he thinks they have been made tougher by the CCHs. Neither case is true. If anything, they've been slightly turned off, and his feelingness has gotten up to a point where he could feel them. These are true.

And you'll notice in doing the CCHs, these surrounding masses of the pc will tend to loom up where the pc has not seen them before. And he'll start to get somatics inside himself that he has not seen before and not felt before. And then these will discharge and very often he moves on the time track in the valence he is in, to a more comfortable position.

To run them all out by the CCHs would be impossible.

Male voice: oh.

Yeah. It's quite interesting, but the phenomena which you see in the CCHs is the phenomena of a valence. And the phenomena which occurs around the pc is the phenomena of oppterms.

Male voice: It ties in with the familiarization, too, you know.

That's right!

Male voice: Because the preclear if he's pretty sharp, would get a familiarization with the kind of terminals he's going to encounter later on.

Yes. That's right. Very definitely true. Okay Jim.

All right, any others? Yes, Jan?

Female voice: Since Peter's question I've been wondering if there is or could be manufactured a pair of definitions that will cleanly distinguish between "pain" and "sensation." Practically, they're not hard to tell apart, but to put into words . . .

Well, I'd say it is very simple. It's very simple. Now, wait a minute, it's very simple. Unfortunately it would be impolite of me to say, "Richard, shake her," and "Richard, stick her with a hat pin." But those would be definitive.

Female voice: Yeah.

Got the idea?

Female voice: Yeah.

Or, "Richard, disorient her." See? All right, that's sensation.

Female voice: Yeah.

Sensation is that which is produced by reason of other beingness and dislocations. And terminals are produced by direct contact between the thetan and an identity. The pain is produced by the directness of the contact. In other words, the pc is more intimately connected with the terminals, always, because he is the terminal. And he feels more directly the pain involved in the thing.

All right, what is pain? Pain is heat, plus cold, plus electrical shock. That is pain. And if those three things are combined exactly, and somebody touches them, a thetan touches them, he gets that experience known as pain. It comes at the wavelength of 1.8 on the Tone Scale, is the sensation wavelength that he gets, and that is known as pain. He must be intimately connected with the mass. In other words he must be touching the mass with an idea that he is it, as a difference than "other is it."

All right, now, get the idea of you – you know this is your hand. And you put it down on your heat-cold-electrical shock gimmick, the response which you would get – knowing this was your hand – would be the sensation as pain. It'd be quite sharp and it'd have a very definite wavelength, and so forth.

Now, if, as you touch this table, somebody picked up the table and moved it around, or pushed the table up against your hand, or shook the table, see, you'd get sensation. Now, emotion is more intimate. Emotion is more intimate – like tears and apathy and that sort of thing – is more intimate to the person than ordinary motion, but is still within that band.

I wouldn't go so far as to say that emotion was exclusively an oppterminal action or exclusively a terminal action. But I would go so far as to say that sensation could include emotion, rather safely in your adjudication of the situation, and that a pain definitely determined the terminal. The sensation is what you get being kicked up 150 feet into the air, tumbling over and over, and let fall. Now, that would give you a sensation. Being taken out and hung over the side of a building and told you were going to be dropped, I think that would give you a sensation. Get the differences in these things? The sensation is inevitably dislocation of space, and pain is inevitably alteration of form. Where emotion fits between these two things is a question.

Yes?

Male Voice: Well, this isn't strictly a question, but with regard to Peter's question about why would a terminal have the pain end of it, we might have an attention factor, because I notice when you're hurt, your attention snaps inward. Now when you have sensation, your attention tends to snap outward.

I think that's probably a very reasonable answer.

Male voice: The oppterm would be over there, and the pain would be in, so it's . . .

That's right, something like that. Of course this is a difference of why you have these things, as opposed to their existence. Yeah. They do exist.

Male voice: Yeah.

Yeah. Now, why they exist, well, there're some explanations could be given. You had a good one. Self always has the overts so therefore is the one that hurts, because therefore he's pulling in hardest on himself. Trying to keep from pushing out against the other . . . I don't know.

Biggest mistake anybody makes, of course, is regarding a human body as self. That's marvelous. But, of course, you can regard anything as self. Just anything I can think of some manufacturer regarding a factory as self. And somebody drops a wrench into one of the drill presses or something and smashes it up, and he goes, "ouch!" Actually is not the least bit peculiar. Might sound odd, but it's within the framework of it. He considers the factory himself. And you've seen mothers double up like jackknives when little Johnny is hit in the brisket. And she regards little Johnny as not an oppterm but herself – an extension of self. I imagine if you smashed up an E-type out here . . .

So, that would be the way it is.

All right. Well, it's nice to have a question period for a change. I hope that you've enjoyed it as much as I have. And I also hope that your next couple of days' auditing will be as successful as it has been getting lately. Your auditing is getting more successful, have you

noticed? Have you noticed that your auditing is getting more successful? Have you thought that it wasn't? Well. You're getting more successful? Is auditing getting dangerous? Dangerously successful?

Well, I want you to get these lower edges fixed up. I want you to get CCHs and Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross all wrapped up, because the Class IV stage I've pretty well got worked out, and it's just about the easiest stand-on-the-head that anybody ever did. It's all in reverse. Prepchecking is actually harder than 3D Criss Cross. And apparently Class IV is much easier than 3D Criss Cross. So we run backwards on these classes. The easiest action comes at the highest class. That's the way it's happening. That's the way it is. But, of course, it's only easy because you can do the two lower classes.

I pretty well got that end of the game wrapped up. As a matter of fact I can see the goal post in the end of the line. And I've been studying for quite a while to find out the best way to handle terminals and that sort of thing. And I had to wind up with some new factors of common denominators of terminals. And that was one to wrastle with. And we needed that one before we could go on with Class IV, and so we wound up with that one. So it's all easy going from here on out. Probably.

But all of you should be very good at these lower levels before you get onto the upper one.

I want you all to have twenty or thirty or forty items. I think that's not unreasonable – thirty or forty items on your 3D Criss Cross plot. I think that's easy. I think you should get your basic chain shaken out. I'm more eager now to make sure that you get any CCHs that are going to be flattened – flattened. And any 3D Criss Cross you're going to get done – done. And to learn how to do Prepchecking very, very well. *Learn* how to do it very well as opposed to putting your end-all weight on it. Because, actually Prepchecking can be used after the fact of 3D Criss Cross, don't you see, and it's most valuable after the fact of 3D Criss Cross.

So, I'd be glad to see you wrap up your CCHs, as an auditor and as a pc, and wrap up 3D Criss Cross as an auditor and as a pc. See, so we can get on with the rest of this sort of thing

Okay? Thank you.