TWENTY-TEN,
3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on
9 January 1962

Thank you.

Well, you look different. You do, you know.

We had a bit of water under the dam, over the bridge, since I've been gone. I had a wonderful congress, absolutely fabulous congress in DC. People thought it was wonderful. Almost ruined me, but probably saved Scientology United States without much trouble. They were running on American meters which had been manufactured, God help us. If any of you've got American meters, there's a garbage can out there. Because these things were built, you know, without any consultation with me, and across – over my dead body, practically, on circuit changes, and so forth.

And this is not propaganda, but by George, you know, they don't pick up withholds. And that left practically all the Scientologists in the United States with missed withholds. Just like that. Bang! And that was what was the matter.

And the first day of that congress, I had to just scrape them up off the floor. It was the hardest show to get on the road you ever wanted to see.

Got to talking to them about withholds, told them what was wrong, and so forth, and they came right along with it. Laid into the organization along about Tuesday. They had by that time three British meters, and they all of a sudden had been finding that there was practically one missed withhold per question on the Joburg, and things like this. And their morale started going up. Everything started moving along very well in the field, and so forth. A lot of excitement about this.

Very funny. The people came to the congress with big plans on how to rewire and salvage American meters. And they took a look at the British Mark IV and saw the thing in operation and just scrapped the American meters. Actually, it was all over the floor that they should scrap American meters. Just skip them.

But Reg gave a demonstration, very ably done, and had an American meter element of all things in the projector, and we got a pc, a field auditor's pc, and he ran her there on the stage, and the withholds were pretty juicy. And they were all missed across the boards, and

Reg glancing back at me in the wings because it was an American meter, you know, should he pull more, you know, and I told him I thought there were probably two more. So although they weren't showing on the meter, he went right ahead and pulled two more.

And then, of course, I stepped on and told people, "Well, you see what missed withholds do." This girl, by the way, started looking very bright and so forth, after she had been looking rather gloomy at first. And I gave the auditor who audited her – I didn't even know his name, you see – I gave him hell and Maria and mischief, and said people shouldn't do that sort of thing, you know, and really cut it up. His mother wrote me a congratulatory letter saying it was about time somebody took him apart.

But anyway, anyway, it was a great congress, and things are really rolling very nice.

But there was a great deal of technical data suddenly swung into place while I was gone. Had some time to think and consolidate a few things. Got a look at havingness amongst other things, and havingness in its relationship to withholds. That was the main thing

And out of this you get Twenty-Ten on which you have just had a bulletin. I think you'll find Twenty-Ten really makes a pc soar. If it doesn't, you haven't got his withholds off or you haven't got his Havingness Process. But in view of the fact that a withhold cuts down havingness – that's all you can say about that, a withhold cuts down havingness – and when you get the withhold off, all you have is potential new havingness.

I better start at the beginning. This is the 9th of January, and this is the mystic month. The mystic month, 9 Jan. You know what a jann is, don't you? It's a ghost from Arabia. And this is the mystic month. This is month of mystic mystics. We're going to cure them this month.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This business about havingness, now, this is very important. Havingness had as many as forty-three different reasons why it worked. And you'd be very interested that it came down to a child's definition. The sixth lecture of that Washington congress, by the way – January 52 [62] congress – one whole hour is devoted to this, and so forth. And a very concise rundown, if I say so myself. I'm going to give it to you in about thirty seconds. That is to say, that havingness is best understood by no-havingness. And I had this in the bullpen for, oh, I don't know, seven years, trying to get the common denominator of what havingness was so that it could then be applied to auditing, and so on.

And all of a sudden, Reg ran some havingness on me, and I kind of took a look at it, and we had an error going in the session, and all of a sudden boom! Why, I suddenly realized what havingness was. It's best understood by the reverse definition. What is no-havingness?

No-havingness is the concept that one cannot reach. I know this is so elementary it's going to take you twenty-four hours for it to dawn on you. Anybody knows this, you know. Everybody always knew this except nobody knew it until the other day.

No-havingness is prevented reach, in other words. Concept of no reach, no-havingness. All right. And then havingness is simply the concept that one is able to reach, and that is all havingness is. One merely has to have the idea that he can reach something in order to have it. You see, you don't have to reach it in order to have it. You merely have to have the concept that you can reach it. And that is havingness. And out of forty-three chances in which this definition did not occur, we all of a sudden have a common denominator to havingness.

Now, this is of tremendous value to you as an auditor. We're back, of course, on Reach and Withdraw. And we're back into the common denominators of communication and all these old-time proven truths. And we're right there, you see. And that is, Havingness fits right into the bracket at once.

So now I'll give it to you with the twelve-inch-gauge barrel. On the other hand, a person with a withhold, of course, has the concept that he can't reach. So withholds reduce havingness. I mean, that's… And therefore running withholds improves havingness. It is so elementary. There is nothing really to it, except it is one of these sweeping truths like the world is round. I mean, it'll make that much difference.

All right. Now, let's look at this. Let's look at this a little bit further.

This tells you that the moment when a pc has released a withhold, he has a potential reach. And if you don't capitalize on it in the very near future, of course, he doesn't realize that anything new or strange has happened to him, very often. He gets off a withhold and it doesn't do him any good.

You've seen that happen, you know? The fellow gives up a withhold and all of a sudden it doesn't seem to do him any good. Well, the reason it doesn't seem to do him any good is he hasn't practiced reaching since. You're waiting for the accidental: Three or four days from now he all of a sudden finds out he can reach in that particular quarter, don't you see?

Well, instead of leaving it on automatic and just letting him find out about it suddenly, well, straight away, why, after you've pulled a few withholds run some Havingness, that's all. And you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness, and you run the withholds, and you run the Havingness.

And the reason I tried to figure out some reasonable ratio – and that auditors can remember it is the better reason for the exact ratio than any other reason – call it Twenty-Ten, and that's twenty minutes of withholds pulled and ten minutes of Havingness, no matter where you're sitting in the withholds, see? No matter what part of the question you've gotten,

whether you've gotten a question flat or not flat, it doesn't matter because you're going to come back to that question anyway.

I had to do some experimental workouts on this to smooth it out, and that apparently is the way it sits. So it doesn't matter then, you just say, "Well, we'll come back to this question later," or anything you care to say to the pc, and, "Right now we're going to run some Havingness."

And just do that on the twenty-minute mark, and you'll find that you're – if you run the Havingness ten minutes, why, you're all set. Now, the rule of Havingness is you should run Havingness until the pc can have large objects in the room. But you know very well that a lot of Havingness Processes out of the thirty-six don't tell you whether the pc can have large objects or not.

Now, Havingness will run to a rise in the needle and then a blowdown. You'll get a rise, rise, rise, rise, rise, rise. You watch the needle, and the tone arm keeps following it on up, on up, on up, on up, and all of a sudden the tone arm blows down.

Well, it would be optimum to run it to blowdown if some pcs didn't wait for two or three sessions to blow down. So that's why we don't use blowdown as a criteria when to stop running Havingness. Just run it ten minutes. That's good enough, and you'll find out that will do a lot of good.

Now, test the havingness after the first eight or ten commands. After the first eight or ten commands, get the second can squeeze.

In other words, when you start to run the Havingness, get the can squeeze. You get your needle set, you see, so that you'll get a third-of-a-dial drop or something like that. Just make a crude estimate of it. Swing your sensitivity back down, don't you see, from where it's been while you were security checking.

And get him to squeeze the cans and watch the degree of squeeze. Well, that's fine. Run eight or ten commands and ask for a second squeeze. And if it drops more, the needle drops more, and it is looser, you're all right, see? You're okay.

And if it doesn't loosen up at that point, of course, your rudiments could be badly out or something like this could happen, but the point is the Havingness Process should put the rudiments in.

In other words, you should get a loosening needle even – if the pc is doing it at all, you should get a loosening needle on the Havingness Process. So although some wisdom will occasionally monitor this and you will do something else like ask him if he has an ARC break or something like that, you ordinarily – and this practice would not go wrong at all – you would ordinarily get another Havingness Process. And you just keep testing for Havingness Processes. And that does not go on the Twenty-Ten. You see, that time stands alongside of the

Twenty-Ten. If you have to find a new Havingness Process, you don't count that into the Twenty-Ten. And then you find it finally, and you run ten minutes of that, and you go back to your withholds.

Now, you're going to find out that a pc – the more intricate or oddball the Havingness Process you find for the pc is, the more – higher probability is that it's going to wear out. And you usually come down to something like "Point out something." That will last a long time. "Look around here and find something you can have." When you finally get on to that and it's running smoothly, it generally will run practically forever.

But "What is the emotion of that room object?" you see? Oh, man, I mean, that thing can wear out, clang! By the way, that is a remark that is seldom made about Havingness Processes. That particular one, you know, is a changed process. After a little while the emotion runs out, and their Havingness Process changes – and you might not have known this – but changes to "What is the condition of that room object?" What is the condition of it instead of what is its emotion. But you realize that that thing changed. I don't think it's written down anyplace. I don't think it's written down anywhere. Might be. It might be in a lecture someplace. But there is that point about it. That one goofball thing

Now, getting back to Twenty-Ten, I would advise you, at this time, not to security check any other way because it capitalizes on your withholds. And you'll find out it should work like a hot bomb.

Now, if this is working properly and you are actually pulling withholds on the pc, and all is going along splendiferously, and you're not missing withholds at every turn, and so on, and the Havingness Process is working, you actually – running this on some character off the street, something like that – should produce some interesting miracles. I mean, some interesting things should happen to the case just as a result of this.

Now, there's another mechanic that I haven't told anybody, and that's this: The oldest test of circuits shows that when you run Havingness, when you run Havingness, the circuits key out and move out of the person's perimeter and out of his head. These black-mass circuits, that are mentioned in Book One, they key out and move out of the person's head.

Now, let's move right on into 3D here. The Goals Problem Mass with terminal, oppterm, terminal, oppterm, terminal, oppterm going on up the line, tremendous number of terminals and opposition terminals could make – if you drew them as circles opposite each other; a long series of circles vertically, one opposite each other, one representing the terminal, the other representing the oppterm – they would represent what you might call the main chance, the main line. Those are the terminals, and those are the opposition terminals as the person has deteriorated down the track until he finally became human here.

And that is the main chance. That's the main track. And when you're trying to get a 3D package, what you want is the main chance. You don't want a whole lot of locks.

Now, if you'd consider that as these two circles facing each other, see, and then below that two circles facing each other and two circles facing each other below that, and so on, as it went on down the line… Now, as you get down lower and lower and lower, you're getting more and more to present time. Let's plot it that way. All right.

Now, back there about the middle of the patch or toward the beginning of track or middle of track, or something like that, just as an example, you have a whole bunch of lock valences. Now, they depend on the main terminal and the main opposition terminal for that particular period of the track, but they are locks. And they confront each other, and they face each other, and they are just little offbeat valences.

And there are so many of these that a pc almost has one for every type of personality there has ever been. I don't know if you're aware of the tremendous multitude of these lock valences. It's something like trying to count the stars in the Milky Way.

Now, what we're interested in is the main chance, the 3D package. There aren't very many of those, you see, and that's what holds all the rest of the bank together.

Well, if you've got the terminal and the opposition terminal for any given period, these will run. These will run very nicely. But – but you could get your hands on literally any one of thousands of subsidiary lock packages. And some of them run, oddly enough. Some of them look so close to something They look so near in and they register so nicely for a while that you actually could put your hands on a false 3D package if you were assessing people who were very bad off and very keyed-in. Why?

Well, let's say that one million years ago he had some kind of a game going and – he was a waterbuck and – oh, now you know I'm back, huh? And the other valence was a tiger, and you've got – now, hanging on to a waterbuck, you have a school of fish. See, water and water and there's a school of fish. You know, he got mixed up, and he was a fish for a lifetime or two, you know.

And then hanging on to this was a school. For some reason or other, there was a school where they taught waterbucks to be waterbucks or something of the sort. And hanging on to this a totally false valence – if you were going to try to run it as a 3D package; it's nevertheless there – we have schoolteacher. See, it's just a piece of this school. But that's hanging on to a school of fish, so that's hanging on to something else. In other words, some silly concatenation of this character, you see, all related in some wild, idiotic way, you see?

And over on the tiger's side of the thing, over on the tiger's side of the thing was, of course, another valence, tigress, is associated with that valence. And then for some reason or other, women who have tigerish habits, you see, is associated with that. And then a girl student, you see, hangs on to that in some mysterious way because she liked to lick her chops or something like that, you know. And she's hung over there on that side of the thing, you see?

Now, unfortunately, he has led a very enturbulated present time life, unfortunately. He's in a very much of an enturbulated state, and he's a schoolteacher in a ladies' seminar.

Well, now, that valence doesn't separate off the school for waterbucks – school of fish – waterbuck, you see, package way back there.

They're so inseparable, short of auditing, that that whole package pulls up into present time, and it makes the Goals Problem Mass have a great big curve on it into present time.

And on the other side, the oppterm, unfortunately, was matched at that point, so the oppterm curves into present time. And in present time, he would read schoolteacher versus girl student. If you were just asking for it, just off the bat, you'd get schoolteacher versus girl student. And it'd look like a 3D package. As a matter of fact, it'd stay in for a little while, a very little while. It'd read kind of sporadically and stupidly, and so forth.

Of course, it's been restimulated so the Goals Problem Mass is warped into present time. If you can get the idea of the mass ever having been straight, you see, which it probably hasn't been – but it has the potential of being straight; it has the potential of being a plotted time track.

And instead of being straight, of just being bent over from a hundred trillion years ago, let us say, down into now, on both sides – you see, it'd look like quite a snarl because it brings along with it a school of fish. And as a schoolteacher, he has always been deathly afraid of fish. This is inexplicable to him. And there's all kinds of other things in there. And if a woman were to look a little tigerish, why, he would either marry her or kill her. You know, sometimes there isn't much choice.

And so there is a Goals Problem Mass which will give you a scratchy needle. Gives you a dirty needle, scratchy. You can't read past it. He's got a horrible present time problem. He's a schoolteacher versus girl students. This is keyed in perpetually in session, has nothing to do with the first available terminal and oppterminal that you're going to run.

You're not about to find a waterbuck, and you're not about to find a tiger. You see, you're not going to get anything here but a big mess.

And you try to audit past this and you try to assess past this, and you're in difficulties perpetually. You can't quite figure out what's going on here. You know the pc has present time problems and yet he doesn't assess and all this kind of thing, and it's just all kind of haywire. Do you see, what's happened there is that the present enturbulance has caused one of these myriad of valences to match up in some kind of a pair up in present time, and they've got no business being in present time. And that makes unavailable other packages, so therefore the pc is more or less unassessable.

Now, your Havingness runs out circuits and runs out valences. And as a matter of fact, if you've ever been audited on some of the old skills, you may very well yourself subjectively have seen one of these things leave while you were running Havingness, seen it peel off.

Actually, you can do a really interesting clinical experiment. You can run a pc's havingness down by making him talk against strain, and you can see one of these things move in, and run some Havingness on him and see it move out. And it's peculiarly noticeable when it is a talking valence, you know – when it's a valence that actually talks – chattering valence. Because the pc at first will notice that it is speaking, and he will be speaking a certain way himself. And if you're very clever on the observation, what will happen next is the pc will start telling you what it is saying as the answers. And then the pc himself will not distinguish between himself and the circuit, but will merely dramatize the circuit that has just been keyed in.

And then you run some Havingness and it moves out, and the pc will again be telling you what it is saying, and then it goes on out, and the pc is not paying any attention to it and talking like himself.

This dramatization type of action can be keyed in and out, and sometimes in auditing you may have seen, actually, a black mass depart from you.

Well, now what holds a black mass in? Havingness, you see, is intimately associated with withhold. So as havingness drops, of course, one withholds harder so as not to lose anything so therefore, when a pc has withholds, he holds the circuits in, and his havingness remains low.

Now, you may have had this experience. You may have taken somebody and audited him for seventy-five hours on Havingness – I'd say some auditors here have done just that – and watch the fellow polish up to the nines – actually just look marvelous, you know? Everything is fine. Everything is going *beautifully,* and so forth. And he walks out about three feet off the floor. And twenty-four hours goes by and he still feels pretty good. And thirty-six hours and forty-eight hours and he's still alive. And sixty hours goes by and two weeks goes by, and where was your seventy-five hours? He has gone completely back to the original state. Well, how interesting. But I'm sure a lot of auditors here have seen just that thing happen. Now, what made him relapse?

You ran the havingness up in spite of the withholds. And the presence of the withholds pulled it back down again. So havingness, apparently, cannot remain stable in the presence of withholds. And when you get the withholds off and build the havingness up, you then are removing – as you take off the withholds – you are removing the reasons the havingness would drop again. Now, this is theoretical, but I think you will find it working out.

So in other words, this offers you an opportunity to be able to run Havingness without having it sag And you know, that would be wonderful because pcs get all polished up at the

end of a Havingness run and fall on their heads. All right. Supposing they got all polished up at the end of a Havingness run and didn't fall on their heads?

Well, the way to prevent their falling on their heads, of course, is get their withholds off. Hence, Twenty-Ten. And that is the design of Twenty-Ten.

Now, why should you run Twenty-Ten at all on a pc if I can give you such a thing as Criss Cross – which we'll take up in a moment. I might as well shoot you with 16-gauge, 12-gauge, 10-gauge, and 8-gauge loaded with buckshot and solid rounds, because I haven't been able to talk to you for some time. And I thought, "Well, I'll plot this out. And this week I will give you a nice lecture today, and I will take up the congress or something of this sort, and tomorrow I will take up perhaps Havingness, you see, and Twenty-Ten. And then Thursday I will take up Criss Cross, and so forth." But you know how it is. You have to get it all done at once, and so on. And I don't think I could withhold from you that hard on this much good news. It would be an actual withhold, so I said, "Well, I'll just let them have it with a grape and canister."

All right. Well, that wraps up Twenty-Ten. That's all you'll hear about Twenty-Ten except being scolded for not running it right. But this goes much further.

Let's take this seventy-five hours of preparation the pc should do, minimum, before he is assessed. Let's take this up, and let's see, now, that if the pc had keyed in to present time a schoolteacher and a girl student, and actually the waterbuck and a tiger weren't even available as part of the package, and these things would get some kind of a weird registry, and then the pc wouldn't go anyplace. And actually, he'd probably beef up the Prehav Scale and all sorts of things would happen if they were grabbed by some auditor in Cape Town or Sydney.

So some auditor just grabs these things, you know. He says, "Hey! It twitched. It twitched. Been sitting here for days waiting for it to twitch," you know. And see, "Well, that's the terminal. We got it now. Got the 3D package. Didn't clear him though. 3D can't be much good. He spun in. Of course, the thing didn't register when it was checked out. And it was checked out after we'd run it 125 hours. Funny thing though. I didn't have any trouble with the Prehav Scale. You know, everybody talks about bad Prehav assessments and difficulty with the Prehav assessment. I could take anything on the whole scale that was all alive the whole time."

Well, that kind of nonsense could immediately result, you see, from having a pc who was unassessable. Well, why would he be unassessable? He'd have these valences keyed in to present time, and every time you ask him for anything, they would simply bang He'd bang on a present time problem, don't you see? He'd keep banging on this present time problem, the terminals resulting to it, and they're attached to the Goals Problem Mass at some tremendously early period on the track. And they're very beefy, you know, schoolteacher – schoolteacher in the days where the child didn't get his arithmetic, and they hanged him, you

know. I mean, real vicious, you know? Something like the teacher at Saint Hill. And they – but totally unsuitable, and you can't assess past it.

Now, you run Twenty-Ten, the probability is that you will knock both of those out, and the Goals Problem Mass under Twenty-Ten should tend to straighten out, thus making available to you the main chance – the actual terminals and the actual opposition terminals of the pc on the whole track.

In other words, you've knocked these little button lock valences off like warts on an apple. You peeled the apple, and you found yourself a good apple and you ate it. But that's the way that would look. You see how that would be? Kind of interesting so you could run Twenty-Ten, straighten it out, and the pc could be assessed. All right. Providing it were done right. All right. So much for that.

We move right straight in, then, into 3D Criss Cross as a logical sequence. Why is it called Criss Cross? It's because you go from the right to the left and the left to the right, upgrading each time you go, and it makes Xes, till you get a whole series of Xes out of it so it looks like a criss-cross, and I thought that would be a good name for it.

The liabilities of assessment are great. Misassessment is very easy to obtain. It's one of the easier things to obtain. Some people hardly have to try at all, and they get a misassessment.

Now, in view of the fact that these little valences, as locks – actual little circuits and things like that – they won't look little to the pc, but they're little in comparison to the Goals Problem Mass. In view of the fact that these things can exist left and right, and as long as they are the only thing you've got, they'll continue to run.

In other words, you'll continue to get a knock on them somehow, although you haven't got the right one, see? And it won't be the right one at all, but it'll continue to knock, usually sporadically, but it can come in and out, and you'll keep getting a reaction on something like this, you know, like schoolteacher. Actually, the terminal was waterbuck, and it was a long way between a schoolteacher and a waterbuck, but the pc made it.

Now, if you don't deintensify that area of the package, you're liable to get the schoolteacher, not the waterbuck. His attention is on waterbuck via the schoolteacher, and you get him to look no further than schoolteacher, and there you land. Do you see how that could be? You're trying to get his attention on waterbuck, and yet you only get his attention on schoolteacher unless you get some kind of a stupid, sporadic read.

Now, the pc does not have to be in bad condition for this error to be made. Now, this accounts for a mystery which students have had here for some time, and that is how they can find an item, and the checker doesn't prove it out. And I have heard more students grinding their teeth, you see. It's the small, petulant sound you hear, grind, grind, grind. It's different

than sound of chewing gum. It goes slightly different. And you hear it out here in the hall, occasionally, when the pc has just been not checked out or the checker has gone ahead and found the – another terminal entirely. Well, what happened? What happened?

It isn't really that the student was wrong, and it isn't really that the student was right. The student didn't null the whole list. When you get a wrong item, the checker always finds that there are several other items on the list still alive. Well, why is this?

They might have seemed null, but they could have all gone null because the rudiments went out at one time or another, and as you walk by them, you X them out, because the rudiments were out. And then you got the rudiments in and completed your assessment on some other part of the list and never went back and read that earlier part of the list, you see, with the rudiments in. So you didn't notice they were still knocking.

Well, in other words, those things haven't been knocked out. Assessment by Elimination actually is pulling innumerable locks off the actual item. And while you've still got a half a dozen of these locks still alive, you've got enough charge on the situation that you can get a lock. You get a lock valence, and it isn't quite the right one.

Now, the checker takes it and works with it for a while. He finds out it goes out. It was probably almost ready to go at the moment you turned the pc in. Maybe you turned the pc in hastily, hoping he'd be checked fast so that it would stay in. But the checker going over this checks against the list items, don't you see, and goes down the list items, and actually releases the remaining valences, and then finds he's got the 3D item. It's a highly mechanical proposition. It shouldn't be considered very esoterically, because if you haven't nulled completely anything that was on the list, you'll for sure have some valences left.

You see, the pc has just called on valences when he's given you the list. He hasn't just dreamed up a bunch of wrong things. He sort of counted the warts on the frog, you know? You were looking for the frog, and he counted warts. And he counted and he said there was a – there were all kinds of kittens and cats, and there were lions, and there were circuses, and there were circus performers, and there were flags with stripes in them, and there were clotheslines, and there were old men with whiskers, and there were cages, and tigers, and men with whiskers, and that's all.

And you've gone off down the line, and of course all these things are associated with a tiger in his mind, you see? These circuses and circus performers and cages and whiskers and all kinds of wild things, you see? So you just keep knocking these things off, you know, and you'll eventually find the frog.

Well, if you've got several of those alive, his attention can still be stuck on the locks. He has never given you a free list. Don't ever think that a pc ever does. A pc does not think thoughts of his own while dealing with the Goals Problem Mass.

And when you get to be an old, hoary-headed veteran like myself, you never believe the pc in relationship to any part of the Goals Problem Mass because he's always talking to you *as* the Goals Problem Mass until you get an item nulled. It's quite remarkable. The pc that rises superior to his bank *does* exist, of course, and you do all the time when you audit.

You've just been finished off in a session, and they didn't finish anything off, and they didn't check the item out, and nothing occurred, nothing occurred, nothing occurred, you see. You didn't get the item. You're still in a big question mark as to what the item is, and our next stop is end of session.

And you go right into your next session and audit, see? And you audit somebody, and you do a creditable job. So you can rise superior to a Goals Problem Mass.

But a pc who has no necessity level or any reason whatsoever – any pc has no reason to rise above the Goals Problem Mass in any way, shape or form. There is no reason for the pc to do so, is there? He's just sitting there, isn't he? So if he says anything at all, I can assure you it has nothing to with anything but the Goals Problem Mass.

That's why you don't believe a pc about his own case, particularly in session. The pc will say, "Oh, yes, yes, I'm a wart. Yes, oh, that's me all right. Yes, yes. Oh, oh, yeah, sure. Circus performer. That's awfully good. Yes, circus performer. I'm an old man with whiskers. That's right. Because you see, I'm – actually been always afraid of cages. So really I'm a cage, except I'm a high wire performer, except I'm a flag with candy stripes." And he tells you he's all these things because his attention, of course, has been put by you on the Goals Problem Mass, and he expresses himself very thoroughly in this particular direction.

You see, his attention is on them and there is no reason for his attention to be on anything else. So you actually never find a pc actually being audited in the vicinity of a Goals Problem Mass who ever tells you anything but the contents of the Goals Problem Mass. Just make up your mind to that.

Now, you characters who occasionally believe a pc and take the pc's choice about some matter make me wonder sometimes because he's just running off like several phonograph records.

He says, *"Rrrrowr,"* and he gets there, and he says, "Circus performer." And he says, "Well, I've always been on high wires. I've always been deathly afraid of them, and that's why I am, and so forth. And this is me."

And it's absolutely true. Because he's in a valence, you see?

You think, at first glance, that there is only this type of valence. You think that there is only the type of valence which exists wholly as itself, and that you are looking for it, and it's not any other valences around it, see?

Examine your thinking on this subject and I think you will agree with me that you more or less have looked at this thing as it was one rock in the middle of the ocean, and you were looking for this one rock.

No, that's not true. The ocean is full of rocks. You're just looking for a big rock, that's all. And when you first start looking, all the rocks look the same size, and then you finally find one is bigger than the other, and it's on the main chance. Don't you see?

So that whenever the pc's attention is on one of these lock valences, he's talking to you squarely out of a lock valence. You put his attention on it thoroughly, so therefore you must never take his judgment because as a circus performer, he's even start – he'll even start using circus lingo. He kind of thinks that way.

And that's the way he tours through the bank. Lock valences. Think of a bag of raisins with an apple in it. And do you know, he can thoroughly dramatize any one of those raisins. And it derives its whole force and power from the apple, but because the apple is invisible, why, of course, you don't know what the apple is, and the pc usually can't quite describe the apple.

He starts to describe the apple and he tells you about another raisin, and he thinks about the apple, but he describes another raisin, don't you see? And it isn't until you've got a tremendous number of these raisins discharged or eaten or something – nulled out – that the pc says, "Well, how silly. How silly. Tiger. Tiger. Knew it all the time. Couldn't think of it. I don't know why I couldn't think of it, but couldn't think of it. *Rrroooowr.*"

Well, if you understand those characteristics of the Goals Problem Mass, and if you've got that taped, that it's a mass of goo, but it is goo which has molecular composition, you see. Any one of these valences will look as big as your head. They will. They don't – they aren't small. They aren't microscopic. Any one of them can be drifting around or appear to be drifting around while thoroughly tied to the Goals Problem Mass, so that your way through all this is a treacherous way.

You see, a pc doesn't give you much help. Of course, he does try to help you. Very often the pc rises spectacularly above the bank, even in a session. He rises spectacularly and he says, "Well," he says, "this is all fine, and it's so-and-so and so-and-so." And we've checked off so-and-so and so-and-so, and it's fine. But that could also be the valence of a judge that has suddenly come up, you see. And as an auditor, you just can't take that chance. Well, it's a judge, so he of course, he can adjudicate at that point.

If he slips a little bit, he'll say, "Well, off with their heads," too. It will sort of slip into the sentence structure.

So you're walking a very tough road, because although there may be just a relatively few vital combinations which are hanging gorgeously suspended in space, gorgeously sus-

pended in time – absolutely fantastic how they could continue to balance themselves this intricately so as never to discharge down through the trillennia – they have accumulated under themselves the most fantastic number of fellow travelers you ever cared to mention.

See, he's got a valence for everything he's ever been, and it gets hooked over onto the Goals Problem Mass. As long as the Goals Problem Mass is charged up, these things are liable to stick together and cross-associate, and so forth.

So the way to find one, of course – the most reliable way to find an actual part of the 3D package is with the goal. Let's find a real goal for the pc and a goal the pc has had, and it'll lead you straight into the main chance. That's 3D which is formal or standard assessment. You find the goal, you find the opposition terminal, you find the opposition goal, and you get the modifier, and you get the terminal, and so forth, and that's it.

And if the case is assessable, of course, that's perfectly workable. And the case could be put into an assessable state by enough preparation, and then you could go ahead and handle it on its standard way, just as you have been doing it.

All right. Is there another way to enter all this? Let me tell you now some of the liabilities of all this. one is, auditors have lost pc's goals lists. You know, that's one of your greatest liabilities. Pc then, when he writes up the goals list, doesn't ever give you the goal. You know? Because it was ticked and stressed, and then rejected in some way, in some fashion, he doesn't come up with it. It's so often true that if you can find the pc's original list, you can find the pc's goal. And if you can't find the original list, you've had it. You get the goal by bleeding down the meter and by doing all kinds of odd things.

And it makes a very tough, long assessment, and you're usually trying to find the goal anyway before the pc is any shape to be assessed, and it takes six weeks to no goal, you know. Rough deal.

Well, is there any way this can be short-circuited? Is there any way this could be short-circuited? Is there anything else we could do about this? And yes, there is. There's 3D Criss Cross.

Let's supposing the pc has had some preparation. Let's say the pc can be kept in session. Those as requisites. And let's say that some auditor has lost the pc's goals list after finding the wrong one and the pc's kind of ARC broke and it's all invalidated, and we don't know which goal was invalidated, so we don't know quite how to straighten out the invalidation, and it's all sort of rough. Is there any other way to go about it?

Well, the first and foremost method of going about it is to run General O/W on the pc, self – General O/W on self – and make a list of his answers: "What have you done to yourself? What have you withheld from yourself?" And make a list of his answers. This is a real slippery action here.

And then you up and say to him in this many words – you say to him, "Who would you treat like that, mate?"

And of course, this takes him by storm because he hasn't thought of this as an activity. He just thought of this as life. This was him, you see.

"Well, who would you treat like that?" you know. "What have you done to yourself?"

"Well, I've kept myself up late at night."

"Well, what have you withheld from yourself?"

"Bad news."

"What have you done to yourself?"

"Well, I've put myself in the hospital every time I've been feeling bad."

"Well, what have you withheld from yourself?"

"Well, I withheld from myself certain beverages such as coffee."

Goes on like this, and you say, "Well, who would you treat like that?"

And he says, "Gor, a sick person."

And you say, "Who else would you treat like this?"

And he gives you a very nice, neat list. You assess that list and you'll find some part of the 3D package. It's quite an interesting thing.

Be prepared, however, to also not find a part of the pc – of the 3D package because this one can slip to this degree – that you again find only a lock. See, that's not a sure-fire method. A sure-fire method is goal and standard, see?

But that gives you a starting point, and that is a thing which is perfectly usable and perfectly assessable. And if the thing does prove out, and if it does match up properly into a package, of course, you've got a 3D item. Of course, all 3D items are susceptible to test, and that is a way of entering a case because it gives you an item, bang!

All right. Now, let's take up more a specialized case. You may not have been aware of the fact that in this running of Routine 3D, one of your greatest liabilities is clearing the character. Yes, you can come up along the line and take your finger off your number and run a piece of free track. You know, there's free track outside the Goals Problem Mass, and you've had a long lot of look at free track. Most of the engrams you've run are actually pc's free track. This lifetime, in most cases, is free track except where this lifetime has been a total dramatization and a restimulation in an enturbulative area so that the person has had the Goals Problem Mass all his lifetime. Ordinarily, it'd be free track.

So you have free track and then you have the Goals Problem Mass, and these things are two different things.

All right. You got the Goals Problem Mass. Here it is.

Free track. You run the pc down this, and you can find a valence floating free, utterly and completely free, and audit it, and have it slope off to the side, sort of at right angles to the Goals Problem Mass, raise the pc's determinism like mad, everything goes along dandy, everything is beautiful, and the pc will clear without having taken apart the Goals Problem Mass, and this can happen to you running 3D. And you all of a sudden find yourself sitting there looking at a floating needle.

Well, having taught you how to make Clears in some cases, I now have to have the dismal pleasure of teaching you how to wreck them. How do you wreck a Clear? Well, it's very simple.

You take any goal on which the person was run and simply find its modifier, and he will no longer be free of the Goals Problem Mass. That is it. Hell make a head-on collision. So all you have to do is make a – actually just start groping in the direction of the modifier, and you've spoiled a Clear. And they spoil that easily. You can spoil them in auditing far more easily than you can spoil them in life. So you should know this about that because if you did ever accidentally make a Clear, you, of course, are up against it if you didn't know this other trick because nothing will read on the meter.

Yeah, a person feels fine. They don't think they need any auditing yet. Everything's wonderful. A few twitches here and there occasionally, but fine with them, you see. They're Clear. But they're only keyed-out as Clear.

So the trick is just find a goal they have run – or find a goal in any event – and get its modifier. And when you get the modifier, of course, that was still a sleeper, and it was contained in the Goals Problem Mass if it was found in the first place, and it pulls the whole Goals Problem Mass in on the pc with a *clunk,* and it is a pc again, not a C.

You should know this. You should also know why life can key in an oldtime Clear, and why, since 3D came out, we have had a general – any time anybody was indifferently assessed in the direction of his Goals Problem Mass, don't you see, even though he had been Clear before, he caves in as a Clear rather rapidly. You should know that. All right.

Now, it's a liability doing this because this can make a Clear. And that is about the only thing wrong with 3D Criss Cross, because you don't have a goal to key in the Goals Problem Mass if you accidentally made a Clear.

Because Criss Cross is getting a package without a goal, see. And then after you've got the terminal and opposition terminal, then you find the goal and the modifier and the opposition goal.

So you could go the whole distance here and wind up at the end with a terminal and an opposition terminal of some kind, but these things just by inspection just sort of went *phsssssst.* So early in the game, for heaven's sakes, find a goal for one of the items that you find. And I don't think that's in this bulletin. Just find a goal. Just take a moment out and find a goal. You've got an item, it's sitting there, it's banging good and hard. You're going to go on and find some more items. You're going to do some more Criss Cross on the thing, but this is early in the game, find a goal for that item. This item of the pc's – it's this kind of an item is, "Well, that's me. That's me. That certainly is me. I always… If I ever ran across one of them, I'd kill them, and so forth. I won't have anything to do with them personally, you see. That's me," and so forth.

He's in a kind of a mixed state with regard to this item.

And this item is reading beautifully on the meter, and so forth. Everything is going along gorgeously. Well, just let's find out what kind of a goal that person or that thing would have, and then find out what kind of a modifier it might have.

But you don't have to find the modifier right then. You don't have to find it because you can leave that off till later if the pc went Clear. Now all you'd have to do is remember you found a goal for this item. See, I'm talking about a fresh pc from someplace or another, you know, and you haven't got a goal yet. If you've got the goal, why, find a modifier for that goal, and your Goals Problem Mass will come right back in with a clang, and you can go on with your Criss Cross. Okay?

It does have this liability that a person will go Clear on it. Now, we're warning you against clearing people, you see? Life is tough.

Now, let's take a Clear – somebody who has been run through to Clear – and let's get an application of Criss Cross. Let's get the person to remember, this Clear to remember, the first goal, preferably, on which he was run. And let's find the modifier to it. Now, that spoils the Clear. That's the end of that.

And let's take the first terminal that was found. Now, he's only got one item, oddly enough. Just a terminal, see. There's no opposition terminal. Must have been the right one, however. And let's take that terminal and let's list: "Who or what would oppose that terminal?" Let's make a list, a long list of these things. And then, having made a long list, bleed the meter, make sure that you got all items. No more needle reaction on asking for further items, and eliminate by assessment until you are left with one item.

And then, having been left with one item, be sure it is the right item out of that list, and check it over just as carefully as you check over anything, but don't take forever about it.

"Who or what would oppose *that* item?" That new item. Do the new item in the same way. Now you get this. Get a list, "Who or what would oppose that?" and so on and etc., and so on and so on.

Well, this is rather unsatisfactory because it gives us a single track, and we're not getting a crisscross. We're getting a sort of a cross-stitch that has just got one side of the X each time, don't you see? And we're missing one half of all of this as we go. See, there's some more things mixed up in all this, and we know there are, and we will be missing them, and we will wind up with only one item. And we want two items. So let's find out, before he was cleared, let's do half of this this way, just as I've told you, you see.

We'll treat that first terminal he found as one of the items, and let's find out, before he was Clear, did he like or dislike that item that was first run on him to clear him. Before he was Clear, did he like or dislike it. And really make him remember this because it's quite important.

If he liked it, you now run the dislike list. If he disliked it, you now run a like list for your second item. And I'll go into that a little more fully in a moment, but that will give you two. Remember, then, that in a person who has had a 3D package already assess – I mean a 3, Routine 3 package already assessed, which is proven out, that you have one item already found. But it requires that you find the other item, another item, at the same time. And you are thinking, of course, "Who or what would oppose that?" gives you the other item, and it doesn't.

There are two tracks. A crisscross of two tracks runs through a Goals Problem Mass. This is what is difficult about it all. And you'll get a skip. You'll skip half of it. If I drew a picture here, you would see it very easily.

You've got your terminal, oppterm, each one represented as a circle. And you've got these two circles. Two circles, two circles, two circles, two circles, see?

Well, you're getting every other circle as you go up on a single side, and you need the X. You need everything connected to everything with a cross-slant, see? And you only got half of this thing if you're just assessing from a single terminal, see? You got the idea?

And it gives you a much more definitive look at the bank to have two sides to this thing.

So remember you have half of this done if a person has ever been assessed on Routine 3. You already have an item. Now, that's dandy. That's dandy, and just leave it at that.

But get the other side with a like or dislike test item. Now, this will all be very, very clean, clear and beautifully understood in about two seconds, so you can stop looking blank. Because let me tell you, now, what a Criss Cross would be from scratch. And this is from scratch.

One: You ask the pc, "What kind of person or being haven't you liked?" It's probably better to get the dislike off first. People dislike easier than otherwise.

Now, that's the burning question. "What kind of person or being haven't you liked?"

Now, if you said, "What person" or "Who or what," you see, he would give you "Aunt Agnes" and "Mabeline," and "George Bernard Shaw," and so forth. And these things are relatively useless to you. They're not sufficiently generalized, so you snake him into giving a generalized term, and you put yourself right up on top right away. And you make a *long* list of this thing.

Well, I frankly don't care whether you bleed this list or not. Just make sure it's a nice long list. Don't let it go to fifteen hundred items or something like that. Any one of these – I would consider a hundred an unusually long list. A hundred items, *aaaah,* that's pretty long Be perfectly prepared to go to that and if the pc gives it to you, well, take them. But this is getting awfully lengthy at a hundred, you see. Eighty. Eighty would probably be more natural. Average list might very well be no more than fifteen, twenty, see? So that's why I say a hundred would be awfully long

All right. "Who or what haven't you liked, mate?" would produce "Aunt Agatha," "Mabeline," "Uncle Bill," and so forth, and we want "a disagreeable bum," see, "a cockeyed marine," "a parachutist." See? We want burning items that will go backtrack and "Aunt Mabeline" will not go backtrack.

So we have this. Now, it doesn't give us the pluralities that we might get. And you could vary the question so that you got plural answers, like "criminals." And you can say, "What kind of people or beings haven't you liked?" if you wanted to go into that. However, this doesn't require all that precision.

I tell you that on 3D Criss Cross, you can blow your brains out with precision that is not necessary. You would remind me of the ensign, who, having taken a sight with a sextant he left out all night and sat on and dropped on the deck, and had its prism missing, and besides didn't get the North Star but shot the truck light, then goes in and by the hour calculates with the greatest, neatest, mathematical precision that he is within six and a quarter millimeters of a certain drop of water in the ocean, you see? Calculation is terrific, you see, and the data from which he is taking it is the roughest kind of a shotgun shot that anybody ever had, see?

Because this is a real shotgun shot, you see? The possibility of his actually coming up with a 3D item with his test list is quite remote. Because you're not asking him against any goal. You're not asking him against any stable data. He doesn't even really know what you're asking him for.

But you get a nice, long list. And then number two, you null that list and locate one item that remains or was last in.

That means you would actually be allowed to go down the line and have them all null except "a machine." And "a machine" was the last one in. So the machine was the last one in. Well, it had something to do with something

Now, supposing you had the terrific misfortune of being left with three alive that you couldn't get rid of. Well, you either have three powerful locks or maybe even three 3D items. Well, it doesn't mention it in this bulletin, but all the time you're working with this, you keep a data sheet over here. And every time you find an item or something on the pc, mark it independently of the lists. In other words, keep all the lists too, and keep them circled, and do anything you want with that, but you find you wind up with an item, you also write it over here on this data list, see, and any other data that you want to write with it so you can identify that item.

All right. We take off, then, with this as a test item. We call that a test item, the item we found resulting from this list.

See, that's a very simple operation. Anybody could do this. You can do this on almost anybody. You could actually do it on somebody who was relatively unassessable, which is quite interesting – which makes it very interesting to you, extremely interesting.

Now, you come over here and write that item in, whatever it was, anything you want to write about it. Now, the one thing I want you to remark on such an item list is what gave the pc somatics. That I want you to remark on. Any time the pc said *ouch* or he had a pain – an actual pain, not a sensation – why, write it down. Somatic. And any time he had a *groove* of energy going through his *goozlum,* and it was giving him a sensation, you write down *that* as part of that item. And also when listing, and he calls any of this to your attention. It was Buffalo Bill he passed by, and you're nulling Buffalo Bill, and he suddenly looks at it, and you say, "What's the matter?"

And he says, "Well, I had an awful pain of an arrow going through my back at that moment."

And you say, "Well, that's very interesting," and write opposite "Buffalo Bill" – on the nulling list, not on the main list – write "somatic," see?

You see what we're doing We're being very smart. We're tracing so that we can identify the terminal when we finally wind up, see? And we can finally look back through and scout down and find the terminal right on the button. So this is a neat way of going about it. All right. So much for that.

We have now nulled one list, and we have wound up with one test item. We've written it over here on a separate sheet of paper, and we have clearly marked it a test item. That doesn't mean that it's a 3D item.

All right. Now, we turn around and we ask the pc, "What kind of person or being have you liked?"

Now, I don't care how strong you make this. Some pcs are stronger than others, and some pcs would much better respond to "Whom have you absolutely, completely, detestably, despised with hatred?"

And the pc smiles, you see, and he thinks that is very nice because it includes everybody he ever ran into.

And on the other one, you'll find pcs that incline in the other direction, and you have to say to them – not "What kind of a person have you liked?" You see – you'll have to say, "Whom have you desperately adored?" Don't you see? "Whom have you loved?" You see? That sort of thing

You can make these as strong as it seems to appeal to the pc. You know, you say, "Well, what kind of person have you liked?"

And the pc looks at you rather tepidly, you see, and says, "Well, well, just people, just people."

"Yeah, well, whom have you – what kind of person have you loved?" you see?

"Oh, men, men. Usually men."

Well, shift your question around: "What kind of person have you absolutely, thrillingly adored?"

And he says, "Well, there's just schoolteachers, uh, schoolteachers, librarians, uh, railroad engineers, uh, professional men, yes," you see?

You ask them the question that gets them the list. But remember that it's the love-hate duo that you're using here. You've already assessed for hate or dislike, and you're not going to assess for like or love. And you're going to make another list, and you're going to ask the pc that. And then you're going to null the list and locate one item as in two. And that again is a test item, and you put it over here.

And when you've got the first test item, you had better write whether or not it produced a somatic or didn't produce a somatic, and you had better also say "liked" or "disliked" on those two items to identify the list. Okay?

If it was the liked list, you write "liked," and if it was the dislike list, you write "disliked" on it. That gives you a little further clue, you see?

All right. Now, you're off to the races. You've got two points located in nowhere but which are, nevertheless, takeoff points. And these are just test items. They're not 3D items at all.

Now. Now, you play the old game which you know so very, very well. On each one of these, you're going to run: "Who or what would oppose that (blank)?"

So you take a piece of paper and you write across the top of it: "Who or what would oppose a schoolteacher?" – what you wound up with, see. And you get a long list of whatever it is, and you proceed on through. You bleed it down if you can, and then null the whole list.

One of the ways of bleeding down is asking the pc, "Well, are you satisfied that any of those items are it?" And it sometimes will produce a search for some additional items. That's almost as good as bleeding the meter. That's just a little side trick I've used. "Are you satisfied that any of the items you've given me are it?"

And then he has to inspect this thing, you know, and he says, "What was the question again?"

"Well, the question was, 'Who or what would oppose a schoolteacher?'"

"Well, have we written down inkwells?"

And "Well, all right." You see, and that's just the same as bleeding the meter.

Then if finally you null the remainder, and so forth, he says, "Well, that's it. That's it. It is inkwells. Yeah. I got it. That's why the mass is black. I know now. I understand that." He even has a cognition on it, see?

Now, that is your first possible 3D item. The remaining item. Now, that's highly probably a 3D item. But you write it down whether it had a somatic or not and whether it proceeded from the other item or not. In other words, this was an item which proceeded from a "Who or what (so on)?" But we don't really care whether these two match up or the list is kept that neatly straight because this thing has run to collision, is what it has run to.

You're taking two different tracks, and they're going to come on to a head-on collision eventually.

Then we take the second item, the second test item, we do the same thing with it – identically the same thing with it. And we run that on down. And we get another potential 3D item, and that will probably either be the term or oppterm. And you've got a package there that possibly you could do something with, but we don't do anything with it.

We use those two items now, and we take a new sheet of paper, and we write on top of it one of them, and we make a list of who or what would oppose it, and we bleed it down, and we null that whole thing, and we write that over here on the list, you see?

And then we take the second one that we actually found, we write that on a sheet of paper, and we write a list for that, and then we bleed it down, and we null the whole thing, and that gives us another item.

And we just keep on collecting items. And we just go on and on and on and on collecting items until we can't collect anything else.

And we say, "All right. Who or what would oppose a waterbuck?"

And he says, "A tiger."

And we say – we'd say, "Well, that ended that list." And we try to bleed it down, and we get nothing but a rock slam, see.

All right. "Who or what would oppose a tiger?"

"A waterbuck."

All right. And you'll find out those two lists will eventually collide. Even though they started rather far apart and went through tremendous vicissitudes, and you found lots of items, you now have guaranteed that you've got 3D items. You couldn't have anything else.

See, that is just assessment by *kwam!* You also have walked well upgrade while you were doing this. And you have also blown several sacks of raisins. They're now went. So there you go. You'll wind up then with a package. It becomes impossible to get any other package. See?

Now, you go ahead at that point and find your goal, and you find your opposition goal, and you find the modifier to the package, and you get the package all taped out. And that's the package, and that's the way it is.

Now, make fairly sure, make pretty darn sure that as you get these items, they're not wrong items because that can throw you a curve and walk you back out of the Goals Problem Mass, you see? Let's make sure that that item hung fire. Let's make sure that item stayed in. Let's make sure this thing didn't go astray. Let's do it with the rudiments in, and let's be careful as we proceed.

All right. There's one further note to make on this because, of course, if you get the wrong item, you're taking off from a lock, and you are not likely to travel the same course as you were taking off from an actual item each time.

1 This cuts down restimulation

2 It has fantastic therapeutic repercussions on the pc. In spite of himself, he feels much better. He can't argue about this one. He's blowing them in all directions, and

3. It cuts down the amount of error which you might make because even if you missed on one of the curves, your possibility is that you just lengthened the number of assessments

you had to do. You've just given – you've had to do some additional assessments before you got back into the mass again, and

4. Gives us a method of upgrading which runs like this: A pc got a package. Pc already got a package. Pc now running package. Pc very happy with package. Pc all set with package. Everything going beautifully with package. You can crisscross it. You take the package the pc has got and you crisscross it.

The funny part of the thing is, you will go on a grand tour, and the probability is that if he was running a center track package or a rather early track package, he'll walk back into the same package again, but this time with terrific clarity. He'll feel wonderful about this package, you see. And this also runs very quickly and will discharge very rapidly.

In other words, you can go on the complete excursion of Criss Cross and get back to the package again, which is rather startling. And you will have blown off all the locks that were making it hang fire. You know, it would have run anyhow, but you can blow all these locks perforce by recognition and he knows what they were surrounded by and how it all links up together now, and so forth, and he's in better shape.

We were trying this a little bit earlier. I was telling you an upgrade, and all you did was go ahead and find a new package of some kind or another, and the pc became considerably depressed because he didn't think he was going to get a chance to run his old package. And the new package didn't appeal to him as much as the old package did, or something like this, see?

Well, in this particular way, if that was the package he should have been running, believe me, he'll come right on back and run it. And if it's not the package he should have been running, then he would have been on it much longer, and he will come into the package he is running But he will now know what package he is in the middle of and how.

Now, there's nothing wrong with continuing to run a pc on a package he is running well on. Nobody is asking you to do otherwise than this. But also part of running that very package would be to do a Criss Cross on it. You could just start out. Now, you take his terminal and run "Who or what would oppose that?" Pay no attention to the oppterm he's already got, you see? You don't keep that on the list.

By the way, don't keep any old items on. Don't carry an item forward on the list.

Well, you got a Criss Cross from "a waterbuck," see? And it wound up with "a tiger," see? And then – you null down and you've got "a tiger." And now you do a new list of "Who or what would oppose a tiger?" Don't perforce put "waterbuck" on it, see? Put only on each list each time what the *pc* has given you. See, don't carry your old item over. You'd have a tendency to do this because all it does is start hanging the pc with what he already has. If it's

right he will move right on back to it anyhow anyway, and there you'll be at. Very simply. Okay?

In other words, you can take any package a pc is running and go on a conducted Cook's tour of the Goals Problem Mass, blow off locks in all directions, soften the whole thing up, blow a tremendous number of cognitions, and you will either walk back to the exact one he is running or an upgrade that will run better. And it's quite amusing that it will go back to the same package again after turning all the way around through a tour of the bank – if it is a middle track package. It's quite funny. It's quite funny.

But having done this, you will find you come back to running the package, and he will now have pictures when he wasn't running with good pictures before. In other words, it takes that much charge off of it.

Now, your next action with this: You can take a pc who is having present time problems all the time and run a Criss Cross on him without even intending to get a 3D package, and you will produce some of the wildest changes he ever cared to have. Quite interesting.

You're not even interested in getting a 3D package. In other words, you've got a day or two to audit this pc, and you want to produce a remarkable change on the pc, and you can read his needle, and you can keep him in session. Well, you could go ahead and do the first few steps of a Criss Cross, and it'll land right squarely in the middle of the present time problem he's sitting in. That's the first thing it hits.

See, and he feels wonderful about this sort of thing. So it stands as a totally independent operation, if anything else, which I think is quite amusing

Well, now, that is quite a package, and that's quite a bag of tricks all by itself. And it has many uses. As I've studied it over, I've seen tremendous numbers of uses to this thing

One of the uses is prove up a package. Well, you got the package on a standard run. You had the pc's goal, so you went ahead and found the rest of the package, and so forth, and you found the opposition terminal and there it sits. And you say this is all fine, and this is ready to run. Good. Run a Criss Cross on it and run it until it can't be anything else, and then for sure you have the package, don't you see?

The other thing is, it is an excellent way of finding out which is the terminal because as you run down the list every time the pc says ouch, you mark what made him say ouch. And you will rapidly find out which side of this stuff the pc is normally on. Is the pc on the no change side of the ledger, always?

You look at it, you know. You say, "Well, what do you know."

You can finally wind up at the other end and you will always hit it right on the button. In other words, you never have to do a test run, one side, then the other side, or make the pc dizzy or uncomfortable or anything like that because he's already been saying *ouch.*

Just every time he said *ouch, you* looked at what you were nulling at that time or looked at the item that you were putting down as the "ouch" item, and this "ouch" item will be the terminal every time. Very interesting. And that every time he got dizzy and foggy and upset in some fashion or other, or had electronic sensations going madly across the fields in front of him – in other words, he had sensation that didn't add up to any change or somatic – you were probably running the oppterm at that time.

In other words, you were nulling the oppterm. So you quickly find out that "people who change everything around" is inevitably the oppterm, and "people who never change anything" is inevitably the term. And you'll find out that's the way he's sitting And that's the attack line he's always been on.

And you'll find some other pc, he quite likely has as change… You see, then, not all games are change-no change. I'm just giving the idea they could be any kind of a – well, any of your Scientology combinations can make up one of these games. He's always the create side of the ledger, see. *Ouch, you* know.

You say, "Well, a design engineer."

"Ouch," you see.

And you're going over it, and he says so on and so on and so on. And he says, "A pain at the back of my neck and so forth," and you've got it all set. And you scratch it all out, and you just mark in – "somatic," see? You'll find these things get studded with somatics, you know.

And then over here on your final recapitulation list, you'll have "somatic" marked in here. Design engineer, painter, sculptor – somatic, somatic, somatic, somatic. Town builder, planet designer. You know, they're all *ouch, ouch, ouch.* And destructive types who insist on no creation of any kind whatsoever – they're always *dzzzzzz, you* know, *dzzoo-wuug, you* know, or zzzzzz. In other words, the winds of space, that kind of phenomena.

And you'll get it as you run down the bank. And you – of course, after you've done a lot of these things, you can spot them, and you will know which side is which. You can hit it right there. Put the commands together; the pc will run like a shot duck.

All right. Now, you've got something to learn then, haven't you, because some of you I've seen take… This was much earlier of course, and doesn't apply to now for the older students, but applies definitely to those people who are here recently. If they have an idea that it takes two or three sessions, or preferably two or three weeks, to write down a – I'm sorry to get sarcastic like this, but I have to do that. I ran a lock off of "a sarcastic professor" the other day, so I have to take advantage of this because I'm free to do it now, you see? And I used to just writhe under this. This made me wince because it was defeating everything in the shop.

Two or three weeks to write down twenty labels or items, you see, or test items, and then assess them and null them all. This didn't seem to me to be optimum.

I would consider that if you could not find three or four test items in a session, you were slipping Just raise your sights. Of course, that's impossible. I have a hard time auditing that fast myself. Oh, I'll give you something to shoot at.

I will settle for an item per session. I'll settle for an item per session, because that's what it's been taking me. But that is not too difficult, an item per session. But don't you go dragging out two sessions with no item. Not on Criss Cross.

On standard 3D package – oh, yes, by all means. Getting them checked out, proving them up, all that kind of thing – oh, yes, that's a different proposition entirely, but not on this.

First place, they're very easy to find; in the second place, they're very available; in the third place, the pc gives them out; the fourth place, the pc is in-session just *obsessively. You* start running these things, of course, he's in one valence, then he's in another valence and he's another valence and he's another valence and he starts to look like a raisin. Just one right after the other, *bangety-bangety-bangety-bang* And he gets – he's really in there tight.

All right. Well, that is Criss Cross. That is Havingness. That is Twenty-Ten. And of course, there are a lot of other things I could tell you, but at the present moment, you haven't got the time, so well have to take it up later. All right?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.