HOW TO DO 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on
18 January 1962

Thank you. Thank you.

And this is the 18 Jan. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. Well, I can stand up today.

This is about the Goals Problem Mass, how to do 3D Criss Cross. And those of you who are now struggling to attain Class I so that you can study for Class II probably will have to review this one later. But this is a good time to find out about this.

There are several things to know about the Goals Problem Mass. There are several things, and there are several things to know about assessment.

There are two leading auditor skills. And these are the skills included in Class II, and those give you Security Checking, Model Session, TRs, Havingness, how to find the Havingness Process; gives you Problems Intensive techniques, that sort of thing And if you 11 notice that these are all assessment type things, they're meter reading type things – to use the word *assessment* very carelessly – they are meter reading type things – in other words. It requires auditor decision on the meter. And in the whole body of Class II skills, there is only one fatal error that can be made in reading a meter.

This meter error is fatal because it brings about an ARC break of magnitude on the part of the pc, and all ARC breaks spring to some degree from this area. And that is the missed withhold.

So you could make a pile of errors in Class II skills. You could make a lot of errors of one kind or another, and your pc would go on getting better. Now the pc would recover and you'd get rid of this as long as you didn't miss any withholds. Well, the way to get over that one, of course, is to constantly be asking the pc, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" don't you know.

And of course, underneath your – your Model Session skills, you can miss a rudiment, I didn't think this was possible, but you can miss a whole rudiment with considerable consequence.

You know, you ask the question, "Well, is it all right to audit in this room?" And you just miss it clean. And it's not all right to audit in this room, and then you'll have trouble. And

it isn't the type of trouble usually which causes the pc to go out and commit suicide or anything, but this is your screaming ARC break, the pc becoming very furious – all of these various mechanisms come straight out of the general classification "missed withhold," subclassification additional is "a missed rudiment."

And the reason for this is that you get an invalidation of the meter, an invalidation of what you're doing You evidently don't know what you're doing because you can't read his mind. Pc evidently makes the demand that you're able to read his mind at any given instant, particularly with the meter. And he then is made to withhold, analytically, something that was a reactive withhold, and it's a half-know. And he, in trying to withhold this but trying to give it at the same time, keys in his reactive bank, and he caves in one of these dramatization things. So you find the pc dramatizing immediately after this because you've knocked in what? A Goals Problem Mass valence. See, you just can knock one in just like that.

So although you could audit all of Class II in total ignorance of a Goals Problem Mass, you should know what happens when the pc ARC breaks.

Probably a vast mystery to some Class II auditors – why the violence of the ARC break on some pcs. Well, there are two reasons for this. One is the modifier going into action. But that reason, of course, is because the pc has had to withhold, which has keyed in the Goals Problem Mass and then, having had to do that, then he dramatizes the modifier. In other words, he dramatizes the package actually. And he sits back watching himself do this, and he said, "How can I do this?" Well, he can do it very easily. Actually, hell become quite – can be made to feel quite ill.

It isn't ill because he has overts on the auditor, worse luck. He feels ill for another reason, is that you keyed in a valence hard. And the way to key in a valence hard is to miss a withhold – and subcategory, miss a rudiment. Just the mechanics of the thing That's enough to know. All you've got to do is miss a withhold, miss a rudiment, and your pc is dramatizing. He is not now in-session, and you have, in his mind, apparently attacked the pc and have supported the reactive bank.

It's all under the old *Original Thesis. You* see, you – the pc – a thetan – plus the auditor is greater than the reactive bank, you see? But the – delete the pc from it totally, and you have the auditor probably a little bit less than the reactive bank. He can do quite a bit in that direction, but it's not an optimum session by a long ways. And now let's get the pc versus the auditor and the reactive bank, and of course, you have a situation at once in which the pc – now that the auditor has sided with the reactive bank, you see – is totally incapable of holding it. And he goes into a flat spin. Because look, walking about in life, he has trouble keeping this reactive bank under some kind of control, you see? And now the auditor has turned on him. So you have a condition where the auditor is on the side of the reactive bank, so now the thetan thinks he has to handle the reactive bank plus the auditor. And he knows he can't do

this, and so he just goes *zzzzzzoooooom,* see, and he just keys in all over the place, and it makes him quite ill.

But that's about all that can happen in a Class II skill. There isn't much else can happen. You can't make a person – you can't key them in permanently or damage them to any great degree. You can miss within that framework. You can miss the withhold. You can – you miss the withhold and you miss the rudiment, you're in trouble, but you can miss all other kinds of things, you see?

You do a Problems Intensive. All right. The auditor just doesn't get the word. He runs the thing on other-determined changes. He makes a long list of other-determined changes.

He says to the pc, "All right. Now, when did you decide to change?"

And the pc says, "Well, well the biggest change in my life was when I had a tonsillectomy."

And so the auditor puts it down, "tonsillectomy," you see.

"And when was another big change in your life?" The auditor Qs-and-As to this degree. And he finally has a list of engrams. He doesn't have a list of postulates to change at all, you see. So he's got a long list of engrams. So he goes ahead and assesses these things, you see. And, of course, if you've got just one engram in the list, it'll assess. And you'll come up with the engram, of course, and that isn't what you're trying to do at all. You're trying to get the prior confusion to the problem.

Well, then, of course, we – he says tonsillectomy is what assesses out. "Well, what was the problem connected with that?"

"Well, the problem was how to keep the doctor off me ruddy neck, that was 'ow." That was the problem. So that's fine. The auditor can put down, "How to keep the doctor off of his ruddy neck," you see, and he's all straight.

And he says> "What was the prior confusion to that?"

"Well, kicking the doctor in the shins and screaming." And, you know? You could get a lot of things. And he goes ahead, and he runs an engram. Of course, he's kind of surprised at the other end of this. It hasn't done much good for the pc. But he hasn't damaged the pc. He's even improved the pc slightly. In other words, it can be that sloppy a job of listing and metering See, that could be sloppy, and you could still make it very nicely.

You get missed withholds of one kind or another. Well, you pick up the missed withhold that the pc thought was missed. You pick that up and you clean it up. And if you keep those things cleaned up, then you could even make a boo-boo like "Were you ever dissatisfied?" Let's think that's a Security Check question, you see? "Were you ever dissatisfied?" And the auditor tries to clear this, and "dissatisfied," and he can't quite clear it

up, and were you ever – he decides to compartment. He's heard someplace you compartment questions, so he compartments "dis-" and "satisfied." And things keep reacting in some fashion, you see, and he fuddles around and falls on his head.

Asks the pc later if he's missed a withhold, "And well, you have missed a withhold. I was dissatisfied while you were doing that." And this might straighten it up, see. He's – he still will get away from it with his life. That's just very inexpert, but it isn't going to kill anybody.

Now, of course, in such a thing, "Were you ever dissatisfied?" – well, probably the reverse of the thing, and an auditor who really knew his business, would say, "Well, have you ever made anybody dissatisfied? Is that the way it is?"

"Well, yes," the girl says, "as a matter of fact, that's my specialty." And we're right into the middle of the case with a crash, you see, and we pull a lot of stuff off by the yard and so on.

But the Class II Auditor skill, done by somebody who is in training for Class II or something like that, why – it could be done sloppily is what I'm telling you, see? It could be done sloppily beyond those ramifications. You'd still get away with it. Now, that isn't true of Class III. We have immediately crossed the Jordan. And you start getting one of these things wrong, you're just in endless trouble.

Now, we're – in handling 3D I've tried like mad to minimize the amount of difficulty that an auditor will have. And we have a pretty good job of it. Done a pretty good job of minimizing the amount of difficulty, minimizing the lack of consequence. Il1 tell you, the amount of consequence to the pc – worked on that hard. And we have patterns of assessment here which arrive with something.

But I'll give you here, at first glance, some of the errors that you might immediately and directly run into in handling a 3D Criss Cross.

You get a test item, and the rudiments go out, and you don't check it thoroughly, and your test item comes up as the wrong item on the list. The odd manifestations will be mostly disinterest on the part of the pc. The pc really will be rather disinterested. He's not sure that this is – this is doing him any good or something like that.

Now, you assess an oppterm from this test item. You get a list, you see, and the list goes null. And you get the rudiments in, and the list goes null. And you get the rudiments in, and the list goes null. Well, you just went up the wrong bank. That's all. You just went up the wrong track. You see, whenever an item is wrongly assessed, you get slackening of interest on the pc. It's a sort of a cousin to a missed withhold, you see? And you get a slackening of interest on the pc. The pc won't be terribly interested in listing this next list, and it'll usually go null. And you're suddenly – you've lost a channel. It's just gone, you see?

Now, if you did this clear across the top after your – all these types of things by which you could get a test item – see, after you've done all of these things; supposing you did a careless assessment all the way across the top? See, every test item, let us say, was done with a Pasadena-type assessment – supposing every one of them, see?

Well, the auditor down along the bottom line would suddenly wind up with no items, everything null, the pc very bored and a little bit upset. And the auditor would wind up with the conclusion that, well, it just didn't work. Or something didn't work and he wouldn't quite understand why. You see, it just all evaporates in smoke because of the inaccuracy of the thing

In other words, inaccuracy on a 3D Criss Cross results in no attainment, see? Class II, you can make a mistake and you still get a little win or a gain. Class III, you make a mistake, you wind up with exactly no attainment and you're fortunate if you don't wind up with a negative attainment.

Now, let's say we had five wrong test items, and then we had this auditor with vast enthusiasm force items in along the line, you see – you know, demand that they go in. Or have them reacting because he suggested them to the pc or something like that, you see? And he winds up with some offball items that have nothing to do with the case. And now we run an oppterm from that. And all of a sudden the pc starts getting very dizzy or upset, or a somatic starts keying in but won't relieve. Nothing passes through. Then supposing, as the auditor went on, assessing from a wrong item, forcing an – a wrong oppterm, then gets a new list and forces a wrong oppterm onto that list. You spin somebody in.

And if you were to take one of these in 3D, without the Criss Cross, if you were to take an improper and incorrect package, you'd beef up the whole Prehav Scale. Your pc walks around, he feels like he has a head like a pumpkin. He feels in terrible condition. The key-out on it is probable in ten days, but I've known that one – that went on for three months. Improper assessment, improper run.

Well, that had more liability. In a Criss Cross, you're not going to run these things, so it cuts the liability down. See, you're not going to run them, so it's all right. And you won't wind up with a package unless you do it all wrong and backwards.

Now, an item will continue to react if it is invalidated or ARC broke. If the pc is invalidated on an item, it will continue to react. What you're reading on it is the ARC break, not the item. So all you have to do is a 3D Criss Cross with the rudiments out, forcing some incidents on the pc, running with ARC breaks, and you've had it. You'll get items continuing to react, and you can walk into a totally incorrect and totally erroneous 3D package. That could just be a dog's breakfast.

Now, if anybody started to run this totally incorrect and erroneous package, God knows what would happen. Because you're right into the middle of the whir you're right in the middle of a hurricane. And this would just be *bloo.*

If you run a lock valence with 3D, you're going to beef up the Prehav Scale. That's for sure. It has to be a main chance. It has to be right on the main games of the pc. If you run a subordinate valence to this which is simply locked up on it, if part of the package has in it just one of these locked valences, you're going to beef up the whole Prehav Scale. You won't know which end you're standing on.

And the odd part of the hidden error – the hidden error in it – is you can actually audit the terminal with a wrong oppterm, and the terminal will bring the Prehav Scale down to maybe eighteen or twenty levels, and the oppterm over here will be beefing up all the time, all the time, all the time. And because you're not running it on the Prehav Scale, you never find out about it. The pc just feels horrible.

Now, that the pc feels horrible is not an indicator that you're doing something wrong. You see how we lack an indicator. Because he feels horrible any time you run a 3D package, as you know very well. He's running out somatics and – God help us, what else? You see, it's a mess.

So the amount of duress that the pc is experiencing is not an indicator that you've done anything wrong So an inexperienced and inept auditor, having heard that the pc goes through the knothole and everything, and seeing the pc run all upside down and backwards, will simply continue to audit an improper and incorrect package.

In other words, there's this wide difference between Class II and Class III. That Class III done wrong is catastrophic, and Class II skills can be offbeat – possibly even to the degree of a missed withhold without killing anybody. And the pc will only be upset if you do miss a withhold or miss a rudiment.

Now, that doesn't mean you should do Class II carelessly. The thing you sacrifice and lose in Class II is case gain. And when you see a lot of people who are going through Class II skills, Twenty-Ten particularly, and they're not getting anyplace, well, just figure it's being done more or less wrong and upside down. There's some gross auditing error involved in this because even indifferent auditing can give you case gains, you see. Some gross auditing error is involved.

You have to know that in training auditors. Don't start grabbing at the moon and handing out extraordinary solutions in Class II skills. It's something like he holds the meter upside down, you see, and tries to read the sensitivity knob, you know. I mean, it's gross auditing errors. Very gross.

Or has heard, has heard that a latent read is the thing which you read. And if it reacts instantly at once, why, then you ignore that, you see. And you only act after it's gone one minute and fifteen seconds after the thing You could get some kind of craziness. It'll be something so wild that you, in training Class II Auditors – as your Instructors right here could tell you – at first glance miss it. It's the easiest thing to miss in the world because you're making the supposition that there's a house there, you see, and it's just a bare lot.

It's something or other. So you're telling somebody how to arrange the furniture in the living room, and that's all dandy, but you find out belatedly that they don't know you were talking about that because they don't have a house or a lot, much less furniture. So they think it's all theoretical.

And when you try to tell them this . . . You can watch it. You're training an auditor on Class II skills, and this guy – it's all sort of foggy, and he doesn't quite get it. And he's agreeable all right, you see. He's socially agreeable, yes. Well, that's right. He'll do that. If you get to be an expert – and you particularly, because you'll be training so many students, and you too – you'll get this, you can sort of feel the fog back of their eyes, you know. And right about that point get inquisitive. "Now, what did I say? And what are we trying to do? And just what *are you* doing And which is the needle on the E-Meter?" You see? Sort of – things like this, you know. It's almost impossible to outguess them because it'll turn up to be something absolutely fantastic.

The guy has got a log crossways, you see? And you think you've got some toothpicks to arrange, and you've got these logs that are twelve feet through at the butt, you see. And he's just got them sideways. And you watch it because when they are foggy about Class II, they've got something awful wrong, real wrong.

So therefore, you don't want an auditor who would be groping around in Class II skills, doing a Class III. He hasn't got time to learn how to run an E-Meter while doing listings and assessments. See, that's not the time to learn anything about it. You teach the person all about this kind of thing in a zone and area where it is safe if he makes a mistake. Then all you've got to pick up is some missed withholds, you know. Keep the missed withholds picked up, then you're all right. You can go along very nicely.

So that's the area to teach them how to use meters and everything else, and those are the skills. Don't ever make the mistake of thinking you can teach somebody to assess by – just hand them a meter and they've read in a book – they read the title page of *E-Meter Essentials, you* see – because they're going to have their hands more full of hurricane than it will have happened for a long time. See, they can just cave somebody in, *crash, you* see. And you'll have a hell of a time bailing them out of iv. You get the differences here?

Well, now, the basic differences of all these skills – and this is not a lecture about Class IIs so much. I'm just trying to show you what it takes to run a Class III 3D Criss Cross. 3D was much more difficult. The basic nature of these skills depend on two operations only. And this is true of all auditor skills – two operations only – is reading a reaction on something within the perimeter of reality of the pc. That is the basic skill by which you do a Security Check, a Problems Intensive, get a rudiment in, and all that sort of thing, you see?

Well, naturally, if you can't keep rudiments in, you can't do a Class III skill, that's all. So if a person hasn't got that fundamental, that fundamental skill – and the fundamental is that he has to be able to detect a needle reaction on a thought that is in the perimeter of reality of the pc. See, he's got to be able to detect that, and if he can't detect that, he's no auditor for Class II, you see. In other words, he's got to read that needle. He's got to know what that needle's talking about. He's got to make that meter talk, you see, on the pc.

All right. Now, that is a basic skill. Now, selection – now, you've got a shadow of this in your Problems Intensive at Class II. Selection of an item by assessment – this is another skill. Slightly different. And it's very fortunate you have a Problems Intensive in Class II skills because, you see, the guy won't get accustomed to doing that kind of thing, you know, before he has to collide with a list.

Now, the list requires absolute precision. Now, we'll stop talking about Class II and talk about Class III only. The precision of selection of an item depends on getting the pc to communicate with the auditor so that the pc is in good communication with the auditor. In other words, you've got to be able to get the rudiments in extremely well, and get the pc interested in listing this list for you, and not do it all on a little – well, toss it off.

Well, you say, "Who do I dislike? Well, you, me, the Instructors."

"All right. That's a list. Good."

No, I think, this type – this type of thing, you see, it requires a more suitable auditor presence, shall we say, you see. By the time he gets down to the list, he should know whether the rudiments are in or out.

Now, in addition to having the rudiments in, in Class III, you have to know this about rudiments. You're handling dynamite called the Goals Problem Mass. And this stuff is highly explosive. And the rudiments go out like scat.

You ever see one of these greyhound races, you know? Did you ever see the greyhounds take off after the rabbit, you know? You were sitting there in the grandstand, and it was a beautiful sunshiny day, and the parade was all lined up in front of you, and all of a sudden there go the rudiments, you know – *swooosh! You* had no warning There they went. You look up, and not a thing reacting You don't know whether the pc did anything You don't know what he said, why he said it, what he did to himself, what you did. Nothing. They're

gone. And they out that queasily because you're dealing with microscopically small reads. You're dealing with tiny reads. And that you can just make up your mind to – that you have to be able to read a meter small.

It's very nice to find out that the fellow has just killed the cop on the corner and get a three-dial drop. And after the fellow was all accustomed to this type of E-Metering, all of a sudden he will collide with this other thing, and these meter reads can just be absolutely microscopic.

You have a list that is not very hot. You have a Goals Problem Mass which is totally pulled in and twisted on itself so that you've only got available lock valences. The amount of charge on the whole thing is in the order of one-millionth of a grasshopper power, you see. And you're walking into the mass on indicators of that size. And boy are they small.

Now, that isn't true that they are always small. Sometimes you get good, healthy reads. But don't expect that a Goals Problem Mass listing is going to give you the kind of reads that you are fond of getting in Security Checking because you're not. And frankly, no squirrel meter, no meter that has been made before the British Mark IV, is up to reading it. That is just – just that. That's it.

Now, these tiny reads at sensitivity 16 are assisted by square block magnifying glasses dropped over your E-Meter plate. You just drop them over the needle. You read the needles through them. And it'll help you. It'll help you. Sometimes – Reg gave me the other day a big crane-neck magnifying glass. That's a very nice one. That's very assistive.

But just get out of the notion of two things. One, that more powerful detectors of bank restimulation are going to be immediately available off the assembly line, because you're awful lucky that it can be detected at all. That's it. You're just lucky it can be detected. And get out of your mind the idea that you shouldn't bother with those little reads because, of course, you're – every time you're assessing a case, you start going in from test items and so on. Bum show.

Now, it is much easier for you to hold with the microscopic reads that you get on test items and so forth, than it is to do a Goals Assessment.

Now, here was 3D. Well, here was Routine 3, Routine 3A – Routine 3D original – a type of assessment. Fifty to seventy-five hours with absolutely no gain and often no goal. You just sat there and sweated it out for that many hours, winding up at the end product of no gain and no goal. And if you did all this kind of on an ARC breaky basis of some kind, what did you finish with? You finished with an unhappy pc and a wasted fifty to seventy-five hours. And I frankly don't think that you like to waste fifty to seventy-five hours.

But if you did find the goal, then you could expect fairly healthy reads. These reads were pretty good, ordinarily – Routine 3 reads. Because you were stabbing into the middle of the bank. But you might have wound up with no goal at all.

If the person had ever lost his goals list or somebody had thrown it away or something like that had happened, what have you got left? You've had it, because he very often now has his goal buried, and he doesn't come up with the thing again. These things are serious, you see. This means that every preclear who gets any auditing is at the total mercy of somebody else's administration. And a case shouldn't be that much at the mercy of administration. That's a fault or a flaw that was in 3 and 3A and, frankly, original 3D. They all came to the same thing, you see.

Now, you're going to do something else. You could always take a case, get the rudiments in, find a test item, and proceed from there, and walk on into the Goals Problem Mass. Now, that is what's designed here. And all the time you're going, and everything you're finding – providing you're listing and your – your auditing is smooth, your listing is complete, and your nulling is absolutely accurate; given those things – you are going to wind up with a case gain every session. You just will not miss. You'll have a case gain every session.

It will be almost unbelievable to you when you get this thing rolling. Right now, even you who have been doing it, you're sweating it out to some degree with the mechanics of this thing, you see. It looks pretty complicated, and you're trying to put it together and so on. You haven't had time to look up at your pc. You haven't actually looked your pc in the eye and seen where that pc was going. But you yourself in being audited on some of this, even though you might have only had two or three sessions on it and so on, you know something's happening. Something's happening.

Well, something happens to the degree that the auditing skill is excellent. The amount of gain is almost directly monitored by the excellence of the auditing In other words, you can find 3D Criss Cross items. We're talking now only about 3D Criss Cross. You can find 3D Criss Cross items one after the other rather heartlessly and stupidly and out of communicationally – you can find the same items, without getting the same case gain. Isn't that interesting?

Now we're up against a factor that I first faced in 1949: The fact that a pc knew he could talk to me and was perfectly free to talk to me and therefore could blow things, being in a high morale state, which, if he didn't feel free to talk to the auditor and was all inhibited, didn't blow. You see, it's the difference between blowing the valence and not blowing the valence.

Confidence in the auditor, a feeling of power or freedom on the part of the preclear, gives you a gradient, and the totally mechanical auditor will get case gains and will carry a

case through, see. He will get case gains. He can't help this, you see. The auditor who inspires the pc's confidence, and to whom the pc can talk easily, and when they're being audited, they feel beefy and hefty, you know, they feel that's fine. They'll get right on through. They're being helped and so on. Man, that guy will get case gains the like of which you've never seen with this thing. Because they just blow these valences, and they just blow them clean, *pooom*.

Now, let me orient you with regard to this. You think you are looking, possibly, for *one* item, and you think the magic of all this is predicated on the discovery of one item. That is not the case at all. The end product is the discovery of one item in any listing and assessment. But *every item* the pc gives you for that list with very few exceptions is a lock valence on the Goals Problem Mass. And every item that he gives you has added to the Goals Problem Mass. He gives you fifteen items for a list. Thirty – that's more usual. Gives you thirty items. You go over and differentiate it with him, you're left with twenty-one items. He decides it's that other.

But remember those original thirty items. See, he gave you thirty. Now, you go over the list with him carefully, and he decides there are only twentyone. He asks you to strike out nine of them. What happened? Why did he ask you to strike out nine? Well, when he first told them to you, he knew those were in opposition to the terminal, but all of a sudden, just a few minutes later, he's telling you to strike them out. Well, what occurred? He blew them.

You understand that every one of those that he blew is a whole package of aberration? All by its little, old, homely lonesome? It's got enough admiration to keep a psychoanalyst or a psychiatrist baffled for the next umptydozen trillennia. Any one of them. You just look over one of these lists sometimes.

I haven't got a sample list here, but let's say this – we're getting oppterms to a – to a railroad engineer. Getting oppterms to a railroad engineer. We have a stationmaster. And that's one of the items on the list. We have a ticket seller. We have a passenger. We have a roundhouse foreman, see. We've got this, that, the other thing, and he's going down the list. Well, you've got the list written now. Now you're going to go over the list with the pc. And here you say at the first thing, "All right. Now, just how would a" – any wording you wished to use – "How would a stationmaster oppose a railroad engineer?"

"Well, so-and-so. You know, he'd make the trains go before they were supposed to go or after they were supposed to go, and might make a mistake one way or the other and crash in the terminal. Actually, he wouldn't oppose a – wouldn't oppose a railroad engineer at all. Ah, you can strike that one out. All right."

What happened? Do you realize there was a whole little, in-vignette game. See? There was a whole game involved here. There was – he'd been playing this game as a little side game. You know, like – like you place side bets at a crap game, you know. You're not

shooting crap, but you're over in the corner someplace basing side bets on how many players will stay in the game or something of the sort. You know, one of these little games that had nothing to do with the main chance. And shooting dice, you know, and "Stationmaster? Railroad engineer?" Boy, you got – every time he'd get anywhere near this kind of an attitude, he knew there was a big game going on there and so on. He's just blown it. That easy.

But you don't pay any attention to that if you don't know the workings of this sort of thing. You say, "Well, he's – there, we got that one out of the road, and we get another one, and we get that one out of the road. Let's see, what is the real item here? What is the real item here?" If you're asking that all the time, they're all real items. Every single one of them is a real item. But of course, as they blow off, they get less and less important and have less and less influence, because they're just lock valences.

But before you found them and listed them, before you discovered them, they weren't just lock valences. They were totally capable of being dramatized a hundred percent. Until they were recognized, differentiated, separated and nulled out, any one of them was a marvelous opportunity to go round the bend. And yet you could blow them off like that. Why? Because you're peeling off toward the Goals Problem Mass. And you're usually left with one item that won't blow. That's because you're in toward the Goals Problem Mass.

He actually gives you something that might look to you like a grapefruit with innumerable warts, or an apple in a bag of raisins – only that's not quite as good as a grapefruit with warts. The way it looked to the pc is any one of the warts were bigger than the grapefruit, until you've audited them, and then all of a sudden they get down to wart size. And the next thing you have a perfect grapefruit, which is the final item.

Now, if you assess very, very well, when you do a list of items from a test item – when you do a list – differentiate the list, null the list, and check it out (which is, of course, just more differentiation), you take the final kick off of any one of them; the pc is just left with a very fascinating conviction that that is the item. He knows that's the item. And he maybe is taken aback by it, but he knows that item belongs on the main chance.

Well, do you know what held that item into the 3D mass? All the lock valences that you blew. And it was only charged up because of an earlier, different item, which is even more pertinent to the 3D Goals Problem Mass, even more pertinent. So you wind up with this thing, and you got a "ticket seller," or something stupid like this.

All right. And we've got – that was the item that was – wound up. Well, that item is stuck. Now, what you've done is taken the warts off of this grapefruit, but this grapefruit is stuck on a pumpkin. And by the time you've taken all the warts off the pumpkin, what do you know? This grapefruit loosens up and is no longer associated too closely with the pumpkin. Might require some auditing, and it might require something else but is no longer as charged.

When you first find the item. . . You will miss this now that we're not listing on the meter, so I better call it to your attention. When you first find the hot item on a channel that's going straight in toward the Goals Problem Mass, you get consistently about a dial drop on your meter. Because you're so busy writing, you seldom notice this fact. You see, you're busy auditing, busy with the pc. But it goes *BOOM!* It's very easy to assess one of these 3D Criss Cross packages if you were just doing that. If you're just looking for items, this is the way you'd do it.

You'd just list it, and at the end of the list have noted how deep each one reacted, and it will be unmistakable.

There'd be one fall a dial or two dials or three-dial drop. And there'd be another one fall half-a-dial drop. And that would be out of the running, you wouldn't pay that much attention to it, and you'd just take that three-dial drop, and you'd say that's it, and you'd be right. Wouldn't do the pc any good.

When you first listed that thing, you got a heavy drop. The key 3D Goals Problem Mass item that you're really looking for reacted very heavily the first time the pc said it and you wrote it down. There was *charge* on it.

And you will notice that the next time you see it and go over it, it's still more charged and still falls more than the remaining items. And it gradually peters down and the charge goes off the remaining items so that they all become null, and this one that was so heavily charged at the beginning is now dropping "tick." No longer a charged item.

Well, in view of the fact that you're blowing without the meter when you list, you miss this point. If you want to check it sometime, list on the meter. Keep the pc thoroughly on the meter as you're listing, and watch it each time he mentions the item. See, he mentions the item for the first time. Don't be looking at your paper and ballpoint, see. Keep your eye on that meter and say, "Is there another one?" And keep your eye on the meter. And he gives you that. Notice it's a degree of reaction.

Well, that's charge, and that charge is coming off the case forever. That charge is disappearing off the case! And when you've finally got this item, it is not seriously charged. In other words, he'd have a hard time dramatizing it. Just finding an item removes it from the perimeter of immediate dramatization. He won't dramatize it anymore, providing it's assessed in the fashion you are now assessing. It has to be assessed that way.

Now, if you assessed another way – as we were doing a few months ago; if he were assessed another way – and you just took it, and you found the one with the high – with the steepest drop and you said that was it and you audited it, it would be your auditing that would be discharging it, and it would be hard to discharge because it had so many lock valences which were holding it in place. In other words, the lock valences were keeping it charged up.

In other words, this is a series of batteries if you want to call it that. And you know very well that if you start taking batteries off of a pile of batteries, you start reducing current. And these things, as you take off these lock valences one right after the other, you see, you've got less and less voltage. And eventually the thing hasn't got enough voltage to push a baby carriage. See, there's nothing there.

Up to this time, any one of those valences were sufficiently charged to run the pc all over the universe. He became a railroad engineer. The moment he became a railroad engineer, he went into a wild, manic enthusiasm and then came down with cancer. Fate, see.

All right. After you've properly listed and assessed all the oppterms to railroad engineer and all the items before it that led to railroad engineer and so forth, you talk about railroad engineer, he said, "Yeah, yeah, railroad engineering. And that's real interesting. That's real interesting It gives me a little somatic in the jaw, that's all. But that's real interesting, railroad engineering is. You just sit there, your arm out of the cab, you know, and you whiz along one way or the other, and so on, it's . . . This stuff they're running on this planet though isn't so hot. We had much better locomotives in . . . " so on. He gives you some stuff like this. He's quite interested in it. You can get him to discuss it. But the funny part of it is he has some idea that he might be able to go down and climb in the cab of a train and drive it. Drive that engine, see?

Well, you know he's never been able to think of doing that before? He'd think of that with horror. When he was a little child, maybe a time or two he thought, "Well, gee, it'd be kind of nice to ride in a cab or to touch the throttle. Yeah, it would be very nice to do that," a little kid. And of course, the thing charged up, and he's never been able to think of it since, you see. That's just a shutoff. Total.

And one day he's walked down the depot. He can't stand riding on trains. He'll give this terrific dissertation on trains and how bad it is, transport on trains and all of this. This was before he was audited, you see. Trains? Oh, he can't stand trains. "You mean you ride train travel? I always fly myself. I ah – " so on and so on. "I – well – a train. . . cinders, you know, dust, and so forth. Actually, I have a sinus condition. And I get around the dust, I can't take very much of that," and so forth.

But this goes further than that. You can never even get this fellow to meet you at the depot. And as he's gone back over the line, the thought of somebody having a job on a railroad has made him feel absolutely, fabulously ill.

This is where you get most of your socialists, by the way. They have these Goals Problem Masses and the idea of work puts them into a total belief, you see, that nobody can work. That is the thing that you can't do. And "the poor worker," you see. And it's all based on the fact they can't work. It's quite interesting.

It's very funny, your own attitude toward – toward some of these skills and work at large, and so forth, when you've blown some of this charge.

Anyway, you went down the line, and you null this thing All right. He doesn't have to go down and climb aboard a train to prove it to himself. He doesn't have any compulsion to do it. He doesn't have any compulsion not to do it. He doesn't necessarily get terribly interested in trains. He doesn't necessarily totally abandon trains. He doesn't have to do anything about trains. But if somebody suddenly said, "Drive this engine down to the roundhouse and get it turned around," he'd sure give it a whirl, and he wouldn't come down with cancer and sinusitis either, see?

In other words, he can *be* this thing again because it's discharged. And watching the charge come off on the meter is something that you should pay some attention to just to get a reality on what happens. It's quite fabulous. But you'd have to watch it while you were listing because just the fact of listing is getting rid of about 75 percent of your charge.

The biggest amount of charge comes off on the original listing. Then the next biggest surge comes off on differentiation, going over the list with the pc. And then knocking it out the rest of the way is very easy.

Now, pcs have lists that stay in almost forever. Some pcs have lists that just seem to stay in forever. You just can't knock them out. Got a missing item on it; you haven't bled it down; key item isn't on the list. And if the key item is not on the list, you wind up with a nondischarge of many of the items on the list because, of course, these items you're trying to null are dependent for their charge on the charge of the main item. And if the main item isn't charged up, they can't be charged up. But if they remain all charged up and you just can't scrub them out, see... Your rudiments are in and you just – you say, "Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck. Thank you. Tiger, tiger, tiger. Thank you. Huh, *ohohooom.* Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck. Thank you." In.

"Tiger, tiger, tiger." In.

"Waterbuck, waterbuck, waterbuck." In.

"Tiger, tiger, tiger . . ." you know. What the hell is happening here?

Well, what's happening here is you got – you got the thing missing.

Now, the funny part – thing about lines, which we'll take up in more detail in just a moment. The weird thing about lines is this, is you can sometimes get an item on one line which is holding the other line up. See. You can have a half a dozen items still alive and they won't rub out on one line because the exact terminal, differently worded, has already been assessed out on another line. And you've got line C. You've got line C with "a roundhouse keeper." And line B has in it "railroad tender," "water tender," and "track roundabout man."

And you got them on two different lines. And you just can't scrub them out. That is why you do an item on line A, an item on line B, an item on line C and an item on line D without any oppterming, until you've got all the lines filled.

Then do your oppterming. And you go across. Now, you finally broke it down and just bludgeoned it out so that you were left with a water tender, see, on that line. And then you went over and your next line to it was a roundhouse keeper, if you were so knuckleheaded you didn't combine these two. And of course, it just went *pfooot.* It's heavily charged. See, you assessed down to it, bang! You get it. Now the next time you go through C, you know, on your way to D, you see, you're oppterming from each line in column – the remaining charge blows off everything. This final item that you're – you oppterm to, oppterms very easily and it all evaporates up in smoke and you come out with some different item.

In other words, you're charging one against the other, you see? And where they start to nearly coincide – you have line B and line C, and line B has an item on it that belongs in the mess on line C. Very easy for a pc to do. This is the paean to confusion, the song of utter spin, when you're doing these things as far as the pc is concerned. "Nothing – nothing makes sense because it all makes sense. Yes, it's all very reasonable, but there isn't anything about it at all. Yes, I am very confused. I see it all now. It's very clear except it's so confused," you see?

So they very easily list the wrong things on the wrong lines, and they crisscross them up one way or the other. And if you don't take these lines – A, an item for A line, and an item for B line, and an item for C line, and an item for D line, and an item for A line, and an item for B line, and an item for C line, and an item for D line, you see – you're going to get funny hang-ups.

In other words, you're blowing consecutively on different approaches into the Goals Problem Mass. That's all that's happening here. And the discharge of major items brings about the easy discharge of minor items. You see how this goes?

Frankly, what you're doing – if you want to say you're looking for something, fine. I'm very glad you're looking for something You will wind up eventually with a 3D package that can't be argued with. It just *is it.* The pc knows it, you know it, everybody knows it. You know which the oppterm is and which the terminal is. You go ahead and find the goal to it and the modifier and the rest of it, and you put together that package. But there's no question in anybody's mind by the time you get to the package. And of course, the bank is tremendously discharged by this time, and the package will run rather easily. What you're really doing is in approaching it, you are discharging it.

And it – what it gives you is gradient discharge of the Goals Problem Mass by assessment – if you want to be very, very technical sounding – gradient discharge of the Goals Problem Mass by assessment, see? And this thing can't keep its charge. It can't charge itself

up again, that's all. There isn't anything to charge it up, unless you get a bunch of wrong items and try to run them, and then the charge of the item is increased. See, you get the wrong item, so therefore you get the phenomenon of the whole Prehav Scale livening up. You get an improper item, you get a lock item, the charge will bleed over from the real item into the lock item, but it isn't releasing, and the pc's attention is forcefully held on this wrong item when actually his attention should be on the right item, you see. And you – withdrawal of his attention on the thing brings all of the charge over in this thing but doesn't as-is anything. Nothing you're running applies to what you're running, don't you see, and he's left in a terrible confusion.

Similarly, on a misassessment, when you misassess, your pc gets very restive and very disinterested and very upset. He's liable to be very queasy about the whole thing because you're not bleeding charge. You're going over items which are not properly discharging All the stuff on the line is somewhat charged up. And that's because you're proceeding from an improper item. The item was never proved out, it isn't on the main line, it's just a lock item of some kind or another, and you're proceeding from there.

And the pc goes over the phenomena of ARC break, upset, beefed up bank, increased dramatization, terrific dizziness and so forth may ensue, or fantastic somatics that don't do anything, and nothing moves. It all – everything sort of hangs up in the thing And he feels very confused, and he feels very distraught, and he doesn't know whether he's mad at you or what. You're doing an improper lineup of some kind or another. You've departed from the wrong side of the wrong whatnot.

But all of these wrongnesses are totally occasioned by improper technical assessment. Every wrongness is occasioned by not assessing right. Just according to the rules. And the rules of assessment are very simple. You list, you differentiate, you null them out by repetitive reads, you check it out to get off any remaining charge on any remaining items, and you've got it. And that is the right way to assess now for 3D Criss Cross because it produces such a tremendous amount of charge blow.

You do those things correctly and come up with a correct item, and there it is, and you know it is it, and there's no worry about it. That's it. That's good. That's fine.

Now you proceed to oppterm that item. In other words, list what would oppose that item, and you go on from what would oppose that item and get another list. List it all. Differentiate it. Null it with repetitive reads. And then check it out against all the items on the list so that they – any remaining charge disappears, *bang! You* know, very proper assessment.

Now you can oppterm from that one, and the pc will just be climbing a steep staircase. He'll be going up, up, up. He'll be feeling better and better. And everything's fine, fine. Everything's blowing, and everything's beautiful, and you'll go right along swell.

All right. Oppose this too, list it on an ARC broke pc that doesn't give you much – he doesn't give you many; he doesn't give you anywhere near the list. And then you null it out, and then it all goes null, except one item in it, railroad engineer, is terribly ARC broke because when he said rail – railroad engineer, you went "Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha, ha-ha," you know. "Do you really want that one down?"

So of course, that's the one that remains in. As you read down the list, of course, it knocks every time you say it because you're reading an ARC break. You're not reading the item, you see.

And you wind up with railroad engineer. Now you cross-list to oppterms to railroad engineer. You're over in left field someplace climbing the fence. You're leaving the ballpark. You haven't anything to do with auditing. No telling what you're doing, and the pc will sort of be upset and irritated and won't think anything's working, and so forth. You get the difference here?

Now, you could make the pc worse with wrong assessment and bad assessment. Just make up your mind to it. You can make him worse. Any reason for me to hold your hand and say go ahead and be brave and audit him because nothing bad will happen to the pc. I'd be a liar if I told you that. You can practically spin them in with bad Routine 3 assessment, see.

Well done, it just shoots the moon. Wham! You'll never see such results in your life. Chronic somatics, things they're worried about – they'll have a new package of somatics every session. They'll have a new bunch of things that they're all concerned about.

Fellow comes in with a callous that has suddenly appeared on his thumb during his sleep. He went to bed, he didn't have a callous on his thumb. He wakes up, he's got a callous on the thumb. You assess him out. The terminal, "archer." Callous disappears. Really fantastic thing, you know.

You're assessing something down the line – you're assessing what really is oppterms. We're using this word oppterms carelessly. The line of stuff that would become the oppterm in the final 3D package makes the pc dizzy and gives him sensations. Sensations of various kinds – dizziness, wogness, and so forth. And when you're assessing terms that would eventually become terminals on the goals 3D package, the final thing, he gets pains. He hurts. He feels like somebody's shoving pins in him and chopping off his head with an ax, and cold masses turn in when you're running the terminal line and almost never turn in on the oppterm line. So he gets cold, and it's cold, and then he says to me, "Why don't you turn some heat on at Saint Hill?" and so forth. I cooperate *if* the furnace is out, you see. I'll cooperate like mad, but very often these chills and so forth . . .

People are in these things permanently, by the way, walking around in the streets and in life and so forth. They'll be right in the middle of one of these 3D valence cold packages.

And they'll be just ice-cold all the time. They feel cold to the touch. Their fingers and hands and arms feel cold, and so forth. Sometimes on an assessment like this, running some Havingness as you go and that sort of a thing, all of a sudden it goes *whooooosh* and that's the end of the cold package. And they're overheated now in the rooms where they've always frozen to death in. Very, very tremendous difference of temperature takes place on these things.

Anyway, in listing and assessing and nulling, anytime the pc gets a sensation, write "SEN" after the item, and anytime the pc gets a pain, write "SOM," somatic.

Now, somatic technically covers both pains and sensations, and so forth, and makes a little bit of a twisteroo on the line, and probably much more accurately to just say "pain." Maybe we ought to change it right there and keep you from getting messed up, and keep from calling me a liar of years ago. Write pain "PN." A SEN and a PN.

All right. And then when you look down your goals lines and so forth, and you know what to look for, you will find that what you finally find in the package – when you finally get the package assembled, you'll be able to trace it back through all the lists. And it's the one that hurt. And the oppterm is always the character of thing that gave him the dizziness and the sensation. In other words, you've already run your proofs out. You've already proved your items out long before you're going to run them. You know what they are.

It also is very amusing to know which side of the bridge this pc is on. It's very, very amusing. The pc comes up with something like "a space pilot," you see. Nothing to do with the pc. Wouldn't know anything about that. Only trouble is when it came up, why, there were these shooting pains of meteorites going through his head, you see. *"Errra!* There was another one. *Rrr,* there was another one, and there was another one," and so forth. And every time you read this thing to null it down, you see, "Oooh, there was another one," you know.

He says, "Well, it's not me because they're very immoral people, those fellows. I've never been one, you know. But a control tower operator, yeah. A control tower operator – that... I've always been sending those fellows out, yes, as a control tower operator." We know more about it than the pc, see. That's an oppterm. Winds of space blowing his head off, you know. Dizzy sensation and so on.

Now, I haven't quite made up my mind whether grief or other emotional responses could be classified as a pain or a sensation. To my way of thinking, all – I know this about all emotions – they are secondaries and have their root in an engram. And unless there's pain in the engram, you don't get the secondary response. In other words, you don't get grief unless the person has been hurt on the same subject. There's always the engram precedes the tears, in other words. The fear is always underlaid by pain. Now whether this has anything whatsoever to do or an indicator on the Goals Problem Mass, at this time I can't tell you.

All right. Now, let's go a little bit further on this, and let's give you a very graphic picture of exactly what you do in order to assess out a Goals Problem Mass.

Line A probably should be "disliked."

Line B, "liked."

Line C, "Who or what would you treat that way?" I'll give you this trick in a minute.

Line D, "Dynamic Assessment."

Line E – if you wanted to make one and you may find it necessary – "Withhold item search." I'll go into that in a minute, too.

Now, these lines actually form a list. And if you wanted to make a list of items for the pc, the very best way to make that list so that it's very graphic and everybody understands it in the code, take and put these line A, B, C, D, E at the top of the – of one sheet of paper, or on both sides of one sheet of paper with lines A, B, C on one side, and C, D or E on the other side, you see. And make a zigzag going down from the A, you see – a zigzag forty-five degrees off the vertical, and then zigzag back the other way ninety degrees, you see, so it's still forty-five degrees off the vertical the other way, and zigzag back, back, back, back, back, back.

In other words, to the right, to the left, to the right, to the left, to the right, to the left, a zigzag, you know, like chain lightning going down the page.

That gives you a graphic picture of from which, and from what, the line proceeded. You see, now you know from what the line proceeded. And every time you get an opposition, see, you – thereafter you never get anything but oppositions to these things, you see.

When you go down to the next zig – down to the first zig, you might say – you've got the opposition to what was at the top, see. And then you go down to the next zag, you've got the opposition to the one that was at zig. And now the next zig, of course you've got the opposition to the last zag, you see.

So you've got your zigzag, and you just write a series of terminals down that line. Now, those are all found items. Those are found, checked out, proved out, they are items. Every one of them. You write nothing on that graph, if you want to keep your plot for the pc, you write nothing on that graph but found, proven items.

Now, of course, you have to start these with test items. So the first line only would be possibly not part of the 3D package. They would possibly be locks of some kind or another. They're indicator items. We call those test items. All the rest are called 3D items by proper terminology. A test item is something that we – we're just using in order to kick off from. But if you get anything to stay in on a list and check out, I can assure you it's part of the Goals Problem Mass, not a lock. It is right on the main line.

So you're liable to get an idea, because there are so many of these things, that you're actually just getting test valences going here or something. And it's not true. Any one of those levels, as you could add it up, could be called a 3D package and run, except the test level.

You'll find oddities, however. You'll find somebody will give you several terminal items and then only one oppterm item on your first lineups. So you can't take them at any one level and say that these things directly and immediately oppose each other. You'd have to ask the pc which one opposes which in order to make up a 3D package, you see. And then you'd have to run some kind of a check, and if you'd noticed the sensation and the pain indicators, as you listed some items, you would then know which was a terminal and which was an oppterminal.

You could go ahead and find the goal, you could find the modifier, you could find the opposition goal, you could make up the whole 3D package at any one of those levels, and it would run. It would run – run perfectly well using the auditing commands of the 26th of December 1961.

But there are faster ways to bleed these things than running them. As long as assessment can be made to carry forward with reliable packages, you're really finding package after package after package trying to walk in toward *the* package which won't blow unless it is run.

Now, it is characteristic and peculiar of auditing that you never audit unless you can't get it to blow. In other words, two-way comm. You ask the pc, the pc says, "I have a present time problem." You ask the pc, say, "What is the problem? Who's involved with it?" and so forth. "Now, do you have a present time problem?" That's always your first action. The thing doesn't knock all of a sudden. Fell off the pin a moment ago, and now it doesn't do a thing. You discharged it, so of course you don't audit it.

You only audit things you can't make to blow by inspection. So therefore, obviously, the first goal of auditing is blow by inspection. You're trying to cause an as-isness by inspection only.

Now, you're bleeding – if you can bleed charge that way off of a case, you, of course, would. Oddly enough, you could sit down with a Prehav Scale and ask the pc every consideration he had on every level of the Prehav Scale. Just take it up and discuss it with him. You know, take level after level of the Prehav Scale, and it'd just – two-way comm it with the pc, see. And you would wind up with a gain. Of one kind or another, you would wind up with a gain whether you liked it or not.

It's not auditing, is it? You sit down and you read this Prehav Scale off to the pc and it starts in at the top, and you say, *"Buh,"* and then, "What do you think of that?" and so forth. You had him on a meter at that time, you'd see the meter go – occasionally the meter would

go *whooooowh,* and go over, you know, and then it'd be down. And as he talked about it, just charge disappears. In other words, you, it's – that's by inspection.

So if you can bleed a Goals Problem Mass by inspection, God 'elp us, let's sure do so, please. Wouldn't that be a smart thing to do? Well, so let's go as far as we can possibly go by inspection before we have to audit it. And if we do it very slippily, we 11 find out in some cases that we will – depending, by the way, on the skill of the auditor and on the state of the case, of course, and the accidental combination of how the 3D mass is twisted and some other things – on some cases I think you will find that you just get a blow by inspection of the whole 3D mass. You just walk through to the other end of the thing and all of a sudden this guy is flying He looks over at the table, and it levitates, you know? Or he unthankingly reaches over and hands you your E-Meter at the beginning of session, but he didn't use his body, you know – this type of action.

But this is then auditing and don't get it tangled up that it's not auditing Otherwise, you won't care to spend time on it to bleed charge, and you will go at it with the impatience of "Well, we got to find the item, see. We got to find the item." And then, therefore, you'll find yourself with this anxiety – occasionally just bludgeoning the list, bludgeoning the list, you know. And trying to knock the charge off of the list just to find an item, you see?

It doesn't seem important to you to get the charge off. Well, if the list is discharging very, very poorly, and it's just all hung in, and it's all hung in, and it's all hung in, well, let's bleed the meter. See, let's be smart about this. Recognize where this comes from.

"Are there any more things that would oppose a railroad engineer?"

"Well, I've thought of several, but I didn't bother to tell you because it seemed so obvious. The president of the company. Well, that always seemed obvious to me." You've got the item now. But sometimes the person doesn't even see what the item would be until you've got the thing about half nulled, see?

So don't be of the opinion that if you just find the item, it's all right. Then you can chalk it up and Ron will be happy with you, and everything is fine, you see. No, you want the item discharged.

And if a list isn't discharging, there's something wrong here. See, you haven't got all of it or something is wrong So you're actually auditing It looks like assessing It looks like a search for needles in haystacks and all that sort of thing. Funny part of it is if you're doing it right, doing it expertly, and got the pc's rudiments in the whole way, why, glory, glory, glory. We're all set because the pc is – man, he's making gains the like of which you will never see him make in any other way. And you're walking upstairs to what this character really is.

Now, the actual Goals Problem Mass will start unburdening, and the terminal he is really in, in, in – and before we would have audited to it, now we will assess to it – is actually

unburdening because we're taking locks off of it all the time. We're blowing charge. And you will find that when this thing finally shows up, and you've got it, that he will become more "it" for a little while, and then he'll become less "it," and then he'll be able to operate in the field of "it" and he will feel much better about the whole thing.

But this is auditing by unburdening This is one of the oldest systems there is – auditing by unburdening. I think there's about – I don't know, I don't remember exactly when that was taken up. I think 53, 54. I think – I don't know. I think it was mentioned, I think it was mentioned in the *Creation of Human Ability,* isn't it? Isn't unburdening mentioned in the *Creation of Human Ability?* Well, anyway, it doesn't matter particularly. But this is an old auditing skill, but we didn't drive it very hard because we didn't quite know exactly which direction it went. But this is how you unburden.

So you write up at the top of the sheet here, line A, line B, line C, line D, line E, and you get your thing Now, your first item is "What kind of person or being have you liked?" I think I said the first one was "dislike," didn't I? That's best, by the way, because you get a reversal, see.

All right. "What kind of being have you disliked?" All right. Now, we go ahead and make a long list of this thing, and we go right ahead and operate with that list. Now, the pc may slip you a few that they liked. Occasionally, they will do this. That's kind of unfortunate, and that's sort of unneat, but put them over on another list. Put them on another sheet of paper because you're going to take up "like" next anyway, see.

Now, a pc would audit longer, and you'd get more list if you got a liked item and a dislike item and a liked item and a dislike item, and a liked item and a dislike item, and you'd get the two lists completely complete. So there might develop two schools of thought about this. Maybe you ought to do the two lists first, all at once, before you assessed anything. And it might save you trouble. I personally wouldn't bother to. You see, I'm just saying there's two schools of thought about this. That one apparently violates the line a little bit.

Because they're opposites, he's going to run a two-way flow. And you're going to free something up with this. And he's all of a sudden going to remember things and all that sort of thing.

Well, you want a 3D item on that list. That's all you want. And that's all you're demanding of that list. You're not demanding that he run the whole track with that first assessment list, and so on. So actually it would work if you just got disliked items, and then went through your usual regular routine on this, which has now been very standardized, which is to say you list. You ask him if he's got any more coming – this is all without a meter, by the way – you and – you list them all. And then you go over the list with the pc and ask him how each one would oppose and if he cares to keep it in or leave it out or what he wants to do with

it. You see, it's his session and his list, and you simply consult him about this. And he'll strike a few of them out and he'll add a few in at the end of the thing, and he'll expand the thing one way or the other. And finally the list is in some kind of shape.

Now, ordinarily you would differentiate the list with just one read down the list. You could, of course, do a second differentiation down the list if you wanted to. And eventually, if you kept assessing the list in that particular fashion and got him to explain "how each one," he would eventually turn up with and give you the final item. But it would take quite a while to do so. This is a longer, longer type of action.

But if a pc's items were nulling poorly and the pc seemed very withholdy on items, and a bunch of things of that sort, I would then bleed the list with a meter. I'd go ahead and bleed the list with a meter. I'd then pick up my meter after I'd made the listing, put the pc on the meter directly and bleed the meter if there were any more, and "What was that?" And then make sure that I wasn't getting ARC breaks. And I'd stretch this list as far as I could stretch it every time, you see. And then go back over and differentiate and get them knocked off and get them squared around.

Of course, your next one is the nulling, and that is your bark, bark, bark, leave it in, take it out, you know. And just ordinary, routine, very sharp, very rapid nulling, and the pc will sit there, and hell watch them go in and out, and what they are, and which way they're going, and he 11 to be very happy with all this. And you finally wind up with an item. And there's only one item in, and then you check that item out very carefully. Well, you check that item out against the remaining list.

In other words, you say the item, say other parts of the list, say the item, say the other parts of the list, say . . . you know. He'd say the item and other parts of the list. You'll find out some of them have come live, and then they go dead again. That's because when you found the item and identified it, the pc has all of a sudden concentrated his attention on it very heavily, and as you're checking it against the other items they then discharge out, and his mind resolves and settles down on that item. Of course, his mind was on it all the time anyhow which is what the trick is.

All right. You wind up with that item, and you've got an item and you enter it at the next zig or zag on that particular line. Now, when you come back to that, you're now going to go on to the next line, you see? You're now going to go on to the "like" list, you see?

That's going to sit there. The best way to handle this is just let the test item sit there rather than oppterm the test item the way it says in the first mimeo. Ah, it's more profitable. I've checked it out a bit. Not very thoroughly, but it's more profitable. Just to leave the test item there and get another test item for the next list.

And you're going to do B. And then you're going to do your C, D, E – all done the same way. You've – that is to say, you're going to make a list, and so forth. No matter how you get that list. And then you're going to write the item down on the next zig or the zag. Then you're going to come back to A.

Now, these items are never crossed over. That is to say, because you found one in A, you don't now enter it in B and so on and so on. That – it's not that type of arithmetic. These lines are all independent. They are totally independent until they collide, and you can do anything but let them collide. You try to keep them from colliding, by the way, by inventing new types of lists and lines to keep the pc flying, you see? Don't let these things collide and lose a line if you can possibly help it. But if you do lose a line, then figure out a new way to get a test item, get a new line going Got the idea? Try to keep a minim-um of four lines. Absolute minimum. I would much rather audit with five or more lines.

So you just keep these lines going, and once you have found the test item of A, then you want to know a list, "Who or what would oppose that item?" Then of course, you do your list, that is write your list down, differentiate the list with the pc, null it down, bark, bark, bark on the meter, get your final item, prove it, then prove it out by checkout, and so forth. That's your next item. You put that down at the next zig or zag on the A list, you see.

Now, after you've done the other lines, you come back to that again. When you pick that one up again, now you go and you say, "Who or what would oppose a (whatever that item was on the A list – A line)?" And you make a list, and you differentiate it, and you null it, and you check it out, and then you write that down on your A line, you see, and then you go to B. Same way each time. Actually, it's a repetitive package and is a very neat piece of geometry or action that you're moving in toward.

Now, this much order is moving in toward, God knows how much confusion, see. It's fantastic confusion that you're walking into, so keep your order very good as you're going into the confusion, see. Because, boy, this is confused.

All right. Now let me give you very briefly how you get additional lists. You got your "like," "disliked," and what was the next one I gave you there?

Audience: General 0/R

Yes, that's it. You run General O/W on Self on the pc – General O/W on Self on the pc. "What have you done to yourself? What have you withheld from yourself?" you see. And you write these answers down. It's not a therapeutic process at all, you see. You don't care if it's flat or unflat or anything else. You just want about fifteen answers or twenty answers. And then you go down this, "Well, who would you treat like that?" is what you want to know. And you go over these answers, and you read them back to him. You know, "Who would you treat

like that?" see. And you just get a nice long list on who would you treat like that, you know, using his different answers.

"Well, what have you done to yourself?"

"Well, I've kept myself up late and not put myself to bed early."

"Oh, yeah."

All right, well, that was part of the list. So when you come back, "Who would you consider it an overt to keep up late?" See, that's the question. See, that's what's obviously inspection by eye. It shows you at once that – well, this is an overt on self, is it? Well, what kind of a self is self? Don t you see?

And the pc'll say, "Well, a sick person. Of course, everybody'd know that." So you write down, "a sick person," you see, on the list.

And, "What have you withheld from yourself?"

"Well, candy," and so forth.

The obvious question that you ask is, "Who couldn't have candy?"

And the pc says, "Well, what do you know. Uh-uh-uh-uh – a – a little child couldn't have any candy."

Well, that's kind of surprising too, so you write that down on the list, and you get your long list going with this. Sometimes, sometimes this is quite a short list. It all starts becoming "A sick person, a sick person, a sick person, a sick person," you know. All right. Then you null it out the same way.

All right. Now your next one is Dynamic Assessment, and I won't take any time to tell you how to do one of those because the data is all over the place. You just simply find your Dynamic Assessment item and having found the item, you use it as a test item and proceed on down a line with it.

Now, your withhold is "What should be" or "What should you withhold7' It's a list of what you should withhold, not to self, but what should be withheld. And you just get a long list of the things that the pc tells you what should be withheld. It's quite remarkable the numbers of things that should be withheld.

Now, when you've got that withheld list – it doesn't have to be complete, anything. Maybe sixty items on it is absolutely adequate. Now you make your potential item list, you see. And, "Who would have to withhold that? What kind of a person would be withholding that?" See? See, very slippy.

See, "Talking too much."

"What should be withheld.?"

"Talking too much." Well, when you find that on the list, you ask the pc – you don't make one for each withhold. You write as many as he gives you for each withhold, you see.

"Who would have to withhold talking too much?" you see?

And he says, "Well, a ringmaster in a circus."

"Anybody else?"

"Well, yes. An opera singer."

And you almost can get dozens of lists out of this thing, but that's perfectly fine. A very fruitful source of stuff.

All right. Now, there are five systems by which you can get test items and this beats the seventy-five hours to no goal of Routine 3 and 3A and early work, you see? Because you've got all these test items, and they're all a ball to the pc, and you all han – handle them all the same way, and you do – it's a very pattern from that time on.

Now, it may be that you have to get inventive later on as to how you find some test items. Perfectly all right because you've got a pattern. You've got the Prehav Scale. You could assess the Prehav Scale, find the level the pc's stuck in, and find out what kind of people or beings or so forth would be whatever that stuck level is, see. Or take several levels of the Prehav Scale and do the same thing with it, or anything you can think of.

"Who do you have problems with normally?" You get the idea? See. You could get – there's dozens of ways you could get lists and so on. But try to keep that many lines going, and if a line peters out on you or goes null, the first thing you should do is go back and see if the item before it might have gone flat. Something like that. Try to trace the line back and salvage it so as not to have an error on the thing, but don't spend much time doing it. It's actually easier to scrap the line and start a new one.

Okay. The net result of all this is terrific therapeutic gain, potentially faster than any other type of auditing I've ever had any development of. Terrific therapeutic gain on this, providing it is done well, providing it's done with a high-spirited pc, providing it's done with a pc with the rudiments in. Providing it's done expertly and the right items are found, there's nothing in the world can beat this one.

Now, the speed with which you do it comes into consideration even though you go rather easily with the pc and the differentiation. The pc does a lot of talking and that sort of thing Let him talk. Don't worry about it. Just keep him on the subject. It apparently is a little slower but actually the greater amount of time spent in the differentiation of the objects means the lesser amount of time in nulling, so you make up in nulling what you waste, apparently, in reading the list to the pc. And you'll sometimes find the list has just gone *brrrrrr* – it's just

evaporated, and you've just got one item sitting there. In other words, you've nulled it down. Well, that's a high compliment to your presence as an auditor because this pc is well in-session, and he's as-ising like crazy, man. He's just knocking the stuff out *boomityboom.* And he winds up with one item. Don't think this pc was in that condition before you read him the list back.

Okay. Well now, that's 3D Criss Cross. That's pretty well how you do it. Those are the liabilities of it, and where it winds up, you're not ready to worry about yet. But there you are.

The questions that you can ask about 3D Criss Cross, and so forth, are rather normally solved in just applying your gray matter to – you know. You, a thetan, you got some gray matter. You might have something to do with it. You never used it, you see. Apply it to this one, huh? And look over the thing and see just about how does this figure out because actually it's a very, very sensible little package of tricks. And it always goes the same way. It always winds up with the same answer. You always make the same mistakes if you're making the mistakes. And there it is. And if your eyes get too strained reading the meter, why, use a magnifying glass or something like that. But find what's there and oppterm it and you'll really get some gains on these pcs.

Now, you can audit almost any kind of case on 3D, but it is still much, much better to prepare the case to be audited with decent Sec Checking and so forth, before you start in.

We've bypassed the necessity now to have the case in perfect condition before you can assess, see? But it's much easier to do if the pc has been set up and this lifetime has been sort of cared for and everything is running a little better.

Well, that's 3D Criss Cross, and I wish you good luck with it.

Thank you.