3GA CRISS CROSS: FOLLOWING THE ROCK SLAM

A lecture given on
23 October 1962

Okay. Here we are. This is the second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 23 October AD 12.

And continuing 3GA Criss Cross, as she is cooked, and the recipe, and the subtitle of this lecture is: "Following the Rock Slam."

The tips which were put out on rock slams earlier apply in 3GA Criss Cross and you will find that the preclear interest follows the rock slam. If you can keep the rock slam you can keep the pc's interest. When you lose the rock slam you've lost the pc's interest.

Now, the cognitions follow the rock slam. We've often wondered, back through the antediluvian periods of Dianetics and Scientology, how come Mr. A cognited and Mr. B didn't cognite? And how come Mr. B sat there through 275 hours of auditing without a single cognition? Well, that's because you never came near any rock slams on him.

We used to try to get rid of rock slams, now we try to preserve them. In photography, if you will look at the modern manuals of photography put out as the great pictures of the year, you know, like the German annuals, and all that sort of thing, you will see in it that all of the bad features of the photography of ten years ago and the things that were condemned in the best photographic salons have now become – become the artistic thing to do today. In other words, they used to think grain was terrible and now grain is wonderful. And they used to think that out-of-focusness was awful and now they think it is just the cake.

Now, that is a process of being overwhelmed by that which you can't whip. Now, you might say it's almost the same thing today with rock slams. Just a year ago, occasionally you would hear a half-angry, authoritative auditing voice in a session saying, "Floor! floor! floor! floor!" trying to turn off the condemned rock slam so he could get on with the game, you see? Not any more. If I hear anybody using "floor, floor, floor" to turn off a dirty needle or a rock slam during an assessment and so forth, why, I will conclude that he doesn't know how to get in mid ruds and is trying to get the pc a loss. Because that's all that's going to happen.

Now, a rock slam, when it turns on suddenly and inexplicably in the middle of doing something else, is still a great embarrassment. But you had better find out what turned it on

and why.

A pc on the rock slam channel, while he's following the rock slam very nicely and you're doing everything to get him to follow the rock slam, has a tiny withhold. The tiny withhold, if it's in the direction of the rock slam object, of course is just the rock slam reactivated by the withhold. And this makes life more complicated because it gives us this interesting fact, that while you're doing a list and finding the last items on the list, the pc can have a withhold on a certain item which will make it look like it is in when it is not. The rock slam is occurring on the pc's withhold or invalidation or protest, and not on the item. Oh, isn't that grim!

Well, that's just – makes life more interesting, doesn't it? That's a hurdle.

This can actually occur, particularly on a pc who incipiently slams on auditors. He just has this one little slight withhold: you're going down this list, everything is fine, and maybe the list is a total blank. Maybe there's nothing on this list. Nothing. Nothing to be found anywhere. It's not going anyplace.

And you get down to the last three items and one of them is "a cadaver." And while you read "cadaver" the last time through, the pc invalidated your auditing. Now, you read "cadaver" again and it rock slams beautifully. Makes life more interesting, doesn't it?

Well, it merely gives us some of the reasons why you do what you do.

And the answer to that, of course, is you get a list down to the last three or four items and then you take the remaining items out, not by elimination, but by Tiger Drill. You got that? You don't eliminate the last three simply by calling them off with "commit overts" and that sort of thing. You take the last three and you tiger drill them. And then you test them with "would it commit overts against" or some such thing. And then you will see whether or not it is actually rock slamming, not because the pc has a withhold on that item. Do you understand that?

Now, because there are so many liabilities in this business, there are certain textbook formulas. Now, these textbook formulas will prevent you from making 98 percent of your mistakes. That's not choosing whether you oppterm or represent, they won't totally eliminate that, but they'll eliminate 98 percent of your mistakes. Now, I said 98 percent. lf you followed them perfectly, they would eliminate 98 percent, and then the other 2 percent will just come swinging in from Mars on an unpredicted wavelength. So you've still got to audit alertly.

In doing 3GA Criss Cross then, the byword and password is "be alert and be lucky." You're going to see some odd things happen to a pc and if you don't catch the brass ring when you see them and do something about it you're going to be out of luck. So it's a very nervy experience. And there's no substitute for experience. It's nerve-racking.

Therefore, there are certain textbook activities go on in this particular procedure, such

as – I got caught with this one the other night and ceased to be cocky about it 100 percent. Took all the wind out of my sails. After all I've argued with people about not completing 3D Criss Cross lists, after all of the enamel chipping and jaw chomping that I have done on the subject, so help me, I didn't get a list complete. Isn't that – *ooowww*. That should happen. And I didn't get a list complete. And at the end of the session picked up the fact as a missed withhold. And having worked all that session to undo all of the mess which was constantly occurring, see – dirty needle and everything else occurring on this thing – I finally find out where it comes from: list wasn't complete.

Well, I hadn't even really been careful to complete that list. So I actually earned exactly what I got. It looked complete, it was apparently complete by test, but I didn't test it very hard. So I sighed and I said, "The next time I do this I will be guided by 3D Criss Cross rules of complete list."

Now, we can actually increase and improve those rules today. So the rules of listing actually go as follows: You list everything the pc can give you easily and when he tells you that's it on a list, you don't keep chanting the auditing command at him because some pcs will go on an automatic, you know, of answering the auditing command every time it's asked. Did you realize that? You see, you're not doing Prepchecking.

Now, that's the first habit you've got to get out of in listing. You're not prepchecking. You're not sitting there waiting for the pc to say, "No, that's the last one." You understand? And if you ask the question every time, every time, every time, some pcs just go on an automaticity of answering the question. They haven't got any more items, but they just keep answering it because it's being asked. Do you see that?

So you will find yourself occasionally shutting the pc off, just letting him run down rather than get some overbearingly long and meaningless list. Some pcs want the list 495 items every time you ask them one question. Well, that is unbearably embarrassing. I consider a complete list in this business of somewhere around eighty, ninety items. But that – that won't hold good for all pcs. But I can tell when a pc is endlessly and arduously listing, and they're going to list it all and so forth. Well, in such a pc I would tend to repeat the command less often. I'd sort of start omitting the command. And the pc would eventually say, "What was the command?"

And I would say, "Well, all right. Good. Good. That's fine, that's fine. Now, let's make a test out of this." Just ignore the whole invitation to go on with this automaticity, don't you see?

But you've got to have a complete list. So there is a rule that you can underscore: You've *got to complete the list.* But that doesn't mean an endless list done by the pc, it simply means a list that has discharged the charge.

There's a phenomenon occurring here, that if you list anything, the pc will have less charge on it. Now, there is also a danger here: you cannot go ahead and just list at random. You can list on the rock slam or near the rock slam with complete impunity, because you're listing on the goals channel. You understand that? But just taking off from nowhere, or from an arbitrary point that has nothing to do with anything, and permitting the pc to list a long time on it, is exactly the same as wrong goal. And every phenomenon that occurs in listing a wrong goal is liable to occur in listing four or five hundred items with no rock slam from a no rock slam item, and then four or five hundred items from another rock slam item, you know, no – no rock slam, this – no rock slam item has occurred, you know? And the next thing you know, your pc star – going to start going sen and wog and that sort of thing.

So you have to keep some control of this listing. The whole operation consists of taking something on which the pc is likely to have overts against and making a list of it. And out of this developing a rock slam. And then taking that list by assessment and finding the one item on it which really contained the rock slam.

Now, the oddities are that you can make a list of things the pc is likely to have overts against. You can null that list and pick out the item and will find that the rock slam has settled on one thing, if it's complete. But if it's incomplete, of course the thing that's least likely to be on an incomplete list is the item. You understand? Because a list completes rapidly after the item is put on it. So an incomplete list is less likely to have the item. You understand that – why?

Now, finding this item we have something against which the pc has overts. Similarly, we could have something which was a terminal with which the pc has committed overts. Now, why overts? Well, the whole phenomena of rock slam and meter behavior is based on the overt-withhold sequence. And a rock slam is the result of – as a meter representation – is the result of innumerable committed overts in a certain direction. And when you've got that certain direction isolated, that is to say, the items against which the overts are committed isolated, you then have, of course, a rock slam. And there'll be one thing that he has more overts on than others.

Now, if he gave you a list of eighty, which is pretty close to right, if he gave you a list of eighty, he will actually have committed overts on all eighty. But the reason he's committed overts on all eighty is A=A=A. He's identified them with *one* thing that he really commits overts on. And these are all of its cousins and sisters and brothers and aunts, you see? The odd part of it is, is getting a list of that character at all. But he of course isn't inventing these things, he's just dealing them off the bank.

Now, this whole thing is an interesting activity of doing clearing – you should look at it as to what it is – it is clearing without having found the goal. Now, it'll take you an awful long time to do it, and it is not – it is not well located or well centered or anything else. But in

theory you could go on finding these and finding these and finding these and finding these, and at the end of a few hundred hours you would have found all of them and your pc would have been sitting there Clear. And then he tells you what his goal is. You see?

So what you're doing is kind of a swindle here, you see. You're actually finding the items before you find the goal. See, now, in Routine 3, you're supposed to find the goal and then find the items. Well, why does this make such a difference to the pc? Actually, why doesn't he find his goal in the first place? That's because he's got so many overts and so many withholds that he himself doesn't know what it is, doesn't dare confront what it is, has lessened the overt so thoroughly, and has then withheld it even from himself to such an extent that he can't even tell you what his goal is.

So this is the basic mechanism of how the pc's goal gets obscured in the first place. It gets overlaid with heavily charged items that the pc has used to commit overts with and things on which the pc has committed overts. The symbol of the rock slam is overt.

Now of course, as every overt or confusion is followed by stills, so the overt is followed by the withhold. So you could actually do this by withholds. You could do a Dynamic Assessment by withholds. You understand? But stills don't run well out of the bank. This would be much less reliable. But it still furnishes you a test. After you've found the overt you can ask the pc what he wouldn't give it and you´ll get the slam back. See, because the slam was held in place by the overt. See, the slam is still residual as the withhold even though you've gotten rid of the overt. Don't you see?

So you can still pull this trick as a test trick, you understand? Let's say we've run all the slam off the bank against waterbucks, with overts, you know. "Consider committing overts a – against waterbucks." *Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam* – proven, good reliable item. It all goes up in smoke, we don't know anything more about it, it's disappeared and that's that. We could still get it to slam again by saying, "What wouldn't you give a waterbuck?" And of course that's what would you withhold from a waterbuck, you see. And it'll go *slamslam-slam-slam-slam*. But if you ask it very much, of course, it all blows up in smoke because there's no powder under it now. See, that one will wear right out. But you can at least see that it did slam at some time or another on overts.

This will be useful to you some time when trying to recover from some HPA's attempt to do 3GA Criss Cross who has run off the slam. It gives you nightmares sometimes. It's very hard to recover the entrances to slams when they are discharged. All right – means someday we'll have a central division – a central division of some kind or another of "what was my item?" you know, and all goals and items and everything else when found are registered there at the central division, don't you see? And *in extremis, why, you* can always cable it and get the pc's reliable items. Anyway, such doesn't exist now, so you're left on your own.

Now, the mechanism here then, is the pc has lived, and being terminal A, has

committed overts against oppterm B. The effort then merely consists of locating the cousins, sisters and aunts or character of oppterm B, then listing this thing down in order to recover a slam. Because of course, while being A, and committing overts on B, he will produce on the meter the rock slam. And oddly enough you can find A by just asking – that is, the terminal – by just asking if it would commit overts. And it will slam. You don't even really have to have "against" anything. See?

Now, "Would you commit overts . . . " – let's say the terminal is waterbuck and the oppterm tiger – "Would you commit overts against a tiger?" *Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam* if the tiger's a reliable item, you see? "All right, that's fine, thank you. Now, would a waterbuck commit overts?" *Slam-slam-slam-slam*. You see? So therefore a terminal will slam, as well as an oppterm. It's just how you word it. You must realize that the terminal commits the overt and the oppterm receives them. Therefore, that will always give you the proper direction for your wording.

Now, this is an interesting action then. Because it goes down through some part of the GPM, actually, if carried on, to hundreds and hundreds of items. You recognize that, just speaking loosely, as far as items are concerned, that pcs list ten, fifteen thousand items to go Clear. You realize that. So supposing that every 100 of those 15,000 items contained a key item that was really built in, terminal or oppterm. See, that's 15,000 – that gives you 150 items to find on the pc to make him go Clear.

And in view of the fact that you're going to be wrong at least 25 percent of the time no matter how lucky you are, that means you will actually be running up the bank at something on the order of about 200 items, a lot of them meaningless, you see, and let's suppose you're an old slowpoke, and it takes you two hours. Why, your whole clearing activity then boils down to something on the order of 400 hours. See, that's far too much. And it's only theoretical that you could go the whole way. You understand that? Because after the slam is gone you might not find yourself going anyplace at all. And then you'd have to shift gears and go by cognition and you'd have to go by needle manifestations and little tiny slams and you'd work your way through this thing most arduously.

So therefore you make far more mistakes in the last half of the clearing than in the first half, so I`d say maybe you got about five hundred, six hundred hours to Clear, going at it in this way. But recognize it as a clearing procedure.

Now, a guy got all messed up because he had a goal. See, he wanted to do something. Somebody has already written in and said to me, "Well now look, if the pc's goal is this important, shouldn't you look just a little bit earlier, Ron, and find the assertion? Now, I'll give you an idea of what I mean. 'To catch catfish.' Now, a little bit earlier he must have had to assume that there were catfish to be caught. And therefore you find the assertion that there are catfish, and therefore it would clear the pc much faster."

Well, that's perfectly valid thinking – as long as you just think about it. That's perfectly valid and I'm very glad that somebody was thinking about it at all. But of course that's the second goal he's talking about.

So he's asking me, "Why don't you find the second goal before you find the first goal?" Well, if he knew how much sweat it was on most pcs just to find the first goal, he wouldn't be worried about finding the second goal before you found the first one because that's impossible. The second goal is totally detached from the third goal, and the third goal totally detached from the fourth goal. But the truth of the matter is, they tend to be solutions, one to a next. It's quite interesting.

Second goal set up problems which the first goal – you know, I mean, we're speaking now of the first goal we find – is a solution to. "To catch catfish," well, it's some kind of a solution. A second goal is, "to make too much of everything." See, and it happens that its terminal, its chief terminal, is a catfish. So he gets down the track a while and he all of a sudden has this brilliant inspiration: The way to remedy it all is to catch catfish. Heh-heh! That will solve the problem set up, you see, on his earlier goal.

They aren't actually connected and they will blow separately, which is the most marvelous thing about clearing that I know of. They will take separate stance and they do blow separately and so forth. But nevertheless I have noticed that the second goal is solved by the first goal you'll find. And so on.

Now, this piece of bank started up by "to catch catfish," resulted in the fellow being something that would catch catfish, and having assumed that identity went about his business happily catching catfish until he ran into an oppterm which said, "Thou must not catch catfish." Of course you say, well, catfish is enough of an oppterm. No, that sort of generally runs through the whole thing. And catfish aren't going to be solved totally by that goal. But he gets to a game warden and the game warden says you mustn't catch catfish. See? So we've got pc – fisherman; game warden, see, is the oppterm. All right. Now, that's all dandy, but he goes into some kind of a – an avoidance there of game warden, so county commissioner appoints a game warden, don't you see, so he gets the idea that he had better be a politician, see, and that sort of gets him around this oppterm. And you'll get by these devious things and so forth, and then he finds out that economics inhibit the catching of catfish because the tackle is very expensive. You know, I mean, all kinds of wild things happen.

So he picks up additional oppterms and additional terminals, and he's still going on this goals line, but he's becoming different things, opposing different things, and different things are opposing him, see? And so you get this horrible muddle of little black balls which you call the GPM.

All right. Now, as this dance continues, you recognize that it's full of overts. He's getting motivators like crazy as a terminal, you see, and he's passing out overts like mad while

being this terminal, against other specialized and selected terminals. And the meter manifestation of all this activity is a rock slam. So all you've got to do is follow the rock slam, and you wind up with the later day things that – you know, you won't wind up with the fundamentals, you'll wind up with the later day things, you know, like "world conqueror," you see, that was the ultimate of politician. You know? And "nut house" is the oppterm, because every time he says he wants to conquer the world they tell him they're going to put him in the nut house, don't you see?

And it's very funny, you look back on the item track of the pc – after you have cleared him – and it all makes sense. Everything makes sense. It looks completely idiotic though, to you, perhaps, while you are finding items. But they all make sense and they are oppterms and they are terminals. Of course, the time we're doing this on most pcs we don't know what the pcs goal is. But these things are so stacked on it that we can't find the pc's goal easily.

The saving of time amounts to this: The pc's goal, we find it. Well, somebody sits down and he says, "What's your goal?" And he writes down five goals and one of them rocket reads and it goes *bang,* and he's got the pc's goal and it's all set, and so he gets a Prehav level and he's going to list the whole thing, and he gets down there and he says, "Now, who or what would want to catch catfish?"

And the pc says, *"hrrmm"* and it rock slams, *"hrmm"* and so on, I get a – so on," he says, "so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so," and rock slams pretty bad, tone arm starts up, and gets up, and gets up, and there it is – 5.0. It's just sitting at 5.0. You found his goal, but the tone arm is now sitting at 5.0.

What do you do about this? Just 3GA Criss Cross. You don't even have to find out, you see, what he's stuck on that made him go up to 5.0. You've just got to find an item that rock slams, don't you see? And then you will take the weight off the bank and then, because the weight is so great, his overts are so great in that direction, he dare not confront in that direction anymore. So he runs into this section of the bank and he says, "Oh, there's nothing there.

Ha-ha-ha." Lessens the overt, see? "Aha, no game wardens. Ha-ha-ha-ha, oh, yeah. Game warden, well, they're pretty unreal to me. Actually game wardens really aren't part of existence and I prefer not to associate with a game warden anyway. And there's no sense in putting that down on the list."

So he starts dealing off old items. You know, it's a treadmill. He never deals you this item. And his tone arm responses go up to 4.5, 5.0, stick, everything looked very mucky and muddy. Well, he couldn't confront it.

See, you found his goal. But you've got a – such a thoroughly burdened bank that the pc can't run it. And you'll find that more than often is the case. So the safe way to do it is not

to spend endless hours prepchecking goals, but find an item or two or three and then check the goal again. Find the goal any way you want to. Do you see how that would be? You can take enough weight off of this rock slam, you can take enough charge off of his overts so that he can confront what he has overts on, and then find out what he is while he's confronting overts against and therefore he can list. You see the track he's trying to list through, you see the game he's trying to list through? The complexities of it all?

All right. Now, as we enter the case, on some cases we'll find the goal more easily than we will find the item. When the goal isn't real, then neither are items. But that's beside the point. We arrive at the toughest end of 3GA Criss Cross, which is its beginning. Now, oddly enough the toughest end of every case is its beginning. And the toughest end of any procedure is its beginning. And this is very sad. Because at that end of the game we, of course, know the least about the pc. The toughest part of auditing should be down toward the end of the intensive, wouldn't you agree? It never is. It's right there in the first session. See, the pc has to be in the best possible condition to handle this, but we find him at this stage of the beginning, you see, in the worst possible condition, casewise, to handle it. And all this is very unfair because it makes the auditor's job much tougher. A ease, of course, should always be Clear before you start auditing him.

Well, turning on the rock slam is the first difficulty that you will run into in 3GA Criss Cross.

Now, in some eases this is dead-easy. You give them a See Check, a rock slamming See Check, and they just drop it in your laps. The thing is slamming like mad and one of the things you used on the See Check was it. Well, you've got your first item. And you just do what you do with it and carry on and there you are. That's easy. Some other ease, you sit there and you try this and you try that and you try something else and there's no rock slams.

Now, there is a method which will undoubtedly be espoused by the American Psychiatric Association – after it goes nuts and is dealing in one of its spinbins and trying to clear itself will of course – for the auditor to beat the pc often enough and long enough for the pc to develop a rock slam on the auditor. But this is not advised. Because all it's going to do is wind up as its basic-basic with the first session. And you were there anyway. So you might as well not take that excursion at all.

The thing to do is to get the pc in-session. That is your first action. Because if this pc is suppressing like mad and throwing his rudiments out like mad, you're never going to see a rock slam. It's going to start to turn on, it's going to turn off. The pc is going to suppress before anything occurs, because a rock slam can suppress out of existence, Careful of can turn off a rock slam, and particularly Protest. Protest, I have found, is a very hot button on rock slams. You get off the Protest and then you get off the Careful of and then you get off the Suppress and you usually have your rock slam back. But Protest is very vital in turning off

rock slams.

Now, how do you turn it all on? Well, the first thing, get the pc in-session. The next thing, there could be many steps and are several different methods. The easiest pc would be one that you simply say, "List the dynamics or parts of existence," he does, you assess it and you've got your first rock slam.

Next type of pc, next grade up, "Who or what have you detested?" They give you a list, it rock slams, you've got one of the persons there, and you've simply got your first item and you go on and use it.

Another pc, not quite as easy as this, is – you sneak up on him by – get "What – what do you wish hadn't been part of existence?" or some such phrase and then get what isn't part of existence. And he gives you a long dissertation on what isn't part of existence, you get a long list, one of those items rock slams like crazy, you're in and you've got your first item.

Now, let's take a slightly upgraded pc from this and let's get "What would you prefer not to associate with?" or "What wouldn't you want to associate with?" That is another entrance point. And you make a list of these things the pc wouldn't care to associate with and you will find there your rock slam at the final end of this.

Now, there are undoubtedly other approaches to this. We do not know them at this particular time. There are undoubtedly gradients that carry us in further on this particular road. But those are the various approaches that you can use to turn on a rock slam on a pc straight from scratch.

Now, how do we write this list? That might take up a little bit of interest here. We sit down, we put the pc in-session, we've got the pc well in-session, well under the auditor's control. We take a piece of legal-length paper – that's 13 inch by 8, or something like this, 13-inch-long paper, and we write the list in a single column, is usually best. Gives you lots of latitude. Some people who write very small can get two columns on the page with the greatest of ease. But if it gets too scrimpy and too small, why, the auditor starts having trouble and the next auditor that picks it up could shoot the last auditor that did it if he's having to renull something. So actually leave some space for things to happen.

All right, so you write it like this: You write the pc's name, you write the date and you write the question that you're asking the pc to get this list. Now, that is vital, because if anybody, including you, is ever going to make sense out of what's been going on with this pc, you're going to need those data. You're going to need the date, the pc's name. We don't care who the auditor is, we can't read it and we still know who you are. I mean, we're getting to be terrific deciphering calligraphers or something like that in Scientology. Man, you talk about cryptography! We'll be getting orders in here any minute from the Royal Navy to decipher the Japanese codes. We're getting good, you know, I mean, good. You'd think so if you could

look at some of these lists. It's all written in Arabic.

Anyway, you write those data. Now, when you turn the page over, of course, to write on the back side of it – and it's perfectly good and you should use the back side of that page, it's of course pure idiocy to repeat the question and the pc's name and the date. But how about Page 3? So you don't write anything on the back of Page 1, but you do write the figure "3" and the question. That gives you a consecutive series for page 3, don't you see? And you – somebody can see that "3" and they know there's a missing first page. Then they can find all the brutal data from the first page, don't you see? Because in the speed of writing up things, you don't want to delay too much, but it's very easy to write "3" and the question, isn't it? Then you can add it up, because you know there's a page there.

Well, supposing it goes over to another list, of course you go on the back of this list. You don't write anything on the back of this list. Now, you go to 5, don't you? And on 5 you'd better write the question again. That makes all these lists join up beautifully. You don't number 2, you don't number 4, don't you see; you don't date those things and so on, because that just holds up the pc. You get how that system works? I think you'll find that's very serviceable.

Your lists actually seldom go beyond page 5 if you're doing any kind of a job of watching what the score is at all, and you keep repeating the question to some pcs and the pcs will keep on giving it to you. And then on some pcs you will get a two or three hundred list to make it a complete list and all that sort of thing. All that's allowed for.

Now, when you null this list, your administration should actually, to keep you from making mistakes as you're flying along the line, your administration should be multiple color. And the best way to handle this is, the first time you go down the column, just to use the pen that you wrote the thing with. I've been using various versions of this and how easy it is or is not to spot. And this is the one I have been using lately and find it's working very well. I also have to work out administration while I'm doing these various things. Because you see, other people read these lists besides you. And if we don't standardize, then the next auditor can't make head nor tails out of what went on.

All right, now, you see, it's important that there be next auditors, particularly if you're finding goals and somebody else is listing the goal. This character will want to know what cooked here, because he may have to take off in the middle of something and do something about it, don't you see? Or some other goals finder may have to pick this thing up and he'll want to know what went on, see? And you may have left it at a dead end or something and then listed the goals against your last reliable item, but that wasn't good enough to carry the listing through. They want to find some more items. They've got the guys goal, but they've got to find some more items. Well, they'd certainly better know where it all ought to stop, don't you see?

Well you put slant marks, just the plain slant mark for everything that is in, in the color pencil that you wrote the list with, and then everything that is out you put an X. Your next time through, grab a red ballpoint. You actually could carry it on through with a red ballpoint. The second time through, if it's out, you put a full X. That leaves you there with things that are still in, glaringly apparent, don't you see? And it also, by the time – you'll find out by the time you've got two or three slants or a cross, to – well, three slants and a cross after several items on a page – it gets very hard to pick out if there are any still there. And you know, we've had some cases bog down in the past with 3D Criss Cross just because the auditor didn't follow this very stupid point.

They – there – there's two items in on this sheet! That are still in! And the auditor never nulled them and the whole thing went blooey and he couldn't find the goal and it all went up in smoke and then Mary Sue'd go over the thing again and there's two in. It was one of those. See, he just missed it, completely. It was sitting in the middle of the page. So this color code system's pretty good. I haven't ever bothered to carry it on into a greenflash system after it, but you could.

Now, how do you call a list? That's your most interesting thing. I've given you the headings of these lists – "Prefer not to associate with," all those these other headings of one kind or another. You ask the pc to list these things. Well you actually just ask the question and he gives you a flock of answers and you ask the question again. Or he wants you to ask the question again and you do, and he gives you some more answers, and then the needle you're watching it all the time.

Now, the best way to handle this on a meter is to pull your sensitivity down. Pull your sensitivity down so that you don't have to be adjusting this tone arm all the time, you got the idea? You don't pull it down to one or anything crazy like that, but you just – you just bring it down. That'd be very important to you when you get to a Mark V It just flies around so doggone much that you have to put it on a lower sensitivity than you would use to null, don't you see? And remember then your rock slam won't be so big. So you sit there with one thumb on the thing and your other hand wrapped around the pencil writing this list, keeping that thing in center, and watching the moment before the pc says it. Watching the meter the moment before the pc says it. See if there was a slam. You understand?

And every time you write down an item, you put after it, if it slammed, "R/S." And if it's just a little dirty needle turned on with it – just went *bzzbzz* – you write "dn." And if the pc volunteers that he had some pain on it you're not terribly interested in this, but if the pc volunteers he had some pain on an item or sensation on an item, why – you don't pester the pc for that data while he's listing, by the way. I see some of you have been. Just write it "pn" and "sen."

You're much more interested in the aggregate pain and sen of the whole list, or a sudden

pain or sensation that turned on.

The pc all of a sudden is going *"Whhhh!"* and you say, "What's the matter?"

"Well, my legs, just from the waist down are – just went hot as fire."

You say, "Well, when did they go hot as fire?" and try to trace it back up the list to what item turned it on and then mark it over here as a very likely item because the somatic is one of your indicators. Got it?

Pc tells you they're – they're – they're uncomfortable – you ask the pc and they say they are – trace it back to where it turned on. That's good procedure.

You don't go nulling back there, you just say, all right, when, and the pc will eventually tell you. And remember, the pc nearly always tells you one or two late.

See, it's on – it's on item – it's on item 83 on your list – you don't number these items, by the way – and actually the pc says it turned on on item 83, that was when he noticed it. It might also have been 82 or 80, don't you see?

So you kind of watch that closely. He gives you an indicator.

Sometimes on a Dynamic Assessment, a somatic will turn on – or a sensation, more likely a sensation – will turn on so shatteringly when you hit *the* dynamic, that there isn't any thought of going on with the session. The pc is practically booted out of his chair, don't you see? And you'd just better take care of that right now. You'd better listen to the pc about it and you'd better hear about this and you'd better hear how it turned on and you'd better mark it down very adequately on your report and you persuade the pc: "Now, without invalidating this item or abandoning it or anything like that, of course – have to null the rest of the list – is that all right with you?" and you go on and null the rest of the list and then cope with it afterwards, do you understand? But every once in a while, when you've got an item, *bang,* you – he thinks the roof fell in. And that's a terrific indicator, it almost always is the item.

All right. Now, just your administration of this should be fairly neat. And somebody should be able to read these lists. But how do you call this list off ? All right, if it is an oppterm list, it's "Consider committing overts against..." Or to shorten it up, ". . . overts on." Uh, "Consider committing overts on____ " Now, that's a mouthful, but you're not going to be able to get away with it. I made several tests of just calling it off all by itself and I found out that I missed the boat when I did that, on oppterms, so oppterms are always called with "Consider committing overts against____ " or "Think of doing bad things to____." You could also say, "Would you do bad things to?" or "Would you commit overts on____?" or "Would you commit?" It' overts against____?" It's what registers with this pc, what makes sense. So there's variations of this. But they all carry the connotation of "Consider committing overts against____." Because it's the overts against that are going to turn on the slams.

Now, you've got a checkpoint, "Consider withholding things from and you're going to get the same responses on your assessment, but

it's not going to discharge it as well. You understand? Once "Consider committing overts against is all worn out on this item, you can always say,

"Think of withholding things from_____," and you'll get the slam back.

See, they're both sides of the same coin. You see that?

All right. So an oppterm list is always called in this particular way. Now, a terminals list – a terminals list, can be called directly or very involvedly. It can simply – you just call it. You know, "Waterbuck, tiger, cat, dog, fire warden," see. And register the instant reads. That's a terminals list. You just go *bark, bark, bark, bark, bark* down the line. Because it gets very involved to say, "Would a – whatever your item is on the list – commit overts against a tiger?" because nearly every one of them turns on a slam. How do you pick a slam out of all those slams? Because one of the characteristics of slams is they are persistent. You understand?

Now, one of the best ways to sort this thing out so it doesn't slam, is to put the terminal it's against, if you're repeating that terminal every time, before the sentence. "On tigers, would waterbucks commit overts? On tigers, would fire wardens commit overts?" See? That's if you're calling the whole sentence. You'll find that's one of the most desirable phrasings. Because you get rid of the tiger's rock slam, and then you just pick up general rock slam that turns on either with the item itself or overts against. But overts itself occasionally slams, so picking your way through it is quite interesting.

But fortunately, with your meter turned up to a very high sensitivity you can read them once and take any instant read on a terminal. You cannot do this for an oppterm. A terminal's list can just be *bark, bark, bark, bark, bark – o*nce each. You understand?

Now, "Consider committing overts against," you see, any such phrasing as this can also be read just once if you're an old sharpie on the meter. Now, if you're not sure, for God's sakes, don't fake it, just read it again.

Now, do you tell the pc if it's in or out? No, you don't. The more words you can get the hell out of auditing, kick them out! Now, "Would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger? Thank you. Would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger? Thank you. Would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger? Thank you. That is out." How long did it take me to say that? A shocking length of time. Multiply it by 80 and you'll see why it takes you a week and a half to find an item, see?

All right, we've got an oppterm list. See? Its got "tiger" on it. And right after "tiger," why it's got "carnivore." We say "Consider committing overts against a tiger. Consider committing overts against a carnivore." Where's the "that's in"? Where's the "thank you"? Well, the hell with it. Pc's got all the thank-yous he needs. How does he know if it's in or out?

Won't that develop you a dirty needle? Well, after a while he'll get bright enough to find out that your pencil goes flick-flick, when it's out, and flick when it's in. They smarten up quick.

In other words you can read them once. There's no "thank you." There's no "that's in, that's out." We're talking about this peculiar type of nulling. This doesn't alter nulling and doing other things in other departments of the game, see. This is talking about 3GA Criss Cross. The auditor says *bark, bark, bark, bark,* new one every time, you know? Then all of a sudden why, "Consider committing overts against a fire warden." Didn't miss that, you know? You don't say, well, "I'm awfully sorry, pc, I – hey – I – I'm awfully sorry – come out of your boil – off – I'm awfully sorry that I missed that. I – I – I think I should have – have – have watched the meter more closely. And if it's all right with you . . ." I'd better run some Havingness first, all right, I'll run some Havingness on him. See, that's not the way you do it at all, see.

You say, "Consider committing overts against a fire warden." Didn't read it, see, you didn't read it, but you don't say anything at all, you just say, "Consider committing overts against a fire warden. Consider committing overts against a fire warden." That's all. You didn't get it the first time so you read it twice. Pc knows you're reading it twice and going to read it again, because he – his mind very rapidly gets educated to the fact that you don't go slant-slant, see. He hears your ballpoint go scrape-scrape. Slash. You got the idea?

Well that's how you pick it up to an hour and ten minutes to list and find the item, see? Now, that requires very, very reliable meter reading, because you miss the key one and you've had it. You shouldn't have gotten out of bed that all – at all that morning, because the pc now has a missed withhold and the pc has this and the pc has that, and everything has gone to hell in a balloon. Now, the upshot of all this auditing culminates in a reliable item. A reliable item. That can be an oppterm or a terminal. And that meant one that slams when you found it. It slams in the same session that you found it. It doesn't have to slam the next day. It reliably slams and that means found. You completed the *whole* nulling and that one slams. You completed the whole nulling and that one now slams and that is the proven item, that is your last reliable item. Next day doesn't have to slam, never has to slam again to the end of time. Because of course you discharge the slam off and it'll be rapidly transferred onto something else just the moment you start listing.

You've got to – it's got to find it that day, though. See, and it had to slam very nicely and then you mark it down there on the report in letters of fire that that item slammed, and how wide it slammed, and how long it slammed. Now, one that slams just twice is something that the pc – and then passed out, you can't tiger drill it back on again, that's not good enough, in the session, see. Because you should be able to get that slam on and off You should be able to regulate that slam with a Tiger Drill, you understand? You understand that?

It's not enough to have it go slam-slam while you're listing, and then never slammed

again and didn't slam at the end and you call that an item. You'll be up in soup. All the way down the list you've got an item slamming, slamming, clear to the end, you've got items slamming. You go over it again, you don't have a slam in the whole lot. And it's – *huhhh! You* say, "What happened?" Nothing happened except the pc's rudiments may be out, but the fact of the game is because the pc was saying them while you were listing them put the pc on the other side of the fence, and now when you're nulling them you don't get slams back on. So don't let it worry you when something doesn't slam again while you're listing; only start worrying if it doesn't slam at the end of the activity. Then you should start worrying. No slam on the list. You understand that?

You don't have to get slams back. What do you expect this list to do? Just stay preserved in wax till the end of time? What do you think was happening while you were listing? You were listing a slam off. It very often puzzles you because you go by a rock slam. You know, it listed it and you marked it "R/S" and you go by nulling it and it doesn't R/S. There's many an auditor here then spends the next half an hour fooling around trying to get that to R/S. Aw, to hell with it. Don't bother with it. So it didn't R/S, so what? Make fairly sure your middle rudiments are in and carry on. That doesn't mean you get your middle rudiments in just because it didn't R/S, either. You just go sailing down the list.

You're only interested in a rock slam on the last item. It's the only rock slam you're interested in. You want that thing to slam. Oddly enough you can instant read it all the way through on a Terminals Assessment just calling the item. No "Consider overts." Get down to the last three, tiger drill the last three, you know, "On this item so-and-so has anything been suppressed?" you know. And add "Protest" to your Tiger Drill. And get that all tiger drilled off, and then I´ll say, "All right. Would a waterbuck commit overts on a tiger?" *Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slams*, great! Do the next two. See? There's no slam in those, they just clean up and disappear. You got – you've got your item. *Slam-slam-slam-slam*. Now, it stops slamming. Don't say to the pc, "What the hell did you do? What kind of a pc are you anyway? What are you doing?. " you know? I found out that doesn't pay.

Pc begins to self-audit if you do it too much. The thing for you to do is tiger drill it again. And then use Big Tiger. Start using Big Tiger when the pc's pulling tricks on you, see. "Not suppress" is one of the things. "Not careful." You know, "Careful." All of a sudden, you suddenly wake up and realize you aren't saying, "Committing overts." That's the thing that produces the slam, you know, you have to say, "Committing overts." "Ah, yes! Well, would a waterbuck commit overts against a tiger?" *Slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam-slam slam-slam-slam,* that's fine. Slams went off, and came on, and go out, and you mark it down in your auditor's report, and you say, "reliable item." In your red pencil in the middle of your blue report, you say, "reliable item, tiger." There it is. Underscored. Never has to slam again to the end of your days or anybody else's and probably won't. You understand? But you've got

the last reliable item.

Now, why do you want the last reliable item? Very simple. There's the law of the last reliable item. What do you do when you've followed the rock slam to a dirty needle and went off the deep end of the cliff and you are now nowhere and the pc is ARC broken and disinterested and all life has turned green and gorgeously bilious? What do you do? You return to the last reliable item and do something else with it.

Second rule is: there are two things you can do with an item – you can oppose one or represent one. If you have opposed one the other thing you can do is to represent. If you oppose one and don't get a slam, then you can represent and down to a slam. In other words, if you've done one, you now do the other. If you've done one with no result you now do the other. And you'll probably get your result.

Now, items that are listed on oppose are always reversed. You say, "Would a waterbuck – ," you know, "Who or what would oppose a tiger?" you know and "Who or what would a tiger oppose?" You always call them both ways. You make two lists, treat it as one list when you null it, but reverse your "Consider committing overts" command, if you're doing it that way or if it is a terminals list, just call it one-shot, you know, one item at a time on the way down, mark any instant read as in. In other words you get two lists out of an oppose. "Would a waterbuck op – " in other words, "Would – Who or what would oppose a tiger?" and "Who or what would a tiger oppose?" And you'll always catch the brass ring in that particular fashion.

Now, inert – this is the law on this: Inert items are represented most of the time, and active emanating items are opposed. And you won't go very far wrong by doing that. If you ask the pc is it – pc sometimes doesn't know. Well, do one or the other and you'll only be 50 percent of the time wrong. You see how this is?

In other words, you represent an inert item, something that is not active. "Dumb bunny." There is a good inert item. So you represent "dumb bunny." Supposing you come to the end "an ox head." All right, now, you represent "an ox head," don't you see, because it's still inert, and all of a sudden you'll find yourself sitting there with an active item. So you oppose it. Got the idea? "A spitting cat," oppose. Get the idea? "Shotgun," oppose. See? And you most of the time you'll be right. And part of the time you'll be wrong.

What do you do when you go off the deep edge? You use the rule of the last reliable item. That's a very reliable rule. The last one that you could really count on, you represented and it wound you up nowhere, ha-ha! Go back and oppose it. Supposing you neither get a represent nor oppose off of it and it all goes to hell? Then you go back to the last reliable item before that. Got it?

An item may rock slam and not be accompanied by cognition. Very doubtful, very

doubtful. You'll get sensation on oppterms, pain on terms. You will get a rock slam and a cognition. In other words the pain or sensation, depending on whether it's a terminal or oppterminal, and in addition to that, the rock slam, and in addition to that, pc's interest and cognitions, and that's what it takes to make an item. If you follow that on down and you either oppose or represent against the rule of whether it's inert or emanating, you'll find yourself following the rock slam. And you will do a very lot for the pc, and eventually, you will find that an item you get to, rocket reads, unless the pc has something against going Clear. But I will take that up in another lecture.

Thank you very much.

Good night.