USAGES OF 3D CRISS CROSS

A lecture given on
31 January 1962

Thank you.

And this is 31 Jan. 62. I'm going to talk to you today about some peculiar usages of 3D Criss Cross. The material I am giving you is at the moment under test, and so on. But you have a right to know about it. And this will ju—also give you a clue while I am—why I'm being so utterly beastly on the subject of differentiation—so beastly about it.

If you can't differentiate, you can't do 3D Criss Cross, and I know you can differentiate and do 3D Criss Cross, and if you don't know it, why, catch up.

The bulk of the older auditors that have been on course longer are doing it beautifully. No complaints whatsoever. Gorgeous. But those that are on the middle grade right now, aah, ooph, ugh! Awful. Just horrible.

There's too much "I tried but I goofed," see? All I want is "do," you see? And if you equate "tried" plus "goof," you don't equal "do," you see? There's in fact an old gag, you know, in Scientology, about try. You know, if you just keep trying, of course, you never reach it.

Now, I've been studying this, and 3D Criss Cross has a great future. And it has a great future in your auditing, let me tell you. And there are only some few basic skills.

And the basic skills are: Get the rudiments in. Know how to read a meter so as to get the rudiments in. You needn't write these down because I keep telling you, you know. And be able to sec check somebody so that you don't miss any withholds anyplace. And be able to do the type of assessment that goes with a Problems Intensive—you know, that's just, run down a list and see which falls the most. And then there's assessment. And the whole field of assessment, of course, consists of those steps which you are doing for 3D Criss Cross. And this is a separate skill.

A person has to know all these other things before they can even attempt this other. But right away, because of the demands on the auditor, the precision of the process just shines up every missing TR. You might have gotten away, you see—in Sec Checking, you might have gotten away with smoking a cigar and blowing smoke in the pc's face in lieu of TR 2; or something like that. You might have gotten away with these little flubs, but not, not on a Class III skill. You just don't get away with it. It just—the auditing just doesn't work, that is all.

And it puts the burden on the auditor's skill. That is where the burden lies. The burden actually no longer lies on whether the technology works.

Now, more and more we have been moving into this area of less and less question about technology which, of course, makes us look around and find out where is the Q factor. And the Q factor is in the application of it. And that is why there is a Saint Hill Briefing Course.

And when that fact emerged, that the auditor was not catching up with the technology, of course, it caused a total review of auditing as it was done all around the world, and we found it wasn't good enough. It wasn't good enough to get the total result. Hence, the Saint Hill Briefing Course. You make me make snide remarks like "Auditors aren't good enough." Actually, I have a lot of faith in auditors in general.

Auditors are good enough in their hearts. I want them to demonstrate it in the session.

Now, this is very germane to the material I'm about to give you. Now, the material will work for you or it won't. I mean, there's no grays in here. I mean, it just goes from dark black to brilliant white with no gray in between. The material will work for you or it doesn't.

And whether the material works for you has nothing to do with intuition or insight. It just has to do with TRs, running an E-Meter and keeping the rudiments in and doing the earlier skills well. And if a person moves up into Class IIb and is still ragged on some of his TRs—bam!—it shows up on 3D Criss Cross like somebody lighting tar barrels and throwing off rockets.

Now, he might have been able to sit there, and—he might have been able to sit there, you see, and do Sec Checks and do nicely and do marvelously and look very good, and everybody thought he was doing fine, and everybody thought it was all smooth, and everybody thought it was. And then you move into Class III and head-on into 3D Criss Cross. And what happens? See?

It—now you have a technology which demonstrates conclusively whether or not the auditor can audit, see? And if the auditor can audit—just do these various things, the TRs and keep the rudiments in, and do his proper address to just the technology of auditing. I mean, it isn't anything esoteric, you see? And if he hasn't got all of those very, very good, 3D Criss Cross—poom— doesn't work.

He sits down, he audits the pc, pc wonders why you're differentiating the list. This is one of the commonest remarks the pc makes: "Why are we wasting time differentiating?" That is a common remark. You just wait for that one. See, well, why are we differentiating? Well, why are we doing 3D Criss Cross, see? I mean, it obviously isn't working if people are busy asking questions of "Why are we doing it?"

And it goes straight back to nothing in the pc's case that is wrong. 3D Criss Cross will audit them all the way to the bottom. The lowest patient in the sanitarium, man—as long as he will talk to you, even gibberingly amongst his monkey squeaks, you can do 3D Criss Cross on him. And you can even go below that and do it on a psychiatrist.

Now, this also goes all the way up to the top, and this thing has burst in upon us, and I haven't given you any top billing for 3D Criss Cross. I've just been waiting—letting you find it out. Well, you found it out. It works. And it works like mad. Well, all right.

Now, for whom does it work? It works for the trained auditor—not for the supersensitive auditor, not for the intuitive auditor, not for the auditor who knows more than the E-Meter, you see, none of those things. That has nothing to do with it. We're out of that because it just takes a good, clean job of auditing, that's all.

A person can do his TRs—pc makes an origin—origination, auditor handles the origination, bang! List goes null, auditor knows the rudiments are out, puts the rudiments in again, bang! He's back into session. You know, I mean, it's just bingety-bingety-bing But everything's got to be working

This is no process to do—this is no process to do at all—if the auditor is still worried about whether the sensitivity knob should be moved before the tone arm. See, if this is still a big problem to the auditor, you see, he had no business doing 3D Criss Cross, see. He has to be able to integrate these tools into one package of action. That's what he has to be able to do. He actually has to be able to do them all at once, perfectly. Sufficiently so that he never has to spend any time worrying about whether he's doing it right.

All right. Then of course he's auditing the pc. He's not worrying about whether or not he's got his fundamentals straight. So that's the time that 3D Criss Cross works.

Now, there's no grays. It doesn't work slightly. It works very well if audited, or it doesn't work. You could make some junior process out of this whereby it could be done indifferently,

and you could find a 3D package, and you could audit it with a repetitive process, and so forth. But it's something on the order of taking a jet plane and using the thing to keep the rain off the motor parts at the edge of the hangar, you know? Thuh just thuhh. Now, some of the uses of this is what I want to talk to you about, not berate you about your auditing, because by and large, I think you're all doing well. Much better than should be expected in some cases, of course.

But just raise your sights. The final test on this sort of thing—it's the easiest thing in the world to classify a Class III Auditor. Just look at his last half dozen session reports on 3D Criss Cross. Was the pc flying? The guy can audit. Pc wasn't flying? Nah, he got a lot to learn. I mean that—it's no longer "What is wrong with this pc that this pc is not functioning" you see? That's not the question you ask.

You just say well, Class III, pc was fine. All right. Fine.

Class II is a much rougher examination than Class III, from that basis. I mean, much rougher on the standpoint of the Examiner. How do you establish whether or not a person can do that. Well, yes, he's cleared up several Sec Check questions. Yes, his rudiments are in. Yes, he can do these various things.

Well, we can examine that, and that's not hard to examine, but it is much more difficult to examine a Class II than a Class III, because a Class III, practically all you have to do is open up the case folders of the cases the fellow is working on: The pc is flying, he's okay. Pc isn't flying, he isn't okay. Do I make my point here? It's just an open-and-closed proposition.

Now, everything I'm going to tell you about the experimental use of 3D Criss Cross is modified by these very things I have given you here at the introduction.

Experimental use of 3D Criss Cross includes curing up anything. Just anything I don't care whether a guy's got lumbosis or what. It could cure it. Experimentally, that is an asserted fact.

Any chronic somatic, any circuit, any hidden standard, any other anything that anybody has run into on cases apparently is curable by 3D Criss Cross worked right and used right. So you're looking at the Kohinoor diamond, in actual fact. And I wouldn't be so mean—because I'm seldom bestial about these things; I'm usually very kind, very kindhearted, mostly—except where I can see where you could go and you ain't going there, see? And then right away, why, I start riding at the flanks and pushing And you right now, of course, as you well realize, are being pushed.

You're not being pushed. You're being shoved hard. You understand? And of course, you're only being shoved up to a realization of your own skill.

Now, here we go. How would you cure a person who had a circuit that accused him all the time of being a beast? Now, let's just take that as a hypothetical case. This is neurosis ne plus ultra. Neurosis Freudosis.

Well, you ask the guy what he's got, and the guy has got a voice which tells him he's a beast. And this is the only thing he will say he has got and this is worrying him. In fact, he is frantic about it. In fact, even as he tells you about it, the voice tells him he is a beast to tell you about it, don't you see? All right.

Now, what do we do? We take any statement that the pc has even vaguely made, and we find "Who or what would oppose (statement)?"—see, that circuit; whatever he's described it as, you see? And we make a "Who or what would oppose?" list. And then we just go through the various steps of 3D Criss Cross with that list, and we come up at the other end with some item that is sticking.

All right. Voilà! We don't do a thing with it. That is what is interesting In fact, you'd better not do anything with it, because that item is unrunnable. Now, let's get into this more neatly here.

The condition which he has told you about—I don't care what the condition is. Mother-in-law stays with him too long every year. All right. You want to solve his present time problem about this, you see. You just do the same thing. It's a statement of what the pc says is wrong with him. You know, pc is always telling you something is wrong with him, and sometimes you look hard, you'll find the pc knows something is wrong with him but hasn't told you. The various methods of discovering this I will cover in a moment. But at the present moment, let's just say this condition.

All right. Now, mark my words now. This condition is not auditable with safety. You cannot safely audit that condition, because it is too far from the Goals Problem Mass. It is probably some kind of a lock valence, and if you ran it directly, you are liable to beef up the whole Prehav Scale. And the pc starts going around wog-glog-zeboog SEN is liable to turn on with considerable PN.

So you don't want to audit that condition. Now, underscore that and mark that well, and flap your ears on it because that's really important. Don't audit the condition the pc told you about.

I'll give you a little back history on this. Along about 1954, I started telling you don't audit the pc's chronic somatics, and all that sort of thing. Lay off of this stuff.

Now, the basic background music to why I kept saying this is because it often enough didn't do the pc any good. That was often enough. But in some of the cases it practically spun the pc in. And there was a bug factor here which made it necessary to lay off of these things.

All right. I wasn't aware of the fact that everybody was spinning in all over the place, but I knew people were not being successful with this, and it was no business for us to be in at that time. Now, I'm telling you, it would very easily be in this business because these are the bugs associated with it.

Why? It is a lock valence on the Goals Problem Mass. The condition is just probably some lousy old lock valence that hangs at the—that hangs on a lock valence that hangs on a lock valence, and the pc is aware of it.

Now, that the pc is aware of it tells you, one, that it will not blow and that isn't what's wrong with the pc. He's got this circuit in full bloom, you see, or he's got these ulcers in full bloom, or he's got this mother-in-law in full bloom. It doesn't matter what he's got in full bloom, he knows what is wrong with it, and it is still wrong. Now, that is your main test. If the pc "knows what is wrong with him" (quote, unquote) and it is still wrong with him, then obviously what he knows is wrong with him is the wrong answer. Isn't that pretty obvious? Because if it was right, if he knew what was wrong with him, it wouldn't be wrong with him. Why? It would as-is.

And if it doesn't as-is, then he doesn't know what's wrong with him, you see? And that—you—probably, even in your own case in running down the line, sooner or later, you collided with this interesting point, and you say, "Oh, I'd forgotten that," you know? That was out of view.

Up to that time, you knew exactly what was wrong with you. You knew it was your upbringing or your father coming home and bringing you lollipops that gave you bad teeth or something like that, and you ran into something, and it didn't have anything much to do with that. It was just vaguely associated with, and you ran into the real reason, and the condition went boom or something like this, and you felt better about it.

All right. So remember that the condition the pc tells you about or that you ferret out of the pc, if in the process of ferreting out of the pc, doesn't disappear, of course, is a description that is inaccurate. Otherwise, the moment it was described, it'd go whoow, see. And that would be the end of it.

But it doesn't, and I wish you to note this very carefully on pcs. There are two conditions. One, the pc tells you about this problem or difficulty, and it goes whoow, and you can't find it anymore on the E-Meter. And the other one, he tells you about this problem or difficulty, and you have to audit it. You see these? You see these two different conditions?

Well, now the first one that blew on two-way comm was factual. That was what was wrong with him. And the second, it isn't—we're not saying he isn't suffering from this, but his description of what it is, perforce must be inaccurate, because it doesn't blow. Now, it is just as one, two as that, you see?

"Well," he says, "I got a terrible headache."

And you say, "All right." And you ask him what's wrong with him.

"I got a terrible headache."

You say, "All right. Good. Where does it hurt?"

And he says, "Well, it hurts around here."

Now you have to audit it.

Well, now, how come it hurts after he told you about it? It's probably because he didn't have a headache. You ever stop and think about that? See? There's something wrong here.

He's either got a backache or his head is hot or something, but he has not made an accurate description of his condition. Of course, that he did describe it, he only described it, of course, to the depth that he could observe it. And he couldn't observe it deeply enough to as-is it so therefore that isn't what's wrong with him.

It goes deeper than that. So you can say of any condition that does not blow on two-way comm that it is out of the pc's view. And that would be its first—the first thing that you could say about it.

So you have to resort to processes or activities which put it in the pc's view at which moment it would go bloom, and that would be the end of it, see? So it either blows or you have to audit it.

Now, if you have to audit it, it must—the auditing must disclose new data. And that is why you instinctively go round the bend halfway when a pc sits there for twelve consecutive sessions and has no single, slightest cognition of any kind. He never finds out anything. He never realizes anything He never finds anything new. He never gets anyplace in his knowledge of life and the world.

Well, that auditing must be up against a dead end, mustn't it? There's something wrong with it. Because, you see, if he's not going to disclose any new data, then what he has said is wrong with him that didn't blow, of course, couldn't possibly be blowing. It'd have to have new data come up to blow it. Otherwise, it'd just blow on two-way comm, don't you see?

And if it didn't blow on two-way comm, then it must be more deep-seated than that, and it requires new cognitions, new information, new knowledge, new penetration, new insight, and then it would blow. And if he's not getting those things, of course, his case is going nowhere.

So sitting down and auditing somebody endlessly—and they never have a cognition, and they never have a new thought, and they never recognize anything.

John Sanborn, back about 54, something like that, made a very interesting remark about this. He said, "Well," he said—he was auditing some pc—and he said, "Well, I'm suspicious of this fellow. Never once has he looked up and said, 'What do you know,' you know? Never has said that. He just never, never said 'What do you know,' you know, in all the time I've been auditing him." He's right, too. Case never recovered from anything.

It was an awfully good description of what a pc might be expected to do—sooner or later, look up and say, "What do you know," you know? And a pc who never says "What do you know," never gives any indication that anything has occurred of any kind whatsoever that might be brand-brassy-new to him— uh-uh, uh-uh, uh-uh, because, of course, no new data's being recovered.

All right. Let's go to the next thing. What is the most buried thing about you? About you? Come on, what is the most buried thing about you? What is the most buried thing about you? What is the most hidden thing about you? You? Aside from you, of course. What is it?

Well, if you can answer this question perfectly and rapidly without the slightest comm lag, why, you'll have disproved this whole theory.

What was your full name and street address in your last life? What was your full name and street address in the life just before that? What was your full name and street address in the life just before that? Now, you have possibly seen pictures of your last life. You possibly, if you were lucky enough to have your last li—unlucky enough to have your last life still kicking around into this life on the newsstands or something like this, of course, you're aware of what your name was. But you've seen some pictures of this sort of thing, and you've seen scraps of this and that and their surmises.

But sitting here in this lifetime, I can ask you this question. What's your name, see. And you'll sing out—bang, bang. You know, there's nothing much to that. Some of you have a slight comm lag, but . . .

Now, there's the proof of the pudding: that you can recover pieces of track and engrams. You can recover sequences and circumstances. Well, you can get an engram—the pc and somebody else is in the bois at dawn very early in the matin, and they have sharp toothpicks that they are about to insert into each other's vitals, and we get this as an engram, you see? We get the somatics; we get all kinds of things. We get the twittering of the "boids" as they twitter in the bois. We even get a death. We may even get a trial afterwards. We get all sorts of things, but we ask the pc, "What was your opponent's name?"

You say, "Aah, oh, well, that's a new thought. Um, René. Yeah, René. No, no, no, that was—no, uh—well.... But let me tell you about the birds in the bois."

Identity or beingness is the most hidden fact about you. Experience—we can find experience, you see? That's easy. We can find masses and pictures and engrams and somatics and all that sort of thing. That is easy. We can find flows, bango. Nothing to that, you see? But what's your name?

So we get beingness as the most hidden factor. And that is why 3D Criss Cross works like a startled dream. Because you're recovering beingnesses, see. Bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang. So you're working at the most hidden piece of knowingness there is on the track which is "Who was you, Mac?" You see?

You notice in crowded areas they solve this. They solve this beingness by always being the same beingness. Did you ever notice this? That makes everything very simple. All taxi

drivers know this in New York City. To them everyone is Mac. And they have no trouble with this whatsoever.

Now, you're recovering beingness, is what you're doing And beingness, of course, is part of the package of experience. And I studied experience a year or two—a couple of years ago, and so forth, and never got much of anyplace with it because it was—experience is the doingness of a beingness. You see?

As long as you run doingnesses and beingnesses, you, of course, will recover experience. And apparently experience is the easiest thing to recover on the track.

You could always say to a pc, "You ever been drowned?" And the pc starts going glug, glug, glug, you know. Well, interrupt him at that point and say, "Well, what was your name then while you were being drowned?" you know?

He can't tell you, you know. He can tell you that he drowned. He can reexperience the drowning, but who was he? In fact, it's a big mystery all over the place. 3D Criss Cross in recovering this, of course, is throwing into view large sections of track. And in that—the basic game of a pc requires first, a beingness and a doingness and then a havingness—the basic game or a no havingness—gets into, then, a beingness versus a beingness. And we get the beingness versus a beingness situation, and these hang up like problems.

Now, a problem is a postulate-counter-postulate, idea-counter-idea, A versus B, and the reason a problem hangs up and tends to go on forever and floats in time is that it is rather well balanced. The idea versus the idea. Since you're not given a problem by a little child very often, who comes up and gives you a gratuitous datum, see? This is not usually a datum of magnitude to what you've got as a datum, see? So it doesn't hang up. You don't worry about it. But you run into a friend of yours, and you say, "Those Russians never did get a man into space," and your friend says, "Well, they did, too."

Now, you've got beingnesses of comparable magnitude and it makes a problem, ha-ha. So you have a fight with your friend about—he says the Russians got somebody into space, and you say they didn't get anybody into space, and it was all hoax and propaganda. And he says no, it wasn't; he saw pictures of the moon and all kinds of things. It can be a problem, see, but what makes it a problem is the A plus B, the identity versus the identity. So you have to have identities of somewhat comparable magnitude to hang this thing up.

Now, the Goals Problem Mass consists of problems of the magnitude of a game. Big, big problems. And of course, these problems are resident in identities. And you can audit the identity out of the Goals Problems Mass, but peculiarly enough, you cannot audit the problem out of the identity. Ha-haha-ha. Isn't that interesting?

You can't audit the problem out of the identity, but you can audit the identity off the problem. That's a funny mechanic, but it apparently works that way.

When you start running a pc on Rising Scale—this is dandy, by all means, run Rising Scale and early processes, and so forth—you're actually merely shifting around slightly the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the beingness that the pc is sitting in. And it doesn't shift much. Let me assure you. Well, it shifts a little. You can get some considerable gains and results. Enough to keep us going for a long time. I mean, it was all right. We were happy with them at the time.

But how about blowing the whole ruddy package, what? How about blowing all the 16,972 problems per minute that this character had, see? Because this beingness in the bank is posed against another beingness in the bank which keeps it in balance and floats it in time. So all time is that time, and here it is all locked up in the middle of nowhere. You get this idea?

All right. So now let's get back to the statement of the condition the pc has made. See, whether it's his mother-in-law's staying with him too long, or he has lumbosis, or it's—he's

got a circuit or something that calls him a beast all the time. We don't care what this thing was. We say, "Who or what would oppose it?"

Now, we don't run the condition because the condition is probably a fragment of the beingness that he has not identified. Nor do we audit what we find as the opposition terminal to the condition. We don't audit the opposition terminal to the condition, but we oppterm that. And those three steps are necessary:

1) Identify the condition. Get a statement of the condition. Find out what the condition is. And believe me, that covers an awful bag of tricks, let me comment in passing. There's an awful bag of tricks attached to finding out from the pc what the condition is.

Number 2, find the opposition beingness. That is to say, you could call it the opposition terminal, but you find an opposition beingness to the condition.

And then number 3, find the opposition to number 2, and you'll wind up with the identity of what the condition has—the identity that—the beingness that had the condition.

You go around Robin Hood's barn to find this thing, you see? He's sitting there with nattering teeth. Let us say, this is his condition. Nattering teeth. And you can't ask him, now, "Who or what would have nattering teeth?" and really expect, in a large. . . On some cases, you'll get the answer promptly. Very few. But in—largely no. He's so fixated on these teeth that are hanging out in space in the bank, you see, that he can't quite....

Now, you say, "Who or what would oppose it?" Well, you've already knocked the chink out of the hidden suspension of that beingness. You see, for teeth to be suspended in the bank, there must be a beingness in the bank who has the teeth.

Well, you see, that is suspended in place by something he's never put his attention on which is an opposition terminal. So you just take that one, and you loosen that one all up. You take a lot of locks off of it and you loosen it all up, you see.

And then you go on around back and find out what would oppose that, and you get a beingness.

Now, if you do this very slippily and very well, something weird happens to his nattering teeth problem. Because now you've identified who and what has the nattering teeth. And you've also identified who and what would oppose the nattering teeth.

Now, you've shaken it up. Now, if you've done differentiation very well, You say, "Aah, oh, well, that's a new thought. Um, René. Yeah, René. No, no, no, that was—no, uh—well.... But let me tell you about the birds in the bois." Identity or beingness is the most hidden fact about you. Experience—we can find experience, you see? That's easy. We can find masses and pictures and engrams and somatics and all that sort of thing That is easy. We can find flows, bango. Nothing to that, you see? But what's your name?

So we get beingness as the most hidden factor. And that is why 3D Criss Cross works like a startled dream. Because you're recovering beingnesses, see. Bangety-bangety-bangety-bangety-bang So you're working at the most hidden piece of knowingness there is on the track which is "Who was you, Mac?" You see?

You notice in crowded areas they solve this. They solve this beingness by always being the same beingness. Did you ever notice this? That makes everything very simple. All taxi drivers know this in New York City. To them everyone is Mac. And they have no trouble with this whatsoever.

Now, you're recovering beingness, is what you're doing. And beingness, of course, is part of the package of experience. And I studied experience a year or two—a couple of years ago,

and so forth, and never got much of anyplace with it because it was—experience is the doingness of a beingness. You see?

As long as you run doingnesses and beingnesses, you, of course, will recover experience. And apparently experience is the easiest thing to recover on the track.

You could always say to a pc, "You ever been drowned?" And the pc starts going glug, glug, glug, you know. Well, interrupt him at that point and say, "Well, what was your name then while you were being drowned?" you know?

He can't tell you, you know. He can tell you that he drowned. He can reexperience the drowning, but who was he? In fact, it's a big mystery all over the place. 3D Criss Cross in recovering this, of course, is throwing into view large sections of track. And in that—the basic game of a pc requires first, a beingness and a doingness and then a havingness—the basic game or a no havingness—gets into, then, a beingness versus a beingness. And we get the beingness versus a beingness situation, and these hang up like problems.

Now, a problem is a postulate-counter-postulate, idea-counter-idea, A versus B, and the reason a problem hangs up and tends to go on forever and floats in time is that it is rather well balanced. The idea versus the idea. Since you're not given a problem by a little child very often, who comes up and gives you a gratuitous datum, see? This is not usually a datum of magnitude to what you've got as a datum, see? So it doesn't hang up. You don't worry about it. But you run into a friend of yours, and you say, "Those Russians never did get a man into space," and your friend says, "Well, they did, too"

Now, you've got beingnesses of comparable magnitude and it makes a problem, ha-ha. So you have a fight with your friend about—he says the Russians got somebody into space, and you say they didn't get anybody into space, and it was all hoax and propaganda. And he says no, it wasn't; he saw pictures of the moon and all kinds of things. It can be a problem, see, but what makes it a problem is the A plus B, the identity versus the identity. So you have to have identities of somewhat comparable magnitude to hang this thing up.

Now, the Goals Problem Mass consists of problems of the magnitude of a game. Big, big problems. And of course, these problems are resident in identities. And you can audit the identity out of the Goals Problems Mass, but peculiarly enough, you cannot audit the problem out of the identity. Ha-haha-ha. Isn't that interesting?

You can't audit the problem out of the identity, but you can audit the identity off the problem. That's a funny mechanic, but it apparently works that way.

When you start running a pc on Rising Scale—this is dandy, by all means, run Rising Scale and early processes, and so forth—you're actually merely shifting around slightly the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the beingness that the pc is sitting in. And it doesn't shift much. Let me assure you. Well, it shifts a little. You can get some considerable gains and results. Enough to keep us going for a long time. I mean, it was all right. We were happy with them at the time.

But how about blowing the whole ruddy package, what? How about blowing all the 16,972 problems per minute that this character had, see? Because this beingness in the bank is posed against another beingness in the bank which keeps it in balance and floats it in time. So all time is that time, and here it is all locked up in the middle of nowhere. You get this idea?

All right. So now let's get back to the statement of the condition the pc has made. See, whether it's his mother-in-law's staying with him too long, or he has lumbosis, or it's—he's got a circuit or something that calls him a beast all the time. We don't care what this thing was. We say, "Who or what would oppose it?"

Now, we don't run the condition because the condition is probably a fragment of the beingness that he has not identified. Nor do we audit what we find as the opposition terminal

to the condition. We don't audit the opposition terminal to the condition, but we oppterm that. And those three steps are necessary:

1) Identify the condition. Get a statement of the condition. Find out what the condition is. And believe me, that covers an awful bag of tricks, let me comment in passing There's an awful bag of tricks attached to finding out from the pc what the condition is.

Number 2, find the opposition beingness. That is to say, you could call it the opposition terminal, but you find an opposition beingness to the condition.

And then number 3, find the opposition to number 2, and you'll wind up with the identity of what the condition has—the identity that—the beingness that had the condition.

You go around Robin Hood's barn to find this thing, you see? He's sitting there with nattering teeth. Let us say, this is his condition. Nattering teeth. And you can't ask him, now, "Who or what would have nattering teeth?" and really expect, in a large. .. On some cases, you'll get the answer promptly. Very few. But in—largely no. He's so fixated on these teeth that are hanging out in space in the bank, you see, that he can't quite....

Now, you say, "Who or what would oppose it?" Well, you've already knocked the chink out of the hidden suspension of that beingness. You see, for teeth to be suspended in the bank, there must be a beingness in the bank who has the teeth.

Well, you see, that is suspended in place by something he's never put his attention on which is an opposition terminal. So you just take that one, and you loosen that one all up. You take a lot of locks off of it and you loosen it all up, you see.

And then you go on around back and find out what would oppose that, and you get a beingness.

Now, if you do this very slippily and very well, something weird happens to his nattering teeth problem. Because now you've identified who and what has the nattering teeth. And you've also identified who and what would oppose the nattering teeth.

Now, you've shaken it up. Now, if you've done differentiation very well, you've blown it to glory. And if you're lucky, you just blew it up on step 2. And if you're—you don't need quite so much luck to blow it up on step 3. But you've certainly got something now that is safe to audit.

You see, supposing these nattering teeth, he thinks at first glance, would belong to some unproved part of a Goals Problem Mass. And let's say that if we ran mother-in-law—this would be so far from any part of the Goals Problem Mass and yet so closely pinned to it that we'd beef up the whole Prehav Scale. See, that would be a risky thing to do. No, let's prove it out. Let's go around Robin Hood's barn and prove the thing out.

Let's take the condition, find the opposition to the condition, and then find the opposition to the opposition, and we are going to wind up with a large chunk of bank with a hole in it. Now, that action alone may be adequate or sufficient, but you also have something that you could audit.

Now, you had to pay attention to what has SEN and what has PN because the—when you found the opposition to the nattering teeth, and it gave him sensation and made him dizzy while you were doing the list— several items on it give him sensation—watch it because in the 3D package term, that is an oppterm.

And then you come around and find step 3, get the opposition to what you found in step 2, and it turned on pain—we had pains, ugggg-ugggg, clank, while he was doing the list, you

know, and while you were assessing it, and so forth; he had pains involved with the thing—that's a terminal.

Now, you run the terminal directly in such a case, or you can run a terminal, of course, against the opposition terminal which was the number 2 that you found. You see how you'd do that?

Now, therefore, just by this alone—depending the degree that the person is in-session and that sort of thing, and the skill of the auditor, and all that sort of thing monitoring it—you have in your hands about maybe a five-hour cure for arthritis. I mean a good case of arthritis, you know? It goes hweeeee, you know? Wheelchair scrunch. See, you got that, actually, in your hands, because somebody had the arthritis, and it isn't the pc.

You see, if the pc goes around and tells everybody he has arthritis and it doesn't disappear, there must be a lie. There must be something wrong here somewhere.

And of course, the basic thing that is wrong is he doesn't have arthritis. It's like these people with chronic coughs.

I blew old Belknap out of his head one time a way back when. I just got so tired of his cough, you know, because people would audit him to get rid of his cough—this was the trap he was manufacturing for everybody: "Get rid of my cough." So anyhow.... It was a game he was playing. So I blew him out of his head out in Phoenix. You know, I just told him to get back there about ten feet, and I said, "You cough."

He surprised himself to death. He started coughing—a thetan—started coughing He, boy, cough, cough, cough, cough, cough. Body. At first, the body was kind of going cough, cough, cough. You know. After that he got so he could cough without the body coughing. And he found out that it was him coughing all the time.

Now, what was wrong with Belknap's cough is, is he said it was his body coughing. And his body was never coughing. So, of course, the condition never cleaned up.

When I blew him out of his head and told him to take over the automaticity of coughing, he, a thetan, sat out there in space, you see, several feet back of his head and was going cough, cough, cough, cough, cough, cough, coughing, you see. He took over the automaticity of it, and I don't remember if that was the entire cure, but I think I—I haven't heard him cough since, I mean, put it that way.

You see what this was?

Now, you could have gone a little bit further. How come a thetan was coughing That's an interesting question. Well, he was stuck already in a beingness. Now, I must have thrown him out of his 'ead in a beingness, see?

And actually it was the beingness that was coughing, so if I had any trouble getting him to take over the automaticity and it didn't blow at once, it was because we hadn't identified the beingness, see? It was still "who was coughing?" Well, he was, and he was being that being, but we hadn't identified who he was—you see the slippiness. So therefore it wasn't an instant and immediate blow. - \ Now, if we'd opptermed this in some fashion, we'd have worked it around with these three steps which I've just given you, we would have amounted to more or less the same thing He would have found out somebody else was coughing That's for sure. Well, he had been blaming the body, blaming his present body all the time, and his present body wasn't doing the coughing, which I think is of interest.

Actually, he, a thetan, wasn't doing the coughing, it was a bank identity. It was a valence or a circuit that was coughing But of course, he so closely identified himself with this thing, and

that was him, you see, that he—it did tend to blow even then. But it would have been a good, clean, quick blow if I had had this other datum, you see?

Now, beingnesses—any error, any condition which is wrong with the individual is, of course, a condition of a beingness. It is not the beingness. It is the condition of a beingness. I don't care if he's got a bullet in his chest and he just received it. His name is John Jones at the moment he got the bullet in his chest, and it's John Jones that's got a bullet in his chest. See, that's the beingness that got a bullet in his chest. And the reason it doesn't blow is because last life's Bill Doakes, and eighteen dozen lives ago soldier Pete and pirate Tom and various other chaps that he has been went around obsessively putting bullets in people's chests, you see?

So you got all of the oppterms mocked up in the bank that he has shot the chests of, and there is all of the terminals that did the shooting of the chest of, and now you come along and with a Touch Assist you think you're going to cure up his chest, are you? No, you're not. Because it's John Jones, or something like this, and that isn't really John Jones's bullet hole, and the body just got in the road of it. He's been deserving that bullet hole for a long time. Man, he earned it.

Most thetans work hard for their motivators, you know. Very hard, hard work.

Anyhow, now, you look over this, then, as an action in auditing, and the thing ought to just go together, just click, click, click, you see, because it's the condition of a beingness. Of course, you can't audit the conditions of a beingness and expect to get anywhere. But you can audit identity or beingness, you see, and you get someplace with that. But naturally, why, as you oppterm the oppterm and go around, you're here or there going to run into a case that isn't blowing very cleanly, and you'll have to make a fourth step, oppterm that and run that down, and make a fifth step and oppterm that, and run that down. But that's all right. They're just more steps. And you'll find out there's—quite mysterious. You'll see this is mysterious. It'll even be mysterious to the pc. The pc knows nothing about past lives. Knows nothing about overts. Knows nothing about motivators. Knows nothing, you know. Standard citizen.

And here we are, and the pc's cheery, cheery, cheery. You know, "Only lived once. Only have the guilt of this lifetime on my conscience, and I get rid of that everyday to the priest. And I'm all set. I got it taped," and so forth.

And all of a sudden he gets lumbosis. And he goes around to the medico, and the medico administers some soup or syrup or pill or something, and it doesn't disappear. And he goes around, and he gets platinum shots, you see. They're made out of solid platinum, and they shoot him with platinum for a long time, and nothing happens, and so forth.

Well, he still only lives once, he still never is guilty of any overts, he doesn't know what could have happened here, it is a condition which has to do with the body, this lumbosis.

All right. You come along, and he says, "Well," he says, "I've got lumbosis."

And you say, "All right. Good. Who or what would oppose lumbosis?" In a good Model Session, you swing it right around, and you nail down a terminal that stays in. Now, "Who or what would oppose that terminal?" Woo-Woo. I think your pc is going to be somewhat faschinated. He's going to be very curious. He's going to wonder, "Who is this standing looking at the last address to Wellington leaving his troops?"

Curious. In fact, he's liable to speak of it. And on the other hand, you're liable to have to pull it as a withhold because he thinks he's gone around the bend. But it'd work. I mean, he wouldn't have to know anything about this. See, it'd work.

Just listing oppterms—you know, listing opposition terminals and listing oppositions to that, and so on. All of a sudden this would start all unreeling. And the reason he doesn't have to

know anything about it, of course, is—that's what's wrong with him: He doesn't know anything about it. But the reason he doesn't have to know anything about it, of any kind whatsoever, is simply because it is. See, it just is. And this is your fastest route in on is-ness that you ever heard of. Identity. A packaged identity.

Now, every identity that you run into is a total package. Every identity. John Jones is a total package. But as old Gallusha said before he left here, he said, "I don't think that in this lifetime a man acquires even ten ideas." He says, "They're all on the backtrack. They're all on the backtrack, and in this whole lifetime I don't believe I've acquired ten ideas in this whole lifetime." It's true, too.

But yet an identity is a series of now-I'm-supposed-to's, packaged ideas— da-da-da-da-da, you're supposed to, and da-da-da-da-da-de-da and you're supposed to, you see? You're supposed to da-da-da-da-da-de-da. And when anything goes do-do-do, you go da-da-da-da-da-de-da, see, and it all works out very nicely. Everything works well.

When people run up the street in a large car, you know it is a General Sherman tank, and you reach for your tommy gun and fire at its treads. Or you run out and put a tar grenade in the tread at great danger to yourself. That's proper, you see. When you see large vehicles, that's what you're supposed to do. Only if you look closely, they don't have treads. And if you reach for something, your tommy gun isn't there, or your bazooka, or whatever it was supposed to be. And you reach carefully into your glove compartment or in your pants pocket, you find no tar bomb. And so you just remain sort of upset by large vehicles.

So you have this individual, and he comes up, and he says, "Well, I'm upset by large vehicles. I just don't like large vehicles, see. I just go all to pieces whenever I see a large vehicle. Gray ones—they drive me mad."

Now, this would be a pretty good pc that had identified it to this degree. Usually the auditor has to dig.

All right. Now, let's look at the mistake we could make. We could say, "Well, now, have you ever been in an accident with a large vehicle?"

I've given you the content of the thing. The fellow was a soldier, and he's supposed to attack tanks. Now, we ask him, "Have you ever been injured by a large vehicle? Has anybody you know ever owned a large vehicle? Have you any overts on a large vehicle?"

We ask him this, you see, without much attention to meter or beingness. And he says, "Well..." He swears at them, so we clean this up, and the condition alleviates slightly.

What are we working on? He goes out and he sees large vehicles, and he still feels a little bit nervous, but he says, "I can take it or leave it alone."

So what you've done is ended his current cycle of overts against large vehicles, and you can do that by Sec Checking, so therefore Sec Checking is valuable.

Let's look at another side to this thing

You say, "Who or what would oppose large vehicles?"

And he says, "Oh, well, that's easy. Who or what would oppose them? Traffic officers, policemen, drivers of small vehicles, a soldier, an antitank battery, an antitank infantryman, a soldier, an antitank infantryman with a bazooka, a bazooka operator, a bazooka pointer, a bazooka handler, a tommy gun handler, a tar bomb manufacturer, a tar bomb thrower, a um.... Yes, well, I think that's about the list."

"Good." You differentiate it out, and you'll find out it's "a soldier," and then you move around on the other side of it, and you say, "Who or what would oppose a soldier?" you see? And we get some kind of a thing like "an army." That's what he's being. He's being an army. And this changes his point of view.

You see, he's always had the point of view of soldier. And he's looking straight out from being a soldier, whether it was a terminal or oppterminal, see, soldier, you know. Because that's a soldier's reaction. But there's something else that is holding a soldier in place, don't you see. And this tank is like a goal operates in Routine 3.

See, I mean this large vehicle, that's just a goal. It's an indicator. There it sits. It's the tab that's hanging out. And what we've done is find a whole bunch of new tabs.

So you just say, well, instead of fighting for seventeen days, day and night with the pc, no holds barred, judo, hari-kari, and other exercises, trying to find the pc's goal, well, just pick his condition out of the line and straighten it up, and you get through with the hidden standard right there at the beginning.

This experimental uses of 3D Criss Cross; and you'll find that you have a lot of use for them. You'll find you have to pilot your way through. Now, let's get down to what's the toughest operation about this. That's getting the pc to elucidate, elicit, spill, spew, impart or communicate the condition to the auditor. That's what's rough.

Pc says, "Well, there's nothing wrong with me." Come in on crutches, he's falling into the wheelchair, can't see, hand won't write.

"No, there's nothing wrong with me. I've led a happy and full life. Yes. I have a little trouble sometime with the pension bureau."

Man, he's not to grips with his problems at all. All the basic reason he isn't at grips with his problem is because he isn't at grips with any identity that he is. He doesn't know who he is.

While being John Jones, he's being Tom—Pirate Tom, or something of the sort. And he isn't suffering from the consequences of the war at all. He's suffering from that last time they went out and captured Julius Caesar. That was an unfortunate activity for many of the pirates involved. This made him a foe of governments ever since. So, you see, he's having a little trouble with the pension bureau. Get the idea?

His tags are hanging out all over the place, you know. The pc is practically walking down the street with long strings with labels on them, you know. But it's very hard to get him to impart a central problem or circuit. A pc very often will sit there with a chronic present time problem and never tell you anything about it. He worries and worries and worries about it. He worries consciously about it all the time, and he never imparts it to you.

Now, we have had a great deal of experience during the past few years trying to—the past couple of years with—trying to isolate difficulties with pcs. And a great deal of that technology has come forward, and you have hidden standards, you have present time problems of long duration as opposed to present time problems of short duration, and you have the mechanisms of circuits, and you have the entirety of the Goals Problem Mass and lock valences and that sort of thing—the way it operates on the pc. But principally, as far as you're concerned, with this particular activity, I recommend to you the Problems Intensive. I recommend to you a Problems Intensive.

You do a Problems Intensive from scratch. There it is. You know, there's a new form out on it, by the way. It's the same form that's in the bulletin. It's just been written up.

Self-determined changes. Never an other-determined change, if you please. Only self-determined changes. You make a list of the self-determined changes in the pc's lifetime, and

you assess that list out, and you get the one which falls the most, and you find out what problem existed immediately ahead of that, just before that, what problem existed. Just as you usually were doing it. And—only we take a wild departure. We don't particularly knock out the prior confusion. See, that's a Class II skill.

Now, if we're going to use 3D Criss Cross on this thing, we're just going to rip up the bank with it. We're just going to tear up the bank in long strips, and we're really going to get there with rapidity. What are we going to do?

We're going to say to him, "Well, now, you have a problem. You don't want to go to school. Good enough. Now, what would you say the thing was, now?"

"Well, it's just I just don't want to go to school. I never have wanted to go to school. It's an awful problem."

He's stated a fact as a problem if you will notice.

And so you would have a list composed of "Who or what would oppose your not wanting to go to school?" See, it must be the exact condition stated by the pc. And although that's an involved sort of a statement, he'll master it. And so you make your list, and that's your—then you get all five steps of 3D Criss Cross, and you get your final line. You strike this final line, you know—your final item—and you've got it, bang. Now, you get the oppterm to that, and you walked it around in a circle again. He will have had all kinds of cognitions and various things, and things blowing up in smoke, and hell know he'd had a change. That I guarantee. Something will have happened if it was well done. It's an oddity, isn't it? You've unsettled this problem.

All right. Now, let's take an additional approach to this, then. We've settled that one. We got a couple of terms and oppterms. Well, let's call it a kind of a line. That's the school-problem line, see. Now, let's do this assessment again, and let's find out what are these self-determined changes, what they amounted to, you see?

And get him to state the problem to the one that now falls. We've struck the one off we've handled, you see, you strike that off. Now, you assess the remainder. Add anything the pc wanted you to add about, well, he suddenly remembered about selfdetermined changes. Get the problem that occurred just before the self-determined change. Get that problem, bang. And of course, you've got a problem like, well, "How to feel safe in a small car."

Well, naturally, there's been all kinds of car accidents in his lifetime, and so forth, and you, with your Class II skill, you'd follow them down, sec check them on prior confusions, and so on. You'd really get someplace too.

But with 3D Criss Cross approach, a Class III approach, what you would do would find "Who or what would oppose not liking small cars?" And you'd get a list, and you'd—that's number 2, and then you would do number 3, and you'd find out that'd wind out someplace, and you'd have another line, wouldn't you. Faschinating

Now, let's strike that particular problem off the line, and let's assess this list again, adding anything the pc wants, and you're going to find—you're going to wind up with eight or nine lines. In other words, the whole case. Every corner of the Goals Problem Mass can be counted on to stick some thumb up in this lifetime. It's a fruitful source of lines.

But what would appear very mysterious to the pc about it, is his phobias would tend to desensitize and disappear, and change his mind about this sort of thing.

Let me give you a very practical example of this. We ask the pc what difficulty he is having in life. And we simply take that. We don't actually probe the case in any depth. And if the pc

just gave us this difficulty, "Well, I can never leave home, see. I can never leave home. That's the difficulty I'm having in life."

Well, you just find who or what would oppose his never leaving home. You understand it's his "never leaving home," not "his leaving home." See, it's always the exact condition, you see, that the pc states because you don't know what trickery and treachery is mixed up in this, and if you already start to oppterm it by dropping the "not" out of it or something like that, why, you've thrown yourself a red herring, and you'll find out it won't work.

So you get your list, and you get your second list, and all of a sudden he'll be able to leave home. It'll all appear quite mysterious to him. You won't really have solved anything at all. He won't find that you have solved anything

What you have done is find the identity of who wouldn't leave home, see, by finding the opposition to that identity and then going back and finding the identity. See?

Now, having found the identity to it, you've blown the identity into view as simply a descriptive identity. That's good enough—to cause the thing to soften up all over the place. So of course it's come into beingness. I mean, his beingness is known. Now, he knows who wouldn't leave home. You don't even have to point this out to him. He all of a sudden cognites. Calls you up at two o'clock in the morning and says he just realized something "Just realized something, but a sick child would not be permitted to leave home." Big cognition. See? That's probably the end of his difficulty with leaving home.

In other words, here's a whole parade of problems. Now, people have come into HGCs for years, they always present some of these psychosomatic difficulties or a hidden standard or something like that, or their present time problem of long duration appears in their goals. Let me call that to your attention very closely, that if you want to find the pc's present time problem of long duration and you're sort of running out of problems to solve for the pc, or if it ever occurred to you to read your own auditor's report that it is written up in the upper right hand corner of the report.

The present time problem of long duration in one version or guise or another is always written in that corner providing you list the pc's goals for the session or life or livingness. That's very interesting

I mean, it's very hard to find because your writing sometimes is difficult to read. I can read it. I can read it, but you I know have trouble reading your own writing sometimes.

But if you look up in the upper right-hand corner, you will find the present time problem of long duration stated as a goal, and this is the commonest occurrence of a pc. He hands you his case there, right there, bang You look over a dozen consecutive sessions of a pc—if he's in communication with the auditor at all and is talking at all, and look over all his life and livingness things, and you can see it integrating against a 3D Criss Cross list most interestingly.

In other words, let's take a pc's goals for last July. Any goals last July. No 3D Criss Cross, you see. The goals that he wrote down for the session and for life or livingness, see?

And now let's take his January auditor's report, you see? Same report on the same pc, but 3D Criss Cross. And now integrate last July's goals in life and livingness as present time problems of long duration and see how that stacks up against the terminal packages which he's running, the cognitions he's getting You 11 find out they're blowing He's blowing last July's goals. It's interesting.

Now, it isn't always easy to put your fingers on a pc's case. So in spite of the fact that they walk in and give it to you, apparently, in spite of the fact that they are advertising, in spite of the fact that this is what they're always worried about, by and large, there's usually

something else that they're far more worried about. These things are quite red herring. I mean, there's multitudes of red herring go skittering across that trail.

The pc just is a little bit ashamed to talk about this other one—this other one, about the—the ghost.

"What about the ghost?"

"Well, he comes at 1:15 and demands lunch."

"Oh, where does this ghost come?"

"Well, he comes around."

And the perceptive auditor says, "Well, is he here now?" you see, if he's quick. You know, the auditor's very quick. Notices the pc is looking at the corner of the room while he is talking about the ghost. You see, he's on the ball, in other words. And he asks him where is this ghost or is this ghost here now.

And of course, the pc says, "Well, yes, of course. It's only 2:10, and he never leaves till 2:23."

Men go walking around down the streets with green alligators snapping at their heels. People walk up and down half a night worrying because they are going mad. They know that. There are all kinds of oddball things occur of one character or another. People worry about these things and they never bother to tell you. They don't let you in on this.

But if you're very perceptive and listen to what the pc says—you know, record it in English—you generally will find it. I'm not now being sarcastic and giving you the impression that it's dead easy. Actually, an auditor very often has to be terribly clever. And when an auditor's very, very clever and listens very keenly and questions just exactly right, sometimes he finds out the damnedest things from the pc, and the pc sometimes didn't even know that was what was wrong with him, you know?

But he says, "Well, that's very true. Yes, very true. I have this horrible feeling that I am dying every time I hear the wind blow. I never realized it before, but I all the time feel like I'm . . . Yes."

But it didn't blow, so you know, then, that the identity cycle and so forth, there's something wrong with it. And you can go ahead and run a 3D Criss Cross on this, and it would clean up.

But don't go auditing those things which blow on discussion. See, don't audit something that blew on two-way comm. Don't take up yesterday's cognitions, in other words. Don't beat to death the item the pc has just blown utterly about you the auditor. Don't always take up what the pc just got rid of or he gets the idea that his aberrations are being continued by the auditor. Do you know that's the illusion he gets? And commonest hidden fault in auditing is probably just that one.

The pc says, "Well, you'd have to be a giraffe before I'd respect you as an auditor."

And the auditor—this is so new and strange, it is so intriguing and interesting, you see, that quite understandably he very often chases this one. And he chases this giraffe around for a while. Well, hell, the giraffe was out of the room and clear over in the next county until he started chasing it again. He chased it right back into the room again.

And he said, "When did you first start thinking of me as a giraffe," you see?

He didn't ever, you see. It's a completely balled up question because if he'd thought of the auditor as a giraffe, then the auditor could have audited, you see? But it's because the auditor wasn't a giraffe, don't you see, and the pc has to explain all this, and it gets all tangled up again, and you get misduplication and so on.

Well, I let pcs cognite and get rid of it. It's always the safer line. I repeat the question in its native form—the first form that it was in—not the question as it was altered to by the pc.

In other words, he said, "Well, in order to audit me, you'd have to be a giraffe."

And I say, "Good. Is it all right if I audit you?"

No reaction, fine, see? But not, "When did you first get the idea that I was a giraffe? Has a giraffe ever audited you? Hm, this is very peculiar."

Of course, you will do it. To the end of your career, you occasionally will do it. You just couldn't possibly keep away from doing it because it's often so intriguing, and actually it's some of your pay as the auditor to find out what the hell's going on here, you know? Perfectly allowable to ask. What I'm talking about is a habit. When you make a habit out of this, oh, my God! That's a dog's breakfast. That isn't a session.

Pc is never permitted to blow anything without it being questioned by the auditor. That's a Q and A straight across the boards. Another additional definition of Q and A is: "A prevention of a pc from blowing an aberration by insisting there is more to it."

Well anyway, look at this as a use and you'll find that if you can locate some of the central pins about which the pc is worried that you can run this by oppterms of 3D Criss Cross, and you can produce some interesting case changes. Now, how far this goes, I am not willing to hazard at this particular moment, because the data I'm giving you is basically experimental data. But it is in use. The data is in use at the present moment.

There's nothing dangerous about this data. In fact, it is much the safest auditing you ever did on anybody.

How far it goes, what ramifications this includes and so forth, I wouldn't at the present moment adventure to say.

I will say this. It's proven out far enough at the present time, that an auditor could just practically go and make a career out of it. Yeah, I mean, make a career out of it, you know, just out of some chronic somatic or something like that. He'd pick out one chronic somatic, you know? Just one like psychiatrosis or something like that, and just go ahead and start and mop it up. You could do all kinds of interesting things from an auditor's point of view this way.

But now let me give you a word of warning before I close this lecture: Don't audit pcs with the rudiments out. And don't audit pcs with present time problems of long duration which you're doing nothing about, because, of course, the rudiments are out.

You've heard this since last September, didn't you. Yeah. Then we sort of dropped it because there was no immediate remedy for it without taking up a whole week or something like this. Now, if you can do 3D Criss Cross rapidly and you can do it very slippily, you can probably knock in the head a present time problem of long duration just in the progress of doing 3D Criss Cross simply by moving over onto it and creating a line for it. Just leave it hanging there. Go ahead, oppterm it. You'll be walking into the bank on that line, too. You see what I mean?

Doing 3D Criss Cross, everything was going along splendidly and beautifully, and the pc all of a sudden put the brakes on like mad and had a present time problem with the pc's

landlady, with all landladies, with the "Landladies' Association of Great Britain," you see. And the whole thing is liable to move up at any moment to a question in the House. And a discussion on this finds out that the pc has had this problem for months. Has always had this problem. And there's something about landladies that just seem to have problems connected to them, and so forth. Well, you've isolated a piece of the Goals Problem Mass.

But the only piece you've isolated is the characteristic of one valence. You haven't located a valence "landladies," you see? You've located a characteristic, which is not liking landladies or having trouble with landladies, and that's just one characteristic of a valence, you see?

Well, it's like a little goal, a little tag here. And you move this little tag over and just add it as line H, you see, or line M or 0, or we don't care where you've gotten to.

In other words, don't beat yourself to pieces trying to do a long and involved present time problem of long duration, you see, and work yourself to death on that unprofitably when you've got a very heavy process that'll handle it, and just add it into the work you're doing. That'd be a very slippy thing to do, wouldn't it? And just add it in and get yourself a new line. Well, good, you can always use a new line. You're going to start losing lines sooner or later as you go down the line and wish to heavens you could find some new lines.

My heaviest worry right now is how to keep lines going and how to get lines, and I'm working on a flows system of finding lines which would interest you very much. And I have a brand-new pattern of flows and a new description of flows and a new formula of flows, all of which are very intriguing

These give us bountiful methods, bountiful lists. I mean, they're hotter lists than like and dislike lists than you ever heard of. I mean, "Who or what would prevent an inflow?" you know, that kind of. . . The pc's bank goes off brrrrrpt! Anyway, just all—make all grist to the mill. So the pc has a problem— present time problem of long duration, and you suddenly isolated this as a present time problem of long duration. You skipped back, yes, the pc has had this problem quite often. All right, we'll just give it the 3D Criss Cross treatment and add it as a new line. Only, the only thing that happens is, is you get the condition, you get the opposition to the condition, and then you get the opposition to number 2.

In other words, you'll wind up two items deep on that line before it's of any great value to the pc, and of course, the present time problem'll vanish in smoke, and you've got 3D Criss Cross going at a fast rate.

Now, it's valuable to know this, because it's very probable that doing 3D Criss Cross will throw up the characteristics of not-quite-revealed valences at this stage. And the not-quite-revealed valence may get himself a nice present time problem, you know? The person had never before had problems with fire hydrants. And all of a sudden he's having great many problems with fire hydrants. And it's getting to be very intriguing And he says, "Of course, it must be this new valence that you just found on me—fireman. And that explains it all, fireman."

Fire hydrant, fireman. And it's all explained, and he goes on having trouble with fire hydrants. Well, it couldn't possibly be explained, don't you see, or he wouldn't be going on having trouble with fire hydrants, if firemen . . . And you finally press it down a little bit further, and you find out it's the firehouse dog So . . .

So anyway, there's many uses to which this can be put amongst keeping—amongst them, of course, keeping rudiments in on present time problems of long duration.

Now, you know what a present time problem of long duration is, don't you?

Audience: Hm-mm.

And a present time problem of short duration is just a breath of air, but it's very recent and very new. A present time problem of long duration? Well, that's been around for quite a while, and there are very precise definitions for this thing. The—there are quite a lot of lectures on this particular subject, and so on. It's really been pawed around and mauled around, and where you get them and how you get them and all that sort of thing.

Now, I'm giving you a way to handle them that's quick as a bunny, and therefore, all of that data becomes more valuable than it was. Okay?

Audience: Hm-mm.

All right. Well, I'm not intending to drive people out of the business of healing I'm not intending to drive them out of the business of healing

They can go on and heal all they want to, but that now includes us. I'm not going to drive us out of the business of healing either. Because there's no danger whatsoever, now, in addressing somebody's arthrosis lumbosis of the psychiatrosis, and you could probably cure it up like a scat without knowing any more about it than his medical doctor and psychiatrist did.

In fact, knowing far less because they pretended to know a great deal that they didn't know.

Okay?

Audience: Hm-mm.

All right. Well, I hope it's some use to you.

Thank you.