ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on
8 February 1962

And here I have us late today. Had a bank manager. I hope I didn't upset him. I had to dash away from that to the session, and so forth. I wear several hats. And amongst those hats is host and diplomat. And today I was wearing my host and diplomat hat. And it got slightly askew because time was going on.

All right. This is what? The 8th of February, and you've just seen a TV demonstration which I trust you made some sense out of. Did you or didn't you?

Audience: Yes. Very much.

Isn't differentiation complicated?

Audience: Yes.

Look at all the self-conscious laughing going on. It's very complicated. Tough. But the Q factor that you might not have noticed was the pc was in-session, in spite of being under the rather difficult circumstance of a TV demonstration, the pc was in-session. Right?

Audience: Mm.

So therefore, differentiation was not complicated. Now, I tell you how to make auditing complicated. Don't put the pc in-session first, and then it's very complicated.

All right. Here we have Saint Hill Briefing Course, 8 February AD 12.

3D Criss Cross, latest bulletin, exclamation information. The hot dope.

To do a flows assessment and not to oppterm it is to invite continuous assessment.

When you're doing a flows assessment on 3D, you're going to find yourself in a position where you have a very long list. Just make up your mind to it. A flows assessment is a bit different than other assessments. They're all have to be complete. The phenomena shows up on every assessment. But when you're doing a flows assessment on 3D Criss Cross, and then getting a list from whatever flow you found, you'll find your list is extraordinarily long. It is quite long. It will go—I don't know—it might go to 200; it might go to 250. That would be extreme. It certainly will go to 110, 115.

I keep telling you expand your list. And on your student reports, those on it, keep turning me in lists of twenty, ten and then they differentiate. No items are crossed off. You know, you've done the list from the pc, and then you got twenty items, and then the pc doesn't cross off any. Maybe one. And you take your ballpoint—make sure you got a new ballpoint because now you're in for it. And you go to the nulling step, and you go in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in, in. And then you run out of paper over here, you know, and have to copy the list because you haven't got any room left to draw slants on. You got the idea?

And the rudiments keep going in and the rudiments keep going out and the pc keeps going out of session, and you have to keep getting the pc insession. The pc, hrhrhrh, invalidates information. He's not in-session. And his mind isn't on anything, and so forth.

You want trouble? Write a short list on 3D Criss Cross.

Now, you can get away with a ten or twenty list on a Prehav level or something or other. I mean, other—other sources of 3D item lines. You can probably get away with it here and there as a short list. But not on a flows assessment. It's going to go on and on and on, that list.

If you have the pc on the meter while you're doing that list, you will notice that, as you are listing, you are getting tremendous rises and tremendous falls. Rise, rise, rise, rise, rise and then fall, fall, fall and tone arm goes down, the tone arm comes up. What is all this action? It's blowing charge.

And the main item that is going to be representative to the pc of that flow, that main item is so thoroughly charged that if it is not written down on the list, and that charge dissipated by writing it down on the list, you are going to wind up with that whole section of the Goals Problem Mass completely charged. And, of course, it won't differentiate and it won't null because nothing blew. You never got the central charge out of the flow.

It is something like fooling around with a fully loaded shotgun. You never emptied the chamber. So you have to handle it very carefully and you have to handle the pc very carefully and everything is going out and you can't get anything done and it's all a complete mess. And auditing is very complicated and such an arduous job and all that sort of thing.

Why? Because the charge isn't gone off that subject. You are auditing a pc who is in a restimulated area of charge.

Now, you have said, "An enforced outflow on others." That's what you said to him, and you kept saying this and it just kept charging up, charging up. You didn't charge it. The charge is residual in the bank. But you've restimulated it, ready to draw it. You're ready to take this charge off the bank. And then by writing an incomplete list you've failed to take the charge off the bank.

And of course, what happens? The pc doesn't get rid of any items. He doesn't blow any items. No items will null. He's all sitting there sort of tense, and you can see his fingernails sort of clawing into the sides of the cans. And nothing is blowing and of course your rudiments are going out and your pc seems to be interested but not really interested and sort of half mad at you and—get the idea? All this phenomena of a difficult session sets in from incomplete list. The rough session starts with an incomplete list.

Of course, I would say a rough session could start a little earlier with the symptom of no auditing. The auditor says in one fashion or another, "Well, I guess we've got to get through this session, so I don't care whether your case gets well or not. Oh, you got some goals. Ha-ha. Well, who cares about them? Oh, let's see. Oh, isn't it nice outside. Uuuuuuuuuh, uuuuuuuuh." This communicates to the pc and you've got no session.

So I've said the trouble you have with an auditing session begins in 3D Criss Cross with an incomplete list. But of course, there can be earlier trouble. The trouble, however, is not with an auditing session. There's just no auditing and no session. See, you can sail into an auditing session without any auditing. Of course, then it ceases to—or fails to materialize as a session.

You'll find that, by the way, is your commonest point of trouble in Academy training and auditing, is they haven't a clue about starting a session so they just never have a session. And then, of course, if you can get this much trouble from an incomplete list, look at what the trouble you can get from a no session. You'll see Academy students in the second week sitting there, and their glazed eye, you know, and they don't know what they're doing and whether they should put their feet in the pc's lap or the cans in the pc's ear, you know? And this is not tense. If you struck one of them slightly, you know, they'd ring like a gong.

And the pc says, "What am I supposed to do?"

And there's nobody to tell him. There's nobody interested in what happens to the pc. It's all "Am I doing the session right?"

See, the session doesn't have anything to do with the pc, so of course, his pc is omitted from the session. And if you want to get any real trouble in auditing, do that. Just omit the pc from the session. Don't have anything to do with the pc.

Just concentrate on—with all of your might on doing a session without any regard to the pc and you'll have lots of trouble. We're saying that if an auditing session exists, then the trouble you're going to get into from there on out, the most trouble you can get into is an incomplete list on 3D Criss Cross.

Now, of course, if we're dealing with sessions in general, the most trouble that you will ever get into is from a missed withhold. Just remember that. I'm talking about trouble with a process when I say trouble with 3D Criss Cross, you see.

Let me organize this for you for just one second. You'd say—all right, if you wanted to lay this out to HPA students, HCA students, and so on, you'd say, all right, the most trouble you can get into is by not giving an auditing session. Now, you're in lots of trouble. There'll be lots of complications, and everything is going to go to hell in a balloon. That we can guarantee. We don't include the pc in or give an auditing session. That's a condition we know as no auditing

The next trouble you could get into in an auditing session would be a missed withhold. If you miss a withhold, then you really are in trouble, with exclamation points, because the pc ARC breaks, blows up in your face, throws down the cans, leaves the room. All of these nonsense activities that we associate with upsetting circumstances regarding auditing, all stem from having missed a withhold on the pc in one session or another or from somebody having missed a withhold in one session or another. And you have to pick them up as missed withholds, not as withholds.

All right. So let's get this in order. And then the most trouble that you can have with Security Checking would have to do with failing to security check the pc, but run some repetitive process that again doesn't include the pc in the auditing session. Do a Security Check, not of that pc, but try to do just a generalized—you know, say "I hope it'll all come out in the end," because inevitably you're going to miss a withhold. In other words, you got to security check straight on top of that meter crawling right down the needle, you know? And you got to security check against a meter. You can't do it a repetitive question or something like that.

The next trouble you get into is in all 3D items is to start a list in which the pc has no interest of the subject of. I've learned that. You take something out of your hat, an arbitrary assigned line. You say, "Well, we're going to have a line now that has to do with trees (comma), only God can make one," because the auditor is interested in trees, don't you see? And so he's going to do a list from trees. And the pc has never had anything to do with trees, plus or minus. Trees are just trees and you never get a list. And you go on and on and on.

Now, your like-dislike items have that liability. Your pc may be in a state where he doesn't like anything and he doesn't dislike anything and he doesn't hate anything and he doesn't love anything and it's all just thing. And then you get, of course, no list and you'll be in trouble. So arbitrary assignment of lines, from what we get lines.

An improper flows assessment will give you some trouble but nowhere near the trouble that you might think. An improper Prehav level will give you some trouble but it's the same trouble as the like-dislike. It's just you haven't got the level where the pc's interest lies. But any flows assessment almost picked out of the hat will find some interest in the pc. That's what's interesting about flows. The amount of precision with which you have to get the accurate flow does not equal the precision with which you have to get the accurate Prehav level.

You could just watch the pc for ten minutes before the session, and the pc is standing there rather quietly, you know, and he hears a door creak, and he flinches.

And you could say, "All right. Prohibited inflow," and list it and you would find that it would be quite an accurately interesting list, you see? So it's the lack of accuracy on this particular point is going to persuade some of you that you don't have to be accurate anyplace on getting a list. And don't let that fool you. It's only true with flows.

On Prehav you have to be right on the bouton. You have to be right on the bouton, perfectly dead center. If the pc is on "withdraw," my golly, you better have "withdraw." Don't for the heaven sakes have "kill." And the pc just won't ever give you a list. And so, of course, the pc is no interest and the pc's attention is wandering and the pc is going off in all directions, and so forth.

You have to have that Prehav level very positively accurate.

All right. Flows—sloppy. You almost pick it out of the hat. Look at the pc, figure out what the flow is, list it and you 11 get someplace. Interesting, isn't it?

All right. An incomplete list on the Prehav assessment can be serious. It can cause upset, but nothing like the upset that an incomplete list on flows will cause.

Now, on some minor thing like O/W on self, and we take that and we get a list which is five items long and we differentiate it. What do you know. We'll be actually getting someplace on the case, see? And other methods of getting a list, like a dynamic assessment, we'll be getting someplace on it. We get a list of three items and we differentiate them and we null them out and then we oppterm it, why, well still be someplace with the case, you understand?

We won't really be in trouble. But of course, anything like a Prehav level is restimulative. So of course, if you don't get the complete list, you've got the case going ngngngngng You hit him where he lives. All right. So that we'd better come right along with and get that list complete.

But you still can't be in as much trouble with a Prehav level as you can be in a flows level. Now, although you can practically pick the flow out of your hat as what flow you're going to list on the pc, man, you've got to have a complete list. If you don't have a complete list, you're going to wind up with a charged list. The whole list will remain charged.

And flows, of course, as it indicates, the obsessiveness of the flow, the continuance of the flow, all of the other things with regard to flow indicate longevity or length, see? This flow has been going on and on and on and on and on forever and the pc just goes on with the flow. And to bleed any charge off of a flows list, it's got to be complete. And you've got to really have yourself a long, nice, arduous list. And while you're listing, it'd be an awfully good idea—it doesn't matter whether you have the pc on the cans or not on a Prehav list. It really doesn't matter unless you want to suddenly put him on the cans and bleed the list. You know, say, "Is there anything more? Any more items belong on here?" Something like this just to make sure.

But on a flows, you'd better have him on the list because it tells you how much charge is bleeding off the ruddy case. See, it wouldn't matter at all on the Dynamic Assessment list. put him off the cans. Have a cigarette. It doesn't matter what you do, don't you see? Because you're going to get any kind of an item anyhow.

The Dynamic Assessment, any kind of an item, O/W on self, any kind of an item. It just doesn't matter. But on a flows, you're charging the living daylights out of the bank.

Now, why is this? Well, you've got two poles here and the flow is going from one pole to the other flow or backing up from one pole to the other flow, and you've got a flow going and that flow is exposing a certain amount of charge. It's also restimulating it. And while you have him listing, you've got a flow going. And if that flow is passing over the head of charged areas, you're just restimulating the living daylights out of the pc, that's all.

And if you don't blow the charge off the flow, why, your pc is all nerved up. He's in a wreck condition because it's only—it's just like he was—took a step and then he never got his foot down, you know, and that foot's still in the air.

So frankly, the trick is that you list as long as the flow runs. It isn't really how many items you have. It's the length of time you list. You just keep him giving you items, giving you items, so the flow will keep running, running, running, running, running, and somewhere in that you're going to pull the thing that is keeping this thing going. And the second you get the thing with the flow on it that kept the flow going, you see, boom! That—the whole thing all dies. That's a dead mackerel now because you've located the pole from which the current was coming, you see? And as long as you have that thing still there and massed, zhuuuuu. You see, it's still charged up, still charged up, still charged up and nothing will null, nothing will blow, nothing goes on at all. Don't you see?

And your differentiation—he leaves everything on the list, and when you start nulling it out, it's just on and on and on and on. Everything stays in, stays in, stays in, stays in, stays in, of course, because you've not discharged this flow. So you see, a flow and auditing of flows is a bit different than other ways of getting 3D lists and items and handling the Goals Problem Mass. There's a little bit of difference in here.

And one of the things about it is it's very, very fast. If done right, it is terribly, terribly fast no matter how long it takes you to list and differentiate and null. Doing a flow is faster case gain, very rapid, because you're pulling the things that keeps the bank cohesed. You're actually pulling the pins out of the reactive bank; the things that make it go together like a—like a bunch of busted glue pots. And you're pulling them apart. And you're taking the things that hold it together. There they are.

So doing flows, you're doing something just a little bit different than you're doing with other items. Therefore, I don't think that anybody should ever be started in doing flows from what I've—experience I've had here, as first bat. Let them get a little bit grooved in. I thought at first we could take almost an arbitrary item and get them started that way better. But the pc is inadequately seized up in the interest in the thing. The interest factor is not helping out the auditor there. So let's take the middle course and let's take a Prehav level as a good way to launch a case.

Now, this adjudication is not final by any means. But apparently there is evidence in favor of oppterming a flow item when found. There is evidence in favor of this rather than getting a second flow item. Oppterm it and then get. That's a slight change from your mimeograph sheet.

In other words, you find an item as a flow and now oppterm the thing and then you'll find another item. Now, that oppterming of the flow is simple because it's right there. Your oppterm list might not be three items long.

You say, "What would oppose a ring-tailed snorter?" And it's a square-tailed unsnorter, or it's a tailless unsnorter, of course, you know, and that's it. And you get a bunch of charge comes off the bank suddenly. So it's a good advance.

Now, you've got two items, and they make a problem. The pair makes the problem so if you've found one pole you can oppterm it and find the other pole of the particular piece of flow machinery and you can get a considerable relief on the pc rapidly, so that has value. So you might as well set it up that you do a flow and then get its oppterm and then do another

flow the same way that you did the first one and then get its oppterm and do another flow and get its oppterm. Call each one of them a line, and you wind up with a whole packet of lines.

Now, it's not necessarily true that there is—that this is much better than continuing to do flow after flow after flow. You understand? There's just some evidence in favor of it. Mostly on the basis that it apparently will blow a little bit more charge than doing the other flow right away. See, that's—we're not now dealing with critical points.

But 3D items can be found in one per line on and on and on and on and on. It keeps the Goals Problem Mass good and handy because in doing 3D, the Goals Problem Mass starts to depart and it starts to dissipate and it starts to fall to pieces. And it's very hard on the pc. He's so accustomed to living with this room full of sponge. You see, the room full of black sponge that he's accustomed to living with, it starts slipping. And it gets out of his view. And he misses it. And he knows he's supposed to audit it. And it keeps snapping back on the track and the track straightens out and things like this. And it's disconcerting.

So if you wanted to get an awful lot of lines, you would do one per line. You see, that's the other thing. I'm not now talking about flows. I'm talking about Prehav items. I'm talking about old type 3 items, I'm talking about Dynamic Assessment items, and so forth. Just rapidly get several line items. One, two, three, four, five, something like that.

You got the 3D mass good and close, pc's got lots of somatics, he's very uncomfortable, that you've got this thing right up close to his chest and it's no difficulty trying to find items.

Now you oppterm each one of these things you've found. And you of course now have a problem and a problem and a problem. Every line now has two items on it. Well, if a line is oppterned, you now have a problem. You've got the valence versus valence that makes up a problem. You have the waterbuck and the tiger. You have the willow wand and the wind. And these things—each one of them—makes up the problem.

Now, there's some other things that you can do with this when you get a pair—when you get a pair. And you understand it really doesn't matter much whether you get one item per line and then go back and get a second item per line; or if you get one item on a line and oppterm it and then get another item on a line and oppterm that, and so forth, except the Goals Problem Mass starts to slide out from underneath you. Person starts going Clear and other embarrassing things. So it doesn't matter too much.

When you start doing flows you start shooting this thing full of holes. It starts swiss-cheesing on you. And if you do, you possibly could inadvertently make a Clear this way. Just straighten the guy out. You know, he's had some—a lot of preparatory auditing. He's in pretty good shape. You're—easy to keep the rudiments in. Now, you find a flows item and then you find an oppterm to the flows item. And you suddenly find you can't read him on the meter and the needle is just floating.

Of course, that doesn't mean you disposed of the whole Goals Problem Mass. It's parked over someplace else ready to key in someday. But you theoretically might have that experience every fifteen or twenty pcs. You know, it'd be about the same frequency as we were clearing people with Routine 3. It just would sstuuh—free needle.

Now, that's very easy to get back. That's very easy to get it back. I'll tell you how you get it back. You want to know how to get it back?

You find the goal for one of the terminals. You find out which is the pc's terminal by which one gave him a somatic and which is his oppterm by which one gave him a sensation or a dizziness, you see? Sort that out. Repeat one or the other at him. Try to clue it in. But you might not be able to get it in that quickly.

And then find a goal for the terminal and an opposition goal for the oppterm. Sounds just like the old 3D package, isn't it? Well, that's just exactly what you're putting together. And then find the modifier for that goal for the pc's terminal and you'll have the Goals Problem Mass right back in your lap every time. He will unclear like crazy. See what I mean? Take the original 3D handout and simply fill in the sheet. Finish it all up, and you'll get the Goal Problem Mass back again.

Funny teaching auditors how to—how to get their hands on aberration after it slid out from under, but you to a slight degree face that problem now. We're into that area of Scientology where we have to audit carefully so as to keep the pc sufficiently aberrated to blow the lot. Because the pc is going to get very restive on us and want to get back into action, and the pc is liable to go momentarily Clear without having been made a Dynamic Clear on all dynamics and gone straight through the Goals Problem Mass. You see what could happen there? It would happen on you.

You want to make another kind of Clear. You want to make a Clear Clear. You want to make somebody who won't have any trouble with the Goals Problem Mass or any trouble with the bank from there on out, and all of his fondest hopes, and so forth.

And of course, if you keep doing that in extremis and then straighten out the whole track, and take up all fragments of the Goals Problem Mass in their turn and handle all them, you'll make an OT. You couldn't help it. So you probably could make a Dynamic Clear or a Clear Clear, a stable, a very stable Clear by moving straight on through the Goals Problem Mass and getting these valences parked in their proper places on the track so they're not troubling the pc, and so forth. And he'd stay that way. It's taken trillennia to get these things

assembled into a black sponge. And it'll take him more trillennia to get them back together again because it's quite accidental that they remain in that weirdly balanced balance.

You mean somebody has got a package that comes from 10 trillion years ago, beautifully poised and balanced against a package that came from 110 trillion years ago, and he's got a 100 trillion year loop in the Goals Problem Mass. And these two things are opposing each other gorgeously. How does he do it? I ask you. Thetans are skilled, but I never expected them to be that clever. But they actually can do it.

Once you get these things unbalanced and unhinged, why, heaaaa. There'd have to be a whole bunch more accidentals way on up the track for him to get these things matched up again.

All right. In doing a 3D Criss Cross, I want a case to be in this kind of condition before we say that we're very happy with the case. I'll give you the items that we would say we were happy with.

One, all the missed withholds available were off the case so it wasn't registering on any missed withholds. A Form 3, last two pages of the Joburg. That's a Form 3, last two pages. Missed withholds, last two pages of the Joburg and a Form 6A. That is the revised eighty-question Security Check on pcs and so forth. We're talking mainly now about Scientologists as the case rundown.

And 3D Criss Cross in this kind of shape: at least five lines, at least two of those five lines flow lines and with an oppterm found for each line. That's only ten items, you see. Two of them are flows, and two of them are oppterms of flows and the other six could be from anything

And if a case had all that done, and so forth, why, I would consider that the case was reasonably auditable without any special anything. I'd say the case should audit like a baby carriage. It'd be very easy to audit.

Now, you could go ahead and finish up from that. I'd know this character was on the road to Clear, you understand? I know he's well on the road. He's down there past the most crucial roadblocks and he's doing all right.

That doesn't sound like very much to do in auditing, does it? And frankly it isn't very much to do in auditing And the results which you get on a case by just getting those things done on auditing are quite astonishing, however. And this is what I would consider—at this particular instant—what I would consider essential. And I'd call such a case, regardless of any—oh, regardless of any test or anything, I'd say the case was certainly a Release.

I'm not giving you a new definition for Release. I'm just saying he would have passed Release by like a jet car. Somewhere in his back track of auditing, the state of Release would have occurred. Probably nobody would notice it because he's too interested in pressing ahead.

But you'd say, "All right. Well, you used to sit in your room and quiver all morning and all evening and particularly at two o'clock in the morning when you woke up in a cold sweat talking to the black thetan in the upper right-hand corner of the bedroom. Now, are you doing that now?"

"Oh, did I ever do that? Come to think about it, I did. Yes."

That's the responses you're getting on the more severe upsets the person has been worried about in his lifetime.

A tremendous amount of aberration goes by the boards in the process of 3D Criss Cross. And you don't quite notice it going until the person does some kind of a fabulous backtrack on the thing. You have to do a careful plot.

It's almost worth making a pc sit down and say, "Now, list all of the troubles that you have been having," so that you get this long and involved list.

"I always slam the icebox door on my hand when reaching for my stomach tonic that I take every night. And I'm afraid to go up broad stairs and I won't ride in tram cars. And every time I see a plate-glass window, I look for a brick, you know, and have to stop myself," and all these various listings because these things are not going to be much in appearance. They're not going to be much in evidence.

They'll kind of slide by because they're whole package aberration, you see, and you get rid of a whole package and you don't get rid of a specific aberration. That's the trick. That's what will fool the auditor, see?

You actually don't get rid of the slamming the icebox door on their hand. You don't get rid of that. You get rid of some valence because it was— obviously you had gotten rid of because it was most available valence if they're dramatizing it.

Have you noticed that the pc will dramatize the valence which you're just about to find or have just found? Huh? Have you noticed that one?

Well, similarly, the valences which you get rid of with 3D Criss Cross are those which are most neighborly to the pc because they're the ones he's dramatizing so he must be right on top of them. So those are the ones which contain all the foibles and frugals that he has been worrying about. Those are right there. When you get rid of these on 3D Criss Cross, any way you audit 3D Criss Cross, these things would come up. In the process of getting ten of them, if two of them are flows valences, you're going to get rid of the most immediate difficulties of the pc no matter if you audit it or not. They're still going to haunt him a little bit, and he's going to work. He's going to find himself working some night.

He'll be sitting in a cafe, and he used to hate waitresses. And he's sitting in this cafe and he tries to work up a good, healthy hate for waitresses out of force of habit, you know, and he just can't make it. He's sitting there concentrating heavily on the waitresses and if you've run twenty 3D items out, why, he's heavily concentrating on how he should be hating waitresses. And one of them comes over and puts her arm around his shoulder. I mean, he's most surprised.

And then—then, of course, because he can't really make this aberration anymore, and so forth, why, of course he's had it right at that point, you see, because he gets friendly.

There's a liability to being sane, you know. You get friendly with all the people you used to hate. Sometimes embarrassing when you're out with people you haven't been with for a while, and they know very well that you hate waitresses, you see? Embarrassing. And you have to tell him that you had some processing or something. Rough.

Anyhow, by the time you've got ten items, if two of the things are that, you've changed a person's pattern. You've changed his pattern of thinkingness quite markedly.

What you'll be impressed with is the fact that he was not all that influenced by that aberration. That's one of the things that you will be fascinated with. Yeah, he was worried by it. Yes, he dramatized it. Yes, it was throwing his whole life out of gear. Yes, he was walking on the—in the gutter when he should have been walking on the curb. But the guy is still the guy. That's one of the things which I find interesting. The guy is still the guy. His more charming aspects are still amongst us. And he evidently could function as himself. In spite of these aberrations, he was himself. And you run into somebody and you still know it's that person, only he's more himself. You see, he's more himself and less inhibited as himself.

And we get back to all of the endless arguments we might have had in Book One on the subject of what is insanity. What does a Clear do? Now, we really start opening Pandora's box, you see? "What does a Clear do? How does a person really behave? What would happen to me if I were really, really Clear Cleared? Would I grow wings and so forth?"

Oh, I think they would find you very much yourself but a somewhat more charming self than you were. It's a disappointment, basically. Disappointment. Everybody expects you to at once develop—you know, what they really expect to have happen is one of the most overwhelming valences they have in their immediate vicinity, you see? They think that they will get the attributes of it, like magician, see, or something like that.

And they think that if they really got Clear, and then they immediately— you see, because they're going to get rid of it, the valence "magician" restimulates, you see? And they think, "Clear? Oh, I see what I would do. I would have piercing eyes. Piercing eyes and I would be able to hold up my fingers like this and long streams of fire would go out and blind any eyes I was looking at. I know what a Clear is. I'd be able to clear the hall by spitting. I could produce elephants out of spittoons. I know what a Clear is. Got it taped. Now, we're in communication. Now, I can talk to you about being Clear," you see?

And then you come along with 3D Criss Cross, and one of the first items you run across is magician. The guy ceases to worry about it, though. He doesn't have any difficulties with regard to it.

Now, 3D Criss Cross is more painful than any other type of processing we have. More painful. In terms of somatics and so forth, more painful early in its run. And you never saw a pc get so careless of these things after a while. But when done in the slower, older version of 3D, where you were just locating a goal and then getting a package from that goal, and so on, you unfortunately kept the pc hanging longer than he liked in the cold masses that are inevitably associated with a Goals Problem Mass. And everybody kept thinking that he was freezing to death all the time. And you go around and some pc would put his hand on you, and so forth, and the frost would gather on your coat sleeve. They were cold, man.

Well, don't think those entirely disappear on any pc that you do this on. In 3D Criss Cross it'll go through a little faster, but it'll still occur. The same things, the same somatics, and so on.

I would say that it would be enough for an individual to reject doing anything about himself, the somatics which occur in the very early stages of 3D Criss Cross, I'd say it would be enough for an individual—if he were operating on himself by himself, unsupported with an auditor, unaudited in other words—there'd be enough somatics and cold masses and pains and dizzinesses and sensations for him to, see, start in and say, "Oh, well, no, I don't think we'll go into that." Because he's been doing just that for trillennia. Every time he started to blow one of these things it started to hurt so he'd back right off of the thing and he's left them strictly alone.

Therefore, the task of auditing 3D Criss Cross is, of course, a precise task in that the pc has to be kept in-session. If you can't keep the pc in-session, the pc cannot on his own even vaguely face up to these things. He just couldn't do it, that's all.

You would just be fascinated at his inability to face up to them all by himself. It is just the fact that he's in-session. It isn't that the auditor has to work hard to get the pc to confront these things. An auditor running 3D Criss Cross doesn't have to get a pc to work anywhere near as hard as when running an engram. Running engrams, man, that was hard work. But the pc has to be in-session. He has to know he has an auditor, he has to know that the auditor is helping him out and pushing him along the line and that the auditor isn't on the side of the reactive bank.

Therefore, be prepared for this to happen: for 3D Criss Cross to go gorgeously in the hands of a well-trained auditor and for it to go splat in the hands of somebody who has just completed his third week in the Academy by being expelled. And then it will just lay the most gorgeous egg you ever saw. It'd just lay a gorgeous egg It wouldn't matter if he went through all the motions or anything else because you'd have a no-auditing situation. And a no-auditing situation is frankly the only thing that could totally defeat 3D Criss Cross. Almost anything else could push it through. But a no-auditing situation, no.

A pc has to have a certain insouciance about the bank. He has to be able to feed himself to the lions. He has to be able to sort of—well, just as he gets down to the last rung of the ladder and sees that it's three thousand feet to the ground, he's got to have somebody there that persuades him to let go. And you say to him, "Well, it's all right to let go, Joe. Actually, it's just illusory, the three thousand feet down."

He says, "Yes, but those houses look awfully solid. And the air's blowing very heavily across my lumbosis here. In fact, it's getting worse."

And the auditor has to help him out; either gently free his fingers off the bottom of the ladder, or stamp on them. But it's something that has to be done.

I don't wish to overrate the amount of skill that is required to run 3D Criss Cross. The actual skill—you can learn these technologies rather easily. The unseen, haunting factor back of all this is, is the session going? Is the pc in-session? That is the background music to all this.

And of course, to people who don't see this or don't experience it, they add all sorts of complications under what is meant by this. And in-session— well, that's just willing to talk to the auditor and interested in own case. I mean, it's as simple as that.

The demonstration you saw a little while ago, you saw I was taking up any little, tiny cross band here that might have been interfering with the pc's willingness to talk to me under those particular circumstances. I was qualifying it. In other words, I was being awfully careful of that particular point. Did you notice that? I was monkeying around with this point and I went

back to it a couple of times and I wasn't doing it very smoothly. I was just being very certain that the pc could talk to me about the thing. And finally I didn't get any reaction on it and let it go.

But you see, that's very, very important. The pc there was obviously interested in own case, but was the pc willing to talk to the auditor under those circumstances? Well, if that had been missing, he wouldn't have gotten any differentiation on the list. Pc would have gone over the items and said, "Mm-hmm, and so on, and oh, yeah, take it off. Leave it on." Or he might have just said, "Well, take it off, take it off, take it off. Take them all off, take them all off, take them all off. Take everything off the list. who cares? Tear it up for all I care."

And that wouldn't have been optimum. Pc wouldn't have been in-session. But it isn't difficult. It really isn't. It isn't even like walking a tightrope or anything like that. It's just making sure of these points. And undoing all the silly complications that you might be adding on top of it, that's all. That's as important as anything else. Getting rid of now the all—all the ought-to's and the now-I'm-supposed-to's, and things that you might just complicate the session out of this world with, you know.

Well, for instance, spend—find out all of a sudden that your E-Meter couldn't be balanced on set. And be very concerned about this sort of thing and be very, very worried about not being able to balance your E-Meter because you just couldn't get it to read on the Clear reads or something You get very upset and very worried about this.

Well, what's that got to do with it? We're not testing anybody for Clear. Are we? We got some vague idea of where the pc is, and so on.

Well, naturally, we want that to be right. If we can get that right. But if we can't get that right easily, we're going to leave it alone. You follow the rationale here? We're not going to do any of these things that are relatively unimportant if they're difficult to do or get in the road of our session.

We're not going to get the whole session held up because we find that we can't put through the—we can't get our ballpoint to work and write the auditors report. In other words, something as goofy as this, you see? And have to leave the room and get a ballpoint, and huh-huh. Well, we can't get a session going because we don't have a ballpoint pen, you know?

Now, a ballpoint pen doesn't make a session, see? So just drop that out of the lineup. And it's almost knowing what you can get rid of as an auditor. And if you'd make a list of the number of things you could get rid of as an auditor, you'd also have a list of the things that you'd never bother to put in if it interrupted the session in any way. You'd never let these things get in the road of the session.

So your ballpoint all of a sudden had expired. These things were originally, you know, advertised as writing forever. And they don't. On some of your first lists on flows, you probably will use two ballpoints getting the list. But the point is that that wouldn't be something you'd hold up the session for. You're going to list and differentiate. That's what you're going to do in that session. And you find out your E-Meter leads is busted just before you begin the session. You're going to list and differentiate in that session.

Ah, well, we don't drop that one out because we could never get the rudiments in, could we. So we go and steal a lead out of the auditor that's auditing in the next room, so he has to find them—proper procedure there! So that would be important. Pc's chair is not a very comfortable chair, and creaks. The pc's called attention to this several times. All right. As far as I'm concerned, pc can go on sitting in that chair for the next forty sessions. I couldn't care less. Audit the pc sitting on the floor. Who cares about the chair? Don't you see?

Your relative importances of what are the parts of a session are something that some auditors could sort out with great value. What is the auditor trying to do? In the rudiments, he's trying

to get the pc in-session. With Sec Checking he's trying to get the pc freed up so the pc can get even more easily into session. And with 3D Criss Cross, he's trying to find the items of the Goal Problem Mass that the pc is dramatizing, has given him all of his trouble and all of his aberrations. They're all contained in this mass and its various component parts. Well, that's all he's trying to do.

And he gets these things strung out and gets the relative evaluation. He knows what he can throw out the window and what he's got to keep in front of him. Therefore, it looks very relaxed when you finally finish up because it all cones down to getting the pc in-session and holding the pc in-session, and getting the pc to write complete lists, finish up lists, get them absolutely complete, get the item out, get the thing differentiated with the pc's interest right straight on it with all twelve cylinders firing. And then get your nulling out of the way, and you know that you can actually go over and over on a differentiated list. You know, you can go over and over, differentiate over and over, and you know it all disappears after a while? Every time the pc tells you it's an irreducible minimum.

If you were watching today on items or remembering items, you saw me go over the same column twice. That was, I went over the whole list once, but I covered one column twice. The first column I covered, I went over again before I ended the thing And the irreducible minimum of the first column I covered had become one-half its size the second time I covered it. In other words, these irreducible minimums keep blowing because they keep blowing charge, so there isn't anything to hold him in.

Charge is that which prevents the pc from thinking on a subject. Prevents him from thinking on a subject or getting rid of a subject or approaching a subject. Sum it up to handling a subject. Charged.

You wouldn't go over and pick up the live wires out of a 220-volt mains, would you? Well, neither will the pc much think about doing it or do it. Not until he's sure the switch is off. After you've turned the switch off, he says, "Well, what—what was this bothering me for?"

Well, that's what happens. You keep bleeding charge off the thing and it's always an irreducible minimum. At any given instant the whole list is an irreducible minimum. But then you blow a little more charge off and the irreducible minimum, of course, is reduced. And then you blow more charge off and the irreducible minimum is reduced again. And you can just keep on doing this and you can actually differentiate a list right on down to one item.

I'm not telling you to do this. I'm just saying you can do it. You can omit the nulling of the list. Not good auditing to do so, but on any pc that was hard to null items on, brother, would I make sure those lists were long and, boy, would I differentiate them round and round and round. And when I got all down through the end of the thing, then I know it'd null. Because I refuse to spend any time nulling That's what I refuse to do because it's the least beneficial of any of the steps.

So being the least beneficial of the steps, let's make it the least time consuming. The other steps are beneficial so let's spend our time on them. The pc always gets someplace if you make him keep on differentiating. And just for fun sometime, take a list and reduce it to one item by differentiation alone. And you'll find it continues to be an irreducible minimum.

But you'll still get one or two off every time you go around and it's still irreducible. But you still get one, two, three, four or six off. Isn't that weird? You're blowing charge off the thing. And of course, the last one stands up, "Well," the pc says, "well, why am I worried about this subject? Why am I doing anything with this subject? Because it is absolutely inevitable that a ring-tailed snorter is the only thing could do that. And I could have told you that at the beginning." He actually has the illusion that he could have.

"I could have told you that. I realized that all of my life. A ring-tailed snorter. Of course, naturally. Well, why are you so bothered with a ring-tailed snorter?"

By the time he's handling this ring-tailed snorter—when he first starts discussing it you'll see drop, drop, drop, charge, charge, charge and after a while he discusses it and he says, "Well, what's this all about, and so on."

And he can say ring-tailed snorter, you can say ring-tailed snorter and you only get the tick of the bridge from ring-tailed snorter to the rest of the mass. You get no charge on ring-tailed snorter. You only get the charge on the next item that can bleed to ring-tailed snorter. And that's what keeps the item ticking. It's never the item. The item you've found never ticks. What you get is the bleed of current from the item you haven't found. And that's why you keep—these things keep going tick, tick, tick, tick.

So actually, 3D Criss Cross, that's why we've obviated running items because the item you found and proved out, of course, is never charged. Isn't that fascinating But the item you've got is serving as a short circuiter to the bank.

In other words, you've got ahold of a connecter that isn't itself charged. Electronically, you've got ahold of a condenser that has nothing in it. It's all gone but you'll still find current in the condenser because the condenser is still connected up to something over here that does have current in another condenser, see? You get this other one bleeding through to the condenser you got hold of. See how the thing works out?

So you could keep on differentiating and differentiating and differentiating and blowing current and blowing current and he'd eventually say, "Well, why are we worried about this?"

Yeah, why are we worried about this? It drove his father insane. It put his mother in her grave. It's what makes him drive cars off bridges every time he sees a bridge and is in a car, you see. And it's what has kept him impoverished and broke and made his wife into a wreck before her time.

And he says, "Why are we worried about this?"

And sometimes it's such a negative gain that I wouldn't blame you at all sometimes to be slightly provoked at the pc not realizing how important that was in his life.

But I wouldn't advise you to try to sell him on the idea.

Bleeding charge is all you are doing on the bank whether it is Sec Checking or otherwise. There are ways to bleed charge well and there are ways to bleed charge poorly, but almost any auditing, if you call it auditing at all, will bleed some charge off the bank.

Now, the auditing only becomes upsetting and a nerve-racking no-Lloyd's premium-risk activity—no insurance, uninsurable, and so forth—when you are auditing in such a way as to stack up charge and let none of it blow. You never let the pc get rid of anything, you never let the pc throw anything away, you never let the pc blow off any charge at all. The pc hands you an item, you hand it back to the pc. Only he had an ARC break on it, see? The pc hands you a cognition. Put an ARC break on the cognition; hand it back to the pc, you see?

Pc gets rid of a withhold. Put an ARC break on it and give it to him and say, "Well, that wasn't a very nice thing to do, was it?"

I can think of so many joyful ways of keeping the bank charged up, you see? Now, if you made up a little list of the number of ways that you could keep a pc's bank charged up and not let him get rid of anything, you possibly would embrace all the auditing errors that could be made, but that would be a theoretical list. But that's how you would make the theoretical list, is figure out any way that you could keep a pc from getting rid of anything and keep the bank charged up and keep his attention off anything—and just make a list of that sort of thing, all of which sums up to not permitting the pc to bleed any charge off the bank—and

you will find consistently that you would have the bulk of the errors that could be made with auditing

And then I will let you in on something. Then you will have a bunch of Academy students and they'll fool you. They will invent some more.

I don't mean that to be sarcastic about students. I don't mean that to be sarcastic about auditors. But I will comment on the fact that they can usually outguess me on these things.

I wanted you to get a look at—in the demonstrations particularly, because I knew you—many of you might have a more complicated idea of auditing than it merits. But you look at all the parts as they go together and look at the auditing as it proceeds and it is not a complicated activity by which you're balancing a bowling ball on the end of your nose while standing on the middle of a medicine ball, you see, with a blonde on each hand, you see, while drinking whiskey.

It's not that type of an activity. It's a rather relaxed activity. But nevertheless it's a highly precise activity. You could make two errors.

The newcomer, the auditor, the Book Auditor, he makes the first error. He said, "It's so simple that anybody could do it and you don't need any training in order to accomplish this thing."

So therefore, he sits down, and I'll be a son of a gun, every now and then he turns in a fine job of auditing. That's because he doesn't know enough to make any mistakes. You'll see this every once in a while.

But then, all of a sudden, he starts hooking into the rough because he doesn't know what he's doing, see. And he starts hooking into the rough and he starts hooking into the green and he starts hooking into the sand traps, and so forth. And he starts having himself a ball and then he doesn't know what kind of trouble he's in. And then he says, "Well, it's because I'm not sitting on my chair with my legs crossed, and I'm not having the pc regard his navel. Obviously, that's why the sessions are going wrong" Because he doesn't know enough about the subject.

From that moment he goes on to greater and greater complications.

So at first he starts out with too simple a simplicity. He bridges rapidly over into a progressively complicated complication. And this complication gets absolutely top-heavy and the end result of it is he's so busy auditing that the pc never gets included in the session. And when the pc is not included in the session, no auditing occurs.

There are several ways that you could make a no-auditing situation exist, but I wish you to cultivate your sense of observation, both as an auditor and as an observer of auditing. Cultivate the ability to detect a no-auditing situation. Just cultivate it. Know when no auditing is taking place. Not because of meters or because you've got a circuit that tells you. Just realize when it happens. Know when the pc's in. Know when the pc is out. Be able to look at an auditing situation and know whether that pc is in-session or not.

I'm not asking you to do anything very difficult. I can look into the Sec Checking room in there just long enough to open the door, sweep one glance around the room and close the door, and tell you every pc that's in the place that's in-session and every pc in the place that's out of session.

And that is not a terrific high level of skill. It is just that obvious. It is not my penetrative eye or my ability to permeate situations. It's nothing extraordinary at all. It's just my ability to look, but you can look, too, and you can see it just like that.

And when you're sitting there auditing the pc, all of a sudden—you're going along with this and that, it's just some, slight change of inflection in the pc's voice. And you say, "Well, there went the rudiments, okay."

Don't bother asking are the rudiments out. "Do you think the rudiments are out? Are the rudiments out, to you? Maybe if I set it up at sensitivity 16, I could find out if the rudiments are out."

Well, man, if they weren't out when you asked, you've got them out by now. Just look up at the pc, you're doing all right, and you ask that question, not to find out how the pc's doing, but to adjudicate from the pc's answer tone if the pc is doing all right or not.

Get the pc to say something to you. Is the pc willing to talk to you? So you ask the pc, "How are you doing"

And the pc tells you or the pc doesn't tell you. And if the pc doesn't tell you, the pc's out of session and you better get him in.

Now, you can start cranking up the E-Meter. But of course, you might have been a little bit cautious. And you say, "Well, are you doing all right?"

And the pc says, "Oh, yeah, I'm doing fine. Now, so-and-so and so-and-so, and this list, and so on."

You don't bother with it any further, do you?

And you say, "Well, are you doing all right?"

And the pc says—any such phrase, you know, no pattern phrase. Just some attention to the pc to get him to talk to you a moment. Adjudicate where that pc sits, and say, "Well, are you doing all right?"—something like that, anything.

The pc says to you, "I guess so."

Mmm. Crank it up. What withhold have we just missed? What has the pc just invalidated? "Is it all right to audit in this room? Why did your grandfather have to marry the girl?" But let's get the pc back in-session because that pc is not in-session.

"Well, how is this list going?" See, you'll hear a stray question like that. What is this question? This question is interest in the pc, certainly, but it's something else, too. It's a test of the pc's response.

It is you the auditor, not rudiments, that hold the pc in-session. And when you the auditor have let the pc go out of session, it'll be one of several things that will get him back in-session. And this list is covered by the whole word rudiment. And you'll get the pc back in-session again.

But there's no substitute for auditing. There just isn't any substitute. It's indescribably simple. It is too elementary to be pounded on the head.

Some of your biggest difficulties in auditing is that you have done nothing to bleed any charge off the pc at which end of session the pc is, of course, out of session gorgeously.

The pc sat there a whole session. You bled no charge off the bank. You didn't do anything to make the pc feel lighter, better or anything of the sort. You must have, then, compounded the felony since auditing itself will automatically make a pc better unless it's interfered with. See, you must have interfered with it in some way, so you must have handed the pc back as much charge as the pc got rid of to keep the pc in status quo or worse.

Well, the rudiments, running down the rudiments, tells you how you did that. How did you manage that? ARC break? You gave him a present time problem? He was unable to get rid of withholds? Something of the sort. But I don't care what the form is; the actual fact is that he did get rid of some charge, but you gave it back to him. You didn't mean to, but you did. Therefore, the pc didn't get any better.

These things are all of the factors of auditing. Auditing is a relatively simple operation if you have already sorted out all of its complexities and chances. So therefore, there is no such thing as simple auditing. Auditing is only simple and only looks simple, and listing and 3D Criss Cross and anything else you're doing, is only simple when you know all about it. And then it becomes terribly simple, and you say, "I wonder why I worry about this. why did I ever worry about this? This is awful easy."

Well, walk into an Academy one day and look around and you'll see why you worried about it once.

A student auditor is sitting there. He's got the E-Meter upside down. He has got one eye on the Instructor and the other eye out the window because he has an appointment. The pc has not been sitting in the chair for fifteen minutes and he has not noticed. You go over and flick him on the left ear, and he rings like a gong

And you'll say, "Gee-whiz, what's he so worked up about? Auditing is perfectly simple. All you do is keep the pc in-session and bleed the charge off the case and get things that are bothering the pc and straighten them up and let the pc get rid of them and the pc's all right."

And you tell him this, you know, and he says, "Yeah," he says, "but what process do you run to handle a present time problem? I'm sure Ron must have changed his mind about this. Well, what do you do to get a session started? Do you say 'START of session' or do you say 'Start of session' or do you say 'Start of session'? How do you do that?"

You suddenly conceive you're talking to a person who is in a large area of unknowingness. They don't know what's important, what's unimportant, or anything else. But they're just swimming, flying blind, compass busted, radar soaking wet, no ports in sight and a gale coming over the horizon.

This they know and sense but they can't figure much of anything else out. But, as I say, it's very simple. But there's nothing like familiarity to breed that feeling of simplicity, and so my advice on the thing if you're at all worried about auditing is just audit and you'll come out of it providing the pc survives.

Thank you.