ENTRANCE OF CASES

A lecture given on
13 November 1962

Thank you.

This is lecture number two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 13 November, AD 12, and I want to talk to you somewhat about entrances of cases.

Now, I'm getting together the material for bulletins, and so forth, on the number of ways to enter cases. And although I took off last week and put in a lot of hours getting the material together for your various bulletins of last week (modernizing and wrapping up material is what I'm mainly engaged in), I haven't spent much time getting cases in a – how you enter them in 3GA or 3GA Criss Cross, and so forth. This is something I have neglected to some degree because there are just too many ways. And it's getting to be a *broad* subject. It's getting to be one of these very, very encyclopedic subjects. I haven't counted them up, but I can turn on a rock slam on cases with this question or that question or do this with them or do that with them, and so forth.

The main thing that I wanted to get out was your HCOB of November 11th, which gives you straightening up 3GA Criss Cross cases – straightening them up, those that have been run.

Now, you've got a new routine, and this new routine is quite important. It's Routine 3-21. Now, 3GA as such was insufficiently delineated. But the original 3GA was highly workable. So what I did was take all of the additional flurries that I knew of that would function well, new things learned such as Tiger Drilling and that sort of thing and just rolled them into the original 3A and gave you Routine 3-21.

Now, Routine 3-21 will probably work on any case that was well prepared. We can't, however, count on cases being well prepared, by which I mean I think somebody was just mentioning Presession 2 – Confront and Havingness, you know, Havingness and Confront – that type of approach; CCHs and a Prepcheck is what you would be doing these days. You'd be doing CCHs and a Prepcheck, and so forth and smoothing the case out to that – in that way. And a case that was thoroughly prepared would actually have, to a marked degree, keyed out their present time difficulties.

Now, their present time difficulties is what's going to give you trouble in old-time 3GA. You'd have an insufficiently well-prepared case. The number of hours required would

not be given by the auditor. You'd have somebody'd skimp it here. Somebody was doing very, very rough CCHs, you know, and so on. And do you know that very, very rough CCHs will build the tone arm up and dirty up the needle? You know, never let the guy execute the auditing command and all this kind of thing, you know. I mean you'd really have to work at it hard, but very badly run CCHs can build your tone arm up and dirty up the needle and accomplish exactly the reverse to what they're supposed to accomplish.

And because there have been frailties in the preparation of cases here and there – bad auditing and so forth; the number of hours that could be afforded and so on – we walked forward into a great deal of developmental work, beyond the point where it was vitally necessary. You get the idea?

I rode this bicycle down the beach many a league beyond the point where I had to get off the bicycle. You understand? This was in the interest of speedup, interest of tougher cases. And I came back to the conclusion, finally, which is an old time-worn conclusion. We find havingness, you know, every six months. Well, it's been six months since we found havingness, you see. And I came to the conclusion that this was your better track. Because it doesn't matter how tricky your auditing question is; if it doesn't get finished in the auditing cycle, why, it isn't going to do anything.

Someday you'll learn this. You can nod at me now, but listen: Someday you'll be sitting there, D of Ping a bunch of pcs and for the fifteenth time somebody has come in and asked you for an unusual solution. And for the fifteenth time you've dreamed up a very, very fancy crosscut, short approach to the situation. And for the fifteenth time you give it to him, and you make sure that it's used, and then you find out that didn't do any good either. And you'll suddenly wake up and maybe remember this lecture.

Well, if in some of the cases the auditor didn't even deliver your fancy technique – and in the remainder, if the case needed a fancy technique, the pc didn't execute it. See? First and foremost is the fact the auditor wasn't using it and then second on that, why, if he was, the pc wasn't doing it. So, of course, you got noplace in a hurry because the reason the auditor was asking for it is because the pc wasn't doing it in the first place. See?

That sounds like one of these terribly redundant propositions, you see. But the reason the case became an unusual case is becau – and demanded of you – as the D of P – demanded of you an unusual solution, was because the pc wasn't answering the question in the first place. So for you, then, to dream up a new question to ask the pc is to court the exact same fate as the first question the pc was being asked. See, he didn't do that either. And that is why you make this statement of "When faced with the unusual, do the usual." In fact, get even more usual. Get very ordinary. And by getting very ordinary I mean start patting the walls, man.

Now, the tricky developmental work in Scientology is very much to our credit. And

we have learned a great deal, and we have gone forward a great distance by ignoring some of these fundamentals. That is to say, well, all right, we auditors couldn't do a process, or something of the sort and instead of trying to force through and say auditors must do this process, don't you see, we tried to get something additional that an auditor could do, that a pc could execute and that sort of thing.

Similarly, that same thing has happened in clearing. Now, you write out 850 goals and you start in at the beginning of these 850 goals on this well – prepared case and you will find then that it is very simple indeed to tiger drill these goals. And if you hit one, it isn't going to hang up. Well, it isn't going to hang up because when you ask, "On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" you don't get the pc instantly protesting. Well, do you see that as a variation of the auditing drill?

You say to the pc, "On the goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?" And the pc says nothing, but in actual fact doesn't even inspect "suppress" but protests. You just disturbed him from examining a goal he has just thought of that has nothing to do with the goal which you are tiger drilling. See, he just thought of another goal that his father must have had, and he wonders if that couldn't have been his goal, and you're trying to do "to catch catfish," don't you see. And he's busy auditing three other goals that he has accumulated as you came along. See, he's not in-session; he's not completing an auditing cycle.

Therefore, he will have a dirty needle all the time, all the time, all the time. Now, that's just from lack of preparation of the case. This guy's got missed withholds; he's never been straightened out; he never completes an auditing cycle – all kinds of wild things are going on. And because he doesn't complete an auditing cycle, of course, the needle is dirty all the time. He always thinks of something else. Or he thinks of nothing.

You say, "On this goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been suppressed?"

And he thinks "To suppress things. I wonder – 'to suppress things.' Do you suppose 'to suppress things' could really be a goal? I wonder if I do have a goal to suppress things. I think a goal 'to suppress things' would be an interesting goal to have. See, I used to squash beetles and so forth and so forth . . . "

And you're going on and you're saying – you're saying, "On the goal 'to catch catfish,' has anything been invalidated?" and he's – you say, "Ah, that reads."

"Reads? Reads? Reads? Reads? What reads? Reads? You said something?. "

And you say, "Yes, has anything been invalidated? Something's been invalidated. That reads. What is it?"

And he says, "Nothing's been invalidated."

And you say, "Well, yes. Yeah, there – there is a read here on the meter. There. There. There."

Actually, all the time you're doing that, there's no more thought going on, there's no more effort to look, there's no more effort to confront, there's nothing happening. You even get an automatic circuit going sometimes, where you say, "Has anything been suppressed?" and the pc says "No," and then you bear down and you say, "There. There. There. There. There. What are you looking at? What are you ... T'

"Oh, well, that. Yes. Well, of course, I suppressed the goal."

See, any kind of an action of this character. You have to drive it home. See, you're not getting across to this pc. What's the immediate result of all this? Well, you're not able to tiger drill the list. That's the immediate result of all that.

But now, let us say the case is well prepared. Let us say the case's needle has smoothed out and the case is doing all right and present time is quite real to this case and everything's fine. Now, could something still be wrong with this case so that you couldn't do 3-21? And the answer's yes, there could still be something wrong. The goal is not on the list or, if on the list, is so unreal to the pc that if you confronted it, it would never answer up.

Now, let's take this in *extremis.* Let's just say, all right, it's impossible to fix up a lot of these cases. You – with beautiful preparation, smooth them all out and spend 150 hours smoothing them all out and preparing them, because people are going to be clamoring at you, asking you to do things about this or that, in environments and atmospheres, and their present times are all enturbulated, and they're going to ask you to find their goal, and that sort of thing. Therefore, you need a technology which overshoots the elements and the elementary things which I've been telling you. And in that you have 3GA Criss Cross.

The end product of 3GA Criss Cross is to so seize upon the pc's attention that the pc couldn't possibly do anything else but give you exactly what is sitting in front of his face. He can't do anything else but answer the auditing commands. This is far, far too interesting to him.

Now, the tip is that interest follows the rock slam. Where you have a rock slam you have interest. Therefore, you follow the rock slam. You also have the goals channel and you also have the consecutive set of pairs which lead actually from the dimmest beginnings of this GPM forward to the tiniest terms and oppterms in present time. In other words, they're pairs and they come all the way forward. And the route between these pairs is traveled by the auditor from present time clear back to the earliest beginnings. He does it first by finding the goal and then does it by finding the items which have been built up by the existence of this goal. In other words, it's a path, it's a track which is marked by a rock slam. All of its mileposts are designated by rock slams.

Now, you can pretty well overwhump almost anything in the pc if you can get on the trail of the rock slam. Now, you're going to be asked to do miracles; you're going to be asked to do cases that are improperly prepared; you're going to be – asked to do this, you're going to be

asked to do that; going to be asked to audit cases in noisy environments; all kinds of things you're going to be asked to do. And you can do that only with very, very powerful procedures. And the most powerful procedures that we have now are – is a combination of old 3D Criss Cross and some of the item – finding steps of later processes. And this we call 3GA Criss Cross.

Well, it has certain rules – certain rules. And I've just given you one of them, and that rule is that the pc's interest follows a rock slam. And if the pc's interest follows the rock slam then the pc will be in-session. You see that? In other words, this is a sort of a forced in-sessionness. This pc has no business being in session, don't you see. In many cases the pc – you know, it's kind of a "What wall?" situation. And yet the pc will follow the auditing cycle, the pc will answer the questions. He has no other choice. Do you see that?

Now, you'll get it sometimes – the pc is in very, very great protest of mid ruds. And either the mid ruds have been abused on the pc, grossly abused

every time the pc originates, the auditor gets in the mid ruds; this is the fastest way to spoil a pc ever invented.

Pc says, "I just thought of another item."

And the auditor says, "In this session, has anything been suppressed?" See?

That's the way to cure them – cure them of being audited. You can use mid ruds, then, to drive somebody out of session. But you start in – YOU start in and even though you've used mid ruds very carefully, even though you've used them very well, even though you have been extremely careful of this pc, you've handled the pc very nicely, you haven't cleaned cleans, you know, and you haven't neglected reads, and you haven't gotten missed withholds and all this sort of thing. . . You've just been going along just dandy and yet the pc's still protesting the mid ruds. Yeah, isn't that – isn't that interesting? I mean, you're following the rock slam channel right on down the line, but every time you depart off the rock slam channel you get a stack of protests about mid ruds.

Now, realize what you're looking at. The rock slam channel is so enchanting, is so interesting, the pc has no choice but to hand out answers and complete the auditing cycle as long as you are only on this subject, as long as you are only calling off these items – there's only – you're only asking for these items or you're only calling off these items. The pc gives every evidence of being in-session. But you suddenly pull off, just to the short distance of the session itself, you've asked the pc to confront present time. The pc says, "Yo ! Nope! *Mm-der-brrp! Screak!"* Smell of brakes. See what happens?

Now, you can't say that every pc who does this, does this only because he's in indifferent contact with present time anyhow and is improperly prepared. You can't say that because in many cases pcs have had so many cleans cleaned and so many reads missed and

nobody's cleaned up the missed withholds and the auditor – in spite of listening to all my lectures and reading all of my bulletins on the subject – still doesn't know what a missed withhold is. They still exist.

All right, what have we got here? Well, we've got the other alternate that the pc has been beaten up with rudiments and so forth, and mid ruds and so on, to a point where they do have a protest, don't you see? Pretty hard to tell the difference. The pc has been artificially put into a condition where he is responding with the same degree as the pc of great unreality. You follow this? I mean, you can always audit a case into a hole. See, this can always happen.

Now, you notice this, then, that as long as you're asking the pc ... You found the Prehav level "smoke," and you want "Who or what would smoke?" And man, you ask, "Who or what would smoke?" and it's right, you did your assessment right and everything. The pc is actually just dealing them off the top of the deck, see. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang – "That would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and that would smoke and..." He hasn't actually any opportunity to do anything else. Because you're dealing out the circuit he would normally operate with. You see that? Sneaky.

You see, in the absence of havingness, when his havingness is low, his circuits key in. You understand that old mechanism. You know, all you've got to do is run somebody's havingness down and you key the circuits in. All right, somebody who is in different contact with present time has all of his circuits in.

What are these circuits? These circuits are GPM items or their cousins or sisters or aunts. So naturally, with his havingness down, he's got all items in. But you can still audit him. If you're on the rock slam channel, you're on this channel of circuits. You see this? You're actually auditing the circuits he would normally be dramatizing. So, of course, they can't dramatize because they're being audited. So you do get an auditing cycle.

And all of a sudden you pull off of this and you – you got your last three items, and you call his attention to present time. And you say, "In this session, has anything been suppressed?" and you have one god-awful time trying to clean this up. And you just can't – you can't quite get anything clean. Everything is just kind of *gluu-umm, zrrp-um,* non-registering on the meter and goes off the meter and on the meter and off the meter and on the meter.

Well, what's happened here? Well, a roughness of auditing could do this, too. Let's say you were busily charging down the line and supposing some kind of a blunder like this happened – it'd never happen here – supposing some blunder like that *did* happen. "Who or what would smoke?"

"Well, a big man, and a little man, and a little man trying to look big, and uh"

You say, "Well, I don't think that's right."

And he says, "What?"

"I don't think it'd be a little man trying to look big."

"Why not?"

"Well, that one gives a funny wobbling motion to the needle. So it couldn't be that one, you'll have to give me another item."

If you did something like that crude to him, see, all of a sudden there he is, and he's all of a sudden *plunged* into the middle of this item. And he'll dramatize it and he'll do all kinds of wild things and your session will just go to hell in a balloon. And you haven't got much of a prayer of getting this pc back into action if this pc is also allergic anyway to present time and its environment.

Look at the difficulty you're running into. You've got a pc who *isn't* well acquainted with PT, a pc that under the *best* circumstances would be in high revolt against being put into present time and now cause a hell of a flub of some kind or another, which would put *any pc* into revolt against anything you said and you practically spin him! You see? There you've compounded the felony.

So all these things like 3GA Criss Cross are given to you with the understanding that as you do them they are done with considerable expertness, because they can actually overcome and bypass the unreadiness of the pc to be audited on them, and you can get away with it. See, you're auditing in depth on a pc that couldn't get his big toe wet without practically dying of pneumonia. So it takes tremendously skilled auditing.

The natural defenses of the mind, so called by somebody who had withholds, are instantly overwhelmed. You cut right straight by those. This fellow will go out and plunge into the Arctic Sea and swim several miles and come up shining at the other end, providing you don't run alongside and jab him in the back with a boathook. You see? So it takes a very flawless brand of auditing to pull this off.

Those are the exact mechanics, by the way, from which these cautions about "untrained auditors shouldn't run these upgraded processes – " see, those are the actual mechanics behind it. These things actually will reach far deeper than the pc could ever reach.

Now, if he hasn't got an auditor there but the auditor is just saying things to him and he is being pushed in over his head anyway and he suddenly triggers and does follow out the auditing cycle with no auditor present and then all of a sudden something bad happens, well, the guy just sort of goes down for the third time, don't you see?

So a person who is unskilled using these processes – well, you get something like happened in Johannesburg before we really raised the devil. There was practically nothing but

wrong goals in the Johannesburg area. They're just catching up with them – how many – and they're just stacked. The way goals were being found down there by this character was ... He's talking about making Scientology a racket in South Africa, see? Well, what kind of a racket do you call this? Somebody comes in to get his goal found and he's going to pay a lot of money to get his goal found. And he walks in, gets put on a meter, and the guy just reads a list of goals at him, and the first one that rocket reads he says, "Why, that's your goal," never checks it out – and sends him out to get it listed. Well, that was what was happening, man. That's why the old man suddenly took a few heads off.

There's wrong goals all over the place, see? And one girl throwing up every time she turned around and has been for months, you know; couldn't keep anything on her stomach. Pretty wild things happen. Just criminally bad auditing, see.

Well, that sort of thing can happen with these. So therefore, we lay down all these provisos, and we say, you know, it takes very skilled handling and you do it just this way and you have to be trained and all that sort of thing. Because you actually can bypass this.

Frankly, if you did Goal Assessment by Elimination – by elimination; that's old 3GA; it's not the 3-21 where they're done by Tiger Drilling – if a pc was pretty ready to have his goal found you would find his goal by elimination. But if he wasn't ready to find his goal, you know, if he wasn't ready to have his goal found, why, you wouldn't find it. You see that?

Now, when you get into 3-21, if the pc isn't ready to have his goal found, you can find it. You can find it by tiger drilling those first 850, providing the goal is on the list.

Oh yeah, you can whipsaw him around, get this thing to rocket read and prepcheck the thing and so forth. But, man, he has no more – he has no great reality on it. To walk down this track amongst the great black boulders which will cave in on him in all directions, he looks upon as something which James Bond would approach with trepidation. And he says that's pretty tough. He looks at the first three or four as something that could only be performed at a circus by a hardened acrobat, see. And you're going to make him walk down the whole track to the vicinity of this goal, and it's just *huh-uh!* See?

Well, he's too stuck on the track, he's too overwhumped, he's too this and he's too that. And the odd part of it is that when you get to 3GA Criss Cross, you can do it, and you can get away with it and you can bring him out. But recognize, for God's sakes, what you're doing! Please recognize that you are short-cutting and saving on the preparatory steps, that you are taking a pc who isn't ready to be audited on "Touch that perambulator," and you're going to make him walk the death mile straight down to the middle of hell, see. Dramatic as that. It looks much worse than that to the pc, when he starts looking at this, man.. And you're going to make him do this. So therefore, it's pretty smooth, pretty tricky auditing that's required.

Now, the number of ways that you can get him to walk the death mile and start on that street that has machine gun emplacements in each window embrasure – to say nothing of the

mines under the road and the diving Spitfires, and so forth, overhead, this is – they're quite incidental, see – are many. And one of them, the earliest, is just to ask somebody to put down his idea of the dynamics and assess it. I mean, that's the earliest and most simple version of it. And then represent it – the earliest one – represent it and get some sort of an item and then list some goals against that as the oppterm and you would wind up with it.

Now, there are very many refined methods of getting this and getting the slam. In each one of these cases you had to get the slam. The next one up from that is, "What isn't part of existence?" You got him to do that. You even snaked him up into that's – what does he wish wasn't part of existence, threw that list away and wrote, "What isn't part of existence?" got some sort of a list there, and when you null that list out you're going to find something that's slamming.

And if the pc couldn't do that, then you say, "What – who would – who or what have you detested?" And he's got somebody he detested. And you represent that and you're going to wind up with a dynamic list and so forth. And if the pc couldn't do that – you didn't find your rock slam – you got your next one "Who or what would you prefer not to associate with?" And you're going to get something out of that and then there's a way of tackling this with Problems: "What problem would you rather not face up to?" That, however, is a package all by itself. I wouldn't use it in that particular lineup.

And these are all various methods of getting a person to turn on a rock slam, which, of course, is his entering interest level. And he's so interested in going down that line that he doesn't notice all those machine gun embrasures. He just says, ouch! when the bullets hit him, and he keeps walking. Got the idea?

In the presence of a good auditor he keeps walking. He doesn't get lonesome. He doesn't get hung up on the track. And he doesn't get the right item taken away from him and the wrong one handed to him. And a lot of other little refinements helped him to do this.

So here he is and these are all methods which get him there. And you've got now an additional method which I think you'll find is pretty darned reliable and that's "Roll Your Own" Prehav.

This is a version of the old Primary-Secondary Scale. And that of course, is just take any standard Prehav Scale or any Prehav Scale or any I will write – one of these days I'll get around to writing a special Prehav Scale for special reasons, you know, like types of scales – and you find a level on that and then get that level represented. And of course the pc will lay on a silver platter the exact level that he's supposed to have there providing you came anywhere close to it on the original scale.

In other words ' he will give you the Prehav level of whatever you're asking for and it will be tailored to his perfect understanding because he gave it to you. And this wipes out Prehav Scales of... Let's see, the English language, I think, has a quarter of a million words;

therefore a complete Prehav Scale would be that proportion of a quarter of a million words which consists of verbs. And you know, I think that's too long an assessment.

So this gets you out of these very long assessments. You don't have to do these long assessments. It wouldn't matter if you took the full Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale, even with its few additions and did that, and rolled your own with that. You would wind up with a very reliable level.

Now, the original idea on this is not as workable. You simply made yourself up a little series of the gradients of overts and the gradients of withholds. You just made yourself up a little scale, you know. You know, like "Would you keep to yourself?" you know. Or you know, "Would you – would you rather not others weren't after you?" you know, I mean, that as the withhold – and run that up to putting down some little item like, "Getting after everybody you run into," you know, "Everybody and everything you run into." Maybe just six or seven of these, you see. And you assess those and find the one which sort of sticks with you the most. And what you're doing there is an old Flows Assessment, if you recognize it.

And you use that and roll your own from that. And just ask him, "Who – if somebody was trying to attack everybody and everything in sight, what would they do?" And you'd get a whole bunch of list. And then you assess the list he gave you, and you wind up with a highly accurate Prehav level.

Now, if you've done that you probably will wind up with a rock slam. That's your – that's a very specialized method of getting down into the rock slam channel, getting the proper thing, getting it going – just using the roll-your-own level. And you want to know who or what would do that – whatever it was, whatever you found out, see? You want a who or what would do that. You make a long list of those things, and they may be terminals, they may be oppterms – we couldn't care much which. And you wind that up and you just do that list and you're going to get something there that rock slams. A high probability is that you'll land right in the middle of the rock slam.

Now, there are various ways that you could handle that. I've been working with this lately and you know, you can do, actually, any list by simply calling it off once. You don't have to say "committing overts" or anything else, actually. You don't have to turn on all that rock slam. If the thing is going to rock slam, it's going to tick. So just take everything that's in. Just do it by elimination, and tiger drill the last few the way I was showing you. I'm just talking about the wording of the – of the assessment. You can do it that way. If you have qualms about it, why, by all means, "Consider committing overts against ." and "Would something commit overts ... ?" whatever it is. But you can actually just call it off once, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.

And if it's going to rock slam, it's going to tick. Then when you've got it there, when you've got the last few, why, you'd say, "Would so and so . . ." after you tiger drill them, you

know, you finish the Tiger Drill and you say, "Consider committing overts against . . ." and you get your slam, you see. Your slam can develop in that particular way.

This actually, by the way, isn't as reliable as doing it the other way. I have goofed on this when I didn't goof the other way. But I still have confidence in it and I'm still – doing it that way and getting away with it. Auditing is what you can get away with. And if you don't have to put that many words into nulling a list you can of course null the list a lot faster. You just go down the list, "Tiger. Waterbuck," you know, and see if it reacts, just calling them once. Because the item is going to do nicely, thank you. It's going to react well if you're right on the track. So anyway, you get down to the end of this list, you go over it, you select it out, you've got an item.

Now, what the hell is an item? Now, it's the protagonist or antagonist in the game, which pursues from the fellow having had a goal in the first place. It's the dumbbells. Now, in actual fact there's another pair of dumbbells on it. And I haven't figured out what to do with these in assessment, and I don't know if they're needed, but they're the "not" pair. They're there, pinned onto it electronically. And you quite often can find this "not" pair. N-o-t, you see. You've got, one of them was, "Who or what would smoke?" Well, actually, there's another list, a sleeper, back of that list, you could say, "Who or what would not smoke?" – just arbitrarily add your not – and you'd get a brand-new list and you'd get a brand-new item sitting out there, see. It actually isn't a pair. It's principally a pair, you understand? In actual fact it is four. There are two dumbbells lying there. But the other two you could ignore.

Now, auditing is what you can get away with and 3GA Criss Cross is what you can ignore. What can you safely ignore? Because, of course, if you start 3GA Criss Cross on this basis of finding the rock slam channel, listing it, finding a slamming item and then do an opposition to it and find the slamming item and then do an opposition to the item you just found and then do a represent for the first item and an opposition to it, and a represent for the second item and an opposition to it, and a represent for the third item and an opposition to it.

Well, you – it's something like they do in Baltimore. They have a tremendous number of white stone steps in Baltimore. It's one of the dirtier, dustier cities you ever ran into. So they have nothing but white steps in Baltimore. We're not sure why there are nothing but white steps there, because it's such a dirty town. But they scrub these off every morning, with an enthusiasm which has often held me in great awe. You see, they *sweep* them off and then they scrub them off and then they *lather* them off, you see, and then they *hose* them off and then wipe them off. Of course, a half an hour later they're dirty. But it's such enthusiasm. And, actually, they wouldn't have to work that hard. They just wouldn't have to work that hard to accomplish it.

Now, you're not trying to clear somebody with this 3GA Criss Cross, but the funny part of it is if you did it expertly you'd wind up doing so. You could clear somebody and never find the goal. The goal would be the last thing you found. You understand this? It's –

you're clearing a person backwards.

You theoretically could keep finding items that rock slammed and finding them nicely so that you could keep going and you would eventually wind up with the bottom of the channel. All this is very interesting. You recognize that there's a possibility in that direction. But it would be very hard and there'd be a lot of guesswork about it and you'd make a lot of wrong guesses, and you wouldn't have the guiding constant common denominator that you're going with, which is the goal. So it's easier to go down the channel a short distance until the goal is available and then pick up the goal and continue to list and null with the goal.

Now, this is trying to get the case discharged sufficiently so that you can do something with a goals list. Now, if you kept discharging the case and at the same time disorienting the case even further, you of course are going to get further and further from finding a goal. You see how that could be? Instead of discharging the case all you're doing is enturbulating the case.

You keep finding items – and handing them to the pc – that didn't slam. I'll give you ways of doing this. Tell the pc that's his item and he never cognites on it, he's just going to get fuzzier and fuzzier. He's going to get less and less real about things, see. There's less and less happening. You follow how you could go at this? You're going to get less and less likely to find these goals, you see. You're going to find wrong items, you're going to find items that don't slam, and he's just going to get buried and confused.

Now, I had to decide what you could get away with. And my first guesstimate was more closely based on what I myself thought I could get away with, as it normally would be, and that was simply to get a couple of items and you'd get something else. See, it's as simple as that. I mean, if you're going to have to go to all this nonsense just to know what your goal is – you get the idea – why, then of course, the most you'd need would be an item or two and you could list some goals against it and that'd be that.

Well, that didn't turn out to be too workable, so we stretched it out to about three items, don't you see. Then we started listing goals after three items and unburdening it, and I finally woke up to the fact that we were leaving pieces of the package behind us unidentified. And that this was raising hell with several pcs.

We were actually into the GPM. We were actually handling pairs. And even though these pairs were the pair of the detested person ... Ah, but the detested person had a terminal that detested him that was just that much in present time. It's sort of like picking pebbles off the beach so you can get to the boulders, don't you see. Well, all the pc could tolerate at that stage of the game is the pebbles. So he's not quite able to confront pebbles and he's worried by the fact that there's a pebble left behind him. You found this detested person. This detested person is Joe, see? See? All right, detested person – Joe. So now from that you get the dynamic list and you get the dynamic, "spirits." And now you get the item that spirits represent, and you wonder why this pc isn't progressing well and why you're really not

having a good time of it in trying to add up these goals and list goals and tiger drill them and that sort of thing. Hell, he's worried about what would oppose Joe! See, he's clear back there.

See, you've gone into this factory and you've showed him everything and you've expostulated and you've pointed to the machinery and the dustbins and the wastebins and the employees' room and the guard rooms and how they file everything and so forth, and you look around and you say, "Hey, hey, where are you?" You know? And you go back. He's just inside the main gate. He doesn't want to know all those things you were telling him, he says, "What place is this?" See? He wants to know who hates Joe. So you get the idea there, because you've left an unmatched – an unopposed pair.

So, to be on the safe side doing this because it helps any case, why, you make a rule about it. And you've got that in November 11, AD 12, 3GA, straightening up these cases; well, you always make a pair. If you get something, you oppose it. That's just your rule. And if it's still red-hot, you represent it. That's actually all you need to know. It isn't a question of representing, always. If you get something that slams you oppose it. Well, if you got something that was a terminal and you oppose it, of course you're looking for an oppterm, looking for something that's agin him. And then you've got a terminal, you've got an opposition terminal. If you got an opposition terminal, you've got to get its terminal, don't you see?

Well now, this isn't all that smooth. Actually, after the person has been cleared, he has it all straight. But this, oddly enough, doesn't do you a bit of good. And you sometimes will find yourself in this weird squirrel cage: You find this item and it's a terminal. And you've gotten it by opposing, let us say, the detested person. And you've got it, you see, and it's "a slave driver." And the pc says, "Well, you've got that now, you know." There it was, opposing the detested person, you've got this "slave driver," and we're very happy about this and now we've got that packaged and ... Pc doesn't seem very responsive about this, and so forth and the auditor evaluate, evaluate, and the pc's being pleasant and propitiative. And the pc ventures and he says, "You know, a while ago there when we found uh – when we found uh – 'ships' – 'ships,' you know, we found this item 'ships' – we were doing this a while ago, you know. I think that's what 'slave driver' opposes." See, that's three down the line, see. He's all mucked up on this subject, in other words, and you've got to pick your way through it.

And the test by which you pick your way through it is what is still slamming. You can always make something slam again if it's going to slam. You can say, "Get the idea of withholding from it," if you've been running overts with it all the time, if it's going to slam again.

Now, if it's going to slam again, why, it hasn't been opposed. I don't care if you got the opposition to it – now, hear me now – I don't care if you got the opposition to it and you wrote it. That's what you did. You're always supposed to be auditing a pc. I'd like to call that to your attention. And although you opposed it and you wrote up, "Who or what would

oppose Joe?" and you got 64a slave driver," when it all winds up and you start looking these – these items you've got on the line plot again and you find "Joe" is still rock slamming, you have not opposed "Joe." You have probably opposed something else.

And you could do the pc a world of good, if you've got several items around, and say, "Well what . . ." you know, "Here's a – here's 'a catamaran,' and here's 'ships,' and here's this ... And what – which one of these does 'a slave drive oppose, if any?"

"Oh, ho-ho-ho! 'ships'!"

Yeah, but you now have the burning question of what opposes "Joe?" You haven't found out yet. So you've got to do something about "Joe" now, again, because "Joe" is still slamming. Do you follow that? You haven't got the rest of the package.

Now, these two, you see, are aided and abetted by others. There's other mysterious ones hanging out in the shadowy darkness. There's all sorts of stuff around. There's no lack of quantity of items. If you think you're going to find four or five items and the pc's Clear – ha-ha-ha! You see, he accidentally goes Clear on 10 or 15 thousand items but in actual fact he has probably blown closer to 150 thousand. You see this? He only mentioned these few. Or he only ran these few. So you think you're going to get six packages and then the pc should be Clear, you got another thunk coming. Because it's quantitative, man; this GPM is quantitative.

But similarly, in your contemptuous eye as the auditor, you know you could confront all that. You know you'd have no trouble of confronting this, so why should the pc have any trouble? Well, you're not in his bank is one of the reasons. And you've sailed on by a pair and you haven't made a pair. You haven't got a terminal and an oppterm sitting back there, and that's going to start pulling the pc back to it, and that's going to keep the thing – keep the thing snarled up.

I don't know if you heard any of the lectures about the – what the GPM does. But the GPM as it comes up in these pairs then starts making question marks and crisscrossing itself and tangling up and the bottom starts fitting up against the top, and *pluuhh! You* keep on fooling with it and eventually it'll come straight, and all of a sudden it'll make sense. But remember, it only straightens out because you've got the pc to recognize the matter, energy, space and time that the item consists of. In other words, this item now has been recognized, and it has been placed where it should be placed and he sees what it is opposed by and so forth. In other words, he's gotten sensible about it.

Now, this whole thing goes back to the earliest laws I developed in the field of the mind, back in 1938. This is out of "Excalibur." And that is that things are composed of identities, similarities and differences. In other words: identification – can't tell the difference; similarities – nearly-alikes, you could tell them apart if you looked hard; to differences – any fool can plainly see. You see that a chair isn't a roof.

Now, the GPM is in a state of a total identification when you greet it. And every one of these items is every other one of these items. And when you list, you are bringing about a similarity from an identity. You've got a complete identification, A=A=A, so you list this thing down. And when you've got this listed down, you have already, by listing it, brought about a step of achieving a similarity where you had an identification. Now the pc knows they're similar. And now, by causing him to find the item they were all pinned to in the first place, differentiation takes place and the thing starts blowing apart. Now he finds out what ailed him.

Now, you take a rock slammer. You're busy testing this rock slammer and you say, "You come in every night and you tear all the files apart and throw them in the waste basket and so forth and do other progressive things with the organization. We think you slam. We think you're a rock slammer. And we think you'd slam probably on Scientology." You recognize the moment that you put him on the meter and isolate the fact that he is a rock slammer, he goes a lot saner at that moment. Did you recognize that? If you did it – if you did it calmly as an auditor, not accusatively, he all of a sudden – he was mad at the whole environment; now he knows what he's mad at specifically. Now if we find who or what was mad at whatever he was slamming on – Scientology or Scientology orgs, something – we would have a pair. And this would tend to blow. See, but if we just found out he was a rock slammer, we'll do him some good.

Now if we find out who or what is rock slamming on it, of course the slam deteriorates because what makes the slam? A slam is the meter manifestation of a games condition. It's the unsuccessful effort to withdraw from the thing he must attack. So you get a games condition and that games condition is the manifestation called a rock slam.

Well, it takes – the Norwegians say it takes – one stick won't burn, and it takes two to make a fight. One stick won't burn; takes two to make a fight. That's absolutely factual. No more sooth was ever soothsaid. It takes two items minimal to make a package.

Now, if you wanted to find the rest of the immediate package, you would have to find out what wasn't against Scientology and what Scientology wasn't. And of course, this immediately – by the positive-negative polarities of the electrical current that goes through this thing – you'll find out that this would discharge like mad.

But you recognize that the moment you have found out that a person is a rock slammer and the person sees that he's a rock slammer on something, you realize, that he has to that degree ceased to be a rock slammer. To that degree, he's ceased to be a rock slammer. Now, we find out who is rock slamming against this and, of course, you've started to neaten this thing up like crazy. And of course, he's much less likely to be a rock slammer, you see. And all the time – the fact of testing this is discharging the condition.

See, a rock slammer is only bad off before he's been detected. See, at his worst state –

he's at his worst before you find out. But just as soon as you find out on the meter, he finds out too. So he's got all kinds of things explained now, don't you see. Makes sense. Well, he knows now what he's fighting. He doesn't have to fight the whole environment, he's not fighting the waste baskets and he's not fighting the files and he's not fighting roofs of that particular line; he is fighting Scientology. "Oh!" you see, kind of "That's my target. Oh! Oh, well, that's silly. Well of course, yes, naturally I can s e how I would be, yes, that's true." Now find out what's fighting Scientology and of course, you've shed this little valence that is fighting Scientology directly, and he realizes he isn't fighting Scientology but that psychiatrists do and he had a kind of psychiatric valence, something like that. See, it deintensifies.

Now, if you went on by and simply tested him as a rock slammer, and then never found out what defied something, a lot of his attention is hung up and he's unable to put his whole attention on the next item he's got to confront. And you haven't improved his confrontingness to any great degree. And the more rock slam you leave behind you as you walk this track, then the less attention he has to put on the items ahead of him. And having no greater – not enormously increased ability to put his attention on things, his confront therefore has not improved up to a point where he can confront. So by leaving items behind you, you get into the interesting conditions of the rock slam diminishing, dwindling and getting lost.

Now, why did it diminish and dwindle? Why does it disappear? Why does it turn phantom on you? Why does it do this, why does it do that? That's because you've left items behind you and therefore left his attention tied up somewhere near PT in some fashion or another, and he just hasn't got the ergs, or whatever attention's composed of, to confront what he now must confront to get a slam on the next item.

See, he only slams on those things which can become real to him. The beauty of an E-Meter is, is it spots the things which have a potential reality to the pc. You're going to find item after item after item on lists that don't rock slam and the pc will list them – oh, God, you're running the goal by this time and you're listing the goal and so forth, and the pc still comes up with "a pullet." This is still going on the list. You look back on the list, he's been putting "a pullet" on the list since the detested person. Never slammed before, and all of a sudden, why, you're about twenty items down on the goal itself, see – you're listing for the goal – he puts down – he says, "A pullet," you know. Crash, crash, crash! Tremendous rock slam. Always previously he was not really up to confronting "a pullet," so, of course, it never rock slammed. You see that?

So you'd better get all of the things the pc can confront. And if you've got available parts of his – of his line plot, which aren't opposed, you've got, you've got availabilities of confront and you can capture some of his attention and give him back some of his reality, and get him up to the point where he really will be able to confront his goal.

So I can define then, what you're doing this for. Why you're doing this. You see why you're doing your 3GA Criss Cross, is you're releasing sufficient attention of fancied

opposition in the environment so the pc can have the environment and you're going backtrack from the referral point of the environment. In other words, by finding items you increase the amount of attention the pc can put on the environment. And he'll get less and less confused and be able to come up with his goal. And of course, he's getting closer and closer to the identity of his goal, his goal is less barriered out, and you'll be able to list and find his goal.

Now, the number of ways there are to find a goal after you've had a hatful of items – these things are getting too numerous to go into very rapidly and easily too. You realize that you can take a goal that fired, which is "to dance on eggs" – let's take this goal that fired, "to dance on eggs." It only fired three times. You realize that you've got a good opportunity, without prepchecking that for the next thirty-five hours, to find out if it is *the* goal. You look it over, it doesn't seem to be very lively, except it rocket reads once in a while or it rocket read. You know you can do a represent list on that goal – a represent list of goals. This is just "What goal would represent the goal 'to walk on eggs'?" or "What goal would be like it?" "What would be a similar goal to this goal?" Got the idea? And you get these goals pulled apart.

Some pcs are listing on goals with one word wrong in them. They just don't go free. Well, that's an awful good step. The goal "to catch catfish," they've got their goal, "to catch catfish." You say, "All right, give me a list of goals similar to catching – this goal 'to catch catfish.'" "What goal would be similar to the goal 'to catch catfish?'" See? And you just make a list of those things and go over those things rapidly and you'll find out there was a comma out of place. Something like this can be done. Or it was a near thing. And some pc will sit around for a long time and he'll say, "I wonder if there's really a third word on the end of my goal? Suppose there really is? Suppose there really isn't?" see? Well, this step gives him an opportunity to find out.

In other words, there are just tons of ways that you can find goals and go out for goals. You could get a whole bunch of terminals, and they all seem to have – these terminals all seem to be in rags. He's got terminal after terminal – pc's terminals – you know, and they all seem to have rags connected with them in some fashion or another. So just turn around, write them all down and say, "Now, look. Look, pc, see all of these guys here, so forth – well, what kind of a goal would such people have? And give me a list." You know? You know? Just read them off there, and so on and so on and so on and so on and so on and so on and one will fire. Got the idea? It's crude, see.

Because he's got such an idea now, these are all reliable items, you see, on the terminals line. What's the goal of them? Of *them?* See? And you'll find out there's a great similarity amongst them. You take one single item on the terminal side, he'll give you a goals list for that and it'll have the goal on it. There's all kinds of ways to find the goal. But unburdening must improve the pc's presence. It must improve his alertness, must free up his attention. Otherwise, don't do it at all. You'd come off much, much better by just giving the pc some

Problems Intensives and some CCHs, don't you see?

All right, this is how you get into – into the case, into the channel. This is how you use it. I'm giving you a very, very rapid summary of showing you just about where we are. This is a lecture – more an orientation than a bunch of data, don't you see, although there are some new things here. I wanted to give you the data very – specifically on some of these bulletins. I've given you how to straighten out wrong goals, and I've given you somatics, how to tell terminals from opposition terminals, and I've given you this straightening out line plots and dirty needles and incomplete lists.

Boy, you guys, some of you make me laugh. You never expect a needle to go clean; list five items – what's the missed withhold? The item, of course! Give a dirty needle every time.

And then the whole of Routine 3-21 – your Routine 3-21 will be something that you will use far more often than you think right at the present moment.

So there's dozens of ways that you can approach this particular thing, we're *there* as far as technology is concerned. Adapting it to the individual cases, trying to get people listed out and straightened up and smoothed out and all that sort of thing – all this requires is good auditing. It takes time, it takes careful craftsmanship, it takes doing the usual, it's keeping your pc alert and in PT and between sessions, making him better all the time. It takes a lot of things. And this grade – you can climb this hill. What I'm trying to do is teach you to climb the hill, teach you to get somebody else to climb the hill. And I personally feel I'm being very successful at it and think your Instructors are having very excellent progress out of it. I never felt better about a course in my life.

What the kids are doing who have gone out of here, hardly without exception is absolutely miraculous. My God, what's happening right now – two Saint Hill graduates in Johannesburg and another one in Cape Town – would make him gasp. They've really got things on the run. The only thing I'm worried about is they're doing their own co-auditing after ten o'clock at night. And that sounds kind of poor. But they can't plan it any other way and at least they're getting some auditing.

Okay. Well, I hope that brief summary of things will be of some use to you.

Thank you very much.