

3GA ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on
25 September 1962

Okay. Lecture two, 25 Sept., AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and we'll talk to you about 3GA.

Well, you know all about it, of course. There's nothing much to learn about it. The first thing you should know about auditing is auditing is what you get away with. That's it. And that sometimes is disastrous. Because you get away with something and then you never get away with it again.

Now, the best auditing, I think you'll agree, is very standard auditing. There's somebody here right now that was screaming about the wound-up doll character of a Saint Hill graduate, got twenty-five hours from one and thought, "Man, Saint Hill auditing is the most." When you're on the receiving end of good, stable, standard, high-skilled auditing, it makes all that difference. It is recognizable miles away.

Now, the difficulties of goal finding are generally put there by the auditor. The pc is perfectly willing to be audited, but the pc has a bank that is very often unwilling to be audited and the first step of any auditing activity is to make the pc auditable. Now, that's quite interesting – he makes the pc auditable.

Now, that's quite important, because the pc has got to be in a very auditable Condition before you can do very much with finding goals. And if you ever want to have a hard time, take some pc who isn't very auditable, who has an anti-Scientology goal, don't improve the pc's auditing quality in any way and try to find the goal. Now, you just – I don't know. I don't know how the devil you could do it. It'd just be too wild for words.

Now, you take somebody who is quite auditable, but has a goal that he conceives to be an overt against Scientology or the auditor or something of this sort, you'll find that's tough enough, without adding the fact that the pc has no familiarity with auditing and isn't grooved in in any way. That's really asking for trouble.

Now, the best way to make a pc very auditable is to give the pc very accurate sessioning.

I can't emphasize this too much. If the pc feels all self-auditish and all run around and messed up and that sort of thing after some auditing, the reason for that lies with the auditor. There aren't ARC breaky pcs. You must remember this. There aren't difficult pcs. You must remember this.

There are auditors who can't handle pcs. And this will come home to you with a crash. You should have seen poor Wing Angel after he got out of here.

By the way, Wing's goal was completely listed out and he was checked Clear a couple of days ago and it's time that he was, because he's handling the Academy in Washington for a few weeks. And I went in and I saw the (quote) id auditors" walking around, you see, very stiff, "With your right hand, touch that wall. Thank you." *Ruf! ruf! ruf! ruf! ruf!* And I said, "My God, Wing!" And he says, "Listen boss..." He's always calls me "Boss." Gag! He says, "You should've seen them yesterday!"

Well, someday you'll be handling some situation like that and it'll just about – you'll always have somebody coming up to you saying, "This is a very difficult and a very bad pc that I am auditing. This pc is very ARC breaky, this pc will not stay in-session, this pc this, and this pc that," and blame the pc, blame the pc. Whenever you see that kind of a situation you just know that lousy auditing is going on and you concentrate on training the auditor up better.

That's the answer to it. Because if you've been at this long enough, you find out that there aren't bad pcs or good pcs – there are pcs that are more auditable than others. This is for sure, but the auditor's job, of course, is to make the pc auditable, not blame the pc.

Now, it's a very funny thing. You take some pc that's been very roughly audited – audited with the rudiments out, auditor has been cleaning cleans madly, you know, and missing the reactions, and the very things that you're struggling with. And this has been going on for several sessions. And, man, this auditor is just getting the pc so the pc is kind of coming up the leads, you know, of the E-Meter. You know, the pc's crowding into the session and the pc's falling back out of the session again and the pc's trying to keep his own rudiments in and all these various things which you occasionally see when you're moving in on this.

Now, this pc is weird. This pc is ARC breaky and had lots of problems and appears to be leading a very messy life and ifs all very upsetting. All right.

You take that pc, just as an experiment, and you just give him three sessions, each one about thirty to forty minutes long. That's within the hour limit of the session. Just give him three letter-perfect sessions. Don't do a thing for the pc. You understand? Don't try to do anything for this – don't try to handle the pc's problems or anything of this sort. See, nothing extraordinary. Just give this pc about three sessions, see, on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. Or week one, week two, week three, you see? I mean, just three sessions. And watch the difference in that pc. Because good, positive auditing is pure magic.

This pc all of a sudden will stop trying to keep his rudiments in, this pc will relax, this pc will say, "This is a good auditor," this pc'll say this and that. He'll give you praise you probably don't deserve. See, you could even miss a rudiment or two and still get a pc into marvelous Condition

But you haven't run anything on the pc. This is what I'm trying to make a point of. You've not run anything on the pc. You've not taken up this pc's constant and continual worry about his lumbosis. See, you've not done anything for this pc. You could even go so far

as to just, well, prepcheck the buttons, Careful and Agreed Upon. Not even Suppress, you see? Since – well, I don't know, pick some random date – since last Tuesday – just any old “Last Tuesday,” you know? And that's all you ran in the body of the session. See, you maybe just cleaned one of them, you know, see? Or since Saturday, or since this morning. We don't care what you did. See, you weren't really doing anything.

Now, all you did was get in those three rudiments up front and clean up this one button for some short period of time and then get your end rudiments in and end the session. Just do this for three consecutive sessions. And you'll find yourself looking at a different pc.

You should get a good reality on that, because it'll keep you from keeping auditors in the lineup untrained. If you recognize that this is true, then you won't put up with some auditor monkeying up a pc, you see? You won't say, “Oh well, I don't know. It's just poor old – poor old Billikins there – poor old Billikins just has a terrible time get – he's unlucky. He always gets bad pcs. Now, somehow or another Billikins always gets bad pcs,” and so forth. That's not true, you see?

You see, if you don't know for sure what I've just told you, then you will keep Billikins in there and not do anything about Billikins. See? He just isn't auditing pcs. That's the only adjudication you can make out of it. I've had the experience a few times... Oh, well, right here, in your TV demonstrations, I've had a pc tell me afterwards – pc hadn't had any cleans cleaned on him, hadn't had any reactions called when there were none, you know. I mean, the pc was just given a fairly straightforward session – tell me afterwards, “Yeah, well, that was a marvelous session!” you know, “Never had such auditing!” I didn't do anything for the pc. See? Except just give a straightforward Scientology session, that's all, without any monkey business.

Now, the worse off an auditor is, the more he figures. Now, that's a stable datum that you can put down. The worse off an auditor is, the more he figures.

And the conclusions he draws will hold at dismay the origins and answers of the pc. The pc is always talking up against a foregone conclusion. See, the auditor has got it all figured out, every time. The auditor never sits there as just a – you know, he receives the origin, acknowledges, and so on. He's wearing himself out, man! He's just working! You talk about work! You never saw so much work as this! Oh, God! The foot-pounds of energy being put in by this auditor there if added to a steam engine would drive a locomotive the length of the – Great Britain or drive the Queen Mary halfway across the Atlantic. That's steam, you know! Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, now let's see, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, and then some more – figure-figure, and figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure...

The auditor says, “Do birds fly?” You see? And as soon – just before the auditor did that, he said, “Well, I know what this pc will answer. The pc is going to answer the fact that birds don't fly because actually he's got – he's sort of flighty, you see, and he's going to have – he's going to have all this, and so forth. And therefore that's – that's the cause of his long – long nose and so forth. And when he – when he answers up, it doesn't matter what's running, I – I – I – I know what the answer is.” Got it all figured out in advance.

So he says, "All right. Do birds fly?"

And the pc says, "I don't know. I guess so. Haven't given any thought to it at all."

And the auditor says, "See? I told you." Confirms it and so forth. Well, actually this auditor hasn't received any communication from the pc. He's received a proof of his own conclusions. And of course, he's never in communication with this pc.

And after an auditor has been at it for a while and he's done an awful lot of auditing, he's getting pretty smoothed out about the thing, well, he says, "Do birds fly?" and it's all right with him if he gets a positive answer, and it's all right if he gets a negative answer, and it's all right if he gets a screwy answer. It's also all right if the pc doesn't answer the auditing question; the auditor just tells him to answer it. And it's a very relaxed emanation coming out of this session – if you want to specialize in emanations. It's very relaxed, see? The theta waves are very smooth in that vicinity.

And the pc knows. He knows he's talking to somebody. He knows somebody is talking to him and that there's not a lot of crisscross going on. See? There are not a lot of crosscurrents going on.

Now, this doesn't say that an auditor never has to figure out a pc's case, because he does. But the thing to figure out and figure on are the important things, not the unimportant things. "Now, let me see. This is the fifth consecutive list of detested people and things that we have drawn up without a single one of them slamming. Now, what the hell is wrong here? What's going on?" See? And he has to come up with the right answer. He has to do something that is effective about this.

So, it's only when an auditor is being ineffective that he starts working it all out. He – otherwise, he could just sail through like a breeze. He knows his stuff, he knows what's happening, and so forth. The pcs he audits; the person sits down there – well, it's just the fact that the session is a very smooth, routine session and it all comes off all right, and the pc winds up at the other end, and the auditor's heard what he said, and the pc has answered what was given him and the rudiments are all straight, and nothing's gone out of line, and there it is and the pc starts building up a big lot of confidence. And he doesn't put all these think-think figure units, you know, to work, and get all stuck in the session and get to fighting and batting around, and so forth. The pc just cheerfully goes on and becomes a pc.

That's very important, because in that state, he'll give you the right answers and he'll be able to look into his own items and units and head and he'll give you goals and withholds and... In other words, auditing really gets done if the person's being audited. You understand what I'm talking about?

Now, if that kind of an auditing session cannot exist, you haven't got a dog's chance of finding somebody's detested person, dynamic, goal, item – anything. And these things are just not findable! Because the pc is just, you know, all nerved-up and knocked around. "God! He – I won't talk to – about this because – yes, I will talk about – I can't find any other difficulties I'm not willing to talk to him about. Difficulties? Difficulties? What are difficulties that I *wo-da-da-da*. I – but I've told you all the answers. Well, you say it still reads on the meter, but I –

let's see! Difficulties? I can't think of any other difficulties that I'm unwilling to talk to you about."

Have you seen something like that? Heavy! Pc will go around the bend! Now, that's no frame of mind to be looking for a dynamic and an item and a goal, man.

So the first requisite of 3GA is that the *auditor* can carry on a smooth routine, unworried, unharassed auditing session. That's the first requisite. And it takes a lot of training to get an auditor into that and it takes a lot of self-discipline, and that sort of thing, to get up to that point. Some auditors just seem to be naturals. They seem to be naturals. And other auditors seem to be – have a hell of a time to achieve it. But they can all achieve it.

As far as discipline is concerned, you'd be amazed that every now and then I have to take myself by the scrap of my neck and audit exactly by current procedure. And I do! I work it around and audit by current procedure – exactly current procedure, you see?

Sometimes I audit just a little ahead of current procedure. For instance, I'm asking two questions now, you heard in the demonstration last Wednesday, probably baffled several of you. There is "done" in the first end rudiment. Did you hear it as it went by?

Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.

Now, it was more important to ask that one than it is to ask the old one, see? Put "done" in that first rudiment. "To impress me," "Is there anything you've done to impress me?" You know? "Have you done anything to impress me?" That's the idea. "Done anything." It's not "said anything to impress me," but "done anything to impress me." You'll find out it's much more effective. And also critical – well, if there's anything misunderstood in the session, the pc's going to be critical; so it's much more beneficial to ask them, "In this session was there anything that was misunderstood?" And you'll find out this will work out much better as the session goes.

Well, those are little changes, and so forth, and I just get so flat out I don't have the time to issue them to you, and it's not terrible important, and I know I'll get around to it sooner or later, and you'll catch up with them. But of course you do this to yourselves. It's all your fault, you know, because you scream like mad every time I change a comma on you. But otherwise I audit with a very standard approach. I can give a very, very standard – very, very standard – session. Extremely so. And groove it in, clean no cleans, miss no read – just give one of these sessions. Quite interesting what happens in it.

When I think of the times in the past twelve years when – or longer than that for me – that I have sat down and utterly sweated blood over a pc trying to figure it all out and not being aware of what conclusion was going to be reached by the end of session and all of this sort of thing. Well golly, I would have given a lot over these years to have been able to audit this very smooth, quiet approach that we audit with today. And man, if you do it right, it holds a pc in-session as though you had him tied down and threatened with wild bulls! They don't move. You really get them into session these days.

Well, it's that attitude of auditing: the calm, effective, certain, hopeful approach. You know what you can do. Sometimes you do it sooner and sometimes you do it later, but you know you can do it. That approach is fundamental for 3GA.

If you're still in a frame of mind where you sit down and audit a pc and "Uhhhh! I don't know how this is going to come out," and so on, and "I know what this pc's going to say, I know what his goal really is. His goal is to – his goal is 'to catch black catfish.' I know what his goal is because he says he's colorblind, and then obviously, I mean, and so on," and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, figure-figure – during the session, see? You're under big strain all during the session. "How is this going to come out?"

Well, just to that degree, this strain is communicated to the pc and the pc is incapable of producing the things which you want. You understand that?

Now, that's something to cultivate in 3GA, if you haven't already got it down. You got to be a relaxed, hopeful, positive, effective auditor. You've got to know your business in order to emanate the fact that you know your business, in order to get the pc to do exactly what you want him to do. And that is how to get a pc to get – to do what you want him to do – not hit him with your fist, but hit him with total competence. And you'd be surprised how far you'd get in that frame of mind.

But for the nerved-up, uncertain, questioning, technique all slipping out of his fingers, you know, like greased pencils. *Uhhh!* It doesn't go across. It's auditing attitude. It's auditing accomplishment. It's auditing effectiveness.

You actually should be up to a position where you can sit there and hand out a rudiments-havingness session. And just know that by the time you've given your pc two or three or four such sessions, he's just going to be calm as a millpond. You just get up to a point where you know that and you're ready to hand out 3GA.

That auditing attitude is important. All right. It's something that can't be neglected. And that's the basic reason why you're not going to get good, accurate goals finding, and so forth, amongst half-trained, poorly trained, uncertified auditors and that sort of thing. The discipline is just not adequate to it.

Well now, what I'm pointing out to you is, there is an actual auditing result as a result of calm, competent, effective auditing. Now, that's what I'm pointing out to you. See, it's on that fundamental that 3GA is built. And lacking that fundamental, you're not going to get another thing done. You could have the data memorized by the mile, be able to spit it out by the geyserful and you would not find any goals or make any Clears. Do you understand that?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

So there is something on which clearing is built: It's competent, calm, effective auditing. And that's your first requisite. And no trick will get you over that zone. So everything I tell you about 3GA is based – understood upon that fundamental.

Now, the next thing that you need in 3GA is luck! See, you want luck. Well, you don't *have* to have luck to succeed, but it makes it so nice! It's so nice.

Now, look: Total competence will breed luck. But it takes some luck just on its own hook, too.

Every now and then... Let's say you're running a clearing co-audit and you're lucky on fifteen pcs out of fifty. You're just lucky, you know? The person just laid the goal in your lap, you know – bang! But there it is and it rocket read, and everything was fine. You – the pc – just before you started listing dynamics on the pc, the pc was waiting for you and he's sitting there reading a magazine – this is what I mean by luck – reading a magazine. It was *Time Magazine*, which is a companion piece to *Dog's Life*. And they just happened to be reading this magazine and they opened it up and they were reading the obituaries (which I think is their most common commodity that they pedal in that magazine). Obituaries, see, obituaries. See, he was reading that and he comes in and offhandedly – giving the dynamics. And he says, “Well, there's God, and there's obituaries and there's so on and so on,” and you assess it all out – bang, bang – and my God, it's “obituaries,” and it just falls off the pin. You see? Crash! Crash! Crash! Terrific rock slam – so on.

And you start checking around hurriedly and he hadn't given you the dynamic, he'd given you an item and you're already there. And all you have to do is list a few goals against the obituaries and it's there. See? That's what I mean by luck, you know? It always takes just a little bit of that luck, you see. It didn't – and that – all luck does for you is just shorten it a little bit. That's all it's going to do. It's not going to make it. You don't have to have luck to find the goal, but it shortens it. It makes it more rapid.,

And you sit down in a session and your pc has done an old goals list. And he's found this old goals list and he drags it into the session and he gives it to you. And he says, “Look,” he says, “there's three goals on there, I just happened to see...” Before you go into the arduous listing of about a hundred goals the pc has, “There's these three goals, and I wrote this about a year and a half ago. And I just happened to find it there and I thought – and it's a very funny thing, but the first three goals on that are all overts against that dynamic, ha-ha!” And you look at it and it's the first one on that list. It rocket reads three times, you clean it up, you have it checked out and that was the pc's goal. You get what I mean?

It's all in the direction of time shortening now. It's not in the direction of total consequence, because you're going to find the pc's goal. Don't worry about that. That's why I'd like to see you find several goals on pcs, because you suddenly start getting insufferably cocky about the whole thing. And listen, you can be as insufferably cocky as you please. I'm not going to put any bulletin out about being insufferably cocky.

So you see what I mean by the element of luck. It's there. It's there. You find the goal at the beginning of the list instead of at the end. You see? The pc opens his mouth and you say, “What is the – what person or thing have you detested in this lifetime?” something like that.

The pc says, “Uncle Joe.”

And you say, “Yeah, all right, give me another one.”

“No! Ha! Don't have to give you another one. Uncle Joe! That's the one!”

You're looking at the meter. Man, that's the one! It's slamming itself off its pins! You say, "Uncle Joe," and it renews its activity. You don't get any list – you never get a chance to. You got your detested person.

And you say, "Well, who or what did Uncle Joe represent to you?" see, which is a proper question there.

And the pc says, "Spirits – always talking about spirits." And you're looking at the meter and it's rock slamming. At this moment we're twelve minutes deep into the body of session.

And you say, "Spirits, huh? Well, what else did he represent?" and so forth.

"Well, mostly spirits!" Bang, there it is, you see?

You say, "Well, that's good. That's good. Now, what do spirits represent to you?"

And the pc says, "Undertakers! An undertaker. Undertaker. Yeah, it's an undertaker. Yeah, it represents an undertaker. That's a spirit to me."

Ha-ha! There it is! Fifteen minutes deep into the body of the session you got the item. You see?

And you say to him carefully, "Well, what goal" – you don't want to stretch your luck at this point. You say, "What goal would it be impossible to achieve if you were an undertaker?"

And the pc thinks for a minute and he thinks for a minute, and you see a couple of small rocket reads, you see? Pc is thinking hard about it and thinking hard about it and finally says, "To live. Yeah." Rocket reads! Crash! Crash! Check it out, that's the goal! Twenty-two and a half minutes deep...

All right. Well, you could be dodging around, you see, against fifty hours, for the – exactly the same result. See? Now, the element of luck has a shortening time value.

Now, the next pc after this pc, you're going to do slower than you would have done if you hadn't had all of this luck, because you say to the pc – this next pc – you say, "Who or what have you detested?" And the pc gives you a 425-name list and the item of detestation isn't on it. The list is not complete. There's not a single slam on it anyplace.

Well, the thing to do in the face of this much luck brings us to our next step, which is certainty. Now, we're not dealing in a "You might find the goal and you might not find the goal," see? That is not what you're dealing with at this time. You're dealing with "How easy is it going to be, how hard is it going to be, to find this pc's goal?" That's the quotient you're stacked up against. It isn't "Am I going to find it or am I not going to find it?" No, you're going to find it. And you go by the rules of the game that we've got right this minute, and you'll find that goal. It's a question of how long it's going to take.

Now, the length of time it takes is to some degree influenced by your certainty that the goal will eventually be found. You follow this?

Audience: *Mm-hm. Yes.*

Because when you become uncertain, you will start doing things that are unusual and extraordinary and which may very well lead you into some backwash that is going to take you hours and hours to get out of.

You say, “Well, I don’t know if I’m doing the procedure that will find the goal or not.” If that thought is occurring to you – “I don’t know if I’m going to find this pc’s goal or not” – if you’re in that frame of mind, you’re going to make mistakes. So it’s up to you and you will perhaps acquire this somewhere up the line – particularly if I mention it to you – you’ll get to a point, after you’ve done a few successful assessments, you’ll realize it isn’t whether or not you’re going to find the goal, it’s a question of how hard it is going to be to find the goal. That is the measure or the yardstick by which you measure pcs.

When you achieve that, you will be in a very good situation as an auditor, because it will reinforce the first requisites – the calm, competent aspect of the auditor. And it will also tend to breed luck.

It’s as a highwayman looks very, very dangerous to the degree that he has a tremendous reputation. I imagine some poor little old highwayman has gotten out on the – alongside the track and the mail coach has come along, and this highwayman has stepped out into the road and tried to flag the coach down and said something or other: “I’m Timmy Simpson! Stand and deliver!” You know? And the coach goes by and not only does it go by, but it throws mud all over him. It’s a disheartening sort of thing. That’s the difference between Dick Turpin. He’s sitting there on a big, black horse and he hasn’t even got a pistol in his hand and the coach comes up the slope to the top of the grade and sees him sitting there and the coach stops, and they stand and deliver. They even volunteer to carry it a distance for him this time. That’s sort of the difference of reputation, competence – that sort of thing. That’s the difference it makes. It’s a big difference.

Now I’m not trying to give you an aspect of Fagin teaching his boys, but the aspect of “Well, it’s just inevitable. You – there – you’re going to give me the dope and you’re going to give me the withhold and you’re going to give me this, and you’re going to give me that, and there it all is and that’s it. Bing! Dm-dm! Inevitable, you’re going to do this. And that certainty, actually, can take a pc and the pc’s... That doesn’t ever enter his head that he’s going to withhold anything from you and a tremendous amount of the battle is won, see?

Comes into session, sits down, says, “Well, I stood armed guard last night while a bank was robbed.” You know? There it is. He gives up the withhold, in other words. Crash!

Now that’s different. You box around with this pc, and you say, “What is this fall? Yes, well. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?”

“Yeah, well, I ate breakfast.” And you say, “Thank you. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding?” (I’ve been hearing this lately said different ways. I’m just throwing that in gratuitously.)

And the meter goes clank, and he says, “Well, I... *tsk! tsk!* Nothing!”

“Very well. I’ll check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, you done anything you are withholding? It still reacts.”

“Well, I don’t know what it could be.”

See, this is not a climate of auditing in which you’re liable to get too much done. You see? As your competence goes up, your luck increases. See? And as your luck increases, why, the whole thing adds up to greater certainty. You finally get insufferable! And that’s just fine, fine.

I’ve heard a person or two say, recently, “Well, whatever else I can do, I can audit. By God, I can audit.” You know? They know that. I heard myself saying it one day. Yep. And they can, too.

Now, there is a stage, of course, before they’ve been trained when they believed that too! There’s a small valley about the depth of the Grand Canyon between that state and the next state of competence.

Now, certainty. You’re going to find the pc’s goal. That’s going to be done because that’ll keep you at it until you do it. That’s what’s important. It’ll keep you at it. And if you haven’t got any real belief that you’re going to find the goal, you’re liable to be kind of weak and staggerish about it.

Now, I’ll admit that at the end of about thirty or forty hours of slog on some pc who gets alternate dirty needles, and that sort of thing, and that is kind of hard to read and is stacking up lots of withholds and it slams on you like mad, you start getting a little laggardly about these things, you know, and you don’t really pitch it in too hard. You have a tendency to slow down a little bit. And the more you slow down, why, the less certainty is entered into the session, the less certainty you’ve got and the less likely you are to finish your job off. You must always finish the job off. You owe it to your own morale to finish the job off. That is the whole thing.

So it took seventy-five hours to find Aunt Mabel’s goal. Kick her in the head afterwards if you must, but spend the seventy-five hours. You got the idea? Don’t go stacking up a bunch of people whose goal you didn’t find, you understand? That’s almost fatal along the line.

Now, let’s get into the technology itself

This is fairly well settled now. I’ll just go over this very rapidly. On a Dynamic Assessment you ought to have your 850 goals audited on the pc just to have a good backlog supply of goals. It should be. You can violate that. Your pc should be prepchecked and be very auditable. Sometimes you will violate that.

But for sure, you enter into your next steps, they go something on this order. And this is current and this routine is susceptible to being changed. And if I find any shorter shortcuts, you’re sure going to get them. But it runs something like this:

It’s “Who or what have you detested?” Now, it’s usually not necessary to add “in this lifetime,” but you can if you wish. And you finally get yourself a list and if you’ve got a very, very close eye to the meter, you’ll see that some of them slammed. You’ll see that some of these names slammed. Sometimes it comes the first one on the list. After you’ve been totally spoiled and realized that every time you ask this – any person who he detests, that you get the

item the first time – because it’s in the majority of the cases you do – you then run into the pc that the item is 436 down the list. That makes a citizen out of you again and there you are.

But you get this detested person and this slams. And you take this slamming detested person and you find “What part of existence – ” – this is paraphrasing; it’s almost any phrasing of this – ”does that person represent to you?” You don’t say, “What is – what part of existence does this person consider the dynamics to be?” or “What dynamics does this person consider to be?” I’ve made that error two or three times and it never works. It’s always, “What part of existence – .”

So you say, “What part of existence does this person represent to you?” and the person will give you, usually, a dynamic list. And this list is going to have some slams on it probably, of one kind or another. And you’re going to get a long list there. And you may not get a slam that you run out on that particular one, you see – that’s possibly not slamming.

Your first list of detested people only had a few slams on it. You had no dwindling slam or anything like that. It just slammed once in a while, you know. And you got this list of dynamics. And it just slammed once in a while. And it isn’t necessary that you have any dwindling slam yet because you haven’t entered that zone or area.

Now, you assess that on cons – and all of these assessments are carried on with “Consider committing overt acts against “ or some such phrase. “Think of doing bad things to .” There’s a lot of these things. Those are not optimum. Someday we’ll get a better phrasing for that, because the pc thinks you’re telling him to do something and he always tries to do it and sometimes gets all gummed up on it. We don’t know a better one though than – at this particular time, than “Consider committing overt acts against .” That is the assessment question.

So we find this thing. And then, having found this slamming item on this list, we then know we have or think we have, the dynamic. And now having the pc’s dynamic, we want “Who or what would this represent to you?” See, this dynamic, see? Well, let’s say the dynamic was families. See? Well, “What do families represent to you?” See, now you’re going to get yourself a slamming. Now is the first for sure dwindling slam you’re going to get. If you’re right, you’re going to get a dwindling slam.

Now, what do we mean by a dwindling slam? You take the item, the dynamic in this case. You take the dynamic, you get it so it reads. Now the rule is, if you’re going to list anything, you get it to read first. If you’re going to list from anything, you get it to read first. I can tell you a lot about how to get things to read. But you get this thing reading. And most – a lot of your lack of success is, is you have this thing so suppressed or so unsuppressed or something that it won’t read. And you don’t – you find the item on Tuesday – I mean, the dynamic on Tuesday and it’s families and it slams like crazy. And you pick it up on Wednesday to continue your session and it doesn’t even tick. So you tiger drill it a couple of minutes to see if it – and you finally get it so it gets a little tiny dirty needle. And now you go ahead and you list from this thing. You’re going to lay an egg, man!

You want a slam in that thing. You want that item slamming, just as before, before you go on listing from it. You understand me?

Now, when you list that item down on, “What does that item represent to you?” the pc – you’re going to get a dwindling slam. And that’s going to start wide and item by item it is going to diminish.

Now, a sporadic slam is different than a dwindling slam. These things are enormously different. A dwindling slam diminishes item by item. Written thing by written thing, you get a dwindling slam. It’s less and less and less and less and finally a dirty needle, and it isn’t even a dirty needle and gone.

Now, when we say dwindling, it may start two inches wide and then it’ll be an inch-and-three-quarters wide and then a few items later you’re watching this thing and it will be an inch-and-a-half wide and then it’ll be an inch wide, and then it’ll be a half-an-inch wide and then it’ll be a quarter-of-an-inch wide, and it’s just a little dirty needle, and then it’s disappearing and then you complete the list. You bleed the meter. You ask the pc, “Are there any more?” and if you see a reaction here you write it down, you see. And you got that thing complete.

Now, that is a dwindling slam. That is different than a sporadic slam. A sporadic slam is you write down, you know, “What does families represent to you?” See? And *Oooooo!* It goes *bang, bang, bang, bang!* And you write the next item down and there’s no reaction. You write the next item down, there’s no reaction. You write the next item down, there’s no reaction. And then you write down an item and you get a *big bang, bang! big* slam so forth. And then you write down another item and there’s no reaction. And *bang, bang, bang!* Another slam, you see? And when you finally finish the thing up it – you aren’t getting any slams anymore. But if you cleaned up the original thing from which it proceeded, you would get the slam back again. You understand?

In other words, this slam has not been listed out. This slam is occasionally turned on. And there’s where an auditor is fooled more than anything else. And it’s most heartbreaking to sit there and watch something that you’re absolutely sure would list. And the darn thing... There’s a slam about every third or fourth item and then you list eight items in a row. They all slam – same width, not diminishing. And then you list seven more after that and there’s no slam on those. And then you list an item and it slams, you see? Nah, that’s not a dwindling slam. You understand?

But this nice interesting phenomena – the dwindling slam – will occur.

Now, when you finally got the item, what do you do with the item? You want to know, “What goal might you have that’d be an overt against and let’s say it’s diapers. That’s a good one for families, and so on. So it’s diapers. And what would be an overt against diapers and, man, there’s your dwindling slam again. If you’re right, and that is the right item, it’ll be your dwindling slam.

Of course you’ve assessed this item list, of course, with: “Consider committing overt against...” Just like you did any – the dynamic list, just like you did the person list, you see? Everything that is an – looks like a dynamic or an item or detested person or a thing, you see, that is always assessed with “Consider committing overt against...” You’re assessing with

slam for slam. Therefore it's Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam and you turn this thing on that way.

Now, when you list those goals out, you list a dwindling slam. And it'll dwindle down, just as I've described to you, to a dirty needle and drift out.

That doesn't mean the goal is on that list. That's just proved the fact that it's the item. And that dwindling slam is the proof of the pudding. The main thing that you're going to do wrong is you're going to ride the horse to death. See? You're going to get this long list and you're going to assess this thing and it's – there's nothing slamming anywhere on the list, you know? It's "Consider committing overtacts against..." and you got your rudiments in and there's nothing slamming and it's all dirty needle – everything's got a little dirty needle, little instant dirty needle – and you finally pick out this little instant dirty needle thing and now that – yet you say that must be the item, and...

See, you've read all the way through this 329 list and you assessed it all and, oh man, you've worked like mad. Now, the horse drops dead, see? About the time you've been through it once and nothing has slammed on the whole list, that horse is dead, man! And yet you'll continue to ride the horse. You'll go over it again. You saw me do it about two or three times on TV on the research sessions, remember? Those were just research sessions, see – no reason why you should do it.

All right. Now, what's going to happen here? This horse falls dead and then you get off and you take your canteen, and you fill up a sponge and you wash out the horse's mouth, and you groom him, and so forth, and you polish all of his harness, you know? And you sleek him up, you comb his mane, you know?

What are you doing? You had no business around there. Get yourself another horse. Grooming dead horses: You're going to often find yourself doing that. Because you're so hopeful. You say, "Well, at any minute now a slam's going to turn on, see, and we're going to go through this 389 list, and it's only taken us five sessions to do it," because it takes so long to get the rudiments in and all you get out of it is dirty needles and all that sort of thing, and you're just nowhere, see?

Well, I'll tell you. Although I may do this myself once in a while – I tell you, I know when to get off that horse now. I unload before the horse drops dead. I know he isn't going any further and I drop into the sand and go find my – start whistling for another horse because I know he isn't going anyplace. He's got "Kansas City" or "Wichita" on his nose.

Now, you've got a tremendous list but this is why dynamic slams are – why you have trouble with them: they haven't got the item on them. Your rudiments could be desperately out in the session – which isn't very probable, not at the auditing skill level you're in – or the item isn't on the list. So actually the answer is, the item wasn't on the list. That's it. The item isn't on the list! If you can just get that through your head! Of course, you – probably everyone of you have to learn as hard as I did. I've just done assessment after assessment after assessment after assessment on and on and so forth. And carry each one through to its final, total completion of finding out not one stayed in. There I am, sitting there. Or one is giving a

little tiny slam of some kind, but won't list. See? The item wasn't on the list, that's all. And I found that to be true every time.

Now, I'll tell you how I do it these days. I go over the list once and if I get a slam, I stop right there and we go on about our business.

I advise you to go over the list twice because sometimes if a pc is somewhat out of session, the item will skip around. One will slam and another one will slam then it'll settle down on something.

I was reviewing a pc, a few – couple, three weeks ago, that'd already been done and had gotten the wrong item on the pc. Wrong item. But there was one item on the list that was slamming. So I just read down the list, came to the slamming item – I would like to tell you that I finished up the list, but in actual fact I didn't. This item was slamming, man! Boom, *bow!* See? Like dropping a hot shell into a powder magazine, you know? *Boow!* See? All the rest of it dead calm, you know? And here's this one. *Bow!* And I just stopped right there. I said, "Well, that's that."

The reason I stopped there is because the pc cognited two-and-three-quarters yards worth. You'll learn that the pc's interest follows the slam and the pc's cognitions follow the right items. Pc's sitting there, you know, holding the cans, you know – sitting there doing nothing, sitting there. Pc is sitting there and you saying, "Hogwash and dillywumps and buffaloes," and whatever the item. And the pc sits there, you know – hogwash and so forth. And all of a sudden you hit "crackerjack," see? And you say, "Crackerjack."

And the pc – "You know I had an uncle once who was in the Cracker Jack business. Manufactured Cracker Jack. I used to eat so much of those, used to always make me very sick. Cracker Jack always used to always make me very sick, and it's a very interesting thing that that ties in with the Supreme Being very well. Now, I have – have two or two or three instances here where the Supreme Being is tied in with Cracker Jack. There are several instances on record where Cracker Jack has been very, very interesting. That reminds me of a goal I had once, too."

You read down the list, you see, and there's the pc, you know. All of a sudden, you know? What the hell? What are you going on any further for? The meter slams, the pc slams, everything slams! See, the pc's interest suddenly – *bzzzzzz!*

Ah, go down to the bottom of the list and go down again. And you'll find your – you'll eventually find out that you're right. And you'll get very great confidence. You'll find that item slams every time you go by it.

You should know the item far earlier than the pc ever dreams of it. You should know that the item is on the list first pass through. And if you're insufferably cocky, you'll just pick it off the first pass through.

You'll be going on down the line and read on down to the end but you already know it's "Cracker Jack," and you just lay the whole thing aside, and say, "All right. Well now, Cracker Jack. Cracker Jack. That slams very nicely. All right. Now we're going to take this now. Thanks."

And pc is saying, "And my Uncle Joe once had a Cracker Jack factory and so forth."

And you say, "All right, thank you very much. Now we're going to take this piece of paper here and we're going to write on down the line here. Now, who or what represents Cracker Jack to you?" you know? We don't care what exact question we ask him, as long as we get "represents" in it "to you," and we get it stretched out there and we've got our next list. Or we've got our goals list.

Now, that's the way it's done.

The goal is – ordinarily occurs on List 6. And it occurs one, two, three or four on List 6, which I think is fabulous. "If you were a Cracker Jack, what goal of yours would be impossible to achieve?" If you're lucky, it'll be in the first three or four of List 6. If it isn't, your luck was out that day and you better follow the next plan of action, which is to tiger drill the positive-negative buttons versus Cracker Jack. "Your goal – would your goal suppress Cracker Jack?" "Would your goal invalidate Cracker Jack?" You just take the thirteen buttons. "Would your goal be careful of Cracker Jack?" Also you add a few buttons of your own selection. You say, "Cracker Jack, that's very interesting. All right, we'll put in 'devour' on our button list, and 'spit out' and 'buy,' and we'll put 'give away,' and then of course we'll have 'ignore,' " You get the idea? Just add them to your buttons list. You make up your own. That's what I've been doing lately, is making up my own Prehav assessment for the thing.

And it's quite interesting. So you say – you take the item – this item's well proved – and you say, "Would your goal," positive-negative, see – "Would your goal suppress Cracker Jack? Would your goal not suppress Cracker Jack? Would your goal invalidate Cracker Jack? Would your goal not invalidate Cracker Jack?" And all of a sudden you're going to be looking at a great big rock slam. You've got it. There it is.

Now, you have the pc list goals which would not invalidate Cracker Jack. And he'll give you four or five, and if your luck is in, it's on that list, maybe the first one or two. Got it?

Seems to do something to his mind. Got that as a method of finding goals? I've talked to you a long time about this, using the Prehav Scale to find goals. Well, I've been doing it lately, and it's been very successful. Looks good. Looks good.

Now, there's another shortcut. You can't find yourself the dynamic. All you can find is something that goes flutter, and thub, and dirty needle and disappears. And you can't find anything. You can do this horrible shortcut but I don't advise it or advertise it. But this horrible shortcut is just skip the detested person, skip the dynamic, skip the item and you just list straight out, flat out – you say, "What do you wish wasn't part of existence?" You make a great, big, long list. Get the pc well grooved in.

Make thirty or forty, fifty items on this list, and then throw it away. That gets him well grooved in, and you ask him, right sequitur to that, "What isn't part of existence?" and you go on down the line and his item will be on it, because the characteristic of all of these items is that they aren't part of existence. The pc has too many overts on them, so naturally, they're totally unreal, so therefore they aren't part of existence. You got the idea?

Now, you take that, and you do the same button trick on it, and so forth. Let's say and then you'll find out this is – this is how you got Cracker Jack. It wasn't part of existence and there it is slamming. All you do is consider overts against that “What is not part of existence?” list. Do you understand?

Supposing you wind up with a dynamic and you can't find the item? Well, the dynamic was probably the item. So you – after you can't prove it out, you abandon the whole thing and list goals against the dynamic. You got the idea? What – you list goals against what you've got. You didn't get a dwindling slam of goals, nothing. But you notice finally – here's the last desperate trick. This is the end trick and the most desperate and the last appeal (and if you got this far, I'd be ashamed of you), but you just find something that the pc slams against. You happen to notice in prowling around that the pc, every time you say “cheesecake” slams like mad. Every goal that has “cheesecake” in it slams like mad. Everything that has “cheesecake” in it slams like mad. So you just take “cheesecake” and list goals against it.

That's desperation with a capital D. Semidesperation is “What isn't part of existence?” You see that?

All right, that's your existing technology today; that's about the way it goes. If you're a very clever auditor, if you're very well trained, if you're lucky, if you audit with certainty and you follow the standards of the procedure I've just given you, you wind up with the pc's goal every time. And you can't avoid it. You understand?

Therefore, goals finding is actually pretty easy today. But I will say, after doing a lot of it myself, that it requires these elements. There's got to be some luck connected with it; you got to be able to think on your feet and keep your eyes open. There's no substitute for it. Think on your feet and keep your eyes open. You suddenly realize that this pc is not completing any lists. You never get any item on any list that you can have anything to do with, but you do have an item – you got to know when to throw in the sponge and do a semifinal action. Don't you see? You got to know when to quit on these things. You got to know when to take advantage of these things. In other words, you got to do some inspection and thinking for yourself within the broad framework of exactly how it's done. There then is no substitute on top of it – and I'll give you the last qualification, which is a clever auditor. And then you just find goals by the bucketloads. Okay?

Male voice: Yes.

It's tremendously therapeutic to find a detested person on a pc. It's therapeutic to find a dynamic on a pc. It's therapeutic to find the item on the pc. Therapeutic to find the goal on the pc. And the last comment I will make is the pc will throw you for a loss every time by telling you how good he feels and how wonderful he feels or how bad he feels, how much he hurts.

I've been telling pcs lately, “Thank you very much, I'm very glad of that. Now, that's very nice. I'm very happy. To hell with it. Now, let's get on with the session.” I don't care *how* they feel. We're not doing these things to make the pc feel good, because we have this enormous gain coming straight up that's greater than anything any man on Earth has ever experienced, before us.

So the pc doesn't have headaches anymore. Well, that's dandy. Is he flying yet? No. Well, let's get on with the assessment.

Okay? All right.

Thank you very much. Good night.