

3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT BY ROCK SLAM

A lecture given on
18 September 1962

Okay, second lecture, 18 September, AD 12. 3GA Dynamic Assessment.

Once upon a time there was a thetan.

Nobody happens to have that rule of thumb, do they? No, that's all right.

Remember most of them.

3GA. The thing you should know about 3GA Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is that when it does not work, you haven't done it! There's several tips one could give on this, this is not particularly an expansive lecture that gives you all of the odd bits and all that sort of thing, but it's definitely of great interest to you that this has been working. And it has been working very well. It requires further working on, and I am working on it further.

But there are many things you can do with this Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. The idea is simply this: The rock slam is called a rock slam because it is a needle manifestation which is achieved when the auditor is approaching what we once called "the Rock." Now, there's something earlier than the Rock and it's called a goal. And if it were called a "Goal Slam," you would have it. Because it is the goal that is slamming. It's producing a great deal of random needle motion. And this random needle motion is occurring solely, entirely and completely because of the currents being set up amongst the items and identities the person has assumed or fought in the progress of executing his or her goal.

And it goes this way and it goes that way, and it goes someplace else, and the individual has no place to go, no place to go to, no place to retire from. In other words, he cannot get away from it, he cannot approach it, nothing else is happening, he is in a state of Agitation. Now, this rock slam, or goal slam, which we will not call it, we will maintain the word rock slam, is a thetan convulsion. And in the absence of a slamming needle, you will very often find a convulsing body. The body will convulse, before the rock slam will turn on.

People who have convulsing bodies may sometimes not develop rock slams, and people who have rock slams may suddenly develop convulsing bodies. Was talking to somebody over in Washington on an innocent subject, and he looked like he was going to go into a convulsion. He's very, very afraid of going into a convulsion, this idea upset him very much. And that I was merely approaching the subject which he thought would send him into a convulsion, if I'd had him on the meter at that moment I would have found a slamming needle.

Do you see that? So, it – there it is in the bank, the reactive bank, and it's the crisscross of currents that are battering a thetan around. And, when this gets into a solidity, why, it of course has the power of throwing the body around.

Now, the degree that it can throw the body around probably approaches poltergeist. The thetan produces a rock slam on the needle. Well this – he's just feeling kind of thththth! He's being – you know his currents are going left, right and center, and so forth, and they're going through him and by him and up and down and side rrrrllmm!

All right. The next thing that would happen is this submerged – this is all surmised, by the way, but it has some factual evidence behind it. I'm just trying to give you this illustratively. You might have somebody who was convulsing physically. You know, the head starts going like this, *uhh-uhh-vuhhvuhh-rvuh-vuhh-vuhh-rvuhh*, see? Like a slamming needle. But then you also might have somebody whose whole body started to go that way, and that is called an epileptic fit. It's also called other names. That type of convulsion is the type I'm speaking of

Now, supposing it advanced further than the body, and – this is surmised, you see – advanced further than the body and entered the physical universe around the person. And you would get the physical universe at first responding sort of enturbulatedly. You get a psycho, walks up the front steps of an HGC, the Shipping Clerk starts cutting his fingers with the shears, you know? That's a fact! You want to produce turbulence, or something, why, just take some psycho and put him into the auditing lineup and you've got it. You yourself will catch yourself dropping commands, and so forth.

I had a session like this in Washington. I was quite amazed. I was handing out the wrong commands a time or two and so forth, ugh! It was a sort of a – of a theta poltergeist, you know, in the immediate atmosphere around me! *Dzzzz-zzzz*, you know, you could sort of feel it.

All right, now, if that went a little bit further, you would get real poltergeist, perhaps. You know, the rugs being thrown around, and so forth. But certainly you get ennest. Whatever else you get, you get ennest. You look at that person's possessions and they're starting to get chewed up, you know? You give this girl a brand-new handbag. And in the process of her grasping the handle it ages! You get the idea?

Anyway, what it is, is obsessive and random motion. Or a postulate which is in a state of producing obsessive and random intentions and impulses when restimulated. Let's say this fellow has a goal "to swim the English Channel." And we know this but he doesn't. You see you never really get that as a pure test. We take him out to the cliff, over at Dover, and we say to him, we say, "Swim the English Channel!" see? And my God, he wouldn't know whether to jump off the cliff, or run to London, or hide under a clam shell, and he'd probably go into some kind of a convulsion.

He's being required to do something, the requirement is illogical, unreasonable, unexpected, you get all these conditions attached to it – would probably produce you some very interesting behavior. And yet very often a person's goal is said to them! Sometimes in a level of command. And a person starts going *bzzz-bzzt-bzzz-bzzt-blzz-wzzzl-zzmm!* You walk

up to somebody who has a goal, “to eat eats.” And you say to him, “I’m afraid you’ll eat the cat!” He’ll totally occlude the statement, he’ll go straight into the bank, and you’ll get a rock-slammy mental Condition.

And he’s liable to remember this on the backtrack as a convulsion of some sort. He’s been backed into his item, or he’s – or he’s been backed into his goal in some fashion, and he can’t quite tell what it is. But he sure feels random about it.

I see somebody has had this experience with an item. Or, even a goal. And you remember times when this one suddenly was presented to you. A fellow has a – has a goal “to jump off high places ‘ “ see. Such a goal, anybody had. Has a goal “to jump off high places.” It is the goal, you understand. I’m not talking about a random, casual little subsidiary goal, you know. Finds himself on a high place. Man, that is enough! He doesn’t jump off high places. But actually he doesn’t not jump off high places. You get the idea? He goes around seeking high places to jump off of, and then never climbing up them.

Now, you should understand a rock slam for what it is, then. It is the goal track. There’s many things you can say about it. The pc’s interest, by the way, follows the track of the goal. And therefore follows the slam. Pc’s interest follows the slam. Pc’s getting interested, the needle’s slamming, pc’s interested, needle’s slamming, pcs interested, needle’s slamming, pc’s not interested, needle’s not slamming. In other words, the pc’s interest follows the slam. Pc’s cognitions follow the slam.

All of a sudden, the pc’s been sitting there, as dead as some of this South African wood that won’t even float in water. See, there he is. Total session response: “Uh-huh, hm-hmm.” Been like this for hundreds of hours of auditing. “Hm-hmm.” All of a sudden this pc says to you, “I’ll bet all roof rafters are not really straight. You know, there is something about that. They’re not really straight. Yes, yes, that item you just called out there, that’s very interesting. Not-straight roof rafters. And – and – yes, and it goes down on the other side too, and very often they’re long. Yes, I’ve had this experience and so forth. So – funny thing, I’ve just realized that most roof rafters, they pretend they are straight!” See? Well, if you weren’t watching your needle at the time, you’ll find that it was – you look down on it, you’d find it was slamming.

You’re looking for the cogniting pc. Pcs, any pc cognites, when the slam is being followed. You’re going down the slam track. And the pc will cognite. If you just get on the edge of the slam someplace, the pc is liable to cognite. But a pc’s cognitions actually go down the track of the rock slam.

That is very interesting, not that a pc is suddenly, inexplicably in-session, never having been before, but the pc in actual fact is being reached as a case. Well, this is all grist to the auditor’s mill. It isn’t the pc is not in-session when he is not rock slamming, but if you want to see an exaggeration of in-sessionness it is during one of these periods.

Now, it’s as much as your life is worth to ARC break a pc who is in the middle of a rock slam. You won’t be able to get away with the things you got away with when he wasn’t rock slamming. In other words, it takes pretty careful auditing. Somebody the other day was busy teaching all the HCAs in the Central Organization to do Dynamic Assessments. And

some of them were even up to running ARC Straightwire! What he didn't realize – well, we won't go into that. And it's all right, everything is all straightened out now, except they're probably all mad at me, and realizing that I am preventing them from going Clear. I'm sure they realize this.

You really got to sit in there and audit. That auditing better be pretty smooth. If a flub on your part coincides with a cognition on the pc's part, well, I don't know, blow up the room with an atomic bomb, it'd be much calmer. Something's going to go wrong. And furthermore the case is going to hang, very badly at that point, and will have to be straightened out.

You can get into more trouble – anything you ever heard of, by putting the pc on the – on the track of a slam, and then all of a sudden making a horrible goof, bust, dropping the ball, laying an egg, in an auditing session. It just isn't done. Therefore, you should be a pretty good auditor before you start monkeying around with rock slams.

Now, the pc's interest is high, remember the old tone drop. Remember the curve, the down curve, remember? You've got the guy going from Tone 30, straight down to minus 8, with no gradient. Now, you're going to erase this. Well, you spend the next few sessions patching it up, see? But this can't patch up, because of course, your patching it up means no auditing, and he already is cogniting, but he , s already cogniting on it, but you've got to get rid of the auditing that messed it up, so that in getting rid of the auditing that messed it up you're not then furthering his auditing or cognitions or ease, but you can't further his auditing or cognitions or case until you have cleaned it up. This is a time an auditor wishes he just had never picked up that E-Meter on that pc. It was the wrong time of day, it must have had something to do with the stars in their conjunctions, if not their prepositions.

This is very intense. The whole subject of Dynamic Assessment is very intense. And it should not be regarded casually by an auditor, it is a very intense activity. All goals finding is an intense activity. The main intent and intenseness is on the part of the pc. His interest is so piqued, that he thinks things get in his road which don't. Because all the time he's going down that track he, of course, is running into the items which you eventually will list out, after you've found his goal. And they're all telling him he can't have it; that they oppose it; that he isn't. You see? And he knows not what of any of this.

So the first benefit of a Dynamic Assessment is that it takes off the lot of the edginess from a case, and gives the reward of some very large finds to the pc. You find his detested person. He's very happy. Oooh! Yes! That's why he's always hated Josibelle! Ho-ho! That's the person he hates the most in the whole universe! That means something to the pc.

Now, we move it on down, we find a dynamic. And we get this dynamic found. If it is the dynamic, and it is found, and it slammed, ah, my! He's really got his fingers on something that means a great deal to him. Now, we go ahead and find the item. And here is something which is enormously significant to him. He can explain things all over the place that have been happening to him for ages. Some people, if they never got any further than finding the item they'd be perfectly happy. The auditing had repaid them thousandfold over anything they'd expected it to be repaid, see.

And then, when you find their goal, why, all else pales. But, this is a gradient. The fellow isn't put on an enormously long wait before anything happens, so that you get a nervous charge building up over that tremendous long period of time of search. That is one of the things wrong with 3GA done on its routine ordinary style of write out eight hundred and fifty goals and tiger drill them.

But you understand, that when we were eliminating goals by Assessment by Elimination, this tension was sufficiently great in building up in the pc over a period of time, to practically break the pc's heart, and the auditor's heart, too. That was tough. But the reason it was tough is not that it was tough to do. Not that it was impossible to find goals by Assessment by Elimination. Because God help us we're now running into more goals, now, after Dynamic Assessment, that were found in the old days, so we can audit them out the rest of the way.

Good heavens! It heads right back to the original goal. But the pc's original goal was so burdened by all of these other things, and rock slams, and so on, that the pc never really did get a full digest of the goal. No full reality on it.

An Assessment by Elimination brought about a nervous condition on the part of the pc, where he is so nervy and so ARC breaky, he was almost impossible to audit. Now that's – that should give you an idea or two of why we're – why we're very happy to have such things as Tiger Drills and so forth.

Now, if you tiger drill a list, the goal is never behind you – unless you're a complete knucklehead. And the pc is making gains most of the time. And by erasing goals by Tiger Drill, you are actually getting a very, very thorough, therapeutic result for the pc. And the pc is feeling better and better and better and better and better. There's something to occupy the pc's time. So an eight hundred and fifty goals list tiger drilled, properly of course, is highly therapeutic, and this is fine. And this is easier to do, but it's still not easy enough.

You need shorter jumps. Now, I've seen a Tiger Drill list go null on a pc, with more consequent splatter than anything I care to put a pc over. And many auditors doing old 3GA, even with a Tiger Drill, just say, well, I just never want to put a pc through that again.

And it's not that it hurts, it's not that it's arduous. But the fellow's right on a terrific attention line. And any little wiggle in the session, or any breath of wind in life, is magnified a thousandfold to the pc.

Well, now, on Dynamic Assessment you throw away most of these liabilities because you're going right in after it. The pc's attention isn't directly on the goal, it's on the goal line. In other words, you're following in to the goal line by interest. See, you got a gradient of interest. And the pc's interested all the way. He isn't sitting there like a dummy, the way he was in Assessment by Elimination. You're actually tearing on down the line and the pc is an active participant in this, because you're getting a result every few hours. Now, that's an advantage that shouldn't be discounted. You're following the interest line by following the rock slam. And the pc is turning up and handing you up data all the time. Very valuable to a pc just to list. List the rock slam out.

Now, aside from this, a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam being successfully done makes the pc feel absolutely marvelous. Just puts him on the top of the world. It's just great auditing. Don't kid yourself, it's great auditing.

The funny part of it is, the auditor doesn't give a damn. Those gains are just chaff in the wind. They are nothing. Three cheers, so the pc feels better. Good. We don't give a damn if he feels better. What we want is his goal! You understand? It's worth doing, just to make the pc feel better. But this is not the end product of it.

Doing this over in Washington just in the last three weeks here, astounded by the fact that the pcs began to apologize to me because I'd made this remark to them two or three times. They come out, "Oh! I just feel glorious! Just top of the world! I never felt better! If I never got any more out of this than audit... If I never got audited any more than this, everything would seem wonderful to me! Wonderful!"

And I'd say, "Will you please shut up and sit down and pick up the cans! I'm trying to find your goal!" And it finally got through their skulls that I didn't give a damn whether they felt wonderful or not, I was after their goal. And they'd cooperate like crazy.

But they'd say, "I'm sorry, Ron. I'm sorry to have to tell you, but you know I feel great!" You know?

Well, one doesn't necessarily try to promote that apology in a pc. But don't lose sight of it. Because actually in doing a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, properly and correctly, with all coal on the fire, and with that old needle wagging on dwindling slams as you list, and that sort of thing, you're liable to be totally misdirected on the subject of what you're after.

You know, a pc feels so good, and everything, and you pat yourself on the back, and you say, "Well, I got the pc's item! Made him feel wonderful!" Don't you ever tell me that! Don't you ever tell me how wonderful the pc felt after a Dynamic Rock Slam Assessment! Because I'll ask you right away, "Did you find his goal? You got the pc's goal?"

"Oh, well, no. As a matter of fact we sort of knocked off on that. He's sort of feeling pretty good these days and we've really entered into a Prepcheck area, and you know, kind of capitalize the gains," something like that. Has nothing to do with it. Did you find the pc's goal?

Now, a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is sufficiently spectacular to distract the auditor from the basic reason he is auditing the pc, believe it or not. He's supposed to find the goal. And therefore, if you do excursions or diversions or something, in some direction, that do not enhance finding the pc's goal, you are wasting time. And enough time can be burned in a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam as it is. You can burn lots of time up on one.

Now any of you that are ever going to make a Class IV Auditor, let me tell you this. You've got to be able to do it fast. Do it fast. You understand, I think you're pretty wonderful, right here, I think you're pretty wonderful, to have picked it up, in the short period of time, and have produced as many dynamics, and as many items, and as many goals as you have in this very short period of time. To learn it and to do that is a great tribute to you. And I don't want you to sit back on your laurels and expect you to think that is how long it should take

you. Because let me tell you something, you should be able to find, by the reason of scheduling, by reason of finance, by reason of routing of pcs, by reason of running groups, by reason of program Clear Earth, you've got to be able to find the pc's goal in a week. And that includes a complete assessment with the goal in your paw. You've got to be able to do it in a week.

Otherwise, nothing is going to tally. Now, I'm demanding something of you, which I can do. And which you can do. But you set yourself a nice zenith. Be effective! When you find that meter in your paws, you audit! You understand me? We don't care how good the pc feels or how bad the pc feels. We're not interested in the least, so long as it doesn't get in the road of our auditing. "You feel as good as you want to, just let me go ahead and get this list!" See, it's that frame of mind.

Now, why am I talking to you like this all of a sudden? Well, that's because I'm talking to you on the basis of an upgrade. Talking to you on the basis of an upgrade. I expect you to get out of here a Class III. Definitely expect you to get out of here a Class III. And if you really want to be up on top, a Class IV. Now I'm not kidding about Class IV. Because it'd take a Class IV to handle a group. You understand why? Let's say – let's say you've got fifty people in a group. And they're going to co-audit, and they're going to do this and they're going to do that, and every week you're going to reach into that bunch of people and you're going to pick up one human being, and you're going to completely alter, change their lives, and send them on the road. Put them back in the group again, to get the thing listed out.

All right, that's your program for world clearing. You'll find that that program is working right now – is being started on the Washington staff course. That program will be started here and there and the other place, and you're going to be very familiar with that program. Because there isn't any other way you can do it. You can't afford the time to do it any other way. Therefore it's up to me to make a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam or some other method of finding a pc's goals as rapid and effective and positive as possible! And therefore it's up to you, a Saint Hill graduate, to be able to do this.

The end of one year, you would have produced fifty Clears. Not to be sneezed at. All right. Now, that's pretty terrific. It's in your hands to do this. I'm not talking to you about pie in the sky and wouldn't it nice – be nice to be Clear. And all this sort of thing. I'm not talking to – anything – about anything that is even vaguely out of your reach. This is right in your reach, right now.

Therefore, I want you to be a Class IV Auditor. And be able to find a goal in a week. And as soon as I am able to trim the edges around the technology a little bit more, to find a goal in twelve and a half hours. But let me tell you, the hotter it gets, the hotter you've got to be as an auditor. The faster you find a goal, the cleverer, quicker and more responsive you've got to be as an auditor, and there's some point where you reach diminishing returns. You find the goal so fast the pc doesn't find out about it!

This idea of setting him up in a ray machine, you know, with one thing going in one side of his head and the impression on a screen on the other side of him, and we analyze the

wave and say, “Your goal is to catch catfish! Ah-ha-ha!” No, I’m afraid that point is without the pc’s interest or attention. He’d say, “It is?”

Now, the funny part of it is that a goal listed, I have found out now, without the goal being tiger drilled at the beginning of every session into a decent read, will not make Clears on all cases. And some cases will bog. So therefore you’ve got to be able to have a goal there that the pc’s got some reality on, will follow down you’ve got to keep it cleaned up, and you will see a pc’s interest in his goal, his reality on his goal, ebb and fade, as his listing continues. It is always brought back simply by tiger drilling the goal into the clear again.

But that has nothing to do with finding the goal. Finding the goal is a precision activity which is based first and foremost on terrifically positive, good, smooth auditing. This auditing can have nothing to do with the fact that I don’t understand TR 4. This auditing can have nothing to do with the fact I’m having trouble reading a meter. This auditing has nothing to do with the fact that I don’t like to audit some pcs. You understand?

In your hands, at this time, exists technology which has not before existed. It is positive, it is definite, it has a definite end product. The same technology undoubtedly repeats over and over. The second goal found on the first second-goal-Clear made here, was found by the original method, but with Tiger Drilling. And it was number 400 and something on the second 850 list. That’s interesting, isn’t it? The second goal was found on that list, and it was that deep onto the list. Takes a long time. It takes one minute to clean up a goal, on an average, on Tiger Drilling. And you should be able to hit a goal a minute. That is the average for the long ones and the short ones, and the middle ones, and those that the pc wishes to God he’d never put on the list, you know. “To tie a knot around my Aunt Marandy’s left ear.” And the pc is saying all the time, “That isn’t my goal,” and the auditor’s having to clean it up. So, there it goes, there it goes, there it goes.

That includes that one, but it’s a goal a minute, that’s about – that is the speed of Tiger Drilling. Now, at 460, you add 460 minutes plus your rudiments, over that period of time. Now, that’s very fast goal finding, if you take a look at it. But with most pcs you will not find it is quite this fast or quite this easy. That’s not slow goal finding. You divide 6 into 460, and you’re going to get something that doesn’t look like too much auditing. Because in the first place, you didn’t sit there and list the pc’s goals. The pc just wrote those goals out of session or elsewhere or somebody else listed them. Well, you see, that one, by indications, comes well within an ability to find a second goal, in a very short intensive, just by routine and ordinary methods.

But a great many pcs will never have their goal found in the absence of a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, and the first intensive, that is, the first time that you try to find a pc’s goal, ah-ha, that’s a rocky road, man. Most pcs, that’s a rocky road. It is amazing that as many early goals as we found are in. That’s amazing to me! Goal after goal, person after person that we found them on originally. But isn’t it interesting that they faded away? Wouldn’t show up or anything until we’d done a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam on them. And headed it right into inevitably just that goal. That was the only goal it could be! I’ll tell you some funny stories about that – right now I won’t, but it’s very amusing.

Now what are we heading for? We're heading for an efficient positive method of finding goals. We're not heading for a method in which it takes us 3 hours on Josibelle and 196 hours on Pete. This method we want nothing to do with. Nothing to do with. Because it lends an uncertainty onto the line which drives an auditor halfway around the bend and sends the pc through the top of his skull – uncleared! Just try it sometime. Say, "Well, list 850 goals, and we'll tiger drill them down the line and find your goal. 850." They're all dead behind you and there are no goals in front of you. So you say to the pc, "Well, your goal wasn't on that list. How about, well, how about writing me another couple of hundred goals tonight, and so forth." And you do the couple of hundred, and you say, "Heh-heh-heh, awfully sorry, but you – seems like we've erased the last goal here. How about writing me 5 or 600 goals tonight?"

On some cases this could go to 5 or 6,000 goals. That's 5 or 6,000 minutes man! 5 or 6,000 minutes of auditing, and that's an awful lot of auditing! See what that adds to?

Now, we found some goals on ACCs earlier, and some ACCs ran all 6 weeks without finding anybody's goal. Auditing and auditing and auditing and auditing; what a terrible lose! Very upsetting. No, we want a stabilized action.

Now, right now, Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is unstable to this element of luck. Just like you have luck as to whether or not the goal was early on the list, so you have luck as to whether or not the list you're assessing is complete. First thing you must recognize. A cardinal rule of thumb about a list is if no item assesses out unmistakably, unmistakably, no item assesses out, the list was incomplete. There is no other reason. I have added these all up, and subtracted them, and multiplied them, and subdivided them and turned them over to the rabbits and birds. There is no other reason. If you didn't find the item on that list, the item was not on that list, and that is the open and shut of it. Very simple.

Now, you'd be amazed how often you have luck, just by writing down the 8 dynamics, calling them off to the pc, and say, "Consider overts against... and so forth. You'd be surprised how often this is lucky. You'll be surprised how often you have 250 (quote) dynamics (unquote) listed by the pc, and have no item on them. Do you see that? Some certainty needs to be attached to that, and the certainty that attaches to it is the rock slam during listing.

Now, new capers can be expected along this line. This is not a sterile line. This is under very hot development. But use what you've got. What I would use right now is exactly what you would use. It's – we know this. We know this. That if we can get a dynamic a pc has rock-slamming overts on, we can then list what represents that dynamic to the pc, on a dwindling rock slam. The rock slam dwindles, item by item, gets smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller and smaller, and we then have a list that we can assess, and we will find an item. And that the goal will be an overt against that item in one shaded meaning or another, as given on the list.

Now, those are your certainties. Now, the entrance point is the tough point. Trying to find the first slam. Now, we developed a new caper. I dreamed one up in Washington on this basis: The most detested person. "What opinionated person have you most detested?" was the original question. Well, it's not a bad question! But what if the fellow couldn't ever see any

people at all? Or people were nowhere near anything he found to be wrong. Now, you're going to lay an egg. You're going to have to say, "Who or what have you detested?" And you're liable to wind yourself up with something that looks like an item.

Now, we're into the experimental field of Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. Do you see why? "Who or what have you detested?" This isn't too good. It isn't perfect. But it's better than nothing. How many ways can you enter this thing Well, let me tell you a shortcut. A very short, shortcut. You say to the pc, "What do you wish was not part of existence?" And you take a list which you scrap. You don't pay much attention to that list. And then after you've done that list, which kind of oils him up and grooves him in, you say, "What isn't part of existence?" And you've got the, "What isn't part of existence" list. This will serve you as an item, if it will develop a rock slam.

You assess it by, "Consider overts against..." "You will find out the common denominator of all dynamics and items is that the person will not admit they are part of existence. It's a test. When the person first thought it over, he said well that wasn't real, wasn't part of existence, didn't belong on the dynamic scale, see. It's a – it's a thing from which they have individuated. It's a thing that they're against. It's a thing they don't want anything more to do with. And there'd probably be several ways you could groove somebody in.

But do you wind up with an item? You've actually really wound up with a person or a thing, which is the most detested person or thing, haven't you? Now, you could regard it as an item, and you could get someplace. But experimental action right at the present moment would be to use this question – highly experimental – you get this thing, "What isn't part of existence" list.

Get that nice and long. Assess it by "Consider overts against..." you'll find one finally has a heavy slam on it. "Consider overts against..."

This last slamming item can be built, perhaps, back to a dynamic this way. You understand, this is a, "When-all-else-fails." You realize I'm giving you the, "When-all-else-fails." I probably haven't made it too clear. Your – you've tried to get a dynamic list and you failed. You tried to get a detested person from that and get a dynamic list that was meaningful. And it just didn't go anyplace. You got the idea? We couldn't get dwindling slams, we just couldn't get anything on. You've always got this one, "What do you wish wasn't part of existence?" Throw that list away and list, "What isn't part of existence?" assess that list and you've got an entrance point. Or, you've got an item!

Well, it's interesting, I'm not sure how you decide. And therefore I'm about to make the following test to see whether or not this works. We take an item so found, and we say, "What part of existence does (item found on 'What isn't part of existence?' list) belong to?" See? "What part of existence does belong to?" And we're going to get a larger thing, which perhaps then... Well, we get a list, we assess that, "Consider overts against..." We pick out the rock slamming item out of that, and then we list this, "What part of existence does a (blank) represent?" See, represent again. See if we get our dwindling slam. You understand this excursion?

What I'm pointing out to you merely by giving you this experimental method is not whether or not this works, or doesn't work. But that this has several entrance points. And if I found as many entrance points as this, you can expect more. You can expect them to be very thorough entrance points.

Right now, you're in a somewhat hit-or-miss state. It's kind of by luck that it's on the first list. Detested person is a very, very fine way of finding it. You use the "detested" person this way: You say, "What opinionated person have you detested?" or something like that. Assess it by rock slam. You could say, "What part of existence does blank (the assessed person) represent to you?" Not, "What is blank's... ?" By the way this is a serious error to say, "What is blank's idea of the dynamics?" That doesn't work.

But we get "Joe," see. And we say, "All right. What part of existence does Joe represent to you?" see. And the person will give you a dynamic list. Sometimes it lists down at once to an item and sometimes you've already found the item on the list. You get the liability here?

Well, your exact procedure – the way I would go about a Dynamic Assessment on raw meat – would be just this way. I'd say, "What part – what opinionated person have you detested?" They give me one person. Then they give me two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, twenty, twenty-two, twenty-three people and I'm not even bleeding the meter, don't you see? I say are there any more, and they add a couple as an afterthought, and then I'll assess that list by, "Think of doing bad things to..." "Each person in turn, and assess it rock slam by elimination with that question, wind up with one of these people. You'd be surprised how often it's the first person they said. It's amazing how often it is just the first person. It's not good enough, however, to just take the first person.

All right, we take this person, we say, "What part of existence does blank represent?" As soon as we've got blank busily listed, we've got a dynamic list, and we will find that rock slams are appearing now. That list doesn't get listed however on a dwindling slam. We shouldn't expect such riches at this time, and we assess that new list by saying, "Think of doing bad things to..." "the items on this list, and we will come out with an unmistakable rock slam, if we are lucky. If we've had a rock slam, why, before, on the person, and we've had a – some rock slams on the listing of the dynamics, and if we've had an unmistakable rock slam, and hammer and pound away on the dynamic we finally eliminated down to, let me tell you, that the list, then, of the item will be a dwindling slam. It'll start wide and item by item it'll get narrower and narrower, finally go down to a dirty needle and had to be bled off.

Then we assess that list, which is the item list, once more, "Consider committing overts against " or "Think of doing bad things to..."

Either command will serve, and bang, one of those things will fire. We finally get that firing very, very well, and we have the pc's goals line. And then we say, "What goal might you have that would be an overt against " (the item found)." And that should be a dwindling slam and go right on down and finally disappear into a dirty needle and pass away.

And then you should list List Six right away. And then you should list some of the other lists, but List Six is a must, because in a high percentage of the cases, the goal will be number one, two, three, or four listed on List Six. So much so, of course, that you quite often ignore List One. And other lists. Hit that List Six.

Also do not, do not tiger drill selected goals by the auditor. Do not do that, just start at the top of List Six, and start going. Yeah, why think about it, see? Why even add that element of evaluation? These lists are rather brief, don't you see? It doesn't take you long to do these things anyhow. And who knows, the pc's goal might be, "to kiss a mermaid who hasn't eaten garlic." We're not sure what his goal will end up, see. But, in any event, the goal is the goal, and it will be the goal, and if it's there, it fires.

Now, an action which must go before, must precede any Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam is as follows: The pc lists 850 goals on his own, or he's listed it for them by another auditor in a co-audit and, don't forget this one before you do the Dynamic Assessment and go to all that trouble, you sit down and you take every goal ever found on the pc, and you make a list of those goals. I don't care whether they were good, bad, indifferent. He says they've been erased, we don't care. We write down that list of goals. And we tiger drill that list. It seldom goes more than 6 or 7.

And we tiger drill them with these magic words. The first Tiger Drill is done as follows – tiger drilling words, this is a brand-new idea to you. "On the word 'suppressed' has anything been suppressed?" Got that? You tiger drill the buttons. It's amazing what you can do. Somebody's sure they've had pain-drug-hypnosis, been proved to them, in upper Sullivan Island, and you can tiger drill pain, you can tiger drill drugs, you can tiger drill hypnotism. Tiger drill words. Quite amazing what it does.

If you think somebody's dramatizing her name because she's crying all the time and her name is Teary, you want to know? We used to do other things with this. Well, the answer to it is Tiger Drill. Just tiger drill the word Teary. And you can tiger drill to flatness or cognition.

Now, that is a must for somebody who has been audited a bit – for a lot or prepchecked and so forth. Let's clean up these words. We have had an experience, a horrifying experience, of a pc selected to have his goal found at the congress slamming with gorgeosity! Kicking the pin. You could see the needle bend, I'm sure. And the second the pc thus tested reported for session, was found to have no rock slam at all. And the rock slam just was off, and that was it. Pretty grim, huh? Well the suppression there was terrific. Because the consequences of all our clearing him were succinctly stated by that pc in letters of fire with exclamation points. He'd have to practically do everything include committing suicide, I think. It was pretty drastic what he'd have to do if we cleared him. Of course the overt word was Scientology. And that saved our bacons nicely.

But as soon as we got onto the line, the rock slam turned back on again. How could this have been turned on earlier? By tiger drilling words. Also, it could have been handled by tiger drilling a period of time. You've not heard of that one before, you heard of prepchecking

a period of time, but Tiger Drilling it is just sitting right there on the meter and bingety-banging it.

That, however, was not too good on this case. What was happening on this case was the consequences of becoming Clear. Something that has to be gone into with every pc that you are working. You have to go into the consequences of being Clear. If I cleared you, what would be the consequences? You'll find out sometimes it's so catastrophic the pc never will give you his goal. He knows what clearing is. He's done it lots of times himself. You put the person in front of the Fac One machine and you start turning the handles. And he knows why you shouldn't clear people, because he gets a hole in his chest! You know, the old machine that had the – had the big blast that went out the front, and the little peephole in the back that it came back and hit the operator. Somebody was telling me the other day they're going to make these for the US Army, and I – why I didn't – I didn't think they ought to do it. They could only be operated by Clears, and Clears wouldn't operate them. Interesting So, why build the machine?

Anyway, here was a case of a sudden vanishment of a rock slam. Now, you're going to confront that many a time. And maybe there are many better solutions to it. But right now, you will find that tiger drilling words will serve an enormous number of purposes. That's one for you to put down. Because I think that will be with us for a long time.

The other thing is work the Suppress button hard, and the other thing is to work the Careful button. Careful is actually more likely to turn on a rock slam than Suppress. And the probability is that our pc's rock slam at the congress would have turned on if the Careful button had been well enough operated, or heavy enough operated. But I don't think it was used. Because it was put in a little bit later. I'm not sure about that but I think that's the ease.

All right. Now, I've seen a lot of rock slams occurring underneath that Careful button. Rock slams which were off. So, now I told you that there were two things that you should do before you start in on a Dynamic Assessment on a pc. There were two things you should do. And one of them is to tiger drill the buttons into some kind of shape, and the other one is to take those early goals.

Any goal found on them to date, and tiger drill those goals with this command: "In auditing, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?" etc. Do you get it? "In auditing on the goal so-and-so..." And you tiger drill with no other phraseology than that. You just tiger drill that one. And you will find out that a goal that has been buried and cannot be made to read again, can be made to read by prepchecking the buttons. And then prepchecking with this formula: "In auditing, on the goal," whatever it was, "has anything been... " the buttons. Got it?

Now, that has a varied – a varied form. Where it didn't succeed, you can go into "Since... " whatever date the goal was found, "... on the goal... " whatever the goal is, "... has anything been... " and tiger drill it in that fashion. Okay? So you've got an alternate method. You've got the period method, and you've got, "In auditing."

I've seen a goal tiger drilled, a goal already found and abused, I've seen a goal tiger drilled, with plain Tiger Drilling, ordinary Tiger Drilling, out of existence. It didn't read, it

didn't fire, it didn't cough, it didn't sneeze, there was nothing. There was not a yep left on it! Pc's satisfied with it, too. No somatics left on it. Everybody happy. The pc happy, and the auditor happy, and everybody cheerful that his goal being gone. Then opened up on again with tiger drilling the buttons of the Tiger Drill, and then swinging in on the goal and making it read.

And I have seen this happen: Taking an old goal, seeing it totally flattened with – utterly and completely erased as far as anybody could tell, not a quiver on a Mark V E-Meter. And here it goes, gone! Not a – not a mention. Couldn't get Suppress to read. Couldn't get anything to read. Couldn't get any part of anything to read. Gone! And then suddenly run, “In auditing, on the goal to catch catfish, has anything been suppressed?” and all of a sudden seeing the goal come back to life with a crash. Okay? Seen them both.

So don't ever discard old goals as beneath your contempt. An early goal is found on this case. This goal is for the birds. Nobody could possibly make anything out of this goal, and it was run on the pc for some days with no success. And you say, “Well, I guess we can neglect that.” Yes, you can neglect it, why not neglect the whole case? In fact, why audit the ease at all? Because from that moment onward, that case makes no further forward progress. That's horrifying, you know? That says why we stopped them from letting HCAs find all the goals! Dzzzz! Must have been rough! See that? So your pc has had this ridiculous goal found: “to tie bowlines on a bight on the backs of catfish and ride with a pipe in my teeth across the seas of Arizona.” And the auditor says, “This couldn't possibly be a goal, therefore I'll neglect this thing.” And the case is parked from there on. Case is parked.

You got to handle that goal like I just told you. I may even think of better ways of handling it. But that's good enough for a few – three weeks of development. You'll get that goal firing and knock out any residual fire in it. And get it out and get it gone, get the protests off of it, and get that thing went. And now all of a sudden the pc a-runs like a baby carriage. Savvy? Get rid of them old goals before you wind up on a Dynamic Assessment and you will be a happy character. Because the pc has already experienced an improvement under your auditing and therefore has confidence in you as an auditor. And you can use every bit of that confidence while doing a Dynamic Assessment.

Course, if you insist on doing it and it's – already they've been thoroughly cleaned up, and you can't get a spark out of any of them, and the pc keeps telling you, “But they've been cleaned up!”

And you keep saying, “Well I know, but I've got to make sure, according to Ron's lecture of September 18, AD 12, I have to go over these things with a fine...”

“I know! But the auditor did last week!”

You'll eventually get the goals reading again. Of course all they'll respond to is the word “protest.” They'll all be reading! That's outside the auditing formula. But there, in final analysis, is where we have arrived at with 3G Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam.

Good hunting!

Thank you!