

3GA GOALS FINDING, PART II

A lecture given
on 11 October 1962

This is lecture two, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 11 Oct. Continuing on the subject of goals finding.

If you've got down the fundamental that it takes an auditor and it takes a meter, then you see on goals finding there's no substitute for being there as the auditor and being accurate on the meter. Therefore, goals finding will never become the subject of sloppy auditing or sloppy metering.

Now listing requires more auditor presence than – that is, the listing sessions – than Prepchecking. An auditor will be able to get things done in a Prepcheck session – “Since October, 1913, has anything been suppressed?” You see, an auditor can sit there and bat this stuff off, and get a result on his pc which will be a very interesting result.

He's sitting there practically without a meter. He simply stops asking the question, you see, when the pc doesn't want to give him any more answers, and so forth. Because he isn't being pressed, why, the pe has a tendency to be rather accommodating. And it all goes off rather smoothly, without too many ARC breaks.

But the moment that you start listing... You see we'll just skip goals finding; it's absolutely impossible to find a goal without a decent auditor and decent presence and good metering. I mean, that's a foregone conclusion.

It mainly requires auditor presence and auditor permissiveness. Now, the rule is a very simple one for you to lay down on anybody. Somehow or another, he has to continue his presence while never asking for more items than the pc has and never preventing the pc from giving him items.

Now, that's the happy balance which this listing auditor maintains. Now, if you also have a circumstance whereby the listing auditor is asking a question and not getting an answer, you'll get a jam-up on the lines.

So this is interesting, isn't it. There's a nice little compromise involved there. The person doesn't have any items for the line and the auditor has asked the auditing question and therefore must get an answer to it.

Well, now, this is – gets interesting, because you'll find out that this little factor all by itself will stack up a case – unanswered auditing questions.

So you've got an auditor who has to be smooth enough to say, “Well, just give me an old one offhand. Well, just give me any one so the question will be answered.” Pc will deal him the same item that he's dealt before or something like that and you've got the auditing question answered.

But that must be done sufficiently smoothly so the pc is not ARC broke or being dragged at, don't you see. Then you've answered the auditing question and you've got the item, and that's all very slippery.

Now what, in essence here, is the thing that would happen? What is the thing that would go wrong in a listing session – is that the pc gets into a suppress or a protest, either one of which turns on sen. In other words, you ask the pc for more items than the pc has. You see, it's the pc has, you know. Auditors don't sometimes get that point, that the pc has them or he hasn't got them, see.

The weird part of it is, see, the pc isn't dreaming these things up. Now, this offhanded, “Well, give me one more, you know, an old one, or something, to keep the record straight,” is asking the pc simply to give you one already dealt, which the pc can always do. But the pc's got them there, and if you realize that the GPM is stacked up like poker chips, you know, he's either got that many or he hasn't.

See, he isn't inventing them, thinking them up, creating them, or something like that. That is just the items he's got. See, that's the – that is pretty hard to realize.

The other auditing point that auditors – poor auditors even have a bunch of trouble with, and any auditor will have trouble with some time or another, quite frequently, is the pc has said something was wrong and it sounds horrible to the auditor and the auditor believes it is now wrong.

Well, no, the pc has said it and it's been acknowledged, so it's actually no longer wrong. But the auditor feels very downcast because the pc has said this was the condition, and then the auditor adjudicates that the pc couldn't possibly get well, because the condition, you see, was so bad. You got that?

The pc said, “Well, I thought, 'What a monster you are!' ”

Well, the auditor says, “My God, I can't audit this pc because the pc thinks I'm a monster.”

No, if the pc had thought that the auditor was a monster and hadn't told the auditor, yeah, auditing – pretty impossible. But the fact that the statement has been made is the alleviation of the condition.

Now, when a pc – when a pc is – that's the – I just added that in as the other point they have trouble with. And once in a while you yourself will say, “Ohhh God!” you know, “Look at what I've been looking at here!” But you're looking at past history. If the pc has said it and it's been acknowledged, it's always past history.

Now, that's with these items. When the pc says them, they're past history, see. And they deal off, just bang, bang, one right after the other. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang. And they deal off, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang.

Now, if you demand that the pc give you more items than he has got, then the pc will have to protest what you are saying. He'll have to protest the demand, don't you see. So that's a protest which adds sen. Sensation is added then – dizziness, misemotion, so forth. And if the pc is prevented from giving items he has – it's the way this finally works out – then the pc will have to suppress those additional items, which gives you sensation.

Now, the symptom of a wrong goal is it starts out with pain and winds up with sen. Sometimes it just starts out with sen and winds up with sen. But sometimes early on in the run, you'll have pain on a wrong goal, which then develops into sen, regardless of how smooth the auditing is or anything else. That's a symptom of a wrong goal.

Now, you can make a right goal, of course, sound like a wrong goal, in a listing session – look like a wrong goal, you see – by making the pc suppress and protest. Pc says, “Well, I just haven't got any more items that – you know, that make a mistake, you know, make a mistake being a catfish. I just haven't got any more, you know?”

You say, “Well, come on, now, come on, now. This line is way behind. We only have a few strikes on this line. I'm sure you can think up some!”

Indeed he could! But we're dealing with just so many chips in the bank, you see. We're dealing with just so many things. These are quantitative items. See, he has so many thousand of this and so many hundred of that and so many dozen of something else.

Well, sometimes the stacks are wrong, don't you see, and you come around and ask for something he made a mistake about, and he hasn't got any mistake items right at that moment at all! He isn't even in that side of the deck! Hu-huh! He can't do a thing about it. He says, “Well, I just don't – I just don't have any.”

You say, “Oh, come on now, come on now!”

Pc says, “But I don't have any more.”

“Oh, come on, I'm sure you can give me a couple of more. I'm sure you can give me another ten or twelve. This line's way behind.”

“But I haven't got them! But I haven't got them! But I haven't got them!”

You see – because that protest, protest, protest, protest – sen, sen, sen, sen, sen, see.

All right. Now, let's take the reverse side of it. You say to the pc, "Well, this line is already overlisted. We've got too many on this line."

And the pc says, "And there's a – a game warden and catfish and there's fish hooks and there's – there's – streams and ponds and there's . . ."

And you say, "Well, there's too many on this, you know. I mean, you know, there's already – got a full card here, it's already full, you know. And uh – can't we get off onto some other side of this?"

And the pc has to go *mvvrrt* – sen!

Well, now, with sen goes a climbing tone arm. Tone arm is a direct indicator of sensation. It's mass, but then of course sensation is symptomatic of built-up mass. The more he chokes down and the more he protests, the more mass is going to get stacked up. So, of course, you've got the symptom of the climbing tone arm. Pc tone arm at 5.0; pc lots of sen – you can say this sort of thing has happened: that the auditor has demanded more items than the pc has, and the auditor has prevented the pc from giving items that pc has. That's your first adjudication.

So, to that degree, you're going to have trouble with listing sessions. But in view of the fact that it does not greatly depend upon metering – in other words accuracy of metering is of no account at all in the actual listing, except to watch the tone arm.

The only thing the meter is used for is to tiger drill in, but again, if he isn't tiger drilling – if he can't tiger drill, you can always have him give a rapid Prepcheck, and as you saw last night that can be done with no casualty at all – maybe not perfectly – can be done with no casualty at all, just on a straight Prepcheck.

So, your listing auditor doesn't even know how to tiger drill – doesn't even have to know how to tiger drill, do you see that? He could just give a Prepcheck round and do it once per session, see? Be interesting. You see what I'm driving at here?

So that's the main trouble there. Your main trouble is the lack of auditor presence – the auditor's getting in the road of the session. See, it's just the auditor won't permissively sit there and be an auditor. The auditor must be getting in the road of the session. The only thing you've got to do to remedy that is get the auditor out of the road of the session, either by making the auditor inspect the cycle of auditing or something like this, don't you see?

That's easy to remedy! You can handle that. And now, the goals finding – the goals finding here – that's something else. That's the combination of the observer and the meter. And the goals finder has got to be hotter than hot on a meter, and got to be accurate and not blurred up, and his auditing has got to be very smooth. Otherwise he'll cause sufficient suppresses to cause the items or dynamics or persons he's trying to find – he'll cause those things just to vanish. They just go!

They show up on the list, but there's so much suppress on the session, you can't get anything to fire. You see this? So if his auditing is rough, he's not going to get any of these things. In other words, they're suppressed before they occur.

Sometimes meters just stop slamming. And you work and you sweat and you slave and you eventually get the meter slamming again, you see, and it's always on the fact that it's a Suppress, Protest, Careful of, all these confounded things.

“Careful of,” by the way, peculiarly enough, seems to be the brute that turns off slams. That seems to be far more pertinent on slam turnoff than any other button. Of course, the others turn off slams too, but that one's peculiarly odd. Have you noticed that while running “Careful of,” you'll very often get slams that you didn't suspect were there?

So therefore, the pc is too careful – he will turn off his slam. Now, the best way to get slams back on is with a goals Prepcheck using the eighteen buttons which of course includes the counter-button.

Now – you just take the item and you just, you know, give it a goals Prepcheck, you know. The item is “a candy bar,” you know. And so you just say, “On the item 'candy bar,’” you see, “has anything been suppressed?” or, any way you want to run it, but you just run it that way, and you go on down through the end. You normally will get the slam back on without any extraordinary action – particularly if you're running it against the meter quite properly.

The best way I know to turn on goals and for you to turn on goals or items or dynamics that have turned off is just that round and round and round Prepcheck.

Actually, running it on the meter on the average pc shouldn't take more than an hour to go all the way through. But you get something that's really stacked up, you get one button per session, you know. I mean, vuuuh! It could be, almost, variable in time, but in ordinary course of auditing and so on, it's about an hour, hour and ten minutes, hour and fifteen minutes, to go all the way through that.

Now, the auditor – the auditor has got to be sharp. He's got to be – I gave you the characteristics most desirable in auditing, in another lecture – but that auditor has got to be a sharp auditor. That auditor has got to be a good observer, he's got to be a good meter operator and he's got to have good auditing presence. And his auditing's got to be very smooth. Given those things, why, man can he find goals! Take those things away and the goals just won't occur at all.

Now, oddly enough, the thing that's going to cause you the most trouble in any area you're operating in will be the lucky fluke – of course, causes you trouble occasionally. You do something that's a little bit off-line; you're being very clever, and you get a goal or you get

an item, or you ... Oh, you've had it! You know? It won't happen again in another thousand years. But you keep on trying it you know, and it's just a fluke.

Similarly, somebody is going to sit down in an auditing chair someday, as – he's just doing a Prepcheck, see, something like that – and all of a sudden the pc lays his goal on the line, you know, and says, “That's my goal.” Or he's going over – he's listing the goals list and he's watching the meter, and all of a sudden one of those goals goes clank! brrrr! see, and he says it again and he says it again and he says it again and it checks right out, right away, right away, see.

Ruins him! The rest of his natural career, he'll be sitting there, listing the first 850 goals, watching for that thing to go brrrr! See?

I think there's only one goal here for a long while that the first time it was read it rocket read three times in a row, there was no suppress on it, there was nothing on it, it was just clean as a wolf's tooth, and there it was sitting right out in the open. Trouble is I don't think it'd ever been on the pc's list before. See, the second they put it on the list it read perfectly. Of course, it checked out beautifully and that was it; and there wasn't any trouble with it, and so on.

The auditor that found it has been ruined, slightly. I mean, that auditor is liable to be – he'll just think back to that. Think back to the good old days, when he found that goal, you know. Next goal he finds, you know, he'll be sweating, sweat running down, and making his – dropping on to the dial of the E-Meter, you know, and pencil's wearing out and pc's wearing out and everything, and ...

Actually the reason he's having such a hard time is, of course, that he thinks a goal should do that. And of course, he's passed over the pc's goal and the pc's – this pc had a quarter of a rocket read and three suppresses. That was the extent this goal showed up, see. No somatics went with it to indicate it, either, you know. This should happen to him. You get how this is, see.

But he just doesn't think you should have to work that hard for a goal.

Well, an auditor has got to be variable and he realizes that his luck is variable, pc to pc. And sometimes he gets up on the right side of the bed, and he reaches over, and by golly, his shoes are right there, you know, and the laces are untied and he slides into them and there's nothing in them! That's the day, see, that's the day!

Next morning he gets up, reaches to the same location – no shoes.

Reaches under the bed – no shoes. Looks all over the house – no shoes. See's his dog worrying something in the back yard! Well, that's the way it goes!

There's terrific variability in this situation. Therefore, pc to pc, an auditor has to learn to be variable in his attention to the situation. Just because he found the goal on the pc in this

peculiar way and this peculiar fashion, is no reason he's going to find the goal on the next pc in exactly that way and that fashion. In other words, he's got to be variable.

Oddly enough, the variability of it is best covered by a very close adherence to the textbook solution. For the first time in the history of any race on any planet, our textbook solution is the best one. That's the first time this has ever happened.

Textbook solution. They had a song in the Marine Corps, about McBill McGin who died with a grin, because he had used the textbook solution, you know. They're usually quite fatal, in more subjects than one. I imagine in a physics or chemistry laboratory, or in the universities and so forth, the textbook solutions – I don't think you'd ever graduate if you used the textbook solution on the experiments. You just never would, that's all.

I used to look around me occasionally in a physics laboratory or measuring laboratory, and I'd find these students passing, you know, and everything panning out exactly, you know, and in the chemistry lab the precipitate always turned out to be pure potassium skoofba, you know. I didn't realize they'd just gone over to the supply cabinet and got some potassium skoofba, you know. It's marvelous, marvelous! And the acceleration tests all work out on the physics bench, providing you put the answer down first and then work back to your experimental data.

No, the textbook solution is never very fortunate, which is liable to give many an auditor an idea that he ought to put a big curve into finding goals, see.

Well, now you take Model Session. Frankly, the more you vary Model Session the more trouble you're going to get into, because the first thing you do is throw out the predictability factor.

See, the pc considers you unpredictable, and the more unpredictable unpredicted things you do, why, the less predictable the pc thinks you are, so therefore becomes less and less certain of you as an auditor. And therefore you as the auditor deteriorate as the pc's observer. You see, by being unpredictable you destroy the reality of the auditor as an observer. You see that?

It might be very clever and it might be very necessary but remember that reality as the observer, from the viewpoint of the pc, is very often more valuable to maintain than to solve that particular little problem with that particular little piece of wit. See what I mean?

You say, "Well obviously, I ought to throw the random rudiment in on this pc after every other rudiment. See, I do a rudiment, then I'll throw in the random rudiment." And it might be very necessary, and it might be all right, eventually, with the pc if you did it every time.

But sooner or later you're going to conceive that it isn't necessary every rudiment to also throw in the random rudiment – you're going to leave it out here and there – then the pc

doesn't know what's coming up next, and therefore doesn't consider that you are predictable, so therefore he's not so certain that he is being observed. Now, the more you use a standard Model Session, and use it every time, why, there you are.

Now, last night, you saw me throw an unpredictability. Well, this is only justified by the degree that the pc has had a wrestling match with this particular one, and it's a source of innumerable ARC breaks on the part of the pc. See?

All right, so we will take this rudiment up. Nevertheless it destroyed to some slight degree the predictability of the auditor – the pc's prediction of the auditor, see. You understand? I could get away with it that once, see, and that was fine. But let's say next time I take up the present time problem rudiment, and straighten it out the same way. And then I run perfect Model Session for the next two sessions and then suddenly take up the “Since the last time I audited you” rudiment and not clean this up but extend it into a full mid ruds. We would start getting an unreality on the part of the pc, on the auditor, don't you see? Well, to that degree you can get away with variability and variation.

Now, in view of the fact that you aren't going to always find detested persons and dynamics and items on this pc, this does not become a part of the picture of predictability. So you could do this different ways. As long as it was in Model Session, the pc would be perfectly happy about it.

You're only going to find the detested person once, you understand, and after that you're not going to find the detested person. But if you find this detested person and then you find the dynamic and then you find the item, all more or less in the same way, you'll find out the item becomes much more easy to find because, you see, the pc's now got a predictable pattern, see. He's more certain of what you're doing, so therefore he's quieted down. You understand that?

Now, he'll become – he'll think his certainty has been thrown out if you don't find the goal the same way. You understand that? Maybe you could swing in on the same system, “What goal does this represent to you?” and you might find more certainty in getting it. If you could figure out how to get the goal with the same system by which you got the item, by the same system by which you got the dynamic, by the same system in which you got the detested person, see. You've set up a pattern of response here.

Well, the only virtue of the pattern of response – well, it has two virtues: (1) It's easier to teach because it's a pattern, but that is not its main virtue. It is actually – makes the pc more certain that he has an observer. The observer always does the same thing, so therefore there's more of an observer there. See, the pcs certainty that somebody is there is compounded by the fact that he can predict the actions of this person.

Now, I'll tell you how to make yourself very unpopular with a pc. Every time you check the pc's goal, do it differently, and do it in such a way that the pc cannot predict what

you're going to do. Make it so that the pc can't predict when you are going to say the goal, if you are going to say the goal, and then do it a different number of times, and all of a sudden the goal won't read for you.

This is not a test which I advise you to make on somebody's goal. But you perhaps have reality on it right this minute, which is why I'm saying it. If you said, "Now I am going to test the goal 'to catch catfish' – to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish," and you always tested it that way, it'd probably be all right – probably be all right.

But it's corny, already. Because you've said the goal before you've said the goal, and therefore the pc suppresses the first saying of the goal, which registers then on the second saying of the goal, which is really the first saying of the goal, you understand? You get the unpredictability of this action?

So it's much better to say, "Now I'm going to say this goal." Oh, a pc knows what goal you're talking about, and if you don't think the pc will know what goal you're talking about, you just say, "Well, what's your thoughts on this goal 'to catch catfish'?" See?

The pc says, "So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, so-and-so and so-and-so."

And you say, "All right. Now I'm going to test this goal – to catch catfish, to catch catfish, to catch catfish. Thank you very much."

However, if you did that too unpredictably, it'd startle the pc enough, so that by the time you've said the second one, he'd squashed it.

Now, have you – I see that you have had a little experience in this! Supposing you had always said it this way: "Now I'm going to test this goal. To catch catfish. To catch catfish. To catch catfish," and that's the way you've been saying the goal to the pc. You've said the goal to the pc this way three, four times, at different times. And now, if you do this one: "Now, I'm going to say this goal, To catch catfish – to catch catfish! To catch catfish. To catch catfish." You know, you're not going to get any reads. It's just splattered all over the landscape, see.

So you see that, if unpredictability can smash a goal out of read (although that's a fairly delicate thing), you see that unpredictability can smash a session out of read, just drawing a wider bow, and of course, a listing session can be "scrushed" out of existence the same way. Do you see that? It's the predictability, predictability factor. Sometimes your cleverness defeats itself, because you become unpredictable.

What are you going to do? Let's say, one day you get in the random rudiments right in the middle of trying to clean up, "In this session have you told me any half-truth, untruth, done something only to impr ... Well, I think I'll get in the middle rudiments." He – oh, you'd possibly get away with it. Probably nothing much happen to you if you did it.

How many sessions do you think you have to audit that rudiment perfectly, before the pc stops being the gopher effect, you know, sitting up on top of his hole, you know, looking around, looking around. You're coming to the first rud. "What's he going to do? What's he going to do? What's he going to do? What's he going to do? What's he going to do? Oh! He's going to read it straight!" See, some part of his mind is doing this, see. You're unpredictable to that degree.

Well, goals – goals finding can get very, very complicated. You could be so complicated and so nagging and so upsetting and so suppressive, and get a – such a protesty pc in goals finding that eventually you just never would find anything at all, just never find a thing.

If something is wrong with the cycle of an auditing question, yeah, something will happen to finding detested persons and dynamics – things will happen to these things. That's why one looks with horror upon the untrained auditor or the lower-level trained auditor, finding goals. Because you know that his technology is just not up to it.

He's liable to find all kinds of wrong things. In the first place, he doesn't know what a goal read looks like. In the second place, he's insufficiently smooth to even read one off. He can take any goal under the sun, moon or stars, make a mistake on it and make it read.

He can take a goal that's very unpopular with the pc. Let's say he's one of these auditors – a sort of an amateur book-type auditor – who is over on the overwhelm side of the picture, see. He's got a basic philosophy that it must be true if the pc doesn't like it. That's his basic test. See, if the pc protests, that's it.

And then let's say he gets on some kind of a – of a sexual goal of some kind or another that in this society Somebody'd be very ashamed of, don't you see, and then reads this with a gleam in his eye. He makes a suggest on it, then tiger drills it wrongly, gets the pc to protest it, asserts then that it is the pc's goal, as the pc is saying that it is not, builds up a nice ridge, and you know that goal will read for years. Of course, it'll only read with a tick, but it'll read until somebody pulls both sides of that thing off and pulls it apart.

Well, that frightens you, when you come down to look at it. So, were not really, though, talking about that crudity of operation. We're talking about just the smoothness of finding a goal.

So, there's no substitute for good auditing and finding a goal. There's just no substitute for it. Luck we can't count on – about the only thing that would cause a person who couldn't audit well to once in a blue moon find a right goal. It'd be his undoing too!

The steps by which a goal is found today are very elementary, they're very simple and they all follow the same pattern. We just ask the person who or what has the pc detested. Make it who or what, because the pc is on a – is on a "things" type dynamic, here. A detested person, though we still call it, will sometimes go by the boards, don't you see? They might not

have any people they detest; they only detest things, you see, and on that pc you're liable to miss most gorgeously if you say, "What person have you detested?" You understand that?

On a large percentage of cases you're just going to get away with "Who have you detested," see. But there's that other case that comes along and you get a thing.

Now, you could make the mistake of thinking this was so marvelous – having gotten this item – that you'll list goals against it or something like that. Well, that hasn't proven out as a good action or a productive action over a period of time. Even though it gives you something that looks like an item if you get a thing. You know, "a burned-out radiator." You say, "Boy, that sure looks like an item," you know? Naw, it's not an item.

Now, your next action is always represent. Now, your action, then, is – starts out with "Who or what have you detested," you see; get your list; "Consider committing overts against _____ (items on the list)." And when you get that item, it's always followed with represent.

Don't try to use other things. I've gotten an awful lot of data on this. And I've come a cropper every time I've tried to use some other form of action.

The pc's substitutes is what we want, and we say, "What does a burned-out radiator represent to you?" So that's always your next action to get the next list. See? And now we've got our next list, and we consider committing overts against it, and we get that one off that list, and it's – a next step is always "represents." Don't you see? And we can actually go along this line until we run out of dwindling rock slams. We could actually continue this until we run out of dwindling rock slams, which is quite interesting.

Why it works, that we only get a couple of dwindling rock slams out of this, I'm not quite sure. There are probably more dwindling rock slams available in some cases. But this works out just fine the way it is laid out now.

Your dwindling – first dwindling slam is, by the way, not on the detested-person point-person or item. See, that doesn't – when you list those, you get no dwindling slam, you understand. There's no dwindling slam there at all. And there may not be a dwindling slam from that ite – that detested person or item when found. That might not be a dwindling slam.

In fact it'd kind of surprise me at times if you did get a dwindling slam. Because, may – man, that one's far out. See, that's the far out bet.

But if you got a dwindling slam, nobody's going to argue with it. But if you didn't get a dwindling slam, nobody's going to argue with it. You see what stage of this operation I'm talking about?

You say, "Who or what have you detested?"

And they say, "Sam Jones! Yes sir! And you, and . . ."

You say, “You? How you want that written down?”

“Well, you! You, you know. Bill Smith! You!”

Well, you write it down as Bill Smith, not “you.” And he gets down to the end of the list, and says, “myself.” Well, you take these pronouns and you want to know how the pc wants them written down. You don't challenge them

“Oh,” he says, “Myself! George Smith!”

You write down “George Smith,” and also write down “myself,” because by the time you're sorting this thing out you're going to get in trouble with pronouns. Cons – get the – get the auditor sitting there, see. The auditor says, “Consider committing overts against you.” So this gives you the “myself” Do you get the tangle that comes out of this thing? “Consider committing overts against you.” And you just never come off of it.

So you “Consider committing overts ... Consider committing overts against____. Consider committing overts against____.” You go on down the list and by the process of elimination, wind up with something that slams.

Now, how big does a rock slam have to be? I'm going to – I'm going to – I'm going to put this in immortal fire, engraved and blazing upon the mountainside for the centuries and millennia to come, because I'm tired of answering the question! It gets asked to me almost on an average of twice a week – three times a week; this same question. How big is a rock slam? It's the same thing as: “How long is a piece of string?” How big is a rock slam? How high is the tide? You know? Popular song!

Now, I can tell you that a little dirty needle on the detested person, in spite of anything you have been told by anybody else is not enough to indicate the right one. And if you have bought the little dirty needle, you're probably in trouble.

Now, the possibility is that you can get the thing down to a little dirty needle, and by doing a rapid Tiger Drill on the item, see whether or not the dirty needle expands to a slam.

But nobody has done this and that is not what is indicated and it's a waste of time as far as I'm concerned. Do I make my point? We don't want a little dirty needle. We don't want a little dirty needle. You understand. We don't want one! It means an incomplete list! You hear me? It's an incomplete list!

And if nothing is left at the end of the trail, it's an incomplete list. And if nothing slammed nicely as you went by, it was an incomplete list. And if you didn't get anything, it's an incomplete list. And if your assessment didn't wind up with a proper dynamic or item, it was an incomplete list. Do you – do I make this point? See?

And if the pc is ARC broke or calm, or something, it's an incomplete list. And the pc didn't cognite and say, “Ha, ha, ha! Ha, ha, ha! I knew it'd be a burned-out radiator! Ha, ha,

ha! Yeah, burned-out radiators. Yeah, I never thought of that before. It's a very interesting thing. I had a burned-out radiator on a Ford one time. Aw, burned-out radiators. Pretty horrible!" Even if this pc is the Sphinx type – never says anything, never cognites – when you get that item, when you get that dynamic, when you get that detested person, dat pc gonna cognite. You hear me? Dat pc gonna cognite. He's gonna cognite with cogs flying!

You come on down the line and you say, "Consider committing overts against a game warden. Consider committing overts against cats. Consider committing overts. . . Consider committing overts against _____. Consider committing overts against _____." The pc sits there. And you finally say, "Game wardens." Pc says – you say, "The item – the detested person I got here was 'game wardens.'"

Just make up your mind it doesn't have anything to do with the pc, man. You got that? I mean, that's the simplest test I know of the rightness of all of this. If the pc is interested in it, it'll rock slam. If the pc isn't interested in it, it won't rock slam. If it doesn't rock slam, it isn't it.

Now, how wide is a rock slam and how high is the sky? Well, a rock slam isn't a dirty needle. It isn't a little bzzt, bzzt, bzzt, bzzt. That's never enough.

When you go down that list the first time, you'll see about three items on it go blam! blam! blam! And you say, "Hey! What do you know! Ho-ho!" And when the second time you go down you will see those rock slams centralize on – onto only one item. They're differentiated now and you've got it on one item. And you go by that thing and it goes blam! And you say, "Ha, ha, ha, ha, ha, ha!" See.

And you go on down to the end of the list. You go over the list again; it goes blam! You go over the list again, and it goes blam! Same item. Go over the list again; it goes blam! In the event you ARC break the pc and upset it, why, of course it won't go blam anymore.

Well, I catch these things very easily as a bra – with the brass-ring tactic. If I go over it enough to have only one item going blam with a rock slam, and dat's da brass ring. And I put it right in the pc's nose right there. And I say, "That's it, son," and lead him right on down the track. You got it? And you do it by elimination.

By the time you go over that list the second time you ought to have that thing, man. You ought to have a rope dropped right around its neck. And if you haven't got it, you haven't got it! And you can unsaddle the horse, you can polish up the harness, you can fix up the brightwork, the brass, you can groom his coat, you can wash out of – his mouth, you can brush his teeth and it still won't be the item. You understand?

And right away, as you go down the line, you'd ... I'd go down the thing the second time, I find there's only one thing slamming on the thing, I'd grab it right there. And I say, "This burned-out radiator, now, that seems to be it."

And the pc says, “Ha-ha! I knew that was it! Ha-ha-ha! Burned-out radiators. Yeah, God, I hate them, that's all. Been the cause of an awful lot of difficulty with me, never really looked at it before, but burned-out radiators ... Oh, heh-heh, I'm not at all surprised, you know. Ha-ha-ha! I'm not at all surprised. Burned-out radiators! Ha-ha-ha-ha! I wonder why that's why I'm always having trouble drinking rusty water.”

Pc's interest follows the rock slam, see. So it's inevitable that you – you're going to get – you get both. You got the item. But this pc that just wooden Indians on you to the bitter end, you got nothing. You can go on and on and on and on and on.

Now, how many lists of detested persons and things can you do before you finally get the item? You do the exact number necessary to find the detested person or thing. You got that? That's how many lists you do. That's a very simple answer to a very burning question. You do it till you get it.

Now, do you put on it the second time you do it, the things which it already ain't? No, you leave those off. You drop them in the spittoon or the cuspidor and let them splash gloomily. Because if they weren't on it the first time – if they weren't it the first time, they're not going to be it the second time.

Of course, there's also no substitute for having the pc in session or for auditing or for watching the meter. There's no substitute for those things.

But the odd part of it is, the pc can be halfway ARC broke and you can still get this thing. It's almost impossible to keep him from being interested in it. It's almost impossible to keep him from slamming on it.

Later on, when you've bled everything down and so forth, you come back to this burned-out radiator – it may not slam. You may have to prepcheck the thing like mad and even then it doesn't slam; it just dirty needles. It's now past history, do you understand. It's past history. Who cares? Who's interested in it? There's no slam on it. PA no longer interested in it. PA no longer interested in it. Don't slam. Got that?

Now, we go through the same old routine from there on. Only we want to know what represents a burned-out radiator to the pc, or what a burned-out radiator represents – I just don't seem to care which – and we're going to get a list of that and we're going to get lists of that and we're going to list that. And that should or should not produce a dwindling slam. We don't much care whether it does or not. If it does, why you're in.

Something weird might have occurred. You might have hit the dynamic; you might have hit something or other, but such luck won't happen to you. You're going to find the dynamic now.

Now, “What part of existence does a burned-out radiator represent?” is the best one to find a dynamic with. That's a good one to find a dynamic with. “What part of existence – what

larger part of existence does a burned-out radiator represent?" Well, "big burned-out radiators" is liable to get a ...

Now, PR give you a rule: Don't put "a burned-out radiator" on a list from which "a burned-out radiator" don't – if you're making a list from burned-out radiators, don't put "a burned-out radiator" on that list, you hear me now. Don't put it on that list! I don't care if the pc gives it to you, thank him effusively and just leave it off the list! Because it's going to slam again and that's going to give you no item!

Knuckleheads. Several of you have done this, you know! And you wind up with the first dynamic as the detested person and the first dynamic as the dynamic and the first dynamic, you see, as the item, and you ... Where have you progressed to? You have progressed to the detested person or thing. Now you list goals against it, you haven't got the dynamic, you haven't got the item, so of course you're never going to get the goal. You got it?

So, that's a rule, see. Never put what you're deriving from on the list you are deriving from it. See, if it's – "a burned-out radiator" is the detested thing, well then, don't put "a burned-out radiator" down as what "a burned-out radiator" represents, you hear. Don't do it. Just omit it.

Now, your dynamic list is assessed out, with "Consider committing overts against . Consider . . ." The same rules apply. Go down – the second time you go down through the thing, the thing ought to be slamming. If it isn't slamming, junk the whole thing, throw it away, get the pc in-session, do something, but get the item on the list. You see, it's again the incomplete list, is your main difficulty.

All right, and when you finally got that one sorted out, why the same rule of cognition applies. Only much more so now. The pc says, "Ho-ho-ho! Ho-ho-ho! Yo, yo! Sepulchers! Ho-ho-ho. Ho! Damp sepulchers, you know! I was always frightened of them when I was – children. Ho-ho! Yeah, yo, yo, yo, yo. With black interiors, yes, I was always frightened of them. You don't suppose that has something to do with the fact that I don't like to look in my hat?"

See, thing's slamming, pc's interest there, everything is fine. Pat him on the back and hurry on, man!

Now, you're going to list that thing. Now, by this time you ought to be producing dwindling slams, see. From the dynamic to the item, for sure, should produce a dwindling slam. I'm sure of my ground there. I know darn well that one will if it's the right dynamic, when you procede from it to the item, it'll produce a dwindling slam.

And a dwindling slam starts wide and winds up and gets narrower and narrower. And every time they put one on the list, you have a narrower slam. And a lot of people think if it

turns on on the fourth one and the eighth one and the twelfth one, and it's still slamming when they wound up, that's a dwindling slam. No, that's a wrong item – wrong; everything is wrong.

See, a dwindling slam starts wide and goes narrower for each item. And you say the next item and you got a narrower slam. You say the next item – if the pc gives you the next item – it's when the pc says it, by the way. And the next item and it's narrower. And the next item, it's narrower. And finally it's a little dirty needle, and finally you bleed it down and that's it, and that's all, that's a complete list, and by God, your item is always on that list – always. Now, it's “Consider committing overt,” and that's done by “What represents____,” you know? “What does a black sepulcher represent to you?” see? And here we go, and it's done down to whatever the item is.

“Consider committing overt against____.” This next list that you derived from that – bang! One of them's live. The second time through, the rock slam has settled down. There it is, bang. And there you've the thing and you've got “a coffin nail.” And you say, “There we go, man! We got “a coffin nail” and that's it, and it slammed. And it's the only thing on the list that slammed.” Well, it doesn't matter if that slam is an inch wide – quite ordinarily is only an inch wide – inch and a quarter wide, inch and a half wide, two inches wide, three inches wide, four inches wide, or a dial wide, or a quarter of a dial wide, or a third of a dial wide; but it's a slam. Doesn't matter how big it is.

And now, you take that thing, and that is the item. And the pc says, “Oh my God, coffin nails! You know. I've always associated it with cigarettes. And, by the way, all I remember is in 45 when I first heard them called that, is all of a sudden they give me a terrible cough. Cough! As a matter of fact, and so forth. Cough and – and cough-cough and – and so forth. And the coffin nails, cigarettes, and so on and uh – so on. I've thought about these coffins in China that they were taking tops off the coffins and so forth, and I thought that's a pretty good idea, and so forth. They ought to leave the nails out because what if you got buried in this thing, and you couldn't get out of this thing, and so forth. And do you know that that very closely associates to the whole subject of necromancy? Do you know that necromancy's a very, very interesting subject. Have you ever been interested in necromancy? I myself have been very interested in necromancy from time to time. As a matter of fact my father one time or anoth ... The last time when I was audited at the HASI, I had an awful lot of things that had to do with necromancy. I remember now, and they now all fade together, and so forth, and that's just fine . . .”

You get the idea? See, the closer you get into that item, the more the pc is interested, man.

And he – then he says, “Well, us coffin nails are very often. . .” so forth.

He'll start to get oppterm trouble, you know. He's against coffin nails, he is coffin nails. Some of them are coffin nails, that's all – slam like mad against coffin nails, but they

think of themselves as coffin nails, don't you see? And some of them: "Those damn coffin nails over there," and they never even come close to those coffin nails, you get the idea. Sometimes they're never close with the item.

All right. That's it. Now you list goal one – "What goal would be an overt against and that's a dwindling slam, all the way down to dirty needle and so forth, and there it is. And very often you're lucky and the goal is on it. But the actual fact is the goal is most likely to be in the first few goals on list six. So, you do list one; you do list six. Fix up list six; you haven't got the goal. Dandy. Let's then write up list two, list three, list four, list five. Let's get some more goals written on these other lists, and then let's cross-index it, and so forth. And the pc very often, if you're lucky, will start putting his goal down on every one of those lists, that's it.

He says, "Well, I hate to, but you know I'm really – act like I'm trying to sell you this goal, but in the actual fact it does belong on that list, you know," and so on. And he puts it on down and you check it out and that's it.

Now, that's if you're lucky; if you're lucky, if you have altitude, if you are considered by the pc to be a good observer, if you have altitude with the pc, if you are the auditor, if you are in control of the session, if you can run a meter, if you are running very smooth Model Session, if you do this thing very flawlessly – if, if, if, if, if, if, if – and if that morning you got up and found your shoes in the exact right place and the laces were untied, and so forth, why, and there was nothing in them – you got the pc's goal. Got that? That's how you do it. That's a Dynamic Assessment.

Now, undoubtedly this can be groomed up. Undoubtedly there are various things we will learn. Undoubtedly this pattern can be expected at one time or another to change. But there are substitute patterns by which to do this already in existence which are not as good as the original pattern.

Now, if I can't find any of these items, why I would write up a list, "What do you wish wasn't part of existence?" And then getting the pc oiled up, ask him, "What isn't part of existence?" Go on down the line, and treat that as an item.

Well, you should test out such a thing and try to list what represents what you found as "What wasn't part of existence?" Try to treat it as something else. If you get a dwindling slam as you list "What represents it?" why, dandy. Marvelous. You're going to wind up with a more pertinent item, don't you see.

Now, there's even another dodge which I have worked on recently, which is quite interesting, and is apparently quite good. It's not the one I've been telling you about, about the Tiger Drill button, "Would your goal – ," something or other. It's possibly not as fruitful as the other one – although that has found goals. See, "Would your goal frarumph (item)?" See?

“Would your goal suppress (item)? Would your goal not suppress (item)? Would your goal – ?” and a couple that you've thrown in, see. Whatever those buttons are, the item, see.

Now that'd give us a list of goals that would do that, see. It'll rock slam, by the way, when you find it – give us a list of goals that will do that – and you're liable to find the pc's goal.

The more a pc rock slams, the harder and more frequent the rock slams, the harder the rock slam is to turn off, the harder it is going to be to find the goal. That has been turning out to be true. If the pc is a rock slammer from away back, that darn goal has got to be exactly on the button; it's being avoided by the pc and it's rather rough to get there.

So anyhow, as far as rock slams go, there is the – there's the criteria. It doesn't necessarily hold true that you won't be lucky and the pc won't be lucky and won't get it on the list earlier, because you very often may. But nevertheless that sort of holds true.

Now, the other thing is – the one I've been working on is – “Who or what would oppose (item)?” Just do a list of who or what would oppose item.

Go over the list, you're is going to get one that slams, and that is the opposition terminal to the item, and ask the pc what goals that opposition terminal has, because that opposition terminal is the pc's terminal.

Sneaky, and it apparently, at first glance, has as much validity as the item. Interesting, huh? It's “Who or what would oppose ____ (item)?” That's how you list it and then you assess it by “Would (it) commit overts against ____ (item)?” And it's going to slam – one of them is going to slam; follows the same rule – and you wind up with an additional item, and you can ask “Who or what – what would be its goals?” or “What goal?” and then also “What goal would make it become what it is?”

In other words, there's a new way of stripping goals out. I'm still working on that end of the line. That's the latest work I've done on it and it seems to be very, very productive. Okay?

It doesn't change anything else you're doing. It's just an additional step that if you're having a rough time, why, try that one and that's marvelous. Okay?

All right, I brought you up to date on this subject. And there's no substitute for two things – no substitute for two things: There's no substitute for finding goals and there's no substitute for your being a good auditor.

Thank you very much.