3GA DYNAMIC ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on
16 August 1962

Well, I had a previous lecture engagement. That's why I'm just a little bit late. I have to keep the children posted on the adventures of the famous Sussex witch, Ermaltrude Godhelpus. And I've just been… So if I happen to throw some spells out to the left or the right while giving this lecture, why, you'll know why.

All right. This is lecture one, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And, what's the date?

Audience: Sixteen August.

Sixteen Aug, AD 12. You said it.

The subject of this lecture is Dynamic Assessments.

Now, we have made a slight improvement in processing lately. I hope you won't object too much to the change. I hope so. Because I know that you don't like change ordinarily. I know this is a very bad thing, but I'm sorry that I had to introduce this change. It reduced finding a goal from two hundred hours to four hours or something like this. So that's the maximum on the minimum, see, the span and so on. So I hope you'll find it in your heart to tolerate the change. The motto of this is: If you can't beat it, join it, see?

Ever since we've gotten into goals we have been assaulted by dirty needles, rock slams and other materials which have been very onerous and upsetting to the auditor. And finally, it occurred to me, belatedly, that this phenomenon might be utilizable. In another lecture I told you how it came about, but there's other mechanics connected with this and decided that we had better do Dynamic Assessments by Rock Slam.

By doing a Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam, if done properly, you have a possibility of finding a goal in four hours. And, if you don't—why, you've still got a possibility of finding it in eight, ten, fifteen, you see? It's a little bit different, isn't it? Well, that was the one point of holdup that I could see along the line of very broad clearing. This all comes out of a specific program—if you have fifty people in a group and you've got two Saint Hill graduates running the group or there are four or five Saint Hill graduates in a Central Organization and they're supposed to find all the goals of the people there in the group or as they walk in the front door, you can readily see that arithmetically, you would have to practice mitosis more than auditing. And if a Saint Hill graduate is merely going to supervise clearing and supervise listing and not do the listing themselves—they therefore could cope with this activity—providing they could find a goal in a small enough period of time. So that has been the target of this.

Now, the most difficult goals to find were those goals of people who constantly dirty needled and rock slammed. And this becomes relatively easy now—that's one of the easier ones to spot. So the hardest to find becomes more or less the easiest to find.

Because some of these cool, calm, collect characters—you're going to have an awful time trying to turn on a rock slam. And with the fellow who's already got one, that's fairly easy— you've just got to find where it's located.

That this sort of thing pays off as far as listing and 3GA is concerned 3GA is getting into the swing—and now that—particularly that you're getting your meter drills down and that the meter drills are being run very correctly, you're making hay. In fact the hay is flying off the fork in all directions and gathering in the stacks. It's quite a remarkable proposition.

Since Monday of this week, two pcs have been listed to free needles in this unit. We produced a second—goal Clear. And we found three goals on pcs that we were about to give up on. Pretty good, huh? You can delete that—we weren't about to give up. But it was about to become much rougher. Now, three goals and a second—goal Clear and two free needles. That's since Monday. You think we're moving?

Audience: Yes.

Now, let me point out something. This is Saint Hill. You've got all kinds of talent sitting around here. All kinds of know—how sitting around here. And if it doesn't know, I'll jump them, you know. And you've got all that sort of thing. Well, you got to be good enough to run all this on your own. See?

Now, you go off someplace and do a Dynamic Assessment and get a goal in some fashion that winds up with the wrong goal ... I was standing the meter manufacturer's hair on end today with the horrors of finding a wrong goal. It's horrible. Don't ever kid yourself. You're used to running somebody on the wrong process for a while and it was all right. Man, you run somebody on the wrong goal—and, oh brother! You see, all gods have two faces—for every positive there's a negative. And just as you can phenomenally, fantastically increase somebody's IQ and ability, so you can pull the floor out from underneath him—not the rug, the floor, see—in almost that exact ratio. It is reparable. Actually, it is a little harder to make him worse than make him better. And you can repair it. But remember, that it is a very rough proposition—very, very rough. You see less of it, but you see enough of it to stand your hair on end if you're keeping your eye open.

Somebody all of a sudden—his ears are about three and a half inches further back than they have been normally and he looks about 29 years older than he has for a long time and so forth. Well, somebody's just found the wrong goal of it and messed it up in general. And somebody's perseveringly listing him in the wrong direction and out the bottom, don't you see. Or he had a right goal, they didn't check it out and now they're trying to do something else, and they're no longer listing on the right goal, see? And these things are quite catastrophic.

Now, the auditor's skill is tremendously challenged right from the first fundamentals of auditing. Not from any new—brand—new skill that you'll learn at Saint Hill. But the fundamentals of auditing are what are challenged. Can you hold a pc in—session? Can you keep him interested in his own case and talking to the auditor? See? How is your TR 0, 1, 2, 3, 4? Well, it may have been good enough to security check somebody—but let me tell you that when the traffic starts to get some load, you know, and there's—the lines start loading up, those weak spots start blowing out. We almost released an auditor here. Well, I had quite—everything—was quite happy about this particular auditor, and all of a sudden this auditor ran into a rough spot. I mean, the pc just started blowing out at the edges—pc probably had the goal on the list and was very anxious and ARC breaky and so forth. And it just took that much more control—that much more good auditing. They had to look a lot more like an auditor and do a lot more like an auditor in that given situation, than they had ever dreamed that they would have to.

Well, all these things are consequent to having cracked the riddle. The riddle is the basic purpose of any given cycle. And the basic purpose of a man is the same, more or less, as the basic purpose of the universe. In other words, the universe has a basic purpose and so does a human being's reactive bank and difficulty have a purpose. It hits a purpose—a basic purpose at the bottom of it which if dismayed causes all the rest of it to go to pieces.

All right, well, we have our hands on that. It's quite an important thing to have your hands on. Now, that it requires you to look more like an auditor and act more like an auditor and do more and better auditing, is almost incidental. We can measure up to that and we can do it if we recognize the necessity of it.

The pc's state of mind when he's coming up toward a goal—toward finding a goal, he wants his goal—is closer to the razor edge of ARC breaks than at any other time in his auditing career. When he was going nuts because his grandmother was about to divorce him or something, that had nothing to do with it. The nervous breakdown which he went through while working for the Lumbago Iron Works, that has nothing to do with it, you see. He really feels in a frantic state. He starts moving in on his goal and he gets close to it.

Well, I'll show you how far away from the goal the ARC break and upstet [upset] commences. Actually when a student arrives here at Saint Hill, they start quivering in the direction toward their goal. And actually, the longer they spend on rudiments and Havingness and Prepchecking and so forth, they "Ya—ya—ya—ya—ya! I got goals! See, I got goal." And they act more ARC breaky than a—than pcs would in an HGC any day of the week. You know? It's fantastic, the high mental tension. Well, that's just occasioned by this same thing. They're approaching—they know they're approaching solution, fait accompli, as far as their case is concerned and heh—heh—heh, it gives—it gives with nerves, it does.

All right. To accomplish this activity then, rapidly—to find the basic purpose rapidly—allowing a minimum of time in which the person—during auditing I'm speaking of, not during training—during auditing toward and directly toward his goal—the individual going in the direction of his goals should go there fairly rapidly. And this factor stood solidly in our road—is that the longer it took, the less likely it was. And, you can still write that down as a stable datum: The less time it takes to find the goal, the more certainly you will find it. Not the—not the reverse necessarily—if the goal is very easy to find, you'll find it quickly. If we put that into a Russian translation machine, it would come out that way and that's the wrong way, you see. It's—the fact is, that the fact that it's found swiftly causes it to be found positively. The longer it takes to find a goal, the more difficult it is to locate.

So therefore, the demand was on a very sharp and certain process which would make it possible for the individual in the minimum length of time to find his goal. Now, this doesn't overthrow 3GA and, therefore, you haven't seen this under the heading of a new thing—like 3GDN or something like that, see? You haven't seen a new designation come out on this. And that's because, basically, you're doing all the steps of 3GA. And I want to hold that to your attention. It is much more difficult to find a goal on somebody who hasn't listed his goals. Because the whole bank will be charged up on the subject of goals, and you're not going to get more rock slam—you're just going to get more suppression.

So, for my money, it is highly desirable and I wouldn't want to tackle anybody who hadn't been prepchecked so they could stay in—session—who hadn't listed 850 goals or so—I wouldn't want to tackle a Dynamic Assessment on that individual. Now, you could go to all sorts of shifts if you wanted to in the finding of somebody's goal, but those fundamentals still remain. We want a list. We want that—we want the bank discharged on the subject of his immediate goals. He's going to give you the solutions to all of his present time problems, don't you see—and you'll be falling all over these things, and so forth.

So let's just carry on as I've given you 3GA. And then let's turn around and not bother to null that 850 list. Let's cut right in through the dynamics and let's chase that rock slam right straight on down and let's pick up the first available goal that we can get on the track. You'll find out that the goal will ordinarily be 1, 2 or 3 goals earlier and still be runnable—this is just a prediction—than if you had pulled it off the first list he gave you. In other words, we're undercutting a couple of GPMs. That's one of the tricks here that might go unnoticed. And yeah, you can find as many as two goals without turning off the rock slam and actually list them out and make the pc feel a bit better and everything is fine. A bit better—hell! Make him feel marvelous! And they still get the goal you would have found by Dynamic Assessment sitting there and it could have been available and grabbed by this system the first time you assessed them. That's worth observing.

Now, we'll know more about this in due course, with more data to hand.

But the method used then depends on having a pc who is sessionable, auditable, that is to say, and who's got a nice long goals list so that goals aren't too charged up. And then depends on the skill and meter reading of the auditor in doing Dynamic Assessments by Rock Slam.

Now, let me point out to you that we're doing … This is right—all about Dynamic Assessments now—all right. Let me point out to you at first crack out of the box that this is not the same Dynamic Assessment that we have been doing—it is Dynamic Assessment by Rock Slam. Used to be change of characteristic. Well, that is good enough and ordinarily would lead you into a rock slam and undoubtedly would have value. And you'll find that many of your findings by rock slam concur with somebody else's findings by change of characteristic. As a matter of fact, you saw this happen in the demonstration last night in spite of the fact that it had been run. Heaven help us! Now that change of characteristic there was relatively valueless because he wouldn't have found it again. So, frankly, by rock slam is a much more positive Dynamic Assessment.

Now, I maligned my poor pc last night when I said that—you notice I didn't use his list. Well, as a matter of fact, we probably will be using his list because I'm giving you a new expanded Dynamic Scale. And we'll take the dynamics and we'll expand it out, and it'll have maybe about twenty items on it. It'll have the main dynamic and some subdivisions.

Now, I learned this the hard way last night at about ten minutes of three. I don't have too much time to get my various research auditing in; and of course you're driving me very hard—you're walking all over my heels as a matter of fact. And, I—to be very factual and to be sure of my data—why, I've got to audit pretty fast and furious to get the thing squared away. And the session which I gave Reg last night, you heard me say it's not a textbook session, you know. You did hear that, didn't you?

Male voice: Uh—huh.

Well it's as much of a pilot session as anything else, you know. Of course I knew exactly, by theory, what I was looking for. But as far as what ramifications are introduced into doing this operation of dynamic, you know, and all written up in a nice schedule and beautifully packaged and all the warning signals all lying there—little flags pop up and hit you on the nose—these are not present in this activity. See, by theory it's dead easy, see. All you do is run down the rock slam and pull the goal that discharges the rock slam and you've got the guy's goal. See. That's all.

All right. But how do you do it? See, I've got you to worry about. See, I—it's not enough that I can sit down, you see, and audit, you see. I have to think about your auditing too, you know. I'm going to get bowed down in an auditing chair—before I am—all these auditors on my back. Get downright round—shouldered. Because the truth of the matter is, is I don't have to—if you see, it would be relatively easy if all I had to do in auditing was just understand what I was doing and resolve the pc's case. See, this is dead simple, if you want to collide with it.

I've got to understand what I am doing in auditing—understand it much better, communicate it with a decent degree of clarity and then correct what everybody else didn't understand, see. This is an entirely added activity, so you don't wind up with a bunch of intuitives. And this is very hard on me, if you don't—if you don't mind my saying so. I'm not trying to act like the victim, but it cuts out my intuitive auditing. And, you know, I'm going to go all out of tune one of these days. You know?

I used to audit by intuition and what not on occasion, you know, and say, "Wow, what do you know, you know, I'll bet! Is it? Oh, it is! Oh, oh, well, ha—ha—haw." And there'd go the guy's case. You know? That kind of thing. But there wasn't any explaining it. See? All right. That is to say, intuition without language meant there must be a deficiency in my own understanding of it, if I couldn't communicate it. So everything I've been doing has to be analytically understood. It's all got to be up on the surface. It's all got to be communicable.

None of these factors can exist in it; every one that does exist, why, other people get in trouble.

Long since I rather disabused myself of suddenly stepping up and saying, "Well, that's very easy—all—I get it now, all you do is intuitivize and the pc gets well." And I've lost hope—people don't. Well, I don't know why this is. I haven't even bothered to explain it. But the other is successful. And so you take a successful route. And I will say this, because I have to articulate what I'm doing, I come to understand a lot more than I ever cared to find out about it. You get the idea? And I have to study it and understand it and make further advance on it than I'd originally thought I would. Do you get that bonus factor which keeps adding in all the time? Well, that of course catalyzes and drives forward the research. So far from being victimized by you, I'm of course considerably assisted by you. Because very often when you in the majority don't understand something well enough—well, I have to step back and say, "Hey, wait a minute, maybe it isn't understood," you know?

Somebody said the divine doubt was the beginning of all wisdom. It's very true. You know, Kipling—Kipling had that, "If" When you can hold up your collar studs when all about you, you know, are losing theirs and blaming it on you. Whatever that was. Anyway ...

Well, you know that there isn't anything to holding your nerve and course when everybody about you is doubting and blaming you—there isn't anything to this. There's a much more fantastic level of approach. If you can doubt yourself, too, while all about you are doubting you, and still carry through, why, you see—you'll be an auditor, my son.

And I have to decide every once in a while that there's some part of this I don't know anything about. And whenever I decide that, why, you get a rather interesting advance into the situation because a new piece of understanding turns up, a new polka—dot piece of the puzzle suddenly shows up and so forth. I suddenly cease to think that you are all being very, very stupid, you see, and it suddenly dawns on me that I might be either uncommunicative or kind of dull myself And at that moment, of course, I'll start looking hard.

When you've had as much trouble as you've had over the last year or so with dirty needles—we didn't follow through this particular course of action on Dynamic Assessments of me deciding that you were having an awful time and that I wasn't having this time and so forth. No, I decided I'd make it easier on all of us because I've run into dirty needles too, see? I'm right in there with you. I've read them with a magnifying glass, and at great cost of eyesight and midnight oil. I have read dirty needles which finally turned out to be meter interference.

And you needn't feel too bad about reading a meter because the manufacturer of the Mark IV, this afternoon, had to be furnished a magnifying glass and almost smash his nose on the front face of one of these things to realize that it had a considerable amount of noise in it. It was jittering like mad, a particular meter that I had up there. It was just whizzing at a great rate. And he thought it was dead still, even under a magnifying glass and everything—until I pointed it out to him and he finally said, "Well, yes, it is pumping, isn't it." But first he said, "Well, it's just smoothly rising." "No," I said, "that is jittering; there's noise on that." And I moved it over into the Set pattern over here and carefully moved it down so he could see exactly on both sides of the needle blade, gave him a big powerful magnifying glass and let him look at it for a while. It took him the longest time to see that that needle was vibrating. It was very plain—you or I would have seen that it was vibrating by just glancing at the meter, see. Nothing wrong with his recognition; but it wasn't a trained recognition. He builds the things.

All right. Now, having this much trouble with a dirty needle brought about various other observations which brought about this fact—that we never really had much trouble with dirty needles till we had something to do with goals. Hmmmm! Here's an interesting coordination. Never had any trouble with them, all of a sudden we start assessing for goals and we have trouble with them. Well, I decided we might as well look in this particular direction. I particularly learned what it was.

After all, a dirty needle is just a small rock slam and a small rock slam is what you get when you get a "Fail to reveal." And therefore, if a goal is a "Fail to reveal," why, it must underlie a big rock slam. And furthermore, if the goal is an overt against one or another dynamics, it of course, will react as a big overt, which is a rock slam. And all you have to do is find the dynamic it is an overt against—and then list the parts of the dynamic and find the rock slam on that and then list the goals and then find the goal that rock—that goes down the list and makes the rock slam cease and peter out. You just list goals until you got no rock slam or until the rock slam isn't riding there steadily. You can assess that goals list and having assessed it you will find the person's goal on it. Quite interesting, isn't it?

In other words, you're tracing a series of overts against a dynamic. And that's all you're tracing. And the person has those overts against that dynamic—not because he has overts against a dynamic—that isn't the genus of the goal. It's because accidentally what he postulated is particularly an overt against that dynamic. You must learn this very well. It is not an intentional fact that he's all messed up with that dynamic. Now, listen very carefully here. It's not an intentional fact.

Spiders, as far as he's concerned analytically, he can take them or leave them alone. He doesn't want to have anything to do with spiders and yet his goal, peculiarly, is aimed at the heart of all spiderdom. He does! He hates spiders and he mopes on the subject of spiders and he gets a big black eye and turns on a rash around his medulla oblongata every time he sees a spider, you know? And there's lots of physiological reaction to spiders and so forth. And this is very puzzling to him because in—when he first postulated this goal or basic purpose, he didn't have spiders particularly in mind. You see that?

But then by the structure of the dynamics, he actually can't postulate in this universe a goal or a basic purpose without trodding upon the toes of one or part of one dynamic. It is inevitable that if he acts in this universe he will act against something. No matter what else he benefits—no matter what else he intends—he's still going to act against something.

Now you can work this out. A fellow says, "I'm going to sit out here in the sun and enjoy myself." Now, let's take as innocuous a goal as that. This particular area that he sits down in happens to be a very attractive spot for bees to gather pollen. And after a few bees have crawled over him and stung him, he, of course, goes out and gets himself a can of anti—insecti and blows it about the place, in all innocence. Direct consequence of this goal, don't you see? Not necessarily an intended consequence, but a direct consequence of the goal, you see?

So he's going to lie in the sun and enjoy himself Well, that's dandy. So he goes down to the beach—no bees down there—he goes down to the beach and the sand flies are all around the place. And they don't bother him so much—he hasn't got enough overts by this time really to be bothered—but they sure get over Junior. So he dusts Junior off with a good slug of DDT, don't you see? And every time he tries to lie in the sun and enjoy himself he gets all mucked up with insects.

He goes to a picnic. He lies down in the grass. The next thing you know his mouth gapes open and he's chewing on ants. So he bites up a few ants and spits them out. You see?

And it just seems as he goes on down the track and the trillennia accumulate that he also seems to have been accumulating some native affinity based on the agreement of mutual hate with the insect kingdom. And he never intended to at all. He had no idea of any overt when he first formed up his basic postulate.

But that doesn't mean occasionally, late on the track particularly, when they formed up the overt they didn't have an overt in—I mean—when they formed up the basic postulate—that they didn't have an overt in mind. Sometimes, you see, no matter how innocent the goal is it

will result in some overt—in a chain of overts. But the funny part of it also is, is many of the goals are just basic postulates which are overts per se—they just are overts, that's all.

"I am going—well, I can think of a good game to play! Ha—ha. Ah, I don't know, that was a good, good old planet, no—no worries about it anymore, they elected too many democratic presidents. Ah, billiard—balled—there it is. Oh, well, another—another cycle, another postulate. Well, let's see, what the devil should I do? I've been sitting here for a couple hundred years and it doesn't seem to me to be very productive. Game—I ought to be playing a game of some kind. What would be a good game? Well, somewhere in the universe there must be young girls. I'm sure. Well, let's play a game of messing up young girls. To mess up young girls—that ought to be pretty productive of a game."

The odd thing, the young girls have done nothing to him and he'd done nothing to young girls. He isn't solving any problem. There's no purpose or basic reason for it. It just seems to him that this would be a good game. And he's absolutely right. So whether he intended an overt or didn't intend an overt or even if he particularly wished to avoid an overt—he's going to wind up with a chain of overts—inevitably. Particularly if he wished to avoid one.

I can see it now, you know. He's been hauled off looking at this smoking ruin that was the planet, you know. He's been sitting on this asteroid whizzing about this system and he, every once in a while, sees this smoking ruin down below there—debris is spread out, you know, and everything is sort of charred. And you go near it, you know, and you can still hear the radioactivity fry. In other words, somebody held an election one way or the other; and there's nothing doing back there. You know. There's just nothing. Nothing. That's it. And he goes whizzing around. And he said, "That was pretty grim, pretty grim, to be blown up by that." He's influenced to some slight degree this way although it isn't the immediate source of his postulate. He makes a brand—new postulate and he says, "Never to hurt anybody again!"

Oh brother! Oh, brother! Man, has he had it! This is the sort of a life he leads. He doesn't want to hurt his wife so he doesn't tell her to use Listerine. So he divorces her. Inevitable cycle, you see. He doesn't want to hurt anybody's feelings. He doesn't want to hurt anybody or upset anybody anyway, at all. And he just seems to wind up clobbering them, you know. And he never quite understands how this is. He's the most puzzled man about the whole lot. Not—hurt he has mixed up with no—communicate, don't you see? And that's where he gets messed up.

Well, we're on particularly firm ground thus far. But it was quite a series of discoveries that led us into this very rapid Dynamic Assessment. Now, the Dynamic Assessment, of course, takes advantage of the fact that no matter what goal he dreamed up, it's going to have an overt on some channel. And that you can put down as a stable datum. Any goal will wind up eventually as an overt on some dynamic.

So, if this is the case it can be found if an E—Meter would register, directly, overts. And, yes, it does—an E—Meter can be made to register, directly, overts. And I found out what it was— it's the rock slam. The dirty needle, is the registry of an overt.

Now, let's take the stable datum and the Confusion. The prior Confusion must exist to hold a stable datum in place—not a stable datum, but to hold a fixed datum. To hold a problem in place you must have had a prior Confusion, you know, this kind of thing. Similarly, you have to have a prior overt—it's the same mechanism, you understand. I say similarly—no, it's the same mechanism; I'm just stating it in different words. You got your Confusion and then that's fired, followed by a fixed problem and decisions and so forth. But you've got this mechanism working here whereby your prior confusion—it'll be expressed as an overt or a series of overts followed by a withhold. And your overt is always prior to the withhold.

There isn't ever a withhold which will register on a meter that hasn't been preceded by an overt. Every withhold is preceded by an overt. This is just the geometry of the mind. This is as simple as the laws of gravity—you hold up a fork, you drop it, it falls to the ground. Every

time there is a withhold earlier than the withhold there must have been an overt, otherwise the withhold won't be withheld. You get the idea? I mean, it's just the mechanics of this thing.

Now, any time you want to prove that a rock slam equals an overt, ask somebody for a withhold and watch the meter reaction. Watch very carefully. Take it—on a quite a few pcs if you're having trouble. And ask them for withholds. Withholds. Withholds. Something they failed to reveal. And if your metering is even vaguely anything—you know, you know which side of the E—Meter to look at—you'll see that little bzz—bzz—bzz needle back of those person after person after person, see. So much so that when you're doing Tiger Drills, an experienced operator on the Tiger Drill sees the thing go dirty needle on him, you know, he sees it go bzz. It was—it was going "To be a tiger," bzz. "On this goal is there anything you failed to reveal?" See? Nothing else—why say anything else? You're not going to get anything else unless you get off the "Fail to reveal." Well, you could pull that. But every time you see this little tiny, tiny rock slam—it doesn't matter how big the rock slam is—you've got a "Fail to reveal" back of it. And the "Fail to reveal"—of course, withhold, in other terminology—must have been preceded by an overt.

Well, now, how is this character so hung up in a dynamic? Consider the dynamic he is hung up with as a withhold preceded by an overt, and you'll see exactly what that is, see? In other words, he's hung in something—it is actually quite heavy and massy what he gets hung in. But it's the same law is at—is at the bottom of this; that is, if the individual is hung in something it must have been preceded by an overt against that thing.

We see this entomologist come down and inspect the house for termites. And he has a flat head and he's got his hair combed in a certain way to look like antenna. Most marvelous thing, you know. He's got enough overts against termites that he's finally building his own body into a termite body, see. He's hung up in that valence. We call it a valence.

All right. Similarly, you go around to a lot of undertakers and, man, if they don't—if they don't resemble corpses! I—not bad looking corpses, you understand, they're all well preserved corpses. Very well preserved. And no matter what their basic goal was or what they would assess out on the dynamic—they'd probably assess out something else—you can see this mechanism in the current lifetime, you see? You see little shadows of this mechanism.

Now, it goes from just a slight think—think. We get the guy on the meter and we say to him, "Are you withholding anything?" And the needle goes bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz, a little tiny, tiny, tiny rock slam, dirty needle rock slam, simultaneous meaning—similar meaning, same thing. So we get this little bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz. Now, we say, "Are you withholding anything? Are you not revealing something?" We don't care what it is, see.

And he eventually breaks down and he tells us, "Yes, I—I thought when you sat down in session that you were in need of a shave." And the thing clears up, boom.

We don't notice that he's given us two in one. See, he's given us the overt which clears the withhold. Get the idea? We can see that all the time. That's just on little thinks and that sort of thing, you know. He said, "I had an overt thought and that is what I am withholding." He'll give you this all in one scrambled package. You see? And we'll see that bzz—bzz—bzz disappear. There it is. Unless, of course, he's got some other bzz—bzz—bzz and he was withholding something else. But there that goes, don't you see—bow, gone. Isn't anything more to that.

All right. Now, how about the fellow that we say ... This guy has really—has really been at it, you see. This guy has—every time we get a Coke, see, and we take a couple of swigs out of the Coke and set it down in order to make a phone call or something like that, it disappears, you know. We're just not ever able to finish a Coke. If we ever set a Coke down it vanishes. And this is a hanging mystery with us—is what happens to our Cokes. You see?

And we get this guy in session and we say to this fellow, "All right, is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it goes bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz. And he says, "Well, I failed to reveal that you needed a shave. I thought that when I came into session."

And you say, "All right, thank you. Is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it goes bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz. "Well, what was that?"

"Well, actually just before the session, why, I—I had a—well, I—I—I thought maybe—maybe your TR 1 wasn't so good."

And that disappears for a moment and we say, "Is there something you have failed to reveal?" And it says bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz. And we say, "All right, something else you've failed to reveal?"

And he says, "Well, yes—yes, there's something else I failed to reveal. I thought that you were a pretty poor auditor in the sessions you've been running lately. I've been looking at your pcs and they're all caving in—that's what I thought." And that clears up.

And we say, "Is there anything you've failed to reveal?" And it goes bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz—bzz. Oh, nuts.

What's happening here? What's going on?

This guy's got a God—awful overt, see. He's got repeated overts—actual overts, so, of course, the thing doesn't clean. And the little—little rock slam persists. And every time he even slightly withholds something or thinks something critical he keys in this big one. See? So it's all charged up from this.

We finally prepcheck day in and day out, week in and week out, sweating it over, wearing out the linoleum with CCHs, Prepchecking, sweating so; and finally one fine day we're particularly gifted and we happen to mention accidentally, "Have you ever stolen anything?" and the thing falls off the pin. Goes into a big slam—acts up, slam disappears, the needle won't register on instant reads, nothing. This meter is sort of shorted. We test the leads. It still does it. "Ever stolen anything?" you know.

And all of a sudden he turns kind of a beet red and he says, "Oh, I did mean to tell you, the last month or so every time you had a Coca—Cola I hung around—it was just a joke, you know, I mean—I picked it up before you could finish it."

And it cleans up and that is the end of it. And you have no more bzz—bzz—bzz, except when he has an immediate withhold. Then we get the bzz—bzz—bzz, and you say, "Is there something you failed to reveal?"

And he says, "Yes, I wanted to move my feet and I didn't."

And you say, "Thank you very much." And it's gone and it doesn't recur. You get that as an expanded mechanism here.

All right. Now, let's just expand it a little further, see. Every time we mentioned Papa he said, "Oh, my father actually did me in and my father has often done me in—as a matter of fact my father was a professional do - me - iner. He lived only for that purpose and he was very gifted."

And we find out he embezzled the old man's bank accounts and ripped the transmission out of the old man's car. And, we finally trace it back to using the old man's pipe habitually for making soap bubbles and then never telling him, always carefully wiping it off and putting it back on the rack, see. And we finally run this one out.

But all during that time we're getting a bzzzzz—bluow—blzzzz! All we do is mention his father, see. Bluzzzzzz—bzzzz! We want to turn it on, all we'd have to say to him is one of two things. "Have you done anything to your father?" That would turn it on. Or just abandon doing anything to his father, say, "Get the idea of withholding something from your father." See? Same mechanism is turned on by the two different sources. If he withholds he gets it. See? And if he thinks of overts against him, he'll get it. Either way. Either way you get the same rock slam!

Now, don't get the idea that the overt is a big one and the withhold is a little one or anything like that. They're just blood brothers. See, the same manifestation of different periods on the track. The overt is the commission and the withhold just parks it. That's all. And they register, then, as a dirty needle, a tiny rock slam, a big rock slam, a huge rock slam, a burned—out meter. The order of magnitude doesn't matter, you see. The mechanisms are all the same.

Now, there's another—now, let's look at that. There's another wider line, see. Let's not worry now about Father, let's worry about families. And what do you know, he hasn't—it isn't that he has made a habit every lifetime for several lifetimes of caving in the family. He—that isn't good enough, see. When we start bringing it over the level of families, we're bringing it across a cycle. In other words, it's fortunate for us that these withhold things run, the little light ones are a day or two or three. See? And then the next grade is almost an absolute, it's this lifetime. See? See? It's either a little period or a lifetime or a cycle. Get that? That's quite—quite interesting, you see. It's three grades. There aren't a whole bunch of intermediate grades and that you can be very thankful for. You'll occasionally see a trace of one and think you've got something, but don't worry about it because these three grades are dominant, as there's a rock slam for the cycle or several cycles, you see? It's a cycle magnitude, lifetime magnitude and very finite magnitude. It's days, you know—days, minutes, that sort of thing. After three or four days the guy—the thing the guy was withholding from you three or four days ago tends to key out. It isn't bothering him, see. And what the guy had withholds in, in a lifetime, key—tends to key out at death.

And then we've got the big great—grandpa of all. We've got those which occur as a result of having a basic purpose or basic postulate or goal which directly or inadvertently tremendously affects the family. Let's say the most natural thetan goal in the world—to be free. And then she marries this guy. And then a life goes on and she marries this guy. And, you know, and she—and he marries her—and she, you know—the thetan as him, marries her and so on. And he always wants to be free, you see, and of course every time he frees himself, the family starves to death or something of the sort. And he comes back and they're all lying there—skeletons in the burned cabin. You know, this kind of thing. And this—this thing just is ... See, basically, there doesn't seem to be any connection between these two things. But in all things, that one is the one key line. Fortunately it remains constant—it hasn't got lots of branches. Thank God a thetan is a specialist!

So, see—you see your various sizes of dynamics. Various sizes. You get this—main postulate will be about a dynamic or some major part of it, see? Your goal, see, is against a dynamic or some part of it. It just winds up that way. Or was directly that way. Or tried not to be that way. It'll always wind up this way. C'est la vie. Now, the next—the next size is ... You actually have postulates in ahead of these things, by the way, even on a lifetime basis, you see? Guy says, "In this lifetime I'm going to be good." Hasn't anything to do with his basic purpose, see. "I'm going to be good." His basic purpose is to be free. But this lifetime he says, "I'm going to be good," see? Louses him up, you see, because it's not his basic purpose in life. But he tries to be good during all this lifetime. You can find this lifetime's leading goal—to be good. It won't do you a bit of good. If you ever try to run it, it will beef up the bank, bang!

Now, of these the only runnable things are the overts. The long—haul runnability is all overts. Overts are the main runnability. Withholds are simply the secondary manifestations of the overts. You can directly pull overts all away along the line and practically dispense with

pulling withholds because, of course, as soon as they told you the overt it ceases to be a withhold.

Now, oddly enough, you can turn it around and for the purpose of rudiments you can just pull the withhold and it desensitizes the overt unless you've really put your foot in it. And most of the time you can get away with just asking for the withhold; you just ignore the overt. "Are you withholding something from me?" "Yes, I had a hostile thought." That might even be good enough to clean it. See? It might also leave you with a missed withhold occasionally. But you can pull it just on a withhold basis. You can ask for the withhold, you see, and ignore this overt until it gets too chronic—too messed up and then you're in a mess. Then you've got to ask for overts.

Hence, you have O/W which is a sneaky way of asking only for overts. And the only reason you ask for the W at all is to keep the flow balanced so the pc won't get caved in on nothing but outflow. Let him taste the inflow as well as the outflow and he can run it more easily and better and longer. That's really the reason why you have the W question in overt—withhold. See? That's "What have you withheld?" See?

Well, that's just to reverse the flow—not because you need to ask the question, see? In just the basic mechanics of the mind you don't have to ask the question at all. But for the basic mechanics of energy and stuck flows and the pc getting gummed up, you have to ask it, see? And the mechanics of auditing require that you ask it, but as far as aberratively—if you could just free all those without influencing flows in any way—of course you could just ask for overts. Don't you see?

So the mechanism, then, comes around to the fact that if you can pull the goal—the basic purpose of a human being—it pulls the whole overt line on his chronic targets. And thus wise go bzzzt and renders as nothing, all them overts. And the odd part of it is, you list it by items and he doesn't even count it off as overts in many cases. Smooth as that.

Now, also a person departing from his (quote) main goal line (unquote) is susceptible to alter—is, counter—postulate, resistance and all the kinds of other mechanics proceed from this particular action. And that he's unfaithful to himself when he disobeys that basic purpose is the main source of aberrative consequence.

But taking that—moving off into the mechanics of the thing, moving off into the energy phenomenon, mental energy phenomenon—all these various kinds of things. Why, the one thing that holds true through all these things is an overt chain. See, it was never intended to be an overt chain in most cases. But it became an overt chain and is therefore discoverable by the phenomena of rock slam. Now, you see this thing all knit together neatly now? You got it?

So all you have to do is find out which one rock slams the mostest and the most persistently to get the dynamic on which he has the most overts and trace that back. And it will wind you up with a very narrow perimeter—in which he can write down his basic postulates—a list of any one of which might be it. You assess out this hatful—very small number. You wind up with the guy's goal, merely because mechanically you have narrowed the field to such an extent.

Now, at the time you pick up this pc, he is wandering in a cloud. Pretty radioactive at that, see. He's in a cloud, he doesn't know whether he's coming or going. You ask him for his basic purpose and he says it's "to shell spikes, to build catfish, to remove universes from my path, to eat walnuts, to worship God, and to like myself." And in some cases, five thousand goals later, he will be going on with that type of list. In that it takes you one minute to null one goal you don't want them five thousand, nor even one thousand, long. It takes too many hours to null them.

So all this other work is very rapidly done and you come into the small perimeter where you maybe have a hundred or two goals, something on that order, at a guess, that you null by the Tiger Drill. The guy's goal falls out of the hat, the bank's all discharged, it lists like a breeze.

Now, the heavy work, the long work, becomes listing. And accurate listing and keeping the goal cleaned up and so forth. And you're sailing right straight toward Clear.

So with this mechanism and with having worked out this path—this tightrope walk—why, we've got a high road to Clear.

What we need is an auditor sufficiently skilled to do a Dynamic Assessment very exactly, very accurately—know a rock slam when he's looking at one.

But there's one thing that stays very greatly in our stead. You might not be able to read an instant read of one tick, but I defy you not to read a half—a—dial rock slam.

Thank you.