

## PROBLEMS INTENSIVE ASSESSMENT

A lecture given on  
11 October 1961

Okay. Now, we have before us, on this 11th of Oct., the little handy jim-dandy, the Class II auditor's pride. It's called a Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing. And you notice it says Staff Clearing. Staff always gets the best. [See HCO PL 10 October 1961, Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing]

Okay. October 11th, 1961, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is Problems Intensives for Staff Clearing. This is the second lecture on this subject.

All right. Now we take this up, we look it in the teeth and we find that we are looking at basically the Preclear Assessment Form.

And you've been using this on preclears or should have been using this on preclears for a very long time. The earliest edition of this is 1950 Elizabeth and Los Angeles Foundations, 1950. So you're not looking at anything new. This has come a long way, and all that's happened here is we're now using it to resolve the case.

Now, it is of vast information to you and vast importance for you to know what the devil your PC is all about. I have seen an auditor, believe it or not, process a PC for weeks on end and not find out that the PC was having a dreadful time with a court or a child has been taken off by the authorities or something. Now, you'd say that would show up in present time problems.

But it gets worse than this. I have seen an auditor process a PC forever, and not know their right name; not know if they've ever been operated on; not know they suffered from various ills; not know whether they were married or single. We'd say that auditor was running a big not-know.

Now, the basic part of this and the early parts of it right up to section O. but not including section O. if you'll look it over, simply consists of vital information on a PC. And that is all it is, vital information on a PC.

HCO Policy Letter of October 10th, 1961, Problems Intensive for Staff Clearing. Every organization has this under the guise of Preclear Assessment Form, right up to but not including section O. You notice the directions have been modified on this. They've just been deleted a little bit, so I had better say something about when you do this.

If you have a new PC who is brand-new to Scientology, you certainly do one. But if you have somebody you are going to give an intensive to that you have never done one of these things on, you should do one. It gives the PC some little confidence to know that his auditor knows something about him. And that in itself is an interesting factor in holding a PC in session—all by itself.

Now, we see here that it starts out "Who Does the Assessment. The auditor assigned to audit the preclear does the assessment." Now, what does that mean? It means that's his first action. That's the first action the auditor undertakes. He doesn't go in and run fifteen hours of "Create a reactive mind. Thank you. Create a reactive mind. Thank you." He doesn't do that. He sits down and he doesn't do rudiments and he doesn't do anything else; he simply sits down and runs off this form. And he sits there and makes out the form. But it is auditing. It is auditing. It is done in the paid auditing time of the PC, because it is auditing.

And when an auditor gets a preclear that he has not had before, he takes one of these forms, and he fills it out on the PC. Now, why is this?

The PC has a sneaking feeling that the auditor doesn't know anything about him until this form is filled out. And therefore, you have a hard time keeping the rudiments in. But it's because the PC is certain that there is a not-know sitting in the auditor's chair. But as soon as you've filled out this form, then the PC feels that the auditor knows something about him or her, and is happier thereby—feels more comfortable about this. PCs always have certain things that they feel that somebody should know, and those things are pretty well covered in this assessment form. All right.

The assessment form is for information. Auditors' reports are for information. Not your information: they are almost never for the auditor's information. He knows. So if you can read your own writing, that would be for your information if you wrote that way. But it's for somebody else's information. An auditor's report form in a Central Organization goes from the auditor to the Director of Processing, goes from the Director of Processing—very often is inspected by HCO, sometimes—but is certainly forwarded into here, or one copy of it. And in a class of this particular character, you are . . . If I ever see Mary Sue complaining about her eyes and so forth, why, I'm just going to go back and find all the badly written forms and put a curse on you.

You want to know something, and bad handwriting is just another method of running a not-know on somebody. It is withholding the information, writing illegibly. Now, some of these fellows in commerce that we occasionally do business with, you look at their signatures. Look at their signatures. Can you read their signatures? It's a blah, and so forth. And you'll find that fellow has withholds. You look over the letter he has written you, and you wonder how much of that letter is true, how much of it is false. The fellow is withholding information from you, ordinarily.

Now, that's true of all handwriting, and you would be amazed how your handwriting improves after you've got a Sec Check Form 3 flat. There's a direct coordination.

So, it is made to be read, and if it's illegible, somebody trying to check up the case is denied information that might be of value.

Now, we look down the line here, and we find out that we want information on the name of the PC, the age of the PC, and we want the tone arm position at the start of the assessment. Now, this will give us some sort of an idea, as we look this over, whether or not this PC is going to respond to ordinary and routine auditing, because as they give you the answers to this form, they should get some tone arm shifts. And if they get no tone arm shifts, talking about themselves, of any kind whatsoever—oh-oh, oh-oh—this is a pretty desperate situation. You're almost running into a CCH situation when you're doing that.

So that gives you that information. If you carry your tone arm position notations throughout this form, why, you'll be fine.

Now, we have—the first questions are Family, and we want to know this data about Father and Mother and so forth. And this gives us reactive personnel, as you will see here at once. (I'm going to pull this microphone closer to me.)

Okay. You will see this at once, that the individual had very bad relationships with his father, and that you're going to be running into Father, Father, Father, Father, Father. And that he can't remember anything about his mother, and so he's going to be trying to run into his mother, his mother, his mother throughout the auditing. You see what we can divine from that at once.

Now, the next thing that we go into here is the other relatives who are in immediate line. Now, at this stage of processing, if this is the beginning of an intensive—at the first intensive the PC has—you're going to have missing personnel here like mad. Well, should you try to find them? No. Just let it ride. Let it ride. The significant allies of the case are going to be missing, always, during the first Preclear Assessment Form. Great-aunt Agatha, Uncle Bill, the fellow who

made a drunkard out of the PC, you see—he is never going to be mentioned at this stage of the game, if he is aberrative.

Now, if it is known to a PC, it isn't wrong with the PC. If the PC knows about it, it is not aberrative.

Someday you will hear me, and you will stop auditing all these big knowns, and you will start making some progress with cases that is rapid. That's one difference between my auditing and, sometimes, yours.

If the PC knows about it, I pat him on the back, shake him by the right hand, cheer him up and go on hastily to something else.

And you all too often say, "Well, obviously, look here, his father was a drunkard and a jailbird and beat him, he says, every day. And obviously we've got to spend a lot of time on Father." And you do. You waste a lot of auditing time on Father, because Father has nothing to do with the case. How do we know that? The PC knew about it! If the PC knew about it, it doesn't have anything to do with his aberrations.

The only time that crosses up is a hidden standard, but a PC usually doesn't even know about a hidden standard until you start interrogating him.

So, this gives us all of the areas we don't have to monkey with in auditing. You see, it's a negative assessment. We're not going to have to worry too much about these.

It's going to say Family: Mother.

"Mother living?"

"Yes."

And you don't then, of course, ask what was the date of her death. And the PC makes a statement of relationship with Mother.

"Well, Mother was a dear, sweet person. Mother was always very good to me, much better than I deserved—much better than I deserved. She lives with us now. And somehow or another, she keeps the marriage from going on the rocks. She tries. She's nice—nice person," and so forth.

Well, you get trapped into this, you see? You say, "Well, what the hell is this? Some kind of an overwhelm here of some kind or another?" you see? "And just exactly how does this thing stack up?" you say to yourself. "Mmmmmmm-mm. Tries to keep their marriage from going on the rocks—I'll bet!" See, and you actually get trapped into this, because you have a little piece of knowingness that is intriguing.

Well, go ahead and be interested in it, but the PC knows all about this. Well, there are some things the PC probably doesn't know about it, but that will turn up in the line of auditing. But what the PC knows about, we couldn't care about.

Then we get into Father, and we—same thing applies. And the PC says, "Oh, yes, well, the old man died when I was eighteen, and uh . . . so forth. And it was good riddance. Uh . . . he used to beat me every day, and he shot me on Sundays, and uh . . . he's what's wrong with me!" Oh. Well, that's one area we don't have to have anything to do with. Get the idea? It's just negative rundown.

If you were to shake that down, you could find some surprising data in it. And the PC, sooner or later in this particular type of intensives will find very surprising data in it extremely surprising—such as his father spanked him once. Very ordinary. His father beat him every day

and shot him every Sunday and so forth. And you find out the father spanked him lightly once. That's the truth of the matter; see, he's got some kind of a synthetic.

But this is something that's going to come up, sooner or later, and you're not going to have to worry about it too much, particularly if he says that is everything that is wrong with him.

If the PC knows that is wrong with him, and has known that's what's wrong with him for a long time, why has it continued to be wrong with him? See? That's the £156,000 question. Why has it continued to be wrong? Why hasn't it as-is-ed? Well, it hasn't as-is-ed because it isn't there, and it never was there. But it gives us a method of skirting these things. We're not going to take that up. It'll all come out on withholds sooner or later.

Now, Relationships: and there you're going to have missing personnel. And Married—very often you find missing personnel.

Now, there's one thing that may possibly go haywire, is numbers of times divorced on this. That is important to know, because the PC is very often holding this up, and it'll hold up his case. But it's the number of times divorced. Well, maybe he didn't get divorced. Maybe he got married five times and only divorced once. And that would be quite a withhold, wouldn't it? So nevertheless, you fill that in, try to get the data on there.

Any difficulties the PC presently has. Now, that gives you some sort of an idea how many present time problems you're going to have to cope with in session.

And if divorced, the reasons for the divorce and the PC's emotional feeling about divorces. And you had better remember again that it doesn't say how many times he is not divorced, or something of this sort. There might be some sleepers back on the case of some kind or another that never get mentioned. So you better get that question answered very, very well and very thoroughly.

And then Educational Level: This has some interest in the matter. Very often you will find a PC squirming around and telling you that he is not educated and he has never been to school and so forth. And it would actually turn out to be a withhold if you didn't go over it slightly. You every now and then find a PC who's ashamed that he hasn't been educated, and you very often find a PC who is ashamed that he has.

You know, I have a lawsuit I've been very laggardly in filing. It's against the University of Texas and so forth. And these things do come up in education. But I want to claim all of the German courses that Mary Sue had there. I want to claim back the fee and considerable damages, because every time we're around Germans—she's had four years of German, see? And every time we're around Germans—I've only had a couple of lifetimes as German, you see, I've had no courses on it, and I have to order all the beds and breakfasts, you see, and so forth. And I turn around to her and I say, "Suzie, ask the lady to sell us a loaf of bread," you see? And Suzie looks sort of blank, you know? And then finally—I finally get Brot. Let's see, Brot, Brot, Brot. Restimulates hell out of me. After you've been killed in a country a few times, you know, you try to talk its language, you get restimulated.

So, the University of Texas is going to get sued sooner or later on this business.

But you run into oddball angles on education of some kind or another. And if you were processing—well, I think probably if you were processing dear old Mr. Penner out here—he's quite a fireball. He's our bricklayer Tad he's quite a boy. You go out there, and-if the materials are available, and if the East Grinstead merchants have been talked into letting go of something, you go out there and you will see a low wall of bricks—a low wall of bricks being put up—and you go back about a half an hour later, you know, and the wall is over your head. You just never saw bricks throw themselves and plant themselves and get masonried into shape as fast as Mr. Jenner can do it. He is terrific. Right now, I don't know how many cubic yards of dirt they've moved out there this afternoon, and bricks flying in all directions and that sort of thing.

But I don't know particularly that he has a thing on education, but he rather considers, to a slight degree, that he is not educated. And he is likely not to inform you on this subject. And it sort of is a withhold, because you are processing him in some highly intellectual line, see—Scientology, and that would be intellectual.

And then he tries to kind of measure up to all this and he gets into some kind of an impressive fog. You got the idea? And his relationship could be actually twisted and made poor with the auditor if this point wasn't straightened out with such a PC.

Other people, they've had twenty-nine years of education, postgraduate courses and all that sort of thing, and they can't write their name, so they're ashamed too. And they try to say "No. Eve never been to school." But you get a lot of lies in this particular area. And so you'd better get that pretty well straight.

It's not that it has anything to do with whether he can run the process or doesn't run the process, but it's a fruitful subject of withhold. And you'll find most of this is.

All right. And you ask him about his professional life and main jobs he's held, and so forth. You ask him about serious accidents and the date of such, and any permanent damage, and that sort of thing. You ask about principal illnesses, and now you're getting into an interesting zone, because if you didn't know some of these things, you could run into them head-on. You could keep running into engrams of one kind or another that you wouldn't have any information on whatsoever because he never mentions them.

And then you go into Operations. And that's one that you should do briefly. Accidents, illnesses and operations are all subject to restimulation. And you can restimulate the living daylights out of a PC if you start auditing these things as he brings them up. Now, how do you audit them? All you have to do is ask about them. Just ask about them, thoroughly, and he'll be in it. You can throw him, as an auditor, straight into such an incident.

Now, you get somebody out in the Middle West and you ask them if they've ever had any illnesses or operations, and of course there goes the intensive. Don't know if you've ever read any letters coming from the Bible belt, but as I've mentioned before, they read something like what was that quack's name that was arrested down in Texas for practicing medicine without a license? And somebody awarded ten million dollars damages for his having—Morris Fishbein of the AMA. Morris Fishbein, the head of the AMA. This is all true about Morris. He was arrested for practicing medicine without a license. But they actually read like his primary textbook: "How to Get Sick and Go to the Doctor," I think the textbook was called.

And you get somebody started on this, and, my God, here we go. You get some PCs started on this who have a slight strain of hypochondria, and man, they will give it to you blow by blow, and writhe around, and run their havingness down and so forth, and then start on their families' illnesses, and so forth; and then they get to all the mistakes the doctor made, and how the

doctor had to open them up again in order to—in order to recover his nurse, or something. And this can become far too windy.

So your ability to acknowledge is the only way you turn this off. Your ability to acknowledge, in making out this form, must be good and never better than under Accidents, Illnesses and Operations. Your ability to acknowledge—wonderful. And you can say to them, if it doesn't turn off, "Well, you know, we'll be taking up that sort of thing in processing—in the direct processing. We'll be taking that up more directly." That shuts it off. You will, too, because inevitably, if they're going to talk about it that much, they're sort of hung in it. But this is not an auditing moment of running engrams. This is not the engram situation that you are running into.

All right. Now, what do we have here essentially? What do we have as we go down this line but data? And that data can be confused with the auditor— isn't ordinarily; auditors do well

filling these things out. But an auditor's natural impulse is to take these things up with the PC. Well, don't take them up with the PC while doing such a form. That's all. Just don't take them up, that's all. Forget it. Acknowledge it and get off of it and get on to the next line—you got the idea?—without creating an ARC break.

Now, sometimes that is neat. Sometimes you have to be very neat in order to get off of a subject and shut a PC off, because, you see, an ARC break is composed of “not able to talk to the auditor.”

But if you've ever watched a PC talk his havingness down, you'll agree with what I am telling you. They can tank their havingness straight out the bottom, just as nice as you please. Down it goes with a dull thud.

They talk themselves right down the Tone Scale: enthusiasm, and the next thing you know, they're a little antagonistic; and the next thing you know, they're crying; and the next thing you know, they're not talking.

You can watch them. They'll slide right on down the Tone Scale if you don't hold up this. So it's best, in entering these, to tell the PC—this is Accidents, Illnesses and Operations I'm still talking about, E, F and G on this form—it is best to say, “Now, I just want to know these things very briefly; exactly what these things were, very briefly.” And you sort of emphasize this “very briefly,” and you won't run into him talking himself straight back into an engram and finishing his first auditing session with a Christ-awful somatic he doesn't know where the hell it came from. Got the idea? That's a good prevention.

Remember that a PC can talk down his havingness. If you're accustomed as an auditor to ever letting a PC run on and on and on and never stopping him from talking, you are doing him an unkindness. And don't think you're doing him a kindness, because you're not. You're doing him an unkindness. The best thing you can do is to get on with the auditing, but this can sometimes create an ARC break, and so you have to handle it carefully.

And the best way to handle it is to pre-organize it. Don't try to handle it after the fact if it's going to be difficult. Handle it before the fact. So that part of your auditing statement is “Now in the next minute or so, I want you to list for me all of the accidents you have had.” You get that kind of a trick? “In the next minute or so,” you see?

Oh, well, he's put in a sort of a little games condition now, and it's how fast can he do it, and he says, “Well, let's see, there were fifteen automobile accidents and twenty-five bicycle accidents and seventeen times when I fell off of railway bridges. I always seem to be falling off railway bridges. And uh . . . let's see. And that's about all. Ha-ha, I beat you. It didn't even take me a minute, you see?”

Bang. Fine. You got all your data. You write it down.

Any kind of trickery like that is better than letting a PC talk his havingness down. You got the idea? So you get the data without the ARC break.

Present Physical Condition: Once more I refer you to the letters which you might see coming from the Bible belt. This is one of these marvelous subjects.

“Well, I have misery. It's—misery has been going on for a long time.” And you very often will see a PC, very often, just sit back and heave a long sigh, and you're just setting in for a long chat. This is going to be a nice, quiet afternoon we're going to spend And that's not what we're there for at all.

Once more, the “briefly,” the this and that, the inference that we've got to get this listed so that we can get on to the next item. You know, the next item is something else, and we don't care

what the next item is, you see? Briefly, you know: “Let’s get this briefly so that we can get on to the next item. Now what is your present physical condition?”

And they say, “Long after . . . Oh, no. He—uh—she—she really wants to know. (sigh) Terrible.”

“All right. Now how is it terrible? All right. Where are the pains exactly? Inform me exactly what parts of the body,” and so forth.

“Oh, well,” she says, “all over my eyes, my head, my back, and I have athlete’s foot,” and so forth, and so on, and et cetera.

Now, you remember that the PC is on a meter. So at this point, it’d be an artfully good time to look at that E-Meter. Now, we’re not interested much in the E-Meter except for the tone arm, up to the point we get to this H. Is there a withheld physical condition? That we’re terribly interested in. And so we read the needle. And you can put right opposite that H that it’s a little old needle-reading stunt right here.

And you want to know if there are any illnesses the PC hasn’t told anybody about, if there are any worries about health the PC has not imparted to anyone.

PCs sometimes go around thinking they’re dying of some dreadful disease and they never let anybody in on it because it’d be too terrible for others to know—all that sort of thing. And also, and very, very much to the point, “Are there any diseases you would hate to have people know about?” Ah, and you’re liable to collide with a freight train, where it can save yourself one God-awful amount of dodged processing. Just get it right there. Let’s just get any possible withhold on the subject of present physical condition off of this case now. And you’ll save yourself a lot of trouble, because a withhold about present physical condition is one of the most serious withholds there can be on a case.

All right. We come to section I. And section I is Mental Treatment. And it says “List any psychotic, psychoanalytic, hypnotic, mystical or cult exercises, or other mental treatment which PC has had, the date of the treatment and the E-Meter reaction.” And you could very well add to that “any treatment he is now receiving,” and you would get yourself something else.

Now, this, too, you want to shake down with the needle. You want to get any withhold in the area of mental treatment off, off, off.

You know, a person who is withholding the fact that he has been adjudicated as stark, staring insane, is of course sitting on the one withhold that can stop his processing in its tracks. And, right here on this course, there has been an instance or two of somebody continuing treatment while training. And evidently this was not shaken down well, because you find no trace of it in their Preclear Assessment Form in the beginning of their folder. The auditor just did not find it.

Those things are important. Those things are very important during auditing. They’re very important in an HGC. The person gets auditing all day and then has somebody cracking his spine all night while they’re hypnotizing him or something, and you’re going to get no place, man. He’s going to be out of session every morning, going to have a high tone arm every morning. And then it takes about the middle of the morning to get the tone arm down. And then the next morning he comes in and he has a high tone arm again. And about the third time this happens—that he goes off with a low tone arm and comes back with a high tone arm—you can suspect that there’s a withhold on present physical condition or mental treatment, or current treatment. That is the most fruitful source of that particular activity. There is something wrong. There is something going on here. The person is doing something else and they don’t want you to know about it.

Although running Prehav Scales, of course, puts up the tone arm, the usual cause of high tone arms . . . It’s not that a tone arm must not be high. As a matter of fact, they can’t run the

Prehav Scale properly without getting high tone arms, you understand; but I'm talking about the mechanism of the PC is always showing up with a high tone arm. You know, you process a PC for a week, and then all of a sudden for a week the PC only has a reading of five and a half. Well, there's just something wrong in this division. The PC is either physically ill and doesn't want to tell you, or the PC has some bug on the subject of the mind and doesn't want to tell you, and so on, or the PC is actually getting treatment in between your treatments and doesn't want to tell you. So if you shake those things down during the Preclear Assessment Form to get the withholds off . . .

Now, this is not a chatty afternoon over a cup of tea. You're just going to go right to it and you're going to get the withholds off on this subject. Now, he actually won't mind you getting the withholds off on this subject. Be kind of a relief to him, as a matter of fact. If he does have withholds on this subject and if he doesn't get them off, you won't be his auditor. That's it.

But if he does have withholds on this subject and you do get them off, then you of course are his auditor. Obviously. You know about these withholds and nobody else knows about them, so therefore you must be his auditor. Follows, doesn't it?

You know things about him, now, that other people don't know, so therefore that follows, then, that you are the person's auditor. You'll find in-sessionness increases very well if you do that.

Now Compulsions, Repression's and Fears doesn't necessarily follow in that same category at all, and we just couldn't care less. It's going to be of no value to you to know of his compulsions, repression's and fears to amount to anything, except as a gauge of how daffy he is or isn't. And that's the only gauge you're going to get out of that. It's just a measure, and you can already read that off the graph. So you go over that rather rapidly.

And you get down to Criminal Record, and this, too, is a matter of grave interest to us. Because people who have criminal records and don't want us to know about it: that can make a bad show in auditing. So let's, when we get to K, let's once more bear down on the needle, and let's examine that needle very carefully on this interrogation on the subject of crimes, prison sentences, and so forth. And let's make sure that we've got that thing showing up.

It's interesting that I had a letter from a preclear that has gone through London HGC on several occasions over a period of time, and he's complaining about his case gains. He is; he's not blaming anybody. He's not mad at anybody or anything, but he's just written me a letter and asked me to please, can't I tell him why, or do something about it.

And the side note that appears on this thing, of course, is the man has a record as long as your arm. Now, we know that here, but does his auditor know it there? See, that could just account for no case gain, right there in a lump sum, bang! Well now, if each new auditor he had had has not done a Preclear Assessment Form, then he feels he has a withhold to some degree from that auditor, and maybe nobody has ever dug this up in this particular fashion. I haven't followed back the other data concerning this, but that is just of interest, in point.

I very seldom get such letters. My letters are usually quite the reverse. They're "Dear Ron, I just this and so on, and wonderful processing and I feel better, and so on." But this chap—he's just worried about himself, that's all. So we would also have found him under Present Physical Condition, and we would also have found him under Compulsions, Repression's and Fears, and we might have found him under Other Mental Treatment. See, it would all have dropped out of the hamper on the Preclear Assessment Form, had we done one properly and if every new auditor that had the case had done one for himself.

Although I have said you have to write on this legibly, remember it is for you, the auditor, to facilitate your auditing of the case.

All right. Now we get down to one that we couldn't care less about: Interests and Hobbies. This will have no great bearing on a case. It'd be very unusual. Once in a blue moon, he has the hobby of "killing little girls in dark woods" or something like that, but it isn't often, and it has very little case bearing. It, however, can serve as a cross-index to his goals terminal. Not very important.

Now we have Previous Scientology Processing. And this is far too specific. When we list the auditors, the hours, and the E-Meter reaction, and everything else, in the HGC or the Academy. This is just too confoundingly specific. Now, we don't have to be this specific. There isn't any reason to be this specific.

The number of auditing hours he has had, he will seldom recall. The auditors you want to get to on the case will be buried, for the purposes of this preclear assessment. So we press him very lightly in this particular line. Very, very lightly.

So, you would do much better to ask him a general idea. A general idea is what you want, and that's all. Otherwise, you're going to plow up all of his auditing, restimulate all of his auditing; you're going to have to take up all of his ARC breaks; you're going to have to take up all of his ARC breaks and failures with past auditors; you're going to have to take up all of his successes. And you've got another afternoon's activity all mapped out in level M, unless you say, "Well now, briefly, and just in general—just give me some sort of an idea: When were you first processed—some date? And . . . yes. And you had some organization processing, and you had . . . All right. And field auditors?" so on. "All right. That's good," and so on. "Thank you." You know, it's very brief.

The best way to get this data is to run the ARC break process on the PC. And you're not running it at this time. And you'll find all their auditors, and he'll find the auditors that are aberrative, and so forth. But you just want to know how long this fellow has been in processing. And this fellow tells you he's been in processing now for 8,642 hours and so forth. Well, you know he's lying. He hasn't lived long enough. I think it takes one lifetime to get that many hours of processing at some fantastic figure per week.

Now, when you say "List briefly the processes run," man, that's a grim one. You take somebody that's been around since 1951—the number of processes run. In the first place, the PC almost never remembers them, and you've got a big hang-up there, and so forth. So I would say, instead of that—instead of that sort of thing—I'd want to know, "What's been run on you, more or less, that made a change in your case?"

Oh, they'll tell you those glibly, and very rapidly; they can remember those. But those things that have made no change on his case, we couldn't care less. But at the time this thing was first compiled, it was important to know what engrams had been started and hadn't been started, you see? And then this was taken off the earlier form, so it has arrived that way.

And "List the goals attained from such processing." Well, now you've asked him the same thing, if you just asked the one I just gave you. You said, "What processes have given you a change?" you see? Well, that just write them diagonally across the (2) and (3) all at once.

And "goals not attained from such processing" is an adventurous question to ask a PC, but should be asked. And it'd be a very good thing to find out what he has not been able to do about processing; because you'll be able to refer to that later on, and it's part of the O section.

It gives you a clue of coordination. You want to know what he's been trying to do with processing that he hadn't done. He might even give you a hidden standard.

All right. The Present Processing Goals. Now, he's going to give you some brief goals of one kind or another. These are not very important at this particular stage, but you want to know what he's trying to do with processing. But very often at this stage of the game he just gives

you a social response: “Well, I would like to be better,” and that sort of thing. Well, you don’t want anything more than that.

Now, we have a whole section here, which is the ne plus ultra of the whole thing, and we get to what makes this a Problems Intensive. We get to section O.

Now, that was where we wanted to get; that was “where, at, to” we wanted to arrive. And this we are going to do now with the greatest of care. We are going to write this up ad infinitum, and if there are not enough spaces, we’re going to make some more.

Here we have “O. Life Turning Points: List each major change the PC has experienced in life.” And that means his whole life, ever since he was a very small boy or girl.

And of course, you’re going to have the PC giving you—you’re going to see the perfect example of cyclic recall as you do this. So don’t try to ask for a certain period at any given time, because you’re going to get near present time ones, then you’re going to get middle range, and then you’ll get early, and then you’ll get near present time ones, and then you’ll get early ones, and then you’ll get middle, and then you’ll get near present time, and it’ll just go back up and down this way.

But you want to list each one of these carefully, because you are now going to use these for assessment, so they have to be listed with precision. They have to be listed with great precision.

Now, what precision? Well, it’s going to be so that you can say it easily on an assessment. You’re going to have to say this several times. So we don’t want it long, lengthy and long-winded. We want a precise statement, so that’s what we keep asking the PC for.

Major change the PC has experienced in life. And the PC may want to know what you mean by a major change. “Well, when you didn’t any longer do what you were doing and started doing something else; when you didn’t any longer live where you were living and moved elsewhere; when you didn’t any longer have that state of health but had another state of health.”

“Ah, well, oh, well, you mean—you mean . . .” and he’ll tell you something else.

All right. Well, we’ll get those changes and you take that up very carefully and then get these changes this way:

“Uh . . . well, after I had an operation for goiter, I found out that I couldn’t go out as much.”

So you put down “operation for goiter.” That’s all you write. Major change point. Then, “All right. What was another major change point?”

“Well, um . . . uh . . . it was when I . . . it was when I uh . . . finished my first year in college. Uh . . . uh . . . I had to leave.”

“Oh? Well, did you go back?”

“No. No. Never went back. Yeah. First year in college.”

So that’s what you want. So it’s “leaving college” is a very, very excellent way of expressing that, see? So that’s expressed very briefly. Your next point. Express them briefly, succinctly.

Now, each one of these is followed by a date. And his idea of the date is going to be the wildest scramble you ever heard of. So don’t press him for an accurate date, particularly, and don’t go pushing on it, because the person will do enough hemming and hawing here to last a lot of people a long time, and the dates you get aren’t going to be very accurate unless you sit down with an E-Meter and go through a timing exercise of putting the things on the time track. And we’re not asking you to do that, particularly. So “ten years ago” is good enough. But

write down something like “around 1948.” See, that’s plenty good. Anything the PC tells you is the date.

And we go on down the line and we fill out all these major changes. Now, you may find yourself needful of more space in order to get all these major changes, and if you do, you just clip another piece of paper up at the top of page five on this assessment form. And you just keep writing them in the same wise. PCs might have lots of them. This would be fairly adequate for the usual case, but you might find somebody with a lot more.

Now, he’s probably missed a great many of these changes. He probably hasn’t looked at these other things as changes at all. So you continue the list with specific requests. You want to know when the PC newly joined any religious group. That’ll be a major change point in a person’s life, you see? And the PC didn’t. All right. He didn’t.

Now, “When did the PC start going to church again?” Of course, that’s a major change point. Ha-ha. Start going to church again: well, that tells us something.

If I had been doing this on an archbishop in northern Greece one night down in Athens—if I had been doing just this—I would have pulled half of his aberrations by asking him why he joined the church when he was nineteen in New York City. Because his sole goal was to die and go to heaven. He did have a psychosomatic goal, which was to keep himself from going blind. But he gave me the whole story about, he was in a terrible upset and so he joined the church, and here he is at 70 or 80 or 205 or something like that—there he was, and he’s still riding the same stable datum.

This, by the way, is interesting. Maybe in the National Geographic, sometime or another, you’ve seen a picture of a monastery in northern Greece, where the people can’t ever walk in and out of the place. They have to be lifted in baskets. And they’re lifted up the face of the wall in a basket.

This was the archmadrid [archimandrite] I think, of that particular monastery. And he had come down to—he’d heard of Scientology, and they had a couple of sisters with him. I could have pulled his whole case right there —clank! Interesting. Because the major “When did he start going to church again?” would in this particular case have become “When did he become a member of the church?”

Well, he became a member of the church after a long period of confusion back in his middle teens. And that was almost sixty years before. Interesting. And he’d been riding the same confusion, and he was sitting right there on the same chronic somatic. Fascinating.

“When did the PC subscribe to a fad?” Now, he’s liable to give you anything, and even insult you with saying Dianetics is one, or something like that; we don’t care what the PC said. But when we say “fad,” we mean anything everybody else was doing with enthusiasm. But we also mean food fads or clothing fads. He joined the Edwardians; he became a Teddy boy. Anything like this, you see? He joined up into something or other, but it will indicate a change.

“When did the PC begin dieting?” And the PC’s normal first response is to tell you that he never did. And you should be very careful about that particular point—ha-ha—because after a moment or two, he’ll find a dozen periods of his life when he had to change his eating habits.

Well, he was in the army. And yes, well, he did start dieting, “if you want to call it that.” You’ll get that kind of response, you see? He couldn’t stand Spam. He just couldn’t stand Spam, and he stopped eating Spam, and he hasn’t been able to eat meat of that composite type ever since. And he Won’t eat meat of that composite type ever since. That’s it. “That—if you want to call that a diet, fine. All right. That’s a diet. But they just served me one more piece of Spam and they would have had it.” That was a diet. It’s a negative diet.

Of course, at that particular level, you write down when it was, and you want to know what it was. So you'd say "1943, Spam." That would be your notation.

"All right. What other diets have you started off on?"

"No other diets. I'm not dieting. I'm no vegetarian, or food faddist, or anything like that. I have no other unusual diets of any kind whatsoever."

Well, this one has to be followed up. You have to get a little bit clever.

So you have to ask a question like this: "Well, do you eat differently, or have you ever eaten differently from other people that were around you?"

"Oh, well, you put it that way, yes, they eat these poisonous meats all the time, and uh . . . they eat these meats, and they didn't care what meat it was and what meat it wasn't, and so forth. And actually, for some years, I haven't eaten any meat." But you see, this, to the PC, is not a diet. He doesn't define it as such because that is ordinary, that is usual. And the thing he is doing ordinarily with food is the thing to do with food. It isn't what everybody does on the subject of food. He never notices that.

All right. He's liable to give you some answer and say, "Well, I was out on the China coast, and all the Chinese were eating rice, and who the devil could live on rice all the time, but I managed to get some food. And I was eating differently than other people then—very differently from the other people that were around me then. They were all eating rice, and I knew you couldn't live on rice, and so forth. And I had to eat other food from that, and there was a lot of trouble getting other food at that particular time."

You say, "When was that?" And you put down "1948, China." Not "rice." That will all give you clues, clues, clues. Something was happening there. Something weird was going on. His life was changed. That won't be much of a point, but this is liable to liven up the next point, you see?

"Well now, did you have any other food changes, any other diets or anything like that?"

And he all of a sudden tells you for the first time, "Well, my family only eats kosher food."

"When is the first time you had any difficulty eating kosher food or finding kosher food, and so forth?"

"Oh, well, you want to know that, that was when I joined the army. Had a lot of trouble. Had a lot of trouble."

Put down "kosher food" and some sort of a date. There's upsets associated with all this sort of thing, but those are not as important as this one: He said, "Well, uh . . . I uh . . . started to uh . . . eat . . . live on lettuce and uh . . . muldeberries—dried muldeberries and lettuce uh . . . in urn . . . 1951." That's right out of the blue, you see? There's no explanation to this of any kind whatsoever. You don't say "Well, you did?" you know?

You better write down "dried muldeberries and lettuce", 1951 right there—bang! Because, boy, he must have run into a freight train.

If you look back of this, you see, you look back here, you won't find anything else happening in 1951, you don't think, you know? You look back here and Mother's death, Father's death—1951? Where the hell is 1951? Nothing happened in 1951. Nothing. That is just a stroke out of the blue, and you'll get it on such things as diets and fads and that sort of thing, much more rapidly than you'll get it on something else.

All right. "When did the PC leave a job?" And, of course, this may get very lengthy, but you better take down every one of them. Much more important than the auditing he's had is how many jobs has he left? How many, how many, how many, how many, how many? And you get some sailors, for instance, and they never show you all their discharges. But they were on a ship in 1949, and they were on a ship for two months in 1955 and they were on a ship for one month in 1958.

"What have you been doing the rest of the time?"

"Well, I've been going to sea."

What the hell goes on, you see? There's holes all up and down the line, don't you see? And something going on during that period; it's all a big not-know as far as you're concerned. And as far as the PC is concerned, it's just all a big withhold.

So when the PC starts to give you his job lines and there's something going wrong with this, you want to start asking, "How long did you hold that job?" And get his job record so that it's somewhat chronological. Find out his leaving points, and at these leaving points . . .

He says, "Well," he'll say, "I left a job . . . I left a construction company in 1951. And I left the uh . . . yes, and I left uh . . . the uh . . . merchandising uh . . . department of Taylor & Sanford's in 1955."

You say, "That's good." Now, you've made an unreasonable assumption: You think that from 1951 to 1955 he was in the merchandising establishment at Taylor & Sanford's. He wasn't. There had been about eight job changes in the middle of the thing, see?

So always find out how long he kept the job. That is the only keynote there. Find out how long he kept that job, and then you will see where the missing links are.

Now, because the changes are sufficiently interesting in that particular line, you had better E-Meter needle it. "Any other jobs you've left?"—blang! "What was that one? Any other jobs you left?"—blang! "What was that one? Any other jobs you left? What was that?"—blang! And so forth. And you get a pretty good employment record, just as number 13's number of lines imply. Because every one of those, he was in co-action with a group. And a person who has too many jobs is having difficulty with co-action, mutual motion. He's having great difficulty with mutual motion.

And this lends itself peculiarly to the development of tremendous overts and withholds. Overts and withholds all stem from mutual motion—that is, the whole theory moves out of that particular field. And job and employment and work are things which notably milestone a man's decline and aberration, and that sort of thing.

It's not that they're aberrative in themselves, but he is in mutual action with some group, and then finds himself in violent disagreement with some group. And then he's in mutual action with another group, and finds himself in violent disagreement there. Well, there must have been some confusions; some hidden confusions are in that period. And by getting a job record, you can spot a lot of hidden confusions.

Now, supposing the person is not a working person at all. Then you change the question over to "When did the PC leave a certain type of activity?" And you'll find out she was a housewife, and then she was a club member, and then she was a this, and then she was a that. And you'll get a type of "job record" which is just an activity record. But this whole number 13 of section O is devoted to spotting departed areas of co-, or mutual, motion on the third dynamic. You won't have much other record if you don't make a full one here.

Now again, that all has to be written in such a wise that you can easily assess it later because you're going to use this and use this and use this data.

Unlike everything up to and including M and N, you're going to use the O section till you practically wear out the paper. So do your best writing in this particular area; make sure that you can read your own writing. That would be a good thing to be able to do, because you're going to assess it and assess it and assess it and assess it.

All right. "When did the PC have to take a rest?" Ah, that's splendid. That's real good. And those are marvelous, because you're going to find those are the points just before which there were prior confusions of magnitude.

So you're going to find out all these points when he had to take a rest, and you're going to write all those down.

And "When is the time the PC noticed a body difficulty?" Well, you're going to write all those down, but this is going to be awful comm-laggy. Going to get all that straightened out.

Now, "When did the PC decide to go away?" Now, of course, you get wives, husbands, little children, almost anybody, subscribes to this one, and of course, it is always preceded by an area of confusion. So here's a very fruitful source of confusions.

Now, if these things suddenly start, about this stage of the game, to be the same areas as you've already recovered, don't worry about it. Just keep writing them down, see? Don't call this to the PC's attention at this stage and say, "Well, I see that you left a job in June of 1955; you left a job June of 1955, and you started going to church again in June of 1955, and you decided to take a rest in July of 1955. Well, what about that?"

Well, you're jumping the gun. You are jumping the gun. That's the sort of thing you do in section P. So let's not take up anything here but data. You just want data from the PC, data from the PC. And you'll find out soon enough that it adds up and cross-checks and does all that sort of thing.

Now, the catastrophe for this whole procedure would be if the PC gave you nothing under the sun but the same date and the same incident. Of course, a PC doing that would be nuts. But an institutional case would do that. And you have one thing to assess.

All they talk about is when they brought them to the institution, or something like this, you see? That would leave you with just one thing to assess. But people that you ordinarily audit aren't that daffy. But remember that if you did that, you'd have to, next time, fill out another O form. If you haven't got enough data on the O form, you fill out another O form after you've handled a P form.

All right. "When [Whom] did the PC decide to leave and when?" Now that's almost the same question, but not quite: "decide to leave." He didn't leave. He decided to leave.

After you've got all the departures, then you find out that there were eighteen periods of deciding to depart and not departing. And what are you running? You're running leave and then failed leave. Ask him questions about leave and then questions about failed leave. Simple.

Now, "When did the PC start being educated in some new line?" That is doubled over with "What have you taken up?" "What have you taken up?" "When did you take up a course in this, a correspondence course in something else?" you see? "When did you start to study something else?"

Now, I just had a maintenance man out here suddenly take up pottery. Hadn't studied anything for years and he's suddenly taken up pottery. I know there's been a catastrophe and a confusion in his life someplace. Isn't any reason for him to take up pottery. He's had little connection with pottery around here to amount to anything. But that's Mr. Jenner's job.

That's very interesting, isn't it? He's suddenly moving over into another field from carpentry, over into masonry, you know? And what's happened? Well, I also notice he looks a little upset. Now, I haven't interrogated him in any way, but I'm just giving you something there that is a cross-question.

Now, it isn't anything wrong with taking up new lines. Isn't anything wrong with studying something new. But it might be an indicator. It might be.

That's true of most of these things, is the bulk of them are might-be's.

Now, "When did the PC's physical body change characteristics?" Getting this out of women, you will have to take the E-Meter and beat them over the head. A woman at 110 will never admit that her body changed anything from that of a beautiful 16-year-old girl, or something like that, you know? It's just things they won't talk about. So you have to pull that the hard way. Go ahead and grab it.

Now, "When did the PC collapse?" They've probably omitted telling you anything about this up to that point.

And "When did the PC start a new life?" That's just the same question over again in some other line, but this is with magnitude. They may have omitted any of those.

And then "When did the PC stop going to parties?" Most girls tell you this, they look very sad, and they say, "Well, I met . . . I met Bill, and uh . . . he was a stay-at-home type, and uh . . . so forth. And so we stayed home thereafter." Well, I'll let you in on something: That wasn't the reason they stopped going to parties. You'll run into it in the P section, if this ever assesses out.

They did various things. There were various things occurred about parties. There were various heartbreaks and upsets. Because stopping a girl going to parties is only done with sixteen-inch guns! You can just mark a big underscore under that. They don't easily stop going to parties. Might have been last lifetime, but it took something to stop them.

Now, "Who has the PC never seen again?" Now, you notice this is down toward the end of the O section, so that if we have to send for the fire department and so forth, and get them to dam up the grounds because of the resultant flood, the end of this is very much in view, because the PC is liable to spill a grief charge. Because you've shaken the PC up considerably by this time, you see?

You ask him for change, change, change, change, change; you're auditing him like crazy all through this O section. Now all of a sudden you say—all of a sudden you say, "Who have you never seen again?"

"Waah! "

And we finally finish up, "what does the PC now consider his or her major life change?" And we don't care what the PC said it was. We just don't care, but it's a good thing to ask.

All right, let us go back now; let us go back now to what we are going to do with all of this data. We have now assembled the doggonedest potpourri of data that was ever recorded, and if employment offices ever interrogated employment sheets to the degree that we have shaken this one down, don't you see even though we did it fairly rapidly—man, would they know something about their applicants.

Miss Jones comes in, applies for a job as a typist. "Where did you work last, Miss Jones?" Lie. "Why did you leave?" Lie. Here it is, you see? "Is there any reason you would not be able to continue long on this job, Miss Jones?"

“Well, no reason at all, except the doctor has only given me two months to live.”

You know, you’d have the lot.

So we’re going to take the O section. We’re not interested in any other part of this now except as a review and a cross-coordination. And we’re going to tackle the P section.

Now, if you are very wise, you will have stopped at the end of the O section and you will have taken a break. Because you didn’t start this thing with rudiments, and the P section has to be started with rudiments.

So you either finished that whole thing off and ended the session and that was the auditing for that day or something of the sort, or that morning, and you start up the P section again, so it might take a little bit of interesting timing to get this thing straight.

Now, this, bluntly, starts an assessment of the PC’s major life changes. But you start it in Model Session, and you start right going here with Model Session, and you want to clear the rudiments. You want to know if anything upset them, you know, about what you just covered with them. You kind of aim the rudiments, you know, a little bit in the direction of what you’ve just been doing earlier.

And if you’ve only got fifteen minutes left of the session, and I find out that you started a P-section with fifteen minutes left of the session, I will be upset. You could possibly get away with a rapid assessment, but you certainly couldn’t bank on the assessment and so forth.

Now, if you had a half an hour or an hour left of your auditing period, well, by all means do your assessment, but don’t go any further. Don’t try to do anything with it. And the best thing would be to have them in completely different assessment periods, because you’re going to shake this person up like mad doing an assessment. They’re going to be in a fit state to be audited, let me tell you.

Now, you’re going back here to O, and I don’t care how many doodledaddles or code marks or symbols you put on the side of this. You could put “1.0 divisions,” you know, “fall,” or something like that. You could make little notations. But all you’re going to do is read them this.

Now, you go down the line. You make that notation: fall, rise—don’t ever note rise. Just fall, theta bop, whatever it is, how much. And you’re going to make it, and this time I’m going to ask you to get clever.

It doesn’t matter much if you assess this wrong. But this is a wonderful opportunity to get clever on a one-pass needle judgment. After you’ve finished up reading through this thing once, your record and recall and so on are quite adequate to tell you which change point of the person’s life registered most. You just read it through once, rapidly.

Now, of course, you can do that by saying to the PC, “You don’t have to say a word while I am doing this. You just sit there and hold those cans, and I am going to read all of this off”—you’ve got him in session, your rudiments are in and so forth—and I’m going to see what this is all about.”

And you simply read this thing off, each one, and note the reactions that greet each one of these change points. When you get over here, you will be able to say that it is number 13 something or other was what assessed. That’s good. That got the most reaction on the needle.

Now, that completes step one. Step one consists of that reading, it consists of your adjudication of picking out from the E-Meter reaction, needle reaction, which one of those life changes that you have gone over in O produced the greatest needle response—not just fall, but what had produced the greatest needle response.

Ordinarily, that needle response will be much bigger than the remainder, and it will not be unusual for it to be a theta bop. A nice, wide, staggering theta bop—if you found something like that, you’re right on his rock chain, and it audits like mad.

All right. You’ve got to note that down and square that around.

Now, this is a disposable form, this form P on page seven. And you notice it’s just on one side of the piece of paper only. And in mimeographing this thing and repeating its mimeographs, that format should be followed, because that’s —this is disposable. This is “add-it-able.” After you’ve done this, this gets added to the PC’s record. And then without throwing away anything from one to six pages, you get another form P. See, and you just keep running a new form P. and it’s just on one page, one side of the paper. (Very well done here, this mimeographing job) And of course you look straight at the PC and you say to the PC very meaningfully, now that you’ve got the point. . . It was their leaving Taylor & Sudrow’s, biggest change in their life, you see? That’s the most reaction. And you ask the PC, “What problem existed . . .” This is very meaningful. It’s just, you plow that question right into him. Everything else has been rather conversational, don’t you see, and this and that, but you just plow this one into him hard. And you say, “What problem existed immediately before you left Taylor & Sudrow’s?”

All right. He’s going to tell you. Now, he may give you a fact. And if he only gives you a fact, you say, “Yes, yes. All right. That’s fine. Good. But state that as a problem. Now what was the problem connected with this? What was the problem? The problem connected immediately before you left Taylor & Sudrow’s?”

“Uh . . . well, it was that I did the accounts wrong.”

“Yes. Good. All right. What was the problem?”

“Oh. Oh-ooh-ooh-ooh-ooh-ooh, ah . . . I ah . . . I—I see. I—I see what you mean. You want to know what the problem was. I didn’t like my boss.”

“All right. Good. Thank you. Now state that as a problem.”

“How to keep from going to jail.”

Ba-bang! You see? That’s a problem, but it’s the first problem they actually state as a problem.

Now, they may be mystified as to why you won’t accept these as problems, because they seem good enough problems to them. But you could even say to them, “A problem is who, when, what, where, how. There’s some question about a problem. There’s something undecided about a problem. We want the undecided thing, you know, the thing that was worrying you, the thing you were anxious about, before you left Taylor & Sudrow’s.”

“Oh, well. Uh-huh-huuuuuuu, well, that’s different. Ah-ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. Oh, well, you ask me that way. I didn’t like my boss.” You know?

“Yeah. But what anxiety did you have about it?”

“How to keep from going to jail.” So you write it down.

Now comes a little bit of a problem: “How to keep from going to jail.” Now, how do you phrase a rudiments thing? You’ve got to do a shakedown on this sort of thing. You’ve got to do a little assessment here sometimes You got to find out what this was all about. But it’s not much of an assessment, because it’s obviously jail that is a worry here.

So your with would have to be changed to about, you see? And you'd say, "What was unknown about that problem . . ." "What was unknown with that problem about jail?" You've got to change the about to with and change it around. "What was unknown with that problem about jail?" Any such phrasing that gets it across to the PC so that you're running an unknown on it.

Now, if he gives you some significance—"How to keep from worrying." Oh, man, that's a rough one because there's no target. You're not running any kind of a terminal.

Now, how do you state this around so that you run about "What was unknown about that problem with worrying?" Man, that is not going to be any process that makes any sense to anybody. Are you going to say "Just worrying? Worrying? Is that what it was? Worrying about what? How to keep from worrying—worrying about what?"

"Oh, just worrying."

Boy, you're really getting a defeat here, you see? A problem just about worrying.

"I just found myself worrying. All the time I just found myself worrying and worrying."

All right. In the last moment of defeat, you can give up and say, "What was unknown about your worrying?" Because that's as far as you're going to get.

In other words, don't cave the PC in and don't abandon it. Just try, successfully if possible, to find a proper terminal to add into this problem. If you can't find a proper terminal, you can move off a bit and say what it was. Because you've got to have the thing run as the PC has it. There is no sense in doing anything else. And he could have a problem just about worrying, you see?

So if you can't get him to state a noun, or get him to state something else about this problem, or if you don't get a noun out of him, you will have to use the exact thing that he said.

"Oh, well, worrying," but this is liable to be your response: "How to keep yourself from worrying. Yeah, well, all right. How do you keep yourself from worrying? Were you worrying about something specific?"

"Well, of course. Of course, naturally. Bill."

"Well, what is the problem then?"

"Well, how to keep from worrying about Bill, naturally, naturally. I mean, idiot!" You know, that kind of reaction.

All right. So your process is "What was unknown about that problem with Bill?" See, you've gotten the terminal out of the thing. But the PC could have a problem just about worrying. The PC knows that people who worry go to pieces. And the PC finds himself worrying. And that is the most problem the PC has got. And that's as close as he can come to any terminal. And you actually would defeat your purposes by being too forceful about giving him a terminal. There are times to be reasonable about this sort of thing.

Try to get a terminal if you can. If you can't get a terminal, run the condition. And you'll still make it.

But if you do, you better watch your havingness. And when you finish up that session with Model Session, just hardly ask him if it's all right with the room. Just run TR 10. Because if you're running a conditional problem, his havingness is going to go down. It can be done, you understand, but his havingness is going to go down, and in end rudiments you're going to have to run some havingness.

All right. Let's take up the next brutal step here rapidly. "What was unknown about that problem?" has got to be flattened on the tone arm. It's got to be flattened on the tone arm. And that may take a long time, and it may take a short time, but you're going to get the tone arm action out of it and going to get the twenty-minute test on it and so forth, because that problem—you're really going to take it up and beat it to death.

Now he's in a position to answer number 5. We've got to "locate the confusion before that change (as [per] number above)"—not before the problem but before the change. And now you're going to "list the persons present in the confusion." And this is going to give you some difficulty because there will be innumerable persons missing. So you got to shake that assessment down on the E-Meter needle.

"Were there any more people in that confusion?" And you keep reading that until you no longer get a needle reaction. You've shaken all the people out of that. And the most important person to the whole confusion will be the person who comes up last. Just take that as a general running rule and you'll be safe.

All right. You make a list of those persons, and then let's just read that list off, as you've written it right here on the form—don't write it anyplace else than on the form—and you run a rapid assessment which just gets your most needle reaction, not by elimination, and you write down the name of the person who reacted most on the needle as you read that list.

And now you've got to get the withholds off, from that person. Now, that means that you might have an additional piece of paper. That means that you might have written up an additional withhold section. It might mean that you have used a standard form to get the withholds off, or it might mean that you just sat there and got the withholds off.

"What were you withholding from that person?" "What had you done to that person?" "What were you doing at the time, that you didn't tell that person about?" And we want to get the basic withholds off that person.

But we're not going to do a fantastic hour-after-hour grind to get the withholds off of that person. We're just going to get the major withholds off of that person. You're going to try to clean that person up till that person doesn't react. And that's as far as we want it cleaned up. We say the person's name. We don't get a meter reaction. And then we're going to assess the list again, leaving the person's name in. We don't take names off as we clear them up. We just keep leaving their names in because they will turn up again. That tells you why we're not being terribly thorough.

So you run down the list, get the most reaction, and you get the withholds off, from that person. You get what the person has done to them, what he hadn't told them, what he was unable to tell them. Remember the three classes of withholds, see, involuntary withhold—the unintentional withhold, rather. All of those things. We get that off, and we'll find out that we've eventually—when we've taken care of all these people and none of these people react anymore on the needle, we'll have cleaned up the confusion.

But the end of that is when the needle does not react while you read the list, with the rudiments in. And you don't get a reaction. All right. Great. Great. That's the end of that confusion as far as you're concerned,—and that is it.

Now, you've just—run that again. And then you—again, as it says it in 9 and 10—you know, just keep repeating the same thing till you get all that, the people in the confusion, off. And now, you return to the O assessment and do all of P again, which is to say that you take this P form as complete and you file it with the person's record, and you make out a brand-new P form in exactly the same way. And you go over that thing exactly as you did before.

Now, that is the extent of a Problems Intensive. How long does it take? I don't know how long it'll take you to do this on how many PCs. But I know that this is terribly productive. And this will get out all the hidden standards, and it'll straighten up all the present time problems of long duration. You'll have all kinds of interesting things occurring as a result of it.

It becomes better when you get the Havingness and Confront Process of the PC and run at the same time. You could do a lot of things. They could get a lot more complicated, and so forth. But if you just do this, just as it says through here, and keep up until you finish every one of these change points of a person's life, you'll find the last ones are going just fast, fast, fast. They're just disappearing quickly. He gets the problem, and he finds a confusion, bang! And he finds the withholds on it, boom!

Don't be too surprised if the person goes terribly backtrack. Let them go backtrack all they want to while you're running the problem. But that they went back running the problem doesn't let that lure you into getting the confusion before the engram. No, we want the confusion before the change in this life, always. And we never wander on to the backtrack from a standpoint of getting off the confusion.

But they will of course run into engrams while they're being audited on the problem. And we don't upset them by trying to get them off of it. We just audit them.

But we want the confusion prior to that change in this lifetime. So that this thing—we don't prevent them from going backtrack—but this thing basically, mainly handles, and is only designed to handle, the present lifetime.

Okay?

Well, I wish you lots of luck with it. I think you've got a piece of dynamite in your hands that won't pre-explode in your face. I think it'll do your PCs a lot of good. Okay?

Thank you.