

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: GOALS ASSESSMENT, HAVINGNESS

A lecture given on
29 May 1962

Thank you.

All right this is what?

Audience: 29 May.

Twenty-nine May 1962, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Lecture 1. And this is a very good opportunity for you to ask some questions. And a very, very good opportunity for you to ask some questions.

Now every once in a while I give you an opportunity to wish you hadn't spoken. Okay, what question do you have tonight?

Male voice: What are the stable datums for doing a Goals Assessment?

What's the stable datum for doing a Goals Assessment? Can you keep the rudiments in on the pc? You must be able to keep the rudiments in on the pc before you embark upon a Goals Assessment. In other words, don't start on a Goals Assessment and then find out that you should have been prepchecking. This is the mark of a knuckleheaded auditor. This is – this raises one to the “Royal Order of Coconut.”

There you are, “To catch catfish, to catch cat .” Dirty needle. Ha-ha. Well, “To catch catfish.” Dirty, continuing and repetitive needle. “To shoot squirrels. To shoot sq . . . Have I missed a withhold on you?”

“Oh, no. No. No, you haven't missed a withhold on me. I . . . “

That is the wrong time, see. That's the wrong time and place.

Somebody wrote me the other day – somebody who got a course incomplete here, by the way – and halfway through it, a Goals Assessment, had been able to straighten out the pc by going into three or four hours of prepchecking. Ha-ha.

What was this auditor doing prepchecking when they were supposed to be doing a Goals Assessment, see? They should have prepchecked it, got it *all* straightened out, got everything *all* smooth so that the pc's rudiments would stay in beautifully and then *zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom*, you could do a fast Goals Assessment and so forth. Otherwise you spend three times the time it takes to do a Goals Assessment doing the prepchecking that you would have done in one *third* of the time if you'd only been prepchecking. Now do you get the idea?

So the whole criteria of when do you do a Goals Assessment or what kind of condition the pc's got to be in to do a Goals Assessment or any other such question, the whole criteria is totally that one thing. Will the rudiments stay in? And if they stay in – *clank-thud-bang*, in concrete – by all means do a Goals Assessment. Answered?

Male voice: Right.

All right. Yes, John?

Male voice: My question, Ron, would you care to say something about the expectancies of Routine 3 GA?

Expectancy of. . .

Male voice: Routine 3 GA.

. . . Routine 3 GA. Now do you mean expectancy in what you . . .

Male voice: In terms of Clearing . . .

. . . in terms of Clearing How long it might take to Clear somebody with this?

Well you'd have to make an estimate of how long it would take to – how long – what's the expectancy of Routine 3 GA in terms of Clearing somebody and so forth. Well, if you add to it how long does it take to prepcheck somebody up to rudiments in, see – rudiments well in. That length of time, you see, that's kind of variable. I don't know what length of time that would be. It's anybody's guess. It depends on the auditor to a very marked degree.

Phil is in the next room so it's all right for me to tell you. But he suggested that I make you good and guilty tonight about this and so forth – because we did three and a half weeks of student-rate Prepchecking this afternoon. We were at it about an hour and a half, something – an hour and forty-five minutes. I won't – I won't shorten it anymore than it was. It was actually an hour and fifty-two minutes. And we cleaned up invalidations of goals, listing prior goals lists – any overts against, you know I mean, that kind of thing Got it straightened up.

And got it straightened up so the middle rudiments would stay in pretty good. And we did it all in about an hour and fifty-five minutes.

Now, this just depends – how long is it going to take you to do it? Well it'd vary a great deal. Depend on prior processing the individual had had.

Supposing – supposing you come into session every day and you say, “Do you have a present time problem?”

The pc says, “Well yes, I have a present time problem. My mother-in-law has left me and I'm – I'm being – being sued by my wife and by three children who are in college are all pregnant.” Or something of the sort.

He's got present time problems galore and so forth. And so you spend three-quarters of the session trying to get rid of the present time problem. Well, you are in no condition to get rid of present time problems. This guy's got problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. How are you ever going to get anything done, see?

Well, how long does it take to clean that up? So that's an open question. You might elect to run Routine 1A or something like that. And run it flat. Right away. Well you've shot about twenty-five hours maybe, bang. Get the idea? So it's that factor – that factor, very variable for the auditor, very variable for the pc.

But let's say we've got this fellow up to a point where it's an “Oh, my God” situation. This one that just came out into the – got his toes just on the edge of Clear at the moment the auditor went south in a hurry. Got there just, you know, just ready to walk in through the gate, you know and looked up and the auditor had blown the area. I don't know why it was, but. . . Now, that history in Prepchecking, CCHs, Routine 1A and so forth is a *long and bloody* history. His auditor used to spend hour for hour, one hour in processing, one hour in her bedroom crying quietly to herself over the hopelessness of it all. Actually that wasn't the action of one auditor, but the action of about three auditors. So all of the tough points of the case had already been straightened out. Case would stay in-session beautifully.

How long did it take from there on? Well the first goal, I think, assessment – I have no real figures on this – but I know that it couldn't have taken longer than twelve and a half hours. I know it just couldn't have taken more than that. And the actual listing down to the first appearance of the free needle with the tone arm down on four lists on that particular goal couldn't have taken more than about twenty-five hours. So there you have what? There you have thirty-seven and a half hours to the first free needle.

But there's this horrible variable, you see, up to this point, see. The ground looked like Flanders in 1917, you see. Everything was all smoothed out. And then from then on, see, very rapid. Careful preparation up to that point and then, gruesome as it might have been, then easy going from there on.

Now, finding the next goal – this is an indeterminate thing – but actually shouldn't take any longer to find that goal than to find the first one. So let's say another twelve and a half hours. And it certainly wouldn't take any longer than twenty-five to list that one if it took that long to list the first one. So, a very safe margin – you've got about another thirty-seven and a half hours. And let's be dispassionate about it and say that it's probably seventy-five hours right about this point.

Then the next one, you couldn't possibly occupy this much time with it. I mean you couldn't occupy thirty-seven and a half hours on the third goal if you tried – if the auditor knew his business. And let's just throw the third and fourth goal and their listing into the next twenty-five hours – you'd have about a hundred. And I imagine that needle would be free, free, free, at just about that time. You'd have a hard time stirring the case up.

I'm just looking at one case, you know – just trying to give you some kind of a forecast on it – just a guesstimate. Ah, I'd say time to burn – time to burn madly on decent auditing at a hundred and twenty-five hours. Oh, I imagine that it would've just been time to burn.

So I'd say perhaps your expectancy on 3 GA should range – the length of time of Prepcheck and CCHs to make sure that the pc's rudiments would stay in – whatever else you had to do – take *that* length of time – which is very variable. And put on top of that maybe a hundred and twenty-five to a hundred and fifty hours or something like that and you've probably got some guesstimate of this situation. You understand this is a guesstimate, this is still an experimental procedure.

But at least this procedure does tend to lower the sensitivity knob, although I haven't had as many reports on that as I would like to. In other words loosen the needle – does tend to – and tends to bring the tone arm down to the Clear read of the pc and all tendencies are that this one is in there.

By the way, there's another process that is on the assembly line. There's another process that is waiting in case, see. It's 3 G4, as long as we're going into it. 3 GA doesn't plow things well case to case – case – you've still got this other one. This other one is all figured out, totally untested, just lying on the shelf, maybe never be used. A very simple process but you would find it harder to do than 3 GA and that's why it is lying on the shelf.

You find a goal and then you find a goal that would oppose it. And then you find – you do another assessment and you assess for goals that would oppose that goal and then you assess for goals that would not oppose that goal. And then – and then you assess for goals that would not want that goal. And now you've got four goals and they all tick alike. You've got to get four goals that all tick alike. There can't be a hair's breadth difference in their reaction and that'll be all the manifestations of the package. And then you list all those four goals and you theoretically would come out with your same package. At the other end you'd come out with

your four items, which are actually two items. And that's just another approach to the situation and I've seen absolutely no reason whatsoever to cook that one up yet or do anything about it. I just worked out the possibilities of processes and that of course is sitting there.

But expectancy for that one – the only reason I'm bringing that up now, you see – it's taking people normally about three weeks you see, to find a goal and now, you understand you haven't audited that goal. This case is in no better shape now, really. This case just feels a little brighter and with that case in that same condition, now, you are going to find an opposition goal. I don't know how long that's going to take. And then you're going to find a notopposition goal and we don't know how long that is going to take. And we are going to find a goal of “something that wouldn't want to” and then we don't know how long it'd take to find that goal. But I imagine you are up there to about twelve twenty-five hour intensives and you haven't yet listed anything So I don't look very. . . I'm hoping you don't find any way to misrun 3 GA, you see. That's the main – that's the main thing That answer your question?

Male voice: Yes it does.

All right. Yes, Fred?

Male voice: Since we don't have a modifier now, how do you keep a Goals Problem Mass keyed in uh – if it – if it should uh – key out and you get a free needle?

Well, all right. That's a good question. Since we don't have a modifier how do you keep the GPM keyed in while you are listing and that sort of thing?

Actually the modifier is only the label of one of those items which you are listing on that listing.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

See at – you were – you were oh, you're still finding the same package. You see, if you found an opposition goal and an opposition terminal, your modifier and all the rest of these things – they're – they're still just – they're – it's the same package as you were finding in 3D. And of course by listing each one of these lines, you of course keep as much of this thing pulled in as you are going to keep pulled in anyway, theoretically.

Now, the next thing that you might run into is the *second goal* – trying to keep things stirred up for the second goal. But the pc will be able to approach the GPM much more closely now because the first package has been whizzed up into space. And I don't think, I don't foresee any trouble with that at all, because you are listing a line which keeps it pulled in. Okay? Right. Okay.

Yes Jim.

Male voice: The stabilizing of the Clear resolution – apparently – was a notice on the board that this was happening I'm curious to know what the procedure is.

Oh, that would just be going on and that would be going on and that would be going on. That is just more goals and more four lists and more goals and more four lists, more goals and more four lists – until you can't get a meter to read if you hit the guy over the head with a club.

Stabilization is just more of it in 3 GA and just more of it and more of it and more of it because you're not likely to find this pc flying off into a keyout. See, because every time you find a goal, you are going to wrap your paws around every element that was part of the Goals Problem Mass. And you could probably look for longer listing, more goals to be found than in Routine 3, you see. Let's see, what was your question again now?

Male voice: The stabilizing of 3 GA Clear.

Yeah. Does that answer it?

Male voice: Definitely, but uh – another question.

Hm?

Male voice: There's another question.

What is it?

Male voice: That is not actually a stabilization that you've described. Rather it's a continuation of the 3 GA process from the new – the . . .

Yeah.

Male voice: . . . new preclear that you have now – you are simply running 3 GA again on him.

Well, stabilization would be – the error in the statement, you see – if there is one – comes from the fact that you said, “Clear – the stabilization of a Clear.” All right, the stabilization of a Clear would be able to get rid of the masses that were liable to be keyed in or that are waiting. In other words, you would get out of the road those masses that could scoop up this Clear and get him all involved in the bank again.

Now, you see earlier Clears, we didn't have that much horizon cleared for the Clear. Get the idea? And he could pick these masses up. All right. He could get enturbulated, in other words, again. The GPM could come in on him again. But by continuing 3 GA – doing 3 GA again and again and again, why you're just shooting holes into the GPM and you continue on out the other side of it and won't find any, theoretically, you won't find any GPM now to key in, see? Because the GPM only stays lined up on the most tenuous impossibility that anybody ever heard of. The only way that can be here and in present time is so – is so fantastically intricate that actually sometimes – sometimes you'll hit a couple of items on the way through on listing and see them go *pfffft* and wonder what was that? It's like releasing a –

taking a string off of a balloon neck at a party, you know, there they went. Well, they can't any longer keep themselves pumped up. So as you carve into this mass more and more and more and get rid of more and more packages, you are actually stabilizing Clear. You're only getting out of the road things – to stabilize a Clear – you'd only get out of the road things that could cause the person to go unclear again. You follow that?

Male voice: I follow that.

Yeah, it's like how do you keep an automobile.... This is – this is this kind of an answer, see. How do you keep a racing car stably going around the track? Well you take all the boulders off the track. Now, you've left on automatic the fact that the racing car will keep running. In this case, the case of a racing car, it wouldn't be safe to rely on it. But in this particular case, it is safe to rely on it because you are not handling a machine. You are handling a livingness, a thetan, see.

But remember that as long as you're talking about the word Clear, just as it implies, you are talking about something which has had the debris pulled off of it, see? You are talking about something which has been unbarriered, see? And this makes an enormous difference to the individual. He gets very close in a native state and all that sort of thing. See what's wrong with the question is, is you are stabilizing a Clear. All right, that's fine. Yeah he's going to stay Clear if there is no bank to run into. But, you see there's something else can be done with this person. See, you can put another engine in the racing car or something like that, you see and you've done a different type of action.

In other words you could drill this individual now into the reacquisition of skills just by the familiarity of things. Now you are doing a different type of operation and that is not doing anything to a Clear, see? You are going on into OT.

See, OT is the recovery of skills. That's overtly the recovery of skills of the thetan. And Clearing is just taking what you find and getting the bricks off the track, see. you haven't asked him to recover any skills. He quite incidentally recovered quite a few skills, you see, by unburying the situation. He'll come back to battery to a marked extent.

But the state of OT is another – another action entirely. That is the overt recovery of skills. You've got this guy Clear, but he can't speak Arabic. Spaceman walks up to him and says “*snob-snos-kerpop*” or whatever – some space lingo of some sort or another that they used to speak. And he says, “Sounds familiar but what is it?” you know. And, all right, well how do you recover the fellow's languages for him and all that sort of thing. Those are the questions asked at the level of OT, see? Just as OT implies Operating Thetan, you recover his skills of operation.

Clear, you just fix him up so he doesn't fall off the cliff every time he turns around. Not to minimize either state, but they'd be accomplished by different actions.

You say, “All right, get in that rubber tire and go round and round and round and round and round. You getting dizzy?”

And he says, “Yeah I'm getting awful dizzy.”

You say, “That's a hell of a note. Get in the tire again and go round and round and round. You getting dizzy?”

And he says, “No, I'm not so dizzy now.”

And you say, “Well good, we'll practice a little more. Go on roll back and forth across the George Washington Bridge on every truck that comes by here this morning and get so that you can stand the atmosphere of the tires and run round and round and round like that.”

And he finally makes that, see. And you say, “All right, now go out and get yourself run over.” you get him run over with steam rollers and he finally finds out this is pretty good and it's okay. He can be more and more there while being run over by trucks.

And then one day he's on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, you know and he's practicing being run over and a big truck – a big truck comes along and at that moment he was sort of bored lying there, you know. He saw something pretty over at the right side of the road. I think the only pretty things on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, an ESSO sign or something like that. He saw this ESSO sign and he thought he'd go over and investigate it and he stood up at the moment the truck ran over him. Wreck on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. You know, something wild.

This is a – this is a wide field. Actually we know an awful lot about this field because we used to do this before we found out that the individual could get keyed in.

See, it looks to the thetan that if he does these things he's going to get his head knocked off, see? Well actually what knocks off his head? His aberration, his inability to reach, sustainedly, is inherent in his own bank – not inherent in the physical universe. As long as he has a lot of aberration, he'll key himself in by indulging in such exercises. But if there's nothing to key in, he won't. He will just get more familiar with the exercises. Got it?

Male voice: Yes.

All right. Did that answer the question now?

Male voice: The question was wrong in the first place.

Oh, I'm not trying to make you guilty.

Male voice: No I'm making you guilty.

I didn't notice. All right. Okay, any more questions? Yes?

Female voice: All things being equal, Ron uh – if an auditor really knows his job, you know he's really – he makes no mistakes, what would be the fastest skill: Problems Intensive or Prepchecking?

All right, all things being equal if an auditor really knows his job. What's the rest of it?

Female voice: What would be the fastest skill, Problems Intensive or Prepchecking?

I can't quite . . .

Female voice: What would be . . . ?

Second Female voice: Problems Intensive.

Female voice: What would be the fastest gain, Problems Intensive or Prepchecking?

Second Female voice: Fastest skill.

Oh, the fastest skill . . .

Female voice: Yes.

You mean what – what would do it . . .

Female voice: Procedure, yes.

What would prepare him the fastest?

Female voice: That's right.

Ah, what would prepare the pc the fastest? Undoubtedly Prepchecking, hands down. A Problems Intensive is a sort of a junior grade Prepcheck. If you want to get where the case lives in this lifetime and clean him up and that sort of thing and if the auditor you are asking to do this is not very skilled . . .

Female voice: Yeah, I'm talking about skills here.

. . . I said if your auditor – this is where this belongs – and your auditor isn't very skilled and you don't want to mess up the pc too much, you hand him a Problems Intensive. Got it? All right. But a skilled auditor, hands down, Prepcheck-CCH route. I would know no better route. I know no better route – that's why you are doing it.

Actually, I'm going up against the fate of the gods. It's almost impossible to teach an auditor how to prepcheck intelligently. See it's rough. Well, what do you think I'm climbing that hill for? I'm not climbing it just to get you exercise and me headaches, see. I'm not climbing it because I'm mad at your Instructors. I'm climbing it because you are not going to get there any other way. And if I knew a faster route up Mont Blanc man, you'd be on it! And unfortunately there isn't one.

I've been experimenting for many, many weeks, months now, with repetitive processes for just working around with Routine 1 sort of oddities and Class I And trying to get rudiments phrased up into various types of processes and so on, so as to give some lower scale benefit so that some auditor could simply run these things repetitively you see and come out at the other end. There's a lot of value to it, there is no doubt about that. you do a three-way bracket: "What didn't you know? What didn't another know? What didn't others know?" And you keep that up for a while on the pc. Or "What did – what have you suppressed? What has another suppressed? What have others suppressed?" – same phrasing "invalidate," same phrasing "failed to reveal," same phrasing "been careful of." You've got these various buttons and you could run them repetitively back and forth and undoubtedly get somewhere. There wouldn't be much doubt about that. And it's all very well and so forth. And I can take an E-meter and after you've ground one of those out for thirty-seven and a half hours or something like that, why I could have gotten there the first hour on a Prepcheck.

You see, I mean there's – I have not totally concluded that the repetitive process at Class I should be skipped because it has some uses. But I have, to some degree, doing a comparison on the thing, not to some degree, but Prepchecking, infinitely faster providing you prepcheck. That answers your question?

Female voice: Not entirely. Doesn't uh – by virtue of assessment on – uh – you know, on uh – the changes – doesn't that sort of hit the beginning of the chain in this lifetime instead of having to go down the chain. That's really what I asked you.

Now let me – let me hear that question again. Now I answered the first question. Everybody will give me that.

Audience: Yes, you did.

All right. Now we've got another question.

Female voice: That's right.

All right.

Female voice: In virtue of assessment on the changes . . . Can you hear me?

Almost.

Female voice: All right I'll try and speak up.

All right.

Female voice: In virtue of assessment on the changes, you know on the various self-determined changes.

You're still talking about a Problems Intensive?

Female voice: That's right. The reason why I am asking this is governed by virtue of assessment on the changes. Doesn't that sort of give the first, earliest incident and that's the bottom of the chain?

No. There's something wrong with this question because changes, the changes he's had in this lifetime, leave you still with the task of a full Prepcheck. But they will get the chronic PTP of the pc and this is very pleasing to the pc and this is a very good way of finding out what you ought to prepcheck. But of course there is no substitute for Prepchecking See? You got your processes; they're not quite lined up.

A Problems Intensive with the change assessment list that goes with it, you inevitably would do a case assessment on the pc. This would tell you something about the pc somewhere early on, you see. Now, cutting loose into a Problems Intensive with the change list and finding out what was the biggest change – the biggest self-determined change of the person's lifetime – gives you a very good place from which to jump off to do something for the pc. This is an excellent way to do it, particularly if you are not very skilled at prepchecking. You see, because you are going to get this anyhow if you are a very skilled prepchecker. It's almost – I wouldn't say it's not worth doing but it actually is to some slight degree a waste of time. You're going to try to prepcheck the rudiments in. You're going to try to prepcheck this pc so the rudiments will stay there and so everything is going to go along fine.

All right. If I'm prepchecking in the rudiments I don't try to get the pc, lifetime problems handled, because I know they're all going to shift anyhow the second I start running a Routine 3 process. So I don't pay any attention to the pc. I just satisfy myself I can keep the rudiments in and let it fly. you see the different philosophy here?

All right. Now, if you're going to – if you've got – if you've got Mrs. Gotlumbosis sitting in front of you and she is howling about lumbosis all the time on the subject and you wanted to find her lumbosis prematurely and that sort of thing – if you wanted to get this chronic present time problem out of the way and handle some little portion of it to make her happy – do a “changes of her life” and an assessment of those changes and get the prior area to that and prepcheck the living daylights out of that and find the fundamentals on the thing – you can burn yourself up, by the way, fifteen, twenty hours doing this – and you can drop a lot of worry off of this thing. In other words you've done something for this person's chronic somatic.

But don't make a mistake. You probably have done nothing for yourself or your rudiments, see. But this is a very good thing that an auditor can do. That – he doesn't handle his Prepchecking well. He sits there and he says, “Could you – willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” He gets a fall and he says, “What's that?”

And he says, “Well I – I don't know, I have an awful lot of difficulties trying to get enough paper clips, see. And I don't like to talk to people about that because I think unkind thoughts all the time about paper clips.”

And if this is as deep as this auditor is capable of steering a pc, he'd better do a list of changes on the person's life and get the one that assesses the most and go at it that way. Got the idea? And well, now we're going to get someplace. See, we're going to get someplace with this pc because we couldn't enter in.

We might have to do it. I'm not trying to run it down, you see. I mean we just can't seem to get anyplace with this pc. Well the pc's interest – we know we can always get the pc's interest on one of these change assessments, you know. What is the biggest self-determined change in this pc's lifetime? Well, man, you'll find it *there*; it registers. You go in *just* before that and ask him all about the prior confusion. Get a list of the people. Assess that list. And you are going to find out where they hid the body, man. And that's going to be very interesting to the pc and that will be very interesting to the auditor and you've got blood. Give the pc a win, all that sort of thing.

But actually it's an excursion. Don't classify it as anything else but an excursion. It's something that you would do either to train somebody to handle things, or to handle the pc that just wouldn't confess to anything. It'd be sort of *in extremis* and isn't a substitute for Prepchecking because that itself is prepchecked. After you've found this change – I haven't given any talks about this and so forth, because we haven't been doing it much, but you see it now on your class line – well, that's to give you, in Routine 3, a crack at assessment.

What is assessment all about, see? Well let's give you something to assess, because people made more mistakes on those, assessing for the biggest self-determined change of a person's lifetime, than any series of mistakes I ever saw in my life. And if a fellow can be taught to assess that list they can be taught to assess anything, see. So you've got – you've got this long string of people and we want to know *everybody* they knew before that time, see. We'll make the auditor make the pc list. We want to know everybody they knew, see. We haven't laid the stress down on this yet. I should be getting out something on it. We want *everything*. We want the *milkman*. We want everybody. We want everybody they *knew* prior to this time. We want *the cousin of the school teacher who taught the schoolroom next door to the schoolroom that was taught by the teacher who was a sister....* You get the idea? We want to know if there are any more people in that area. And that will give the auditor more drill in milking down a list. see it's just a list milked down, that's all. You are going to bleed this meter for a list. Let's find out if there is any other human being anywhere in the world, you see, on that prior confusion.

Well, that's marvelous, see. First you've got a kind of a Goals Assessment in problems. See it's a kind of a mock-up Goals Assessment and if you get it wrong, so what – it isn't going

to do the pc any harm. And then we've got this *long* list of people and we're going to get this list of people and we want a nice long list of people there. We want 75, 80, 100, 125 people that they knew just prior to January the 3rd, 1938. Man if you don't think that isn't going to make that pc dig, you see. And that'll teach the auditor how to get some more people, you know. "Any more items on this list, see, any more people than that? Did you know anybody else prior to that time on January the 3rd in that lifetime – in this lifetime did you know anybody else?" And by God you will finally dig up the girl who knew the girl next door. you get the idea?

Just teach them to bleed a meter out to nothing and get their middle rudiments in. And every time they get their middle rudiments in they get the suppressions and things off, why then they find out the person's memory opens up and we finally get the age before January of 1938 so exposed that the pc thinks he's living in it.

But you see that's a method of doing a parallel action to a Goals Assessment and a parallel actions to listing. We can find out at that stage. Because you see, we suddenly lost 3D Criss Cross to train auditors in. 3D Criss Cross occasionally somebody did lists, got all stuck up in the lists – too hard to straighten out, that sort of thing, so it had a liability so I fell back on a Problems Intensive. Problems Intensive has the same two steps. The problem sounds like a goals list and the assessments, so he's already done it and we can teach him to do these things without fooling around with the pc's goals – because that is tough.

In other words there is a process that we can teach him to do it before he does it. This is a marvelous thing because we can teach Johnny to swim before we let him go swimming. And that's actually all the Problems Intensive is there for. Don't get it as a Problem Intensive – as a comparable magnitude to Prepchecking, because actually Prepchecking is how you would *do* the present time problem when you finished up.

You get the earliest incident on the mostest person that was involved with the prior confusion. You'd find out that'd blow the whole thing. You understand? You'd assess these people. You'd find the one that was left in – I don't care what nonsense you engage in here – and you find out that it was Aunt Gertrude.

All right, let's get all – "What about doing things to Aunt Gertrude?" and let's get this thing bled on down to the bottom of the barrel, you see. Let's get the earliest thing off of this thing. This thing will blow up along the line. You'll find out that problem will blow right at that point. But they are not comparable processes, okay?

I didn't mean to answer so long, but there's some data here which I hadn't handed out. I thought I might as well mention it. Okay? All right.

t All right, after that exhausting thing, you understand I answered two questions there. All right. Okay, any other questions? Yes?

Female voice: There's a rudiment question on end rudiments.

Yes.

Female voice: The last question on the end of the rudiments is asking about goals and gains.

Yeah.

Female voice: One of the last. Now, if the pc uh – gives you an untruth on that or an impress on it – it throws all the rest of the end rudiments out that you've already gone over.

Mm. That's right.

Female voice: What is the best way to handle that? Just repeat the – the package after the goals and gains?

Forget it.

Female voice: Forget it?

Forget it. Totally nonsignificant. First place it's not a meter question.

Female voice: Mm-mm.

Person isn't on the meter. I sometimes keep a pc on the meter. I did today when I was asking it. I put in first goals on a meter occasionally, particularly if I've got the pc holding the cans and he starts about goals. And I ask him, "Well are there any more goals you'd like to mention?" And I get a dirty needle. Let's not go into the thing with a missed withhold, if you please. So I get *the goal I don't know about* and get him to tell me that in the session. And the missed withhold reading disappears and the pc goes into session beautifully.

But at the end of the session *don't weight* those last two questions. Give them no weight at all. It's, "Well have you made any part of your goals, you know, for this session?"

And the pc says, "What are they?"

And you cheerily, cheerily – but my God he's off the meter now, I mean, you are not looking at the meter. You've almost, you've made the gesture to – sort of brushing the whole session off, see.

This is the point where you are slowing down. Nothing you are doing now is of any importance. That is the weight which you give it with your voice and that sort of thing. "Oh, well, all right. Now we're, you know, end of session," you know. I mean, that's the sort of an atmosphere we have. "Well we can stretch now," you know. "Thank God we're over the – over the Great Divide now. All right, okay, made any part of your goals in this session?"

Pc says, "What were they?"

And you tell him cheerily, "Well it's so-and-so," and "did you?"

“And, yes, yes, yes.”

You don't correct him. put no weight on it at all. And then you say, “Well any other gains you'd care to mention?” or whatever it is.

And pc says, “Yes” and so forth and so on. Of course if you are really smart as an auditor you know damn well when a pc is propitiating you.

And I handle that. I have a special rudiment that I put in at that point, is I tell the pc, “You don't have to tell me that,” when I see the pc is propitiating I wouldn't advise you to use it. It requires – it requires a great deal of sensitivity. You see the pc is looking at you and he sort of, the eyeball does a small corkscrew. That's the way you can tell.

And he says, “Well, I – I actually feel tremendously better. I came into the session, you see, with a terrible stomachache, you know and I feel much better.” I mean you get that kind of a response.

I say, “You don't have to tell me that. How did you really feel at the beginning of the session?”

“Well, I didn't feel too bad.”

I say, “Fine” that's it and “anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session,” you know, that sort of thing Then I give him “End of session” Tone 50.

Two little kids the other day, eight and nine auditing each other. One of them really got the CCHs in. she used Tone 50. She was nine or something I put it in an Information. Wildest tale of a session you ever heard in your life.

No, honey, that's a matter of weight. Don't put any weight on that end of the line and you won't throw anything out. Your session actually ends, to all intents and purposes – as far as your determinism is concerned, you see – just before you introduce the idea of goals and gains, see? It's over, it's all over.

It's a wonderful time to slow it all down, put on the brakes, you know. Start picking up your jacket and looking for the pencil you dropped underneath the chair, you know.

There's a bit of skill in weighting You don't want a session to end this way – you don't want a session to end this way. you don't want a session to end that way anyway. You want a session to end sort of this way. Only I end them this way. Give tremendous weight to that “End of session,” see. Really make sure they got out of session. You'll have a drill on that pretty soon. But that's all under the heading of weighting

Yes, it is perfectly true that the pc could give you a half-truth and an untruth, but if the answer isn't terribly important it won't make much difference to the pc either. That is a

courtesy rudiment. It has no real value in the session beyond making the pc realize he got someplace and bring him to the end of the session.

That's sort of like fishing a cognition – the old TR. You make him realize that something happened in the last couple of hours. Only you don't work at it. And in view of the fact that your – it could be pushed to a point of evaluation, you put it that way, you see. So it's got to be very light. “Well, did you make any part of your goals in this session? If you didn't it's all right with me and if you did it's fine with me,” and so forth. “I'm not particularly influenced one way or the other whether you made your goals or didn't make your goals. And you make any additional gains? All right with me if you made gains, if it isn't – if you didn't make gains, why. . .” That's the atmosphere you see. I'm adding the additional words just for the heck of it. “Well if you didn't make any more gains that's all right with me. The world isn't going to perish tomorrow, so what.”

And then well, so we're all finished up around here and you've already more or less ended your auditor's report, sort of time we got out the cigars, you know, that kind of thing. Then all of a sudden why you bead the pc with a beady look right straight in the eye and you say, “Now” you know, “is there anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?” See, this is not important, see. It's not important that he say anything. You don't care what he says, but that's the warning light, see. That's five, four, three, two, you see. And he says, “Well, thank you,” or something like this.

And you say, “All right, now.” Really fix him, you know. Here it is, “*End of session.* Now, is the session ended for you? All right. Good. Good. Now tell me I'm no longer auditing you. Good, that's fine.” We don't care what he said. One auditor upstairs by the way got in a hell of a fight with a pc because the pc wouldn't tell. This was months ago. The auditor isn't here anymore. But the pc wouldn't say, “Is it all right?” he wouldn't say, “You are not auditing me now,” you know, but said, “Go to hell.” And it was – totally conversational thing and the auditor jumped right in there and tried to 8-C and Tone 40 this pc into saying it. But of course the session was over. The auditor has no control value over the pc once the session is over, you see. And the auditor was Q-and-Aing with the purpose of that last remark which destroyed the control value, you see. And the auditor went right there puppy to the root. I think she even hauled the pc downstairs and pushed him into the training office with all four feet, I-think, something like that. Most horrible squabble, fantastic, never saw such a ruckus in your life. Pc wouldn't say, “You are no longer . . .” Well, that's the wrong weight, see.

Now, you see that – yes, very easy – very, very easy to miss this and I will give you a method of getting over it if you want to. Before you say, “Is there anything you'd care to ask or say,” so on, you can ask again for, “In this session have you done anything I haven't found out about,” or something. You can ask for a missed withhold, in other words, again, just before

that. If you are queasy at anytime during rudiments why ask for that. And any time you've got a dirty needle showing up or something like that, you can work that one to death.

But, if you wanted to be very sure – to answer your question very precisely – after you'd asked for goals or gains and you'd figured out they told you an awful half-truth and an untruth and impressed you and were actually trying to damage themselves or something and you could ask at that time, “Well have I missed a withhold?” Well this would get you out of any liability for this. They won't be mad at you then after the session, see? At least get off the missed withhold. And that's right before you ended the session, why ask for a missed withhold.

But I must tell you that this would be unusual because there's no weight, see, to “Have you made any part of your goals and any gains,” see? There's no weight to it at all. It's just a courtesy to a pc. This is part of our free service, you know. That's all. That answer your question?

Female voice: Yes it does except if the pc is asked by somebody who is checking his rudiments out . . .

Oh, I knew there was probably an ARC break there. Why doesn't somebody pick up her ARC breaks? Somebody has found your pc's rudiments out.

Female voice: No, to the contrary, but it could happen. If he's done – if he's . . .

Then you're worried. Then your pc's rudiments should have been out and they didn't find what. . . You're right, you're right. If I was having my pc's *rudiments* checked at the end of session they would never find them out, because I would *always*, just before I said, “End of session” or “Anything you'd care to ask or say,” I would say the middle rudiment from one end to the other and I would knock it cleaner than a toaster. And I would say “That's it, man.” Whizzer-whizzer and the pc would go out of there and so on. And if that didn't work – that didn't work I'd just simply ARC break the pc.

Now, does that answer your question?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. Okay. We have time for another question here. Yes.

Male voice: Ron, could you say a few things – words on the importance of havingness and the use of havingness in Routine 3.

Yeah, yeah I could. It doesn't apply to Routine 3 anymore than it applies to anything else. It's just the importance of havingness. A pc is going to start to have odd reactions if the havingness goes down.

Let me just fill you in, just to this degree. The pc's havingness goes down and you start to get physiological reactions, eyeball swivel, they notice the carpet and they get a theta bop, you know? And if you notice this you should ask yourself this question – why does the auditor say, “Look around here and tell me if you can have anything,” see? And watch the meter. See, why does he do that? And if the meter reacts, then run Havingness. If you don't know this point, you see, that would seem illogical to you.

You'd say it much better than that, “Have you had any trouble in this room? Are there any objects around here which restimulate you?” You do all kinds of other things, but not just run Havingness, see? “Look around here and tell me if you can have anything,” and it goes *clank!* And then, if you are very observant you turn this tone arm down here from a 16, where you had it maybe a minute ago – and you turn that down – and you turn it down to zero and you say, “Squeeze the cans,” you see. All right, the pc squeezes the cans and he gets – he gets *zoood*. Inevitably if you say to the pc, “Look around here and tell me if you can have anything,” and he looks around and it causes his eyeballs to move or his neck to go or something like that, so as to make that kind of an action – unless he's done something weird with his hands, which you should know better than to accept anyhow – let's just rule that out – the pc just looks around, you know and you get this thing going tick, particularly if you get a little sharp tick. Well, what do you need? Neon signs to give you the word? How come it gets a sharp tick?

Well it gets a sharp tick because Havingness is what draws the *noives* – that they are having in New York right this minute, *noives* – very, very taut. It takes the masses and brings them down physiologically against the body. It packs this pc up like something that is going to be sold at the Safeway, see.

Male voice: Hm.

And this pc then, physiologically, could actually go like this and you're going to get some kind of a meter reaction. This is why I laugh like mad when somebody comes around and tells me, “Look I can make the meter react by swiveling my ears.” *Nobody argues* with him. What we're trying to tell him is, “*Yes if your havingness is shot to hell you can always do this.*” Now we could – we could run – we could pick any of you up and run you for a half an hour solid, “Look around here and find something you could go out of ARC with.” And then ask you to “Look around here and tell me if you can have anything.” And the motion of the eyeballs will cause the meter to go *clank-thud-dirty needle-boomp-theta bop-crash*. You get the idea?

So it doesn't – wouldn't matter what you did. Now, some people they just move their head like this, you see and you could get a meter reaction. But why do they get that kind of a meter reaction? Well it isn't – that is not how the meter is supposed to react. And the meter doesn't react that way on the bank – except when the person's masses are so borne down on

the body – the GPM, man, is right there, see. Every PTP the person has ever had is sitting on his left eyeball before it'll do anything, you see. You've got these solid electronic masses which are invisible which are sitting right up against the body with no relief or relaxation of the things and this person is a bundle of piano wire, see. They – they've got him tuned out to high C, you know.

So, you of course tell him to look around here and find out if he can have anything is *pling-poo-h-bing*, you know. Well, you are going to run into infinite numbers of troubles on getting meter reads and so on.

There's two ways you can do it. One, miss a withhold, but that's what? Miss a withhold, the withhold the guy's pulling back against himself, see. So you get a missed withhold. So it registers twice as much as anything else. It gives two ticks where it should give one, see. What's the second tick? You see that's just hard up against the body, that's all. see the person's got masses pulled down on him.

And the other one is when his havingness goes down. When his havingness goes down, the guy just sort of wiggles one ear, you know and you get a *thidth*, you know, on the meter. You get this thing going *tick-tick-tick-tick-flurb-surge-whoop-woop-burr-ba-ba-burr-burr-burr-ba-ba-ba*. What the hell man? Why bother!

See, along about this time you say to him – you say to him, “What's your Havingness Process?” or something, you know. you say – by the way, you very seldom do this. you should coordinate this. When you get real clever at reading the meter you will see that something is going wrong here. There's one of two things go wrong The guy's got a missed withhold or he's got a very dirty needle and the last twenty-one auditors in the last forty-five intensives have done nothing but miss one withhold per minute, see. And he's got so that he's got nothing but a dirty, swinging needle all the time.

Well, of course, this runs his havingness down which is the same phenomenon compounded. Or the person's havingness is down – badly and you'll get these interjected, wandering needle actions and they wander and they tick and they do this and they do that. The person isn't even thinking of anything. The person closes one eye and you're going to get a needle reaction. See? It's not a needle reaction, it's just an action. Goes click-click-click-click, wiggles his big toe, going to get some disturbance in the needle. Well why? It's a very extreme condition of no havingness. It's a very extreme condition. It's nothing funny, man.

Well, if you want that kind of a circus going on while you are prepchecking or while you are looking for goals, why just skip Havingness, see.

But watch it in the beginning of Routine 3. Now, this is what you want to watch. I'll give you some very – I'll give you one out of the session today. I was checking a goal, actually prepchecking, but it was about goals and things. Now, in this session today, it became

apparent that the pc's havingness ran out. Pc's havingness ran the TA down. This is not always true – this isn't a reducing TA reduces the havingness, see. But it became apparent to me that when the pc's havingness went down, the TA dropped down toward 2.0. So I became alert to this and after the session was all over, after we'd done goals and gains, why, we did Havingness and some missed withholds. Sounds funny doesn't it? But I had noticed that the TA, when the pc's havingness was going down, came down here to 2.0 and that the pc's Havingness Process pushed the TA right back up to 3.0, neat as you please. So I noticed that in getting goals and gains the pc lost his havingness – for some reason or other lost his havingness, because it – goals and gains brought the TA down here to 2.0.

It was very peculiar, so I simply told the pc to squeeze the cans again and we got a *good, broad* can squeeze, see – we got that *much, you know, huh-huh*. I wasn't going to let a pc leave the session in that condition. So I just uncorked the Havingness Process and ran the TA back up and all was happy and everything was fine. That's all, see.

So there was – there was, right in today's session, there was something happening after the end ruds, see. And as far as running a Routine 3 is concerned, you start watching the pc's behavior pattern and you will learn what the pc looks like when his havingness goes out. You'll learn how he looks. And the pc starts going this way or the pc dopes off, the pc that . . . All right, it's a missed withhold or havingness, you see. They are both cousins, so if you are just doing a – if this pc's havingness – by your experience – you ran fifteen commands of Havingness and it brought the pc up to a dial drop. And after you'd been auditing this pc for twenty minutes, it came down to that much drop. If that was your experience, testing around on the pc's reaction to Havingness, you'd do the middle rudiments and run some Havingness, see? Every time you did middle ruds, run some Havingness, see – *bang-bang*. Well, there you caught both ways from the middle, you are not going to get this eyeball click.

There is just no doubt about it whatsoever, you know, that a pc can move and influence the meter by wiggling their big toes, swivelling their eyeballs, clicking their teeth together or raising their ears higher. There is no doubt about this whatsoever, but *only* when their havingness is out the bottom. So if you want to avoid vagrant manifestations of the needle, why, keep the pc's havingness up.

By the way my record was sustained. There hasn't been anybody around here whose havingness has been found. Before he came to me his Havingness Process didn't work. This is getting to be an all time championship. I found another one today. Pc's Havingness Process didn't work. Everybody had apparently been running this Havingness Process, but it didn't work.

Do you realize that to run the Havingness Process effectively your first squeeze is tested with this sensitivity knob practically off. Bring it down here to nothing, see. Now, tell him to squeeze the cans. Now they quite ordinarily and routinely will get that much of a fall,

see? If their havingness is off they are liable to get this much of a fall and it's liable to go up here and then fall back, but not all the way and other goofy things. You understand? But it's just a little bit – maybe it's going to be an inch, inch and a quarter, something like this at zero sensitivity. Let's say something like that.

All right, if that is the case this is the havingness drop you want. You want more than third of a dial. You want about a half-a-dial drop if you can possibly get that. If you've got the pc's right Havingness Process, you will get your half-a-dial drop. Your pc's havingness was there, let's say there, now, you ran the pc's havingness for a few commands and you got the pc's Havingness Process and it's a half-a-dial drop.

You watch that. You'll see then – you see apparently you aren't giving enough attention to how much *increase of fall* there should be for the pc's havingness to be up.

Now, don't think this will continue. This gain happens almost at once and then happens very gradual increase from that. So, just a few commands, see and bang. You've got the – well that's the last command, the hell with it, see and you are off your horse and far away, see.

But we've got to have a third to a half-a-dial drop with this sensitivity knob at zero before we can say the pc has any havingness at all. Otherwise you are going to get the eyeball click phenomenon. Besides the pc is going to feel bad. The pc will get withholds faster. He will suppress things bad. He'll do think, think, think, think, think much more quickly. Why? Because the ridges and things are down and the masses are talking.

And if you want to really get masses talking, run a pc's havingness down, you know. “Run around – look around here and find something you couldn't have. Thank you. Look around here and find something you couldn't have.” And the next thing you know these inert masses and spheres around him will even start talking. He'll all of a sudden hear circuits turn on, other goofball things start to occur, see, by running his havingness backwards.

So just – the answer to your question is when do you use the Havingness Process on Routine 3? Same as any other time when the pc's physiological condition is liable to influence the E-Meter by reason of dropped havingness. Okay?

Male voice: Yes. Thank you.

All right. Okay, that's it. Take a break.

Thank you. Thank you.