An Experimental Process
Experimental Case C by V No. 2

I started session by attempting to clear a p.t. problem. First he had to clear the command. The pc, very restless, defined a problem as “Something that can’t be solved.” “You can keep trying, but of course you can’t solve it.”

I tried in vain to get pc to as-is that computation. It would not change.

I was faced by this: One cannot audit successfully up against a p.t. problem. If one tries to do so without clearing the problem the whole case hangs fire. Every unchanged profile or case after auditing is unchanged because the auditor left a present time problem partly or wholly unflat and in restimulation. A pc whose definition of a problem is “something that can’t be solved” and who yet has a p.t. problem could not be audited successfully unless the computation altered.

Trying “What is a problem?” as a repetitive question for half an hour only made the pc nervous, restless and tearful. Obviously the consideration would not change. Therefore, obviously, the consideration was mis-owned. It was a valence, another person the pc was being with complete tenacity and total error. Process abandoned. Decided to strip the valence off.

A discussion of what was a valence finally bore fruit. Pc understood term as meaning a mental package of ideas and considerations really belonging to another person and unknowingly borrowed by pc.

Started in to run a process to at once give greater reality on valences and to hit at the computation.

If pc would fight help so hard then the valence had four considerations that were known to me. (1) It couldn’t be assisted; (2) it considered a problem as “something that could not be solved”; (3) it was steeped in defeatism; and (4) the pc thought of the valence as self.

Just to ease into valences I ran a process as follows “Can you get an idea of somebody that cannot be helped?” Pc could. “Describe the person.” Pc did, thus getting a detached idea of a personality in the mind. “Now what would you say that person’s definition of a problem would be?”

The first dozen people so imagined all had definitions of problems identical with pc’s own. But then there began to be a change in the definition.

Possibly this process would have gotten further but pc was looking brighter and a flat place was reached and I was really trying to clear by valences.

Therefore I bridged, started in on valences directly. I called the valence in which pc was stuck “that valence” (pc thought of it as self). I used the repetitive command
"Tell me how you could waste that valence." Now and then I asked where it was. Pc didn't know sometimes, sometimes did. (At first it was just back of pc's eyes and was pc's "thinkingness").

Terrible somatics cut in after fifteen minutes, all chronic with pc.

I went right on with process for some time (over one hour) when pc suddenly began to cognite on problems. The somatics had ceased entirely fifteen minutes before.

As a process can be left when (a) an ability is regained, or (b) three responses are given with equal comm lag or (c) pc truly cognites in line with process, I could then leave it and bridge.

I bridged over to "What part of that valence could you be responsible for?" for twelve minutes to round process off and keep pc from making "that valence" an enemy if any bit of it remained and to check out somatics. Pc felt very dazed for a moment or two (typical of a separating somatic) but came out of it very bright. Process flat.

Bridged into earlier commands for a few commands each to flatten them and bridged out to begin clearing of session.

Pc could not now consider any of the five initial problems listed as problems now . . . they all seemed simple and routine parts of life.

Ended session.

Time of auditing 2½ hours approximately, including one short break.

Goal of session was to clear up problems on the subject of problems. Goal was attained.

Added bonuses—Loss of main thinkingness circuit, loss of chronic somatic and service facsimile, increase of potential, new zest to continue on to clear.

Pc heretofore desiring little auditing, hard to control in session, reactive toward help offered by others. All changed.
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