

## PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on  
15 February 1962

I thought you might be interested at first glance here—I thought you might be interested in the Auditor's Report notations on that. You saw Prepchecking, I didn't show you the Withhold System. You were looking at Prepchecking and the numbers are different on Prepchecking.

You've got here Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" which is just a good, solid Prepcheck question, which is a rudiments question. This is mostly what you'll be doing with rudiments anyway. I mean, pardon me, Prepchecking is just getting in rudiments so they are zeroed in a hundred percent, hence the number zero. It's an artillery term. I might as well just give you a lecture on this.

Okay. This is 15 Feb. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we're concerned here mainly with Prepchecking. We've got some people that are going; they'll be having a wrastle around with this, and I'm sorry for that, but you can make it all right.

Did you learn anything from the demonstration?

*Audience: Yes, yes.*

Yeah. Did you notice that the questions were being given actually that appear on the Withhold System fairly repetitively? Pardon me, one after the other in sequence and not repetitively, but occasionally repetitive? Why was that? Why did I repeat one of the When, All, Whos? Why did I repeat When, All, Whos? At what moment did I repeat those?

Yes?

*Female voice: You ran an extra incident that keyed in.*

Yeah. The basic reason is the pc still looked puzzled. It's as elementary as that. You get how elementary it is?

You say, "Who should have known about this?"

And the pc says, "Well, Joe, you know. Joe should have known about this and . . ." See?

"All right. Well, anybody else should have known about it?" or, "Who didn't find out about it?" or "Anybody fail to find out about it?" any variation of the question.

But you're just looking at the pc for a little surge. Well, that will only go so far. Sometimes the pc doesn't surge. Sometimes the pc doesn't say, "Oh well, yeah. Well I shouldn't have known about it, you know," or something like that. He doesn't have a little cognition. Just leave it. It comes under the heading of "fishing for a cognition." You want him to find out something, see?

So remember that pulling withholds is totally and a hundred percent . . .

You don't mind my talking about your session, do you Fred?

*Male voice: No.*

You remember that fishing a cognition?

*Audience: Yes.*

Remember the old TR, Fishing a Cognition? Well, that's actually what you are doing there. And I'll tell you something: your pc can go out of session if you were not auditing the pc, but auditing a system, you see? Pc'd tend to go out of session because they—interest, of course, wouldn't be on the pc.

Now, the system merely exists to get withholds. That's the first thing you should recognize in Prepchecking. The system exists in order to clarify difficulties. And Prepchecking in general—although it has a whole ramification of stuff—is compared to the rudiments and is plotted immediately and exactly against the rudiments. And you'll get a whole bunch of little questions which are Prepcheck questions, which are Zero1, Zero2, Zero3, Zero4, Zero5. Do you see the numbering on this?

The rudiment that you're writing down here. . . I'm not going to say anything about your withholds, you can start breathing Just talking about the system. The Zero, of course, is the rudiment question. That is the Zero which you're trying to clear up. But to clean up this Zero you have to have a Zero1, Zero2, Zero3. They're a little Zero1, Zero2, Zero3. Do you see those? Huh? And this little—will simply be for this rudiment. They're different for every rudiment. You have a different panoply of and parade of questions, you see?

This rudiment happens to be the dynamics. “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” Now, if you want to put that together—if you want to put that together—you just take all the parts of the dynamics. You see, you take self, sex, children—all of this sort of thing Well, what was very peculiar here, is all I was trying to clear of the first of these, the pc's withhold came up on the second dynamic, not the self, see? And we had a second dynamic withhold occurring here, but remember I started out to clear self because I had no other choice. At the beginning of this session, we didn't know anything except the pc knew it was a withhold session and was very happy about it, and said to get “the biggest present life withhold I have and run it out,” see? All right. He said that so naturally he's going to give it to me.

But what I want to have done in the thing, is let's clear the auditor. And I wanted to show you the most fruitful rudiment in action—let's clear the auditor. That we almost skimp in auditing, and yet it is the most important one. Yes, it's important to get people's havingness together. Yes, it's important to do this, but there's nothing else in auditing clears the auditor but the rudiment!

See, other rudiments clear other things, but there are no processes we have today that clears the auditor. See? “Are you withholding anything from me?” you could say in the session. Yes, that tends to clear the auditor a bit. “Is there something you—I should have found out about you?” Yes, this tends to clear the auditor a bit.

But, actually there's this whole huge area that we've got to raise up to the highest possible pitch. We've got to get the highest possible relaxation on the part of the pc for the auditor. There is the weakest part of your auditing You see? And it's not the weakest part of your auditing personally, see? But in auditing pcs, that shows up as the weakest point, is the pc hasn't much confidence in the auditor and you've got to build that confidence up.

Now, if that confidence is built up, the pc will stay in session come hell or high water. The pc will actually get mad as hell at you and still be in-session—do you see the difference—instead of being mad as hell at you and out of session, you know? The pc you've just—because why? This particular prepchecking activity is peculiarly liable to the pc going out of session. Why? Well, you're asking him for very intimate activities. It drives him out very easily.

But there's a more important one than that. It's just before he stubs his toe on one of these kingpin withholds; it's a missed withhold! It's been a missed withhold for several seconds, at

the least, see? Even while it's a missed withhold for just the period he said, "Hmm, well—uh-hmm, well—uh-hmm." Just at that moment it's a missed withhold. You haven't got it yet have you? And if he doesn't articulate it right at that second, he starts getting angry with you. He gets a little upset with you, and so on.

Well, it's worse than that. He starts running into it about five minutes before. And he doesn't know about it yet. And the only person he can locate that's badgering him—you see he's being badgered. He's something like a bull with banderilleros being shoved into him, see? And he doesn't quite know what's—what's kicking him. So he looks around to find the most likely target and, of course, it's the auditor. So he tends to be a little bit nervy on the subject of the auditor at that moment. And you will see this time and time again and please, please in sec—in all this Prepchecking, please recognize what it is. It's the pc is just coming up right on the edge of it.

Now, if a pc isn't tremendously well in-session, zzhhhh. See? So therefore it becomes very important to get the auditor clean as a wolf's tooth just as early as you can in Prepchecking

Now, your rudiments aren't run 2, 3, 4 in order. There are some rudiments that it's more important to run than others. And this first one—the first one, the most important one—is, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" That's your first rudiment and that's the most important one. So therefore you take that up. If you were doing an HGC pc, what you would do, would be to clear up, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" as your kingpin Zero question, and then move over on to the last one: present time problem. And you do a Problems Intensive. And that's what fits under there—just your standard Problems Intensive complete with form, just as you've been taught to do it. You see?

That's the old 22 December, Problems Intensive, HCOB. Don't look at me blankly; you know of it. And you just do that whole thing from beginning to end. I don't care how much data you get on the pc before you get up to that—I think it's the O section. But when you get to that O section, you get those self-determined changes in life and you go down there and you find out then what those self-determined changes are. You assess the selfdetermined changes. You get the one that is the hottest one and then you ask him, "What problem immediately preceded that change?" and it'll spit out if you've assessed it well. The pc it—it'll just sort of appear magically.

He doesn't have to grope for it. If he gropes for it, you've goofed. You haven't got the selfdetermined change. You assessed wrong; the pc didn't give you all—something crazy went on here that was just simply lousy auditing It has to be that crazy. It has to be that bad for this phenomenon not to occur.

You find the self-determined change, "When you decided to go rowing as a profession on the Thames." Oh yeah, that's good. And that falls like mad. And you say, "What problem immediately preceded that in your life?"

And, he's hardly ever thought of it before, but it should just appear in front of him like a magic lantern is turned on, you know? And he suddenly looks at it and he says, "How to drown my wife."

And it surprises him almost as much as the surprising things that come out of it. I mean, that's the way it ought to pop. But if he's at all in-session, that is the way it will pop. If he's worried about session and he's—not any confidence in the auditor, it won't pop that way, see?

All right. Now, you just handle it just the way you handle it, that's all. You just go down the line and list all of the people of the immediate prior confusion. Actually you locate the immediate prior confusion to it. (Let me put this straight way to.) Get the prior confusion to that problem. And listen, it wasn't five years before; it was anything from five minutes to five

days or something like that. It's closer. It's much closer. He'll give you an earlier one before he gives you the actual confusion. Don't just take the first confusion he gives you.

Well, he'll give you a confusion, "Well, immediately prior, how to drown my wife. Well, it was my childhood. My mother beating me and so forth every day, and my mother and my wife must have looked like my mother or something I read in a textbook, and so therefore, my—this—this must have been it. And the immediate prior confusion to wanting to drown my wife? Well that, that's it. We've got the immediate prior confusion—when I was three." Only he's forty when this problem came up. And you'd be surprised, that's your main—your main error in spotting prior confusions, see?

Well, you just walk that up and let's just spot—let's just spot the minutes, hours, and days and weeks immediately before that selfdetermined change for that problem. You just spot that. You can take it on the meter and you'll find it. God almighty! He found her in bed with another man and he completely occluded it. You know, it'd be something wild in here, see. Much more likely, however, this turns out to be a complete dub or something of the sort. And it's an entirely different situation as we turn out in Prepchecking.

All right. You take that zone—that prior confusion—and list the people who were present in that. You get a list of the dramatis personae in that area and then it was—you assess that list and you'll get the hot one. And you take that hot one and your—it get—it—you get a Zero1 that runs something like this. And the Zero1 would be, well let's see, "What—well, what difficulty—What about your difficulties with Fred?" That's a perfectly good valid question. "What about your difficulties with Fred?" See?

And he says, "Well what about them? Nothing about them," and so forth.

Now you have at this point, you've got your—your Zero, of course, is the rudiment—present time problem. Well, that is narrowed down to getting this fellow's problems straightened up. So that's still your Zero.

Then you get a Zero1, which is your Problems Intensive result. And that becomes, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" You got the idea? Hmmm? That's your Zero1. And then you get, of course, you get 11, because he's going to give you a withhold and now you're going to run the Withhold System.

So your whole Withhold System runs off of 11 until you can finally clear about—"What about those difficulties with Fred?" You see, that is really your master question, is: "What about those difficulties with Fred?" That is your real 1 that you're trying to clear. But in order to try—in Prepchecking in trying to clear, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" he gives you a withhold—you even chitter-chatter, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" and you see that it's reading.

And he says, "Well, I don't know."

"Well, are you withholding something about Fred?" Give him a prompt, see?

And, "I was withholding, I guess that I've hated him for years, I've withheld it," and so forth, you see?

And you say, "Okay. What about hating Fred?" See?

Now, that is your 11. And you just clean up this, "What about hating Fred?" And you just clean it up with the Withhold System, see? Sounds very sloppy, but it isn't sloppy at all because your next line, of course, is, "When did you first start hating Fred?" or "When was that?" if he starts giving you hotter withholds, don't you see? And so on.

Now, frankly, that can go to a 12. See, you're sinking one stage at a time here off of this thing. What this is, is a German schema.

"What about hating Fred?" is awfully broad. Maybe too broad, you see? Well, certainly, "What about those difficulties with Fred?" is broad enough. God, that's—that's the Thames estuary-wide, you see? And then you get into this little tributary, "What about hating Fred?" and that's your 11, see?

But we find, now, he has innumerable withholds from Fred and, "What about hating Fred?" well, so forth, well you kind of have to steer him now. That's what I mean about steering the pc's attention.

And, "What about hating Fred?"

"Well I hated him for this—motivator, moti—"

"Well, what did you done to him?" you see? "What did you do to him at that particular time?" or something like this. Anything you can steer him into. You don't put that down, because that's just a spat. Nah, it's something or other. He's just going to give you tons of these things, see? And you will eventually get out of it. And finally you'll clean up, "What about hating Fred?"

But I said you didn't put it down. If it's "What about hating Fred?" and then he gives you one that is worth calling a new What, see, as soon as you've got a new What, is "Well, actually, all my life I have tried to undermine his reputation." And that is the withhold. That is a real withhold, see. Now, you've got your 12 and you carry on from there. And you clean 12 which is about his attacks on Fred's reputation, see? That all cleans up.

Each one of these, you see, is done by the Withhold System. But as—if you run down to the second 1 and the third 1, you see, you have to clean it up before you clean up the second 1, before you clean up the first 1. You've got the idea? So, I don't care how deep you go into the well.

Now, you could keep this far too accurately. That's one of the things you should know. You can keep it far, far, far too accurately. God, you could fill notebooks for one session, see? These things are simply indicators. We've got to know where we go back to. That's all we've got to know here. We've got to know where we go back to. If we've cleaned up "ruining Fred's reputation" and that Fred didn't know it and nobody knew it and we went over the 2-34—we're going to get incident after incident, "What about ruining Fred's reputation?" you see, if that's your 12, that's—well, you've written that down—"What about ruining Fred's reputation?"

And he says, "Oh, uh—well, uh—I uh—actually planted a letter in the mails; it was a forged letter." Something like this, you know. This is very hot, see? Well, you don't go on with, "What about that forged letter?" you see, and get a 13, because this is just a whole cluster. This is going to—this is a big mess—across the boards, you see?

You must remember that a withhold is a mess, see? Now, you are applying a very neat, precise system to something that is totally gummy. See? You're putting on a nice pair of boots to weed and wade through the darkest of mud.

So, you start to get too neat and try to follow down every trend and everything the pc says and everything the utter—the pc utters, and make a sub-numbered What out of it and so on—you'll just run out of auditor report paper in the first ten minutes of the session, and you also will have gotten lost—lost your whole orientation on the case, which is simply: get this withhold good and slicked up. You see? And well knowing you could be mining very arid ground at any time. You see, it doesn't amount to anything Nothing much is happening.

So the thing for you to do is to keep your orientation—to keep your orientation on what are you really trying to clean up, and any time you hit a central thing that you really want to clean up, you make a sub-numbered 1. But if you've got that cleaned up, now there's no more kick at all on having put this in the mails, you see, and this forged letter and so on. You've gone the 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4 on this, you see? Well, let's come back up to ruining Fred's reputation. And now we go at 2-3-4, 2-3-4, or something on this, and we get off a bunch of other stuff.

Now, just as likely as not, we're all of a sudden liable to run into his planting evidence in Fred's desk at school. Oh well, we've got a brand-new incident, haven't we? So we've got a new sub-2, a 12. All right. "What about planting things in the desk at school?" See? Let's clean this up 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4. All right. We've got that all clean. Nothing more about planting the desk, but there's plenty on ruining Fred's reputation, see?

All right. So let's fish around and the pc gives you a lot of boz-woz and a lot of nonsense that doesn't have anything to do with the price of fish. He says, "Well," he says, "Well I—I, I—I nattered to him. I nattered to him—to the principal and I—I told his girlfriend actually that he sneezed, and I did this and I did that and all of. . ."

It, just—you're pulling withholds, you see—anything that's coming up. What you've got to meet here is the fact that every time you get off a hot one, you sort of take the lid off the boiling pot. And it boils over for a while and you clean up the mess and then you get back to this other thing, "Well, what about ruining Fred's reputation?" And all of a sudden, well—that's dead. That's a dead one. So you knock out that 11. You'd just knock that flat. That's gone now—ruining Fred's reputation.

But remember, we graduate upstairs again, "What about hating Fred?"

And he says, "Oh yes, my God! I certainly do!" and so forth, and "Not so bad as I did. He's not a bad man. He simply should be electrocuted and hanged, and so forth, and well . . ."

"Now, have you done anything else to him you haven't told anybody about?" You see, that's your incidental question. That's a leader, see, "What about this.7"

And he says, "Oh, you know, mmmm-mmmmm. Well, I actually made an attempt on his life. Ha-ha. Three days before this problem. Ha-heh-heh-hehheh-he-hehhh."

And it has been totally missing from view that Fred was included in the plans of killing his wife. He had never remembered doing that. It was just somehow out of view, kind of—but he, of course, has a sensation that he knew about it all the time, because he did. But he hasn't thought about this and it doesn't blow, you see, immediately.

"Well, what about threatening Fred's or—what about trying to take Fred's life?" You see, that's your new sub-1.

"All right. Well, it goes clear back to when we were boys and I just remembered this incident, and we were down at the old swimming hole and so forth and he was floundering in the middle and I stood on the bank and I didn't save him and now that's all cleaned up isn't it?"

And you say, "Well, that's fine, that's fine. What about the old swimming hole?" And it goes clank. It didn't clean. Well, that's your test. See? It didn't clean. So you've got to clean it up.

Now, what rocks—let's get a little rule together here—is after you've put down a What—whether it's the main 1 or the sub-1 or the sub-2 or the sub-3—if you go back and ask about it and it rocks, you actually have a subquestion that you've now got to write down. You get the idea? But remember not to ask it with a restimulative word in it.

You say, "What about the old swimming pool, or the old swimming hole?" You say that, see?

And the pc says, “Well, yeah. That’s right. I stood on the bank and didn’t save him.”

You say, “What about the old swimming hole?” There’s nothing on that. That’s not a sub—a 12, see? We’ve cleaned it. See, because make allowances here, you see. You’re really blowing things. And your incidental test—and not too precisely either, you know—your incidental test is when you repeat it, or when you ask him a What question and you don’t get any rock on the thing, well he blew it! So let’s get something else to ask a What question about. Let’s not clutter up the auditor’s report.

But every time you get a big bang after he’s given you a withhold, he has not told all. So it’s—really, should be a What question. That is your basic fundamental on which you’re dealing.

All right. So anytime we put—anytime we write anything down, if we’ve written it down, then we go 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4, on that question until it cleans. And we finally say, “What about the old swimming hole?” And there it is.

Now, by the way, you probably don’t realize in this demonstration which you have just watched. . . And I want to thank Fred for that, that took a brave man, didn’t it? What hasn’t emerged from view is, is because it was only an hour session, I didn’t run end rudiments as an interim action, I ran—didn’t have time—I ran a skimmed—they were adequate—but end rudiments in which I was hitting “half-truth” and “untruth” and “damage” harder than the devil, because those are the things that are going to give you trouble in Prepchecking.

Now, frankly, every now and then, if the going is getting very gummy and too rough, run that end rudiment. Or run as many end rudiments as you care to. And run his Havingness or anything else you care to, you see? But for heaven’s sakes don’t go more than an hour before you do your end rudiments because this question, “What about this incident in Rome?” cleaned. I didn’t put it back on the meter because I didn’t want to throw the pc back into session; we were already running out of time. But it cleaned on the end rudiments.

How do I know it cleaned? Well, I watched carefully the needle pattern that was still residual. And when I did the end rudiments, that needle pattern cleaned on the half-truth, the untruth and damaging himself. I won’t ask you to do that kind of E-Metering because you don’t have to do that kind of E-Metering, but there we went. And that was why we were still getting a knock on it. Which is why I closed it off with the speed with which I did. I said, “Well, there’s nothing much left on this. This goes back someplace else.” I would have left the pc with the feeling like it couldn’t possibly be clean and he’d be hunting all over the place on a bare street, you see?

Of course, the thing knocks. Now, naturally I will go back and test it when I audit the pc again, see? I’ll check it. But the odds are very much in favor of it being clean.

Now, do you see how an incident can be held in? A What question can be held in because your end rudiments went out. But the beginning rudiments go out in 3D Criss Cross and the end rudiments go out in Prepchecking. Isn’t that fascinating?

To get rudiments in, you do end rudiments in Prepchecking Do you want to do a bang-up job of getting rudiments in, why just do the end rudiments. And in 3D Criss Cross if you want to get the rudiments in, why, do the beginning rudiments. I think it’s quite amusing—an entirely different aspect of it.

Anyway, you saw those exact needle patterns tend to fall on-off on the subject of half-truth, untruth and try to damage anyone in the session. Well, now listen, when you’re doing—when you’re doing a bunch of withhold pulling, let me call your attention to something “Self” is the fellow he feels he is damaging because sometimes giving up a withhold threatens personal survival. That makes sense doesn’t it? So he feels he might be damaging self. And sometimes

pcs run themselves down and make themselves appear worse than they are, just as this pc did in a desperate effort to make it blow. See? We found out it wasn't quite that discreditable. And there it is. It all of a sudden came back into focus again.

You saw those falls that you—had been left on 11, “What about this incident in Rome?” See? There's that one. We consider that thing pretty washed. If there's anything on that it's going to be somewhere else, but will come up as another What on 1 here.

Now, what are we cleaning on 1? Let's take a look at this. We're cleaning “Are you”—Zero—”Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” Zero1, of course, we're starting out with the dynamics aren't we? All right. And Zero1 is where we got to, and on Zero1 we were cleaning 1, “What about these physical difficulties?” That was the kind of the withhold the pc had, see? You got the idea?

So we're cleaning up here Zero, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” and go on cleaning that up for a long while. That's one of these broad, Atlantic-wide, questions, see? And then Zero1, self: well, that's the mouth of the Mississippi or something like that. That's as wide as that thing is. And now each time he gives us some kind of a withhold on physical difficulties, we get out of this a 11 as a What. Now, out of that 11—if we can't clear this 11 with the 2-3-4, 2-3-4, 2-3-4, and it doesn't clear up right away and all of a sudden some hotter subject shows up while we're doing this—we get 12, new What, because that will be a brand-new withhold, don't you see?

And he says, “Fred,” he said, “Well, Fred, Fred doesn't know it but he was in the sporting goods store with me the day that ohmmmm . . . He was in there the day I bought this shotgun I was going to shoot him with.”

Probably won't become a What. Why? It blows, see? That blows right there.

But all of a sudden you press him a little bit further and he gives you another withhold, “Well, I haven't told anybody that I've always been looking for the perfect weapon with which to kill Fred, and still am.”

You say, “What about the perfect weapon to kill Fred?” and you've got a new 1 sub-something Now, we'll run this off, see? And we're still working on this thing about extinguishing Fred. See?

Now, we've got the subject of killing Fred and maiming Fred and ruining Fred in various ways. We've got—that's all out of the road. We've cleaned that back up. Remember we've still got, “hating Fred,” you see? And now we go to town on the thing, because “hating Fred,” at this point, he doesn't think of any other withholds right away and it's all—the needle seems kind of quiet and everything seems kind of quiet. Well, let's run the end rudiments, see? And the end rudiments will probably sweep out of the way what's left on it.

Now, as far as repeating the When or the precision of the When, you adapt your When, All and Who to the needs of the instant—just the need of the moment. Of course the more difficulty you're having with it, the less precise the pc has the When, see? So the more Whens you use—the more often you come around the little squirrel cage—the more often you have to ask him When, the more precisely you ask him When. The more often—the more precisely. That is the rule. Until you get right down there to a point of where you're dating it, “Well, was it ten minutes of ten or five minutes of ten? Six minutes of ten?” You see, you could get down into it that precisely if this thing wasn't blowing. And every time you do this—you come by—you'll date it a little more precisely and get right on the bouton. And finally—that is all assisting in the blowing, you see?

All right. So you would date it, but at first, “Well, when was that?”

He says, “Well, that was when I was a child.”



You say, "Fine."

If you're going by it again, "Well, about how old were you?" you see? You're asking him a When but it's with another phraseology. "You—about how old were you?"

You've already kept it in mind that he said with great generality, "When I was a child," you know. Let's get how old he was.

And he said, "Well, I guess I must have been about ten."

And you say, "That's fine. That's good enough."

And now you're coming by—you've done the others—and now you're coming by it again and you say, "What year were you ten?"

"Oh, what year was I ten? Let's see, that must have been 1941. No that must have been 1940. It must have been 1939. It must be no, no, no, no, no, no—that year I was twenty. Ah, let me see . . ."

And as long as he's willing to figure it out and he's making some progress, don't interfere with him, see? Don't let him run on—don't let him run on and on either, but don't interfere with him.

He says, he's figuring it out. "I was thirty-nine. No that's a, that's a—let's see, I was thirty-nine when I was well, ten and ten... Let's see, what year when was I born? Well, that'll give it to me. What year was I born? I was born in 1921. All right, that's good, that was the year I was born. So, ten, this must have been 1930. Couldn't have been 1931. Why, I must have been twenty when this thing happened! Yeah, why, I was twenty! That's terrible, but I was twenty when this thing happened."

And you say, "All right. Well, what date does that make it?"

He says, "It must have been 1941. I was, well, I was twenty years old when it happened."

You say, "Good."

Now, you say—if he's gone into this much of a comm lag, kind of prime the pump a little bit. You know what you're working on here. He just got through telling you that he threw a rock and you say, "Well, is that all about throwing a rock? Is that all? Is that all there is to that? About that? Isn't any more to it? Is that all there is to it?"

And he says something and answers your question. And then you want to find who didn't, and who did and "Was there any determination that never in the future would anybody ever find out about it?" You know, your notknows can go that far. They can go past, present and future not-knows, you know? You can run the whole gamut.

The most fruitful ones is "Who tried to find out about it and failed?" or "Who should have known about it and failed to?" "Who didn't find out about it who had an opportunity to?" That kind of question is your hottest button, remember that. So don't fail to stress that. But at the same time you can say, "Well, who didn't know about it?" "Who decided never to remember it?" What—you can run a whole lot of postulates out of this, on the subject of memory if you want to, you see? Actually the stress with which you can do this far exceeds the need of it. You have far more tools than you need to pull the simple fact of somebody stayed in ignorance of this misdemeanor.

All right. You could get very fancy with this and very complicated you know. But it's kind of fun sometimes just to throw it around. You just play this off the cuff. It isn't the way it looks to you. You're not reading any crystal ball.

You just say, well, we've talked about—we've talked about his wife never found out about it for a long time, how about Fred, you know? Let's us just interject this thing, "Well, did Fred ever find out about any part of this?"

"Well, no as a matter of fact he occasionally—and so forth."

"Well, should he have found out about it?" You know? Press it a little bit. "Well, did he ever almost find out about it?"

"Oh well, yes." And you'll get some little peak on this thing. "Yes he, as a matter of fact, he turned around just as I was standing there, and I put the rock in my pocket. Yeah, the dumb fool. He could have seen me do that."

You know the way they blame somebody for not having discovered something is what is marvelous about the thing. You see what I'm saying?

Anyway, you run it down the line and you're back to your question, "Well, what about throwing a rock at Fred?" something like that. Deader than a doornail. Nothing to this thing. You graduate upstairs again, ask this upper one. Maybe you can clear that now, maybe not. And if you can't clear it, of course, you can run a 2-3-4 on it, if he gives you a new withhold. And you find yourself stuck with a new What. Well that What had better be written down with the 12, don't you see?

So you clean the lower ones and go back to the upper ones. You got the idea?

So you can keep this scale going on and on and you keep moving it upstairs. It takes an awful lot of withholds to make a single Zero1. That takes a lot—there's an awful lot of Whats to make a whole clearance of self. See, that's pretty terrific. But eventually you graduate it upstairs and you've got that, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" requires a subself.

Now, what is the exact question that you would ask to find out if you should move on to sex or something else? There'll be something else here. Yeah, well you've got a subquestion at Zero1 and that question would be, "All right. Are you willing to talk to me about yourself?" you see?

And the guy is all set now. Yeah, you've cleaned these other things up so he says, "Yes."

Now, you've got your new one which is Zero2, which is sex, children; Zero3, family; Zero4. Here we go, you see? And whenever you see these prepcheck questions you'll see Zero1 and all that sort of thing, you'll know what that is, see? And you just move it out of that category Zero1, into your 1. And that's the first big, broad, general, cracking withhold the pc gives you. And they usually are very broad. And this one is a perfect example: 1 is, "What about these physical difficulties?" For God's sake, how much broader, see, do you want? Naturally you're going to run a lot.

You'll find it comes out pretty textbook, actually. It's not a difficult subject; just don't make a difficult one out of it. If the every—oh, some twenty percent of the withholds that you run across or something like that, are going to stick. The other eighty are going to blow the first time they're ever mentioned, because they're little tiny things, you know?

Now, there's another aspect of this I should mention, and that is that the pc gums the system up. Now, don't get impatient with the pc because he insists on giving you information that doesn't fit into your form. That is the way a government operates, not the way an auditor

operates, you see? The government gets into a savage, roaring fury, you see, if what should be on line four appears on line two. The quartermaster will never issue it. The Treasury Department will never pay it. Well, don't get that bureaucratic on this because the pc insists on giving you the When, What and All in the same sentence. Just consider it an added bonus. But don't omit asking your routine, but not in such a way that it invalidates him.

He's just told you, "Well, I had a—I had a whole operation and I never told anybody about it, and—nothing about it. I had this whole operation when I was twenty-one and nobody at all knew about it. Secret from everyone."

Boy, has he fixed your clock apparently on first glance, you see? He's given you the When and he's given you—and he tells you, maybe very in extremis, you know—he tells you all the details and what he withheld from the doctors too, you see? And it all comes out brrrrrrr, see? And there is the situation, all laid out on a silver platter for you. So, what are you supposed to do? Well, don't let your system get in the road of the pc's withholds. That's why, when I was auditing, you saw an irregularity in the system. The pc's already given me the data. What was I expected to do? Invalidate the pc?

The pc says, "It was at three o'clock in the morning, the night of December the twenty-third, 3:01."

And you immediately say, "Well, when?" You see the invalidative use of the thing. I wouldn't put that in practice. If he gave me that much detail, why I'd just let the system skid its wheels for that particular one and go on to the next one.

Now, it's interesting to use a system with fluidity and flexibility, because after all, all it's trying to do is keep your number on what page of the book you're reading, see? That's the only thing the system is trying to do. And let me tell you that bookmarkers never get in the road, or shouldn't ever be permitted to get in the road of the adventures of Don Quixote, you see? You don't ordinarily let a bookmarker stop the paragraph, do you? Well, that's all a Prepcheck system is, is a series of bookmarkers. That's all you're recording here.

But the odd part of it is, if you omit it entirely, you find yourself reading the last chapter when you ought to be reading the first chapter and you get a lot of restimulated withholds.

Now, that's the only danger that you run—is not getting all of it and missing it. So you use, every now and then, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" or you certainly use it before you start end rudiments or something like that. Just throw it in gratuitously, not very often, because it's rather self-invalidative. Don't throw it in very often, but before you start running end rudiments or something like that—You know, you're just going to run a little bit of a punch end rudiment just to find out that we've cleaned up the half-truths and that sort of thing, kind of precede it with, "Well, have I missed a withhold here?" and watch your meter very carefully, and it'll flick.

But when you ask that question, "Have I missed a withhold here?" for heaven's sakes, don't put any restimulative reference into it, because of course it'll fall. And remember the pc is still working on withholds. You still have half-truths and that sort of thing. And if you can't clean that, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" go ahead and run the half-truths and so forth. Realize you haven't cleaned, "Have I missed a withhold?" and after you've got the half-truths, whole truths, so help me God, get the damage and then, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" Because, of course, that he was telling half-truths and untruths and damage, will also be a missed withhold. So don't beat that to death. Just keep your finger on it. Because after all you're pulling withholds all the time. I'm sure you—at the end of the session you won't have missed any withholds on him. But it's a good one to throw in occasionally, you know, just as a checker.

Now, you'll find that the system itself has a high degree of flexibility and it prevents you from sounding like a wound-up doll, providing you don't exactly codify the wording of every line.

I think you think that—I think you—the demonstration—I'm sure the pc was not even aware of really much of a system going on, and yet I was asking him the very salient points of exactly these things. And he didn't notice any system going on because these are the questions you ought to be asking, see? However, I'm sure that if somebody worked on this real hard, they could get that well obtruded into the situation.

“What about stealing your brother's marbles?”

“Thank you.”

“When was that?”

“Is that all of it?”

“Who should not have found out about that?”

“Thank you.”

And you know I think the pc would get a vague notion there that he wasn't really being listened to. I think that would be a little bit poor.

You've got a flexibility. So you have to keep the sense. What I'm asking you to do is keep the sense of what you are doing in your head—the sense of it. Whiz-whiz-bang, you know?

And won't—it's just basically this. Well, right now it's When, you know? He's told me and he's given me some other remarks and it's When. “What's the date of that?” See? Anything that fits. It's what is appropriate to it. “When was that?” is fairly early. “What's the date of that?” “Now precisely when did this occur? Precisely. Look, I'll help you out here. All right.”

And we go ahead and we just date it down. We take maybe three or four minutes dating the thing, you know. Ah, we found out it was December the 10th and 1941, 2:03 o'clock in the morning—2:03 and 15 seconds. You can do that. “If it was, it couldn't have been. It couldn't have been. That's when I said I was—oh, oh, I get that now. Yeah, yeah.” And you get another one falling out of the hamper.

So anyway, that is a preview of what Prepchecking looks like and sounds like and acts like. And I wanted you to have this so that it wouldn't look strange and peculiar to you. I think you'll find it very easy to use, because it sure do pull those withholds.

Now, I want to point something else out to you. At any time did the pc even look like he wasn't going to tell me?

*Audience: No.*

The pc protested the embarrassment of telling me a couple of times, but didn't ever say he wasn't going to tell me. It never entered his head. There's no reason why it should have. The difficulties of the session were very minor, very minor difficulties. The pc to some degree was braced in that session as an auditor and so forth. And he was watching the Model Session steps and he was checking it off very, very carefully, very. See? Challenging my right to omit a rudiment, things like that, and so forth. Well, all of that comes in—I'll tell you why that comes in. The pc's riding up on hot stuff, do you see. The pc's fine, and remember we're clearing, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” so the withholds we're pulling are restimulative of having difficulties with the auditor, you see? But you can expect that sort of thing. Fine, three cheers.

Another point: In withhold sessions you can waste a lot of time by asking for withholds when you're not working with—when you're working withholds in the body of the session. Man, can you waste time, because you've started your session out without inquiring about a present time problem. It's more important that you get the rudiments covered than you try to do the body of the session in the rudiments. So did you notice we omitted the question we were going to work on, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" as far as cleaning it up was concerned. I asked it and saw it fall, and then I said, "Well, that's all right," I says to the pc. "This is what we're going to take up in the session," and we went on to the next one.

All right. We omit withholding. Why otherwise? See? Why waste time, you see, on that? And it was for your sakes that I tried to omit Havingness at the end and you saw my—you know auditing is what you can get away with. And you saw me miss, you know. But I—pc looked okay. His face looked bright and everything and so on. He said his havingness was down. I took a closer look at him and sure it was down. So I ran Havingness just before I ended the session.

But in lieu of finding his Havingness Process, and throwing your timing way out, I ran the surest one I know, see? And we didn't run any distance, see? We didn't have anything very far away. And I call your attention to that process if you're ever caught short on the—without a pc's Havingness Process and have to do something, I just call that demonstration to your attention; because it nearly always works perfectly. You see it's—the reason why it's "reach," see, with the hands, it's "feel." It doesn't tell him to do anything with it. And he becomes aware of the presence of something, you see? And of course, he's been aware of this desk straight away and then his chair. And of course he's been aware of the chair straight away, and just a table and a chair, and a table and a chair, and your feet on the floor. That is the—oldest form of that was, "Feel the floor beneath your feet." And you'll find out that'll bump up havingness. And that was an interesting thing. I had him clear down at O there on the sensitivity or close to, and we got a third-of-a-dial drop gain on the thing before we left that thing and we had how many commands on it? Twelve? Fifteen? Something like that.

So anyway, that is a—that is a good one. By the way, on some pcs that is only adventurous because it doesn't flatten in a hurry and it turns on exquisite agony. It just hurts like the blue blazes on some pcs. Some small proportion of pcs are so far out on their havingness, that this is such a positive enforcer—touching things—that when they touch things, they haven't touched anything. They've been carefully not touching things while they were touching things, and it turns on pain in their finger tips. And the pcs that are having the most trouble with havingness are most likely to turn on tactile pain with that particular thing. But if the pc does, my God, that was what needed to be run.

All right. Well, that's just comments, broad comments on the session. We're talking mainly here about Prepchecking.

Blowing withholds, blowing overts—before they are finally cleaned up on the whole subject matter you are working on—will reduce havingness. You get your biggest resurgence in havingness when you blow a whole package. You've got a whole chain, and you've blown all these overts and that sort of thing, and the guy has got this all taped and straightened out and you'll find his havingness is in pretty darn good shape when he's done that. But before he gets to that point, his havingness will go up and go down and it's very irregular. And if he's been under considerable strain in the session, and you've gotten charge off of it—we only got, I think a slightly less than a half a division of charge off that particular session, but did you notice he was walking back up toward 2.0?

And remember how hard we had to work on that down in Australia trying to get him up from the 0.0 out there? Well, Prepchecking brings them up and you just saw an example of it. I don't know if you noticed it. We watched something we've been trying to solve for years in that particular session. Prepchecking was bringing up a pc who was running at 1.4 on the meter and brought the pc up to 1.9 at the finish. I thought that was fascinating, huh? Since it's

impossible—was impossible for a long time with old, earlier processes to bring the pc higher on the meter, when they were registering below—between 1.0 and 2.0. Remember? Well, did you notice that we did it in that particular session?

All right. This is Prepchecking and although you will see a lot of publications on this one way or the other, the complications of it are not very great. It's a sort of auditor shorthand on, "Where are we going?" And the system itself simply gives you the questions in the exact rotation they are to be asked.

Now, that is the basics of the system. Everything else that's added to the system is simply let the auditor keep track of what he is doing. And you'd hate to have to stop a session in the middle of the big withhold that has just tumbled out at one hour and forty-five minutes of a two-hour session. And the pc says, "Well, of course there was the time when I murdered my grandmother."

And you say, "Good. Thank you. What about murdering your grandmother?"

And you get a four-tone-drop movement of the tone arm. I think at that time you want to have, "What about murdering your grandmother?" on your auditor's report, numbered with its proper subnumeral in the proper sequence of things to be cleaned up. I think it'd be very beneficial at that time.

And it would also be very beneficial to have the pc's confidence, both from having done a good job of auditing and because the pc was cleaned up on the auditor. And I think that would also be very beneficial because it means your pc will survive till the next session. And do you know there are those who might not believe this, but I myself am a person who favors the survival of the pc till the next session. I belong to that small, small band of die-hard auditors who believe the pc ought to live through it.

Anyway, so there it is. I hope you understand it. I hope it looks good to you and more basically than that, I hope it works for you like a mad thing

Okay?