

PREPCLEARING AND RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on
22 February 1962

Thank you. Thank you. Well, we made that one. All right. This is the what? Twenty-two.

Audience: Feb.

February, AD 12. All right. And Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

We just had a demonstration of Prepchecking. Actually, we're not Prepchecking. We're Prepclearing. There's probably a vast difference. Nomenclature settling down a little bit. Give me that sheet. I'll show them a sheet. There's your auditor's report. Yeah. It's the same heading Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties." Zero 1, which is now changed to Zero A as "self," and 1, the 1 question is, "What about these physical difficulties?" And then your 1A is, "What about this incident in Rome?" And your 1B is "What about proposing marriage?" And 1C is "What about this 17-year-old girl?" And 1D is "What about this first girl?" And 1E is "What about these earlier girls?" And then there's 1F, not articulated. But I didn't ask him about this. It's what about raft incident, 1935. We're running it down to the basic. And we must be awfully close to basic right there, you see? That's what this chain is stuck on. Now, do you see what a chain is?

Audience: Hmm-hmm.

Hmm?

And that's what I'm running down. Now, you notice there's still a—there's a tick-tick. Well, we got the tick two or three times, little tiny tick. Can you see that on the screen all right? Well, that little tick is what I'm looking for. And we're in the vicinity of that tick right now because the tick changed characteristic slightly. I didn't really see that it changed characteristic. I just know it was doing something else. And we're running it down at the bottom on the thing and then we will turn around and go back up this chain merely as a check. And we'll go up this chain and you'll find out they will all go null. They'll go over and take what I was working, on the other one, and you'll find out that that one and this one are tied in together.

Now, why I started working the other one hasn't anything much to do with it. You shouldn't consider it a model, but you shouldn't feel too abashed if you find yourself working a nonworkable chain to abandon the chain temporarily and come back on it later.

And you notice that this chain was working well and the index that this chain was working well is the fact the pc's havingness did not go down as far today as it ordinarily did. You see?

That is an index. The tone arm motion was there and the tone arm motion was doing all right because at that particular point tone arm motion is mostly read on the needle position on the dial rather than on the tone arm because at sensitivity 16, at that needle position on the dial with the tone arm, you can't even see it on one of these screens when you move it so microscopically.

But it was moving. We were playing it over on the right side of the dial and the left side of the dial and it was doing all right, but the index was the pc's havingness did not drop as far today.

And you saw a session that was run almost totally without rudiments. If you're good, you can do it. If you hold the pc in line with interest and auditor presence and you don't fool with anything much else. Of course, you realize this pc is working under—Fred's getting off the

withholds like he said yesterday, you know. He's getting it off to whole Saint Hill, you know, whole world. Crash! Really getting a withhold off, you know. Boom! I hope he hasn't lost the . . . At the same time, why, that's a rough one.

Now, let me ask you a few little basic questions about preclearing. One, did you see the pc unwilling to talk to me at any time?

Audience: No.

You didn't, did you? Well, I don't think that ever enters into it. Now, I don't know what trouble you have, but I never have any trouble having pcs talk to me.

Now, you understand this pc is talking to me over a TV network. Well, that's an awful hurdle. And if he can talk to me over the TV network, he sure should be able to talk to you as a pc in a nice, quiet room with everybody's ears stopped. Wouldn't you say that would be the point?

You go getting the idea that the pc isn't going to talk to you, you're in a games condition with the pc. I'm not in any games condition with this pc. This pc only faintly goes into a games condition with me. He has once or twice, just a tiny little bit when I wasn't mining anything that the pc was interested in. I got over into an area and I was plugging him and chugging at him, and pushing him just a little bit and then he all of a sudden said, "Gee, I'm being pushed." And he's recognized this, just a—just a shadow of it once or twice. And as far as you've seen, it's caused him to comment on other things that didn't have too much to do with the session. And that's as far as that goes. Otherwise, he's been running like a well-oiled dream, right?

All right. Now, you start—you start Prepclearing on the assumption that the pc isn't going to talk to you, you've assumed that you're not auditing a pc. Pc will always talk to you. But of course, that we are clearing up, "Are you willing to talk to me?" is actually, "Are you willing to talk to me about certain subjects?" you see, because he's perfectly willing to talk to me.

But I want him to have complete breadth and width before we start going into 3D Criss Cross. He shouldn't have the idea halfway through 3D Criss Cross that he'd better not tell me about a seventeen-year-old girl in Reno. Now don't you think that'd be the wrong time to have him suddenly get this idea? Huh? I think this would be the wrong time. And let me invite this to your attention that the time to put in rudiments is before 3D Criss Cross, not after you start 3D Criss Cross.

And the whole basis of Prepclearing is just to get your rudiments in. You're getting them in with a maul. I mean those rudiments are going to stay there. You see? That's the whole purpose on it.

Now, I should comment to you that on using havingness as an index and I'm not using havingness—a havingness Prepccheck, but I could very, very fortuitously and very fruitfully clear up the havingness environment rudiment with Prepclearing, see? Let me call it the Prepccheck is the operation and the whole operation is Prepclearing. Now, I could prepccheck the room. How could I prepccheck the room? Just by prepcchecking rooms.

Let's locate withholds about games conditions. What has he denied people? What spaces has he denied people? What spaces has he pushed people out of? You got the idea? And we could—we could actually prepccheck that thing straight on down to the ground. And we'd all of a sudden find his havingness would stay in without any Havingness Process, providing while we were doing this, he was willing to talk to the auditor all the time. So you'll find the best way to handle this, however, is to use Havingness Processes while you're getting him—getting the pc to talk to the auditor.

All right. And then clear up things like the Joburg and 6A on an old-time Scientologist. Just clear these things up and run them down as chains. That's on the withhold section.

And then as far as problems is concerned, well, let's find out what problems he's caused people in this lifetime. That's all. It's just a Prepcheck totally devoted to the problem he's caused people to have, see, using problem as an overt. And we could prepcheck that out of existence and you'd find your pc wouldn't have any present time problems. And that—we could do that, you see? Your—your routine form is the Problems Intensive, see. You can do that with a Problems Intensive. And that directs you on to the problems, do you see? And that pulls you over on to the problem he's really sitting in and you could just take off from that point, clean up the prior areas of confusion, you see?

Now, that is the more stylized way to go about that, but I'm telling you a shorthanded way to go about it is, "What problems has he caused in this life?" Just use that as an overt. Instead of, "Do you have a present time problem?" you use as a Zero question at that particular rudiment, "Have you ever caused anyone a problem in this lifetime?" or "Have you ever been a problem to anyone in this lifetime?" Such a Prepcheck question cleared for this lifetime totally would leave you with that one in.

Now, we could take up telling people half-truths, we could take up telling people whole-truths—always a Prepcheck action. We could take up "impressing people" as a Prepcheck action. And we could take up "damage" as a Prepcheck action. And then we could swing on down into, "the meter," and we could take up the meter. And about this time we'd probably be wanting to clean up missed withholds and that would be about it. I don't think you could go much further than this. The pc would be blowing things left and right.

There's a possibility that you could make a MEST Clear with Prepclearing. But of course, it'd be a preparatory sort of Clear, wouldn't it? It would just be a this lifetime Clear. And that's what we've been making and that was the target and goal of Book One.

So don't look on Prepclearing as being an incidental technique. Who did we run into today but a psychoanalyst, you see, a psychiatrist down the line. And this must have looked very restimulative to the pc because what you're doing is what they wish they could do, see? You're actually plowing right on down the line. If you could get ahold of a psychoanalyst who wasn't any dumb bunny, straighten him up himself and teach him Prepclearing, you'd find out he could learn it, you find out he could learn it.

You'd have to beat him over the head to make him keep the Auditor's Code and so forth, but he would find this is "Oh, my God. What have these Scientologists done now," you see? "They've gone and wrapped up psychoanalysis," which we have. And of course, it's so much more fundamental than psychoanalysis, there's hardly anything to it. And the psychoanalyst had no such goal for people. He just didn't want them to be neurotic. You want them to fly. Slightly different target.

And then you're just opening it up so that we can take this case over the jumps with minimal auditing upset. And it'll be a colossal joke on one of—one of the old boys to explain them all this, teach them all this. Show them what you could do, run it on him, get him a good reality on the thing. Give him wins and goals that he's been reading about for ages, you see and has never attained. Put him right through the lot and then when we showed him that we have gone ten thousand feet higher than any goal he had and so forth, we say, "Well, this is just preparatory to the basic skills of Scientology." I thought it'd be rather amusing

But now, you're liable to get lost watching a demonstration. You're liable to get lost a bit in wondering where the hell I connected things. And I am throwing a little bit of a curve on you because I won't downgrade what I can do just to give you a demonstration because I'm actually just auditing the pc. I'm not trying to demonstrate it.

And I'm using Prepclearing on a very unstrained basis. I don't shut the pc up so that I can ask him the next question, you see. Nor do I let him wander off of it very far, but I add things up. By watching the meter when he says things, I add up what he said. See, I got one eye cocked at the meter and he says, "Well, a proposed marriage" and all of a sudden I see the potential chain, see.

I say, "Well, gee whiz, maybe we've got a lot of proposals of marriage here, see? Maybe. Maybe. Who knows? So there's some kind of a subsidiary chain in the middle of the chain that we're running. Well, let's just ask him this as a What question and strip it down and sure enough we found one. It wasn't terribly fruitful or very bombastic, but it was—it was, it definitely had to be asked.

Well, you say, well how did I get to this point? Well, I was auditing the pc, I'm afraid is the answer. And how many overts or withholds did you see me take off on one What question? I just went on and on and on, didn't I, see? Got him talking and talking about it some more and talking about it some more. And asked him, "Is that all of it?" And sometimes I didn't ask him, "Was this all of it?" because he just got through telling me there was a lot more to it. So I just asked him Who, don't you see. And then you saw me shifting the Who question around a little bit so as to fit the circumstances of what we were talking about.

In other words, the system was being adapted to exactly what the pc was doing so it didn't matter how many What questions we were plowing. We could have a thousand What questions written down and trace them all back, but if we tried to get one per incident, we would quickly get lost. All you want is one per chain. You have this little subsidiary chain, you better have a What question there, see?

And frankly, we ended that session without articulating, as you will see on the auditor's report, the last What question. But there's a "What about" there, that I'm not sure what that question is about. You probably would have jumped at that point and you said, "Well, what about frightening little girls?" And very possibly that is the What question. But I want to hear this pc tell me a little bit more about this before I make up my mind, see? I'm not in any hurry to put down a What question.

What I don't want to have happen—and this is what is important—is for the pc to give me a bunch of different chained withholds that have no relationship to one another. And that I don't want to have happen.

The fellow says, "Well, I stole a car and ah—I, ah—ah—got drunk and ah, I made a pass at my sister and ah—let's see, is anything else I'm withholding from you? Well, ah—oh, yes and ah—I robbed a bank and ah—I always quit my job by parachute."

Now, there—that pc would have gotten the brakes put on him the second—first time he changed the subject. Well, I would have put the brakes on him. I would have guided that right back to the first one he told me or, if he—while he was going over this, I'd had my eye on the meter, I would have seen one fall like mad and I would have picked that one and I would have mined that one and I wouldn't have asked him another thing about the others, on the danger of missing a withhold or something like that, you see? I'd just sort of pretend I didn't hear about them and hope they don't restimulate.

But don't let a pc jump all over like a hot flea on a griddle, see. He's liable to be just impressing you or something like this. No, mine a chain, mine a subject. Well, what is a subject? I don't know. What's a subject? You can certainly define what a subject of withholds is.

Now, you can define it too narrowly or you can define it too broadly and defining the subject of a withhold is something like how do you ask a What question. And asking a What question is an art. That is an art. You can lay down the rules. I can give you a written paper about how

to convert what the pc says into the What question that's pretty precise. But it is still a bit of an art. You still got to listen. You got to listen to what the pc said. That's important.

Now, I'll give you some of these rules on how to lay down a What question. As one, it must not be too general. It must not be too wide so as to miss a chain entirely. It must not be so narrow as to pin the pc on a single incident and prevent him from exploring a chain. That's too narrow. It must be designed over the most, if possible, the most contrasurvival portion of the withhold, if you have a selection like, "What's most dangerous to the pc's self-preservation?" Not what's most dangerous that he has done to life, but what would be the most dangerous thing to him. So that's your too wide, your too narrow and that is the most important item in a What question.

Now, I've given you another definition similar to this and I'll give you another that's written, but there's more to it than this now. You must not take motivators, criticisms, other people's withholds or explanations, period. Now, those you mustn't—those mustn't be part of What questions.

Now, there is something you do to each one of these. Now, let's take the motivator. What do you do to a motivator? Now, this is a broader question. What do you do to a motivator? You always ask for the overt instantly. You don't—you don't monkey with the motivator. You don't do anything with the motivator except have the motivator indicate to you the class of person against whom the overt has been done.

"My mother beat me. My mother beat me daily, daily, daily, forever and ever. I was beaten every day my whole life, sometimes twice a day. And I often only got a delay in being beaten because she couldn't find a fresh place to beat me."

Well, if the pc has managed to say all those things without you asking something, you need your thetan examined because it's got a revving gear in it. See.

As a little point of amusement, I once explored, a long time ago in some of the early, early, early researches I was doing, I once explored, "Momma has beaten me" and I've also explored, "Papa has beaten me" and so forth. I've explored parental motivators. And by George, at the other end of the line we could just find one light spanking on the Momma case and we couldn't find any at all on Papa. That was when we finally got it all mined out. There hadn't been any such incidents at all.

Now, that's not really the reason why you shouldn't buy a motivator but it's a good reason not to ask for one, because you're throwing the rudiments out wildly and brutally, because you're letting the pc tell you an untruth. And of course, that stuff will go out.

Now, every time they start talking about motivators, you've got an untruth, right there, it's very close to. It's worth knowing, isn't it? You can throw your rudiments out taking one. You do anything about one, you've goofed with a capital G. A "G" is for, "Oh, my God."

You convert it at once into the overt. There's no hanky-panky with it at all. You find the pc never ARC breaks. Don't do it accusatively. Just do it overtly. If you're going to Q-and-A with anything, Q-and-A with your own overtness in asking for overts. But never Q-and-A with a motivator.

"My mother beat me." It's instantly, "What have you done to your mother?" or, "What about doing something to your mother?" if you want to be fair and neat and so forth. I don't. I just say, "What have you done to your mother?"

Pc says, "I was just beaten daily and . . ." so forth.

And I say, "Well, who beat you?"

“Oh,” he says, “Oh, my, my mother. My mother. She used to beat me every day and it was terrible.”

“Well, all right. What have you done to your mother? Thank you very much.”

And the pc comes right off of it and goes right on to, “Oh, I never did anything to my mother except, well, except pour scalding water over her feet one day and ah, matter of fact, I said I would support her and I don’t now. I never sent her any money and ah—ah, I’ve never written to her. she doesn’t even know where I am. Ah, there are no overts though.” You mine that one out and you’ll have it.

Now, what’s the next one?

Female voice: Criticism—criticism.

The criticism. Yeah. The natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter. That’s the same rule that follows the motivator. That’s identically the same rule.

Person says, “Well, they gave me seven infraction sheets and stood me on the head in the corner and made me eat Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health page by page.”

And you’ll find out if you accept a criticism it’ll go into the motivator. Now, a criticism is a hope that they could damage. And that’s what a criticism is—with an inability to do so. It’s a little higher toned than a motivator. But that’s all a criticism is and that applies to life in general.

I’ll give you a good example—I criticize governments. That’s because at the present moment I’m not in any position whatsoever to completely smash them. I—I make no bones about this, see? This is not covert at all. Governments know what they’re doing, not cooperating with me, if they’re that smart. If they were very, very clever, they never would. And we’ll have to cut that off the tape, you see. But at the present moment—at the present moment—it’s not that I’m in a position to—but it just doesn’t fit the cards to make nothing out of all national governments, that’s all. It just isn’t in the cards at the present moment. I criticize them.

Now, you say, “Well, what have I done to governments?” What do you want? A costume historical? What do you want? Something the size of the Encyclopaedia Britannica? I guarantee you it would be entertaining More entertaining than the Encyclopaedia Britannica.

But if you even want to find out some of these, well, just go to the Encyclopaedia Britannica and read some of these sections. Of course, I’ve never done anything to France. That’s different.

You want to know overts, man—man, you got them when you’re into an area of this particular type. But criticism is not necessarily a covert action. Criticism is a confession of inability. It’s also, on a broader scale, a confession of an overt.

It’s higher toned. Criticism is higher toned by far than a motivator. Well, “They took me over in France and they threw me in a tower and they did this and they beat me and they did this and that,” and so on.

But that of course, would convert instantly into, “All right. What have you done to France?” You see?

And the fellow says, “And I wish and ah, they—they just ought to have their head examined. Leave it to the . . .”

I’ll give you a comment I made the other day. “Leave it to the French.” While trying to get rid of a piece of their empire, the French settlers of which don’t want to get rid of it—France

has a revolution from a third party. Leave it to France. If you want to know how to mess up a situation, why, just get some advice from the French government because they're experts.

Of course, in politics, they have gone mad on the subject of politics. Somebody commented "Every time two Frenchmen get together, you have three new political parties."

Well, now, that's rather mild criticism and we're not talking in the same line, but you, nevertheless, the question is just exactly the same. "What have you done to France?" See?

It isn't necessarily true that all criticisms, however, are based on unknowingnesses, which is different with a motivator. Motivators are always based on an unknowingness. Criticism being a little higher toned, it's not based on an unknowingness. Person may know all about it.

Now, there's other people's overts. Now, on the basis of safety, this is the safest thing apparently to the pc to do. And actually, now, if you want to draw a scale here, I think you're below motivator. That is the safest thing for the pc to do—to get off other people's overts. "I heard that . . ."

I'll give you—you hear this sometimes around the Academy or something like that. We used to hear it here. I hear less and less of it. Some reason or other, propaganda wins at long last. Training is reaching there. It's been a long time since I heard anybody work over, for any number of hours "Well, I heard the other day that such and such a student actually, in their own town, had met a girl and had . . ."

And you know and I just don't hear people around here doing very much with those. But out in the field, that is practically all that ever gets mined. That is the whole mine. And do you know? Here's the proof. I could show you this on auditors' report forms over a long period of time here at Saint Hill.

Wherever you have a session like that and the person has listened to other people's overts or criticism or motivators—we have a "goals and gains," section of Zero, no goals made, no gains made. That is the test. After all, Scientology is an heuristic science and it is there because it is workable. And if you let people get off any one of these four that I just gave you, you get a no goals and no gains.

Now, I don't care if you run them as engrams or anything else, you just get no goals and no gains made. That's it. And I can show you just auditor's report after auditor's report. Even the auditor writing the report didn't notice the connection between these two things. Because, you see, maybe the next session they did the same thing again and got no goals and no gains, you see? And then maybe the next session did the same thing again and got no goals and no gains. And then an Instructor caught up with them before they were absolutely obliterated by Mary Sue. Because if anything stands her hair on end is this particular one because she is very, very aware of this factor. That is the way to get no auditing done and even to retrograde a case.

Now, you get the other people's withholds, it's absolutely beneath contempt. The person has not done it and your proper response on such a thing is—they say, "Well, well, actually, I heard that John Q. Jones, when auditing so-and-so, said. . ."

"Well, what have you done to John Q. Jones?"

Well, if you let them go a little bit further, you're liable to find a more pertinent target.

"Uh . . . said that somebody in Cape Town," blank name, you see, something or other.

"Well, what have you done to somebody in Cape Town?"

I would clear it up on this basis. I would say, “Well, which one of the— which of these people do you know?”

“Well, I—I—I know John Jones.”

You say, “Good. What have you done to John Jones?” And you’ve got your What. That, in other words, converts. These are all convertive. These are— these disobey the rule of taking what the pc said.

Now, as far as explanation is concerned, when the pc gives you an explanation, you know you have an overt. So once more, you ask, “What have you done?”

Now all four of these conditions are answered by the same What. You convert them all to “What have you done?” Now, frankly, an explanation is perfectly innocent. And there’s no reason to condemn a pc for explaining. But whenever I hear a long and involved explanation about how—”Well, you see I actually was a younger child in the family and I never really had the advantages that the older children had. And so I never really got to school and— the way I should have. And the reason why I had such a terrific amount of trouble on my first job was just this—just this lack of education and so forth.”

I’m liable to say, “Well, all right. Your first job, who was that with? Who was that with?”

And he says, “Well, it was Burchiman Company.”

And I say, “All right. What have you done to Burchiman Company?”

And it’s another conversion, see. I find out carefully what my target is because in an explanation, the target is never given until some fifteen hundred words are exhausted on the situation. That is, it comes under the heading of extenuating circumstances. And if an explanation records on your consciousness as an auditor as an extenuating circumstance, we could realize then, at once, that it’s an extenuating circumstance for an overt!

So whenever the pc gets too interested in explaining I will always put a What on—no matter whether that’s a sub-A, B, C, D or E. And incidentally these are terribly important. Don’t think I’m just forbidding pcs from doing these things. I’ll go into that in a moment. But I can always be counted on to use one of those things in a What.

And sometimes, you see, you can’t—you really haven’t got a pc giving you any overts. He doesn’t— isn’t giving you any overts and he isn’t giving any withholds. He’s talking to you. Good. But he isn’t telling you that he did anything. And you, why, lightly, without any challenge or anything of the sort, can’t really—this is early, before you learn very much about the case. You see, you learn cases and your first few sessions on a case, just as these demonstration sessions, are a bit fumbly, don’t you see, because you’re learning exactly where we’re going. We’re learning something about the case. We’re knowing where these chains land up. And after you’ve given two or three sessions, of course, you get these things so that you know about where they’re taped. And you know what you can ask about and what you won’t ask about. And these four things I just gave you are beautiful indicators. And you can play those things on a one string violin, an electric guitar, a chord organ. You can play them with one finger or like Bach. It doesn’t matter.

But the pc who is defensive will always give you one of those. He’s explaining something. Marvelous. These must be extenuating circumstances he’s explaining. Well, what is he explaining about? That’s all you have to establish. And that doesn’t become a What question because you’re trying to find a What question.

You’re trying to get your toe in the door, you see. And these four are lovely because there isn’t a humanoid alive that won’t do them. See? They always do them.

You're trying to clear up the second dynamic on "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties." And by George, you just can't get anything much out of—the pc's going on talking about what a beautiful day it is, you know? Oh, it's not the pc's fault. The pc isn't withholding from you. You just haven't directed the pc's attention. Well, this is how to direct the pc's attention to a thing and so forth.

All right, you can say something as innocent, "Well, have your parents ever been mean to you?" It's not very accusative. Doesn't sound accusative to the pc. It would to a Scientologist. Even at this stage, see.

And he said, "Well, yes, my father's always very, very mean to me. Always very mean to me."

You got a What question. You just instantly convert it and you say, "What have you done to your father?"

And you're sailing. Now, you got your foot in the door, you know you'll get some withholds of some kind or another. You know you'll get the case rolling, you see?

Now, if you want to go milder, you can vary the—vary the thing on the harpsichord. All you've got to do is say to the thing, "How is it that you went to—." You just know a little scrap of something or other about the pc, you see. "How is it that you went to such an expensive school?"

And the pc says, "Well, I just did."

Well, that just leaves you exactly nowhere. So you say, "How is that you got married when you did?"

"Oh, well, that's—that's another thing Now, actually—actually, the truth of the matter is that my parents contested this marriage a considerable degree, you see, yet the girl was very desirable and that sort of thing. They wanted me to marry another girl and I—I—I of course, had my reservations about this sort of thing, but, you see, I hadn't actually been educated very well and I wasn't making a tre--- "

Oh, well, what the hell. You walked into it, you see? You can sort it out on the meter quite overtly in front of the thing. You can say, "parents," "girl," whatever it is. So, all right, "What have you done to this girl?" And you're off to the races, see? Very revelatory.

Now, the person who talks—who gives you other people's withholds, of course, you could always ask, "Have you heard any gossip lately of any kind like this?" And the gossip that sticks in their mind is always about the people they have overts on. So you can mine that one. And you can—you can also say—these are just—these are just hunting mechanisms at the beginning of a Zero question, you see—and you just can say such a thing as, "Well, what should be done about . . . ?" And then just run off the gamut of the dynamics.

If the pc starts answering on any particular point, the pc at least will communicate on that point and let's take that point and mine it down. You could almost do it without an E-Meter. And you'd find yourself in a fruitful area. So, this is how to get into fruitful areas. So they're not really condemnations of the thing.

Now, as we sit there watching the pc going on and on, the pc, of course, is unconscious of these various approaches. And the pc can steer us with these things. Steer us very nicely. And you listen to those—that type of response and when you hear that type of response, convert it. Whatever these things have as a target, convert the response to that target. It's on your subject. It's on your chain, but your chain is getting wobbly. It's getting kind of ragged. You don't quite know where you're going. You're steering a course down a chain of incidents which the person considers relatively discreditable.

Now, because the person considers these incidents discreditable, they are not in communication with the subject matter. Therefore, they feel this subject matter, therefore, has them at the effect-point. And the subject matter is at the cause-point. And it actually is the source of the aberration with which they happen to be boxing, as far as one lifetime or one valence is concerned.

You follow how this is? The individual has certain areas he's chosen for his randomness. Well, of course, he has varying approaches to these things. Give other people's withholds. Well, he isn't even on the receipt-point. Motivator—he gives you motivators. Well, golly, he sure can't flow back against the motivator. He can't flow back against cause there, can he? Because he can just tell you about motivators, right? He's got a victim computation with regard to this subject, so therefore it's quite fruitful.

All right. Let's move up a little bit more. All he can do is criticize it. It shows that he has an impulse to destroy it. He's a little bit better off if he's just criticizing it. If he starts to explain one way or the other, it shows that the lines are in a dispersal. So that you've got your cause with your pc at the receipt-point and what you're doing is walking your pc back to cause again over these points by knocking out any reason he has to attack those particular points or defend himself or retreat from certain materials or subject matters he has on his track. So therefore, he can communicate on all subjects. It's very, very simple. Do you see why that is?

You can actually draw these four things with the arrows with regard to cause- and receipt-point, then the pc is at effect-point. And you can draw how little he's backing up against the cause-point. Well, naturally, because he can't back up against the cause-point in any one of these cases, he doesn't know.

Now, if you want to find a pc in total ignorance as to what's going on, get the other people's withhold. Man, that pc has—doesn't even know he has a bank, see? That's the wild one. He doesn't even know he's aberrated on this subject.

On the motivator, he knows he's in trouble with regard to this subject, but there he is. Well, how did he get in trouble? Well, he can't tell you and so he doesn't know anything about what's causing him trouble. And he'll have the wildest fantasies with regard to this sort of thing.

And the pc who is criticizing, he may—he may even understand the situation a little bit, but he just wants to knock it out and make nothing out of it.

Well, it's not necessarily true that he—that there is an unknown at all on the channel; and as far as explanation is concerned, similarly, not necessarily true, that the subject matter is terrifically unknown to the pc.

If you want to find unknowns that the pc couldn't even vaguely confront, get other people's withholds and mine it. So you don't mine that one at all.

The pc is suffering from and tells you he's suffering from and therefore has motivators on certain subjects, well, you know that you're in your most profitable area of not-know. But you may be in an area which is so thoroughly unknown that the pc cannot penetrate it at all.

So it's what the pc gets a reality on. Well, a reality with regard to that is solved by your E-Meter. If you get a disturbance of the needle on any given subject, it is real to the pc to some extent. And if you get a disturbance of a needle on an E-Meter, it is the charge generated between the not-know and the know. And if you've got an unbalance between not-know and know, you get a reaction on the E-Meter providing, of course, that you've got the pc on the E-Meter and can read one.

Now, the pc must know something about it to be in a clash with a not-know on the subject, you see? Now, when the pc is at not-know and the subject is at not-know, you get no read on the E-Meter. Now, when the pc is at know and the subject is at know, there is no read on the E-Meter. When there's as much known about it as the pc knows about it and could know about it, you get no charge. If it's totally unknown to the pc and in the bank and everywhere else, you've got a not-know versus a not-know and the pc does not register on the meter.

There's possibly somebody here who burned down a cathedral sometime or another. And they don't even in this lifetime have any religious prejudices of one kind or another. You put that person on the meter and you ask him—you see, it's—the reason why you don't see this is because you can't test it, see, this is totally out of use so it's untestable—and we say to the pc, “Did you ever burn down a cathedral?” and we get no reaction of any kind whatsoever, you see?

Everybody didn't know and he doesn't know and he's never heard about it and he doesn't remember it and nothing remembers it and it's just all gone and the not-knows are matching the knows, so of course, there's no flow generated. He doesn't know anything about it. You'll get a total null.

And then you're very surprised after a considerable period of time of auditing and so forth, you ask him the same question. You might remember this vividly because it's one of your favorite overts, you see? And you've asked the pc one of your favorite overts and you got no reaction and so on. And you were disappointed so that you remember this—you remember this vividly. And you go on and you audit this pc for two or three weeks and all of a sudden, why, one day you say, “Well, did you ever burn down a cathedral?” and the needle falls off the pin, in running something like 3D Criss Cross, you see? And now the pc knows something about it. He just dimly remembered something about this, you see? And that's enough against the unknow to cause a generation of current or charge. So it's a difference of polarity is what you've got. And postulatewise, it's the not-know versus the know that gives you a polarity difference.

All right. Now, similarly, the more a pc knows about his own life, the more charged up the bank will appear to be. So you're always pulling new withholds off of a pc that he didn't have last week. And that is the increasing phenomena of withholds on the case.

Of course, the no—more the person knows about his own life, why, the more the areas of occlusion can be located. So he knows now that he doesn't know about more areas of life and so you get many more areas of charge, so you get many more withholds after awhile than you started out with originally, which is quite fascinating

Now, you can take somebody who is sitting calmly at 3.0, absolutely right on the button. You stamp on his toe, needle doesn't even quiver. You say, “How are you getting along?”

And he says, “Fine.”

And you say, “How do you do in life?”

And he says, “Fine.”

And you look it up and you find out he was fired that day. And you find a lot of other things were going on in life that he has never seemed to discover.

And this person's getting along well. And you say, “Could you. . .” You run your test on him . . . “Well, could you help me?”

“Help you?”

“Well, how could you possibly help?”

“Yes, I guess I could help you. I could loan you a pound. No, no. I—I— that wouldn’t be of any help to you. Ah, no, I don’t think I could. Is it really true? Can anybody ever help anybody? Now, that—that’s a philosophic question. Ah, does anybody ever really help anybody, you know?”

You get this kind of blaaah, and you got your dead thetan reaction. And by George, you can’t get an overt to register. He doesn’t know he’s done anything. He doesn’t know anything is wrong, he doesn’t know that he doesn’t know. He’s almost a circuit which is a total not-know, you see, talking as a total not-know. And even if he says it, it isn’t true that he knows it, you see? Something operated his mouth and some words came out, you know. And you just get no registry. You can be fooled by that case unless you know these tests for Help and other such things.

Ah, old Helen, she used to call some of these very, very statuesque, not even present people that she’d see around, “Operating GEs” an operating genetic entity. It described them wonderfully, you know? Honest to Pete, they could be standing there with a 13-inch bayonet dripping blood that they have just pulled out of the policeman’s back and you say, “Have you ever stabbed anybody?” on an E-Meter and so help me Pete, you wouldn’t even get a quiver on the needle. They haven’t found out. And there’s no know versus no not-know because they’re just total not-know, don’t you see? And you don’t get any overts on this character.

Therefore, Security Checking as a means of business prevention could go down to the reduotio ad absurdum of only selecting out as employable those people who are dead thetans—Operating GEs. Anybody who had any ability couldn’t pass one, see? It isn’t the operator. It’d be the mechanism of the bank. A guy that’s halfway crazy is much better off than one of these birds who hasn’t even found out whether he’s crazy or sane, see. Operating GEs.

All right. You look this over on Security Checking type of activity for admission of personnel and it’s a—gives you a very dangerous view. A person registers on nothing and so therefore he’s employable. Ah, that isn’t so. You’d only employ your worst-off people.

Anyway, the other side of this picture is much more interesting. As you start running—well, this has always been true of pulling withholds. The more withholds you pull, apparently, the more withholds the person has, so that on the first of August, you get the last two pages of the Joburg. And you got them slicker than a whistle. And they’re just dandy. Everything is fine. You got these things clean, buffed up and shining, you see. Somebody could check them right after you. They’d all be null as null. Isn’t that marvelous? And you give the person some more Prepchecking or 3D Criss Cross or give them some more auditing of one character or another and somebody says, “Well, I—you might as well give him a test on the last two pages of the Joburg.”

And the person says, “That’s fine, they’re all null,” he says.

And then they ask the first question and the second question and the third question. This person’s going, “What the hell, you know? Well, that should be cleaned up, but actually what is this?” You know, he gets into a terrible puzzle. Actually, he’s gone up into a higher state of knowingness. He’s in a higher state of awareness and knowingness, so of course he bangs against these hidden areas. And you have the phenomenon of more withholds.

You’ll think that it’s endless and it’s not endless because at the same ratio, their ability to find them and blow them increases. See?

Now, the other test of it is, is you’ll find one withhold on this person at beginning of processing. And you’ll find out that when they left, they forgot to lock the office door yesterday. And this is a withhold and you get this and you clean it up and it takes you two or three sessions, but you clean it up. See, you get that withhold out of the road. It takes you

quite some time, but you do, only to find out, after you've spent that much time on it that now they have more withholds and then more withholds and more withholds.

But they blow slow. Withholds are few and they blow very slowly at first. And as you continue to go on, withholds get more numerous and blow faster. And you can bring the person, just by auditing one lifetime, you can bring the person up to a state very happily. You can bring them straight up to a state of being able to blow when viewed. You find it, they blow it. And you get a pretty fast-acting needle when you do this kind of . . .

Now, there's—I just got a report from HASI London, one of your recent fellow students up there now as Tech Director, and I got a report that they have found something new. They have found out that all you have to do—an incident's turned up on doing Prepclearing—and all you had to do was pick up these past life incidents and you included them in your Prepclear and it all blew beautifully, and it all straightened up and it worked.

Well, I doubt the last part of the line, see. You see, that isn't what we're trying to do. We are not trying to blow incidents. We are not. We're simply setting up a person's alertness up to a point of where they can handle more in this lifetime. And we can show them very nicely that this lifetime can be cleaned up and we're getting them ahead so we keep the rudiments in easily. And you're actually not trying to do a great deal of auditing with pulling withholds. You're trying to fix the person up so the person can go into session.

Now, the time to pull backtrack withholds is after you have done 3D Criss Cross into a totally stable package. So they're trying to do what you do at the end of auditing at the beginning of auditing. And let me assure you that I could take any one of the pcs on which they have miraculously cleared something by finding a past track incident and I can show you that the things would just have cleared just beautifully if they'd gotten "Dropping a candy cane when they were five." See? Didn't have to go in for this kind of nonsense at all.

And if the auditor is going to reach for past track every time he wants to get the rudiments in, to 3D Criss Cross, where are you going to be? Because you're going to be nowhere. I can tell you why. Because the more—the more valences that become available, the more past track identities that become available, the more withholds become available and the pc has never been guided into the unit value of a valence. The unit value of one lifetime.

See, he doesn't think he can do anything about this lifetime. He doesn't think he can do anything about anything. He's never had any big win and you plow him into the bank after he's never had any big win and of course, he gets no big win and he gets no win and he gets no win. He could go all the way through . . .

You'd probably audit him for two or three hundred hours without ever giving him a win. Just miring him down and miring him down and miring him down.

For instance, don't think I don't know some processes that'd take a pc's head off. Big effect processes are very easy to have. They'd be very easy to find, they're very. . . That's the easiest thing to do. I can give you—a—well, you've had one for a number of years—is R2-45. That's a big process.

But you're not trying to establish—you're not trying to do anything with Prepclearing except straighten out this lifetime so the rudiments will stay in while you do an effective process on the whole track. That's the only reason you're doing it. See, if you do anything else with it, why, there it is. The pc—gradually a pc will get quite a few wins.

Now, oddly enough—oddly enough, if you're going for gain and you're going 100 percent flat-out and if you were a crackerjack auditor and everything was fine and so on, you could probably produce, probably—probably produce all of the gains that you could get out of Prepclearing, you could probably produce them with 3D Criss Cross. You probably could produce all of them with 3D Criss Cross. The real, real gains—cognitions in this lifetime,

Now, I would advise you—and getting hold of rudiments let me give you clarification now. Just one little last tip here on this subject. I advise you to use the old first Model Session

script rudiments processes to get your rudiments in on 3D Criss Cross sessions which you are now doing. And that is for this class and it's a temporary measure.

Until a person has been Prepchecked up to a point of where they stay in by—with a club and all you had to do is ask them about a two-way—a little two-way comm and it blows, I wouldn't try to do Prepchecking to get individual Model Session rudiments in for a session.

Now, there's Prepchecking to get a whole rudiment in in the body of a session. Now, do you follow me? You're busy cleaning up "Are you willing to talk to me?" So you go across the rudiment, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?"

And the pc says, "Bloooooop," and click it goes and clank.

You say, "Well, we're taking that up anyway in the bulk of the session." That's what you're going to take up. And, "Are you withholding anything" And amend it. Say, "Well, are you—are you withholding anything that has happened since yesterday?" See, snip it out. Present time problem, handle it with what part of it could he be responsible for or any of the other old processes by which you handle present time problem. Then come down, fix up your end rudiments the same way and so forth.

And use Prepchecking for the body of your session because you're being thrown curves—this is what we're learning—in that the rudiment is out, you use Prepchecking to get the rudiment in, but your Prepchecking was supposed to be running on that.

You shouldn't necessarily take a model off my demonstrations of what you ought to do with rudiments, by the way. If you see me get a rudiment in, well, I'll get the rudiment in pretty stylizedly just like you would. But you will—you also are watching a certain cockiness on the part of an auditor. My rudiments don't go out very often. I can ignore them. I can always cope with the situation. If the pc looks to me like the pc isn't going to go into session and isn't going to do what we're doing and isn't interested in that, oh, yeah, you'll—you're not likely to see this kind of a condition arise, however, in a demonstration I'm giving you, see? But if you do see it arise, you'd see me go back and hit those rudiments. You might even see me start into the body of a session. And all of a sudden this thing is going eight ways for the middle. See me all of a sudden pull the end rudiments and the beginning rudiments. End rudiments, two-minute break, beginning rudiments and on back into that session again. And we find out what's wrong, see.

But I use rudiments a little bit differently than I advise you to use rudiments. I use rudiments to salvage a session which isn't going well, not to create a session, because I'm very cocky about this. I can always create a session.

I'm not talking necessarily about my auditing and your auditing or anything like that. Let's hope you can do that, too. But you can—you sometimes—I watch you sometimes destroy a perfectly good session, however, with a rudiments mess-up of one kind or another.

But I don't yet trust, on most auditors' parts, the ability to look at the pc and just listen to the pc two words and know whether the pc's attention is on the session or on something out of session. That's a sensitivity. And when the pc—when you can tell that "bing" why, then is your time to use rudiments or not use rudiments. Pc looks like they're out of session, use rudiments. Pc looks like they're in-session, why, don't use them.

As far as end rudiments are concerned, pc's happy, pc's talking to you, havingness is—might be repaired and so forth. They're happy with the session. Well, ask them what goals and gains they've made and get the hell out of there, man, see. But that requires you sufficiently confident unto yourself as an auditor that you're going to get results and so forth, that you don't have to keep patching them up all the time. I'm giving you another look at this sort of thing and that goes along with this.

That means that you've got to get wins. You've got to know what you can do as an auditor and you've got to be able to get wins. And I know nothing under God's green earth fit to make you cocky like two things we're doing— Prepclearing and 3D Criss Cross. And those things can actually make you cocky.

You do those things well, you will see wins, wins, wins, wins, wins, wins. So after you've had a lot of these things and you know where you're going and what you can do and you haven't got any little questions in the back of your mind about this and that, you'll start watching the pc and putting your attention on things that are important. Up to that time, follow the rote. Until I can show you the win, you sure got to use the rote. And then you'll use most of the rote to get the win. You see?

We're very fortunate right at this particular moment. We have Prepclearing and this procedure almost puts your feet on the path one after the other. It is so good a rote procedure that you needn't not use it.

And the other great gain in Prepclearing, the other great gain in it is that an Instructor and a person reading your auditor report knows just like that whether you're doing it or not. And there's no doubt in anybody's mind on what you're doing. We know exactly what you're doing.

And you can be steered then until you're doing it right and then you're walking with your feet practically put on the path and the next thing you know, you happen to look up out of the session and notice the pc. And the pc's getting better. That's how powerful the process is.

And then you'll all of a sudden come into a dawning someday of, "My God, how easy auditing is." Well, of course, a pc will occasionally nag you, you're just starting out a case and you don't know where you're going, something like that. You feel a little bit nattery about the thing.

And then all of a sudden, why, you realize you just sit down there and you get results. Cocky. You become absolutely overbearing and insufferable. But you won't be here, so I won't have to worry about that part of it.

Thank you very much.