

PREPCHECKING AND BASICS

A lecture given on
27 February 1962

Thank you.

Well, this is what?

Audience: 27th.

Twenty-seventh of February . . .

Audience: AD 12.

AD 12. Very good. Very good.

All right. We begin herewith, herein, amongst our battered selves, a new type of schedule simply designed on several basics. And one of those is that I'm perfectly willing to give you all the instruction time I possibly can and your schedule was a bit colliding with this particular fact and so I've stepped it up to eight hours of demonstration and lectures a week. And that's a bit better than you were getting And I've tried to put it in that part of the day that you were least harassed. And I think you find this more satisfactory.

And the demonstration's going to work like this. The regulations on the demonstration is that you can leave at ten. You don't have to leave at ten; you can leave at ten, on a demonstration. But me, I audit for results and after I'd done some of this postage stamp auditing for you . . . I audit for results, that's all and these results are scheduled on a—just that. They're scheduled on the pc's reactive bank. They're not scheduled on a clock. And I like to audit to a result and knock it off. Or audit to a point where I don't think I'll reach anything that session and knock it off. It's a different framework.

And trying to audit somebody in an hour, I was setting a bad example to you because I ordinarily do beginning and end rudiments. And now, by the time you've subtracted beginning and end rudiments from an hour's session, you've got damned little auditing left. And I could fully expect—I don't say that it will—but I'd say on seldom occasions, one of these demonstrations is liable to run until two o'clock in the morning. And that's because I audit to an item, audit to a result, don't you see?

And nobody expects you to stay till two o'clock in the morning. You can leave at ten. Or you can stay until two o'clock in the morning You understand?

Audience: Yes.

But doing it this way, why, then I can put in an extension of time. The only people that have any problems with this, is some of your Instructors have problems with this new schedule. But that's all right. We can—we can solve those one way or the other. We can get those.

Now, one of the old-time students at this late stage of the game is coming up to Clear. And it's almost a shame to let her go. But I just received a letter from her—her true love down in South Africa—or down in Rhodesia, saying it was all right for her to stay this one extension, see, but I shudder to mention another one. But that's awfully tempting to see that there's a floating needle amongst us. The tone arm is too high, but that will come down with a—with a few more items. But it's awfully tempting just to hold this person over and clear her. Or let the auditor, go right up to the point where the tone arm is unable to maintain its present height, you see. Let him go right up to that point and then take over with the last session, you see. And clip out the few W/Hs and terminals, you know, that are holding the tone arm up

there, you see. And then tell everybody well, you see, I can clear somebody in one session. I think this is very funny.

After he's worked, you see, for a couple of hundred hours on the project or something like that—that would—that would be a college professor's trick, wouldn't it? Yeah.

Yeah. They take all the students' inventions, don't you see, and patent them themselves. That's the California Institute of Technocracy. They specialize in that. As a matter of fact, one of the greatest names in American physics does nothing but that. He's never had an idea in his life.

But we don't work that way around here, so we won't do it that way. But it is very, very tempting to hold this person over until we get the tone arm down and then we can say, "See? A Clear."

And then we could put her on a frame alongside the door and you could . . .

Okay. Well, I forgot my notes and—you haven't heard that gag for some time, have you? It took you by surprise. I forgot my notes, so I don't have very much to go over with you aside from Scientology, Prepchecking, 3D Criss Cross, clearing, chains, engrams, secondaries, valences, circuits, reactive mind, the E-Meter, auditing sessions, Model Session. These things sound familiar to you? Any of you heard of these things before?

Now, I will talk to you about—a little bit about Prepchecking. Because this is where you will find your biggest strength and it's sort of a knack.

Once upon a time, you were given a bicycle. Or you saved the money you had been stealing out of the church collection plate or something and managed to buy a bicycle. And you couldn't ride it. Or you had a sister or brother or the fellow next door had a bicycle and you couldn't ride it. Do you remember a time when you couldn't ride a bicycle? Hm?

And you may have some recollection of falling off the bicycle a few times, of steering it onto the grass plots and off the curb and narrowly missing various inanimate objects and maybe not missing a few animate objects and you had quite a time with this bicycle and it was all in the matter of steering the thing and keeping it balanced.

And then all of a sudden—there was no transition period—all of a sudden, one day, you could ride a bicycle. There was never a period when you could almost ride a bicycle. You remember that? Then one day you all of a sudden could ride a bicycle.

Oddly enough, both Prepchecking and 3D Criss Cross come under this category. And you go on falling on your 'ead and falling on your 'ead and not riding the bicycle and then suddenly one day you'll be riding the bicycle. Then you say, "How is it possible that people can't ride bicycles?" And you will be very, very snide about this, I'm sure.

It's not possible not to ride a bicycle—if you can ride a bicycle. And one day you'll get the feel of this. But there's a certain amount of information and technology that is necessary toward the riding of a bicycle. And one, you must recognize whether by definition or merely fooling with it, that there is such a thing as gyroscopic action.

And gyroscopic action is one of the most complicated mathematical subjects you ever tackled in your life. If you ever wish to make life miserable, if you just feel in one of these masochistic moods, you know, don't go out and get yourself beaten with a club or run over by a taxicab driver, just study the mathematics of gyroscopes. They're fantastic. And that's a bicycle, see. And study the delivery of mechanical force from point A to point B and study mechanical advantages. The operation and construction of coaster brakes. The metallurgy of the frame. That's a nice, complicated one. The synthetic chemistry in the composition of tires. And as long as you're getting into tires, let us go into something worthwhile. Let's go

into balloonostatics. Let's get further into the stress analysis of spokes. I never knew that spokes could be complicated till we put a coaster brake on a little 15-inch wheel for Quentin.

We put a 3-speed gear shift on one of these little, tiny bicycles. And of course, they're not made for that, you know. And this little bike, now, will practically—you could peddle it up a vertical wall, you know. But all of the— all of the spokes, since they don't make spokes small enough, you see, to go in that wheel on a coaster brake, they all had to be cut, hand cut and that was a mess because the wheel would thereafter not vibrate straightly. So they had to be cut and recut and bent and rebent and every wheel spoke had to be balanced in so the wheel eventually ran smoothly on its own axis. Very complicated business.

Well, you could go into all of this. And then because you're going to ride a bicycle mainly outside, you could go into and make a complete and exhaustive study of meteorology to know when the weather would be good or bad so that you could ride your bicycle, don't you see?

And then because you're riding your bicycle on ground, you could take up the study of materials of construction. This would give you everything to know about roads. And you could go just a little bit further than that— knowing more about materials and construction because you're going to ride this bicycle on Earth—you could take up geology. And then geology is influenced, of course, by electrical currents and that sort of thing, so you could take geophysical hydrostatics of various kinds.

You could take the influences of Earth's magnetic fields, you see, as it might influence matter, as it might influence the ground, as it might influence the sidewalk, in case you ever hit your head on the sidewalk and couldn't ride the bicycle.

Now, if you approached it from this very, very complicated sphere, you still wouldn't be able to ride a bicycle. You've made all these studies now and you still can't ride a bicycle. So you see, you could go around Robin Hood's barn on a perimeter of about seven miles away from it and wind up at a destination nowhere, even yet, couldn't you? Well, I'm just giving you this as an example.

Now, you could know all of your theory and you could know all these things very well and you could know exactly how to—well, not how to, you could just know the theory of practically everything in Scientology and still not be able to prepcheck. That's the only point I'm making.

You don't have time to steer the handlebars to the left or the right by calculation. The people who do this by calculation have remarkably knobbly skulls by this time. And if every time the bicycle had a slight impulse to go out of balance to the right, they did a calculation as to whether or not to move the handlebars to the right or the left, they would be full of dents after a while. You recognize that as a fact?

Well, similarly, the auditor actually never has any time to calculate in doing a Prepcheck. You ride a bicycle by instinct. And you prepcheck by instinct. Now, you can get the rules down pretty well and you can know about where you're going and so forth, but when you totally delete out instantaneous instinct out of the thing, you're in bad shape.

But if you read your withholds into the pc's case and call that instinct, you also will not ride the bicycle. You know, people do that. You know, we did that to you and I don't think anybody ever told you about it.

We asked you what withholds does your pc have and then did you realize you had been run on them immediately afterwards? We took the withhold the auditor was sure the pc had and had it run out of the auditor. It worked pretty well, didn't it? You found a few, didn't you? Just a corny gag. See?

It's a truism that auditors will sometimes assign all of their own withholds and misdeeds to the pc and then try to audit them out of the pc like mad. And of course they aren't in the pc. They're in the auditor's own case.

So if you ask an auditor at any time to list the withholds it's most likely the pc has and make a long, arduous list of this thing, particularly if he hasn't much experience with the pc, don't you see? And then you take that list and have it and check it against the auditor, you'll find those withholds.

I don't know that you are aware of that, but it's pretty rank. And if instinct is running your withholds out of the pc, why, then you're not again going to ride the bicycle.

No, you have to be able to sit in front of a human being—a being—and ride it down the line. You sometimes don't even find out what you're after till the session is over. Theory be damned. I mean, I did a session the other night and I found out after five hours and a half of auditing or something like this, I found out I had been auditing a chain called "women." But I didn't know it for five-and-a-half hours. That was the only common denominator to the chain I was running

I thought I was running another chain entirely, all stemming out of a channel of withholds and sure enough, I was following down the channel I thought was there and we were winning hands down all the way, but I never got the whole chain summated until the session was over. There was another deeper common denominator to the chain of withholds that I was running. And that was women. See? That was actually the basic common denominator of the chain I was running.

But nevertheless running a very successful Prepcheck. Running a terrifically successful Prepcheck with, actually, hardly the foggiest notion of what I was prepchecking. But I couldn't find out.

Well, it was, to some degree, my fault because I started the session without really starting the session and started away from a present time problem. And the present time problem was dead on the line, but the auditor was actually assigning the channel rather than finding out from the pc what the channel was and assigning it.

In other words I—if I had spent a little more time at the beginning of the session, you see, instead of getting myself hurled into the session with a present time problem. . . . Actually, I had no subject left unflat on this, see. This was a new start on this case. It was a brand-new start.

And this brand-new start—it meant all the 1s and 1A, 1B, and so on it had before, they were all washed, you see? So I had to find a new departure point, so I just took the present time problem as a departure point and the case walked over from this present time problem right down a chain. And then after five and a half hours of auditing I found out what the chain was called. It was called "women." Interesting Huh? I thought it was very fascinating

So your basic orientation on the case of what you're doing and so forth is largely a matter of touch. It's finding out what the pc will give you as a withhold and finding out what runs nicely as a withhold and then going on down that chain of related withholds and carrying on with it without letting the pc's attention jump entirely off that to some other disrelated subject. You know, you have to keep the pc's attention on this and it's sort of interesting. You sort of keep the pc's attention on it without forbidding the pc from talking about other things or stirring up a lot of bank that you're not now going to pull and keeping the pc on a chain and you sometimes will find yourself unable to identify the chain.

But it's obviously all related, you see? You're just running it by instinct. So we could tell you all about meteorology, geology, the magnetic fields, gyroscopy, synthetic chemistry and we could tell you all about those things and you could still sit down and if you have no instinct

whatsoever for the pc and no interest in auditing the pc, if your—if your point here is totally missed, if you're just studying and your point is not you're going to audit the pc, you see, why, we'd wind up not riding the bicycle at all. You follow this?

We could lay it all down with beautiful rules and you could memorize these rules and so forth. Well, you've already got a tremendous summation of information as contained in the withhold system itself. See, a tremendous quantity of data have been summarized and synthesized into that very neat package, just as fantastic quantities of technical information and modern science have gone into the making of a bicycle. See?

And what's left? Well, you haven't got a bicycle unless somebody can ride the bicycle, you got the idea? Bicycles are not display objects. They are riding objects. And so it is with Prepchecking. It's something to be used and you can use it or you can't use it. And there's hardly, apparently, with 3D Criss Cross and Prepchecking—apparently no grays. It's black and it's white. And how it got from black to white is as sudden as can't ride a bicycle and can ride one.

And just how it got through that zone will probably continuously evade your eye. Once you've given an auditor—once an auditor can sit there and run a repetitive process, he can get his rudiments in somewhat—if he can do these things, see, you know—run a repetitive process on the pc and he can keep his rudiments in, then I think you could teach him forever without getting him any closer to prepchecking than just prepchecking.

So the best—the best way is, I think, is kind of make sure he knows all about it, you see, that if you reverse the turn of the pedals, you apply the brakes, don't you see, and make him learn these various things and make him learn all that. And then just let him prepcheck and keep him from going off the roadway completely. And one fine day, why, not too distant future, he'll all of a sudden say, "Hey, what do you know!"

Now, just as you have to be able to walk and move your arms and legs to ride a bicycle, so do you have to be able to use an E-Meter and have a fair command of the basics of auditing. That is to say, sit in a chair, repetitive question, these various things. Well, we assume that you're good at these things before you move over into it. But you'll find sometimes, when you're teaching somebody to prepcheck very industriously—you're gorgeously slogging ahead teaching somebody Prepchecking and they just can't prepcheck—you're liable to find out that they're trying to ride a bicycle but have no legs or something. And this is embarrassing.

They don't know how to use an E-Meter, see. Or they actually haven't ever had Op Pro by Dup flattened on them. And they can't repeat a repetitive question. They wouldn't be able to do this or they haven't a clue about Model Session or keeping the rudiments in and they're so busy doing all of these other things that their attention's not on Prepchecking at all, don't you see.

So the stunt is to get somebody into some kind of shape where he or she can audit—knows an E-Meter, able to sit in the chair and do the TRs more or less, do Model Session and so forth. And then be able to handle the E-Meter against rudiments. Be able to handle the E-Meter pretty well against rudiments, before you turn them loose on Prepchecking. That's basically what they have to know.

And of course, they have to know the withhold system and they have to know what that's all about. And they'll get that pretty straight and then next thing you know, why, there they are, running.

But you could learn all the rules and it'd still be to some degree, excusing your presence, ladies, fly by the seat of your pants operation. It is that. Because nobody could lay down what the pc's going to give you for withholds. Nobody could lay this down.

This is a variable just about as wild as—well, there's no telling what a state legislature or a provincial assembly or something like that's going to pass. That's about as wild a variable as you could think of. And it's sure as variable as that, you see? And since I one time was asked to congratulate—I was asked to congratulate an assemblyman who informed me with great pride, expecting I would instantly pat him on the back, that he had just read the Ten Commandments into law in the State of Arizona. They were now going to be the law of Arizona—the Ten Commandments. It's marvelous. I don't know how the hell—I don't know what that had to do with the price of fish at all, you see? It's pretty good.

Oh, yes, I've seen some wild ones come through there and you're going to sit there sometimes and just absolutely drop your jaw at what the withhold is. You always tend to run by your own moral code. And the basic mistake that you make, once you can do all the mechanical operations and so forth, is assign your own moral code to the pc.

And if you could think of you being sec checked—not prepchecked—but if you think of you being sec checked, now, by an Ecuadorian headhunter, now what kind of questions would he ask you, see, and then think of this Ecuadorian headhunter becoming frantically furious with you for not having abided by his moral code, you'll get the frame of mind of the pc toward the auditor sometimes. This—this you can make a mistake on.

Now, you can also let yourself be talked out of pulling a withhold on the same grounds in reverse. See, you mustn't do that either. See, either way is a sin. You're caught. So sometimes it's right and sometimes it's wrong

Now, let me give you an idea. Let us have a 3D Criss Cross. Let's take a look at 3D Criss Cross and we shake out of 3D Criss Cross an item which gives the pc pain, meaning it is his terminal. And it's an unmistakable item. It blew a lot of charge when we got the thing off, but let's prepcheck it. Now, that sounds funny running Prepchecking after 3D Criss Cross, but you're going to be doing just that, you see.

It hasn't got another name. You run it before and you run it after and so on and we're catching up with the aftermath because after you do 3D Criss Cross, you still have to do an operation which looks exactly like Prepchecking and is Prepchecking and possibly be called something else because it's a sort of a mop-up. And it's—you steer the pc's knowingness down these channels and blow them apart.

Well, I know, at the moment, no faster method of reaching the knowingness of the pc than taking a 3D Criss Cross item, which you've got—it's nicely isolated and you got a lot of the charge shaken off the case and so forth—and just enter a Prepcheck along these lines.

The item which we found and gave the pc pain was “a moral man.” That's— not—would not be an uncommon or a strange terminal to find on a case. A moral man. That is the item and it is obviously a terminal of the pc's because it has pain on it. If it made the pc dizzy, it would be an opposition terminal to the pc—if he merely had sensation or misemotion or something like that on it. But if he had pain, if it gave him real good aches and pains, it's his terminal.

All right. Obviously then, we could prepcheck this item and how would we pull the withholds that were holding this thing on the whole track. What would be our Zero Question?

Well, I'm not going to give you the perfect Zero Question from this. And I'm just going to give you some thinkingness on this subject. We know the pc has a terminal, a moral man.

Now, what is the obvious Zero for a Prepcheck? This is running it backwards. This is running it from the bank up to present time. Obviously, he has a whole chain of withholds on this right in present time that you've never spotted.

I don't care how carefully you prepchecked the pc originally. This is going to be a whole new chain. No matter if he almost wrapped Clear on the present lifetime. There's still going to be

this buried chain because it's going to go completely in all directions on forward right up until now—a moral man.

See, there's still going to be stuff missing. You couldn't help it. What's the Zero? "Have you ever been moral?" Well, wouldn't that be the Zero? Wouldn't it be something like that? Honest, you'll find withholds on that line if you had that terminal—moral man.

Now, you think of all terminals as representative of some bloody-mindedness of one character or another, you know, like "A vicious thief" Ah, that sounds like a good terminal. Well, you could understand that one. Now, let's get that one. Now, we find that "the vicious thief" as a 3D Criss Cross item has pain on it. Every time you try to run "vicious thief" why, the back of his neck comes apart and his skull splits in half, and he has horrible shooting pains going through his stomach. Now, that's dandy, so it obviously is something like a terminal. Obviously. And it's all checked out very nice. Naturally you could run this one. "Have you ever stolen anything? Have you ever stolen anything just to be mean?" See? Nice, nice Zero.

Now, you can understand that one, can't you. That's an easy one to understand. Well now, look, "a moral man" as a 3D Criss Cross item giving the pc pain is the same confounded concatenation of what-not. It has exactly the same value as "a vicious thief" as a subject of withholds. Believe it or not, that is what it does. Now, you look that over and any question that you ask about "a vicious thief," substitute "vicious thief" or "thievery" for "a moral man" and "morality" and you'll get the same value of withhold. These withholds will come off fantastically charged.

Supposing this was a girl we had this terminal, "a moral man" on. "Have you ever been moral?" Oh, man, this thing falls off the pin. Just falls off the pin. "Have you ever been moral?" "Have you ever abided by any of the Ten Commandments?"

Big withhold. "I didn't kill Bill." See? Big withhold.

It's reprehensible in some fashion. Sounds weird, doesn't it? There could be just all that backwards.

Now, let's get a little more involved on the thing and let's get a terminal, "an immoral girl." That would be common enough as a 3D Criss Cross item. And if "the immoral girl" was being prepchecked up the line, you possibly would get the same package of withhold. "Have you ever done anything moral?" you could ask. You follow me now?

So it could fall on either side. This terminal has a different value of withhold. And you'd get into a whole chain of what people call laudable withholds.

Now, supposing we had a terminal—"a lady." Isn't that a nice terminal? We can just see the pc now sighing with relief at the end of the item, for her male auditor was sitting there and she was still trying to impress the auditor a little bit. And at the end of this long and arduous list of 3D items which contain some of the more interesting lines—it doesn't fall on any of those. It doesn't fall on any of those. And she's sitting there, whew, you know, because down at the end of the line the last item that was left in on the nulling was "a lady." Isn't that sweet. Isn't that sweet.

And she's so happy about this. Gives her an awful pain straight through the ears and straight this way and that way. That's fine, but nevertheless it's a nice, pleasant, acceptable terminal. And now we start prepchecking this. And the Zero Question, "Have you ever been ladylike?" "Have you done ever—ever done anything that was ladylike?" Would oddly enough be quite responsive. Each one of them as a solid withhold. Why withhold? Well, the terminal, a lady, was withheld, wasn't it? So all the acts of a lady would be withheld.

Now, look at the law—now let's look at the thing in reverse. Look at the laudable withholds of a lady. she withholds herself from drinking. She withholds herself from swearing. She withholds herself from rowdy companions. She withholds herself from dirt, you know and getting dirty. Withholds herself from getting sweaty. See, all the things a lady withholds herself from. Withholds herself from sex, from pleasure, from pleasurable excitement. This starts to look like a very interesting series of withholds. And we finally find out that "a lady's" primary mission was to hold herself from living. Not that that's—things I have mentioned are the total composite of living.

Actually, then, you could just translate the terminal in two ways. why can you translate it in two ways? Because if you were running an old 3D set of commands, it'd be, "What have you done to a lady?" see, "What has a lady done to you?" see and "What have you done to another?" Which of course puts the pc in the valence of the lady for the moment and so on.

So it's what the pc has done as a lady and what the pc has done to a lady. So we have the pc interiorized into this terminal, a lady, only because the pc has tremendous overts on a lady. But the pc not only has overts on a lady but also is being a lady, see?

So we'd ask, "Have you ever done anything ladylike?" would be the response to that 3D Criss Cross item. Or "Have you ever failed to be ladylike?" would give you another channel, all on the same terminal.

In other words, you'd have a string of withholds on the subject of being unladylike and you'd have a string of withholds on the subject of being ladylike, equally, wouldn't you.

In other words, these are two channels which would have moved forward into present time as a series of problems and they would have made all these problems. Every time she powdered her nose, she knew she was doing wrong. Why? Because ladies don't use powder in most periods and ages. And this could be practically a trained mechanism.

But ladies look nice, don't they. So every time she didn't powder her nose, she was doing something wrong. Isn't that right?

A 3D Criss Cross item is simply an item with which nobody wins or has won. See, nobody's ever won with this item. This item is not a winner. It's only an apparent suppressor of other things and items, see?

So if you dramatize the item, you are obviously wrong and if you don't dramatize the item, you are obviously wrong, so it gives you two different types of withholds on the same case—the withholds of having dramatized it and the withholds of not having dramatized it. And you'll get the same thing.

In other words, you'll get all of the withholds of a moral man and all of the withholds of not being a moral man all at the same time, see, because it's a nobody wins situation.

Now, the easiest time and the easiest point of departure in the clearing of a pc, the easiest time to start the clearing of a pc, of course, is when the pc is Clear. And then you know all about the case. You've got adequate case records, then, with which to process the pc.

Now, you know how to process the pc. You know what all the terminals were, so what all the types of withholds there would be. You know what all the items were and so you know all the types of items to pursue and you know all about it.

Now, one of the things you want me to do is to give you the whole map of the case as cleared in order to clear the case. Well, the funny part of it is I fool you and I almost do. But you've got to apply this data and this know-how to the case you're auditing at a time when you don't know a blasted thing about the case but the mechanics of Scientology. And that's all you know about this case. All else is variable.

You have the stabilities of knowing about locks, chains of locks, secondaries, chains of secondaries, engrams, chains of engrams, the effect of the lock, of the engram holding down secondaries and secondaries holding down locks and you know that this is plotted against time. You know there's such a thing as the time track. You know there's such a thing as the known part of the mind and the unknown part of the mind.

All right. You know there's such a thing as a thetan. You know the various dynamics, and you know the axioms on which this thetan is operating and you know that—about ARC and the fact that the thetan is in bad shape when he is unable to communicate and he's in good shape when he is able to communicate. Not necessarily when he is communicating or not communicating, but is able to communicate or able to be, you see, not necessarily when he's being. You know these various things.

You know about be, do and have. You know these various items, see? You know the meter—you know what that's shining up to—and what a session ought to look like and from there on, the sky's the limit, see? You know these basic mechanics.

Now, you got a withhold system which will pull these withholds which are preventing the pc from communicating broadly. But what are the withholds? What chains do they form up? How do they associate in the pc's mind? That's your bicycle seat. see what I mean?

And after you've been prepchecking for a little while, you'll find out that when you give the pc a good controlled session that is going right down the groove of something the pc can talk about because it is on the line and channel of a chain of withholds the pc can talk to you about, that are real to the pc as withholds, you'll find out that if you keep the pc's attention directed and you make the pc go on and look and you carry right straight on through at a good heavy controlled session with the pc talking the whole time—I'm talking about the type of session I've been giving on demonstration on Prepchecking; no more witty or arduous than that, but very controlled if you noticed—you find out the pc at the end of the session gets his goals and gains. He makes his goals and he gets gains.

And when you give a sloppy, stupid session and you ride the bicycle all over the town and wind up on the cathedral roof without the least clue of how anybody got there at all and then just leave the pc standing there while you go home to supper, and then never find out where you left the pc thereafter, you're not going to get any goals and gains over on that right-hand channel. It's a question, of course, plotting, steering, understanding and so forth.

And I'm telling you very frankly the easiest point of departure for Prepchecking is, of course, naturally, when the person is Clear. That's the easiest point of departure. Then you know all the 3D terminals that have given him all the oddball withholds that he has. You know the whole composition of his bank. You know every incident on his time track that is worth knowing. You know what has been suppressing his second dynamic, his first dynamic, his third dynamic and why he and God are on swearing terms.

You know all about these things and therefore you could run a perfect case. But of course, at that stage, the person doesn't need any auditing, so the information is of no value. That's the sort of thing you pick up en route.

Well, now, how en route can you get in a Prepcheck? I'll say that if you audited a pc for four or five hours without finding anything about where you were going, there was something wrong with the way you were attacking the case. So this is always a test of whether or not you are doing an accurate job of riding the bicycle. If every few hours—and I don't mean just every five hours—but every few hours you fail to know more about what makes this case tick, then you must be riding a tricycle or a velocipede, but you're sure not riding a bicycle. You understand what I mean?

If you can look back over the last session or two and find out—know pretty well where this pc lives and get some kind of an idea and anticipation of where this pc is going next—some kind of a prediction factor with regard to the pc, in other words—a higher understanding of the pc, let me put it that way, why this pc got that way, what made this pc that way, how come (the how-come factors, call them those) why, you're probably prepchecking well. Regardless of his goals and gains—that's the other test, of the pc making his goals and getting gains. That's your primary test, of course. But this other one is a test as far as you're concerned as the auditor.

And you sort of know what makes this pc tick. You get a better idea of which way this is going And you got a better grasp of it. And not only of the pc, but a little bit better grasp of the human mind; a little bit better reality. That applies to me, too, see. I'm not saying a student should do that, you know. Why, man, you must be prepchecking like a wizard.

Now if you're getting his goals and gains and you're understanding the pc better and you're knowing a little bit more about the human mind, wow! See, I mean, gee-whiz. That would be your point of expectancy. That's what you would expect out of a Prepcheck activity. Pc's getting his goals and gains and you understand this pc better and you got a prediction about where this pc's going, you know. I mean, what this pc's done. You understand this better—what he—how he hangs together better. And you understand the human mind a bit better, too, just through having audited this pc. Man, you've just made it, see? And that's an excellent little yardstick by—of finding out whether or not your Prepchecking is pretty darn good.

And if your Prepchecking is pretty doggone good, then all of those things will be true. If your prepchecking is bad, it might first mean that your auditing stinks. You know, just as the matter of an auditor, you know, not auditing the pc, you might be auditing a chair. But this wouldn't be any small thing. This would be not having a clue about what an E-Meter read was. This would be not having a clue, you see, about how to run a session, having total intolerance of sitting there just being a complete buaaaah. You know, first week, co-audit type auditor.

Yeah, well, that could be all wrong, you see and you couldn't prepcheck. But then there's this other zone and area. If you know how to ride this bicycle, why, all these other things will be true.

There'd be two areas wrong, you see, just the person couldn't audit at all. And the next—they can audit all right, but they can't prepcheck. Prepchecking is a specialized activity. And if they can prepcheck, then this is what they should expect out of the pc. They should just expect those things. Pc making his goals, making some additional gains. The auditor understands the pc better, what the pc has done and been, what makes the pc that way and a better understanding of the human mind.

And if you've got all those things taped, my, my, my, are you prepchecking Wow, wow, wow. Good test. Good yardstick, huh?

You've possibly—I realize in saying that, you possibly for a long time may have been expecting the pc to suddenly grow wings or something if you were prepchecking well. Just as a pc will sometimes give you outrageous goals when he wants to get even with you, so does an auditor sometimes get even with himself by setting outrageous session goals of what he's going to accomplish in this session.

Well, if you can just relax to a point of accomplishing what I've just told you, you'll make Clears, see? You'll go on all the way up there because you won't be straining it and be very relaxed.

Now, there's one other test on Prepchecking If you all of a sudden think Prepchecking is very easy and you're very happy to go on prepchecking people, then you can prepcheck. And if you think Prepchecking is very arduous, then you probably can't prepcheck. Because it's odd,

but Prepchecking is probably the easiest auditing which you ever did if you've really got the knack of it.

My goodness, it's just a yawn and a stretch for the auditor. There's just nothing to it because when he gets the pc running on a chain that's working, it's just pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. The pc won't do anything else. It isn't a question of trying to get the pc to talk to you. There aren't any problems in this if you're doing it right. The pc will talk to you. And it's just bong-bong-bong And you suddenly get the impression—there is a ride the bicycle sensation, you know? Just as you one day went sailing along the level, you know, “Wheeee! How come I thought this was hard, you know?” You get the same point in Prepchecking. That it feels just as exhilarated and just as easy as that.

It isn't quite like any other auditing you've ever done. It is just a little different. It's just a little bit different because it delivers wins into your hand per unit of time faster than any other auditing I've ever seen and it is easier in that it gives the auditor no strain.

And you can run rougher cases with it with wins. All of these things are true of Prepchecking When you can do it well, why, you kind of feel like you've got it surrounded and made. And of course, to be able to do it well is worthwhile in accomplishment. And I notice that all but four students on their last Prepcheck session did it without a blunder. Got the chain, got the What questions, had the pc rolling just right on down the chain. Isn't that interesting?

So it must be that you can learn it. It must be doable. Partially due to demonstrations which you've been getting, as I'm sure this is a speed up factor in training—and due to the system itself and also due, of course, to the good instruction you've been getting and so forth and the good tips you've been getting, I've never seen anything catch on faster than Prepchecking. It apparently is not very hard to ride the bicycle and the criterion then is how fancy can you get with this bicycle.

So most of you, the largest majority of you, are in the interesting state this moment of how fancy can you get in riding this bicycle and not whether or not can you ride the bicycle. As I say there are only about four of you are having any difficulty with it at all and that difficulty was relatively minor.

So it is a teachable process and it's a winnable process. That's why I recommend it to you very heavily.

Thank you.