PREPCHECKING DATA

A lecture given on
27 March 1962

Thank you.

I know that's all for Mary Sue. I know that's all for Mary Sue. Well, thank you, I won't throw away your applause.

Well, here we are at the what?

Audience: 27th of March.

It's the 27th of March, and the vernal equinox is five days, six days behind us, and it's as cold as ever!

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

All right. This is a little longer lecture. We're going to finish a little earlier this evening. I'm just going to carry straight on here.

I'm going to talk to you about Prepchecking. It's just about time somebody talked to you about Prepchecking. And this is the inevitable lecture which follows the pleasant lectures. This is the lecture that goes after the lectures which tell you how to do something.

Now, you've had several lectures on Prepchecking, an awful lot of lectures on Sec Checking, which is quite a different proposition, and this is the "Oh my God how could you" lecture. The horrors of war sort of thing, you know? And you'll find this lecture is complemented by the HCO Bulletin of March the 21st, 1962, PREPCHECKING DATA.

There's some additive data in this bulletin. Inevitably when a technique is handed out, we find that there are holes in its use. And the primary hole that was found in Prepchecking was succinctly and definitely this: You do not ask a What question until you have found a specific and actual overt. Engrave that in letters of fire back of your prefrontal lobes no matter how uncomfortable it is, because that is an absolute necessity. You won't ever get any Prepchecking done unless you do that and nearly everybody missed that.

Now, here's what was going on. We had a Zero Question: "Have you ever stolen any white cross buns?" you see, or some good broad general question. "Have you ever been mean?" or "Is it all right for you to tell somebody else my difficulties?" Any—any Zero Question. These are generality questions. They are broad, broad generality questions. And what you have been doing is coming off of the Zero too fast. You have forgotten that there is a Zero, that there is a Zero A and a Zero B and there could be a Zero C and a Zero D and a Zero E and a Zero F. We don't care how many Zeros there are. You've been using Zero Questions for What questions.

Now, you've already gotten the word on this because you've had this bulletin for a day or two. But listen, looking over your folders, one stands his hair on end! And that is very rough because you've routinely been using this—the questions that should be in the Zeros for your What questions. And of course this tells us adequately that you are not finding a specific overt to write your What question; you are buying a generality. You can't run a series, a chain, from a generality. Let me assure you of this.

Oh, a number of chains can come out of a generality. But until you have found a specific and actual overt, you cannot, absolutely cannot, run a chain. And, of course, you've been coming up against the bumper in the railroad station and thinking the tracks went that-a-way. And all

you did was keep hitting the bumper in the railroad station, hitting the bumper in the railroad station, and of course you got nowhere. Because you weren't on a chain, you were on a generality, and that generality belongs to the Zero Question.

Let's take a—let's take an example of this: "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Zero.

Pc says, "Well, I wouldn't really like to talk to you about my difficulties with my mother."

Previously this is what you were doing; the What question, "What about your difficulties with your mother?"

And the pc said, "Well, I had some difficulties with my mother."

So you say, "Good. Well, when were those? Oh yeah, this lifetime. Very good. Is that all there is to that?"

And the pc says, "Yes."

And then the next inevitable question, "Well, who didn't find out about it?"

And—"Well, you didn't," would be the only possible answer.

And that's not Prepchecking. No.

That's a Zero A. See, that's a Zero A. You don't—it doesn't matter how it's worded. You could even word it with a "What," but it's a Zero A. And it is—that's all it is. And your Zero A would inevitably be—if the pc said that—would be, "Well, how about these difficulties with your mother?" You write it down Zero A.

This doesn't delude you into thinking you have run into anything, because you haven't. You haven't connected with anything but a generality. You've got to have a specific incident, specific incident. And it may take you five or ten minutes of steering and yammering and running into holes and getting out of them again, and so forth. And the pc is liable at this time to just steer all over the football field. I mean, there's nothing going on here. It's just they're just, "There you go," you know?

I mean, it's liable to go something like this, I'll give you an approximation of it, see. Well, you say, "Well, how about these difficulties with your mother?"

And he says, "Well, she was always beating me. And she hit me over the head. And she did this . . ."

And you say, "Yes, yes, we know that. Well, now, did you ever do anything to her to give her any difficulties or anything like that?"

"No, no, I didn't. I was always as good as gold. The neighbors always used to say that I was a model child."

And you say, "Well, that's fine."

Your meter, you see, wouldn't—you wouldn't be on this if your meter hadn't fallen at the time you ran into these difficulties with Mother, you see. You wouldn't have written it down as a Zero A in the first place.

And you say, "Well, did you ever mess her up in any particular way? Something like that?"

"No, no, never did. Never did. Uh—always tried to be kind and thoughtful and she just used to kept—keep beating me all the time. Just beating me, beating me, beating me day and night."

Well, you say, "Well, that's good. Now, now, let's get on to this now. Do you remember your mother at all?"

Well, the pc says, "Yeah, well, sort of vaguely."

"All right. Well, now, did you ever do anything to her?"

"Oh, maybe some little things. Something like that. Embarrassing her. Embarrassing her in front of guests. Little things. Didn't amount to anything"

"Well, did you ever embarrass her in front of any guests?" You haven't written another thing about any What question yet because you haven't got an overt yet, do you see? Do you get the idea?

"Well embarrassing her in front of guests. Yes, I—yes, I remember one time there was a tea party at my mother's house, and I came in and held up a dirty diaper in front of her, and so forth, and bragged to her about the fact that I had done a good job. I remember that was my. . . so on and so on. Yeah."

And you say, "Well good. Do you remember this or were you told about it?"

"Oh. I was told about it. It was one of the family stories, you know. I just always was told about it."

"All right. Well now, ahem, now do you remember ever doing anything to your mother at all?"

"No. Never did a thing to her." The thing is still falling off the pin and so forth.

"Well, now, do you recall ever doing anything that embarrassed her?"

"Oh, well yes. Yes, yes, there was one time, when I was in high school. I remember there was a girl in high school I was going with and her parents got very mad at me because of Mother, and so forth."

You say, "Good. Now, what's the extent of that?"

"Well, it's just the fact that I sure did embarrass her. I—I sure did embarrass her, because this girl, you see, I mean, we'd been fooling around you know, and she got pregnant."

"Ahhhhh. Oh, well, all right, now. What about embarrassing your mother about girls, or with girls?" And you write that down! And now you go, "When was it?" "Is that all of it?" "What might have appeared?" "What didn't appear?" "Who didn't find out about it?" and so forth. Let's get this thing pounded out, see?

Then, by George, you'll find that if that didn't clear up by the time you've gone through it twice, there's an earlier time that he did something like this. So you ask, "When's that earlier one?"

"What earlier one?"

"Well, is there another time when you did that?"

"Well . . ."

Now that he's got that other one softened up a little bit, yeah, he'll give you the earlier one. All right.

Then you'll play that one and maybe you'll get four and maybe you'll get six. You haven't written another thing on your sheet yet, see. If you want to do any writing for your own benefit, write over here on the edge someplace, something. We don't care what you write, but it has nothing to do with these questions.

And "Oh yes," he says all of a sudden. This other series isn't clear yet.

And you've now hit the third one. And you're working over the third one. And all of a sudden he says, "Yes. I beat my mother up once."

"Oh, all right. Thank you." And you go right on plowing the chain you're plowing, you hear me? I'm warning you. I'm warning you. I will materialize over your left shoulder. You put it over here in the margin—"Beat up his mother." And you go right on working the What chain that you are on and getting new withholds until it is clear.

In other words, you do not—for every overt on a chain you don't get a new What question. For every overt on the chain you'll get charge, and eventually that chain will discharge, and it is a chain, specific, and it itself will discharge if you get the earliest part of it. And it's the only thing that will hold that chain down.

Now, a chain is a series of similar incidents. There is a chain of hitting people with the left hand and a chain of hitting people with the right hand. You got the idea? There is a chain of being mean to Mother in the morning and there is a chain of being mean to Mother in the evening. You get the idea? These chains are very specific.

Now, you actually are working, maybe, two or three little chains, but they are very minor little chains. And these little chains will interweave. Well, embarrassing Mother about girls and so forth, is probably embarrassing her about big girls and embarrassing her about small girls, you see? That's two chains. But it's definitely embarrassing Mother about girls. And that chain will discharge if you get the underpinnings of the chain. If you get the earliest incident on this, you're going to have a flat chain.

And you can actually work overt after overt after overt all on the same channel, providing you stay with that channel—providing you stay with the channel and don't go wandering all over the place about it, see?

The difficulties of handling a Prepcheck question are what you make them, or what the pc makes them and you flub on. But there are no real difficulties of getting the Prepcheck What question, as long as you remember you have to have a specific overt, and as long as you recognize that that specific overt is going to be a chain. And it mustn't be a very broad chain, it must be a pretty narrow chain. "What about being mean to women?" is of course a major chain, but "Being mean to Mother" is definitely a part of that chain, but is itself and would ordinarily clear by itself.

Now, a chain is going to clear if you get tone arm action. Now, let's go to this next one. Do you dig this first thing that I've been giving you here?

Audience: Yes.

Listen, I don't care how much boz-woz and yap-yap you go into with a pc. I don't care if you argue with him, sit there and argue with him for half an hour. They've given you a generality that gave you needle action. Now, it's your job to find one overt within the perimeter of that generality.

And that's the step where all Prepchecking has been breaking down. It's just right there. It's as simple as that. And the rest of it will work out on the basis that continuing to get off overts on the subject of that What question, earlier and earlier, will eventually plow up enough unknowns on it that it will desensitize on the meter. And that is all you're trying to do. And then you get the next What question.

You got that now? That—it's actually pretty easy. But it was just this little thing we were missing All right.

Now, in steering down one of these chains, if you do not get tone arm action, you might as well just skip the whole subject, because it is buried in the land of never-never, or you're on top of a terminal that if you ran it on a 3D-type process would simply beef up the whole Prehav Scale on the bank. There's something wrong here or the pc—which is the basic thing—doesn't even vaguely consider it an overt. It sounds awfully juicy to you, but to the pc it is not an overt, whatever you're working.

This is the sin of auditing somebody against the Auditor's Code. You only audit a process as long as it produces change and no longer. You don't audit a process if it does not produce change.

Now, believe me, you can desert that thing in an hour or half an hour or ten minutes—it doesn't matter how long you have worked this with no change of the tone arm; it does not matter how long you have worked this—it is equally a breach of the Auditor's Code to work it ten minutes with no change, two hours with no change or ten sessions without any change. Do you follow me?

Now, ten minutes—this is cutting it a little bit fine, so we get a twenty-minute rule. If you're working a channel, and you work that channel for twenty-minutes—now, you understand, you haven't been working the channel with tone arm action and then hit a twenty minute flat period, that's not what we're talking about, see. Well, you've been working this Prepcheck overt the pc has given you. You've worked the thing for twenty minutes and you haven't had any slightest—well, you haven't had any significant action on the part of the tone arm, call it a breach of the Auditor's Code if you continue it.

The way to get out of it is to ask if you've missed a withhold on the pc, clean up any missed withhold which turns up and drop it like a hot potato.

Several things could be wrong You've gone through, you've found out that he has innumerable overts on his mother. And you go through and for twenty minutes you are running along with this What question. And he's telling you that he used to up-end the cookie jar over his mother's head and kick her out the back door, and right now why she's starving to death in a poorhouse someplace. And you haven't gotten any tone arm action of any kind no matter how juicy this sounds to you—no matter how much you think it ought to produce reaction, no matter how desperately you believe that this is a violation of the social mores which must be upheld.

You know, if you just stop upholding all these social mores, nobody would need any auditing You realize that.

You've got an Auditor's Code breach staring you in the face if you continue it. But you must, if you're going to come off of this thing . . . oh, you're going up and down the line, up and down the line, up and down the line. You're trying to get off overts. Person's actually giving you overts. You're running When and, you know, everything No TA action. You do make sure the meter is connected. And there's no TA action—the thing to do with it is to ask the pc if you have missed a withhold, and clean up any reaction you get on that question and get the hell out of there and find another subject. You're just going to waste more time prepchecking things that the pc doesn't consider an overt. That's the other thing which you're doing.

Now, maybe someday he will consider this an overt and maybe he won't. But remember, a pc does not prepcheck—I'll just extend this a little further now—remember a pc doesn't prepcheck all the way to the bottom of the deck. I don't mean by that, that—he does go backtrack. But remember, not all levels of pc prepcheck. Prepcheck is not as broadly good an approach to all cases, no matter how low toned, as the CCHs or even 3D Criss Cross.

Both 3D Criss Cross and the CCHs go much further south than Prepchecking. Prepchecking takes a bit of responsibility for thinkingness. 3D Criss Cross takes a bit of responsibility for existingness. And CCHs take a bit of responsibility for mass and repetitive action. And you'll find out, responsibility for beingness and responsibility for mass or repetitive action equally go further south than responsibility for doingness.

And, of course, you've got three processes here and if you'll look it over again in the light of what I've just said, you've got a be, do and have breakdown of auditing, see. 3D Criss Cross, that's direct beingness. Prepchecking, that's direct doingness. And CCHs are what they always have been designed to be—they're direct havingness. And by some odd freak, the beingness processes go further south than the doingness processes. Why? We wouldn't care, but they just happen to by actual experience.

You can do 3D Criss Cross items on somebody who's practically rave, stark staring mad. You can do them pretty low. But not as low as the CCHs.

To admit to doingness... All right. We get some boy and he's sitting there—I'll give you why, see—sitting there and he's half way around the bend in the local spinbin, you see? And you say to this fellow—you say to this fellow, "Did you walk down the hall?"

And he will say, "Oh, goo-goo, ga-ga, blah" you see?

And you'll say, "Well, are you Joe?"

And he will say, "Yes."

That get more real to you right there? Now, he'll identify himself, but he won't—he won't admit to doingness. Doingness is the main punishment factor in this universe.

Now, that's probably just a specialization of this quarter of the universe and maybe someplace else this might not add up this way. But it sure adds up this way here.

Now therefore, when you are running into trouble in Prepchecking, and that trouble is excessive, and you do not seem to be able to get any tone arm action out of Prepchecking, there is one place where you should send the pc—to the CCH room. That's for sure. That's the easiest thing to run on this pc, and that's the thing this pc's going to get the most gain on, per unit of auditing time.

Supposing under no circumstances could you find any type or line of action or overts on any dynamic, on any subject that would get you tone arm action on the pc. Let's say you fooled around with this for a couple of sessions. You could fool around with it for two or three sessions, but I certainly wouldn't go any further than that. And you have not yet produced a tone arm motion, a reasonable tone arm motion—a quarter of a division or more for every twenty minutes of auditing—you have no business wasting your time and wasting the pc's time.

CCHs, brother. CCHs. And you'll find out that that will work out much better. It's not particularly a comment on the pc, it might also be a comment on the auditor. Do you see that? The auditor, for some reason or other can't pick the lock and combination to this safe. Maybe another auditor could come along and pick this lock or combination, see? Maybe something else could be done here, some extraordinary solution entered in on the thing. I'm talking about the sensible thing to do. Instead of going on endlessly trying to pick a tricky lock to a

tricky safe, don't you think you would get in more auditing by just running him into the CCHs?

I can tell you this by experience, if a pc is going to prepcheck easily, they will prepcheck within the first two sessions well. And you all of a sudden will have the pc flying in a couple of sessions. I'm talking now about two-hour sessions. And if the pc isn't flying in a couple of two hour sessions—ah, no. We don't care if it's wrong with the pc. We don't care if it's wrong with the auditor. We don't care if it's wrong with the environment you're auditing this pc in. We don't care what it's wrong with or what we're blaming it on to. Let's just recognize the practical fact that if you haven't done it in a couple of sessions, and you haven't got that TA wiggling in a couple of sessions, that you are now taking a gamble with your auditing time, and the pc's auditing time, and the much safer bet is just to run the pc into the CCHs.

Any number of things could be wrong, rather than case level, don't you see? Let's just take them all into action.

Number 1. The auditor may not feel he has sufficient altitude with the pc and is therefore a bit timid.

Number 2. Well, actually, it—a subdivision of 1. Part of this could be the pc is new and the auditor doesn't want to charge in there too hard and upset the pc and embarrass the pc or something of this sort. He wants the pc to keep on getting processed and therefore is hitting it with a feather, you see? And actually doesn't want to ask any embarrassing questions that will upset anybody. This—these factors all enter in to it, besides case.

The pc may have some God-awful PTP of long duration that the pc is just sitting right in the middle of, and the auditor hasn't gotten near it, and hasn't had anything to do with it. And an undisclosed PTP of long duration will discharge with the CCHs, even when undisclosed. So you could—pc wouldn't own up to it or something will happen to it. Those things, you see, could all be off, completely aside from case.

Or—now we move into case—the pc has an overt put-together which is entirely foreign to the social code of the auditor and the two just can't embrace each other's zones of action. In other words, the auditor just can't wrap his head around what would be the overts of a fireman or something, you know? And we just don't ever seem to be able to pick up any overts, and the pc is out of this world . We're talking about case now, because this would only be true if it were wrong with the case. The pc is running an out-of-this-world social mores. What are overts to this particular pc have nothing to do with the social code on which we're running See, a lot of things. These are all little things.

Now, as we get down the line further from this, we could get into a situation where the pc just has no confidence in this particular auditor on Prepchecking.

And then let's go a little bit further than this and get the extreme case— the pc has inadequate and insufficient responsibility to respond to any doingness. That would be the extreme. CCHs will still work on this pc.

Now, under any of those conditions you can see that, rather than beat your brains out, it'd probably be much more successful for you to simply move over into the CCHs. That isn't saying that you can't do some extraordinary things. That isn't saying you can't get around most of these things. That is saying, however, I don't expect you to be able to in all cases, because that would be, to my way of thinking, an unreasonable demand. Because I've already run into a case or two where I wasn't getting tone arm action, see? I just wasn't getting tone arm action and I just slated the case for CCHs. Then we'll come on to it later.

The odd part of it is, the very things that you're prepchecking the pc on before the pc has CCHs—the very thing—after an intensive of CCHs will produce tone arm action. That's what's curious, and I think you'll find that borne out.

This pc's got overts, overts, overts. He keeps giving them to you and the tone arm is just sitting here. The tone arm just—just sits here statuesquely there. That's it. I don't care how much the needle is knocking around. That is to say the needle is—is twitching, you know? And the needle twitches. And you keep it very closely centered, however, and you'd move it just that much, see, to keep your—keep your needle centered. You're getting falls on these things, you know? You're getting little rises and little falls, and it all adds up to less than two-tenths of a division on the TA arm. You're not going anywhere. You're wasting your time. Because whatever you're working at this particular time, you might be working the wrong channels, there might be a lot of things you could do about it, but let's just face up to it, nothing is happening!

You see, regardless of why nothing is happening, to separate these things, you see, separate the whyness that nothing is happening from the fact that just nothing is happening! Don't go on puzzling yourself about it till the end of time. Go on and do something where something happens.

If you feel embarrassed on some outside pc or something, let me assure you that starting in on CCH 2 is often less embarrassing You know, old 8-C. Almost anybody could be run on old 8-C. Start 2 instead of 1. It'll seem to make more sense to them, and by the time you've run them a little bit on that and run 2 and 3, why 1 won't seem silly to them. It'll seem quite natural that they should sit here sticking their hand at you. Get the idea?

But it's a better approach, just between ourselves. It's a better approach. Because you're getting something done. The only thing that breaks an auditor's heart is getting nothing done! So you have some responsibility for yourself, as well as the pc. And you frankly just mustn't run things that get nothing done. You just mustn't do that, that's all.

One, you owe yourself training so that you yourself feel competent when you're doing something, you see? All right. That's for the pc, but that's for you too, you see? And then applying what you know, you owe it to yourself to get some results completely aside from the pc. Because the only thing that can happen to you is a long concatenation of failures. You audit ten pcs in a row and get no results on any of those ten pcs, and somebody will be scraping you off the boards. You know that.

Oh, we could probably audit you up in—in theory, you see—we could audit you up to a point where it wouldn't matter to you at all whether you got results or not, and therefore we would beat this whole thing. Then the probability is, you wouldn't be auditing! So we better give this a more sensible approach.

Now, I frankly don't care what you run on a pc. I really don't care what you run on a pc as long as you get some results. That's an interesting statement. I don't care what you run on a pc. And as long as you flatten it! It's all I ask of you. I don't care if you say, "Get the idea— or mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner. Thank you."

And somebody will come along and say, "What the hell are you trying to do?"

"Oh, I'm trying to cure his alcoholism, of course." "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner," and so on.

You see, it isn't anybody's opinion, if, while you were giving him these commands—"Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner"—you get clank. "Thank you. Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner"—clank. "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner"— clank. "Mock up a little doggy standing on his head in the corner." Man, if you were getting wild tone arm action of that character, man, that case is going

places, I don't care what you're running on the case. The answer lies in the tone arm, not in anybody's opinion. And actually not in the zone and area of what you've been told to run.

And the only kickback you would ever get from me, if you didn't run it finally to where it stopped at 2.3—at 2.75 or at 5.5, or wherever it stopped, it stopped! And you went for twenty minutes and you didn't get a quiver out of that thing. I don't care where it stopped. You can say at that moment, "That is flat."

So you're justified in running any process that produces tone arm action. And you're justified in running it until the tone arm action ceases. And we don't care where the tone arm action wound up. And we don't care where the tone arm action went while it was moving, or stopped where it stopped. See, we haven't any argument with these things. These things are not as significant as you make them. You know? You make these things a lot more significant than they are.

This bird has been sitting over here at 2.0. He's been sitting over here at 2.0 forever, and you do ARC Process '61, see? And you finally park him up here at 6.0. And he said, "I've got a terrible headache, and I feel totally packed in and I can't move and I can't wiggle and life is horrible."

And you've run this process, and you've run it flat and it finally stuck at 6.0. I assure you the case is better off than the case at a dead 2.0. See? It's if you produced reaction and if you ran it until you no longer produced reaction.

The only weird thing you'd—adventurous thing which you do when you go off into the blue with a process is, you don't know whether it's going to produce action or not. And if it does produce wild action, it's liable not to be flattenable in any finite lifetime. That's about the only thing. You might be—you might run twenty-five, thirty... Not a lifetime—you might run twenty-five, thirty hours on this confounded thing. Having run twenty-five or thirty hours on the confounded thing, however, you would have produced more gain on the part of the case than any other thing that you could have run at the time if that was what you were running and it did produce tone arm action and it finally came to a stop.

But picking up these wild processes and offbeat processes and running them, you sometimes dedicate yourself to a longer period of processing than you actually should be administering

Most of your errors, by the way, are just in not flattening processes, not running processes right or wrong. You know that. Your errors are in not flattening processes. And the brakes that I have put on you on processes, you very often will run a limited process when you pick them out of the hat, you very often run a limited process which will all of a sudden stack up fast. A backwards process.

"What effect have others had on you? Thank you. What effect have others had on you? Thank you. What effect have others had on you? Thank you."

Oddly enough it would—if it produced tone arm action, why, that's fine. But you only dare run it to the moment that it stops producing tone arm action. That will be fairly soon. It will probably leave the pc as gnawed out as a battlefield tank, but nevertheless you must have gotten rid of something if you produced tone arm action. Unbalanced processes are not all bad. But if you're going to do things like that, watch that tone arm.

Now, it's awfully interesting to watch the True Romances or True Story or "This is—Was Your Life Mabel" unrolling off . . . Isn't that the famous program? "This is—This Was Your Life Mabel." I think it's given from Hollywood. They bring in the submarine commander she was in love with when she was two and then they fly in the native that he—who tied up his foot when he was five, and they fly them all in. And then the fellow comes on the stage and they furnish glycerin so that he has lots of tears as he faces all these fellows. And he's all overcome. Have you ever seen this program? "This Was Your Life Mabel." Well, you know,

it's very engrossing. I'm told that people sit in front of TV and just watch it with great fixation. I'm told they even listen to it. That's a fact. Fact! Actually people have not only sat and watched it but have actually turned the sound on.

And an auditor can get in that state. He can! And completely overlook this TA motion. It just goes on and on and on. It's very engrossing, very engrossing, but no TA action. So engrossment has nothing to do with it whatsoever. In fact auditor engrossment has nothing to do with auditing I know you won't believe me when I say that, but it happens to be true. It's just TA action. You get tone arm action while you're prepchecking, fine. If you don't get it while you're prepchecking, get off of that handcar, man. Unload into that ditch.

I know we've carried that guy on down until he's five and now he's spitting in the face of his big brother, and we got incident after incident where he spits in the face of his big brother, and where they tie him to a stake and roast him and that's why they withered his hand and that's how come it's all so horrible. And it's just going on and on and on and on and on and on, and you've just got it all fixed and you're down there to the age of five now, you see? And you know there's some earlier stuff.

Wake up to the fact the tone arm hasn't moved for the last half-hour, would you please? And let the pc run on a little bit further so as not to make it too abrupt and then ask if he's missed—if you've missed any withholds on him. And pick it up, square it up.

Now, frankly, if you picked up an awful lot of missed withholds, you might get the TA action back and you might even be justified in pursuing the chain. You understand there's that liability, too. But the final test even of that is tone arm action. Ah, just bail out of there. Unload off that handcar, because you want nothing but the Twentieth Century Limited, if you please. You don't want any of this handcar stuff. Pc sometimes will give you a bunch of lies, too. They feel so much better, they feel so relieved. Well, that's because you never got near any of their overts. Tone arm action tells you the lot.

Now, there's a gag here about mores, that you should know how to crack a mores. I'll tell you now how to crack a mores. This is rather new to you. Let us say that we have isolated an item. We have isolated an item and that item is an elephant—that's 3D Criss Cross. And it is a nice big crash-banging item. And it's just got nice action, and the oppterm of it got nice action. The oppterm was "native." "Elephant" and "native." And we have isolated— because native produced so much sensation while we were doing the list—we have isolated the fact already that "elephant" happens to be the pc's terminal, and "native" is the oppterm.

Now, you know that you could handle this in this weird way: You establish which is the terminal and which is the oppterm. While you were doing the opposition terminal list, which will give you the. . . You know there's— oppterm has a double-entendre. You oppterm something is a verb which merely means you get the opposite's item. But an oppterm is something the pc ain't.

A pc becomes a terminal. In a loose phraseology you never find terminals with 3D Criss Cross. You always find items. You never find terminals, because a terminal is a specific type of item, and an oppterm is a specific type of item. And the terminal is what the pc is and the oppterm is what the pc isn't.

And the oppterm, when discussed, will give him sensation—grief, dizziness, staggerishness, that sort of thing And the terminal, while you were listing the terminal, he had pn—pain. He got a little pain here or there. You got pains when you were doing the terminal list. So you know when you've finished it up that the pc is the elephant and the native is what opposes the pc.

Now, to be very, very precise, you could—I'll show you how to do a social mores on all this. You get the social mores of an elephant and just ask the pc—I was going to do this the other night and the pc acted up on me. I was going to get this item and show you how to do this. A

piece of my planning went by the boards and so on. It's all right. It's not the pc's fault—exactly. Actually, it was her Prepcheck auditor's fault. Anyhow, the thing about this is the elephant, you'd say, "Now, what—what would be considered antisocial amongst elephants?"

Make a list of it. At that moment, by simply reversing all of those, we get a tremendous number of Zero Questions. It's just as simple as that. "Well, what—what's social? What's social?"

Well, "Eating grass. Uh—eating—eat—eating leaves off trees. Uh—not picking up a wounded uh—failing to pick up a wounded—well, you're supposed to pick up a wounded fellow member of the herd and carry him along. And you're supposed to do this."

All right. You get out of this: "When haven't you eaten grass?" Sounds fantastic, doesn't it? That you—you ask this pc, well, you've got all of these— you ask this pc, "When haven't you eaten grass?" There you go. You'll get tone arm action.

"When haven't I eaten grass? Well, I'm not supposed to eat grass. I'm a human being now."

"Well, that's good. All right." You'd think you'd get that kind of response. But not this pc. "When haven't you eaten grass?"

"Well, that's—yeah, that's right. I haven't been eating any grass lately."

And you can get over and clean up the Zero Question, "Well, when haven't you eaten the leaves off tall trees?" see? And, "When haven't you picked up a wounded teammate with your trunk?" And do you know all these things will register?

Now, after you've gotten the list, it's a good thing to survey the list for the biggest needle action and you've got the overt that he's carrying forward into present time. You might wind up with twenty of these things, don't you see? And you can kind of do a little assessment across these things, watching the tone arm action for each one. You could actually do Assessment by Elimination; find out which one he's sitting in. You'll finally wind up with one of these that you select out. Actually, you could just start at the beginning on number one. But you'll get more powerful action if you do an assessment of all of these things.

And you're liable to get this kind of a—of a thing on it, see? Because, remember, you do have an oppterm for this package. You've just—so far you've just ignored the oppterm. Pc's liable to come up with this oppterm himself: "Well, let's see, what would be antisocial for an elephant? Well, to fail to slay any natives."

And you're liable to find out it works out that that one—of course, because it's the dead center of the terminal/oppterm package—that one just sits right there, clang!

Now, this bird in this lifetime has been down in Arabia and Syria and Berkshire, and by God he hasn't slain any natives! And every time he has not slain a native was an overt! See, that's how you disentangle your social mores. Every time he has not slain a native. And you'll find out this will react beautifully on the tone arm. Do wonders for the case.

And you say, "Well, good heavens! The obvious overt is slaying a native."

Has he slain a native in this lifetime? No, he hasn't slain a native in this lifetime. Well, therefore, he doesn't have an overt. No, that's according to your mores. That's according to McCloud's mores. That's according to somebody else's mores. It had nothing to do with this pc's mores. Failing to slay one! You follow me on this? It's failing to slay the native that is the horrible thing

You see how that's a direct reverse, and then how you could miss it utterly. That type of approach requires a 3D Criss Cross item. But sometimes you can smell these things out

without the 3D Criss Cross item. You're watching the thing as you're discussing life, with a capital "L" with this pc and you notice it's sort of banging around on the subject of—well, let's say it's banging around on the subject of haircuts. Well, you see, by social mores you would assume that his failure to get haircuts would be the overt, or something like this, you know. That might be it. You make up your mind when you see the thing bang, and then you ask him a question and this is a big mistake. You don't search this thing out on both sides of it before you take your plunge.

What type of an overt are you looking for? Because it could be a plus overt and a minus overt. And if you take what you consider the overt would be, you will be fifty percent of the time wrong. Because it's getting a haircut that is an overt. This girl has a past life as Delilah, and cutting any hair ever since has been very restimulative. See? Something stupid like that is sitting in the lineup.

You see, these overts are formed on old now-I'm-supposed-to's and they have nothing to do with good sense, otherwise it wouldn't be this universe. It just strictly, entirely and only has to do with the—which side of the fence the fellow was on. Duck hunting Well, what's an overt for the duck in duck hunting is not the overt for the hunter, don't you see? That's—it's liable to be totally reverse.

So when you find a subject don't be so ruddy fast in plunging off the springboard. Let's find out what side of this thing is an overt.

Fellow says, "Oh, I've—I've made a lot of propositions to girls in my time. I used to stand down by the drugstore and I used to proposition girls."

And you say, "Good. That's—in my upbringing, that was always an overt to proposition all these girls. Good." All right. Use that as a Zero question, "Have you ever propositioned any girls?" and now we're going to get the What. "All right. Now, recall a time there you—you got a specific time when you propositioned a girl."

Now, the fellow says, "Oh, yes, yes, yes. Last Saturday night propositioned Amy Glutz."

You say, "Good. What about propositioning girls in front of the drugstore? All right."

And after you've been working about fifteen minutes, why, what I've told you about the tone arm motion, you all of a sudden said, "You know I haven't looked at that lately. I'm going to look at it." It's up the spout, you see?

The overt is "Not propositioning girls"! Your Zero Question. . . This is the way the thing really put together. The Zero Question is "How about doing bad things to women?" see? And your What question, after you've fished it around and so forth, is you find "What about not propositioning girls in stores?" And this thing falls off the pin on the tone arm action, you know? Well, he didn't proposition this girl and he didn't proposition that girl and he didn't proposition some other girl. And he's totally—he's totally mired into just this one fact—that it is a terrible insult to a woman not to proposition her.

I'll give you an example. I think I was thrown out of an English inn a few hundred years ago; I'd failed to kiss the landlady! Insult! I don't know what was wrong with me that day. I must have had my mind on something else. But that gives you an idea. They considered it an insult. Upset them!

Now, if you don't think this is general—I'll let you in on something. You girls needn't listen to this, but listen, fellas. The only time I have ever gotten in trouble with women was when I—well, you know! Boy, I've been in trouble then. Wow! Grim.

So you see this thing isn't quite as obtuse as it looks. Maybe it might even go so far as to say that the social mores we are brought up in and taught, aren't the social mores on which we are

actually operating at all. So I just plead your attention closely to just this one little interesting fact. Plow around awhile, and try the thing on both sides and scout it out a little bit before you take that What-plunge, because you're running into this social mores proposition. You may be square on—sitting on the middle of it.

Well, in view of the fact you probably haven't any 3D Criss Cross on this pc yet, or if you did have, it's not in the folder you're prepchecking him out of, or something of that sort. You're not paying much attention to this. You're keeping these things well separate. See, there's no telling what you're running into. There's just no telling what you're running into—what kind of items.

Now, reincarnation doesn't exist as such because nobody ever went through a staged line of—became a beetle, became a cockroach, became a mouse, became a rat, you know, and then finally became a politician and then became a member of the human race, you know. Nobody ever went this particular channel.

The Egyptians used to try to lay in an I-am-supposed-to on the subject. And also the Lamas give you some interesting maps. And maybe some people believed them. I suppose there's some thetans who went around sort of remembering this map, and remembering "Now I'm supposed to become a cockroach having just been—so forth, and before I can be a temple priest again," and so on. Well, that's—merely was an interesting way to get a fellow from— keep a fellow from picking up a body and becoming your rival in his next life too. Because that was a big problem in Egypt.

They had more problems about thetans picking up things. I know; I was there, and they had problems. They had problems. For instance, they dreamed up a good one one time, that whenever a Pharaoh died and when he came back to Earth, the possessions were st—his again. Man, you know that was unpopular at the Land Office and that was unpopular every place. But made it stick there for about, oh, I don't know, a couple of thousand years.

So naturally somebody would think up a now-I'm-supposed-to—"Well, after you die, really, you're supposed to become—at once, you see—you're supposed to go down this channel and then up this channel for this many lives." That puts you out so they no longer had—the Land Office had—any records, see?

These are just dodges. But reincarnation has gotten itself loused up with this very interesting progression that you're supposed to go through. And this progression has no regularity at all. A pc has actually been anything that he could pick up. In the lineup a thetan—a thetan goes on the motto of "Anything is better than nothing." And that extends to beingness—"Any beingness is better than no beingness whatsoever."

You'll find—sometime or another you'll be auditing a pc and he gets this little sensation; it goes flick, you see. He says, "What was that? You know I have a definite impression of having been a mayfly, but it just all ran out." He probably was!

It's awfully hard getting yourself into the head of a small dog. I will tell you that. It's a hard thing to do. I tried it one time. It didn't work at all. Cats—I generally save those for my randomity. Cats, they're very interesting things. You don't pick up cats—you steer cats. You do various things with cats. But anyhow, all kinds of attitudes toward beingness.

Now, every race has it's own fourth dynamic and it tends to fixate on this fourth dynamic and you get a predominance of continuance in that beingness line, you see, in any one race. If you've got gazelles, why, people will tend to—who—whatever thetans are running the gazelles will tend to go on being gazelles, you see? And they'll go on and on and on being gazelles, and they'll pick up gazelles as long as they can pick up gazelles. But what if all of a sudden the population of gazelles is too small. Well, they're liable to become almost anything Capitalists, communists, anything, see? They go over into some other line.

The buffalo. There were at one time I suppose something—must have been in the neighborhood of twenty-five, thirty, fifty million buffalo in the United States. There are only a couple of hundred of them now. Every once in a while you're going down the street in the United States, you see some fellow with a long shaggy beard just going along.

Thetans aren't necessarily stupid. There's no particular reason why you shouldn't have been an animal at some time or another. It's quite a relief. It's quite a relief. There's not much responsibility involved with the thing. You pick up the various now-I'm-supposed-to's very rapidly. Animals tend to stay with their now-I'm-supposed-to's because they can't talk about them. It's about the only thing that's wrong with that.

But it's interesting In Rome for instance—of course, after you'd been voted out of office and voted out of the army and blackballed and beat up and sold into slavery and a few things like that, it would be quite natural to become a wolf and bite every Roman you saw for—for a lifetime or two, you know, just to kind of even up the score. And then go back to being a Roman, you know?

It—as far as nationalities are concerned, you get totally scrambled up politics on this particular planet. These poor nations! I mean, it's something you could hold your head in your hands about frankly, just hold your head in your hands about. They have absolutely no safeguard of any kind whatsoever from mixed politics by thetan transfer from one nation to another. They have no prevention of this whatsoever and naturally some Indian that wants to

wreck England is going to pick up and is going to be terribly interested in promoting the fortunes of an Englishman. And he'll move on up into Parliament and he will move. . . "Well, let's see. Let's see. What could be the most destructive thing that could happen in England today? Oh yes, well, let's nationalize the railroads. And then raise their fares. Yes, yes. That's the proper thing to do." you know?

Just destruction, destruction, destruction. Everybody says, "Well, he always sounds so reasonable. You know? It must be true."

The United States is starting to get this now. Of course, they're getting Heinies. They're getting—they're getting Germans like mad. I mean German Germans. This isn't genetic line Germans. See? This was the Afrika Korps boys, and guys like this, you know?

Guy gets knocked off with a General Grant tank in front of El Alamein. You know? And he said, "Well, damn those Americans. If they hadn't come in we'd have had this thing whipped, see. Natter-natter-natter-natter-natter-natter-natter. "   He's too mad at the English. He isn't going to have anything at all to do with them. He goes over to America and he picks up a body. Next thing you know we see him around with an Afrika Korps black motorcycle jacket on. Imitating Rommel. There they are, going around, Hitler Youth movements, all over the place, you know?

Nobody has any way of taming this down or straightening this out, see? It causes political chaos. Because everybody's now-I'm-supposed-to's, his nationalities and so forth go by the boards and they're no longer fitted to fit in any nationality or any framework of government. There's enough people getting mad at the Russians, so God help the next crop of commissars. See? Not quite enough time has gone by.

England has set up shop here, about 350 years, you see? They've had a lot of time to get that nicely mucked up. Russia hasn't been in the running that long But the next crop! Ha-ha-ha. That will be something, see?

Quite routinely you used to go from Egypt to the Middle East to Greece to Egypt to the Middle East to Greece to Egypt to Rome to Egypt to Rome to Egypt, and then skip it all and go to Greece. By this time you've been an enemy of Greece, and a friend of Greece, and a supporter of Greece, and Greece is supposed to survive, and Greece is supposed to die, and

Greece is supposed to do this and that, and don't wonder that you don't have a very interestingly complicated 3D Criss Cross package. Because it's all messed up. See?

Well, once you start to straighten this out, however, there are very straight now-I'm-supposed-to's which are dominant in spite of all this other. You get the idea, you see, that there could be no dominant now-I'm-supposed-to's on the case, that it just all goes into slush and soup, see. But there actually are, and they will be the most dominant 3D Criss Cross items. And they can be plus or minus on anything.

You can actually take the item at any given time and work out the mores of that person, and the violations of that mores will give you the hottest Prepchecks. It sounds pretty weird but they will, get it? It sounds weird only because you yourself, of course, aren't fitted in with that social structure at all. You sit there and say, "How could this bird be this upset and get this much charge out of 'not drinking chocolate'? " You know?

God! We got tone arm action from here to here, you know? It finally emerges when you do a 3D Criss Cross item, you've got a Dutchman, or something of the sort, and it's—it's a failure to maintain the East Indies or weird something or other going on. It's a hell of an overt! You find out the same time in this lifetime that he's committed every social crime known to man and he doesn't get a quiver on any of them. See, you can't find anything on what you consider social crimes, but you can find on this "Not drinking chocolate." Man, that really cooked it.

You sometimes get an item of "Failed to bite people" or "Bit people" or something like this. See, it could equally be either one, see? It's just because you believe that biting people would be an overt. You have forgotten, momentarily, the overt of omission. See? Overts consist of omission and commission. All right.

Now, don't forget "Guilty." Remember, "Guilty" is lovely. "Of whom and what have you made which guilty of?" And you can do whole Prepchecks on nothing but the subject of "Guilty." It's fifty percent of it, you see? It doesn't matter if... I'm not going to give you a long talk now on the subject of "Guilty." Just being a victim. You think of overts of "Whom have you victimized?" Well, there's a broader view: "Whom have you made guilty of making you a victim?" See? You could use words like "blame" and things like this but it doesn't quite register as sharply as "make guilty." You sometimes will find an auditor that everything seems—this is on your 6A, Form 6A—and there's this auditor and it's just nothing... He's—he's kept picking up E-Meters and bashing pcs over the head with them and he kept doing this and he kept doing that and he kept doing something else and he kept doing something else. Wild, you know? This thing is wild! And no tone arm action.

You say, "Well, he has no conscience of any kind about pcs. He's utterly conscienceless." Then all of a sudden you get on to that "Guilty" question. Oh man! He's been making pcs guilty, you see? Making them guilty. Any time the pc would say anything, he'd make the pc guilty and make the pc guilty and make the pc guilty and make the pc guilty. Tone arm action all over the place. Make the pc guilty, guilty, guilty. Of course, that principle applies to anything.

You get somebody, he has homosexual tendencies or something Well, socially you're going to ride this into the ground. "Boy, we've really got something here. Man, this is really juicy. This is something See? This is fine, and so forth." No tone arm action on it. So all of a sudden—guilty—ah, "Whom have you made guilty of homosexual tendencies?" and just wham-wham-wham! Because that's all he's doing, see? His idea of punishing, punishing, punishing, making guilty, upsetting, blaming, showing up, exposing. You see? Any type of wording that might fit in with the thing. But he's trying to make that other fellow suffer in a covert way. And this works out to this degree, that any What question, you can bleed it down of just a little bit more charge by putting "Guilty" with it. It's not necessary to do that. Nobody is even recommending that you do it.

"Have you ever let the air out of your father's tires?" See? And we've gone through this whole thing and we've got a whole chain of where he used to go out and let the air out of his father's tires and make his father think he had a puncture and that sort of thing. Something like this, and he did all that. That's fine, we got that all. Not necessary to do this. I'm not telling you, you must always do this or anything like that. But you could also ask, "What— have you ever made your father guilty on the subject of tires?" And you find out there'll always be a little more motion can come off the tone arm on that subject. Yes, because he's done overts, of course, he's made his father guilty in an effort to get a motivator. It's just the other side of the overt-motivator sequence. And it's always sitting there ready to be plucked.

Whatever side of the overt-motivator sequence you run, you can always bleed a little charge off the other side. You see? Not only doing it to somebody, but trying to get a motivator from somebody on that same subject is always hand in glove. The effort to get a motivator exposes at once a doingness. See?

All right. You already got "Appear," and as far as whole track is concerned, you should really go down the whole track. It doesn't matter where you wind up or where you don't wind up, interestingly enough. I knew there was something on a case here in class, I knew there was something on this case because it just didn't add up right. And I insisted that it be followed through, and it didn't appear in this lifetime. It appeared in last life, which I thought was interesting. I knew there was a bug there, and I just wanted that to be gotten out of the road if it possibly could and, by George, we picked it up in last lifetime. So these things will fall through sometimes.

Now, when a pc always dodges into a past life every time you try to get an overt off for this life, when the pc has overts for this life that matches the question, and so forth, we're posed a problem. But the odd part of it is, in the normal course of human events, if the pc gets it off on the dodge and then you clean up, "Have you told me any half-truth, untruth or tried to damage anyone?" See? Clean up that rudiment and then ask him again, he eventually will give you the one in this lifetime if he's using that for a dodge.

Routinely in Prepchecking, you should use that "half-truth-untruth" question and missed withholds. These things are the—are the background viol that's going hoomp-hoomp in the corner, you know? You want to ask these things every once in a while. Don't get your pc waving madly around on the needle and the thing is all stalled and no tone arm action without asking for missed withholds, half-truth, untruths, and so forth.

And you'll get to know your pc. And some pcs require this to be cleared up about every ten minutes. You—you'll learn that from that pc. Others require never to be cleaned up. They just don't ever tell you any half-truths or untruths. But some of them, they give you three overts. You can absolutely count on two of them being utterly false. And if you don't pick up that falsity, the two falsities, why, the third true one will keep banging and your meter will just be all out of gear all the time. So the background music that you play all the time is your "half-truth," "untruth," "Have I missed a withhold on you?" You ask people these every— routinely, regularly. They're, you might say, your "middle rudiments," and you'll keep the case straightened up this way.

As far as going full track—whole track is concerned, let them go. Because as soon as your "Appear" comes up, that was what turned the tide. And "Appear" will send it whole track for you, and spit. But it can also plow the pc out of the whole track incident he gets into without it hanging up forever. So it's perfectly safe.

Now, if you were to do a 3D Criss Cross item and to do a Prepcheck on a 3D Criss Cross item—"When have you not eaten grass?" or "Have you ever eaten any dirty grass?" or "What about eating dirty grass?" "What about eating another elephant's grass?" or something, well, we've done some kind of a sort-out on a 3D Criss Cross item—and we've done this four-way run here of When, All, Appear and Who, you inevitably will go whole track. Inevitably, you just aren't going to wind up anyplace else. And you just grind it out, man, grind it out. It's all

off one What question. You could make marginal notes about where you've gotten to, and so forth, but you're going to get down to the bottom of the chain.

Now, the chains are all pinned with an unknown. Unknowns appear in the incidents. Unknowns appear at the foot of the chain. The basic on a chain, for a chain to be active and charged, must be unknown to the pc. You are never plowing known material out of the pc when you are running a Prepcheck chain. All you're doing is preparing the pc to find something he doesn't know. And you'll find out that the most spectacular ones sometime are yesterday. He had yesterday mixed up with last week or something like this. You'll find his time is all loused up. Those are very spectacular and very noticeable, but they are not very significant.

The early ones are the most significant. A chain of similar circumstances occurring, reoccurring, happening, happening, happening, time after time after time, cannot exist in suspension in the bank without the earliest part of the chain being totally or partially hidden from view. This becomes very striking This is so much so that I can—I know exactly when a chain will release on a pc. I know when to start going back up again, because the pc just released one big slogging "What do you know!"

We carried it down to a something or other and there was a totally buried something or other at the bottom of this thing. Boy, was it out of view! And we plowed this thing into view. I know now the rest of the chain will tear up. You should develop that particular sensitivity. After you've discovered enough unknownness on the chain, the chain will tear up. It's all in the pc's attitude. The pc gets very positive. The pc reacts very directly under these circumstances.

Recurring withholds—of course, the pc that tells you—tells Auditor A, "I kissed a boy last week," tells Auditor B. "I kissed a boy last week," and tells Auditor C, "I kissed a boy last week," that's a recurring withhold, you see? And that means that Auditor A, Auditor B and Auditor C did not get the withhold. They never got the unknown out.

A recurring withhold is caused by the unknown remaining unexposed at the bottom of the thing. The pc only continues to feel uncomfortable about withholds the bottom of which have not been pulled. So you could also find what would be a recurring withhold by asking a pc, "Is there anything you've told me that you would hate to have me write down and publish in the local newspaper?"

The pc says, "Oh, well, that little piece about so-and-so."

That's the one you haven't got all the chain on. The second you pull the bottom out of the thing the whole thing just folds up. But there's still an unknown piece at the bottom of the chain, if the pc still feels queasy about it. Got it?

Audience: Mm-hm, Yes.

All right. As far as missed withholds are concerned, we haven't missed talking to you about missed withholds. But if you ask the pc sometimes— sometimes this is true—if any auditor has missed a withhold on them and the pc says yes and you say, "What is it?" you very often have established yourself a beautiful chain if you work it right and if you ask the What question right.

"Well auditor after auditor failed to find out about my mother, ha-ha. Ha."

All right, it's quite often—not always—but quite often quite profitable just to use that as a basis because he considers it an overt that somebody has missed, so it's already classified as a hot chain.

But this doesn't mean that it's going to be good. It's only as good as it'll move the tone arm. If it doesn't move the tone arm, why, unload into the gravel and let the handcar go putting along by itself.

"Have I missed a withhold on you? Good." Goodbye. Let that chain go by and find another one.

Now, rudiments. The main difficulty with Prepchecking that is constant, continuous, occurs over and over and over, is that Auditor A is auditing pc. Auditor A starts on a What question and a whole chain, and he's got this working very, very well. Pc comes in for next session, has a present time problem. Auditor asks the pc about the present time problem, finds himself in a new withhold chain.

Third session. He's now got the first chain and the second chain now in restimulation. Pc comes in and pc has a—an ARC break and the auditor goes into that and finds himself on a third chain! Now we've got the first chain, the second chain and the third chain all in restimulation and nothing cleaned up.

In this way, the pc, by getting rudiments out, can control the session. And you mustn't let the pc keep throwing the thing to the wolves without rudiments. The only way the pc can do this is if the auditor uses any version of O/W to handle any part of the rudiments. Now, that also, then, would apply to the missed withhold question—or the withhold question in beginning rudiments. It would also apply there.

So you translate that over to—I have—for a Prepcheck session you must use—"Have I missed a withhold on you since last session?" as a cleanup. "Have you done anything since the last session that you are withholding from me?" and you get a big fall. Well, don't explore the fall. Say, "Now—now look. Now, listen to me. Now, listen: Since the last session, that was yesterday at such and such a time, have you done anything that you are withholding from me?" and you all of a sudden don't find a fall. You say, "Good. Thank you," and go on to the next rudiments question. Get out of there—because it's dangerous. Why is it dangerous? By having a withhold at that juncture, the pc can louse up the whole session. And they do it consistently. I'm talking about troubles you're having and troubles I've had. And this is how you get onto chain after chain unfinished, see? You get onto chain after chain unfinished, always the same way. And it's just by using any part of O/W to clean up any rudiment.

So you could say, actually—you could say—"What's unknown about that problem?" Pc has a present time problem. You say, "What's unknown about that problem? Thank you. What's unknown about that problem? Thank you." All right. State the problem to him, don't get a reaction, get off of it. See?

Or "What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you. What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" You know? State the problem. Don't—no reaction, get out of there. Simple as that.

If you're working over, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" there's no sense in asking it in the rudiments. But you could say, "Who'd I have to be to audit you?" See? And the reason you ask . . . The way you do that is, you use as a rudiment question, "Is it all right if I audit you?"—the old, old rudiment question. That is—that's only if you're using "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" as a Zero Question.

And you clean up "Who'd I have to be to audit you?" Clean up any difficulty this way—or an ARC break. But my God don't say, "What have I done to you? What have you done to me?" Oh, no! Just leave your O/W in all shapes, forms, sizes and descriptions alone in the rudiments.

Look, you've got easily five hundred processes you could use in the rudiments from Scientology and Dianetics. You can run engrams in the rudiments. But for God's sakes, don't touch withholds or overts in the rudiments, because the pc, every time, will throw you off into a new channel and two hours later you will be sitting there auditing something the pc has chosen and you won't be over into what you were running And that way you'll just leave the case unflat session after session after session after session, and it's lousy auditing. So that's how you get around it. Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yes.

If you find yourself being thrown—you all of a sudden wake up a half-an-hour deep into a session and suddenly realize that you are on a new chain of withholds—this is liable to dawn on you all of a sudden—that you weren't on yesterday and you didn't clean up yesterday's, and yesterday's was producing tone arm action and today's is doing something else. Maybe producing tone arm action, but it hasn't anything to do with yesterday's session, yesterday's session isn't complete! No, just bail off that handcar, that's all. Just get off of it right now.

"Have I missed a withhold on you since yesterday?"

"Yu-du-hu-da-duth."

"Have I missed a withhold on you right now? Well, what was the withhold? Oh, well, thank you, oh, good, that's fine. All right. Well, that's all of that now and we're going to get over here onto this . . ." And you ask yesterday's What question and get going

You see just thud. If you find yourself that far drawn in, see? Well, break it off. I don't care how smoothly or how ungracefully or how stupidly you break it off—just get used to knocking it out, and stop falling for that. See?

Pc can come in with a new PTP every day and keep you ever from completing any chain or any What question or any Zero question. He'll actually just stay in a total state of restimulation all the time with no gains, nothing discovered, anything of the sort. You've already, I think probably every one of you, had a little trouble with that particular aspect. You sat there and found yourself an hour, you're still going on but it's some new chain that you're running It's a brand-new chain. Hasn't anything to do with what you were running yesterday. Okay? Well, that's how to get around that.

All right. Now, I've taken up this bulletin with you in full. And I think you will find this—this is quite something or other. Your two Prepcheck bulletins, the two principal Prepcheck bulletins, are very concise and very precise and they're crowded in. They rank along, with—wording—with the E-Meter Essentials.

Writing a bulletin like that has two things about it, one of them advantageous and one of them very disadvantageous. When you start machinegunning data, as it is in E-Meter Essentials, you're putting the person on "every line is fantastically important." You're not appealing to his understanding whatsoever. You're just machine-gunning him. You're saying, "This is the data. This is the data. This is the data. Datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum, datum. You see? Produces quite a high strain. But at the same time, it's awfully easy to review, and unless it overwhelms you, awfully easy to learn. So there's something in favor and something against this type of an approach.

Well, where you get stuff as we have in these two Prepchecking bulletins—the earlier one and this one—it's fairly high tension. Every datum in it is of considerable importance. And they take a different type of approach in study. You have to read them over many more times because there's much more there. You see, for the same amount of wordage there's twenty times as much there. We only have a few small publications that are in that classification. One of them is E-Meter Essentials and the other are these two Prepcheck things. And they're really crowded. And every datum in them is meant and meaningful.

Prepchecking, if you're having any difficulty with it, I recommend that you get these—the first bulletin that was written on it, very precisely, exactly how you prepcheck and this one that I have just taken up with you of March the 21st, and you just read them through several times, one right after the other and all of a sudden you, "Oh, oh, oh. Oh, that's what you do. Ha-ha. I missed that. You have the E-Meter on during the session."

Okay.

Well, I gave you just this one short spurt tonight. Let you off just a little bit early and let you happily go home. Stagger out into the spring which is dawning here. And I wish you all better luck with your Prepchecking.

Thank you very much and good night.