USE OF PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on
21 February 1962

Thank you. Thank you.

All right. Now, you've seen an example of Prepchecking and that is an example of Prepchecking And that example should serve as *the* example for how you put these things down.

Now, if you had more than this on your auditor's report, you're nuts. If you had more than this on your – the auditor's report which you wrote… The Zero from which we're proceeding is "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulty?" – your Zero$_A$. We started using A because 1 is the number of a question and you could very easily get tangled on it.

So your Zero$_A$, self, and the 1 is "What about these physical difficulties?" We already had those from an earlier session. We're trying to clean those things up and our 1A is "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" which is a question in desperation, see. The pc has not given me a withhold, so you have to take off from some point.

All right. That's a very fine point to take off from, I assure you. And we immediately got a list. And, as the pc gave the list, if you were listening and watching the meter at the same time, you saw that the middle one was the one that fell, and we got 1_B – "What about this rectum trouble?" 1_C – "What about not keeping Jim clean?" Because we got that straight from a withhold.

And then 1D, because that wasn't cleaning, we have to have a 1_D. And "What about doing something to Jim?" which is, of course, a direct auditor question. Let's get the overt. Let's find out what the overt is, see.

Boy, you look like you're all adrift. Well, after you've done this a few times, you won't any longer be adrift. You only write down what the auditor says on a Prepcheck report. As far as your auditor Zeros, 1, 2, 1_A, 1_B – that's only what the auditor says. you only write down what the auditor says. you never write down what the pc says. What the pc says, of course, reflected in what the auditor says.

But you don't do a stenographic job of auditing of simply sitting there, writing down everything the pc says and think you're prepchecking because you're not – on any relationship to Prepchecking

Now, if you want to make a few little old comments, you come over here. Results and comments, you have in this column. And you have over here some – the goals, and you have some notes by the auditor, and of course, they're totally incidental to the auditor's report. And I notice that 46 or 47 has something to do with the rectum trouble, but then heavy reaction on the word *damage* was something I noted, so I just put that down for future reference, see? So that has nothing to do with the auditor's report as such. Okay?

But there is that. This session served as no fantastic revelation. The pc, however, I think, felt better. Right?

Male voice: Mm, yeah, much better.

All right. And of course, I didn't want to hold you up, so I didn't take his goals or gains at the end, but that was purely by reason of demonstration and no other reason.

Now, in a Prepcheck you write down what the auditor says. And if you're going to write down anything about what the pc says, it's going to be some kind of a little notation of something you considered interesting, and you're going to put it over, way over on the right hand side that has nothing whatsoever to do with your Prepcheck Zeros, 1s, and so forth. You see?

In other words, the report is for you and for referral to keep you from passing up a question which you then don't clear.

Now, we've got to clear all these questions up the line. Now, because I audited this pc before and got some tone arm action on an incident in Rome – I got some tone arm action on that particular line – I got considerable amount of half-truth and untruth off the end of that but that was running relatively well. That whole series, I must comment to you, is in question whether or not that is clear or not. you understand? But we were only going back such a short and shallow distance in the pc's life that I thought, "Well, now, let's see if we can't get a little earlier and get a little more germane to our original question – 'What about these physical difficulties?' So what I'm going to do is run down physical difficulties some more and find out if there wasn't something else in the way of physical difficulties, find a chain ripping up here someplace, and now go back and clean up this other chain."

I figured I'd be faster to do that than to slug as we went on that. Do you see this?

All right. Now, there's another rule on Prepchecking and that is that you are only trying to pull withholds, and a withhold is held in position because of a prior overt.

If you can find a withhold, your Who, When, What – pardon me, your When, All, Who, to be precise, round and round and round, applies mainly to the overt, of course. It does not apply to the withhold. It applies to the overt.

Now, the steering of the pc merely consists of steering the pc into giving you a withhold and then steering the pc into giving you the overt. And that is the whole of the

steering action. There is nothing esoteric about it. you are pulling chains. You are not looking for withholds. That's the next thing which you've got in crosswise. You are not pulling individual withholds. You are pulling chains of overts. And that is your target in Prepchecking: chains of overts. That's all you're interested in is a chain. You are not interested in a single incident. You want chains.

The anatomy of the mind tells us that we have incidents forming in chains which go down to a basic. And this basic, when pulled, pulls the rest of the chain. That is purely the mechanics. That's Book One. That's been with us for ages. It's hardly worth going over again except to remind you of its existence. You have chains, which is a whole series of incidents plotted on the time track, and those incidents derive their force from the under, lower, earlier incident.

You are not looking for the hidden part of a single overt or withhold. You are looking for the hidden incidents earlier on the chain. That is what you are looking for in Prepchecking, period. You are looking for nothing else. I find you going *thud-thad-thud* on something of the sort – why, you're just going nowhere. Trying to take an engram which occurred yesterday and trying to find the unknown or hidden part of the engram which occurred yesterday in order to release the engram which occurred yesterday and after you have worked on that for forty, fifty or a hundred hours, I would love to be able to show you on the meter that it was dependent utterly upon a whole series of engrams, and any one of those engrams ticked would have done more than your hundred hours of work on that single engram. Do you follow that? You're pulling the underpinning out.

And if you could consider a chain as a whole series of steps on a ladder – looking at the ladder from the top, you only see the top step, right? The top step obscures all the remaining steps of the ladder clear to the bottom – you see that – if you were looking at a ladder from the top step down. So that is what the pc can see. He can see the top step of the ladder. And that's all he can see. And that's what he gives you as his withhold.

Now, your When, your All and your Who are directed toward finding the rest of the steps of the ladder. And this is a very peculiarly built ladder in that the top step of the ladder will remain inexorably in place until you pull the bottom step of the ladder.

And of course, you find the bottom step of the ladder by finding earlier steps than the top step. And you finally will get to the bottom step of the ladder. And when you get that, you suddenly have a stepless ladder. It is very mysterious. It just suddenly goes *zzz-addda-zzzzz*. And there's no reaction on it.

The unknowns that you were looking for are the earlier incidents on the chain in this lifetime. Prepchecking has only to do with this lifetime. That is what Prepchecking has to do with.

Now, I have advisedly not used the word *basic-basic* with regard to Prepchecking And I have not used this word *basic-basic* with regard to Prepchecking because the basic-basic of any chain of incidents is anchored in a valence, a beingness that you will find in 3D Criss Cross.

But you can find this lifetime's basic, and it'll rip up. It'll rip up. you do not have to find, in doing Prepchecking, the past life upset. And you'd better not.

You can, then, clear a whole chain of overts resulting in withholds in one lifetime by going back and finding the basic on the thing and by asking pertinent questions.

Now, therefore, your What questions do not apply to one incident ever. And your Who, All and When – your When, All and Who, to get it in the proper order – your When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, on and on and on, round and round and round does not apply in any way shape or form to one incident. So therefore, you have the greatest fluidity and flexibility in the asking of questions. You have enormous fluidity and flexibility in the asking of questions. You can ask about anything as long as it's on that chain.

Now, the stunt which you ordinarily employ is you try to clear the What you've got. And if you can't clear the What you've got, then there's a subsidiary chain. So you try and look for that chain, and if you can't clear that, why, let's find another subsidiary chain, and let's clear that. And if we can't find that, why, we clear the other subsidiary chain.

In other words, when your reaction is not dimming out by reason of asking When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, and our reaction doesn't go off the test What question, why, then we must have – this chain must be dependent on an earlier chain, or a different chain, slightly different chain, more or less on the same subject. So we finally get the pc to give us another withhold, so we mine that. But it's all on the same subject.

And we finally get this lower one, and we finally get the – I don't care how many l_CS and 1_DS and 1_ES and 1_FS that you go to, you'll eventually get one of those that, when by asking, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who, When, All, Who – all of a sudden when you ask it again, you haven't any reaction on it at all. And that moment you've got a null What question. So that last What question that you were working on goes null. So you mark it null, and now you've got to work the one above it. If that was ID, and it went null, you've got to get l_C. Now, you work over l_C a little bit more with When and All and Who, and When, All and Who, and all of a sudden it goes null. And then you go back and you get your 1_B, and you got When, All and Who, When, All and Who, When, All and Who, and it isn't nulling, you've got to find you another subsidiary of the chain, get a new What question. You've got to now get a new l_C.

In other words, you clear these things by finding new withholds and new chains. It is not at all difficult to do this. It sounds actually much more difficult than it is. And once you get the hang of this thing, it goes like *zz-zoop-zoop.* There's hardly anything to it.

Then finally you'll clear this new one that you got. You'll come back and now you'll try 1_B again with your When, All and Who, and you just test it. And you're liable to find out it has evaporated. Maybe you didn't ask the When, All, Who for it at all. you just test it. you ask it. No reaction on it. All of a sudden, you ask 1_A – *bang.* That thing is no longer there, and then *boom,* you're liable to have your 1 gone by this time. And that is clean. It's a progress into depth of chain.

Now, let me show you the association amongst these questions. Our Zero is, of course, a rudiment question. That is all that is. That's just a rudiment question. So we got to have a $Zero_A$, and this particular rudiments question, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" gets a starting point for you.

And you've got your starting point. And I'll go into that more in just a moment, but your starting point in this particular one is the dynamics. You have the dynamic, the dynamic breakdown. And we are working at the moment on $Zero_A$, self. Therefore, you don't find me taking up much sex because we are working $Zero_A$, see. We're working self. And what could he talk to me about himself? Well, he got a bad meter reaction. That is to say he got a nice fall there the second that I asked him – he talked about physical difficulties and he got a pretty steep reaction on physical difficulties, so we are actually entering this case from the rougher side because we're going directly up against physical difficulties. And the physical difficulties, of course, depend utterly upon a tremendous number of withholds of one kind or another, so this is a heavy slug.

But you should be aware of the fact that the beginning of the case is when the case should be Clear; then the auditor would have a perfectly good time of it.

The hardest end of the case is always the beginning end of the case. This is when everything is wrong with the pc. See, that's always the rougher end.

All right. The optimum, of course, you can't have, so you have to take what you got.

Now, we have "What about these physical difficulties?" and we didn't have the pc volunteering any new withholds in this particular session. Pc volunteered no new withholds about his physical difficulties, so I had to prod him.

Well, that doesn't become a What question. So I had to talk to him. So I had to coax him, persuade him, accuse him, crisscross him, and he finally breaks down, and he tells me that he has some physical difficulties, and one was a rash on the ankle, the other's rectum trouble and the other one was sexual urges.

And just by keeping my eye on the meter at the time he announced these things, then I didn't have to make a further assessment because rectum trouble went *bang so* obviously it was the most available subject, so I just take one out of thin air on the thing because this might go anyplace, you see.

And I took one out of thin air – "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" – he gave me this list. I got my list here a little bit crossed up a moment just talking to you about it.

Now, we got "What about this rectum trouble?"

Oh, he did tell us, didn't he? All right. This was actually our point of departure in the session. We didn't have a point of departure up to then. The auditor was simply working the whole way.

All right. And at that moment, why, we had it rolling and we find out all of a sudden that the pc has some kind of a reaction here on the subject of taking care of his little brother, keeping him clean. Well, let's see if we can't get away from this. Let's get out from under on this particular one, see. Let's see if we can't get that one, see.

Furthermore, it follows up the purpose very much better. Because we had an incident in Rome in an earlier session and it was very late. It's only two years ago, and we were having an awful time mining any earlier. Well, when somebody has a little brother who has been with him an enormous number of years, that is awfully good mining area.

But more, more importantly, you should realize that it is risky. You're asking about a valence. This might be an oppterm. This might be almost anything, see. So we – when we introduce an identity into a Prepcheck, we introduce it with a little catch in the breath, you know. We might or might not get away with this very easily, see?

We try not to use identities, but we've certainly got to start someplace here, and this was minor enough to try to plow up one way or the other.

Now, that didn't clean up, so the auditor simply got overt, and the auditor said, "Well, what about doing something to Jim?" Just out of thin air because we didn't clean up "What about not keeping Jim clean?" after we'd gone over it a few times with a When, All, Who, see? We didn't get it clean. It was diminishing, but we didn't get it clean, so what have we done to Jim? That's the inevitable question that we ask.

If we're not being able to clean some subject up, well, let's see if we can't find out what the pc did to him, see? What did the pc do to this person? There must be something there. Otherwise, the pc wouldn't have any antipathy on the subject.

You're using the basic rule of the overt-motivator sequence, which is what has been done to you has very little bearing on your psyche. But what you have up and went and did, brother, that's it. And they only clean up on what you've done.

Somebody here, by the way, ran an engram the other day which is a motivator engram because they couldn't find anything. All that person had to do was just ask for an overt to the subject matter and it probably would have cleaned right there. *Bang!*

So you always have this dodge which you work continuously, "Well, what have you done?" see. Natter, the person natters. The person says there's an upset, the person says this, the person says that. you always got "Well, what have you done?" you see, as a leading question.

Now, we notice that the auditor in this particular case didn't write down anything whatsoever that the pc was saying. It was just that the pc was saying these things, influenced the auditor's report because we were keeping a record of the Whats, don't you see? That was all you were keeping a record of, and we're all on the main line.

Let's see if this is on the main line.

"What about doing something to Jim?" and "What about not keeping Jim clean?" All right. This is starting from the bottom. Your 1_D; "What about doing something to Jim?" 1_C, "What about not keeping Jim clean?" 1_B; "What about this rectum trouble?" Is that all – this all pertinent as we go? 1_A; "What physical difficulty would it be unsafe for you to reveal?" Isn't this on the same line out of which, of course, we got a list? And isn't that germane to "What about these physical difficulties?" And your $Zero_A$ – isn't that germane – at self it's certainly germane to this chain. And then our Zero, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Is that all of a piece? Well, you just make sure that any Prepcheck chain that you set down of What questions is all of a piece.

Now, if you write a new What question every time the pc gave you a new withhold, you'd go stark staring mad. There isn't enough paper manufactured. You would just go mad, that's all. you don't care about individual withholds; you care about the subjects of withholds. Therefore, the drill of the What question – "What drills?" Pc says, "(Specific withhold)." Auditor says, "What about this chain of withholds?" Interesting, isn't it?

Pc says, "Well, once upon a time in my life, the only time in my life I was up on the top of the Empire State Building, looked over the Empire State Building's edge, and I was terribly, terribly stricken about the whole thing because I had an impulse to pick up the companion who was with me and throw him over the side of the Empire State Building down to the ground." And the pc gives you some long, involved withhold like this. Well, you've got to condense it. What's the most likely chain that requires an auditor insight? What's he habitually do in life? This is – regulates the What question. What's he habitually do?

Is he always going up on the top of high places and trying to damage people? Is he always being afraid of height? Oh, that's motivator, isn't it? So we leave that one alone. We don't have anything to do with that one. Just skip that one. Any mention of the fact that he's afraid of something only would lead us astray, one way or the other. We've got to have

something there that's overt, so we choose something out of this. And the widest thing that you could say, "What about damaging people?" That would take in the whole reactive mind and would be a no What question at all, and you see. But this is a neat little one.

"Well, what about wanting to throw people off things?"

See, that's a nice neat What question. There's probably a chain of these things here. And you understand, you mustn't let your desire to get it all done now, at this instant, interfere with your sensible What question – the sensibility of the What question – because everybody to some slight degree suffers from "It's all gotta be done this instant, now. And we haven't any time to repair it, because it's all an emergency anyway." Well, this all comes out of problems, don't you see?

He says, "Well, I wanted to throw this person off the cliff."

And you say, "Well, what about being aberrated?"

Now, that's a good What question and would include all of his overts, and you would get nowhere with the Prepcheck.

No, your What question must uncover, if possible, a chain. And if that chain doesn't clear, you've got to narrow the chain. And if that doesn't clear, you've got to narrow that, all done by his withholds. And you'll finally get a What question, a subsidiary What question way down the column – it will clear. When that one's cleared, why, the next one above it will clear, and when the next one above it clears, why, the next one above that will clear. And if you're kind of having a rough time of it, you've got a question now that isn't clearing, so you've got to get a new subsidiary What, and a new subsidiary What to that one, and clear those two. And now that one that you hung up on, that will clear, don't you see? It's going back and forth, up and down.

Actually, it's a very neat relatively simple action. Nothing very pertinent to it. But if every time he gave you a withhold, you got a new What question, you would just be *blaaa.* You'd be nowhere, you know?

I expect a fellow to give me – if he's working well, he'll give me two or three withholds for every What question, see? So what? You say, When, and he says, "Well, which one?"

Well, tell him. Pick one at random. "Well, the earliest one or what about that one about – that you just told me about Keokuk?"

And "Oh, well," he says, "that was in 1960."

"All right." You say, "Good. Well, is that all there is to that one?" and so forth.

And maybe you've got three, four, five dates you're working under the same What question, don't you see? You just go on and on and on and on, and I don't care how long you

roll one of these things around. Or how many overts come out under the heading of it as long as they're pertinent to that.

Now, where do you get your next one? Well, the pc jumps. You've mined the thing out, and all of a sudden, you're not clearing this easily, and he gives you another brand of withhold. It's on the same subject. You've been talking about shotguns very, very nicely, and he starts talking about rifles. Well, you're talking about breaking up shotguns, and he starts talking about stealing rifles.

Well, you've got a new subsidiary What question, haven't you. He changed the subject on you. So obviously he tells you that your shotgun chain went over here to a stealing-rifle chain, and then the stealing-rifle chain went down here to an insulting-quartermaster chain, see? And the insulting-quartermaster chain went down here to trying-to-please-his-wife-by-getting-her-money chain. That's all under the same series of Whats.

And all of a sudden that clears up. That was the reason he was trying to needle quartermasters into giving him more goods – because he could sell them illegally. And when that cleaned up, because that was a basic withhold, and the next one is – cleans up, and the next one cleans up, and all of a sudden shotguns all blow up, and there you've got it. You've got the lot.

But this is all dependent on the fact that a piece of hidden information, one or more pieces of hidden information, exist on a chain.

It isn't that one or more pieces of hidden information exist in a withhold. You see, we are dealing, not with my arbitraries or what I'm trying to make you do or what would be optimum. We're actually dealing with what we find in the mind. That is quite important, Scientologically, to understand that. And the datum which we have is a very ordinary datum. That datum is simply that on one chain, why, you have, usually, one long, involved, confused

chain of stuff that has little hanger chains and that sort of thing

Somewhere down around this thing someplace, there's going to be something that's totally out of view.

The person didn't ever know that before. He didn't ever think of that before. Where did that come from? What is that all about? And you'll see these things start to dawn on the pc. In two, three, four or five hours of auditing, you'll, you'll see some one of these things start to dawn gradually on the pc and they – sometimes they dawn slowly, sometimes they dawn fast.

But, the pc all of sudden – I'll give you a typical one: "Well, I never remembered that, you know. I was in the doctor's office and I reached around at the cabinet, and I pulled a vial of morphine out and put it in my pocket, and that's where I got the morphine."

He's been telling you always before this, there was something else going on with this morphine, and so on, and he hadn't even remembered that he had stolen it, see?

That one comes to view; the whole chain pulls up. It's some little oddball scrap of information, usually an overt, usually discreditable, and it'll have this whole chain mired. It'll have the whole thing pinned down. The chain won't come loose till a piece of hidden information discloses. So you can tell about when a whole series of chains are going to pull. you can just about tell. Because the pc says he didn't remember that.

Now, early in a case you can mine for a long time before finding one of these. You can – you might go several sessions before all of a sudden, the person, you're doing Prepchecking, the person says, "What, do you know I didn't know about that. I didn't know about that. But do you know that I – I – I actually went and got the boiling water and poured it on him. He didn't have an accident at the stove. Yes, well, what do you know? Yes. Oh, well."

You see this preclear start to spark up. Well, cover that for your needle reaction and you'll find the whole chain. All of a sudden, you'll be able to run back that chain, *brrrrrrp-brrrrp. Brrrrrp-brrrp-brrrrp.* All of a sudden, the chain cleans up.

It may not clean up all the way on that one hidden piece of information. It'll clean some distance. And if you've been unlucky enough to string yourself out to eight What questions, you'll find the piece of hidden information and suddenly you go up the line, you'll lose maybe – at least four or five of those What questions will drop right out, see.

It's almost as though there is a hidden tent stake and you're trying to strike camp. The pc has been setting up camp here at the old water hole, and this has to do... And he's just been setting up his camp setup for a long time. Tells everybody about it, you see. Whatever it is. And there's a stake that is driven in the ground. And it is not visible to him, and it's not visible to you, and it's not visible to anything. And you keep trying to get this tent down, you know.

And you can pull on the tent. you can yank on the tent, and you can try to bind it up. you could try to burn it up. you – anything you did, it won't matter. I mean, because this tent is just *there.* And you could kick in its sides, and you can pull up some of its stakes, and you can drag its ridgepole down – you can make it look messy – but for some reason or other, the thing insists, utterly insists on remaining on the ground. And then all of a sudden, this mysterious tent stake – that, by the way everybody's been falling over – and you take a sledgehammer to it, and you knock it a couple of times, and all of a sudden it comes into view, see.

And there it is, *bang!* And the pc looks at it, and he says, "Well, I never knew that stake was in there."

Of course, you're in good company because neither did you. But you were at least looking for it and he was avoiding it. So we take the tent stake and all of a sudden the tent wraps up real neatly and we strike camp and that's the end of that chain.

And we – the pc can move on the track from there on. But every time he went back past that particular camp, man, there was the kettle still sitting on the coals, you know. And it was still erected. And it always takes one of these hidden tent stakes of one kind or another.

She was always kind of upset with the local library and didn't like to go into the local library until we all of a sudden find out that she made a practice of going into the local library. And anything – any poem or anything that she found that was real good, or something, she'd tear it out of the book on the shelf, you see, and put it in her pocket. And she's totally forgotten this.

This just seems to never come up. Only it might be something – it's not the, it's not much of an overt ordinarily. It's you – sometimes quite mild, quite idiotic. You can't look always for the big punch. It may be something like she forgot to take this child a birthday present, you know. Just didn't ever take the child a birthday present. Never wrote a thank you letter, and for some peculiar reason, wouldn't have anything to do with this particular zone or action, this whole series of overts. And she has never looked at this series of overts. This is ordinary in Prepchecking

Well, that's why you're running down these chains is you're – you're actually mining whatever the pc gives you. And it's all valuable, and there's a little more being disclosed about all this, and the pc knows a little bit more about it. It's freer. It's less reactive. But you can sometimes go on for hours and hours and hours without falling over this tent stake. And of course, you're looking for a needle in a haystack, so the trick is don't look for it.

That's actually the trick in Prepchecking. You don't go looking for this tent stake because you'll just try the big effect. All you do is run the system; the tent stake will all of a sudden show up. you see, actually, the tent stake can't be found until you get those coils of rope off of it. Everybody knows the coils of rope are sitting there, but it's necessary to move them. you see?

Prepchecking has the facility of bringing to view incidental items that apparently had no bearing on anything but which in reality were holding down a whole chain of incident and were making it reactive and making the individual have a jolt on it.

Now, in laying out a pattern of this sort of thing, you of course can go in on all manner of wild questions. You can go in with any kind of a wild question you ever heard of But the best way to establish a question is what you call Prepchecking. Now, the reason this is called Prepchecking and the reason it isn't called withholds system and it isn't called anything else but Prepchecking is it's preparatory to clearing. And that is not just a loose advertising phrase. That is a neat fact. you can't do 3D Criss Cross while Prepchecking.

Well, well, it's idiotic. You spend a lot of your time on your rudiments and that sort of thing. All I mean by that is not that it's impossible. But I merely mean that when you're doing 3D Criss Cross, you should be doing 3D Criss Cross. You shouldn't be Prepchecking, and so

forth. You shouldn't be monkeying with rudiments. Let me put it much more strongly than that.

When we start a pc into 3D Criss Cross, we expect the rudiments will stay in for a little while maybe. We expect this pc can be settled into auditing. We expect this is a possibility that we will get some 3D Criss Cross done.

Well, the best way to guarantee that is to prepare the pc for clearing. We get, then, "preparation for clearing," "Prepclearing," "Prepchecking" – synonymous at the present moment. And you get the rudiments in with an ax. And that's what you use this for. you just get them in with an ax – with a mallet, with a maul. you knock them in and cement them down with concrete. These rudiments are not going to come out and the only reason you should do anything is just to get the rudiments in. So of course, your basic Prepcheck questions are the rudiment questions. There they are. They're just the rudiment questions.

Well, under Havingness, we have the 36 Havingness Processes and others. We can straighten out the pc's havingness, and so forth. So that could stand outside of these, but at the same time there could still be some Prepchecking done in this particular zone.

"Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" Well, the pc who is sitting back there unwilling to talk to an auditor about his difficulties certainly is having a hell of a time when he's getting 3D Criss Cross thrown at him.

So that's a very good one to straighten out. Now, "Are you withholding anything" – you get your Form 3 and Form 6A. "Are you withholding anything" – you just don't sit there and say "Are you withholding anything" You try to – you guide it. And when you get down to that rudiment, you put that in by running a Form 3 and a Form 6A.

Now, you've got present time problem, you've got a Problems Intensive. But you prepcheck the withholds that the pc comes up with in the prior confusion areas. You just use those as Prepcheck runs. That's all right. They're your $Zero_A$s.

Now, end rudiments, same way. you can go ahead and talk to him about – you can break that – Half-truth, Untruth, Impressing people and Damaging people – you can break that up into a four-segment question, each one with a Zero Question, and you'll get anything on this lifetime out that makes him impulsive along these certain lines.

You could go – the E-Meter influence, and you can take meters, electronic gear, influence, mind reading, allied subjects of this character. You could whip those things out and get that thing in so that you haven't got somebody trying to sell you an item all the time and doing a sell, being upset about the meter, get that thing squared around. Pc can sit there and look at the meter without having to do something to it.

Anyway, the difficulties of handling a preclear under 3D Criss Cross are sufficiently great that why do you want to buck into the lot of this, don't you see? Why do you want to

have to handle the rudiments at the same time you're doing that. So just go ahead and get your rudiments in and you've got Prepclearing, and the activity – the broad activity of setting him up to be cleared would be to get his rudiments in hard.

And you've got his rudiments in hard with a *thud* all the way along the line, they're not likely to come out very hard. And a pc can then be gotten into session right at the beginning of the session for a 3D Criss Cross activity, and you can get him out of session at the end, and you've done a bang-up job of that. And you get a lot of 3D Criss Cross done on him, which is high validity processing. And that is very valuable processing. But what gets in the road of 3D Criss Cross? Out-rudiments. That's the only thing that gets in the road of 3D Criss Cross. Just out-rudiments. That's all.

So Prepchecking is totally devoted to straightening the pc out so the rudiments reasonably stay in.

Now, you've got your next problem with regard to rudiments, which is when you change valences by reason of 3D Criss Cross, you will bring areas into view by reason of having changed the valence of the pc. But it isn't true that just because you are finding new valences on the pc, the pc is going into a new valence every time.

They are still in all the old valences and they are also now in the new valences, but they have been in the new valences, and they have been in the old valences.

In other words, if you find a new valence on the pc by 3D Criss Cross, that does not mean that he abandons all of his old valences, throws away the old shoes out of the attic and moves into the new valence. As a matter of fact, the 3D problems mass pulls apart a little bit. It just pulls apart a little bit. It has less influence on him than before. But just before you find this, the pc will dramatize the new valence coming up.

So that dramatization, of course, influences the case and tends to some degree to throw your rudiments out. But if your pc is already capable of being kept in-session, then influence of this is minimal. You get less influence on this.

Now, actually you shouldn't have to pay much attention to this particular phenomena because the pc while he's running this and doing that will get a lot of cognitions, will give you a bunch of withholds and so forth. Remember that isn't rudiments. That's all incidental to 3D Criss Cross.

So if you could just get the rudiments in so he vaguely could be audited without thinking the auditor was going to shoot him down in flames, and he was – all of a sudden wakes up at nine o'clock in the morning and suddenly says, "Oh, no," and realizes all of a sudden that he, all of his life has done nothing but rob banks and this was totally occluded to him before this moment. He doesn't come into a 3D Criss Cross session with the session burgeoned with all this.

You've already more or less got this cleaned up in, in your Prepclearing. So your case tends to maintain a greater stability if the case is well prepchecked before 3D Criss Cross is run.

Now, it isn't absolutely necessary to do a Prepcheck before you do 3D Criss Cross. But you will find out that it takes you about four times as long to do the 3D Criss Cross as it would have if you'd also done a good Prepcheck. So it's in the interests of saving a tremendous amount of time. 3D Criss Cross can upset the person most gorgeously, and if you're upsetting the person with present time problem, out-rudiments and everything else going this way and that, you haven't much chance of putting the case back to battery.

Now, the way to put a case back to battery is put it in some kind of shape to move forward before you move it. That's the time to put a case in shape, not after you *have* to put it into condition. See, it's too late now to do the effective, so we have to do the urgent. And you'll find yourself in all kinds of heroic activities. Middle of 3D Criss Cross all of a sudden the person has a screaming present time problem, you're halfway through a list, and so forth.

Well, if your – the person isn't rather accustomed to handling present time problems, and so forth, the pc's liable to be far more worried about this than they ordinarily would have. So just by the fact the pc knows he can talk to the auditor and knows he has been able to talk to the auditor, and knows that things aren't going to bite, why, he can get these things – you can get the rudiments in more easily. That is the least benefit from it.

Incidentally, Prepchecking looks to somebody in off the street as a fantastic activity. It's about a psychoanalysis – the complete psychoanalysis – every three or four hours. And Papa Freud would just be in love with it if he ever saw it, man.

A well done Prepcheck and, man, fantastic. Wouldn't Freud have had a ball with that session I had today? Wouldn't he have? Wouldn't that have been marvelous. Psychoanalyst would be talking to the patient yet. Explaining all this beautiful data.

Of course, I don't know why he'd explain it. There's a little pin worth of it – there's a penny's worth of data he – around there someplace we haven't collided with. And we'll collide with it and that will spring the chain and that's that.

Now, here's – this factor is confidence. When you're doing 3D Criss Cross, a person can get awful low. And a person can become very morose. And a person can become very upset. And the person can wake up at two A.M. and suddenly say, "What was that item they found on me today? Oh, no. Not a terrified louse. I wonder if that could be why I'm lying here shaking and sweating. *Mmm.* Is that why I – every time I get caught in a rush hour, I'm afraid of being squashed? Do you suppose that?"

And he goes over this. "Yes, by George, that's true. That's true." Cognition, cognition, cognition, you see.

And after he self-audits himself, incidentally and accidentally because he had no other choice, half the night, he gets up, stumbling off, while walking on both sides of the street the next morning – and he's so concerned about all this he doesn't really want to face up to any of his friends or meet anybody like this. That would be the wrong thing to do.

Well, he neglects to eat breakfast, you see, and comes in to get audited. And now if you're ever going to have any trouble with this person's rudiments, you're going to have it now. So it's a good thing to have the pc in a condition where you can put the rudiments in rather easily. Right? Good safeguard.

But if we just had that, we didn't have anything else, Prepchecking is actually more valuable than the – most any other process we have ever had. It is more valuable as a single activity. It is well worth doing very well.

I don't see any signs of it changing around. You'll goof up here and there, and I will have to make a few little minor changes because of whatever you're doing with it or something of the sort or make it a little more simple someplace or more explicable, but I don't look for anything to happen on it. Because actually I worked on this for months.

I worked on 3D Criss Cross for ages, and we've only had one change in 3D Criss Cross, I think, in about two months almost – a month and a half. And that's just to find out that – oh, oh, the one little change in a month; that's not much of a change – don't cross them out obligingly for the pc because he's going to all of a sudden realize that it's unsafe to reveal. So he's of course liable to take out the item. He's of course rather – abandoned.

He sees – he sees these tremendous lists, and he sees by their very length that a terrified louse is being beautifully swallowed up and is meaningless on this long list, so he goes ahead and gives it to you, you see.

And then if you're asking him what these things mean, he can have a change of heart. And he isn't operating with that interesting feeling of confidence and abandonment he is operating with when he's just giving you the items one after the other. He – it lets him have an afterthought. And apparently, pcs are not entirely proof against striking their own list off. They really don't know it's theirs, you see, and they don't know it is, and they don't know that it's not. "But oh, well, no, a terrified louse, that wouldn't oppose an insecticide factory. Take it off." You're bound by the rule there. Off it goes. Your list will go null.

There's a phenomena of bouncing out of the 3D problem mass. People go into it and move out of it, and bounce off of it, and sit on top of it, and try to approach it, and the auditor pulls them down to it with winches and heavy oxen and so forth, and the pc's heels have made a furrow, you see, that can be traced back down the concrete highway, you see, two furrows clear back to Los Angeles, you see.

And you gradually got him, you see, to confront this point. And he's giving you some answers at this point, and of course you let him go at the end of the session, and he goes back to Los Angeles. And he says, "What uh, why ah, that list – put a new one on it. All right. Now, differentiation and so forth – well, I wouldn't have anything to do with it, and that wouldn't have anything to do with it, and the next one wouldn't have anything to do. .. And a terrified louse wouldn't have anything to do with an insecticide factory. Take it out, and so forth. None of those things would be," and so on. He's bounced.

You haven't had many changes and this thing is well worth learning. You had a variability. The – this came out of this interesting inability of the auditor to vary the Sec Check question. The auditors could never vary the Sec Check question sufficiently to get all of the data. Well, this is the system by which you do that.

And this is how you vary the Sec Check question. Now, I've had that – you've had that difficulty for many, many months, and I worked hard on this to get this thing shaken out so that we could get around that difficulty. And it does rather easily.

It looks tougher to you than it is. But by the time you've kept a few auditor's reports on a few demonstrations, it'll all of a sudden start looking awful simple to you.

By the way, if anybody gets an improper report, one mistake on the report, you know, gets four infraction sheets. I don't think you knew that. We tell you after the fact today, you see. And failure to turn one in, why, you spend the night in the dungeon. Well, not that crude.

But anyway, you're working chains, and you're looking for the little scraps of data that evaded people's memories. And you recognize that if this little scrap of data could make this much change in a whole chain on a pc, why, then actually a fully, completely recognized valence from the past track, the whole package occluded, would make an enormous change in the pc. So you're actually getting those gains which are in vignette.

But don't be too hopeful that after you've got the person Prepcleared – by definition all rudiments in – and gotten the whole 3D Criss Cross and gotten all of the items of the Goals Problem Mass beautifully stretched out, beautifully opptermed, everything laid out on a line plot marvelously, don't be too sure that you have heard the last of Prepchecking. You haven't. Because it's very probable that a similar technique will be used to take these items to pieces. So it's what you start with, and it's probably what you will end with. Okay?

Therefore, you are not at all concerned, before you've got the Goals Problem Mass isolated, in establishing – in any past life activity. You don't want anything to do with a past life activity with Prepchecking until your Goals Problem Mass – because you've got the method of reaching those withholds. Those are the biggest withholds of a pc's life – a whole life.

Yeah, for instance, some of you come to England and you go zzzz, and you go *huuuuuu,* and you say, "I don't know what's the matter with me," you see. And of course, you've probably been hung for a poacher or something like that. I think we had somebody who was killed down the road here just a few miles south. But it's not very serious. It's just a restimulation of that sort of thing

And some of you, of course, come to England and feel very relaxed. You think this is wonderful. England is very relaxed, very nice, and so forth. Haven't done anything to it for centuries. All of your overts are against France or Los Angeles.

Well, anyway, the use of what you're doing is very broad, and all I'm asking you to do is to become very expert at it and watch your meter rather closely. Now, those things which are falling, of course, get some representation here on your Sec Check plot. And you'll find out they will all stop falling if you get the chain out of the road. That's all you do is if you get the chain's unknowns out of it, why, the whole chain will wrap up, and then anything that you've been hitting on in the chain will wrap up, and you'll finish that off. But of course the chain won't wrap up till you get the bottom of a chain.

So therefore I wouldn't work too long, just as a tip, on any What question if it seemed to be resistive – if the question seemed to be resistive. And in Prepchecking we've answered one of the big problems, is: "What is this continuously banging withhold?" The withhold bangs and bangs and bangs, always with the same intensity, always with the same intensity. You won't find that in Prepchecking because if you found it, you would go on and get the next What question.

In other words, when, you get a constancy of reaction on the meter and you're not cleaning it with your When, All and Who, it's time for you to find a subsidiary What. And don't just take it out on the pc; you just haven't asked the right What question yet.

Well, it doesn't matter how many What questions you have down. But remember these What questions must all be of a kind and they must all apply to the case. And they are in an effort to clean up a chain which starts in with concern, in this particular chain. You've got it there in your 1; is – that names the chain. You've got a chain here called "physical difficulties." It could say "What about these physical difficulties in this lifetime?" And that would be more pertinent to what you're doing but the pc isn't showing much proclivity to drift elsewhere, so there it is.

Okay? Do you understand this a little better?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yeah.

Well, I hope you have good use of it.

Thank you.