

# SECURITY CHECK PREPCHECKING

A lecture given on  
29 May 1962

Thank you.

Well, we probably ought to have a lecture this time. You've had that, but I haven't got anything to talk about. I haven't. It's a fact. Wouldn't have me guilty of a missed withhold amongst so many people.

Second lecture, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, 29 May 62.

And now, the use of the Sec Check with the Prepcheck. It's been the subject of a bulletin recently. If anybody's got that bulletin, you can hand it to me.

*Female voice: May 10th.*

May 10th? The – you got one up here? Thank you.

This is the material of – it is covered on HCOB May the 10th, 1962.

Now, the easiest way in the world to do a Prepcheck is to let a preconceived form guide you into the overts which you're trying to cover.

Now, that's a very easy way to do the thing. Now, such a preconceived form would be a rudiment question. Let's take a – let's take the – an early variety of this sort of thing. Just take any one of the beginning, middle or end rudiments questions. Take any one of these and use it as your Zero and then just put “Have you ever – “ type of questioning on the front of it or “Are you willing . . . ?” or “Have you been unwilling to talk to an auditor about your difficulties?” You see how you'd have to convert the question? “Have you been unwilling to talk to an auditor about your difficulties?” – something like that.

It wouldn't much matter how you worded this thing, but try to word the rudiment so there's little more span to it, don't you see?

“Have you ever had a problem during a session that you didn't tell the auditor about?”  
I don't care how you add these things up. Do you see?

You take your rudiment question as your Zero, you reword as your Zero A. Let's be very precise. You're going to reword this thing so that you get a Prepcheck going on it. "Had any trouble with problems lately?" You see?

The Zero is "Do you have a present time problem?" Your Zero A is possibly arrived at after you've done a little talk to the pc or something like this, you know, just present time problem, "Do you ever get messed up with present time problems in a session?" you know, that sort of thing

And he, "Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. Oh, terrible. You're never going to get rid of them."

And you say, "That's – thank you very much now. All right. Now, did you ever have trouble with present time problems in a session?" That's your Zero A, see?

All right. And then you fish around. This question is hot. you see, that's the only reason you'd have a Zero A. If you've asked the Zero A, you know, you check the Zero A – the guy tells you something, then you check the Zero A – your drill applies, just let's – applies to a What. This thing is still hot. you know you've got a Zero A. Otherwise, you'll have to monkey around and find another Zero A, because that one cleaned up, don't you see?

So you've got to have a hot, persisting Zero A.

Now, you start fishing around trying to find out what goes with this and did he ever do anything with this, and what's this all about and keep his mind on the subject of problems, and you suddenly see a dirty needle tick or something like this, and you say, "All right. What was that you were thinking of?"

"Oh, well, that was that time. See, I had this auditor who was very unsympathetic and he just never – never would let me get rid of any present time problems and that sort of thing, and . . ." You know, lovely motivator sort of a reaction. Well, you have to remember to convert this. You're searching for your What question now, you see? And you have to remember that the question will be something like this, "What about lousing an auditor up by having present time problems?" You know – something like this, see?

You have to ask What questions until you get a reaction. Now, your What question is tracked right out of your Zero A, don't you see? And there is your What question.

"What about getting lots of problems before you came to an auditing session?" You know? "What about worrying about problems in an auditing session and not telling your auditor anything about it?" You know – that sort of thing

I don't care what you finally cook up out of this Zero A. It's going to be something that is very applicable to the case. And you're going to test around on it until you've got – he's told you an overt; make sure that it is an overt, steer him down till it is an overt. First he says,

“Well, auditors just keep giving me problems all the time. Auditing itself is a problem,” and so on.

Fish up. What's he done with problems here, see? Get an overt action, get your What question formed, make sure that it reacts. Now you ask your What question; the pc gives you the answer. Well, the same formula holds, see? You got to ask this What question again and you're in the soup if it cleaned up.

You've got to go find another What question. Your whole job is you're trying to find a question that's going to hold. And everything you write down, the Zero.

First, of course, your Zero had to be persistent, see, before you would monkey with it; and then your Zero A dragged from it has to be persistent before you'd monkey with it; and then your What question has to be persistent before you would monkey with it. Do you see? Each time – each time you follow this same drill. You ask the question which you have finally cooked up here, and the pc gives you the answer to this question directly – even though you've just discussed it and he's given you something like that. you ask that question you just cooked up very directly, and you say so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so, and it goes *plang* on the meter.

He says, “Well, I – something or other, something or other, something or other.” That's an answer to the auditing question.

And then you say, “I'll check it on the meter.” And you ask him this same question again. And if it's there, well, you go to your next step. And if it's not there you retreat a step. This formula is *always* the way you do it. See, you go back to your Zero.

All right. Supposing your Zero was impersistent. “You willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” You're going to write that as a Zero Question. You got it on there? “That's fine. That's what we're going to check on now. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” Well, of course, it's one of the rudiments questions, so therefore it gives you a pat question to proceed from.

All right. Dandy. *Voilà!* This is there. You say, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

Now mind you that you can rephrase that so that it gives a little more span – like, “Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” But, let's not go very far afield here. It's *best* if you just run it, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” and you get a fall. Or you know you consistently have difficulty with this, see?

But that's got to be persistent.

Now supposing the guy says, “Yeah, I can – found out I can talk to you everything a – except Indian tomahawks, and I just – just can't bring myself – I haven't been able to in the past – bring myself to talk to you about Indian tomahawks.”

And you say, “All right.”

This is your Zero. You see, “Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” You've had it.

But because this has already been cleaned up in the rudiments, you'll find out you have best luck if you broaden it for the Zero. Otherwise, you already got by it once, so you're not going to expect it to hang up again, are you?

So something better: “Have you been willing” see, “to talk to me about your difficulties?” You know? Anything that you wish to put down. But it has to represent that rudiments problem and preferably has to give more track.

You check it now and you say, “All right. Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

“Yes, everything except that.” you got no reaction at all. You've had it. That rudiment can be expected to stay in because you broadened the rudiment, see? You broadened the rudiment one way or the other.

Now your Zero A. Now, let's say it stayed in. “Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?”

The fellow says, “Indian tomahawks. Never have been able to discuss Indian tomahawks.”

“Good. Have you been willing – have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?” *Clang!* And you say, “Oh, well, that's all right.” Well, we're in there now. And now we're going to go to the Zero A.

And the person says, “Well, I don't know. It has to do something with uh – your – well, I don't know. It's just, I have never been able to – to really express myself, and so forth. I feel that you're down on me.”

Anything that you care to wangle out of this situation; it all depends on what occurs. Now you still want a very broad field here.

And he says, “Well, it's when I start to tell you something – well, I just feel all suppressed.”

Well, your Zero, “Have you ever felt suppressed when talking to me?” I don't care if it's a motivator, see, because we're going to turn that into an overt. We don't care what are – those Zeros are that we clean up because it's not very serious.

From there on, it's got to be overts for sure. By the way, it is not necessary to have a Zero A in all cases. You understand that?

All right. Now, the person says, "Well, I – I just – just felt unwilling," and so forth. And you say, "Well, have you got any particular instant when you felt unwilling to discuss sex with me?" whatever he says. (You know, he says, "just unwilling to discuss sex with you.")

"Unwilling to discuss sex? What about – what about not talking to me about sex? What about hiding sexual data? What about . . ."

He says, "Well. . ."

You say, "You done anything specifically to me or have you done anything specifically to auditors on the subject of sex?"

You see, you're not going to buy anything or put down a What question that isn't an overt.

And the person looks at you and says, "Well, I – actually, I was being audited by somebody one time, and I – I made a play for them and they rejected me."

And you say, "All right. What about making a play for auditors?"

And it goes clang! Now this same rule applies.

And you say, "All right. Thank you very much."

You asked them once, didn't you, and they'd already given you this thing So frankly, you have checked it twice. You get this – this is a little bit tricky. But if you want to be absolutely by the boards – very pattern about the whole thing – ask it again and let them tell you something and then check it to see if it clears. And if it clears, all right – it clears, man. Don't argue with that. You've got to go back up to your Zero or your Zero A, and come on down – anything is still reacting. Don't you see?

Supposing the whole thing wipes out and nothing is reacting now. Fine! Well, you've skipped it. Go on to your next Zero, see? Got the idea?

*Audience: Mm-hm.*

All right. Supposing he says, "Well, making a sexual – I . . ."

"What about making a sexual advances to auditors – making sexual play for . . .?"

It's always best to use the pc's wording in the thing, you see? "What about making a sexual play for auditors?" *Clang! You see?*

And he – "Well, I did. I did. My – my first auditor. I – I actually thought he was awfully attractive. Ha-ha."

And you say, “Good. Thank you very much. I'll check that on the meter,” if you want to be lugubrious and laborious. Because you've already done this twice, you understand?

So, “What about making a sexual play for auditor?” and so on.

“Well, yeah.” It's clang! Well, you're in the Prepcheck business at that moment.

“When was that?” See, he gave you the specific incident. You didn't form the What till you had one. “When was that?” “Is that all of it?” “Is there anything more to it?” See? “What didn't appear?” or “What did appear?” or “Who should have found out about it?” “Who didn't find out about it?” You see?

Your wording is varied on these things, by the way. you start using the same wording every time and you're going to be in trouble, because you're actually not listening to the pc; because these questions have to be adjusted to what you want to drag out of it. It doesn't require too much skill, but adjust this thing.

The person is telling you, “Well, I was trying to hide this thing.”

And well, you say, “Who might have appeared there?” or “What might have appeared there?” you see?

And the person says, “Well, I've just – nobody told me anything about it.”

“Well, what didn't appear there?” That's a very natural question. And he'll tell you. And then – and “Who didn't find out about it?” “Who should have found out about it?” Any one of these formula, see? “Who didn't you reveal that to?”

Doesn't matter what wording you use; it has to be appropriate. It follows these four things and you're saying them in various ways.

All right. You go down that once and you want to beat the pc to death, go over that eight or nine times. If you really want to get nowhere with Prepchecking, run the When, All, Appear and Who about eight times on every overt you find. That would be very good. That would get nowhere at a high rate of speed.

It all depends on what your needle action is with all this. you can watch your needle. Now, you are not checking your When, your All, your Appear, or your Who against the needle. You're just talking, see? And he's just talking. But you've got an eye, and that eye can be on that needle. And if this thing looks quite active as we discuss it, we can be very sure that we are not on an incident that is going to clear.

And actually, it'd be all right if you passed over it twice and it was unchanging – oh, my God, you should have been off of it the first pass over, see, because you're wasting time.

Now, your magic question you use after that is “earlier.” See? “Was there an earlier instant where you did that?” See?

“When's the first time you can recall that happened?”

And now you can fall into your own trap.

You've asked him, perhaps, for the first time that this occurred, and it was during auditing and he gave you something which had June 1950 on it.

Now, you know confoundedly well that there's nothing earlier than that. So you abandon “earlier.” You give up the ship right at that point. Well, let me assure you if this thing is still banging after once over on the – that is so powerful as the When, All, Appear and Who – the thing is still banging once over, you haven't got the first overt.

See, “What about making a play for an auditor – a sexual play for an auditor?” See? And it's still banging. You've got June 1950. Well, God, you're getting awful far aft. I mean, they – hardly even known as auditors. Heh-heh.

And you say, “Well, you can't get any earlier than that,” so you give it up. See? Now don't – don't logicize yourself out of business.

Actually, a little thinking goes a long way. It didn't clear up. Now, what anybody who's having trouble with Prepchecking hasn't gotten through their heads is the old, old, old Book One material about basic on the chain will clear the chain. And nothing works so gorgeously as this.

If you want to see some marvelous examples of this, they're to be found in Prepchecking And if a *chain* isn't clearing, you are not getting the basic on the chain. Actually, a this lifetime basic is usually most – a great majority of the time perfectly adequate.

So he says, “Well, I made a play for an auditor in 1950 in May, and that was when it was,” and so on. And you're looking at this thing and it's going *cling, clang*. Well, now don't figure yourself out of existence and say, “Well, it could have been a psychoanalyst – could have been trouble – they had trouble with their accounting department.” Now, don't figure yourself around the bend. Just ask them, “Is there any earlier incident?” That is the magic cure for all of this. “Is there any *earlier* incident?” You can't get before then, can you?

Well, he drags up – he drags up May, or she does. You've got May of 1950. *Ooo-oh-ho-ho!* And when you've covered that, it still falls. Well, don't lose faith, don't lose confidence. You just haven't – this is the only reason you haven't got the thing clear. You haven't got the first incident. So you ask them if there's an *earlier* incident. See?

Yeah, there was a person audited him out of *Astounding Science Fiction*. They'd forgotten all about the session; session totally buried. They weren't called auditors then. They weren't called sessions then. This person did talk to them about it and try to get them to remember something because of it. Don't you see?

But I really wouldn't call it a session. "Well, would you call it a session?" and so forth. "Well, wouldn't, no." See? And all of a sudden they give you this, and that happened in – sometime in the end of April of 1950, see?

Ahhh! We go over this and we notice when we say, "when – " you know, why, we get action, but the action damps. And when we say, "Is that all of it?" "Is there anything more to it?" the action is much milder than it was. And we ask – we go around it again, see, and we say, "All right. When was that?" And do you know that there isn't anything happening on that needle?

So we say, "Well, all right. How about this incident there in April when you made a sexual pass at an auditor?" whatever it was – "play for an auditor," so on. Yeah, that's it. Everything is . . .

You come straight back. Don't go through all those overts They're not there anymore. You're just going to waste time, man. you got the first one – it's scrubbed. He – you is going to come right back up the channel, and you're going to ask the What question again. That is your next immediate action. If you've got the chain, that is it. There won't be a breath in that – left in that What question.

What question is null; you mark it null. That's all the writing you've done so far. No matter how many incidents you got, you just wrote the What question.

It's all null all the way – What question is null. The Zero A. Ask the Zero A. The Zero A is still alive, which is improbable. You've got to have another What question, so you proceed from there.

In other words, you go as far north as it's gone null, see, and you go as far south as it's necessary to null things. You just play within those two limits. And the next thing you know, "Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" and there's no response, there's no action, there's no nothing "Have you been willing to talk to me about your difficulties?" whatever it was that you were trying to clear.

That's all gone; everything's gone; everything's fine; needle looks better; pc looks better; everything's fine – well, get the hell out of there. What are you doing monkeying around with that rudiment?

It doesn't take a week to clear a rudiment. It doesn't take a session to clear a rudiment. It actually doesn't take fifteen minutes to clear a rudiment. If you're very slippery as a Prepchecker, you're in there, down the chain and out again with stuff that the pc hasn't ever remembered and was totally occluded before he has time to marvel at it. It's cleaned up quicker than he has a chance to worry about it. There isn't any value in it, except that you get auditing done. And you'll find out that you could get these things in fairly rapidly.

But you understand that a person – now that's just checking the rudiments in. you take them one by one and check them in, in this particular fashion. No matter how many What questions you had, it would be as many What questions as you kept coming back up to the Zero A and found a Zero A still alive.

Well, yeah, that leads to another What question, see?

Now you clean up a big chain of that, and you come back up, and you'll find that Zero A is still alive. Well, you better get another What question and clean that thing up. This is getting unusual though, for that to happen, see?

All right. Now we start – start in on this thing. We are talking to the individual about *exactly* about those things which are absolutely pertinent to the subject of auditing when we are prepchecking rudiments. These we've got to have in.

Well, the funny part of it is if the pc is living a life of secrecy, if the pc walks out of the session door every day and looks up and down the street wondering if the police have arrived yet and that sort of thing, we're going to find that we put the rudiments in on a Prepcheck broad basis and they go out; and we put them in, and they go out. Why?

Because there's something more fundamental about this particular activity than rudiments. Then we eventually find out that there is something wrong that would ordinarily be covered by some type of a form as – such as the Joburg. This is so wrong; never been discovered about the pc; we have a horrible time trying to lean into it – it's actually a hidden factor on the case.

You notice the pc that has this once in a while will get a dirty needle and then you can't find out what it is. And it's mysterious and it sort of – you get the case lined up and then the case isn't lined up.

And this case keeps falling on its face all the time. Well, that's because there's an unknownness about the case – of magnitude.

Now, cases that go mad have simply got a number of missed withholds – if you want to know the anatomy of madness. It's the missedness of it all.

Sunday afternoon, Thornville, Ohio, was mysteriously, uniquely and suddenly on the telephone. I happened to pick up the telephone. First told the person that I wasn't here because I just didn't feel like going into all that, and – and it was a collect phone call. So after I'd put the thing down, it got to be a right-in phone call and they would pay the charges. And I talked to somebody that said that they had done some Self Analysis a long time ago, but now these days they felt they were going out of their mind. This girl felt she was going out of her mind and going stark, staring mad and insane and couldn't go to the organization or anything of the sort, and expected me to be on a plane at once and go to Columbus, Ohio, to audit her.

Well, this is all symptomatic of this and that and the other thing. Although people do call me up rather constantly here and there and expect me to go to the North Pole to audit them, or something like that; I always say, "Well, if the guy is worth saving, he can at least come within range." I always offer some auditing if they'll come within range, sort of thing. But you find out when they're in that kind of a state of mind – this is what's very interesting – their reach is very difficult, and their departure from an area is very difficult, and the number of crimes they have under their hats are absolutely uncountable.

And if you were to take such a person in that *extremis* and try to put their rudiments in – *pssssssss* – you'd find their rudiments would go out faster than you could get them in. Why?

Because there's tremendous weight of unknownness, of crimes, of other things on the case. They're not related to Scientology or are related to Scientology. Now, the more nearly these crimes are related to injuring Scientology, the less you will be able to keep the rudiments in. Quite interesting. That has a definite coordination. That isn't just me talking.

People kick the bucket on these things. I mean, there's nothing to fool with about them. We just had a doctor up in Scotland die just the other day, by the way. He had been calling me up rather persistently and constantly and telling me I had to go to Scotland and process him. I actually knew the man's background. Possibly, if it had been any of you, I would have said yes. Do you understand?

But this guy's background – he'd had an awful time. He'd been murdering people and doing other odds and ends and putting women into trances and using anesthetics on them and raping them and – pleasant, you know? His activities – now never kid yourself – the activities of people of that particular character are gross.

Now, I'm not maligning the dead, because he's probably already picked up a body in Scotland. But don't kid yourself. When they're – when they go spinny, you've got a wrestling match on your hands if you don't get your paws on what's making the case so woogy, see?

I know this boy's background pretty well – I knew his background. I knew something about it, but more than that, I knew my Scientology. And I knew well, if anybody in his family could boost him up and get him down here, why, I'd happily get somebody to pull a few of his overts and so forth.

The girl that called from Ohio, I simply told her over the telephone, told her sister-in-law, to write – sit down and write all the things nobody knew about her except herself and send them in a letter to me. See? So that when that gets here, I will simply say, "Well, this is all very, very interesting, and thank you for sending this, but you have omitted several," you see?

And I'll just keep this thing going, and eventually this person will straighten out. See? But don't be so filled with sweetness and light about all this sort of thing. People who invalidate E-Meters and have a hell of a time with this and with that and the other thing are actually having a hell of a time with something they've done in life.

Don't be naive. This is not just talk – this is fact. This is fact. And just stop wasting auditing time. Just accept the fact this bird's – you can't keep his rudiments in – he's got overts. Just accept that fact. And don't keep knocking your own brains out, see?

Here's this *dear* sweet, old lady who belongs to the Cat Society and who is kind to Half Decayed Flowers clubs. See? And you say she's never done anything in her life. But you can't keep her rudiments in. That's the only test.

Their rudiments keep flying out in various directions – man, they've been busy! I don't care – and probably the apparency they're sitting there with – and that's not in some past life, that's this one. And the apparency they're sitting there with is a – is a camouflage. Anybody that would join the Society for Decayed Flowers and Protection of Cats – camouflage.

They sit there with one flower waving on their Victorian hat. Camouflage, man. And you're probably talking to Mata Hari of World War II. Who knows? See? Used to kill partisans for the fun of it.

Don't be 90 naive, in other words. It's just a direct coordination – absolutely direct: can't keep the rudiments in – they got a lot under the lid.

Easy way to get it out is to take some broad, pervasive thing like Form 3, the Joburg. Take that thing (and it's got every crime known to man and beast on the thing one way or the other) and you clip some corner of what they've been doing. See, you'll take some – you'll scrape at it at least, see?

You'll notice every time you mention the word “rape,” or something like that, their hair stands on end or needle goes off the pin or something like this. There's something going on here, see?

And in that way, a packaged form is of enormous use. Now, who knows? You'll be able to take perhaps one pc and directly – directly put their rudiments in. Overtly. They stay in. you can do a Routine 3. Everything is going along swimmingly, you see?

Now, I'm not saying the pc, the worse – or pc should be taken up in some other way, particularly, but you're going to get the next pc to that and you prepcheck all the rudiments in and they don't stay in. And you prepcheck them in, and they don't stay in. And you prepcheck and – and it's all like living in a world of hot grease. It's slippery. What's going on?

Well, what's going on is they've been up to things which in this lifetime would be termed, to be very understative, antisocial. See, it's not they believe they has been doing

something antisocial. They've been doing something antisocial, for which they would be damaged if discovered. Get that? I mean, they'd be damaged. So, of course, they can't get off the withhold easily.

They wouldn't dare say, "Well, I – ha-ha – actually accepted German marks all during the war to turn in the number of ships passing Point Conception." They don't know. They read in the paper every once in awhile, huh-huh, that they're still trying war criminals, you know. They're not sure. Their judgment is never good on these things, you know? It always looks to them like everything is still rigged and these have to be pretty juicy. They have to be pretty good crimes. They can't be mild.

You know, one person doesn't consider crimes wilder than another person. The crime is the crime. I mean, that's all there is to that.

One of the reasons you don't get anyplace – when you don't get anyplace with Prepchecking – is because you say, "Well, Joe," you see, "is much queasier than Bill. So then Bill would have to have much less crime on his background to be as nutty as Joe," see? See? "Because, you see, Joe here, he gets all upset. Let me put it another way: he gets all upset here at just the *thought* of doing something bad, you see? Whereas Bill, he's very extrovert, and he can do something bad and not be that upset. So therefore, Joe and Bill being entirely different people, you'll be able to get Bill's rudiments in even though he has done many criminal things. But Joe, you can't get his in because he is a – a delicate flower, you see? And he really hasn't done anything. You just, you know, it's just his – his – the feeling of guilt is stronger."

Man, you're just rationalizing yourself into a hole, that's all. I get any of these girls – there's a girl, lay up here in a hospital and died one time – I guess about a year ago or something like that. I asked a staff auditor here to go up and give her some auditing, and he did, and the hospital was so upset, crowded and appetite over tin cup, there wasn't any way you could even get to her bedside and she went ahead and kicked the bucket. It wasn't no Scientologist – just a local girl up in town. We heard about it and so forth – thought we'd do something. And didn't make the grade.

Well, this girl wasn't even injured very badly. This girl was lying in a funk and was saying nothing Ah – fascinating. Now, you think this is because she picked some flowers in the town council's front yard? No, brother. There's something her family didn't know about her, and she went ahead and was leaving. And the extremity of leaving is kicking the bucket. See? And when they get too many overts and too many withholds, that are too antisocial – they're very damaging themselves – they want to get the hell out of there.

That's all they can think of and so they die very easily, given the least provocation. Now, in the process of doing one of these, if you simply went and monkeyed with this case – I'm talking about dying people here with malice aforethought actually – if you went and

monkeyed with this case and thought it was because they picked some flowers out of the town council's garden, and you went in at that level of expectancy of what you were going to find in this case, this case would be a corpse before you got anywhere.

See, you've got to say, "What is this now?" See? A kind auditor could actually – in this type of case, lying in the hospital – a kind auditor would just pat them on the head and say, "God bless you, because that's all that's going to happen."

And of course, the guy gets out of his head and tries to find God, but that's another story.

What's going on here? Well, the auditor has kindified him to death, that's all. This girl, the only way you could possibly have rescued her or snapped her back – if the medicos had built enough beds up in the hospital, you know, and didn't leave so many patients dumped in the corridors – you actually couldn't even walk to the side of her bed if I remember rightly or some such exaggeration – the auditor going in there, he has somebody who has a very, very short attention span, see. They aren't long for this thing Well, he can't monkey with it; he hasn't got any time to monkey with the thing, you see? So he's got to ask some pertinent question.

He'd have to find out something about the person, you know? Is the person married? Not married? Living with family? See? Who is it here? You see? Something of that sort. He actually couldn't even spend very much time on rudiments on such a case. Don't you see? Because the person's concentration is withholding on a specific thing. You'd have to parallel what the mind is doing

You'd say, "Well, where don't you want to go back to?" You know, "Where don't you want to go back to, dear?"

"I don't want to go home. Oh, no, no. No, I don't want to go home."

"All right. Very good. What don't they know about you, dear? That's right. All right now."

*"Ooo-oooh, ooo-oh."*

"Yeah, well, what have you done that you're hiding from them? Come on. Tell me. you can tell me, you know."

And "Oh – wow!" and they tell you, and they're out of bed and dressed and gone home.

Magical. Magical. And of course, if you're kind and you go in and you say, "Well, you can confide in me. Have you ever smiled at somebody?" You know, some big overt. They haven't got the span or anything else, because their mind is straight on to the withhold when they're trying to pass out.

So you can try your pc's attention and you can throw your pc wildly out of session by not taking it somewhere where the pc's mind is concentrated. Now, to that degree, a pat list has a certain liability. See? It bores your pc stiff before it ever gets to his crime. So therefore, you should learn to rapidly sift the coffee beans from the chaff, with rapidity.

Here's the way you run one of those lists. That's what we're talking about.

“Have you ever stolen anything?”

The guy says, “Yeah, I stole a penknife once.”

You say, “Good. I'll check it on the meter. Have you ever stolen anything?”

That's your Zero A, don't you see? And you say, “Have you ever stolen anything?”  
You say, “That's null, thank you very much.”

“Yeah, have you ever drowned a waterbuck?” *Clang!* “All right. What's that? It's reacting. For your answering, I'll repeat it there. Have you ever drowned a waterbuck?”

“Oh, yeah, I'd forgotten all about that. Yeah, I did. I was down on the south side of the Brisbane River. Yeah. Yeah, I did.”

“All right. I'll check that on the E-Meter. Have you ever drowned a waterbuck? All right. That's clean. Thank you. All right. Have you ever raped anybody?” *Clang!* You say, “That's reacting. I'll repeat it for you on the meter. Have you ever raped anybody?”

“Uhm – I've been worried about being raped.”

“I'll repeat that for your answer. Have you ever raped anybody?”

“No, no. No, I never have.”

“All right. I'll check that on the meter. Have you ever raped anybody? I'm awful sorry, but that is very, very live.”

All right. Now we're going to go into it, see. And you say, “Well, let's fish it up here. What have we got? See?”

Let's get a What question wrapped around this thing Let's get an incident. Let's get him raping somebody. Let's talk it over. What is this all about? Let's get him discussing the subject. Get him immersed in it one way or the other. Get a What question out of some overt.

“Well, I actually – I actually touched a girl once in a subway.” That's all you can make out of it, man. That's the first chain you're going to have to clear.

And you say, “Well, what about touching women?” or “What about touching girls?” Test it out – see. “What about touching people in public places?” Whatever it is, get something. This pc is queasy, see? It's actually doing something. It's touching something. All right. Get that. Clean that up.

“What's the first time you ever did this?” You know, I mean, you've got the incident all right. We're going to chew it up.

“When was that?” and so on and etc., and so on. Fine – that's good. *Boom! You* know. “When's the first time you ever did this? Come on. When was the first time? Let's get to the bottom of this chain. All right.” We picked that up and so on.

“Well, it was actually in school. I used to get a kick out of pushing around my kindergarten teacher and that sort of thing Used to hang on her skirt and used to get a tremendous bang out of it.”

You – “Thank you very much. When was that?” “Is that all there is to it?” So then you notice this thing is deader than a mackerel.

You say, “Ah, ah, that's fine. Thank you very much. All right. Now let's check this question. What about touching people? That's null. Thank you very much. All right. Now – *ahem*. Now, heh! Have you ever raped anybody? That is the question.” *Clang! Boom! Thud! Crash!* Pots and pans falling out of the E-Meter.

“Well, I thought about it once. I actually considered it once.”

“All right. I'm glad. Glad you got that much now. All right. Now. Have you ever raped anybody? That's what I want an answer to.”

*“Ah-whoohoo!* Well, you wouldn't really call it rape.”

“All right.”

The doors are going to open on that one. Get the first one on the chain. Get back up there again, man. Clean up that “Have you ever raped anybody?” You really got the chain. You have got a thing knocked out, so you null it off and that's that Zero A gone. Shouldn't take you very long to do it.

Now, because this is going to strain the pc's attention when you're doing a pat list from one end to the other, you should do it rather – well. See, you should do it rather positively. You should do it well. you should steer his attention very much. you shouldn't be in any doubt about what you're doing, because otherwise you're just going to wander on and on and on.

Now, in view of the fact that you're already not well paralleling his central crime – you're going to find it someplace on the list, but you haven't got it yet – and his attention is going to require an awful lot of direction because it tends to disperse all the time. He's actually hiding something from you, knowingly or unknowingly. And if he's knowingly hiding it, then it's got an awful lot of unknownness connected with it that he doesn't know about either.

And it'll be a tremendous relief to this character when you finally get down to that. But where is it? Where's the key question? Is it on the beginning of the list? Is it in the middle of this long canned list? Or is it at the end of the list? Or – you know, where is it? See, you can't tell.

So therefore, because you're checking – Prepchecking, Sec Check Prepchecking – a lot of dunnage . . . Although it'll be very important to him, it'll make him feel a lot better and everything'll be a lot better. Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah; but there – it isn't right exactly what his mind is doing, therefore we have to do it rather well. you have to do it slippily, you have to do it fast. you have to be able to carve right straight in there and get right what you're going – clean up the chain, come right back up to the top again.

I don't know how many chains of this particular character you could clean up, but I think I could handle any number of null questions. I mean – let's say fifteen or twenty questions that had only one question that released them, see, plus at least twelve questions you had to prepcheck the living daylight's out of in one two-hour session. I mean, I'd consider I was doing about all right if I did that many – about twelve Prepcheck chains out. Clean – clean as a wolf's tooth, plus about maybe ten or twelve, twenty null questions – all clean. See? That's the expectancy of rapidity.

Now, if you were doing it that fast, you'd be getting enough gain on the pc, you see, so the pc would be interested and in-session even though you weren't in the center of the pin.

*Wheeeee!!* You know? Now, there's no monkeying with one of these things. You don't sit down for a Scientology career on one question, because it won't clear on one answer. You see? Don't take the next 25-hour intensive to clean up “Have you ever hit anybody with a pease porridge pudding” You know? It doesn't take that long to clean up man, I guarantee it. Not if you fish the What question into view, you see? Not if you get that What question hot. you get the actual overt; get a What question that matches that overt; get down that line like a rabbit going down his burrow, you know, and just pull that basic-basic right *psszzzzt*. The rest of it'll just go *rrrrrrrrr*, just like a bunch of dominoes, you know? Knock them one *brrrrrrrr* – *bang!* There it went out at the top end.

You say, “That's it.”

You can do it; you can do it. Actually, the patter that you use with it is becoming narrowly quite precise. There's very few questions about how you vary from one to the other and so on. you just do it, you know?

You say, “Have you ever raped anybody?” and then you ask a What question, “Have you ever raped anybody?” and it gives you a tick-tock, splash, you see, on the meter. You know? And then you get a What question that goes tick. I don't think you're on the right chain, you know. I really don't. I think there's something wrong with that.

I think somehow – usually something wrong with your wording, and you sometimes wake up out of a dream and realize that you're on a motivator chain or something stupid of this particular character. See?

You're talking to this girl. You've asked the question “Have you ever raped anybody?” You'll find out – you got to be pretty well grooved in or you get tired or something And you suddenly got this thing all wrong She's a girl, so therefore, she's the logical person to rape, so she was raped. So he gives you this rape thing.

Obviously, he says, do you mind – missed withhold. See, it's a missed withhold. And she's never told anybody before, and therefore, it is perfectly legitimate and then you go on, and you go on, and you go on, and you pull incidents, and you pull incidents. You find out she was raped when she was one, when she was two, when she was three, when she was four; raped twice when she was five, six, seven; skipped the whole eighth year. she was unconscious the whole eighth year for having been raped in the seventh year. And you can – it's just going to get worse and worse and worse, because the pc is not being prepchecked on the auditing question.

The question is “Have you ever *raped* anybody?” She's a pretty girl. you know very well that pretty girls never rape anybody. Oh, yeah?

And you'll sometimes get tricked into one of these things and dead end. And then you'll come up at the other end, and you'll say, goodness gracious, you know. It sure takes an awful long time to prepcheck something like this. Golly, it takes a long time to get one of these Zero Questions, you know, and get the Zero A, you see – and then get a What and then just-just takes – what really takes time is trying to get all of the overts on that particular chain from one end to the other. And if you ever find yourself in that frame of mind, listen to what the pc is telling you sometime. Because the pc never is answering the auditing question if that's the way it is.

You've kind of heard it crosswise. You got caught napping

You said to this pretty girl, “Have you ever raped anybody?”

She says, “Yes, I was raped.”

You say, “Good. All right. When was that?”

“Well, I was raped at the college prom. College prom, my freshman year.”

You say, “All right. Now let's get a What question for that. What about being raped at dances?” and so forth.

And you got – you got to figure it out, and you – a little bit hard to figure it out. And you finally get something that reacts there very well. And you go on and you get the earlier rape. And next thing you know, you're throwing your end rudiments out like crazy, you see?

You just – pc is at effect. Got the whole thing backwards, but – I'm giving you a very silly example, but these can be pretty interesting.

A pc can really throw a curve at you and you all of a sudden realize that you're sitting right there square on a motivator, and this thing is a motivator chain and you weren't listening. And that's about the only time Prepchecking gets rough.

Or you're on some kind of a think, or a figure-figure base that sounded all right when you went into it, but somehow or another didn't turn out to be all right.

The pc has ceased to answer the auditing question. Is audit – answering something else. That's what happens to Prepchecking: It's that the auditor buys the wrong answer to his auditing question, see. The auditor asks for an overt: he gets a motivator. He asks for an action, he gets a think, see? And the auditor, unwittingly, at that moment goes on into that channel. And you'll find out, if you're ever training auditors, this is what gives you gray hair. It's grim, you know?

You say, “How could he possibly ask this?” You say, “What about being beaten by your mother?”

You know, you'll see this as a What question. You say, “For God's sakes, man. How the hell did that ever get on there?”

And you'll find out, if you coordinate them, you'll find a question, “What about being beaten by your mother?” is then followed by the remainder of the session auditing time.

They found this – it – the session was between 2:00 and 4:00 and they found this at 15 minutes past 2:00. And then down here at the end of it, the thing is still in full bloom and isn't marked null yet and it's 3:55, end rudiments. And then you look at next day's reports, you see? And they start into this question. And you'll find out that when they give these motivator answers – these think, these figure-figure answers – or answers not to the auditing question.

Say, “We're clearing Zero A. Have you ever raped anybody?”

And we got some What there that has to do with kissing

“What about not wanting to be kissed?”

Well, the auditor sitting there has got to be able to translate this right away into the proper action. Otherwise, he never gets a fast Sec Check Prepcheck.

Here's the way you go astray:

You say to somebody, “All right. Have you ever raped anybody?” *Clang!*

And the person says, “Well, yes, I – at the junior prom, I – I was raped at the junior prom.”

You say, “All right. Good. Ill check that on the meter. Have you ever raped anybody? Uh-huh. This isn't clear, so Ill have to go into a Prepcheck now. Let's see now. you say the junior prom. All right. Let's see now. What about being raped at the junior prom? What about being raped at dances? What about being raped by young men at dances? That seems to register well.”

And all of a sudden, you say – I *hope you* will say to yourself, if you get that far – “What the hell am I doing?”

“Say, what was the answer to that question?” Oh, come off of it. “Look, look, you didn't answer my auditing question in the first place. Look, have you ever raped anybody? That is the answer I want. I want – and you gave me some other answer. I'm sorry, but we've got to go back and pick it up.”

You know, you'd have to do it in order to get your end rudiment in.

“Now, look. Listen, listen carefully. Have you ever raped anybody?”

“No.” No reaction.

You say, “Good. Thank you. I'll check that. Have you ever raped anybody?” No reaction.

All right. Well, on to the next question.

You see, it's corny mistakes, actually, that get you into these fixes, and then you think Prepchecking, Sec Checking, goes on forever but actually the mistakes are quite corny. And you go back and you laugh at yourself.

I know the early times when I was doing some Prepchecking, working out Prepchecking, I mean, I got some outrageously weird cross-steers some . . .

In the first place, while you are still learning your tools, you feel like an Indian juggler on the stage, you see, whose nearest rival has covered the whole stage with little round sticks. And there you are, you see? And you're learning your procedure and that sort of thing and you just don't hear these things as they go by. And you form this opinion that Sec Check, Prepchecking kind of takes forever and takes a long time. And your training pattern then becomes that this is a very slow action.

So you say, “Well, have you ever stolen anything”

And the fellow says, “Well, I stole a clock once. I stole a clock once from my brother.”

And you say, “All right. Thank you very much. I'll check it on the meter. Have you ever stolen anything? That still reacts. Thank you very much. All right, you said you stole a clock once from your brother. When do you suppose that was?”

“Back in the fe-.”

“Oh. All right. Now let's see, what could that be about? Let's see, 'What about stealing clocks?' What about stealing things from your brother?' What about stealing things from your brother?' That'll – pretty good – *heh-heh-haha* – pretty good, there's the original read. All right. Thank you very much. All right. Now, when was that? All right. Anything else you'd care to say about that? All right. What didn't appear there? Okay, thank you. All right, who didn't find out about it? Oh, all right. Thank you very much. Now, is there an earlier one on that chain? Earlier – earlier than that?”

“On what chain?”

“Stealing things from your brother. Is there any earlier time you've stolen anything from your brother?”

“Stolen anything from my brother? Stolen anything from my brother? Oh – oh yes! Yes, as a matter of fact. As a matter of fact, yes, we were – when we were thirty, I borrowed his car one day and he said it was stealing, but it wasn't. I sold it I know, but actually he . . .”

“All right. When was that? Is that all there is to it? All right. What didn't appear there?”

Well, cripe! Thirty – you know this thing is going back there, man.

All right. Work it over. Work it over. Buy it. Give it the dignity of it. “All right. Who didn't find out about that? All right. Thank you very much. Good enough. Were you and your brother together when you were kids?”

“Oh, yeah. I suppose so. Yeah. Oh, yeah, yeah. Big occlusions in the area, but we were together when we were kids.”

“All right. What did you steal from your brother when you were kids?”

“Oh. He used to pick on me a lot!”

“Good. All right. That's fine. That's – that's good. But what did you – I'll repeat that. Now, what did you steal from your brother when you were kids?”

“Nothing actually. I didn't – I never developed the habit until he stole . . .”

“Good. Thank you. What did you steal from your brother when you were kids?”

“*Whew!* I stole my mother's affection from him. That's what I did.”

“Good. All right. Thank you. All right. All right. That – that's okay. When was it? And so forth. When was it? All right. That's good. Good, that's now all right. Okay. Now is there anything earlier than that?”

“You can't get any earlier than that.”

“Well, why can't you get any earlier . . .?”

“Well, we were both eight.”

“Oh, I think we can find something earlier than that.” And all of a sudden, well, this comes up at five he used to... His brother was smaller than him – and you've all this time had the idea that the brother, you see, was years older. But actually the brother is years younger. See? Suddenly, he gets this straight. Cognition – you see?

And you find out that he used to tell his little brother that ice cream was poison, that meat was poison, that dessert was poison and where his mother came in, was telling him that his mother was always trying to poison him, and befriending him by eating the food for him.

And he just never remembered this. And you can see that thing just fade out; the pc square around. You ask some question about it, you know? It's just deader than a mackerel. You come right back up there. “What about stealing things from your brother?” You know? Null. “Have you ever stolen anything” Null.

Fine. *Clang!* You're out of there, man, and you're on to the races. But actually, it shouldn't take you any longer to get that out of the pc than it took me to tell you and that was three minutes. See?

You're driving a pc – if you're not sitting there just going along for the ride, if you got your hands somewhere near the wheel – I don't absolutely insist at first that the auditor run the session. We like to sneak up on it and get him up to a point, well, where the session actually gets some control.

But, if you're sitting there right, with your hands on the wheel, you have that guy back down the track and snap that thing out of there and get the pc back up the line again. And that question nulls so fast, he hardly knows what has happened, except he suddenly feels so much better.

“Any goals or gains?”

“Yes, for some reason or other, I've – you know, I've always had this feeling like I've been poisoned. That's very funny. I don't have that feeling now. Yeah, that's some gain. Must have been something in the session that had something to do with that.” Sometimes when you're in private practice, they call you up at twelve o'clock at night saying, “I just remembered. It's because I was trying to tell my brother I was keeping him from being poisoned, that I felt being poisoned.”

“Thank you. Thank you very much.”

Well, there's your Sec Check, Prepcheck rundown. I tried to give you some idea of – rather than an example of doing it and so forth – I'm trying to give you the feel of it – trying to show you where to push, the pressure to put on the thing, and so on. And canned lists of predetermined overts of one kind or another are of tremendous use. Don't minimize their use,

because they scrape up areas that the pc is trying desperately to avoid. And because they are a generally formalized – formulized thing that contain all that particular type of thing that would be considered reprehensible in this lifetime, then they scare up an awful lot of material and lay it in your lap and generally will come into some collision course with what the pc is trying to suppress.

You get one of these things done, get this thing done very well; you go back; you put your rudiments in; all of a sudden – with a Prepcheck, see, you prepcheck your rudiments in now – you'll find out they go in quite easily. That pc is very happy about the whole thing and they will stay in. Now you can move over into a Routine 3-type process and you are all set.

But unless you get up some of that stuff, you'll find out the pc just kind of keeps spinning, and he gets up and he falls flat on his face, and he gets up and he falls flat on his face, and so on.

Now, if you've gone over a lot of these things, your case repair, your checkout and so forth is to go over the same list of What questions. I must tell you this.

When you check up to find out if some auditor knew his business on a canned Prepcheck, look over the What questions. Do not look over the Zero A's. That's quite important. The Instructor or you or something, when you're trying to check up to find out whether or not the auditor cleared this up, *don't* look over the Zero A's, look over *only* the Whats. Check up only the Whats in Prepchecking. Never check – when you – just like when you're checking somebody's rudiments – never check somebody's Zero A's. Why? Because the process of Prepchecking increases the person's responsibility.

So if you checked Form 3 again, the questions consisting of Form 3, of course, there are many of them going to be alive, because they came alive because of the improved responsibility of a pc.

Well, why were you prepchecking the pc, see? To improve his responsibility. But what won't come alive are the What questions you've nulled. So you always check the What questions.

And if you find one of those out, why, really start chewing on the auditor. If he's gone on and left the What question live, he has sinned, because the pc's returning responsibility does not come up and revivify that What question. Do you follow that? And that's what you check. That's the only way you check out an auditor's ability to Prepcheck – is check his What questions, never his Zero A's – and you'll find out this will work rather like a dream.

If you checked his Zero A's, the increased responsibility of the pc will show them to be alive, when actually at the time he went over them, they were quite flat. And that's how you keep from hanging somebody falsely.

Now you check somebody's rudiments, of course, after they have had a whale of a session and if the rudiments are checked for the session, they are just in – for that session they just now had – the scale of improvement and increased responsibility of the pc is more or less on a plane, and you'll find out those things will be in. They'll be in for that session if they're checked right after that session.

If you want to have some fun sometime, start – and get really mad at early auditors, check the (quote) rudiments (unquote) or absence of them of very early auditors. Because, of course, the gain of the pc in the interim knocks the action and attitude and responsibility of the earlier sessions out of gear. It won't happen for the session we've just had this last day or so.

But you ask him if he had a missed withhold. He's liable to make a total mistake. He's liable to tell you yes, he had a missed withhold from that auditor. Whereas at the actual fact, the actual time he was being audited, he didn't consider it a withhold and he didn't consider it an overt, but he does now. you see the trickiness involved in all this. Okay?

*Audience: Yes.*

But you can develop a lot of speed with this, and you can get a tremendous number of results with this. you can make people really shine. These results am just as you see, that a What question remains null, these gains stay stable with the pc. It takes quite a bit to knock out a Prepcheck gain.

So anyway, there is how you Prepcheck and Sec Check, and I hope you'll be able to make use of it.

We're overtime again.

Thank you very much. Good night.