PREPCHECKING, ZERO QUESTION

A lecture given on
21 March 1962

Vernal Equinox, Earth Colony of the Marcab Confederacy, Space Command, Planet 5. Let's be factual; stop this nonsense. Year of the Fox. Time tracks and time tracks.

Okay. 21 March – for those earthlings that don't understand – AD 12.

All right. I'm going to give you a talk right now on the subject of an experimental method of establishing Zero questions in Prepchecking.

The first value of this particular method is that it relieves you from a lot of fish-around, at the beginning of a case and it also removes you out of those zones and areas which you're liable to be in, which the pc doesn't consider overts but which you do.

In other words, it takes you out of the zones of Sec Checking which, although you think they should be getting someplace, aren't really getting anyplace and the pc isn't really getting any big gains, and so forth.

In other words, if – you can prepcheck, you understand, on standard social aberrations that you consider social aberrations that the pc doesn't, and get a lot of withholds on this subject, which doesn't do the pc any good at all. Do you understand?

Audience: Yes.

Now, you are entitled to a tremendous amount of win and a tremendous amount of gain in any Prepcheck session. And I ask you first and foremost to put your sights up on the subject of what ought to happen to a pc in any one Prepcheck session.

Now, true enough, under training your sessions go two hours. In actual, professional practice they are much more likely to go five-and-a-half or thereabouts. Now on a five-hour-and-a-half session, on a Prepcheck, if you don't wind up with a tremendous resurgence on the part of the pc by reason of Prepchecking and so forth, you just don't know your business.

Now, of course, you can't always win. Don't expect to win always. But what do I mean by a win? You understand the pc better. You know more about the mind. This is from the auditor's point of view.

The pc has made some part of his goals and has made some progress. Now, that's your minimal expectancy, and if you've made that inspect – expectancy, fine, dandy. Call it a win.

The pc got some cognitions and knows more about himself and knows more about life and is better in-session. Yeah, that's a nice win. That's nice. The pc's gotten over something which he's always had around. That's a little bit phenomenal. That's a big-win-type thing. You don't expect those every session.

But you expect one of these minimal wins, certainly, every session. And it ought to look pretty good. And you – after a week's prepchecking of five hours and a half a day on a pc, you ought to be sitting there looking at almost a different being. You know, this pc should look different to you.

I can generally prepcheck up to changing the color of their eyes in a five-and-a-half-hour session – generally.

But how do you know whether a Prepcheck session is running The tone arm moves. Just like any other process, Ollie. Just like any other process. If the tone arm, it then move, you makes progress. Ya. And if she don't move – I don't care how juicy the quality is; I don't care how marvelous this would sound from the pen of Lawrence or how forbidden and banned it would be in Boston – you're not making any progress.

Just as in any activity, the movement of the tone arm gives you the degree of change on the pc.

Now, you saw a tone arm moving last night in a demonstration session on the subject of 3D Criss Cross. And you saw that tone arm flicking about, but only going from about 2.8 to about 3.25 or something like that. There was an out of – between-session-break rise to 4.0, but that didn't have anything to do with the processing. See? And that was only about a quarter of a division.

And you saw the old man choke it down to a point where he could get one read, that there weren't any more, and you saw him get out of there, man, like hurry, and say, "That was the end of the list. And now we're going to null this list."

And the pc's still saying, "But there are some more items."

And then the old man says, "That's good. I know there are. Thank you very much. *Ha-ha.* Well, you can give me those in due course."

All this a part of understanding, "We're going on and null this list," crash! Why?

Pc's giving you a list that only moves that much, you're not on a very hot list. Now, the next list along this line is going to be hotter. The oppterms are maybe going to be hotter, and so forth. But that list wasn't hot. Did you see that? Yeah.

And you saw me bail out of there, man. I'll actually leave questions unflat if in the process of a – four, five hours or something like that we've got no TA motion on the pc. It isn't moving. He's given us data. It isn't moving. Get out of there. Skip it. Don't argue with yourself that you've restimulated anything. You couldn't have; no TA motion. See? See how simple that is?

And when you're prepchecking, if you don't get a – well, let's take the minimum amount – a half a division, from 3.0 to 3.5 to 3.0 type of swing, back and forth, half a division swing . . . Well, I'd say that would be absolute minimum that you would tolerate in a Prepcheck session.

You couldn't be mining anything very hot if you weren't getting a tone arm motion – couldn't be. That's no excuse to go off and leave it because it's only moving a quarter of a dial. But after you've been at it for two hours and it has only moved a quarter of a division on the dial, *ah-oh,* come off of it. We must be mining asphalt from a solid bank of asphalt which has nothing to do with anything the pc ever found out about. That's for sure.

The amount of case progress is directly proportional to the amount of tone arm motion.

Now, a two-division motion in the course of a two-hour session – that's a lot of motion: 3.5 to 4.5 to 4.0 to 3.0 to 5.0 to 4.0 – oh, my God. Wow! See? We're mining with both hands all day and all night, you see; up to our necks in the roaring stream, you see. Breakers busting all around us, you know. Four – comes in at 4.0 – goes down to 3.75 during the beginning rudiments, goes to 3.9, goes to 3.8, goes to 4.0, goes to 3.8, goes to 3.9, goes to 3.75, goes to 3.9, and this goes on for two hours. Well, that doesn't have anything to do with us. Well, does it? Couldn't have.

Pc isn't getting anything off that has anything to do with his case. He couldn't because it's not changing any mass.

Now, there isn't any interval of time specified for which you ought to look for this motion because sometimes it goes on like this for an hour and then all of a sudden you start to get tone arm motion. Don't you see? Well, that's fine. Well, I'd say if you went on for the whole session and there was no tone arm motion – there at the end of the session – I mean the next time you picked this thing up, you would – ah, I don't know – I'd do something else.

You couldn't have restimulated the case. That's for sure. It's on any – no line that he has anything to do with.

You see, this – all comes under the heading – this is brand-new; this is brand-new. This is auditing . . . This is a brand-new way to audit: auditing by the Auditor's Code. You run a process only so long as it produces change and no longer.

Therefore, you're guilty of running a process which is producing no change and you shouldn't do that. Well, that's how you judge it. That's how you know whether it is going or not going as the case may be.

So, is there any remedy? Because the amount of tone arm motion in Prepchecking is directly proportional to the auditor hitting the chain the pc is trying to avoid. Isn't that interesting

So if the amount of tone arm motion is directly proportional to what the pc is trying to avoid, if the auditor hasn't got any directional bearings – assistance toward what the pc is trying to avoid, they'll both sit there and avoid, won't they?

And then we find the auditor walking around in this little duck pond I was talking about. You know? Oh, he really found something – he saw a goldfish.

Therefore, many methods of assessment could be expected. Many methods of assessment could be expected to be developed which would orient what Prepcheck question to ask and what Prepcheck question not to ask. And the one which I'm giving you is just one of these methods.

You've got the scale already. It's the Secondary Prehav Scale for overts. Overts; Secondary Prehav Scale. I'll edit it and publish it again but it's right now available. It exists. You've probably got it. Scale for overts.

And what you do is take your ballpoint in hand and run a standard Prehav-type assessment on that Secondary Scale. You do an Assessment by Elimination on that Secondary Scale. And you'll find you're left there with one that is ticking faintly or banging largely. Very simple, hm? All right. Well, you've got that item now.

Now, the funny part of it is that you . . . This is not necessarily the way this thing goes together, but I'll just give you a rundown on it. you do a Dynamic Assessment now on the pc. That gives you a terminal of sorts.

Now, you take that overt and that terminal and combine them into a Zero question and it's hot the whole way. Won't make any sense to you. For a while it might not make any sense at all to the pc, but that's why. See? That's what the pc is trying to avoid. It's "dusting." The overt – let's be corny about it – the overt we find is dusting and the Dynamic Assessment that we do on the thing; we get fences. Sixth dynamic, and it falls out to be fences. "Dusting fences." And I guarantee that the pc will consider that about the most awful overt he can do. why we care not. But every time he's dusted a fence, he's practically plowed himself in and he's always dusting fences.

Now, what this has got to do with the price of overts – Lord knows what this goes back to! But it'll steer into some wild concatenation of events of some kind or another that

will be quite aberrative and will give you quite a lot of tone arm motion. Well, you'll find out he dusted a fence day before yesterday, you see. you run this. This is the actual one. You've still got to get this What question, see? "Have you ever dusted any fences?" you know. That's your Zero.

Now, you've fished around and found an actual fence, see, and so forth. Your What question can almost repeat the Zero questions when this goes, but you didn't put it down until you found the actual incident. It's "What about dusting small fences?" is your What question. Now, you got the idea? You didn't put that down till you actually found him dusting a fence. It was day before yesterday and he did dust a fence, you know?

And you'll find that tone arm will rock around, and it looks like Big Ben – round and round, man. Quite amazing. Well, you pan that thing out, it's liable to go backtrack on you. So what?

The reason I redesigned the Withhold System with "Appear" in it was so that it would run a backtrack incident if you ran into it. I didn't want you to be running the backtrack incidents when you might stick the pc in them, but this Appear, particularly if you also run it as Not Appear, alternately . . . You know, you go When, All, Appear, Who, When, All, *Didn't* Appear, Who, see. It'll knock out engrams. It'll blast them out of existence. So that's fine. you won't get the pc stuck anyplace on the track. And you'll find the pc will scoot all around, and it sounds pretty wacky.

Now, that it can be – this has a liability – that it can be wacky, will sometimes wind you up in some kind of a situation where you've done a bad assessment. That has happened, you see. A poor Prehav Assessment and poor Prehavs Assessment are more frequent than you would ordinarily suspect. They're quite frequent. They're accidentals.

Because a Prehav Assessment is a very precisely done action and lately we haven't been doing very many of them, and you don't get much practice in doing one. And of course the way you do this is just to read the items over to the pc. He just sits there, and you don't put the rudiments in halfway down the list. you don't run Havingness halfway down the list. (God, what I've seen lately on some of these cases.) You don't do anything. If the pc fell out of the chair and snored, you'd still go on doing it because it'll still register on the meter oddly enough. You're not auditing a body; you're auditing a thetan.

All right. You go right on down the thing, and you just read each item once. *Pow! pow! pow! pow! pow!* And you don't read the item: Helped. Controlled. No, it's *Controlled,* then look at your E-Meter a minute or so later, and you don't do it that way. you don't look at the pc at all.

You just do, *"Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark."* It only – if that thing isn't reacting, you see, it isn't reacting. And you're going to be able to tell that in a quarter of a

second, so the devil with it. It – actually, saying *"and"* between them is too long! "Helped *and* controlled." That's too long to wait between those things.

You just go right down; you read the whole list, *"Bark, bark, bark."* one each. And you mark in every one that it looked like it reacted. Instantaneous reaction. You mark that in. put a mark after it. you only mark those that reacted. You leave the rest of them out and then you go down those you marked only. And you only mark those that *now* react. And then you go over the remaining ones. There's only maybe three reacted and you go over those three.

Sometimes you're left with two, and one reacts and then the other one reacts and it takes a moment or two reading one and then reading the other and so on and you're left with it. And then you check nothing; you don't do another thing And that is why you can get a lousy mess, because sometimes you check it and become unsure of it or you don't know or your last two readings were bad or something and you start quivering And the only reason you ever do a bad Prehav Assessment is because you quiver and doubt somewhere along the line. you have to do those assessments boldly, brashly and come what may. And maybe the pc got some incidental reads on something else. He thought of something else and you got a read and that made it look like one of them read, don't you see.

Well, that's all right; you'll get it by elimination anyway. And you usually are down to two and you have to read one against the other and you could see that they're both reacting. There's not much question in your mind. And one of them drops out and leaves the last one and you only read it once. Well, you can read it, maybe, two more times and see if it reacts, but it wouldn't matter because if it stopped *reacting* on those two more times, doesn't mean you've got it wrong.

The primary cause of a bad Prehav Assessment is the auditor's doubt of what he's seeing on the meter; the lack of boldness and brashness.

This is one of those slap-happy, go-to-hell, flat-out sort of actions. You know, this one you do. There's nothing to one. But you start hunting around and being a little bit doubtful and trying to keep the pc awake while you're doing it and being superchecking and supercareful about the whole thing, and you wind up in the soup every time. The pc kind of goes out of session.

It's a remarkable thing how a pc will stay in-session at a brisk, machine gun, Prehav Assessment. You see, auditors that get all kinds of things and the pc will all of a sudden pop up and say, "You know, I'm still thinking about 'startle.'"

And the auditor – he's liable to do something about it or something like that. The auditor is liable to say, "Well, thank you," and go on with the assessment. Well, that's perfectly all right. I don't usually say – I just say, "Shut up!" He isn't supposed to be talking "What you talking for? Now, let's see, where were we?"

But he only starts to help you if you look helpless. And if you want to get an auditor that gets pcs wildly out of session, why, always train the auditor to believe that the pc should help him, and then of course, the auditor will look helpless. You know. That auditor doesn't even have to exist in the level of Help as far as operating helpfully or something of this sort. If an auditor just operated briskly and interestedly, you'll find out the rudiments will stay in. You can almost take Help out of the soup.

Pc says, "Let me see. I don't know. Let me see. What date . . . ?"

"Oh, come off of it. What date is it?"

You don't help him. But tell him to give you what date it is, you know.

"Well, let's see if you can find out what date that is. Let's see." Let's help him out and so forth, of course. And then this immediately is liable to go into being helpless, you know? Like, "Well, let's see, now if you think about it there I'll read on the meter here, and you think about it while I read on the meter and then we'll find out, and so forth, *da-da-da. You* help me out here." I never act helpless when I'm auditing a pc. Because he's the one that wants the help – I don't.

And there's where Prehav Assessments go completely by the boards – is the auditor acts unsure. And that's actually the only reason Prehav Assessments ever turn up as very wrong. It's just the auditor's monkey, you know, and he hasn't got much practice in doing it.

Well, you can always do a Prehav Assessment on somebody. See you can always practice this thing Now, you do this secondary overt list. you do that as you would do any other Prehav Scale. But you have to do it briskly, surely, snappily, on-the-bally. Then the pc sits there and he doesn't go out of session. He knows. Yes, that's right. *Bang! You* got it, see? That's the way you handle it.

But you start going, "Well, let's see, now. Is it kill? *Blah-blah-blah, reow, reow.* How's your havingness?"

You see, you're not assessing the pc's analytical mind anyhow. That's why you tell him to shut up and you get along much better. You're not assessing him analytically. You're assessing him reactively and, of course, he hasn't any control over the reactive mind or he wouldn't have one. So the more monkey business occurs around there, why, the more analytical mind gets dragged into the setup, you see, and the further out that assessment can go.

Well, that's – that would be one of the reasons it failed, and the other one would be a bad Dynamic Assessment or going too esoteric on the thing. The way you do Dynamic Assessment, of course, just read the dynamics to the person and see what – which one changes

the needle pattern. If you got two, put down two, and assess two items. Then assess the two items one against each other.

All right. So you get second dynamic. Dandy. "What would represent the second dynamic to you?" And he gives you a few items, and you put those down. Well, assess them. Simple.

"What represents the second dynamic to me? Oh, coffins."

"Good." That's a very – that would be an almost usual response.

If that's really a nutty dynamic, the guy will give you something that hasn't anything to do with it, every time.

"Give me something on the sixth dynamic."

"Girls."

A person who assesses out on the first dynamic – oh, boy, that really leaves you in the soup. "What represents the first dynamic?"

"Me."

Well, you can always say immediately afterwards, "Well, who are you?"

And put down what he says. you can – it almost gets to be a 3D Criss Cross action if you let it go too far. But get something in that zone.

Now, you say, "All right.. ." You don't say, "How do you feel about – ?" *ever,* on these types of assessments. You just say the item. It's like in flows, assessing flows.

Somebody who took forever and ever and ever here – I won't mention any names – to get an item on a flows assessment. Well, the flows assessment was wrong Must have been. Doesn't take you forever to get an item on a flows assessment. Pc doesn't have any difficulty giving you items for a flows

assessment, for heaven's sakes – couldn't have. Because if you got the right flow, it's all on automatic.

"Who or what would enforce inflow?" See?

"Cheese, cats, kings, coal heavers, *da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da-da, da-da. Whada – what. I* don't know what's talking – something. *Da-da-da-da-da-da."*

Tone arm flies around and you say, "Is that all?"

"Well, *da-da-da-da-da."*

"All right. Is that it?"

"Da-da."

"Any more?"

"La-da-da."

"All right. That's fine. All right. Now, let's differentiate this list."

You've got it. That's the easiest one in the world to do if you got it right. But if you were to say to somebody, "Now, how do you feel about uh – um – ," let's see, it says here "enforcing inflow on self." "And how do you feel about enforcing inflow on self?" Latent read. "Well, we got *that* one."

I mean, you could get just crazy, you know.

You just say, "Enforce inflow on self," you know? And read it, you know? *Bang,* the next one. *Bang, bang.* Just like Prehav Assessment. And the more rapidly you do it, the more accurate it is. And the more competent you sound and look, the more accurate it is. And the more helpless and stupid you look about it, the more stupid and inaccurate the thing is going to be. Works the same way in 3D Criss Cross.

You want to get a wrong item? Take four days to do it. Every time. I mean, it will be off somehow. The pc's out of session. You're boxing around somehow. It just means the auditor doesn't sound positive. That's all. Long time to get the item? Incorrect Prehav Assessment? Incorrect Dynamic Assessment? Auditor doesn't sound like he knows what he's doing. Period. To that pc he doesn't sound like he knows what he's doing.

That's why you find me punching you along to speed you up, because sometimes you don't notice that you have ceased to look helpless. You see? And you speed up, and you all of a sudden look calm, and you get it done, and you feel competent, and that makes you competent, you see. And so I just keep booting you in that direction, without giving you much mechanics about it.

I don't keep saying to you, "Look competent." Because, I tell you, that is susceptible to many interpretations. But you have to be competent in order to be fast. So you can just stress speed, and you'll eventually get an appearance of competence.

So the faster you do one of these things, the more accurate it is. Now, it takes about twenty minutes to do the Auxiliary Pre-Have Scale all the way down the line and find the item and nail it on the button, not moving very fast, but not moving slowly either. That is a sort of an easy action. I mean, it still looks competent at that. It is not much of a rush. It can be done much faster than that. But if it's done any slower than that, you're in trouble.

You find yourself taking forty-five minutes to do an Auxiliary Pre-Have, *Oh-oh-oh-oh-oh. Mm-mm-mm-mm.* Probably is incorrect. Same way with the Dynamic Assessments. Same way with this Secondary proposition.

Now, the bark-bark-bark system of assessment is sometimes very hard to do through a scratchy needle. The needle is going *bzzzzt-n-bzzzzzt-nbzzzzzt-n-bzzzzzt,* and the pc's thinking random thoughts, and the flow terminal that you haven't found is still going off and is like a sparkler, and so forth. Dirty needle proposition, you know, and so on. And reading through that is very, very hard to do sometimes. But you'll find out that a Dynamic Assessment can still be done through it because it doesn't go *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz* when you hit the item. It goes *blhuth.*   And you get a Prehav Assessment through a dirty needle. Ah, that's rough, that's all. You're looking for the change of needle pattern; that's all. You're looking for the change, whatever changed it.

If the item didn't change it, it hasn't got any charge on it. It's obvious. Pc is always reading at 1,000 ohms, and there it is. He's reading at 1,000 ohms and something makes him read all of a sudden at 1,500 ohms for an instant.

Well, it doesn't matter if the reading of 1,000 ohms is *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz bzzz-bzzzt.* At the moment it reads 1,500 ohms, it'll be *thillllop.* And it'll go on saying *bzzz-bzzz-bzzz-bzzz* again. So when you're doing these assessments, just make up your mind that's the way the needle reads and stop worrying about it and swearing at the pc and yourself because it's a dirty needle. Just say, "Well, that's the way his needle looks," and read it occasionally.

You saw a needle pattern last night. Every time the auditor spoke, you got a one to two division fall on the first session. On the first session it occurred on the first time the auditor spoke. And on the second session it occurred on the second time the auditor spoke, which then had nothing whatsoever to do with the assessment. So you just avoided them, ignored them.

You had to get something else than that before you had a read. It – actually, it didn't require any judgment. It's much less difficult than you would have imagined because after all you were reading the item three times. And if any one of the three had fell, you left it in and if you weren't sure you left it in – so what judgment was involved?

Your only – the only time you took it out is when you were sure it wasn't reacting. And you kind of occasionally made sure that it wasn't reacting by asking it a couple of more times.

Well, you don't have a chance to do that in a Dynamic Assessment or a Prehav Assessment. There's no verification, see, beyond the fact that you're going to cover the item again if it fell, so you see? So the more rapidly you do it, why, the less chance the pc has to dream up something between reads. That's about what this amounts to.

It's something like soldiers getting across an open field. The slower you move across, the more likely you are to get shot. And of course, the optimum way of getting across the field is to get across in instant time. And so that would be the ideal or optimum speed at which to do a Prehav Assessment.

See, the faster it's done, the less trouble. You know, that pervades all of auditing. You recognize that. The faster it's done, why, the less difficulty – the less MEST universe difficulty you get into while it is being done. See? So that is very true of a 3D Criss Cross item. If it takes you three days, your neck is way out, man.

How many present time problems can this pc get in three days? How much trouble can he get into with his girlfriend in three days, see? How many arguments can he get into in three days? Oh, wow!

Get it in one day – he didn't get a chance to get into any arguments at all, see, from the beginning to the end of the item. He didn't have a chance to get into a fight with anybody, to have a – meet a bill collector, to get sued, to pick up a missed withhold, to pick up a missed withhold. He didn't have a chance to do anything, see, except the way that he was.

See, so that's the optimum period in which to get an item. Well, the optimum period in which to get a – the absolute optimum in which to get a Prehav or a Secondary Overt Scale item, of course, is in zero seconds. Because this assessment can be interfered with by the strains and vagaries of the fellow's mind during a session. See, it can be interfered with to this degree.

Because if it took you thirty minutes to do the thing, he's got time to pick up some invalidations. He's got time to think some thoughts. He's got time to think his usual critical thoughts of you, the auditor, see. And if you did it in fifteen minutes, he's got only *half* the time allowed to do this. see what I mean?

Now, therefore, you just put the throttle on the floorboard and go through that one. And you go real quick, and the quicker you go, of course, the more accurate it is. That's – it's no kidding I mean, you can frankly start with a clean needle, if you did it in an hour and a half – let's do an Auxiliary Pre-Have Assessment in an hour and a half. You can start at the beginning of the session – I mean start at the beginning of the assessment with a perfectly clean needle, and wind up with a very dirty one if it took you an hour and a half.

The pc has just accumulated and – *nyah* and *nyah.* See, you're auditing the pc plus the MEST universe. And of course, the less time there is in it, the less MEST universe gets into the session.

So your accuracy has everything to do with your speed where it comes to this. And the only place you get into trouble working this system in Prepchecking is making a *bad* assessment – completely unapplicable, in some way or another.

So therefore, we lay down the rule that if you can't find, after you've done an aux – a Secondary – a Prehav Scale Overt Assessment – that little section there on the Secondary Scale that's devoted to overts – after you've done that, and let's say, do a Dynamic Assessment, and after you've done that, and these two things add up, you put it down as a test

Zero question and the pc can find no overt of any kind whatsoever – why, scrap the lot, get your rudiments in and do it again. That's for you, because the probability is your assessment is way out. But that's after you honestly tried and you can't get responses on the needle for any overts in that direction. Because if he's got overts on the subject, he's going to get needle responses when you ask for them.

In other words, if you wind up with one of these and you've got a dead needle – there's nothing happening and he can't give you anything about it and he doesn't understand it and he can't get anywhere near it and all that sort of thing – well, scrub it. Get the rudiments in and do it again. That's your best answer. Do both of them again. Don't use either one of them. And then you're liable to land straight up.

If you're doing a 3D Criss Cross list on flows and it just doesn't go all *brrrrr-brrrrrr-boom-bang-thud,* and there's your list – oh man, you didn't get the right flow; that's all. I mean, there's no answering to that. I mean if it didn't just – you know, pc saying, "I wonder what's giving you these items?" – you know, that kind of action. It's not going well. It's not going easily. You're having a struggle to get on with it and it's taking quite a while and all that sort of thing You just must have had a bad flows assessment.

Well, similarly, you just have a bad overt scale assessment and maybe a bad Dynamic Assessment in order to make this thing go wrong. But expect that it will, occasionally. Don't worry about it if it does.

Don't keep arguing at the pc for an hour and a half to find the overt when you're not even getting a knock on the needle. You found out "strangling," "strangling God." And the pc can't remember any time when he ever strangled God and you get no fall on the needle on the subject, I think that you'd better leave it and get another assessment.

Now, this is as experimental as it goes. It's mainly experimental because you haven't done it yet. And I don't . . .

There are probably many systems which would turn up types of withholds, but this is a particularly promising one which is pretty well set on the rock of experience. And if you can do the accuracy of it all, why, you can probably arrive with a type of overts that are really overts.

You might find out that "injuring cars"... You don't consider this as particular – you've been at it your whole life, and it's never done anything to you. And you'll find out the reason the pc is always clearing his throat – *rrrrrrm-rrrrrrm-rrrrrrm-rrrrrrm...* All of a sudden he has a hell of a cognition, *"Rrrrrrm.* That's a car, you know! Heh – *Zoooom.* Yeah. I didn't think I was getting into that when I took that hammer to that fan blade. See, adjusting the fan, you see, and I was adjusting the . . ." It's fantastic overts. It's a whole channel of overts. You

don't consider them overts. He does. If he considers them overts, you'll get TA motion. If he doesn't consider them overts, you won't. And that is all there is to that.

The pc very often runs along like this, and he says, "Oh, well, yes. Yes, I . . ." This girl says, "Oh, I committed adultery with my first husband, second husband seven times, and so forth, and the third husband four times, and so forth. And uh. . . well, as a matter of fact, I was a prostitute down on the San Francisco docks for a little while between marriages, and so forth. And uh – let's see now. And uh – the specific overts you're looking for there is actually getting a man in an alley while I was pretending to be a frail girl, hitting him over the head with a blackjack and taking all the money out of his pockets. And then the police came along and picked him up and took him to the hospital. That's the one you want." you go All – When, All, Who.

And you take that specific overt and you work that thing over, and you say, "Boy, I'm really getting someplace," you know, and that tone arm has just been sitting here at 3.6.

And you say, "Have you told me any half-truths? Untruths? Tried to damage anyone?"

"No." There isn't any motion to that. It's 3.6. It's moved down here to 3.4, and it's gone to 3.6, and it's gone to 3.4, it's gone to 3.6, it's gone to 3. . . I don't care what good material it is for books. It's not doing a thing for the case. Do you see that? You'll get fooled this way, because every once in a while you'll buy that, and you'll say, "Boy, we're really cooking with gas," you know? You're not. Tone arm tells you so.

And then you get onto this chain – this chain: "Well, I shut off the water on the hot water tap and I kept on turning it off and the handle came off." One dial drop; one division tone arm change.

And you say – you're liable to say, "Well, that's so ordinary and so stupid that we don't even work that over. It's not an overt, you know. Let's pick up something else."

No, no. you got a nice What question, you see and you say, "Well, *what about* turning off hot water taps so they break?" That's what it added up to.

He's got a whole chain of it. He's been at it ever since he was two.

Find out he's had trouble with his kidneys and had trouble with his liver and had trouble. . . And it's a real series of overts. And if that's the case, then your tone arm is going to be moving, man. It's going to be flying It's going to be moving, moving, moving, moving – back and forth, back and forth. That's your only test.

There'll probably be other systems developed as you come along the line. It all depends on what turns up, but I think we'd better give this one a whirl, and you better direct them in. And, for my sake, and just to save my disposition – you have an interest in keeping my disposition mild and calm, the way it always is – and just to save – just to save my

disposition, why, please stop getting the – your big toe wet in a duck pond on Prepchecking. Let's find something the pc really considers an overt, and let's really plow on down the line on that and that, you will find, is what really moves the tone arm. And if you don't find a real tone arm . . .

Now, I'll give you this. That for two, three, four sessions, learning a case and stumbling around on a case, and so forth, you may not get much tone arm motion, you know, and so forth and you can't really connect with anything. You don't quite know what makes this case tick. And all of a sudden, swing in on it, and you all of a sudden find it and it goes like an express train.

But if you didn't learn anything from – enough about the pc to finally make it go like an express train, it becomes unforgivable. Okay?

Audience: Yes. Okay.

All right. Well, I wish you luck with this particular one, and I would invite your attention to the fact that it's an actual overt before you write the What. And it is what moves the tone arm not what you consider antisocial or what you're particularly trying to cure in the human race that makes it an overt to the pc. Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you. Good night.