

PREP CHECKING DATA  
WHEN TO DO A WHAT

Prepchecking can be defeated by failing to ask a what question at the proper time.

If you ask the what question when a pc gives you a vague generality, you will find yourself doing a "shallow draft" prepcheck that never gets any meat.

When you obtain a generality early on after the Zero question, you make it a Zero A.

You never ask a what question until you have managed to get a single specific overt.

Only when the pc has been steered into stating an actual overt, do you ask the what question and write it down.

And when the pc gives you a specific overt, you frame the what question so as to take in the whole possible chain of similar overts. A chain is a repetition of similar acts.

Example:

Wrong: Pc says, "I used to disconcert my mother." Auditor says and writes down, "What about disconcerting your mother?" as his What question. Of course the prepchecking goes lightly nowhere.

Right: Pc says he used to disconcert his mother. Auditor steers pc into a specific time. Pc finally says, "I jumped out on her and startled her one time and she dropped a tray of glasses."

Now the auditor has a specific overt. The chain will be startling his mother. The What question, then, which is written down and asked is, "What about startling your mother?" and the first incident the pc gave is worked over. If the needle doesn't fall when this What is asked, then the auditor asks for an earlier time he startled his mother. This What question is worked on different startlings of mother and only on startlings of mother until the needle is cleaned on that What question.

Then one asks the Zero A, "Have you ever disconcerted your mother?" The needle reacts. The auditor fishes around for a specific other incident. Finally gets, "I used to lie to her." Now it would be an awful good to give the What question on this one, as the pc has given no specific incident. But the needle reacted, so the auditor writes a Zero B, "Have you ever lied to your mother?" and then nags away at the pc until a specific time is recovered: "I told her I was going out with boys when in actuality, I dated a girl she hated." Now write the What question: "What about lying to your mother about dating girls?" and work over that one time the pc gave with the When All etc. If the needle reacts on the What question after a couple times over the When All etc., ask for an earlier time. Get another specific incident, work it over.

Test the What question, work over exact withholds and find more incidents earlier until that What question is clean on the needle. Then ask the Zero B. If it's clean write nul after it. If not find a new What on that subject as above.

When the Zero B is clean, ask the Zero A. If that's clean, write nul after it. If not, find a new chain. And that's the way it goes.

Working only generalities and never specific incidents wrecks all value of prepchecking and upsets the pc with missed withholds.

If the pc does come up with a withhold not on the chain (example: while doing above what, pc says, "I also lied to my father") write notation ("Lied to father") on margin for later reference and leave it alone. Don't pursue it. Work only one chain at a time.

Q and A is a serious thing in Prepchecking.

---

Moving Tone Arm

If you fail to get tone arm action while working a chain of overts on a pc (less than 25 division per 20 minutes) you are working a profitless chain. Clean it up a bit and leave it. Your Zero A is probably quite wrong. Be sure and ask, "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and clean it before so abandoning a chain.

You want TA motion in Prepchecking. Find Zero and Zero A questions that do move the TA.

It is a violation of the Auditor's Code to continue to audit processes that do not produce change. Or to stop processes that do produce change. This applies to chains

and subjects selected for Prepchecking.

Social Mores

The criteria of what is a hot withhold depends utterly on the pc's idea of What Is An Overt. It does not depend on what the auditor thinks an overt is.

The pc is stuck in various valences in the Goals Problems Mass. Each has its own Social Mores. They may not agree with or apply to current life morality at all. This can cause trouble in prepchecking.

Example: Pc is stuck in the valence of a Temple Priestess. Auditor is a bit fuddy on being a school principal. Auditor keeps looking for sexual misconduct with small boys. It isn't on pc's case. Result, no TA action. Finally almost by accident, knowing nothing about the pc's G.P.M. yet, the auditor disgustedly asks, "Have you ever failed to seduce anybody?" and bang. That's a Zero A to end all Zero A's and the pc gives up "overt" after "overt", failed to seduce her husband's friend, her sister's boy friend, her kindergarten teacher, etc. etc. etc., with two divisions of TA motion.

"Have you ever tried to cure anyone?" is a fine Zero question for all killer types.

Prepchecking is at its best after one knows some G.P.M. items from doing 3D Criss Cross.

What are the mores of a Temple Priestess and how has the pc violated them in this life?

Prepchecking is wonderful at any time but it really soars when one knows some of the pc's terminals.

This lifetime hasn't added anything to the G.P.M. It's just keyed it in. We live in quiet times.

Don't forget "Guilty"

A fine Zero question is "making others guilty".

"Have you ever tried to make anyone guilty?" Pc says Policemen, he guesses. Needle reacts. Auditor writes Zero A, "Have you ever tried to make a policeman guilty?" He fishes for an actual incident, finds the pc bawled out a traffic officer, writes the What, "What about bawling out cops?" and we're away.

Add Appear

In the Withhold system, add "Appear, Not Appear" after All.

The question sequence becomes for any one incident:

- When?
- All?
- Appear?
- Who?

The next time around use "Not Appear"

- When?
- All?
- Not Appear?
- Who?

The phrasing of this is, "What appeared there?" or some such wording. And "What failed to appear?" for the next round.

This injects "Afraid to find out" into Prepchecking with great profit and knocks the Not-Is off the withhold.

This will run a whole track incident.

Whole Track

If the pc goes back of this lifetime, let him or her go back. Now that Appear is part of the Withhold System, it's unlikely the pc will hang up and get stuck. But the golden rule of Prepchecking is to always work specific incidents, work them one at a time, and go to an earlier incident if an incident doesn't clear easily on the needle.

Two times through When, All, Appear, Who should free locks, ten times through should clean any engram.

If the chain you're working isn't moving the TA, you're up to your neck in red herrings. Clean "Have I missed a withhold on you?" and abandon it.

---

#### Unknown Pins Chains

There is always an unknown-to-the-pc incident or piece of incident at the bottom of every chain. Only an unknown incident can make a chain of incidents react on the needle.

You will always find that a chain will be sticky until the unknown incident or piece of incident at the bottom of every chain. When you've got it fully revealed, the chain will go nul. The chain will not go nul until its basic is reached. It can be this lifetime or a former life. But it sure is unknown to the pc. That's "Basic on a Chain".

---

#### Recurring Withholds

The pc that gives the same withhold over and over to the same or different auditors, has an unknown incident underlying it. All is not revealed on that Chain.

---

#### Missed Withholds

If you ask a pc if another auditor has missed a withhold on him or her and find one, you have a profitable chain to work in many cases.

---

#### Rudiments in Prepchecking

When you are running a chain and in the next session you find rudiments out and use the form of withhold question, the pc throws the session into a new chain and you will find yourself unable to get back to yesterday's session.

This utterly defeats Prepchecking. Do not let it happen. In a Prepcheck session, when getting rudiments in, avoid any suggestion of withhold questions. Use only processes that avoid O/W entirely. See early Model Sessions.

Example: Pc has Present Time Problem. It won't resolve with two way comm. Don't ask for withholds about it or you'll ruin your control of what's to be Prepchecked. Use Responsibility or Unknown on the problem. For Room use Havingness. For Auditor use "Who would I have to be to audit you?"

Exception: In a Prepcheck Session Ruds ask for Withholds since last session. Ask this pointedly. "Since the last session, have you done anything you are withholding from me?" If you get a needle reaction, ask the same question again, very stressed. Buy only an exact answer to that question.

If you use any version of O/W in the rudiments in a Prepcheck session you open the door to a new chain and you'll spend the whole session on new chains without completing yesterday's session. This results in a scrambled case. You have lost control of the session.

---

Prepchecking is a precious tool.

This bulletin covers errors being made or material evidently needed for successful Prepchecking.

I can tell you that if Prepchecking doesn't make a case fly for you, you need training on meters and auditing. This is one process that's a doll and if you can make a work you can do more for a case per session than any being in history.

L. RON HUBBARD

LiLph  
Copyright (c) 1962  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.