

THE COMPLETE AUDITOR PART I

A lecture given on
28 June 1951

Valid Processing

I am going to give you a fast review on what we have been over. This is not because one and all have failed to grasp completely the tenets and procedures of Dianetics, but because it might point out a few things that there have been questions about and so on.

However, I'm not going to cover this material redundantly. This is really just a review of what I have been over, but oriented around the basis of what makes a valid technique and what makes an invalid one—how to audit wrong and how to audit right.

The first thing we ought to cover is how to audit wrong.

There are certain fundamentals which any technique must have in order to be a valid technique, and if somebody comes along with a technique which does not have these fundamentals and does not accomplish these specific things, that technique is, bluntly, no good. Even though it gets action, it is not necessarily getting a preclear well.

I spoke earlier about stage-demonstration auditing, how you pick the guy up off the couch and he hits the ceiling and caroms off the wall, screams a few times, faints down into a wilted mass of MEST, and everybody says, "Three cheers! Boy, Dianetics really works!" Then you take the preclear and straighten him out. That is a stage demonstration. There is the spectacular—the observance of the spectacular and a complete neglect of the important.

This is one of the first things that a technique has to be evaluated on: Is it spectacular or is it important? Are you trying to produce with this technique a number of phenomena, or are you trying to get a preclear well? I know of several techniques going around which produce phenomena astonishingly. I can produce lots of phenomena too. As a matter of fact, when it comes to thunder and lightning on techniques—making the preclear curl up into a ball so that he won't uncurl for three days, sending him into a boil-off which will last the next two years, or getting him to run all engrams on the time track simultaneously—I can really give you phenomena if you want it! What good would it do? We would be picking this fellow up in pieces.

Now, the danger of a low-tone-scale auditor is simply that he deals in emergencies; he deals in short terms. Short-term investment ruined capitalism. The quick, fast story about the disaster has ruined journalism. There isn't any good sense in a newspaper; there is only entheta on those front pages. Once in a while it gives you a scrap of data that you need, but mostly it is not data, it is just junk. What do you care that a warehouse burned down? Is it your warehouse? But it is exciting and picks up people's attention—particularly low-toned people's attention.

This is the background of a spectacular technique: Is the auditor interesting himself or is he getting the preclear well? You can sell a completely inefficacious technique which yet produces an enormous amount of explosion in the preclear much faster than you can sell a smooth, quiet technique which produces a steady and stable gain in the preclear. That is a heck of a thing, but it is true enough!

For instance, take this character Reich. He teaches people how to do convulsions. There isn't any slightest desire behind this, actually, to get anybody well; he has never gotten anybody well. Some of these techniques that Reich has are tremendously interesting. His contributions to the field of structure are, without doubt, very great contributions. But as far as a therapy is concerned, even Reich admits that he doesn't have one. I know this because I have talked to intimate disciples of Reich's. Now, let's give the devil his due: he is a wonderful man on

structure and he is very good on theory, but he has not produced a technique that does anything.

We had at the Foundation, very early—at 42 Aberdeen Road—two of Reich's disciples. One of them could throw himself into a convulsion at will, and that was some convulsion! That was the most spectacular convulsion you ever wanted to lay your hands on. Of course, it was never going to get him well, but it was a beautiful convulsion. And this had been all right and he had gone along with Reichian therapy right straight up to the time when that convulsion became bigger than he was. He would start to walk down the subway stairs or something like that and begin to go into this convulsion automatically. All this man had to do was lie down on a bed and start moving his head in a certain way and he would instantly go into this convulsion. The floor of the room would shake! This was spectacular as the devil, but it wasn't therapy.

In Dianetics, if you don't think you could produce "therapies" which would produce convulsions, break people out in rashes, make them walk on the ceiling and have their ears rot off, you are foolish. You definitely could. You are working here with the basic tools; you are working with what is wrong. And when you are working with what is really wrong with the human psyche, you can of course just specialize in making it more wrong. For instance, you can take a preclear down the time track and turn on a fever that won't turn off for two or three days. That is spectacular! You can actually send him down the time track and get him into a fever engram and take his temperature or see that his skin is very hot to the touch, and he will have a fever.

We could add that up this way: "In ancient India they believed all of the evil that was in a person was contained as a hot devil, and merely by raising the person's temperature you could actually see the exudations of evil come off him. Therefore, the thing to do is to turn on a fever." (Actually, there is an Indian theory like that.) But what good would it do you to have him locked up in a fever engram? This is merely spectacular.

Now, I am trying to show you what you can do with Dianetic therapy on the spectacular, emergency side. You can take any chronic somatic a person has and make it much worse with great ease. You just reverse your principles and lay into the case with some solid authoritarian auditing. I have no doubt that just by reversing the vectors on ARC you could have your preclear crying hard and long. We could work out a technique where he would cry for days—I'm sure of it!

Somebody came in one day and had a technique by which somebody, while he was asleep at night, could scan up through chains of emotion. That was a pretty good idea so we made a couple of tests. We gave one woman the command that while she was asleep she would run this chain and get the grief off the grief chain, and we sent her home. Her pillow was wet with tears the next morning. She had no recollection of it whatsoever, but the pillow was wet with tears. We tested it on another case on a similar line and a similar thing happened. These people didn't get much better, and as a matter of fact, I think one of them got a little worse. But there is a spectacular manifestation.

Theoretically, then, there is an unexplored mechanism in Dianetics by which you can actually—just as you lay in a freewheeling command—put somebody out on the couch and give them an order that that night, when they go home and go to sleep, they will scan through all of this and that. You could give them orders, evidently, to do almost anything, and they would go ahead and do it. They would have no recollection of what they were doing, and the efficiency of it or efficacy of it has not been measured.

If you want spectacular, screwball, off-the-beaten-track techniques, we could probably sit around and have a bull session and cook together hundreds of them. We could fix somebody up so that his temperature would go down to ninety and stay there or something. All you have to do is just take these various factors with which we are working and put them a little bit in the wrong order, and the next thing you know, you have what could be called a very spectacular technique.

Now, not all techniques show up their viciousness in two or three months. Some of these techniques can be run and run and run, and because man is a fairly resilient beast and because the mind is almost indestructible, a person could stand up to some of this stuff just beautifully for months without cracking up. If he were told consistently enough that he was getting well and that this was the new white hope, 1 he would have on that suggestion level a continual hope from day to day. If he has lost hope in a technique which you have been using and you give him this new one, he will do a little upsurge in tone on the hope that now he is going to get well and something is going to happen. Because there is a raised ARC, you are actually going to see, occasionally, a chronic somatic pop out.

But one of these fine days he is going to discover that he is not getting well. In addition to that, the case meantime may have been mechanically loused up. So watch out on these spectacular techniques.

There are two things an auditor can do. He can demonstration-audit or he can audit to make preclears well.

I am not pulling any punches on this. Some of the techniques that have been put out in the field are so confoundedly, slap-happy stupid that anybody using them ought to have his ears knocked off. I'm not kidding! Some of the preclears I have seen on whom this stuff has been run are really thoroughly loused up!

Then there is freewheeling; I got my fingers burned on freewheeling, but I went ahead and investigated it very religiously. Here was a brand-new phenomenon; it was beautiful! You could just tell the person to freewheel through all of his engrams and they would all reduce—only they won't. He will keep on freewheeling through these somatics, evidently, ad infinitum.

I can give you now a final report on freewheeling. I know that a case can freewheel for ten months without the reduction of any somatics and yet experience those somatics time after time after time. The person will occasionally flash himself, "Are you stuck on the track? All right, what's the phrase? Well, it's . . .," and he will give himself some holder or a grouper or something of the sort. By the end of a relatively short period of freewheeling, a person who is doing this, if he is even middle range on the tone scale, will probably find himself with his time track grouped, his secondaries all run into engrams and his engrams run into locks, with one side of the bank top and the other side bottom, and he will be shuffling off to the nearest spinbin. This is a rough deal, but boy, that technique sure was spectacular!

Imagine it, a person doesn't need any auditor; he just walks around and a somatic turns on here and another one turns on there and he says, "Gee, I'm sure getting rid of these things. I spent all morning running out stubbed toes. I never knew I had stubbed my toe so many times."

Once in a blue moon, a piece of an engram somatic will dive out of sight on freewheeling, or erase or do something. For instance, he has run a birth engram and the freewheel has taken out a little bit of a somatic. It would have taken an auditor fifteen or twenty minutes, when running the birth engram, to have gotten that much somatic off. But this guy has spent three or four months freewheeling, and the total benefit to his case has been getting in the same amount of work that an auditor could have done in fifteen or twenty minutes. Yet freewheeling is tremendously spectacular.

You can take a preclear and put him on a couch, and you can run him without the somatics but with the somatics converted into temperature. You can do this, if you want to really louse somebody up thoroughly. He will just lie there, evidently in present time, and his temperature will go up and his face will turn red; he will get cold and then hot, then he will get prickly all over, then he will get cold and then he will get hot—boy, is he getting action! And after he does this for a while you pick him up and wring him out and put him in the ragbag.

We are playing with dynamite. Don't disabuse yourself of that fact. You have gotten used to handling your tools and you don't consider them dangerous tools. But you look at a person who is an oil-well shooter—a person who is out there dropping nitroglycerine into the hole in an oil well—and you say, "My gosh, that fellow handles dangerous stuff!" He doesn't think so. He is out there with his little flasks of nitroglycerine; he puts one in his pocket and goes over and drops it down a hole and it goes boom, then he gets into the truck and throws a jug of nitro up on the seat alongside of him and drives over a nice rattly road. You look at this man and you say, "Oh, no!" This man has developed a sort of an immunity to the dangerousness of what he is handling. But every once in a while these guys get blown up too.

Believe me, from the standpoint of somebody out of and beyond Dianetics, you people are oil-well shooters. You are handling dynamite, nitroglycerine, Cordtex;1 you are really handling dangerous stuff. You can do tremendous things with this stuff, too. But that doesn't for one moment lessen the fact that high-tension, high-explosive stuff sometimes explodes. And you have seen it explode.

The dangerousness of much of this material is very insidious; you don't notice it. You are like a technician in an X-ray lab who says "I can't possibly get an overdose of radiation," and so never wears the rubber-lead apron.

If you start auditing preclears phrase after phrase after phrase, eight, ten, twelve hours a day, well into the night, when you are tired, when you are upset, when you are worried, eventually those little phrases will creep up on you. You will start going down the tone scale and you won't even notice it. It is too gradual. Then one day you wonder why your case isn't running well. Isn't running well? You haven't got a case anymore; you are a wreck! Yet there are many auditors out in the field who don't even bother to scan off the auditing they do on preclears. That is getting up to the point where you are throwing the jug of nitroglycerine onto the seat of the Model T Ford alongside of you.

An auditor can't do a good job of auditing if he is way down on the tone scale. Little impulses and stupidities will come up and hit even the brightest auditor from behind as he goes down the tone scale. The next thing you know, he is making some stupid blunder on the preclear. It only takes a few.

Dianetics contains the answer to the riddle of sanity. It contains also, perforce, the answer to the riddle of insanity. Any one of us could take a human being and, with malice aforethought, drive him stark, staring crazy with greater efficiency than even psychiatry does. What would you do to him? You would just reverse all the things that you know would help him: you would group his track, put a lot of entheta on it, latch him up in all the secondaries, slug him with some drugs, hit him in the face, take a hypodermic needle to him so that you give him very painful but unobservable somatics, give him all the line of palaver—bouncers, denyers, everything else—and package it all up. Then when he comes out of it say this had never happened to him, feed all the content back to him again by telling him about other people's engrams or even his own, convince him that he does not know what his reality is and convince him that you are his friend. A person can't take this; he would spin. That would be an efficient job, but that could be done on a person who was pretty doggone sane!

Now take the people that you handle as preclears: there are very few of these people who are not below 2.0. You take these people and just start messing up the techniques of auditing. "Let's throw in a little dash of paprika and some cinnamon and that 'fire clearing' that somebody had. We'll let him go home and audit; I'm tired of him." And the next thing you know, your preclear isn't functioning very well.

For instance, you can get careless about boil-off. I think one of the forms of hypnotism is simply talking to a person about being down and being relaxed until he finally starts into a boil-off. You get him into the boil-off and he dopes around, and then you feed him phrases and it goes into the boil-off and becomes part of the engram which that boil-off is in. That is a possible explanation for some of the phenomena of hypnotism; it may be one particular brand

of hypnotism. I know that if you start a preclear into a boil-off and he is lying there boiling off when somebody walks in the room and starts talking to you, then a couple of months later, after this case has been bogged for a long time, somebody checking back over the auditing will suddenly come into this boil-off area and find that all that talking has gone in as positive suggestion just like hypnotism.

That is pure carelessness on the part of the auditor. An auditor who will open his face or snap his fingers to a preclear who is in a boil-off is doing a very bad thing. When a preclear starts into a boil-off—he slumps over and starts boiling—you just sit there and wait for him to snap out of it.

We used to hurry up the deal a little bit; that is not good. The results of hurrying it up are far more detrimental than letting it ride. The way you ought to handle a boil-off is to simply let it boil, and be quiet around the preclear and don't leave the preclear.

Some preclear will start boiling off, and if you, quiet as a mouse, get up and walk out of the room, you will get just about one foot outside the door and you will have detached from him the group theta that you and he maintain. By doing this trick, you will drop him into the middle of the engram in which he is boiling off. You have just removed from his vicinity, evidently, the ARC that he has to have to keep rolling, and it is quite a jolt to him. You will hurt him if you do that, so you have to stand by on it.

Letting a preclear run himself while he is lying on the couch and you are sitting there is psychoanalysis; it has nothing to do with Dianetics. The Dianetic auditor who does not know at every moment where his preclear is on the track and what his preclear is doing isn't auditing. That doesn't mean he has to keep up a running fire of comment. He can start the preclear up a chain and so forth, but when they are running the chain the first time or two he should have the preclear check with him—just tell him once in a while a little incident he is passing and what he is doing. He should keep close tabs on this case.

The auditor still runs the case. Don't get stampeded by this confounded school of permissive psycho-bungling! Don't get stampeded by it into thinking that nondirective therapy is the ultimate goal; it is not. Minimally directive therapy is a good goal, but nondirective therapy is not a goal. That is just wasting the preclear's time and money. If you stand there and let that preclear auto-run himself, maybe he can do it better in your presence because of the existing theta body, but you might as well let him go on auto-auditing by himself. He will eventually start to auto-audit. Check that datum back, if you have had preclears that you just let run and run; you will find out pretty soon that they start to run themselves when you are not there. That is bad auditing. You are handling nitroglycerine! It is a human being you have got there on the couch. Don't kill him.

How do you know this preclear isn't going to go auto-auditing? You are not checking on what he is doing. How do you know he isn't going to go into a manic suicide engram—"What would really make you feel good is to go kill yourself"—something like that? How do you know he hasn't tripped this? How do you know it isn't in restimulation at the moment he is getting off your couch? You don't know where he has been if he goes on with this nondirective processing. So he smiles at you sweetly and walks out of your office and bumps himself off!

Don't think that you would be in unusual company if your preclear did that, because they do it in psychoanalysis to a very high percentage. A fellow by the name of James Forrestal is the most prominent example of that in the last few years. But there are lots of them; it isn't just James Forrestal.

There is a certain type of potential suicide who gets down in the apathy bracket and then is very, very nice to the auditor. He feels good; he is fine, he is sure he is improving. Then one day he kills himself. That is a characteristic of the lower tone band. The guy has skidded down there to a point where one of his defenses of "Go away and leave me alone" is saying "I'm all right" when he is all wrong. If you haven't got a good, tight rein on this preclear at all times,

you don't know what he has been into. If you can't keep awake when you are running him, just put a few tacks in your chair; it helps out.

I am not kidding about this. You can run them through this idiotic auto-phrase boil-off technique, 1 but that is the most hideous piece of garbage anybody ever ran into. I couldn't condemn it enough. Those phrases he is running have no reality on them. What good are they? Do they improve the ARC of his case? No! He starts wondering where they came from, and the more he wonders where they came from, the more he introverts. The more he introverts, the less efficient he is and the further he goes down the tone scale. It becomes very obvious once you take apart the anatomy of that technique or once you examine one of these preclears who has been run that way for four months. It takes about three months to knock the stuffing's out of him to a point where it is really solidly observable. Yes, you will get a lot of anaten off the case, but you have got a terrific job on your hands if you really want to put this case together afterwards. This fellow has hit groupers and bouncers and denyers.

Take an engram with five separate phrases. Let's say this is an impact engram, and the anaten level is deepest right near the beginning. You will be less likely to get the first phrase with Standard Procedure than you will the fifth phrase or even the third phrase. So you ask him for the earliest phrase he can get in the engram and he gives it to you and repeats it a few times and repeats himself into the engram. If his level of reality is good, he knows where he is on the track and he knows what that engram is about and he knows who is talking. He is volunteering this stuff to you; you are just helping him out. You shouldn't be running engrams on a preclear who says he doesn't know whether they exist or not, or whether this is China or August.

So he gets back there and he runs the third phrase. He will miss the second one usually. He will run the third, fourth and fifth phrases. Then we start him over it again and he will run the second, third, fourth and fifth phrases. Then we go over it again and he hits all five phrases.

But the file clerk can give you that first phrase!

Where are you going to get the boil-off on a case? At the deepest point of anaten. You are auditing exactly backwards when you demand from the file clerk a phrase which will give boil-off. Sure, you will get that whole section of boil-off just as neat as you please, except you will leave much of the engram in restimulation!

But you will get action. It is spectacular. The preclear will lie there and boil off; he will dope off for you and he will go on doping for quite a while. Yet that phrase has no reality on it because it is too far down the tone scale. That phrase is really buried; it is buried under pain and anaten. There is no reality on it.

You get him to repeat it a few times and he starts going down and goes into a boil-off. You can produce all the boil-offs you want to. But are they the boil-offs you should have for that case at that time? That is the question you should be asking. You can't ascertain that question just by asking for random phrases and letting somebody boil, then letting him scan through a line of phrases and then letting him scan through some somatics and, after a while, asking him rather wonderingly "Where are you on the track?" What track?

There is another mechanism involved here: the scanner, the mechanism which tells the fellow what the next phrase is. There is a sort of a beam arrangement like a flashlight dispersion, whereby you have the flashlight trained on one thing but there is a dimmer light shining around the edges. It is very, very bright in the center where it is trained, but just sort of dim around that. When you get one phrase this scanner will turn on to the one before and the one after, just restimulating them enough to be active but not enough to be recognized. If either of those phrases happens to be a grouper and you are running somebody low on the tone scale, there is a sudden crash and his time track flies together. It can happen and it has happened, using this command-phrase boil-off technique.

I don't want to be harsh about this technique: It is no damn good!

Now let's take another one which installs auto-auditing. This is a wonderful mechanism. There is no doubt about the fact that there are more things dreamed of in the mind of man than we know anything about. I imagine that we could plow around and figure and think and postulate and search, and we would find dozens and dozens and dozens of these tricky mechanisms. And very possibly, one of these days, we will discover one that has a tremendous amount of use.

We shouldn't stop looking for them, but we should stop jumping onto every one of them we find and saying, "Aha! This is it! Oh, this is the mechanism we've been looking for. Now look at that: Every time you touch a preclear's big toe his left ear starts wiggling and doesn't stop wiggling. Now, obviously this expends all the enMEST energy from the case. The left ear just keeps on wiggling and this expends the excess energy and the preclear gets well." Most of these techniques are just that silly. They produce an effect but they don't make the preclear well. And making the preclear well is what we are trying to do.

I am still appealing to that minority who wish to remove the aberration rather than the preclear.

These scanning mechanisms are very interesting. Auditing itself, if not scanned out and trimmed up on a low-toned case, if it's forceful auditing in the prenatal area, eventually tends to install one of these very mechanisms. (That is probably how people learned about it.) The preclear will then start auto-auditing. So people say, "Well, naturally, let's just install one and let him roll." Patching up cases that have been loused up in this fashion is an arduous job, as anyone could say who has had to patch them up.

When you are dealing with people below 2.0, you are dealing with people who ask for suicide. They will buy succumb, so if you can dream up something that will give them a terrific effect, and obviously something is happening that is short-term and dramatic, they will buy it much faster than a quiet, orderly thing that will push them above 2.0 on the tone scale. You can sell strychnine to a person below 2.0 on the tone scale with great ease. All you have to do is tell him that this is just exactly what he wants. He is in a hypnotic trance anyhow—most people low on the scale are pretty hypnotic—and you could sell him anything.

There is a fixation that some patients have on pills, which is the reason doctors give them flour-and-water pills. A good doctor who really knows his business always mixes some quinine or something that tastes like green persimmons in with those pills and tells the patient, "Let this melt in your mouth slowly." Then the patient says, "Oh boy, that's good medicine. You know, Doc Brown really knows his stuff!" "You are doing the same thing when you pick up a spectacular technique. This doctor knows very well that the few minutes of diathermy he is handing this case are doing the case some good—relaxing it or something of the sort—and he gives him the pills just to keep him hoping. But the nice, quiet part of his technique is usually what is doing the job, not the explosive stuff.

By the way, I checked over patent medicines which are still in existence, and the patent medicines that have survived fall into two categories: those which contain a very high percentage of alcohol and can be taken with great aplomb by old ladies and those which just taste terrible. You remember the tonic Tom Sawyer fed to the cat? That was "good medicine." The cat didn't come back, I think, for three days!

So, here we have a perimeter of known techniques, known responses and known results—known stability. And also, with these, we have a communication system which has been worked up so that these things are codified and can be delivered on that codification basis. Any technique which has really gotten along and is doing its stuff well has to be codified well so that it communicates easily, not only to other auditors but between the auditor and the preclear so that the preclear quickly gets the idea of what the auditor is doing. Any confusion which exists around and about the communication of a technique from one person to another will introduce a confusion, ordinarily, into the group of auditor and preclear. There is something misunderstood about it. It is too much in the field of an art.

These techniques have been used for a long time. They have been tested. There aren't any real kickbacks on them except occasionally they are not spectacular enough, and in the past they have not opened up a case here and there fast enough. Furthermore, if run too long on a low-level case, they have had a tendency to foul up the case.

These things are resolved with the Chart of Human Evaluation. If you can spot your preclear on this chart, you won't have trouble with these techniques, provided you use them in the proper order. If you use the proper level for the preclear, you can go on up the line. Furthermore, your very, very occluded cases will pull to pieces.

Now, you take Validation Processing all by itself. That will go in on some cases that have been highly resistive to you and start producing results.

By the way, sometimes the spike is driven with a gentle tap much more efficiently than with a terrific hammer blow. You take this validation technique and start running it on somebody who is pretty well down the tone scale, and you will see more boil-offs than you will see by the repetition of phrases to produce boil-off. You will actually see more boil-off and longer, deeper boil-off. That is a very remarkable thing. Here is something that "obviously isn't going to do anything," and then all of a sudden there it is, doing something.

This sneaks up on your preclear. A large percentage of preclears stop processing because processing is too heavy for them. They are scared. Their file clerk will shut off and so forth from a little code break or auditing which is a little bit too heavy. There have been preclears who had secrecy computations and who didn't talk too readily. That is natural; a secrecy computation is a mechanical thing. You look low on the tone scale and you will see a secrecy computation lying right down there. Shut-off communication is all it is; it doesn't have to be a computation. He just is low on the tone scale so there is secrecy. He isn't going to talk.

You can take Validation Processing and coax him up the tone scale to a point where he will reveal all. But don't just sit there and try to make him reveal all and wrack your brains to pieces.

You can be very clever in auditing. You can be about ten times as clever as you have to be. You could sit there and figure out the computation on this case from A to Z. figure it all out and all of a sudden drive right straight into the center of the case, pick up the exact computation that it is, knock it out—and knock out the preclear.

It is better if the information turns up when the information can turn up. And if you sit there and do a relatively routine job without banging your brains out any, all of a sudden your preclear starts up the tone scale and suddenly gets up to a level where he can communicate and he will give you data.

So, here is this group of processes; there are several of them. There is Present Time Processing. There is the processing of independent, individual locks. There is the processing of chains of locks, the processing of secondaries, the processing of engrams and chains of engrams, and then there is Validation Processing. And there is also a technique which has fallen a little bit out of use, Imaginary Incident Processing. You shouldn't neglect that, though, because you will have to use it on the case sooner or later to coax the fellow into a rehabilitation of his own imagination.

Most people are scared to imagine. Imagination is wonderful if a fellow knows when he is imagining. If he knows when he is imagining, you can actually train him back into trusting and knowing all about his imagination, and you will have restored a considerable part of his computer. Don't just sheer off from imagination by confusing imagination and delusion.

So we have this little line of techniques; that is not very many techniques. An auditor practicing up can get very expert on these things and know what is going to happen. Furthermore, he

knows he has a tremendous amount of backing; an awful lot of people have been doing this. If sudden happenstance's or bugs develop, it isn't necessarily up to him to find them; he may find some, but somebody else is going to find them if he doesn't. Furthermore, the bugs have been reported and reported and the thing adjusted and adjusted until you have a pretty reliable product.

By introducing these techniques at their proper levels on the tone scale, you have a type of processing that will fit each individual on the tone scale, or you have a consecutive line of processes which are used progressively on each preclear.

This is in the known world. These techniques are not unknown. But I will tell you something about them: there are very, very few people who are experts on all these techniques. As a matter of fact, there are some people who aren't expert on more than one of them. A study of these techniques is necessary to make them produce. A good attention to the fundamental principles of their use is necessary to make them produce the best results.

Now, you can go into a case with what you may fondly suppose is Standard Procedure running of engrams and find out that this case is pretty badly bogged down. When you start to examine it a little bit you find out that somebody else has been into this case with "Standard Procedure running of engrams" and has run about four engrams half out. The auditor got bored or something of the sort and didn't reduce them, nor did he reduce the basic on the chain, and he has gotten the whole case fouled up. You had been told this person could run engrams, and now you are working a case that is too low on the tone scale to run an engram. So what do you do? If all you know is how to run engrams, you are going to be in a bad way. So you have to remeasure this preclear on the tone scale. Furthermore, you have to develop a sensitivity to your preclear to know when he has shifted down the tone scale so you can use a lighter method on him.

A good, thorough knowledge of the patten, purposes and application of each one of these techniques is something which, frankly, no auditor could develop too much of.

Standard Procedure—that is a great word. Somebody says "Standard Procedure" and it clicks in somebody else's mind that he means something about running out engrams. Standard Procedure is every procedure you see on the tone scale at this time. We should call it, as it says in the book, Proven Procedure. It is a whole gamut of techniques which, lumped together, now mean Dianetic processing.

If you knew how to run an engram and knew all the tricks of running an engram—just that—if you could anticipate that next phrase, if you knew what that case was going to do next in running these engrams, you would be doing better auditing than I have ever seen in the school. It is something that needs to be practiced and rehearsed and practiced again. One should never be too cocksure about his ability to run out an engram.

I saw an auditor not too long ago who was considered rather expert. He went into the thing and ran it along, and his preclear was trembling; he came back over for the second run and the preclear was not trembling. So he ran it again and the preclear wasn't trembling. The preclear seemed a little more relaxed, if anything, so he ran it a couple more times and then he said, "All right. Let's go to the next engram."

I took hold of the auditor's arm, pushed him back (I know any auditor would practically shoot you for doing this, but this preclear was a psychotic) and I said, "Give me the bouncer. (snap!)"

"Stay away." The preclear went right back into the engram and started trembling again.

The engram had just been greased over—obviously! Here was an auditor who should have known his stuff. The preclear had come out of this engram just a little bit but was close enough to keep on repeating phrases. And this auditor, despite his experience, had missed the fact.

This is the commonest mechanism in the world—to hit a bouncer, go partway out of it, and later on in the incident hit a call-back, so the bouncer and the call-back are operating, your preclear is riding just above the engram and the somatic isn't on but the preclear can still get phrases. You can run an engram like that and keep missing the bouncer and the call-back—because they are the effective phrases—and keep running it and running it with obviously less and less manifestation. You are getting a tiny little bit of reduction off it.

What did it require? Just good, ordinary auditing of engrams! Knowing what happens. Knowing how a preclear looks when he hits a grouper, knowing how he looks when he hits a bouncer or a call-back. An auditor with experience should be able to sit alongside of the couch and know the whole content of the engram before the preclear hits it. I'm not kidding—he should!

For instance, the preclear goes into the basic area or something of the sort and all of a sudden starts to scrunch up, and he rolls up tighter and tighter. The auditor says to himself, "I wonder what this is? Here we've got something on the bowel-movement chain or something of the sort," and he says, "Give us the first phrase." And sure enough, that is the chain it is on, but the fourth phrase over is something off the coitus chain. Something has skipped! If he knows the kind of engram he was running, he knows this alien phrase has no business being there. The preclear has run along this much of the engram but then he is up the track, so there is a bouncer sitting there. An auditor ought to be pretty much on the alert for such a thing.

Perhaps the preclear is running the engram very nicely and it seems to be getting along fine. He is running out Mama saying "Oh, now you go away from here, George. I don't want any more to do with you. (pause) Oh, on the dresser. (pause) I didn't put the cat out. You might as well just forget about that. (pause) No!" And the auditor says, "Oh, an engram! Isn't that sweet!" So he starts him back at the beginning again and he runs this conversation out and he runs it out again. The preclear gets bored with it after a while, so he has "obviously" reduced the engram. But the auditor has left it with a whole valence missing!

As a matter of fact, I ran one of those one time where a preclear was into Papa's valence and Mama's valence sort of compoundedly all the way up and down the track, but an Aunt Ethel kept coming into the case and was making a third valence, and the auditor who had been running the case had been missing the third valence all the time. It had phrases like "Don't pay any attention to Aunt Ethel," and "You know that you are your parents' child. You are part of your parents now, you must understand this," and as a consequence it made this kind of a silly computation on the case. The auditor had actually run phrases like "What do you think about it, George?" "Oh, I don't know, you girls had better make up your mind," and gone happily along saying it was a conversation between Papa and Mama. I think he was confused. I think he thought he was doing psychoanalysis, because in Dianetics you listen.

So that is the running of engrams. Running out an engram and doing a good job on it is a precision project. If you can't find the engram necessary to resolve the case right away, you know that you have to hit a chain and go back down the chain of similar engrams until you get the basic, and you know that you sure as the devil had better get the basic on that chain now that you have gone into it. There is a lot to know about the running of engrams.

How much easier it is just to sit there and say to the preclear. "Is there a circuit here?"

"Oh, yes. 'You can't take it with you.'"

"All right. Repeat that." And then say to yourself, "He's in a boil-off. I'll go into a boil-off, too. I wonder what I was thinking about yesterday. I guess I'll auto-run for a while. Oh well, what was that phrase I was contacting the other day? Let me see, it was a very interesting phrase. I wonder what it was...."

You don't have to know anything to do that; that is easy. I don't mean to be insulting, but that is the source and spring of a lot of wildcat processes:

you don't have to be very smart to run them. Now, take Lock Scanning; that is a simple technique. When do you stop scanning a chain of locks? What kind of patter do you use that is least upsetting to your preclear? What kind of patter can you use that will upset a preclear for Lock Scanning? What happens to the earliest incident on the chain of locks?

Every time you scan a chain of locks the chances are very good that the next time you scan it you are going to pick up an earlier incident. Yet you can set up a beautiful invalidation: "Give me the earliest incident on this chain. Is this the earliest incident? All right. From there forward to present time, begin scanning." The next time the fellow goes back there he finds out that there were seven earlier incidents, so he didn't have the earliest incident on the chain. Therefore "the file clerk was wrong."

No, the file clerk wasn't wrong; the auditor was wrong! The file clerk was made to answer that way in order to get any information through.

The right way to do this would be to say "Now return to the earliest available lock." Remember this, the earliest available lock. When you get him back there, "Is there an earlier lock available?" Start him up the line from the earliest one you can find. And it will get earlier and earlier on some of them.

If you are running a very cloudy chain you can start with the incidents only five days ago. The first one was five days ago, and the next couple of times you run it you find him back at five years of age and then you find him back at five months. In other words, the entheta carves from the top down. It is the same way with secondaries: you have to run them from the top down.

When do you stop scanning a chain? Somebody could say offhand that it was when the chain was so short that it was covered in just a flash. No, there is another test on scanning a chain: You stop scanning a chain when the preclear extroverts on that chain, because he will go just so many times and then he will extrovert. If you carry him one more time he will drop through to another chain. You carry him twice more through or you try to get that chain so short that he just goes over it in a flash, and you may get it so he goes over it that way but you may find yourself sitting on the next chain down. Maybe this happens close to the end of the session, and you now have a chain that is going to take another forty minutes to get rid of!

More importantly, you can run the preclear on chains until he extroverts, and on most chains he will extrovert. If he isn't extroverting, you are running chains on a case that is too low on the tone scale. You ought to be doing Straightwire on this case.

Now, what happens when a preclear locks up on a chain? You start running him up the chain and he obviously is running through no secondaries or anything like that, but suddenly he can't move on the chain; he is stuck. You certainly don't tell him that is bad and send him home. You can do two things: You can find out what incident he is stuck in and find out if you can run that incident as an engram; it is just a lock, but find out if you can run that as an engram. Or you can find out if there is an earlier incident just like it which can be run as an engram. In other words, you have run into a series of locks which are manifesting just exactly like a chain of engrams, and you can run them just like that. Or you can simply step over to another chain. Go on over to another chain, let that first one hang up; there is nothing you can do about it. Sometimes it will. But if it did hang up, you started lock-scanning a preclear who was too low on the tone scale. In other words, your estimation of where he was on the tone scale wasn't accurate to begin with. You should have been straightwiring this case.

What if a case can't straightwire? Well, if a case can't straightwire, you had better have him locate the bed for you—in other words, "Here is present time." That is the indicated level of contact: present time. Don't try to get him up to present time in any way other than trying to

make him contact present time. Feed him some ARC. Mimic him. Be with him. You can then become a part of present time or maybe you will become all the present time there is. You are working way down on the scale with a preclear who is like that.

Getting the preclear to contact present time is highly beneficial. As a matter of fact, it could be said that that is all you are doing all the way through therapy—just getting somebody into present time. If you get a person 100 percent into present time he is 100 percent extroverted. His computer is running evidently at 100 percent efficiency.

Now, how do you use Straightwire? This is a neglected subject, and in view of the fact that it is the most efficacious tool for a psychotic, beyond present time and mimicry, an auditor who doesn't know all he can possibly know about Straightwire ought to be ashamed of himself. It may be a lot easier to install a fire-control hydrant in this preclear than to sit down and learn how to do Straightwire, but it is not good sense.

Straightwire is an interesting technique. Do you realize that if Straightwire were the only technique we had, we would roll along like an express train? We would have something that this society has not had before: the mechanics of memory. We could omit knowing engrams; we could even take Straightwire and somehow or other get around the hurdles of a secondary, and we wouldn't have to know about a time track or anything else. If we just had Dianetic Straightwire, Dianetics would have more reason for existence than this society deserves. Straightwire is awfully important!

What do you ask for in Straightwire? How many kinds of Straightwire are there? How do you use it? There are some auditors who are very good at Straightwire, but it actually doesn't have to be an inspirational art. It is a mechanical thing, and that is all it is. You know what it is on the time track that brings down a person's level on the tone scale, and adds up and becomes enturbulated with engrams and secondaries on the time track: it is moments of inhibited or enforced affinity, reality and communication. You couldn't get a clearer statement of the target. "You can't love anybody" is inhibited affinity; "You've got to love people" is enforced affinity; "You never agree with anybody" is inhibited reality; "You have to agree with me" is enforced reality; "You never pay any attention to anything I say" is inhibited communication; "You've got to pay attention to me" is enforced communication. These are the lower-tone scale manifestations of ARC.

Below 2.0 on the tone scale is ARC enforced. This is domination, domination by command, insistence. Insistence on affinity, on reality and on communication: "You've got to look!" "It is true!" "You've got to admit it!" That is domination by command.

Lower than that we have ARC inhibited, and that is domination by nullification—the computation of "You don't exist. If I can really convince you that you don't exist, then you are no danger to me!" So the things this person says are "You never love anybody," "You never agree with anybody," "You never talk to me"—"You ain't!" So, ARC inhibited contains all of the ways you can say "You don't exist," and ARC enforced contains all the ways you can say "You have got to be" that are aberrative.

And the whole combination of ARC adds up to understanding, so you have affinity, reality, communication and understanding. ARC enforced says, "You've got to think," "You've got to understand me." That is domination by-command understanding—understanding, computation, thinking. And ARC inhibited says, "You never think," "You never think what you're doing!" "You never understand a thing I say!" and so on. That just takes the bracket of them—all three.

Those are the ways in which the life force of an individual is enturbulated and tied up in the lock forms on the time track. That is the way it is done: ARC-I and understanding, ARC-E and understanding—enforced coming in at 1.5 and inhibited coming in at about 1.0 and down.

At the top of the scale is ARC the way it ought to be. That is neither inhibited nor enforced. Did you ever have anything to do with a person who was really reasonable? Have you ever noticed a person who could figure things out well in the humanities and figured things out well about you and about what you were doing, and who you understood very well? And did you notice that this person didn't try to enforce upon you and insist that there was love, that there was agreement, that there was communication, that there was this, that there was that? They didn't do this. It was not necessary, because actually in this upper band you felt ARC for them ordinarily. That is sanity: ARC and rationality.

So these are the component parts of insanity, below 2.0. You get these turbulences off the case, and in just this way, in maybe a hundredth of the time that it takes to psychoanalyze a person, you could probably produce remarkable results with him.

“Sure, we're straining at it; we have got to get down there to cause, basic cause! We have got to get in there to those engrams right away and run them. Well, sure, this preclear is 0.5 on the tone scale and he latches up every time we ask him to go into a boil-off, but so what? Let's get in there to cause! “ That is spectacular as the devil. But what the person should have, if he is very low on the tone scale, is ARC Straightwire. You find out that you can occasionally scan this person; you have scanned him through several chains and you got away with them, so he couldn't possibly be that low on the tone scale. And then the fifth time you lock-scanned him on something he stuck; he got stuck right there in the middle of the time his dog sat on the front porch and barked at him out of an error: “I just sit here looking at this dog.”

Now, how you get him out of that mess is to just straightwire him back to earlier times maybe when dogs frightened him. Don't keep on lock scanning him. Or you can straightwire him back into earlier times about dogs in general, and then later times, or you can take Straightwire and bring him up to present time. Just make him remember an earlier time about the dog, and then make him remember a little later time about the dog—”Did you ever see a dog that looked like this?”—and you can jockey him out of the incident by getting enough free theta around so that it will dissolve the entheta of that incident. It takes a little doing sometimes. But he probably should have been on Straightwire all the time.

Don't undersell Straightwire. It is calm. You are sitting there and the preclear has his eyes open; he is not upset about anything. About the greatest manifestation you get out of him is an occasional smile or maybe a little giggle or something like that. That isn't spectacular, but boy, is it important! Don't ever confuse the spectacular with the important. Most spectacular things are below 2.0. Authoritarian procedures are, all of them, pretty spectacular.

Now, there are two brands of Straightwire. There is a Hurdy-Gurdy system—a good, simple system. I ran into an auditor the other day who ought to have been ashamed of himself; he didn't know anything about the Hurdy-Gurdy system of auditing. He had heard of it but had never read it, had never reviewed it and had never used it. And yet this auditor occasionally worked on psychotics.

Hurdy-Gurdy can come off completely mechanically. You have an ARC triangle for Papa. Now, Papa is not always at 1.5; Papa occasionally slumps, let us say. So you have your ARC triangle for Papa again—enforced and inhibited. We have a pair of these for Mama, and pairs for Aunt Grace and Aunt Ethel and Grandma and Grandpa and the school teachers and the boyfriend; we have one for everybody.

Keep a notebook when you're doing a lot of Hurdy-Gurdy and you have a case very low on the tone scale. The reason you do this is that when you work him on Straightwire on Monday he may not get very much. But you ask him the same questions on Wednesday and he has a lot of answers for you. Memory jogs itself. It takes a while for this wandering beam to get through the spin drift and clouds and black hurricanes which are, actually, most people's minds. So getting this little ray of light down through all that and stretched to the data takes time.

All straight memory carries with it a pretty good level of validation. It validates itself. If a person really remembers something he remembers it; if he tells you he has a concept of remembering something—he has a concept such-and-such happened—even that is memory. At least he knows the concept itself is real. He might not be able to tell you where it happened, but maybe on Wednesday he will know where it happened and what was said.

This is a method, then, of keeping tabs on what you are doing with a case without taking tremendously voluminous notes. It is awfully obvious once it is broken down mechanically, but it is not obvious at all to your preclear. He thinks you are reaching right straight into the depths of his soul. This builds up a lot of affinity.

On Monday we covered Papa and Mama, for instance. We went at it by asking for moments when affinity, reality and communication were enforced or inhibited. Now we ask him, “Did Papa ever insist on affection around the house, or did he ever insist on anything like that?”

“No, not Papa. No.”

“Was he a very agreeable fellow?”

“Papa? Are you kidding?”

“Can you remember a time when he told you that you had to agree with him?”

“Uh . . .”

“Do you ever remember a time when he made you stand there while he talked to you? Do you remember a time when this happened?”

“Not Papa.”

Right away we know that Papa is 1.0. But we sort of lay that aside for the moment because we don't want to get the case up to a point where it alarms. Sometimes Straightwire comes through best with a little sudden punch rather than by dragging it out; that just gets the preclear restimulated on the subject.

So you come over and you ask about Mama on enforced.

Then we get back over to Papa and we find that Papa Milquetoast Smith never agreed with anybody; he said continually that nobody ever loved him, nobody ever paid any attention to him, that he couldn't agree with that, anyway, but he supposed that he would be forced into it anyhow. We find this character and all of a sudden we have Papa nailed on the tone scale.

Now, where is the Milquetoast in our preclear? We can just mine this and mine it and mine it. How did Papa get this way? For that we can look to the other people. How did Mama react to Papa? How did Mama react to Grandma?

This is a plot of interpersonal relations. How did these people react to each other in the family? By the way, you don't say things like “Did you ever own an automobile?” (which is simply memory) unless you are working with a psychotic. With some psychotics, if you can get them to remember that they own an automobile, you have really done something.

But we are talking about a person, now, who is a good, reasonable, 0.1 “normal.” The wrong way to do Straightwire on such a person would be to say to yourself, “I'm an expert on Straightwire. I've read the title; I know what it means. All right, let's go right into this case and let's just clean it up,” and then say, “Do you have a circuit?”

“Uh . . . hm-hm, hmm.”

“I guess people treated you pretty mean when you were a kid, huh? You remember when people treated you mean?”

“I guess somebody must have.”

“Well, did anybody ever take your toys away from you, or anything like that?”

“Well, I suppose they might have.”

“Did you go to high school?”

“Yeah.”

“Do you remember high school?”

“Oh, sure.”

“Did you go to college?”

“No.”

“Oh, you didn’t go to college. Did you ever have a job? Oh, you’re working now. Oh, you’re working for the government. Do you ordinarily like people? Well, now, let’s get down to business. How is your sex life?”

This is not Straightwire. I wish to point out to you the difference between those two techniques!

If you got to be an expert on Straightwire you could make a fantastic living in a community, because you would be doing your ten- and twenty minute routine stuff. You wouldn’t be seeing people over a long period of time. You could just have them come into the waiting room and you would take them in line as they came in.

“I will see Mrs. Jones now. How is your arthritis today, Mrs. Jones?”

“Oh, it’s just terrible, just terrible.”

“Hmm. What have you been worrying about lately?”

“Well, it’s little Joanne. She’s going around with that awful Beagle boy.”

“Did you ever know anybody that looked like that Beagle boy?”

“Oh, n—you know, he looks just like Frank Savage that I used to go with when I was in high school. Gee, you know, that’s a funny thing. I hadn’t thought about . . .”

“Just pay the nurse as you go out. Next!”

That is all you would have to do, just keep people from being enturbulated. Every once in a while you would hit the jackpot and her arthritis would turn off and never come back anymore. And you wouldn’t quite know what you hit either, but you would solemnly assure her, “Yes, Dianetics works miracles.” This is all you would have to know.

Now, we have gone over Dynamic Straightwire, with the interlock of affinity, reality and communication between the dynamics. We set it up for all the dynamics; we know of eight. They probably go on up to the clouds. There is probably a whole series of theta-universe dynamics that we don’t know anything about.

Somebody gave me a note the other day and said they were picking up free theta on the interim between lives. Now, that might be. Who knows? If you can really find this level of activity, you might be tapping into free theta sources, you might be tapping into free life-force sources. Wouldn't that be gorgeous! You wouldn't have to audit anymore; the preclear would come in and you would give him a "glass of ARC"!

On this Dynamic Straightwire you are working the interplay, the carrying of ARC from one dynamic to the other, realizing that every angel has two faces; every dynamic has two faces as far as that is concerned. The interior dynamic and its exterior counterpart in the world are in conflict. For instance, the interior of dynamic one and what the person has been led to believe by the environment that he should think about the first dynamic will come into conflict. So there are suppressors for each dynamic.

The exterior group may suppress the individual's third dynamic. For example, take somebody who is a member of a defeated army: he has a very badly blocked third dynamic because a third dynamic has suppressed him on the third dynamic.

The member of a defeated army has had such a smash to his third dynamic that he has a hard time on it. He can get down so low on the third dynamic that it will fall apart. He can't be made to actively support a government, and he may be perfectly willing and cheerful about going over to the enemy and serving their causes and purposes. His own group has fallen apart so badly and he goes so low on the tone scale for "group" that his ethic goes to pieces, his support goes to pieces. You will find this is very often the case. They go way down on the tone scale.

For instance, Japanese soldiers at the present time would be perfectly willing to fight for the United States Army. And undoubtedly a large number of them could actually be recruited to fight Japan. They are way down. That army was smashed, so their ethic level went all to pieces. Their level of responsibility and persistence and so forth would have gone too.

I am giving you that as an example to show you that in the individual there is a third dynamic; there is his concept of group.

If you were processing a psychiatrist, you would actually be picking up material on any assault Dianetics might have made. You would pick it up on dynamic one. You would undoubtedly pick it up on the second dynamic because Dianetics says that sex is not all, and he has fondly hoped all his life that it is. You would certainly pick it up on dynamic three. We are talking here about Dianetics as a group being suppressive to the psychiatrist personally—to what his conception of sex was, maybe, and certainly to the psychiatric group. He will have a concept about an intergroup relationship of one group suppressing another.

If a person had all of these dynamics riding at 4.0, he would really be a powerhouse. But it's the interplay—one high, another one not so high, one very high, and so forth—the unevenness of these dynamics as a bundle, which establishes the chronic tone.

You could draw a tone scale for each one of these dynamics. What we have in the Chart of Human Evaluation is more or less a composite, because you don't want to have to fool with all these odds and ends. Where you see variability cropping up on that—and you will see occasional little variability's on the tone scale—it is because all the dynamics have been more or less grouped into it as one plot. A completely accurate plot—but not quite as useful—would consist of plotting dynamic one on all the columns, dynamic two on all the columns, dynamic three on all the columns, and so forth. But you can get entirely too precise about this.

There is a place on the tone scale not only for each one of the dynamics but for each person in the preclear's life. He will be at a position on the tone scale toward that person. He is at a place on the tone scale toward Mama. He is at another place on the tone scale toward Papa. He is at another place on the tone scale toward his wife. He is at another place on the tone scale toward his children. This gives you what has passed in the past for actually being a sort of a schizophrenic state of affairs: a fellow seems to have many personalities because he reacts

differently in different areas. That is simply because he is at different positions on the tone scale with different groups. What we are doing is taking a good overall mechanical average of the theta/entheta ratio and processing him accordingly.

But you will find—and sometimes be rather fooled by—a preclear who, in the vicinity of his own home, around the wife and the kids and so forth, can lock-scan and do all sorts of things. But if all of a sudden you get him back into his childhood home you can't even get any Straightwire! He just bogs. There is a section of track there that is more heavily occluded than other sections of the track, therefore the free-theta/entheta ratio is much stronger and heavier early on his track.

But you get the overall reaction of this when you just look him up on the tone scale and plot it by asking him questions. I'm just showing you that there is a further breakdown possible.

Now, some fellow might be 0.5 toward Mother and 1.0 toward Father, and this same fellow is liable to be 4.0 toward his golf partner. They are friends, they play golf every day, they are very cheerful together and they are in full agreement about things. And he actually wouldn't think of interrupting a communication from his partner. He thinks of talking to him; he wouldn't think of just remaining silent around him. If you saw this person with this friend of his, you would think he was really something.

That is why you need many columns—because the actuality is that he is not with this friend very much of the time. When you start plotting him out on the chart, you are plotting him out against such things as children, against his physiological condition, and so forth.