

METHODS OF PROCESSING

A lecture given on
23 October 1951

Knocking Out the Conclusions on a Case

We have now a number of processes that we know work and accomplish results, and I want to go over these with you.

First, let's take the lightest of the light, which is straight ARC. The methods of gaining ARC must be understood by the auditor, for the good reason that ARC is the only way you can reach most psychotics. You give them an appearance of similarity and they will start to move over a bit into your valence and start processing out things that weren't themselves anyhow.

That is just present-time ARC. The various ways in which this can be used don't need to be covered particularly; possibly they ought to be, but they are not very complicated. It is very easy to understand them.

One of the earliest uses of it was by a fellow by the name of Homer Lane. Lane went into an insane asylum in England and he said to the individuals involved in the management of this insane asylum, "I want to see your toughest case." He was not a psychiatrist (most developments in the field of the mind come from wildcat sources—in fact, all of them do).

They said, "Why, you couldn't possibly do that, because this man would tear you to pieces! Then we would be responsible for you, and we're responsible for him." "Well, he's no good anyway—isn't that so?" Lane said. "Well, that's true." "Well, then, I couldn't do him any harm." "Well, that's true." "I can give you a release as far as I'm concerned, so that you're not responsible for me." "Well, that's true. Well, the devil with you—go ahead."

He went and opened up the cell door, and there stood a hairy, horrible creature, naked, in a padded cell. This fellow had been there for a number of years, and he was just a wild, huge beast. Lane stepped inside the cell, closed the door behind him and said, "I understand that you can help me?"

And the alleged psychotic said, "How did you know?"

That is the contribution factor. The fellow was sane! "How did you know?" That was all he had been waiting for. He had been invalidated to a point where he was insane, so Lane suddenly validated him. That was contribution, and it was just straight ARC.

There is one character who is basically a pretty good old dame; there is nothing really wrong with her at all. If she hadn't gotten associated with psycho-analysis and a bunch of other things, she would probably be quite a gal. As it is, she has had to turn into a poseur just to hold up a front, in return for not being able to produce results. That is Dr. Frieda Fromm Reichmann. She has developed herself a very weird accent and so forth.

But there is nothing wrong with this old girl's courage—nothing wrong with it at all. She doesn't know what she is doing, but she will go into a cell with an insane person, and no matter what he does, she will do. That is the total knowledge on which she operates. Every

once in a while, one of these people turns sane. That is her technique. That takes nerve. But, again, this is ARC—operating on a mimicry basis.

By agreeing with an insane action, you may give an insane person the idea that it is no kind of an action to agree with. So he will criticise the action in you and therefore invalidate it in himself.

You will find, then, that there isn't very much which can supplant ARC and contribution as a technique. It takes a lot out of an auditor sometimes to carry this technique along any great distance. An auditor who goes around imitating insane people and agreeing with insane people certainly had better start out with a conclusion that it isn't going to affect him! So we have that level of operation; it will be a long time before that one is supplanted.

The next level of operation is Straightwire—good old Straightwire. The earliest Straightwire that existed in Dianetics is still valid. You can start asking a person, “Who used to tell you you were like your mother and father?” And you can spring them out of valences sometimes and get them moving on the track and so on.

But you must differentiate between a mechanical treatment of entheta facsimiles and what you are treating. In other words, here is a mechanical operation: How can you handle entheta facsimiles? What do entheta facsimiles do? You must know this. What can you do to them? What can they do to you? That is basic knowledge and you have to know that.

Then there is definitive processing—definitive. What is there in entheta facsimiles which is bad? What is there good about them? And where are their weakest links? How do you cut them up? That is a definitive operation. If you will notice, in Dianetics we handled the field more or less on a phenomena basis. We knew people could go back down something called a time track and they could do certain things to incidents. There was a mechanical process there, which overstressed words but was still terrifically valid. But the definitive in it, the stressing of words, the running out of engrams as such—which we now call entheta facsimiles—was defining what we did with our mechanical knowledge. That has changed, but it has mostly changed in emphasis.

We still have the mechanics, then, of entheta facsimiles. What will they do? What is important about them? What is important in them? What are locks? How are they formed? This is mechanical. The entheta-theta theory is very valid.

Take an entheta facsimile: A young child gets thrown on the operating table and they give him a tonsillectomy. He has gotten a nice entheta facsimile. It has all the perceptics in it. It has a position in time, and it can get cut loose from its position and drift into present time. It can be restimulated (he can bring it into restimulation). Locks can be formed on it and it can lie as the basis of a secondary engram—grief, fear and so forth—because it has physical pain and effort in it.

That is an entheta facsimile. We find that it is not necessary to reduce all the perceptics in that facsimile, because if the effort is taken out of it, it doesn't have any punch anymore. So we just take all the effort out of this entheta facsimile. That is definitive. We have the entheta facsimile and we know that we can nullify it, erase it, reduce it. We know that mechanical fact, but the definitive fact is that if we take all the effort out of it, it just goes by the boards.

Quite in addition to that, if we can pick up the self-determinism which selected it—again, this is definitive; we are just taking another little piece of this same entheta facsimile—it will

cut loose and we will no longer be worried about it. The stress is on what you get out of these things, and you can take anything out of them you want to.

The mechanical formation of enttheta facsimiles is outlined in Science of Survival, and nothing is changed about that. But our whole study is definitive now, on how to best get rid of them. We know everything that we can do to them, practically.

Take somebody getting out of a dentist chair: he is in a state of shock. You are looking at an enttheta facsimile, not at a human being walking around, because what he has is fear, charge and so forth.

Let's take one of the things that you can do to an enttheta facsimile—just one thing: you can scan it. You don't even have to go into the depths of the facsimile, but just go into the facsimile in the vicinity of the depth point.

Just scan somebody three, four, five times over his going to the dentist's office, sitting down in the chair and getting up out of the chair. Just scan him through this stuff—miss the tooth if you want to—and all of a sudden the fellow will quiet down. He stops sweating, his heart starts revving up and he no longer has any sign of shock. It is fascinating.

So that is one thing you can do, then, with one particular type of enttheta facsimile: you can scan it. This is still valid. There isn't any reason for you to sit around and ask this person when he first concluded to be shocked. He is in a state of shock! What you want to do is get him out of this state of shock as fast as possible. So you address the enttheta facsimile; you take out of it what you want to take out in order to produce the result which you want to produce at that time.

In other words, here you are with a number of known factors. Your technical judgment must be exercised in which of these factors you handle, what you treat, what you define as the thing that is important about this case.

Now, that is a very simple thing. You take somebody who looks like he has just come out of a dentist chair, although he hasn't been near one for a long time, and this fellow is in a state of shock. Let's take some shock off his case. There are several ways that we can do it—several ways. We can just start scanning back through areas of his life, if he can scan at all. Or we can give him some Validation MEST Processing, and the next thing you know, some of the kick will come off the line. It is quiet, it just works the memory and it is not dangerous in any way. Just run Validation MEST Processing on him.

The fellow is sort of in a state of shock, he is kind of neurotic and so forth, so we just desensitize enough enttheta facsimiles to bring him back to battery a bit.

Your knowledge of the tone scale and of individuals on the tone scale is still valid. You can look an individual up on the tone scale and know what kind of processing this fellow can stand. But the point is, you want to get the fastest kind of processing to him that you can. You want to get the fastest process available for the position of the preclear on the tone scale.

Now, you have Straightwire; the next technique is Validation MEST Processing, then Repetitive Straightwire: he remembers it and he remembers it again and he remembers it again. You don't have to just make him remember it time after time; you can have him remember other things, then come back and make him remember the first one again, then

remember other things and remember that one again. All of a sudden he doesn't care about that anymore—he extroverts.

The symptom of extroversion doesn't have as much to do with attention units as it has to do with the fact that an entheta facsimile has just kicked off. It is no longer of interest to this preclear; he is no longer holding it in place, so it shoves off.

The next process would be lock running on an individual lock—one lock that you run just like an engram. You can run out a lock in this fashion, and in a case which is pretty badly off you are going to have to do this sometimes. Simply take a lock out; run it just like you would an engram.

The next is the technique of running engrams. And believe me, you can run an engram by original Standard Procedure and get results. If there is an engram sitting there to be run and you can run it, you ought to run it. There is nothing much to it. But definitively, take the effort out of it; concentrate on getting the effort out of it. It is something like taking this engram and pulling up all the pins in it by which the individual can hold on to it. If he can no longer get a line on this engram again, it will just go. That is a dirty trick. You haven't found out why he is holding on to the engram, but you just make the engram impossible to hold on to. And that obeys the law that says you should get the earliest engram that you can get on the chain and knock it out.

Then there is the matter of knocking out secondaries. You will find out that getting a grief charge off a case is very, very beneficial. In psychoanalysis they call this a “release of affect.” They fish around for five, six or ten years, finally get two tears, and then they consider the patient well.

This is what really fascinates psychotherapy about Dianetics—the fact that you can, by repeater technique, get a person into one of these charges.

For instance, there was a girl that I couldn't get any charge out of at all; I finally persuaded her to repeat the words “Your father is dead” I didn't know what the words in the engram would be. She started repeating “Your father is dead, your father is dead” and bang!—she was into it. I just repeated her down into what was an obvious statement with regard to it.

I cured somebody of sinusitis one day. I say “cure” advisedly because I just got a letter from this person. It was a long time ago that I gave him this treatment. This is all the processing he ever had! Perhaps his total time in processing was around two hours; he said in the letter “two hours” but I remember it and it was not two hours. It was much less than two hours. He had a bad sinus condition and he couldn't do anything much about it. This person had been an orphan. So I said, “Repeat the words ‘Poor little boy’” “Poor little boy, poor little boy” —half a dozen tears! “Hey, that's funny” he said.” I don't even know where that's from?” “Well, try it again” “Poor little boy, poor little boy, poor little boy” —then he cried for five or ten seconds. “That's strange; I don't know where that's from! I haven't any idea of it.” “All right, try it again.” “Poor little boy” and he got “Poor little boy, his mother is dead.” and then splash!—a few more tears. And he said, “Well, let me see if I can get ahold of that thing again; let me see if I can contact that again.”

So he tried to contact it again just with those words—he had no further words on it, he didn't even know where it was in the bank. All of a sudden he said, “I can't find it anymore.” “Well, how do your forehead and sinuses feel?” “They feel all right.”

And they are still all right; there has been no recurrent attack.

This was done with repeater technique. This case, by the way, was a completely occluded case; he didn't know yesterday from August. He didn't know anything about his life.

So you have a trunkful of tools, and the oldest tool in it is still a valid tool. It is sort of clumsy to go around fixing up cases with a bone drill, but it can be done! Naturally, you could overuse this, but sometimes it is the only technique that you can use on a case.

If a person doesn't think anything is going to happen and you know he has a certain kind of an incident, anything is valid to get rid of the enttheta facsimile.

But let's define what we are doing. All we want to do is get a moment of pain or discomfort disassociated and disconnected from this preclear. That is all we want.

We can deintensify it and let the preclear keep it or we can snip the moorings on it, at which time he can't get hold of it anymore. We can do it either way. How you want to do it is all that counts.

Your next technique is Lock Scanning. This is very valid. You will find yourself using a lot of Lock Scanning on Conclusion Processing. If I just sent you back to the first conclusion that you ever made, as you scanned forward to present time you might latch up on the track in some other kind of incident. But nevertheless, we keep this up. It is very simple. We just say, "Go back to the earliest time in your life that you made a conclusion. Now, are you there? Okay, scan forward to present time. All right, can we find any earlier conclusion?" "No, I could only find four on the track there." "Well, let's go back to the first conclusion you can find and scan forward to present time.... Now can you find an earlier conclusion that you have made? Let's scan through that, catching, if we can, reasons and so forth as we go by—but just push forward again."

We could keep a person doing this, probably, for eight or ten hours, and at the end of that time we would have quite a remarkable preclear on our hands.

What we would have done is cut the moorings. We didn't tell him to get the affinity, and we didn't tell him anything about anything.

We just want him to do nothing but scan all the conclusions of his life. That is a process that is very simple, but you had better make sure this preclear is high enough on the tone scale to be able to lock-scan. It is not whether or not he can reach his conclusions; can he lock-scan? That is the mechanical aspect of it. You can do processing and get terrific results with just that one technique. I don't think we can get much simpler than that.

But what is actually happening? We are, at once, knocking charge off locks—desensitising the locks themselves, these enttheta facsimiles—and pulling out the center pin that the individual has in each one of those enttheta facsimiles. What happens as he scans these conclusions is that he is scanning all of the times when he has reached out and picked up enttheta facsimiles and put them into use in his life. That is what you are really doing—casting these things off in wholesale lots, by just scanning conclusions.

Now, the next technique is very much in question, because a fellow has to be practically up to the top of the tone scale to run it. He would have to be 3.5 or something like that. You can scan engrams and you can now scan the effort out of engrams, if you can get anybody up that high on the tone scale. You can scan the effort out of them. It makes for an interesting proceeding. Make sure you have a preclear who is in very good shape before you do such a thing. It can be done, but the case would have to be almost three-quarters

cleared already before you would venture to do this. If you scan through all a person's conclusions, the reasons why, you will find out these things have kicked off anyhow.

Therefore let us postulate that our goal in processing is not to run engrams, not to desensitize entheia facsimiles, not to get off secondaries and so on. These are not the goals; these are just by-stops, just routes—ways to get to the goal.

What is your goal? A very finite, short-term goal, but a very positive one, is to get all the conclusions the fellow ever made, with their reasons, cleared up. You can put that down as your goal, and any time another process does not assist you in getting this case closer to doing that, skip it. Don't do it. Just because this fellow has had eight operations and nine something-or-others is no reason to run them—unless you have to.

In other words, what you are doing is fixing a case up, first, so that it can straightwire conclusions with accuracy, and then fixing it up again so that maybe it can lock-scan conclusions with accuracy. Then you will find that the case will get to a certain point where it is blocked off by an engram—maybe a fall out of a highchair or something of the sort. It has some conclusions mixed up in it that you aren't able to get, so you run the fall out of the highchair; you run the effort out of it. You get rid of that one; you get the postulates out of it. Then you go right back to work on conclusions again.

Let's postulate that your finite goal in a case in one lifetime is to get all of the times when his adding machine said "total" You are knocking out all the totals, because there isn't a single total this individual has which is now valid. Not a single one.

There is an old Christian statement, "Judge not lest thou be judged." There is more to that than they knew! It isn't very obscure either. A person says, "Oh, he was no good because . . ." and yak, yak, yak, and then he finds himself a little later on in a similar situation, so now his opinion of himself is that he is no good. But he doesn't realize why he doesn't like himself anymore. So every time a fellow adventures upon a criticism of another member of the human race, he will run up against the confounded conclusion himself before he gets too much older. It isn't that it is not nice to judge or not judge, it is just the fact that it doesn't happen to work. You can do all the judging you want to, but knock it out after a while and keep this steady stream of conclusions desensitized.

There is your finite effort, then; and I don't care what you are going after in this case, that is what you are trying to do.

Now, the running of engrams, the running of secondaries, the running of locks, the use of Straightwire (just gunshot stuff), the use of Validation MEST Processing—all of these things are just tools which you have in your hands to patch a case up to a point where it can run all its conclusions.

You will find that an individual can't run all of his conclusions without running an engram or two, or six or twelve. Sooner or later, he is going to fasten up on one. He doesn't know why this happens. Then you go back and find that he is busy in the middle of an operation concluding like mad, and a lot of later conclusions are hung up and a lot of earlier conclusions are on this thing. He can't blow it without running the engram.

The same old rules apply: If you start in on an engram, don't leave it unfinished. Fortunately, effort seems to be able to come out of an engram almost anyplace you find it, though some are tougher than others. In other words, you can get effort out anyplace.

So let's set that up as the finite goal of an auditor. That is what he is trying to do, and that is why he has other tools. You could not do this trick of getting the conclusions off the case if all of the body of Dianetics did not exist behind you, simply because such things as Lock Scanning are necessary. You have to know how to run an engram occasionally. You have to know how an engram can behave, know how they come into restimulation and so on in order to handle these things.

You will find that psychoanalysis is going to pick this up: "Boy, that's all you have to do is straightwire these conclusions. Oh, we're going to start turning out well patients for a change." But they are hung. It is not that easy, it is not that simple. We can say it is that simple and all that sort of thing, and I am going to write a little book on the subject and so on, but it is not that simple.

You are going to get just so many conclusions desensitized on a case and then you are going to run into a brick wall. You are going to run into an engram, in other words, or you are going to run into something else on this case—the reason why it can't get the rest of the conclusions off it. And you are just going to have to turn to and run it.

That is why you have to know how to run engrams, you have to know how to run secondaries and you have to know how to lock-scan. You should know about past deaths and all kinds of things in order to accomplish this one goal. But that goal is terrific in its simplicity. You can produce marked results with an individual without doing anything else but that, but I am afraid the markedness of the results you will produce will be about one to fifty compared to what you could do if you knew the whole package of tricks.

Now, let's take one of these preclears who has gotten butchered up one way or the other; you have to straighten out the case. What is the easiest way to straighten out a case? You can lock-scan off the auditing. If you can't do that, you can just straightwire decisions to be audited and keep banging away at decisions to be audited, and the next thing you know, you will be straightwiring decisions to be treated and all kinds of things. And these are hung up on decisions to be sick! So, in straightening this case out you are really just working the case. It isn't that auditing did this person very much harm; it is that it occasionally put a lot of locks on greater decisions to be sick.

Sometimes auditing has been able to demonstrate to an individual how he can really get hold of entheta facsimiles—he can get hold of hundreds now—and he holds them to his bosom. That is what is known as self auditing; he goes around juggling these entheta facsimiles all day long and he says, "Oh, boy, I'm really sick now—finally achieved my goal." No kidding—that is what self-auditing is.

Therefore we have a shape to our processing now. We know the individual holds on to these things himself. We know he holds on to them by decision, actual decisions.

It is very mysterious to a preclear. After you have worked him for a little while on Conclusion Processing: he finds this out for himself (much to his great horror). When you start running him through the moments just before he got sick he will all of a sudden trigger the moment when he decided to be sick. He has never realized that he had ever decided it. He has so much entheta on the case and everything else that he is doing his concluding underneath the layers of entheta, so he doesn't even see these conclusions.

You know how an individual is surprised when you run him through a burn and there are a lot of perceptions of the environment showing up in the middle of this burn that he didn't know were there? The fellow has burned himself, and on the first run he says, "Well, I burned myself, I took my hand back and I went out the back door." That is all he sees on that run. You go through again and find that he burned himself, a pot fell off the stove, the

cat jumped off the sink, and he went out the back door. You run him through it again, and he burned himself, the frying pan and a pot fell off, the cat jumped off the sink and screamed, he went out the back door and the cat hit him in the leg! This thing keeps developing; these are perceptions. Preclears sometimes are quite surprised at this.

By the way, if anybody doesn't believe that the mind records when it is unconscious, run him through one of these light injuries. He will see how much he was perceiving and picking up that he didn't know he was picking up. That is a good proof. The worst way in the world to prove up an engram, by the way, is to give somebody four or five gallons of sedation, and knock him out and latch it up on top of all his operations as a late-life engram, and then say "Well, he can't remember this anyway, but we're just making it as a scientific test. And yes, we're following protocol. We're doing exactly what everybody said—he won't be able to remember it though" and so on, and then try to audit this thing out. Of course nobody can touch it. (Some psychiatrists did this when we were back at Elizabeth.) And they say, "You see? Nobody records during engrams?"

The other test is much more valid: If you have a psychiatrist or something like that who you are working with, take his hand and lay it on a hot stove. Then you say, "Now, let's run out this engram." He will proceed to run it out, and he will find out that he was recording during the whole period. It will be a great surprise to him.

It is equally surprising to a preclear. when he starts scanning areas of decision, that he suddenly picks up a bunch of hidden postulates which he didn't know were there. He was making up his mind to do this and to do that. This is a great shock to him. I did it the other day to somebody on his decision to wear glasses. I just went over the area about glasses, looking for the decision.

The fellow said, "I never made up my mind."

I said, "Let's go through the periods before you started to wear glasses: the day before, two days before, a week before, a month before?" All of a sudden we dropped into about seven years of age when he had a teacher who was all-protective, who scolded Mama and who wore glasses, and we found an analytical decision sitting there—a concentration on trying to be like that teacher. It was not just "Well, it's an automatic response and I'm sort of a puppet on the strings of fate." The child was sitting there saying, "I want to be like that teacher" and then it suddenly occurred to him that the glasses looked nice on this teacher, so he decided, analytically, to wear glasses.

We are not looking for anything hidden, obscure or anything like that; this stuff is locatable. And when he finds it, it will be some kind of a studied decision. It is fascinating.

For instance, a two-year-old child sits down and thinks, "My mother is mean to me. What am I going to do to get even with her. Now, let's see, I was sick. Yeah, I had a bellyache; it didn't bother me much, but she sure looked worried." Okay. "Mama, I got a bellyache." "Look how worried she looks—ha-ha-ha-ha?"

This kind of a thinking operation goes on. And the fellow was doing it, just sitting there consciously, willingly, willfully doing all of this right straight along—step by step, everything understood, exactly why he was doing it, nothing blurred about it and so forth.

Later on, he has gotten it down to an automatic process, falling against the original decision. Something happens—bing!—the decision for that is to get sick, so he gets sick and so forth. You can even locate it during that period if you scan over it a lot of times. All of a sudden he finds it. "Hmm, that's funny. I sort of said to myself, 'I hurt my head;

therefore I have to be sick.' I wonder why I said that?" You get him puzzled about these darned things; start looking for them and you will really find them.

But what do you do with a case that doesn't know whether it's Tuesday or macaroni? Can you run Postulate Processing on this case? No, you can't. You can find things like his decision to go downstairs.

This is like the boy whose notebook was found and turned in by the master-at-arms on a ship I was on. The book was full of stuff like "I am forward, now I am going aft. I am now going below. I am below, I think I will go topside. I have started to go topside. I am now topside." It was a thick notebook. He was keeping a written record of all of his decisions on what he was going to do. He was crazy, of course, but that was very interesting. This mechanism had come all the way to the front. It is operative all the time in everybody. All that had happened is that it had just come out and become the whole individual.

You can find with some preclear that he can find the moment when he walked downstairs and the moment he decided to walk downstairs. First he will try to tell you that he just walked downstairs, he didn't have to decide to walk downstairs. The devil he didn't! Unless he was carried down, knocked out cold, he had to decide to walk downstairs. Or he had to decide to walk upstairs.

The instantaneous character of such decisions renders them rather hard to locate for a moment, but they are decisions. If you got up all the decisions to walk down, to go down, in a person's life, you would bring him up to present time.

But you are looking for decisions in the middle of enttheta facsimiles, so you had sure better know how to handle enttheta facsimiles.

A woman comes in and she looks rough; she looks bad to you. You start going over her case, kind of testing it out lightly and finding out what has happened. You build a little ARC in the process of doing so, get a little inventory, talk to her "Oh, your father died?" and so forth.

You look this case over and it is obvious to you that if you ever got this case near a grief charge it would hang up fast. So you take some locks off; see if you can find some worries that you can take off, cure up a worry or two. Pick up her worry about being home in time for supper; she is worried about that. Just go over this a few times. Get her to remember times when she was late for supper and a few things like that—just nonsense, practically—until you get this case lined up so you can figure out what you can do with it.

All of a sudden you figure this case is stuck in an engram, that the ARC of the case could actually be raised up to a point where we could run the effort out of that engram. So you decide on this very adventurous postulate, that maybe this is what you are going to do. You are deciding that with some deliberation, not with any spontaneous wandering-around kind of proposition. This is an actual diagnostic decision. You are going to take this scalpel and this pair of scissors and put on the rubber gloves and take out one engram.

So you take out one engram. This doesn't mean that you are just loafing on the job or sitting around, nor that you are going to go on and on and take out more and more engrams. No, you are going to take one engram out of the case, and then you are going to see if this case can't do a little scanning on locks or something of the sort. Or you take out one engram and the case doesn't improve particularly, so you say, "Well, this probably wasn't it. I wonder if we could take out a grief charge." How are you ever going to get the

case up to a point where you can get a grief charge out? Validation MEST Processing. So you start pounding down the line on this, orienting the preclear with regard to matter, energy, space and time—just orientation. Then all of a sudden you find that there is a charge ready to come off, because that little book Self Analysis will occasionally blow a charge into view.

So you start to take that grief charge off, you get it about halfway off and you find that it is being held down by a very bad circuit of some sort. If you were really a red-hot auditor you would shoot that circuit. That is really the ne plus ultra of auditing. If you can take a computing psychotic and shoot his circuit out, you will have a well person on your hands immediately. What is the circuit he is operating there?

But until you have become adventurous enough to shoot circuits, you might as well bypass that. Get off as much of the grief charge as you can; get it all off and the case will start running.

All of a sudden this case is ready to roll on some scanning; now scan it, get up locks. What are you looking for now? You are looking for nothing but conclusions and decisions. You get a Tot of those up—a lot of scanning—then suddenly you find out that the case won't scan anymore.

Why won't the case scan? You may now find out you have latched this case up in a tonsillectomy. Now you take the effort out of the tonsillectomy; you are going to put on the rubber gloves and take out one engram. You do that and you find the case has freed up and you can then run more postulates out of it.

This is the way I work a case.

But I have seen errors an auditor can make: He takes a case and decides he will get fancy with this case. The case is wide open, locks are ready to be run, conclusions are ready to be shot out and everything else—the case is in good shape. But the auditor doesn't take those locks out. He decides he had better just dive down the bank and get the earliest engram or something of the sort—not a very good decision.

Or he will run this case for a while and run it and run it, and all of a sudden this case is no longer getting up locks the way it ought to, but he continues Straightwire long after he should have done something about it. This preclear is getting the same incident, the same incident, the same incident, over and over.

On a case like that, you have to drop it into the next strata by running one engram or by running one grief charge or something like that. You lay it open and you expose, by doing that, enormous sections which can now be straightwired. You drain those sections and get that all squared around, until all of a sudden you run dry again.

And I have seen this happen: An auditor gets into the case, runs the case on locks, finds out there are very few locks available and then shoots some sort of a charge off the case, or an engram. He shoots something off the case and then shoots something else off the case, and then shoots something else off the case—but he isn't picking up everything he is laying bare; he isn't even beginning to pick up what he is laying bare. And this case can actually become disoriented and scattered. The way we are doing it now, the case can actually become disoriented by picking up too many of these entheta facsimiles and running the effort out of them as such.

Run all the decisions you can get off a case, in other words. When it won't run any, then decide what else you have to do to this case to lay open some more area. Then take everything you can get on it, and just keep this up. You have here a repetitive process.

But you are in the position of individuals who are being asked to judge—diagnose—what is wrong with a case. You have a good tool in the tone scale, a very good tool. Look over that tone scale and you will find that those mechanical processes still work at their own levels of the tone scale. You will find that there are cases which won't work to anything but ARC. And you will find that there are cases which just appear to be completely bogged until you have done something about a grief charge, and so on.

But judgment is needed on your part. You now have a new, further end goal than you had before. You want to get the case into shape so that you can straightwire, repetitive-straightwire, and lock-scan out every conclusion the person has ever reached in his whole life. If you can do that for one lifetime, we will grant that you have on your hands technically what is a Clear. We will just grant that that is it. That is simple, isn't it?

What do you have to do to the case in order to get all these things up? You would be good auditors if you took any case that walked in, and by the technique and formula of Conclusion Straightwire, you just got all the conclusions that you could lay your hands on out of this case. That case would be in good shape. He could then walk away and he would be saying, "Well, Dianetics did a lot for me. That auditor's a good guy: he got results."

You could do that and get away with it. But it is something like delivering a five-cent package when you can deliver a five-hundred-dollar package. That is the idea. There isn't very much comparison to what you could do if you took all the conclusions available out, or if you set up the case in such a way that you could get enormous numbers of them out.

If you know the rest of your tools, if you can shoot out the engram that has this case latched up—he is stuck in this thing and has been in it for ages—take the effort out of it.

Or you get a person so far out of valence that he doesn't know which end he is standing on. Find the effort that is keeping him out of valence and get him into valence. Turn up his ARC at that period, and all of a sudden the case will be beautifully patched up. Now you can do an enormous amount for this case; you can get a lot out of it now.

So that is diagnosis. You are going to get people as well off as you can use these tools. A person doing Foundation auditing ought to be able to do Straightwire by formula on Validation MEST Processing and conclusions. He ought to be able to shoot a circuit; he ought to be able to run an engram, completely, and at least get all the effort out of it. He ought to be able to run a secondary and get one when it is available. He ought to be able to muster up enough ARC potential so that he can take a psychotic and have this psychotic in fairly good shape in order to be processed. He should be able to do all those things, but that is not very many things to do, actually.

We would have, then, a bag of tricks by which we could ensure that anybody who walked in would certainly walk away in good shape.

Of course, a Foundation auditor ought to be able to shoot out, at will, a chronic somatic—just shoot it out at will. And I will give you some processes by which this can be done.