

REVIEW OF VALIDATION PROCESSING

A lecture given on
9 July 1951

Handling Theta

I want to briefly review Validation Processing from the beginning.

There are two things involved in an organism: The first is life energy. However many ways this could be described, it is still life energy, and we call that theta. The second is MEST. MEST is a composite word which means matter, energy, space and time—in other words, the physical universe of matter, energy, space and time. The first letter of each of those words is used to compose the word MESS.

Life energy may or may not be a part of the physical universe, but it has its own basic characteristics. It has its own behavior pattern, which is quite easily observed when we look at the three components of affinity, communication and reality. Here we have a triangle which interoperates so that you can't have affinity without having communication and reality, you can't have reality without having affinity and communication, and you can't have communication without having affinity and reality. That is theta.

This can be stated in another way. There are two minds: one is the analytical mind, the other is the reactive mind. We are very familiar with these two things. We find that a person who is restimulated dramatizes or acts reactively out of the content of his reactive mind. The material in the reactive mind could be called entheta—enturbulated theta, theta which is caught and captured and enturbulated in a disorderly fashion.

We see, then, that the free reason—the analytical methods of thinking which an individual uses—can be called either his analytical mind or theta. There is no effort here to break down the fact that there are two minds; these are just two ways of stating the same thing. A person who is being reasonable is working with his analytical mind; he is working on theta. When a person is being unreasonable, reactive, confused, upset in general, he is working with his reactive mind; he is working with entheta, enturbulated theta.

Now, wouldn't it be a nice trick if we could take individuals and without paying much attention to either engrams or grief charges—which is to say, secondary engrams—bring them up to an analytical attitude on the subjects where they are aberrated or most aberrated? Evidently this can be done by merely addressing the lock chains of the case.

As we know, an engram accumulates locks and secondaries. First there is an engram, and then as time goes on this thing gets keyed in. Then it gets more and more locks so that there is a lock chain sitting on top of this engram. This is in the reactive mind. Before that engram was received, the organism was potentially analytical on the subject and contents of the engram and remained so, even then, until the engram was keyed in. Then it still remained somewhat analytical. But it keyed in more and more locks, and finally this engram and its locks built up to be a greater force on his behavior than he could reason around. In other words, reason then became relatively impossible on this subject.

How would you restore reason on that subject without removing these locks and without running that engram? This would be a good trick, wouldn't it?

Let us sort of turn this chain of locks and its basic engram sideways and look at it, and let's say one side of it is the reactive mind. But on this same chain, on this subject, the organism was analytical up to the point of that first key-in. During the next period it was somewhat analytical, but as time went by and the organism collected more locks, it became less and less analytical on the subject.

At the same time, though, there is the analytical side of that lock chain. You could call the reactive side all the times when he was reactive on this subject, and the other side is all the times when he was analytical on this subject.

Let's say that he is some normal American male and has a lock chain on the subject of women. This engram has to do with women; it says bluntly, "Women are no good," and it has a bunch of locks: this girl left him, that one stabbed him in the back, this one ran off with his best friend, that one told him he didn't amount to anything—a standard chain.

There is the engram and it is surrounded with a lot of physical pain; maybe there is a whole chain of these engrams down there. Maybe this preclear is pretty occluded, or maybe you just haven't got time to run out all these engrams on the subject and clear it up. How would we get him to be analytical on the subject of women?

The key is on this same chain. We would do Validation Processing. We would validate the analytical side of the ledger and neglect the reactive side on that chain. We would run this as a chain of analytical moments and leave the reactive material alone. We would run it like this:

"Do you remember anyone who ever gave you cookies?"

"Oh yes, there was an old lady in our block who gave us cookies."

"Good." Now we have a woman who was some good. "Do you remember a woman teacher you liked?"

"Hmmm. Yes. Yes, I remember a woman teacher."

"Do you remember a girl you went with that you had fun with?"

"Yes. Yes, there was one. I don't remember her name now and I don't know what she looked like, but I'm sure there was one."

Then we would just go back over this again and we would pick up the old lady who lived down the block and the teacher and the times he had fun with this girl that he liked, and contact these moments—the analytical moments.

Now, a strange phenomenon begins to happen when you do this to an individual. Theta has a peculiar characteristic: it tries to attack entheta. It tries to attack enturbulated theta and disenturbulate it. In other words, it tries to straighten out the trapped theta, so that when you get up 1/100th of one erg of theta it begins to be very ambitious and it immediately tries to tackle 560,000 kilowatts of entheta.

You will find it very difficult sometimes to run somebody on one of these chains through more than one, two or three locks without having him try to dive into the bad circumstances.

This could be stated another way: The analytical mind, when asked to be analytical about it, starts to discharge the reactive mind and the person can't be anything but reactive about it for a moment.

We are trying to keep this person analytical on the subject of women, and all we are doing is constantly, continually and carefully steering this preclear up the analytical side of the chain about women.

Now, if he is not permitted to go into the entheta and is calmly restrained from doing so, a strange manifestation is liable to take place. He is liable to start getting a somatic, and the more pleasure moments he hits, the worse this somatic will get. This somatic is demanding attention;

this is at least one of the engrams on the track having to do with the fact that women are no good or that you shouldn't look at women or something.

The auditor sometimes finds it difficult to resist the temptation to say "Oh, he's got a somatic! Let's jump into that engram with all four feet!" That is the auditor being theta and trying to attack entheta. The auditor has to restrain himself; he is being analytical and he wants to attack this bad, confused problem.

As long as the preclear can be kept over on the analytical side of the ledger, as long as he can be kept in theta moments, analytical moments (these are not necessarily pleasure moments, they are just moments when he was analytical on the subject), this somatic is liable to turn on hard. If you keep going, it will not only turn on hard but it will go off. We haven't enough cases to know how long it stays off or, really, whether it disappears or merely goes out of restimulation. But in the course of the processing your preclear becomes analytical on that chain and evidently there is some stability connected with this.

However, some of these chains are so heavily entheta that every time you run one—you run a chain once, twice, three times on the analytical side—he dives off back into the entheta and you cannot keep him out of it. You have to go on to another similar chain and find theta in that chain.

By "keeping him out of the entheta," I simply mean that when he is running this thing and he says "Oh yes, I remember this old lady and the cookies, and I remember my teacher. And the first-grade teacher—I certainly hated her! Oh, she was terrible and . . ." (he is off into the entheta—he has gotten up just that much theta and he has dived; theta is ambitious), you say, "Now, what about your second-grade teacher?"

So he plows through this for a second. "Oh yeah, she was all right; I didn't have too bad a time."

"Now, this third-grade teacher you were talking about, did you ever go to a picnic with her?"

"Oh yes, we went to a picnic. It was very fine. But you know, the eighth-grade teacher was there and she was horrible "

"Now, what did you have to eat at the picnic? Did she bring you any food or anything like that?"

In other words, keep him out of that entheta and you will knock out the somatic.

This goes on a very ancient postulate: That thing which is validated in the case grows stronger.

For instance, did you ever talk to a demon circuit? If you have talked to a demon circuit, you know that after a short time that demon gets stronger. He starts really listening.

Processes of religion back in the past validated spirits; they said spirits existed, demons existed, this existed and that existed. Maybe all these things existed, but there was a good chance that somebody was merely hooking in on a demon circuit, and if he did he had to really pay attention to that demon circuit because it was what was being validated.

You can take a preclear and work him and work him and work him on engrams, entheta, locks, bad experiences and so on just endlessly, until suddenly one day he sort of goes all the way over on the reactive side and he will start thinking about these things constantly. He will start worrying about them. You, by giving them your attention, have more or less trained him into a belief that these are the important things.

You as auditors have been neglecting the analytical moments as a matter of course, because you know they are important and you don't worry about whether they are good or bad or whether

they will continue to exist, and you expect him to neglect them too. You validate engrams and validate secondaries by listening to his secondaries and listening to his engrams, but you don't want to hear about the time he found fifty cents when he was a little kid and got this great big sack of candy and so on. The first thing you know, he will even go so far as to start self-auditing. He will start running himself; he will go around thinking about this phrase and that phrase and this bad thing and that bad thing. The thing for the auditor to do at that time is to start Validation Processing and snap him out onto the validation side of the ledger.

For example, take this fellow who has been audited badly, and there are some bad Auditor's Code breaks. You as an auditor could run those Auditor's Code breaks on the auditing chain. But remember that there have been pleasant moments in the auditing chain; there have been pleasant moments with the auditors he has had. You run these, you don't run the code breaks, and the first thing you know, he will extrovert on the subject of auditing. He will no longer be restimulated. You can sometimes turn off chronic somatics restimulated by auditing.

This has its values in two fields: the first is the processing of chronic somatics or somatics turned on by auditing, and the second is the stopping of self-auditing. Those are very specific usage's.

There is a third one: By constant and continual use of Validation Processing, you can keep a person coming on up the tone scale just by running chain after chain after chain. He is liable to get up too high to support himself on the chain and dive off into a lot of enttheta suddenly, but he will be at a higher tone than he was at when you started picking him up.

You actually could follow and plot a case, going way up, then going off into bulk enttheta and then coming on up again, but each time going a little higher on the tone scale. You could watch this occurring.

The way you turn off a chronic somatic is by a rote process; you say just exactly certain words. There is a certain rote for the way you run an engram, and there is one for this Validation Processing:

First the auditor figures out the chronic somatic he is going to turn off—for instance, glasses. Then he says to the preclear. "How many lock chains are there connected with eyes? (snap./)"

The preclear gives him a number.

The auditor says, "Can you give me the names of these chains? (snap./)"

"Yes."

"All right. Give me the name of the first chain, . . . name of the second chain, . . . name of the third chain."

However many chains there are, the preclear will give the names of these chains.

The auditor then starts with the first chain named and scans the analytical moments on that chain. He does this by Lock Scanning or, if the preclear is too far down the tone scale, by Straightwire on incidents, and he just comes up the analytical side of this chain. He doesn't look, in other words, for locks. He looks for analytical moments connected with the subject. If the first chain was "reading," then he would find moments when the preclear enjoyed reading. If the next chain's name was "looking," he would find pleasant things the preclear had seen.

He covers the first chain as long as he can on the analytical side. It sometimes occurs that the preclear will go off into the enttheta in spite of anything the auditor can do. At that moment he should desert that chain, right there, and go to the second chain.

He could even ask at this point what chain it is necessary to run next. Usually, however, these chains are given out in the sequence in which they should be run.

So he runs each chain and he just ignores the somatics he turns on with the preclear. He is liable to turn on headaches, he is liable to turn on backaches and everything else while running one of these chains, but he just goes on picking up analytical moments. The auditor at no time falls into the trap of believing that he now has an engram available and that he wants to know all about this particular incident on the enttheta side of the ledger.

The auditor who has set out to do Validation Processing fails at the moment he pays attention to the enttheta on the case. That auditor who is trying to use half Validation Processing and half enttheta processing can be expected to louse up a case most gloriously. In the first place, he has introduced a confusion into the preclear. The preclear might very well have expected him to do analytical processing, Validation Processing, but all of a sudden the preclear finds out that he is being permitted to run enttheta. So to the preclear, either the auditor has lost control or the auditor has changed his mind, or something like that has happened.

The auditor is almost certain to have an impulse—which is the impulse of theta—to dive at the preclear's enttheta. It is up to the auditor, when he sets out to do any process, to carry through and finish up that process which he set out to do. An auditor should never switch horses in the middle of the stream. For instance, after he has explored the case with the file clerk and has made up his mind that he is going to run an engram in the basic area, he gets the preclear halfway down the track toward that engram and all of a sudden changes his mind because the preclear said "Oh yes, that reminds me of the time my grandpappy died." The auditor starts to run a secondary, gets two tears off the secondary, finds out that it was really a fear engram he should have been going after, gets into a postnatal period and runs whooping cough. Then he gets up into a late exodontistry and says, "This is what I should have been running in the first place; let's see if I can find a grouper right in the middle of it." Even if nothing else happens, his preclear will get practically frantic!

It is merely good auditing to persist along an outlined course. If you have decided on what course you are going to take with this particular session, it is bad auditing to desert that course. But you don't undertake these courses without looking at your preclear and consulting with his file clerk. You make an estimate of what you are going to do this session, then finish it up and do it. If you figure out what you are going to do with this preclear, go ahead and do it right straight on through and persist until you finish the task. For instance, if you set out to run a preclear through every past death you can find, one right after the other, don't run five past deaths and then all of a sudden get bored with the project and decide what you should be running is basic area engrams, prenatal and suddenly shift over and start running those.

An auditor, then, should do two things: He should first make a statement, if only to himself, of what he intends to do with this preclear or of his decision about what he is to do with his preclear, and he should then persist along that line until he has concluded his mission or carried it out to a point where it is completely and utterly futile to continue, if he is along a line of failure.

If an auditor sets out to discover whether or not Papa beat the preclear morning and night or just mornings, he shouldn't give up halfway down the line merely because he finds Aunt Mary. He should go on and discover what he was trying to find out about Papa.

The auditor should be nothing if not clear-minded about what he is attempting in the case.

And in Validation Processing, don't, under any circumstances, mix alcohol and gasoline. You are getting up more and more theta on this case. You could actually dive this preclear over solidly into a secondary which the preclear is not ready to run merely by suddenly picking up, momentarily and artificially, a large quantity of theta and then rushing over into the enttheta.

The preclear is going to rush over into the entheta. If he starts to pick up a secondary or another entheta part of this chain and run it for you, you may be running him right straight into something he is not ready to run, because the method you are using to free reason, to free theta in this case—to pick it up and loosen it up—is artificial. You are doing an artificial action here, and by running all of this analytical stuff you are actually getting up an energy which shouldn't completely be there. You are coaxing this energy out into existence, and its natural action is to go over and dive into the entheta.

You keep it out there in existence and you build that thing up until it is a lightning bolt so that when it hits the entheta it knocks out a whole lock chain. It is up to you to build up the tension and the potential on it. That much energy wouldn't be in existence on that chain if you weren't running analytical moments, so don't sacrifice it.

Now, I have given you a rote on Validation Processing and I hope you will abide by my precautions on its use.

In any process, whether it is chemistry, physics or housework, it is a good orderly thing to do to make a statement about what one intends to do or recognize what one intends to do before he does it, and then to go on and finish what one has said he is going to do. That certainly applies in processing. That is good order.

Validation Processing, to some degree lately, has been used on a halfway basis. When running the analytical chain, the auditor takes his finger off his number and says, "Well, the preclear is over in the entheta anyway; let him run some entheta. We've got lots of free theta here, let's let him run into the secondary now." Nothing happens in the secondary, but the preclear doesn't move on the track.

I am not telling you that it is terribly dangerous to do this; it is just going to fail of its mission. Of course somatics are going to turn on, but you are not running the analytical side of this chain to get the somatic content, you are running it to extrovert this preclear on the subject of the chain.

The subject of extroversion and introversion is something you should understand with regard to self-auditing. A person begins to self-audit only when he is too introverted. He is looking inside himself at the past; then he will self-audit. He is wondering and worrying about what happened to him in the past instead of the exterior environment he has here, and the future.

If a person had all of his attention units in present time and if those attention units were all free to examine and reason about the present environ and future actions in it, he would be a very, very sanely acting individual. If you could get someone into that state without running any engrams and keep the person stable in that state of extroversion, not worrying or thinking too much about himself but considering the exterior environ, you would be achieving a very short route toward a person who would act like a clear.

About the best you could say about a clear is he is in present time; all available attention units are in present time.

So, you have an individual in a state of extroversion; he is on the present time section of his time track. Now, if you want to introvert him, you are not going to introvert him to this present time part of the time track; he can look at this part of the time track all he wants to.

What has happened in the past is you have shifted his attention down to a lower part of the time track by introverting him, and then you have shifted his attention down to an even lower part of the time track. You can keep this up and keep locking him up in engrams until he is stuck on the track just to that extent—he has a lot of attention units stuck at different parts of the track—and the first thing you know, he will start auditing himself. He is trying to get free from these parts of the past and get up into the future, and he thinks the way to do it is to self-audit.

That is not the way to do it. The way to get auditing done is with an auditor.

When an individual is in this condition of extroversion, he is going to perform pretty well. But when a fellow is in this circumstance of introversion, he is not going to perform well; he is going to have somatics, he is not going to feel well about present time and he is going to get kind of dreamy and hazy. The auditor doesn't want to put his preclear into this circumstance; he wants him up in present time, extroverted.

Now, there is a method of extroverting a preclear that is not recommended: You sit him down in a quiet room in an easy chair and lock all the windows carefully, and then go out in the hall and take a very hungry lion and throw it into the room. This will extrovert your preclear. It is not recommended.

One of the reasons why the present world is pretty aberrated is that the initial basic amount of tension on these attention units was built to stand the lion-dropped-in-the-room kind of shock. This was the environment for man for a thousand thousand times the number of years that the level of environmental shock has been his youngest child walking into the room or having the bill collector call on the phone. That is about the magnitude of shock he is getting now.

Man used to be geared up for a level of tolerance like this: He and his pal are sauntering through the jungle, coming home of an evening from a clambake he and his fellows have had, and a leopard jumps out of a tree. He hits the leopard over the head and goes on down the line a little way, and there is a boa constrictor down there, so as he and his pal are walking along they break its back. Then they see a couple of deer, so they chase them over a cliff and then scale down the cliff and finally get home.

Man got built up to stand terrific environmental shock—immediate, understandable, emergency shock. This is a lot different from engram shock. This is something happening; this alerts somebody that something is occurring.

For instance, I doubt that very many people have had a lion dropped in their living room lately. But they have a set of nerves to stand it and, believe me, that is not what drives people crazy. Immediately one would think in terms of getting out—that is, the more sensible souls. Some of the braver souls would think of chewing up the lion. That is not recommended either.

But this is necessity level, and what is necessity level but a sudden, sharp, immediate extroversion, whereby all these attention units all the way back down the track come up to present time suddenly? This is present time reality.

I imagine there are some of you who have been frightened of something at some time in your life—something major, of course. But if you can remember through the period when the house caught on fire or when something like that happened, I don't think you will find any moment in it when you were worrying about other houses having caught on fire or anything else except doing just exactly what you should have been doing at the time. In other words, that is a present time environment. That is not laying in a big aberration. It is merely bringing a person up to present time.

I think nature had this all dreamed up and then man worked and worked and got himself beautifully secure. The more secure he got, the less external-environment tension he had so the more he could drop back down the time track. And he got crazier and crazier and crazier and finally got "normal."

Now, what you are trying to do with Validation Processing is find each one of these points where he is introverted and merely extrovert him. The way you extrovert him is very simple: just make him concern himself with the times in his life when he has been analytical about that area. Something happens when you do this and he will extrovert finally on the subject.

We are making a couple of little tests, following through on Validation Processing, and it may be that it will turn off chronic somatics. It will certainly turn off acute somatics. And believe me, the auditor who just plows right on through these things can certainly turn on some fancy somatics running Validation Processing; he can turn on some beauties. The somatic can get tougher and tougher, then all of a sudden recede, and it is gone. Where did it come from? The auditor doesn't care. If the preclear does, you keep him on the analytical side of the ledger.

"I wonder where this horrible headache is coming from?" he will say to himself. "I just feel like somebody is grinding my eyes with a mechanical drill."

And you say, "Now, let's remember the time they gave you the piece of pie."

And he says, "But this hurts! Oh, all right! But . . ."

"All right. Now, do you remember when your aunt baked any cakes? Did she ever bake any cakes?"

"Yes, as a matter of fact—ouch! That hurts!"

You keep him on the cake, because the next thing you know, this thing is going to just fade on out. The somatic is then gone.

That is just an interesting manifestation of Validation Processing. It is all adequately accounted for in basic postulates. And again I wish to stress that if you set out to do one kind of processing, don't wind up doing another.

Validation Processing can be used with any chain or on any other postulate. It is merely a theory. I am going to tell you about MEST Processing later, and you can take MEST Processing and apply Validation Processing to it.

Now, when you are running a pleasure moment like an engram, you are actually doing Validation Processing on engrams. If you could run enough pleasure moments on a case just like they were engrams and keep that up day after day, remarkable things would happen.

In California about six or eight months ago one auditor was working an old lady who had been bedridden for a number of years, very bogged down. And this auditor was sort of weary of listening to a lot of enttheta from his preclear. so he just started to run pleasure moments, and he ran all the pleasure moments he could find on the case. He ran out of past pleasure moments, so he went out into the future and he ran future pleasure moments and imaginary moments and so on. He just kept running pleasure moments. One day he went over to give her a session and she was out of bed and walking around, and she felt fine and didn't want any more auditing because the present time environment was pleasant enough. She didn't have to go into the future or into the past to find pleasure, and she gave him quite a little sharp talking-to on the subject, and he went away.

Three months later I checked this case and the old lady had stayed stable on that. I asked the auditor how many hours of pleasure moments he had run on this person and he said, "Oh, I guess around two hundred."

Now, on any kind of processing we come up with or any rote processing like Lock Scanning, Straightwire, running secondaries—any one of these things—we can take the pleasant analytical side of the process and repeat the process as Validation Processing. Everything that is in the book so far in the way of processing can be applied either as enttheta processing or as theta processing.

If you are going to do Validation Processing—in other words, theta processing—you do nothing but, and address nothing but, analytical, pleasant or theta moments with the type of processing you are using.

Or, you do only entheta moments with the type of processing you are using.

You can lock-scan through the theta moments on any chain or you can lock-scan through the entheta moments on that chain.

I would like to see some chronic somatics turned off. I want to build up a case book on this thing; it seems to be fantastically effective and I want to see how far it will go. We know now that it works. How far will it work?

In connection with that, you will find there are many low-toned preclears who cannot lock-scan—in other words, who cannot go back down the track and run rapidly up through a series of locks into present time. Cases that are badly stuck on the track have a difficulty in doing this too. So I just want to give you a little caution right now about Lock Scanning and give you another technique to substitute for it.

This technique is called Repetitive Straightwire. This is not repeater technique, this is Repetitive Straightwire. The way you do this is to ask the preclear to recall this and recall that and recall the next incident like that. Whatever you ask him to recall, see if he can then recall another similar incident. “Are there any earlier incidents like that that you can remember?” “Are there any earlier moments you can recall?” He goes on and he gives you five, six, eight incidents that he is remembering.

Now you ask him to remember the first one again. Then have him recall the second one again and the next one again, and he will go through the same sequence. Then ask him to go through the same sequence again, remember them all over again.

Of course, what you are doing is deintensifying the entheta or intensifying the theta on those moments. That is Repetitive Straightwire; you are asking him to remember and remember and remember.

Evidently he will come up to a point where he breaks naturally into Lock Scanning. He will get up the tone scale to a point where he actually can lock-scan. And he will start to lock-scan when you ask him to start this process; he will actually be lock-scanning.

The graded scale then would be, first, just Straightwire, asking him to remember, and then asking him to remember an incident, and then remembering it again, and then remembering it again. This works best on a chain of incidents. And then Lock Scanning would be where you ask him to go back to the first incident similar to this and sweep on forward to present time through all similar incidents.

So this is how you go about Repetitive Straightwire: You ask the fellow, “Did you ever have a car?”

He says, “Yes.”

“What kind of a car did you have?”

“Well, I remember one car I had; it was a Model T Ford.”

“Did you have a car before that?”

“Yes, as a matter of fact the family had a Maxwell.”

“Well, what about another car?”

“Well, at the present time I am driving a Plymouth.”

“All right. Now let’s see, do you recall the first car that you ever had?”

“Yeah, a Model T Ford.”

“Do you recall any earlier cars?”

“Yes, the Maxwell.”

“Yeah. Now, do you recall a later car? What kind of car do you have now?”

“A Plymouth.”

“Oh. Now let’s see if you can remember about this Ford.”

He may think that you are just asking him to remember more incidents or more kinds of incidents about it. But what he is doing is remembering the Ford, the Maxwell, the Plymouth, the Ford, the Maxwell, the Plymouth— that is a repetitive line and will actually discharge things which don’t just automatically discharge.

A chain of locks will come on up the tone scale just like an engram will. The emotional tone of a chain of locks, if it is ready to come up, will come right on up the tone scale.

If you find this fellow angry the first time you go over this chain of locks, whether with Straightwire, Repetitive Straightwire or Lock Scanning, you go over it a second time and you are going to find out that he is probably just antagonistic; you go over it the third time and you will find out he is getting bored and then he will finally tone 4 on it.

- Now, you will notice there are some preclears who, when you ask them to go back to that first lock, say “Oh yes, I remember a time like that. Ha-ha-ha! “ You have broken the thing all the way on up the tone scale to tone 4! You can break almost any chain of locks up through to tone 4—if it is ready to come up—just by Repetitive Straightwire or Lock Scanning.

But something very strange happens with Lock Scanning: A person quite often (most of the time, as a matter of fact) doesn’t tone 4. He extroverts. You start going over locks, and you sweep over them once and he finds a couple. You go through this chain a second time and he has three or four new incidents, just like Repetitive Straightwire. Ask him to go through it a third time and he gets a whole bunch of new ones, then when you ask him to go through it again he doesn’t have any new ones.

This is no time to quit that chain, just because he can’t find any new ones. You run that chain until he extroverts. Each time he comes up to present time you ask him, “What are you thinking about?”

“Oh, I don’t know. I just ran across that one about Aunt Bertha again, and gee, you know, that was an awful tough one.”

Run him through it again. “What were you thinking about that time?”

“Oh, Aunt Bertha.”

Run him through it again. “Now what are you thinking about?”

“I was thinking it was about time I got to work!”

That is the time you leave that chain alone—right there. He is extroverted to the exterior environment on the subject of that chain.

A chain, by the way, will apparently charge up again sometimes. That isn't really what is happening. What you have done is gone out on the edges of it with other chains and you have pulled these other chains on the side and made more theta available in the line. There was more on the chain that you didn't get up and it will apparently charge up again. But don't worry; the case hasn't suddenly slumped or something of this sort. There is just more enttheta there to be gotten up.

I wanted to mention Repetitive Straightwire because in Validation Processing you will find that at first it is much easier on a preclear if you don't lock-scan him but just ask him to try to remember. Whereas there are preclears who can remember theta moments, when you first start a person out on a chronic-somatic chain, the chances of your finding theta moments are much less than your chances of finding enttheta moments. So, doing it by Straightwire and Repetitive Straightwire, you keep him from locking up quickly into the enttheta. You can control the case better, in other words, by running Straightwire and Repetitive Straightwire. The case gets to be in pretty bad shape sometimes if you just start scanning him up the line; he will jam up somewhere on the track.