

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

would be way over here to the left bottom corner: negative knowingness about hiding. Then negative lookingness about hiding.

Now, what's interesting about negative lookingness about hiding is you ask a preclear to close his eyes and you say, "Now, what are you looking at?" (By the way, a preclear today isn't a body—it's a thetan.) And you ask him, "What are you looking at?" and he'll say, "Nothing."

You'll say, "What are you looking at?" and he will say, "Nothing."

You say, "Come on. What are you looking at?"

"Nothing!"

You're running into negative lookingness about hiding. He won't even look at where he's hiding.

And you ask him this a few more times, and he'll finally say, "All right. I'm looking at this mass of blackness." You've moved him one more button over. And he will go through that panel, more or less, until he moves over to hiding.

He'll finally say, "I don't want to know why I'm hiding. It's too dreadful."

Then he'll finally say, "What the devil am I hiding for?" And he's gone over into the right-hand parallel. See how that would be? He

5 JUNE 1955

changes his mind from one to the other. He doesn't want to know, and he wants to know.

Now, as you move on across to the right, you get the gains. And he'll say, "Well, if I hide . . . you know, sex, if you hide, you know, and you really aren't, you know, saying that you're there, and that the body is doing it all, and—yeah, that's not bad. That's a good idea. If people knew I was here, then I wouldn't get any sexual relationships at all." They'll tell you goofy things like this. They've got it rationalized beautifully.

And you'll get them over finally to a point of "Well, where the devil am I?" And they will really start looking around.

9 Now, understand that this is a Subzero Scale. This applies to a thetan. This does not necessarily apply to a body at all. It applies to a thetan. And this is the state of mind he's in, and why people have a hard time exteriorizing thetans, because they just haven't gone far enough south.

Now, actually, if this Waiting button is good and valid, it would simply be drawn in below the Hiding button, and you would have a person not wanting to know anything about waiting as the extreme low point.

Now the extreme low point of that chart is all the way to the left and all the way down. So if we put another line down below that, we

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

would have “not wanting to know anything about waiting.” And you could mark that in simply by remembering it’s there and putting an “X” below the Hide line, if you wanted to plot your preclear.

Now, as your preclear is being processed, you could actually mark him right on this chart, and you can also keep track of processes run on this chart. You can just mark him right on in. He’ll fit in there someplace. And that will be his level of reality.

Now, where he has a problem or a puzzle that he’s talking to you about (now, here’s the trick of using this chart), where he has a problem or a puzzle—you know, a confusion—and he knows there’s a confusion there, he already has something known about it, and you might say you undercut the preclear by going down one step and to the left one step from the confusion. Down and to the left one step, and you’ve got a reality. Your preclear should be able to attain a level of reality there. If he can’t, go one step further down and one step further left and you will get his reality.

But he probably has, unless he’s a very strange preclear indeed, a level of reality just below and to the left of the point where he’s got a worry—a confusion or a worry.

Now this person comes to you, and this person says, “Well, I don’t know what I’m going to do about my wife. She just buys, buys, buys

5 JUNE 1955

everything. She's just spending me poor. I've got to do something about her. She just buys everything in sight. It's just something I just can't understand," and so forth. And "Of course, I really don't want to know exactly why she wants all these pretty clothes, but that's generally what she's buying. But it's her buying that I'm worried about."

That, of course, is an extreme sort of a case. But you would be surprised how many classes of worry are presented to you as you listen to people. And you just stew around and puzzle around on that chart until you find them, and then you cut down, and you will find some point where he can talk with relief.

Now, let's use it just as two-way communication. Tricky chart. Let's use it as two-way communication.

This person says, "Sex has become a horrible burden to me. I feel upset in the presence of a member of the opposite sex. I don't feel comfortable at all."

You got negative Sex, Hide, haven't you? Well, if Waiting were down there, you would go down to Waiting, and you would go over to the left one pace, and you would have a comfortable topic of conversation.

You could talk to them about Egyptian pyramids and things like this, and they would find it a very engrossing subject. You see how that would be?

Well, what they tell you they're concerned about, they're telling you what they are unknowingly confused about. And you have to find his reality level, you go south and to the left. 10

You'll find a lot of high-toned people around, too. You'll find a lot of people that go way up the line. They say, "Well, I just don't know what I'm going to do with my husband. He's in and out and around and about. Always into things, doing things. Doctors keep telling him, I keep telling him, he's going to work himself to death. He's got to take a rest, you know. Can't understand why he keeps on all this work." Where's that person worried about? Trying to stop somebody and can't.

Well, what would this person talk about? Let's just take it on the broad scale and just go down vertically just one step. Trying to stop somebody—couldn't control them, can't even stop them now, so let's go down one step. All right. Now let's go over to Sex, that being closest in to the marital picture. You could run a process on this person or you could talk to them on this subject with great ease. But you could certainly talk to this person about ownership. See, they'd have a cognition about owning things. Why? They're in a confusion about stopping things. So you would find them, very probably, intelligible on the subject of owning things. And you could have a good old talk with them and they

5 JUNE 1955

could go into two-way communication with you real good on what they bought yesterday and the day before and what she owns and they own, and so forth.

This is an interesting key. If you were to merely use the vertical scale, you could find yourself in a two-way communication with almost anybody. First you get them to sort of voice or articulate something about the worries in life or what's bothering them or something of this order, if you did make them articulate that, or if just in listening to them—if you were really an expert, you wouldn't ask them what's wrong, you'd just listen to them and spot them on that vertical scale. And you want to know what to talk to them about so you will have a nice, quiet conversation? I just go down one point and talk. And you'll find them very eager to go in communication with you on this point. How to talk to people. It's tricky. You want to try it.

All right. The salesman has a great many problems in two-way communication, trying to get somebody into two-way communication. This chart solves it for him. You want to know why traveling salesmen always used to have to tell dirty stories all the time? They thought they did, which merely told you where the traveling salesman was. Being in motion and on trains all the time without any great contact with his family or wife or something of the sort, he got down and stuck at that

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

level—Sex. He didn't feel free about it. He was sort of obsessed on this line. He would have talked easily, then, one down and to the left.

Now, the oddity is, is this will usually take place: They will talk any down and any to the left, which just opens the doors wide for conversational topics for two-way communication.

Well, let me tell you now something that is of great interest to the auditor. A preclear who is not processed within his realm of reality will make such an insignificantly tiny advance that both the auditor and the preclear will believe nothing is happening. And where do we get this "nothing happens"? Where do we get this "no change of case"—from change itself? No. Addressing the subject of change is usually too high-scale and out of the reach of the individual who can't change. You understand? He can't change, so therefore he can't talk about change. All right.

What about the preclear that you can run any process on, that never gets a communication lag. (The length of time between the posing of the question to the person and the answer to that question, regardless of what intervenes—that's the definition of a communication lag.) He just always runs everything flat, doesn't seem to be affected by anything one way or the other, and just keeps on running very easily and always has flat lags. And any new process that comes out, you just use the process

5 JUNE 1955

on him and he has no—flat lag and he gets no change, but he's usually sometimes very happy to go on being audited. What about this person? Well, we've solved this person with that piece of paper you have in your hands.

I've solved him on this basis: He gets no communication lag when you're processing him above his level of reality. That sounds fantastic, doesn't it? You mean this fellow would go on and talk to you about mice and goats in enthusiasm, and football games, and you process him on all kinds of buttons and trick processes and everything, and nothing happens. And he goes on and he perfectly—he just talks back and forth and he's evidently doing things all right in life, and he is just going on just beautifully. And you say, "Well, huh! Something wrong here. Process seems to work on Josie and Anna and this one and that one, but isn't working on this person. Because the person isn't getting any better." You begin to suspect this after eight or nine thousand hours.

You couldn't look into this person's head and see the poorness of the person's reality. Most of their responses are machine responses. The world is not very real. Communication is not at all real. You're not really there. And yet they have only one thing by which to judge reality, and that's their own reality. They don't have two realities—not until they exteriorize. Sometimes they exteriorize, they'll have reality as a thetan

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

and then, plus the body, they get another reality. This is the routine. This is why many thetans who are actually in very poor condition have quite a high—they have an *apparent* reality. They know walls are there. They can drive cars. They can get elected to government, and so on. They have a fairly high apparency, you know. But it's just the body and its size and the automatic response that carries them on.

But actually in this combo, there is only one reality and no other reality with which to compare it. So what is the person's actual reality? Well, you can't compare his reality with his reality so he can't tell you how things real—how real things are, and you really can't judge how real things are, unless you go sideways and look at another metering thing, like communication.

Well now, the oddity is, when a person is going on machine responses, you're getting the communication lag of his machinery, which is usually pretty good. You see? You're not looking at the preclear at all, you just—machinery goes on, it's the communication lag of the school he was educated in. You know what the communication lag of somebody who was educated at Oxford would be? It's the communication lag of Oxford. Somebody educated in Boston, the communication lag of Boston. And this would be routine—nothing much to that. He'd just go on, on these social responses. But don't ask him suddenly some searching question

5 JUNE 1955

which would be in his level of reality, because you're going to produce a communication lag that'll just go from here on out—*wham!*

So we just look this person over and find out where he is obsessively unknowing—where he doesn't know. There's some level that he gets troubled at, a little bit bothered, doesn't know about it. And then let's undercut it and move over one to the left and talk to him about that, and you will all of a sudden be talking to the preclear.

12 Looking at this chart, you can take this person who goes on and on and on and on and on, gets audited forever and forever and forever and apparently no change, and realize that he's probably being audited above his level of reality the whole line. And therefore, it's up to you to find his level of reality. His level of reality sits just below where he's worried—just below where he's unknowingly upset.

Now, this person doesn't have to say, "Well, I am worried." We don't have to find something wrong with him. We just look at him, we find his position on the chart. What have we got here? He isn't going to say, "Well, I'm worried about this," or something of the sort. We just happen to notice that he is just doing fine in life—he does things just swell in life—in every department except children. He's in wonderful condition, the fellow is practically a Clear, we know that, he's successful—but

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

boy, does he hate kids! Get the idea? Children are already above his level of reality.

We ask him, “What’s wrong with kids?”

“Oh, I don’t know. You know—motion, noise, confusion, no control, no control, no control, see.”

Boy, we could sure have a heart-to-heart talk with him on responsibility for the original sin; move down, not very far to the left. We could certainly talk to him with great reality about hiding. We could talk to him with great reality about what we had to protect in the way of our rights in this society. See all the various things we could talk to him about? They’d just be anywhere down and anywhere to the left.

Now, when you’ve moved to the left on one line, move all the way to the right on the next line. It’s that mechanical. Go down a line and move all the way to the right. Let’s say we have negative knowingness: doesn’t want to know anything about how you go about owning anything—a tramp, see. Now, where’s the next step down? It’d be all the way to the right on Protection. You see that? You’d move all the way over to the right on Protection and then start going downscale to the left again. And then you’d move all the way over to the right and then downscale to the left again.

5 JUNE 1955

Well, let's look that over just as a test. You realize that somebody who would want to know nothing about ownership would be a tramp. And his level of reality would be how he got protected. He'd want to know about protection, and then successively right on downscale from there. Just drop down and over. Well, let's say we found his level of reality over here on negative knowingness or anywhere along that line—we would go to the left and then go to the right, just like you read in English. This way we find realities; and this chart is most useful in discovering the reality of the preclear.

Now, we have some preclears around—which is why I'm glad Waitingness suddenly shows up—we've had some preclears around who have flunked out of Hiding. They didn't want to know anything about Hiding. So we weren't quite far enough south, and I imagine these people could process on Waiting. All right.

Let me tell you, now, the uses of this. Now, there's several processes listed on there. You see that down in the corner? You could check these off as they were run. Those processes are actually not stated in the order that they should be run. "Think a thought about ____" is the auditing command. That's the first: "Think a thought . . ." "Think a thought about hiding."

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

Now, actually, the senior process to all this is simply “Think a Thought.” You just say to this person, “Think a thought.” That’s much too tough a process for a lot of preclears. We say, “Think a thought.”

“Gabbbb.” Or, very glibly, “Oh yes. Yes. Yeah. Yeah.” You got a goat out here—a facsimile of a goat—and it says “baaah,” and that’s thinking a thought or something. Something real wild like this going on.

So Think a Thought is quite a tough process. There is a process that undercuts Think a Thought, which is you give the preclear a thought to think. You know, he’s having a hard time trying to think a thought, so you give him a thought to think. And you say, “Buildings are big. All right, can you think that thought?”

And the fellow says, “Sure, I can think that thought. Buildings are big.”

And you say, “All right. Now place it there and place it there and place it there and place it there and place it there, place it there and place it there and place it there.” After he handles this, he gets to a recognition that he can handle the thought that all buildings are big. So he can handle a thought. And after he can handle one for a while, you’ve got him up Tone Scale a little bit and he possibly can think a thought. This is an extreme preclear, however. But that’s one of the ways of handling him.

5 JUNE 1955

But just—you ask anybody, “Think a thought. Think a thought. Think a thought. Think a thought. Think a thought.” It’s a fantastic process, but it’s a tough process. They’re supposed to independently think this thought and know they’re thinking it, it’s what you begin to drum into them after a while.

13 The next one is Problems and Solutions. Now, that in its entirety is contained in *The Creation of Human Ability*—Problems and Solutions—one of the Route 2 steps. And it’s definitely not to be undervalued.

The basic definition of the performance of thinkingness in *The Original Thesis* is: “The function of the mind is to pose and resolve problems”—its first statement was; I believe it appears differently in the book—“pose and resolve problems relating to survival.” And that process, which is R2–20, is right there—right there. And that process—its value on a case cannot possibly be overestimated. Wouldn’t care how long it continued.

And the way we’ve been running that is to ask a person just to think of a problem. Or “What kind of a problem could you be to yourself?” And then ask them this question several times, and then ask them, “All right. Can you think of an answer?” And then don’t take the answers to the problems they’ve been giving you. Don’t let them answer their own problems.

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

And don't ever run it consecutively. That is to say, "All right. Now, can you think of a problem? All right, give me an answer. All right, think of a problem. Give me an answer." They'll just start talking back and forth and solving their own. We're not interested in them doing that. We want them to have a great number of problems.

Just as it says in the old Greek grammars, "The animal, man, is unhappy without laws," we could say, "The animal, man, is unhappy without problems." And you can run your preclear as fresh out of problems . . . Did you ever solve a terrifically weighty problem for somebody and have them hate you? Huh? Did you ever work and work and worry and worry and worry and finally get Joe's problems all solved and give him the answer, and then have him not speak to you for days? Well, the poor guy, he just had *one* problem. Pauper—you made a pauper out of him just like that. (*snap*) You just said, "That's easy. Why don't you leave her?" He realizes this is the answer. "Duh!" All right.

Now, as we look over Problems and Solutions, we discover that an individual's brightness depends upon his ability to arrive at solutions. But his sanity depends on his ability to invent problems. Got that? A great oddity. Actually, answers themselves will cure panic. You could just say, "All right. Now, can you think of an answer?"

And the fellow says, "To what?"

5 JUNE 1955

“To anything. Can you think of an answer?” And you say, “All right. Think of another answer. All right. Think of another answer. All right. Think of another answer. All right. Think of another answer.”

And he says . . .

Doesn't matter to what problem he's trying to answer—he'll start answering a lot of problems in his bank and then all of a sudden start to dream up answers just in general. You'll find his panic or feelings of fear or insecurity will rather melt away.

Answers. The most valid answers are answers in relationship to location. But you just ask him answers: “Answers. Give me another answer. Give me another answer. Give me another answer to this problem.”

But if you haven't run problems to a point where he realizes he can invent them, you will make a pauper out of him and he will get very unhappy. And he all of a sudden will pull in some of the most fantastic problems from way back on the track—“I'm being chased by demons.” See, he'll start pulling in irrational problems because he has a shortage of problems. There are evidently quarts or pints or tons of problems. It's quantitative and he makes them up.

14 Now, a problem is very closely related to an object. You can't possibly have an object without having a problem, because a problem was basically an object. Very curious. If you don't think this is the case,

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

just think of one of the last objects you acquired of any size or shape—just think of it for a moment—did it create any problems?

All right. So we have to have a great plenitude of problems, a great plenitude of solutions. But instead of letting the guy wander around all over the place, let's just take "Think a thought about hiding." Or "Give me a problem about hiding" or "An answer to hiding." You see how you could use the chart there? Or, and this is the key process for this chart, "What would happen if/What would happen if not?" because that includes the future. "What would happen if you hid? What would happen if you didn't hide? Well, what would happen if you hid? Well, what would happen if you didn't hide?" And that's all the auditing there is—acknowledging, of course, the replies of the preclear. Making him think up the consequences of hiding and not hiding—one of the more powerful processes.

But these processes which are listed there are interlocked. You don't do them independently. For instance, you realize that if you keep on asking a person about the consequences of this and that, he's keeping on giving answers, isn't he? He's giving you answers, answers, answers, answers, answers, answers. And if you say problems about not hiding, he'll start giving you problems. See, "What would happen if you didn't hide?" And he'll give you a problem and a problem and a problem and a

5 JUNE 1955

problem. Well, problems and solutions and consequences are then interlocked. And you simply use them with the terminology I've just given you and your preclear all of a sudden starts to come on up Tone Scale, *if* you've undercut his reality one pace.

- 15 For instance, this individual is interested in controlling all the taxicabs in his town. And you say, "Well, look-a-here"—here's the common fault of an auditor—you say, "Look, this guy is real hep. He's real interested in the subject of owning—or pardon me, controlling all the taxicabs in this town. Therefore, we'll process him on it." Oh no, you don't. Because he hasn't any reality on what would entail owning all the taxicabs—or controlling all the taxicabs in town, or owning them. You better start talking to him about protection or ownership—preferably probably about protection. He's got a reality on that. He's trying to own or control, he's not able to, so therefore it's a big problem and a mix-up and a confusion to him. But he knows he could protect. If he were interested in controlling all the taxicabs in town, I'll give you 10 to 1 that this individual has originated a number of devices by which taxicab drivers and the passenger persons and the bumpers, and so forth of taxicabs, can better operate to protect the taxicab business. He'll have a lot of solutions that he's already manufactured on the subject. If he's entirely sold on owning and controlling taxicabs, he's already taken care of protection of taxicabs. And there's where you can talk to him, where

HOW TO CHART THE PRECLEAR—KNOWINGNESS AND UNKNOWINGNESS

he'll relax and then he'll get into communication with you and realize you're there, too, and he'll go on upscale from there.

Now, these are the key processes—just going over them lightly. If you were to take a preclear and you were to ask him, one after the other, “Think a thought about hiding. Think a thought about hiding. Think a thought about hiding.” Or this lower button, “Think a thought about waiting. Think a thought about waiting.” And then you were to say, “Well, give me some problems about waiting. Some problems about waiting. Some problems about waiting. Some problems about waiting,” got this rather flat. “Give some answers to waiting. Some answers to waiting. Some answers to waiting; some answers to waiting.” “What would happen if you waited? What would happen if you didn't wait?”—those two, alternation—believe me, you'd be bringing him on upscale.

But for you in all practical purposes—having nothing to do with auditing—with this chart, you can always establish ARC with anyone. After you've listened to them or looked at them a short time, you can see exactly what they're trying to do. And if you want them to listen to you and if you want them to know you're there, if you want them to know that you *are* married to them or that they *are* supposed to buy a tractor, or if you want them to give the church a better contribution, you'd better undercut what they seem obsessed about one or two levels, and

5 JUNE 1955

talk and get into two-way communication with them. And that isn't auditing, necessarily.

The most practical purpose of the chart which you hold in your hands, then—the most practical purpose it has—is communication with certainty and reality and with some affinity with your fellow human being.

And as such, to this congress, I give it to you.

Thank you.



SIX BASIC STEPS— SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

A LECTURE GIVEN ON 6 JUNE 1955

62 MINUTES

All right. Want to talk to you now 2
about the fundamental of auditing today, in a very, very fast review. Six
Basic Steps. I'm going to give this in an hour, and it only takes eight weeks
to learn them.

The Six Basic Steps, as they exist here and now, you will find in a
little bit cruder form, but nevertheless quite workable form, in *Dianetics*
1955! They were put in *Dianetics 1955!* so that a Dianeticist won't shy
away from the words *Scientology* and *religion*, and so forth, and he will look
there and he will see this *Dianetics 1955!* and he'll feel comfortable and
he'll go on using Scientology, Six Basic Steps, which will make a citizen
out of him. It's a covert trick, isn't it?

6 JUNE 1955

First thing you should know about what we're doing in Scientology, is that there is more to living than dying. And that there is more to man than sickness. And the purpose of the Six Basic Steps is to bring about, not a revival of capability, but to bring about new abilities on the part of a thetan. Which means new abilities on the part of man.

And these steps are not designed to make men well. If they happen to be sick, it is only their incapability as a spiritual being which continues them in sickness. Therefore don't treat their sickness, since it is only their inability to handle their sickness that continues that illness. You can cure a sickness without curing the man. Do this with the greatest of ease, although I cannot stress too hard—it is not that anybody has the least qualms that somebody is going to come along and say, "Hey, you people are practicing medicine without a license." Who cares? Be a very wild statement.

What we're interested in is getting an auditor to pay attention first and foremost to the primary and basic goal of what he's doing; because if he doesn't pay attention to it, he doesn't get any success to amount to anything. And if anybody is having any trouble auditing people, I can tell him immediately and exactly where his trouble is, which is right there: he's trying to cure something or make somebody well. He's finding something wrong so he can make it right, and as soon as you

find something wrong in order to make it right, you get the persistence of the wrongness. It works out just as easily as that, there's just nothing to it. Let's delve into this fellow's psyche and work around until we find a couple of snapped neurons, you know, which are "synapsesing," and find out that there's a misconnection of the oblogata. And now let's put him on skim milk so that he'll get well. We may take his attention off this wrong condition, but we won't make him well.

Because the thing wrong with him, if we've got to find a wrongness, is that he isn't controlling that malcondition. He isn't handling it. He's backing up from it, he's running away from it, he's trying to hide it, he's trying to do something else with it, or he's obsessively trying to change it as matter and energy. So along that road lies failure. And failure has always lain on that road and it always will—the more vaccines, the more politics, the more illness. Let's pull out from underneath the whole human race every developing ability to handle illness and put them all in a condition where they have to be administered to medically constantly, and we will eventually wind up with a bunch of people we have to keep in vats.

If you continue to validate the materialistic aspects of existence, and only validate those things, and if you continue to neglect the spiritual abilities which are inherent in the being, you forecast and predict for **3**

6 JUNE 1955

your auditing, and for what you are doing, failure all the way along the line. This tells you that the words "healing science" applied to Scientology are about the wildest misnomer you could apply, because it would hand to the auditor the wrong formula. It would give him the wrong idea and the wrong goal about what he's trying to do. And he'd take the Six Basic Processes then and start to heal things with them. Well yes, working cleverly, working with communication, working with other things, he undoubtedly could heal a great many things, but in no case would he heal the preclear.

Now, I told you the other day about the old man who came up and I told an auditor to say "hello" and "okay" to his cataract until finally the fellow developed sight in his eye again. Maybe you missed part of that story, I want to punch that up and I saved that punch for right this minute. The man had *no* wider concept of existence at the end of twenty-five hours of expert, coached, professional processing than he had at the beginning. He had experienced no enlightenment, no increase in ability, he could simply see better with one eye. And he was being just as silly and just as stupid at the end of that week as he had been at the beginning of the week.

Now, if we had operated on these eyes, if we had done all sorts of strange things to cure up these cataracts, filled him full of vitamins or

something of the sort, we would have had the same condition of beingness. If we want to hang the responsibility for cataracts upon anything, you had better hang it up in his inability to have good eyes. And unless you improved his ability to have, to control, to handle, to develop, to keep well his own eyes, you would have failed.

Why should anybody be dismayed because an operation—a medical operation—fails? If he knew this, he certainly would not be dismayed.

Therefore, I'm not arguing—I never will argue—against medicine. There's no reason to argue against it. We're not talking about a healing science, we're talking about a science of ability. And part of that ability happens to be, incidentally, being well—part of the ability. If we took a huge disk here, and we cut it up into an infinitely small number of pie slices—an infinite number, tiny little pie slices that you couldn't see with a microscope—one of those would be the ability to stay well, and the rest of them would be important.

Therefore, the direction of processing is successful so long as the auditor is knowingly aware that he is increasing the ability of a spiritual being—as long as he's aware of this. Increasing the ability of a thetan to handle existence. Might lie in the field of education: you give a thetan some data, he says, "Hey, what do you know? Gee! Oh, so that's how you handle women." You know—*bang!* Might lie in the

6 JUNE 1955

field of exercising—you know, getting him to practice having a body ride a motorcycle or a bicycle or a horse. You know? That's just exercise, that's physical culture. Might lie in a great many fields, but mostly it lies in the field of being able to think and handle one's thoughts. Because thought is senior to everything else there is. All other things stem from thought.

I told you, I was finally forced into this as a final conclusion, that although thought might be influenced by masses, it could only be influenced by those masses which had been created by that thought. Therefore, Concepts Running—an old old-timer, way back when, running of concepts—is successful. Why is it successful? You just run the thought that made the mass and the mass will disappear. You just think the thought parallel to this bothersome thought over here, and they both disappear. The thought made the aberration.

Well, if a thought can make aberration, it can also make sanity and can make anything else. It could make universes. So, let's remember when we're processing a preclear that we are increasing this individual's ability and capability to live. And that there is more to living than dying, and more to a man than sickness.

So, the first and foremost step of auditing today is to get the preclear aware of his environment, of his auditor, of the session, and then get him

into communication. And we don't care *what* he's going to talk about, just as long as we can get him to talk—in a two-way communication, as entirely distinct from a one-way associative flow. The auditor has to know how to acknowledge communications, he has to know how to originate communications, and he has to get the preclear to a point where the preclear gets into a two-way communication. When we've done that, we have an auditing session well on the road. And actually, the first basic goal of the auditor is to achieve a two-way communication with the preclear.

Now, the oddity is, you can sometimes do it with masses. Hand pressures on an unconscious person will sometimes bring him into a two-way communication, which is an oddity, isn't it?

Now as soon as we get him into some awareness of his environment, the auditor, and into two-way communication, we're ready to go. And we call the first step of the Six Basic Steps, Two-way Communication. That's the first step. But that first step assumes that an auditing session is in progress. So the first step is preceded by an auditing session. Just this way: awareness of the existence of a session. Where it's happening, and with whom it's happening. So you have to start a session. So when we say, "Start of session," we're not saying anything very light and airy. We're saying start the session with the preclear. 5

6 JUNE 1955

It's one of the reasons coffee-shop auditing is sometimes not successful at all. The fellow is sitting there trying to eat his coffee and doughnuts, you know, and dunking away, and some fellow suddenly asks to him, "Give me three places where your mother isn't beating you."

Fellow says, "Oh, I can find some—where is present time?" He didn't know a session was in progress. There was no agreement on this at all.

Now, there's a lower harmonic on the process known as 8-C which fits right in there with the auditing session beginning. Without getting the preclear into two-way communication, you can ask him questions and have him note the answers. He doesn't give you the answers, he doesn't respond, he merely notes the answer. You could say, "How many chairs are in this room?" and the fellow kind of looks around—that's an answer. It's not two-way communication, but you at least have gotten something through to the fellow. You've made him more aware of the room.

You say, "How many ceilings are there in this room?"

All right. You say, "Does this room have a floor?"

You say, "Well, how many windows do you see here?"

"Gee, there's a lot of them."

You finally say, "What are we doing?"

"Oh, you're auditing me."

"Well, fine. Now why don't you tell me something about your life and what you do?" We're in two-way communication.

We can actually haul a person up out of the morass of no communication by simply calling their attention to various things in their environment and having them note them. They don't even answer us. That's a low harmonic on 8-C. They're not moving around touching anything, they're not being directed or ordered particularly, they're just sitting there and they just note some things, and you note that they note them. Well, that's one way to start a session on a case that's really gone. It's quite workable too. Then we get into a two-way communication—the first step of two-way communication. No reason particularly to go into the formulas of two-way communication, there's a whole book on the subject—*Dianetics 1955!* All right.

Both people have to originate, both people have to acknowledge, in order to have a two-way communication. In order to understand any further step than this, we have to understand communication lag, and that is the length of time between the posing of the question and the receiving of the answer, regardless of what intervenes. This tells you that there are communication lags which are trillions of years old.

6 JUNE 1955

Somewhere back on the track you said—while you were traveling along in your rocket ship, you said to your fellow rocket jockey, you said, “Say Bill, what’s that funny noise?” Don’t be surprised if through—a few billion years up the track somebody walks up to you and says, “Well, it’s too late now.”

- 6 All right, we have somebody—somebody poses a question, and he says, “How do you feel?” And the person he asks the question of—this is a poor question, because it can have a machine answer, by the way; you know, person just automatically says, “I’m fine” or something—but he says to this person, “How do you feel?”

And this person says, “Well, I never could stand my grandmother.”

Communication lag is in progress—no answer received. You’d have to kind of prod him along a little bit more; you say, “How do you feel?”

“Oh, my grandmother is a terrible person.” No communication.

You’d say, “How do you feel?” And this person was telling me the other day about a preclear—he asked her time after time after time after time after time. Consistently and continually, the person said, “I’m not receiving any results from processing.”

He’d say, “How do you feel?”

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

The person would say, "I'm receiving no results and nothing is changing," and so forth. Never did answer this question until had been in session about five or ten hours, something on this order, and then finally one night said—forgot what he said she said, but something like "I feel terrible." That was about a ten-hour comm lag, you see, over such a length of time, just to receive that one question.

Now another person, you start to say, "How do you feel?" you know, you say, "How do you f—."

And they say, "Well, I thought I'd better come down here because I've been worrying lately. I've been having hallucinations and bats in the belfry, and my husband says I have these things. And you know, I think it's very mean of him to go on the way he does, but he keeps telling me I'm crazy, crazy. Says I talk all the time, all the time—that's all he ever says, I talk all the time." Three hours later, no answer. It's all talk in between.

That's one of the first things that people have a little hard time learning about a communication lag: that it can be filled up with talk, not silence—either one, you see. It can be a silent lag or it can be a talking lag—a compulsive outflow lag, or it could be a nervous or jitter lag, or it could be an emotional lag, where the preclear—you say, "How do you feel?" and they say, "*Waaabbb!*" So we have all sorts of things that could

6 JUNE 1955

fill in this gap. It just doesn't mean silence. So it's the length of time between the posing of the question and the receiving of the exact answer to that question.

Now "I don't know," by the way, is an answer to a question. Auditors also miss that sometimes. You say, "How do you feel?" Fellow says, "I don't know." Auditor is unwilling to accept this and thinks he's in a communication lag. He's not. Person has told you the truth—they don't know. They haven't felt anything for years! All right.

So we have this whole subject of communication lag, and that has to be understood really, to carry on any kind of a sensible two-way communication. But the two-way communication's basic—the basic on it—is knowing the formula of two-way communication. Things have to be acknowledged, communications have to be originated—both sides. The auditor has to originate them and the preclear has to acknowledge them; the preclear has to originate them and the auditor has to acknowledge them.

There's a mechanical drill that belongs way upscale from two-way communication, called mechanical two-way communication, which belongs in Opening Procedure by Duplication—way upscale. It's too tough for a great number of preclears, but a very beneficial process. But it has the formula of two-way communication in its exact severity.

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

People asked to face that much communication, if they can't even say how they feel, are not likely to be able to do the process. But anyway, the formula of two-way communication is the basic in two-way communication, of course.

And we move up, and the next thing we have to know, very 7 definitely, is comm lag, before we go into the Significance Processes. And these Significance Processes today could be a great many processes. All of the processes on this plotting chart, each and every one of these processes—every single one of them—belongs in the Significance Process band. And that band lies between Two-way Communication and Opening Procedure of 8-C. Those are all Significance Processes. There could be thousands of processes in that band. They are all dependent upon a mechanism, and the mechanism is simply this: the auditor continues to ask a question and the preclear continues to answer the question until there is no further communication lag on that question. You see the simple mechanism? You could say, "Did your grandmother wear a hat?"

And the fellow says, "No."

And you say, "All right. Did your grandmother wear a hat?"

And the fellow says, "Well, I don't know, sometimes."

And you say, "Okay. Now, did your grandmother wear a hat?"

6 JUNE 1955

“Well, I don’t know—hats being what they were in those days, I suppose she did.”

“Well, fine.” Well, there would be no communication lag on that at all—the process would be flat. You can go off to another higher, worse, more arduous process. But look at this: “Did your grandmother wear a hat?”

“(sigh) (pause) Who?” Process isn’t flat.

Now, we get as the first and foremost of these processes that we handle on this significance band—you see, the auditor has now established a session. And the first step of the session after it was established was Two-way Communication. And as soon as Two-way Communication seems to be fairly able and going along all right—you know, he’s got the fellow a little conscious of that—he’d then move up into the significant band of processes, and he’d start paying attention to communication lag.

And the first process that he would start to stress and handle would be Problems and Solutions, R2–20. That’s the first thing he’d think of. And if that was all he thought of, he would still win. But if he thought of Problems and Solutions and added to that Consequences, he certainly would win. We would get these things all flat. We would get the preclear completely able to dream up any number of problems about himself or

anything or anybody else. And he'd stop holding, clutched to his bosom, his cherished problem of not having a head or something.

You know, a lot of preclears go around, they get so desperate for problems—they solve them so easily and ably—they get so desperate for problems that they go along clutching a missing arm. The arm is apparent to you, see, you can see they've got an arm, but—they use an arm—but the arm to them has no density or feeling to amount to anything. They've got a missing arm. It's a nice problem—no arm. It was a terrific problem to them at one time, and they become so short on problems in this modern age that they no longer have enough problems to go along with. See? So they start pulling in old problems of this character. They pull in all kinds of problems: a missing arm; this fellow hasn't—his hearing isn't so good. It's just a problem. But it puts a problem on the communication line. Any problem is to some degree a break of communication.

And so he's got: Doesn't hear well—that's a problem. Doesn't see well, has to wear glasses—that's a problem. His right foot is a little bit twisted—that's a problem. But these are problems expressed in mass. To call these things illnesses would be a misnomer. They're not illnesses. If you treat them as illnesses, why, what will happen? If you throw this whole thing over into healing—we get just to the crux of the matter

6 JUNE 1955

immediately—if we throw this into healing, we'll start to change a twisted foot. We're trying to take a problem away from the poor guy. And he's got a twisted foot, he hasn't got enough problems already. And we're going to straighten up his foot? No sir!

Furthermore, we're going to change mass; and the second we change something, we give it time and it'll start persisting. So if we categorize any of these exercises into healing, we're going to lose, right there, with Problems and Solutions.

His main difficulty—and this applies to anybody living in a very safe society like this—his main difficulty is he doesn't have enough problems. Talking to you the other day about—if you've got a big army, you naturally have to have a war. Follows, doesn't it? If you have police, you have to have criminals. There must be an awful lot of criminals around if we've got all these tens of thousands of police. Well, what state do you think those police are in? Why does this phenomenon—exactly why does it occur? It occurs specifically because of this: The police do not have enough problems per capita.

8 The basic function of thinkingness is to pose and resolve problems relating to survival. All right. And the police go around, and they haven't got any problems. All the citizens are walking along and they say, "How are you, officer?" They're very polite to him, and they all park in the

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

right places, they move at the right times, they don't loiter on the corners, they throw no trash, they don't spit in the wrong places, they stay out of the places they're supposed to stay out of, they're . . . Everything is going along fine—apathy. You see that? They go home and read *Real Detective*.

And you know what they'll do eventually? This happens in a fascist state, and is practically the definition of a fascist state. If you want to know when a state enters fascism, this is what's occurring: The police cause problems and criminality, overtly and knowingly. They take people and they start—the police start—beating in store fronts and grabbing citizens out of their homes and shaking them down, and so forth. In other words, they start to create problems. They can't stand this monotony anymore. Then they find someone who will lead them, and you've got a fascist state. That's happened in Germany, happened in many places. You recognize that?

All right, what is the basic cause of it? Basic cause is a scarcity of problems. Not enough.

Boy, I tell you, just—your preclear, on the genetic line (his body, rather)—a preclear's body on the genetic line was rushing out of the jaws of death three times a day. You know? Snake fangs went *crunch* here and pterodactyls went *smish* there and you stepped into a bog and the

6 JUNE 1955

earthquake came and gaps opened in the earth and you stepped just at the right time—boy, there was plenty of problems. Lots of problems—no scarcity at all.

Nothing like that to keep a man in present time. Keeps him in present time, keeps him alert, keeps the environment in good shape, he just—he feels good. Every time he turns around he's demonstrating his competence or his incompetence, on a black-and-white Aristotelian proposition—no maybes. He doesn't sit around wondering all day, "Gee, I wonder if somebody sometime this year will commit a crime on my beat." He doesn't sit around wondering as his store is going along and making money evenly and carefully and all of his customers are nice to him and his help is sufficient, and so forth, he doesn't sit there wondering if possibly he might at least go broke next year.

Did you ever see anybody who was involved in a totally successful business just sitting there stewing, stewing, stewing, stewing, stewing, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. Huh? There's only one thing wrong with him—he just has not enough problems, if we've got to find something wrong with him.

Well, the oddity is, we take this person—or we take this cop who's going bad and bored . . . I've seen cops, by the way, walk into bars and simply take somebody who's standing up against the bar minding his

own business drinking beer, and turn him around and say, "What are you doing here?" and shake him around and finally hit him. And then say, "Look at the fight this guy started!" and kick all of his teeth out, load him onto a wagon, ship him down to jail.

Well, just last night, just down the street here in Connecticut Avenue, I saw a cop standing there—there was a drunk, he was kind of feeling bad and he was sitting on a set of stone steps. And he was sitting there, he wasn't bothering anybody. And the cop came along and told him he'd better send him to jail. And the fellow said, "Why?"

And, "Well, I don't know, you're liable to get into trouble sitting out here, and . . ." It was true, too—the cop was making it true. The drunk wasn't bothering anybody. All right.

Now, that isn't just germane to police. It's germane to almost anything. If you've got—supposing you had a perfectly calm, beautifully calm nation, where things were going very well and the citizenry was fairly happy and everything was orderly and there was no hidden stores of arms. Supposing your OGPU or something of the sort had the name and address of every foreign agent or adherent in the country and could arrest him at a moment's notice, knew exactly what he was doing, and your boys were secretary of all of the revolutionary groups. Supposing everything was going along fine, there was no depression in progress,

9

6 JUNE 1955

there was food, and you didn't have to do a thing because all of your assistants were so efficient.

Boy, about the only thing you could possibly think of was starting a war with somebody—that'd be one of the finest things you could think of, you know? And of course if you were unable to start a war, if you were repressed in doing this, you'd probably go on off into psychosomatic illness or—oh, I don't know—scandal or impeachment or something of the sort. One would hardly be able to rest through all that.

As a matter of fact, I'm not talking about Russia or any other country of modern times, I'm talking about the Roman Empire. That's exactly what happened to it. Augustus got in, and you know there was no trouble from there on out? He just solved all the problems. And this left people like Caligula and Tiberius and Nero, and so forth, and those guys really had worries, you know? How am I going to fiddle just right? All right.

Your preclear is sitting there—because he's in a modern society, because he can buy his food at a delicatessen, because he *can* find work—he's sitting there in a vacuum of problems. So he's going to manufacture a whole lot of problems *unknowingly*. And that is the motto of any upset: He's doing something unknowingly that he could do knowingly. And all the auditor has to do is pull this unknowingness up into a knowingness,

and that solves it. But oddly enough, the unknowingness to knowingness band does not itself constitute an enormously difficult problem.

There is no liability to knowing. People even try to dream them up. They say, "You know, gosh! If I knew all there was to know about this, and if I didn't have all the neuro—" By the way, we have two—heh!—sciences that hold very close to their chests the idea that if we didn't have neuroses, we would have no art. Look, I know an awful lot of fellows who were good artists and then they got neurotic and didn't "art" anymore, but I never knew the reverse. Fellow that's really dishing it out, throwing out the pieces of canvas like mad, throwing out the stories, writing the music, and so forth, is doing best when he's sanest. All you have to do is observe this. But we had two outfits that wanted problems so badly, that they even wished this problem off on themselves. This is a huge problem, isn't it? "The only way to be a successful artist is not to be an artist." And there you've got a neat problem.

So all kinds of things immediately stem out of this sort of thing. Problems run well enough, long enough—Problems and Solutions run long enough—on a has-been artist, will put him back in business again. This is a certainty. So right there at that strata, you have a very powerful forward push in ability, because his foremost ability is the origination of problems and his solution of those problems. And that's a foremost

6 JUNE 1955

ability, that's right up there in the lead. So we've got to put his ability to rights on Problems and Solutions, or we never put the fellow to rights at all. All right.

- 10 If we have somebody who is apparently afraid, you would say by this formula, the best thing to do is make him able to be afraid. Not find something *wrong* with his being afraid, but let's put it under his control so that he can *really* be afraid if he wants to. So he can scare himself purple! And what do you know, won't bother him anymore—but he sure probably will bother somebody else with it.

Anyway, where we have somebody who is lingering below this band of Problems and Solutions, we probably have Consequences as a very fine process. Now, it fits right in that same bracket. The one you want to think of, the one that is really the important one, is Problems and Solutions. Right next door to this we've got Consequences.

Now, how long does it take to run Problems and Solutions flat? We've audited it as long as eighty hours on a preclear with benefit. Alternating it. You know, couple of dozen problems, couple of dozen solution questions; couple of dozen problems, couple of dozen solutions—about eighty hours, this guy coming up all the time, all the way. And he was one of the roughest cases anybody ever tried to exteriorize with a jackhammer. That's right, he wouldn't have come out of his head

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

if you'd taken a diamond drill to him. And about eighty some hours, Problems and Solutions, and we were getting a resolution of this problem. Quite cute. So, there was quite a bit there in thinkingness. All right.

We would then be able to run Consequences and this Tone Scale chart which I have given you. And we could run the whole thing and any combination of processes on there, and I believe there probably is ten thousand processes on that chart. Any one of them would increase his ability one way or the other, but remember the keynote is Problems and Solutions. All right.

If a fellow is—you find his level of certainty, his level of reality on that chart, have him originate problems about that. Supposing we found out this fellow's level of reality was responsibility: just have him originate some problems about responsibility. That's refining the process, but it's doing the job very fast and very well.

All right. The next step up from that is a process known as Opening Procedure of 8-C. And do you know this process is too tough for many preclears? The ability to go over, obeying somebody else's command, and touch a wall and know it's there and let go of it, is quite often above the ability of a human being. Number one, he attributes all of his trouble to having followed orders too often. That's what's wrong with him—followed orders. People told him to do things, he followed orders—that's

6 JUNE 1955

wrong. No, that couldn't possibly be his trouble. His trouble might stem from the fact that nobody gave him any orders, he was doing all the ordering and nobody else ever ordered him around—that might be trouble—or nobody ever really gave him an order. They said—his father kept saying to him, “Go over and pick up that hammer. What are you doing with that hammer?” Never let him complete a cycle of action, something like this.

So he gets allergic to accepting orders, and he starts to fight the environment around him. This wall over here says, “I’m a wall,” to him, and he says, “No, that must be something else.” What’s happening? The wall is actually giving him an order. It’s saying, “Be located so many feet from me” or “I am a wall” or “You have to be convinced I am a wall”—it’s saying something to him, isn’t it? And if he can’t receive this—if he can’t receive this order particularly: “Stop when you hit me,” he’ll be in trouble with walls all the time. See, he can’t receive orders.

So your auditor has to be a very exact handler of the preclear in giving him orders and running 8-C. There are a tremendous number of side effects of this 8-C. It is a process which has three parts as contained in an—I think it’s Issue 24-G of the old *Journal of Scientology*. A, B, and C.

The first one is simply you just ask the guy to go around and touch things, and you ask him to go around and touch them and let go of

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

them—but you ask them very precisely. You say, “Do you see that table?”

And the fellow says, “Mm-hm.”

And you say, “Fine.” You always acknowledge the preclear, see?

He says, “Yep.”

And you say, “Fine. Now walk over to it.”

And he does, and you say, “Fine.” See, you’ve acknowledged that he’s done it. All right.

Now you say to him, “All right. Touch it.”

He does, and you say, “Now, that’s fine. All right. Now let go of it.”

And he does, and you say, “Good. All right now, do you see that chair over there?”

And he says, “Yes.”

And you say, “Fine. Walk over to it. All right. Touch it.”

He does. You say, “Okay.” And you say, “Let go of it.”

And he does, and you say, “That’s fine. That’s good.”

And in this way you send him around two objects and make him make and break communication with these objects. And this is the purpose of it. He’s following orders, he’s completing cycles of action,

6 JUNE 1955

and he's finding out all the time "Look—I can complete a cycle of action. Look—I *can* follow an order without falling flat. Look—there is a universe around here after all." Very interesting things occur.

A variation was introduced on this—had them put attention on something and then touch it. And this, on a preclear who's having trouble, particularly in centering himself, and so forth, is occasionally very, very good.

11 Now, here we have a process which runs on a comm lag, too. We watch the comm lags of 8-C, we watch it very carefully. How long—you know, the people will do the oddest things. You say, "Go on over and touch that wall," they go over . . . They do the darnedest things when you run this process. You would be amazed! It's just their inability to actually make contact, to actually locate or be located. And that's a comm lag.

Anytime you say, "All right, do you see that table?" and the preclear goes promptly over and touches it and puts his hand on it and lets go, what do you do? You say, "I asked you a question. Do you see that table over there?"

"Well yeah, I just touched it."

"Well, all right, walk over to it."

“Oh, you want me to do that again,” so he walks over and puts his hand on it, lets go and says, “There.”

You say, “All right. Now touch it.” You get the idea? You make him fit in the groove with a cycle of action. Very, very remarkable what occurs. But what are you doing? You’re not getting him over anything. You’re not getting him over a thing—all you’re doing is making him capable of following some orders. And if a fellow can’t follow them, he can’t give them.

A fellow who can’t do 8-C gives orders in this fashion: “All right Johnny, you see the hammer over there? Go on over and get . . . What are you doing picking up that hammer? All right. Bring me my slippers. Where the devil is that kid?”

“Oh, I was just bringing your slippers, Papa.”

“Why? Who said anything about slippers? Where are you going now? Go on out and water the lawn. Go on out and water the backyard—no, I said the front yard. What . . .”

He says to this fellow after the fellow has reported to him, he says, “Well, uh—all right. Good.” Fellow starts to walk away and he says, “Come back here. Where you going?” He can’t finish a communication. All kinds of oddities occur in his behavior, simply because he cannot give, he cannot receive, orders, directions and instructions. Which tells

6 JUNE 1955

you immediately he can't be a communication terminal. So there's something very wrong with his thereness, and he finds wrong things with everything else's thereness. So he's in trouble. And that's what 8-C is run toward.

Finally it progresses up with two more steps so that it . . . "Locate an object" is the next step, and the fellow has to pick out an object, make up his mind, make a decision about an object in the room and then he walks over to it and touches it. And the third part of it—*when* he's going to touch it is up to him, and *when* he's going to let go of it is up to him. And this gives him decision and timing. And it's a very, very interesting process. All right.

The next process is Opening Procedure by Duplication. Why are these both called Opening Procedure? Well, that's their name. And Opening Procedure by Duplication in Great Britain is called Book and Bottle. When I first put it out it was called Dirty 30. Started calling it Dirty 30 and an auditor who was here had some remark on that. He said something or other, and he said, "If an auditor did that wrong, why, he ought to turn in his thetan right then." It's not the exact joke, but it's very similar.

Anyway, Book and Bottle. You set up, for instance, a book and you set up a bottle, and you have the preclear go over to the book. You say,

SIX BASIC STEPS—SOME FUNDAMENTALS OF AUDITING

“Do you see that book?” Now, you see, we’ve gotten him all through so he can follow orders. Now let’s have him follow the same confounded order time after time after time after time after time after time after time.

It is true that if you were to take a bad-off preclear and do Duplication Processing on him without doing the intervening steps—without the lower-scale steps—that he would feel very hypnotic before he got through. But he would come out of it. And if you ran it only a short space of time he’d probably feel hypnotic, which gave people the idea that it was a sort of an hypnotizing technique. There has been more cursing and swearing and damning on the subject of Opening Procedure by Duplication! All right.

You have the person walk over to the book.

You say, “You see that book? All right.”

“Walk over to it. All right.”

“Look at it. Okay.”

“Pick it up. All right.”

“What’s its color? Okay.”

“What’s its temperature? Okay.”

“What is its weight? Okay. Fine.”

“Put it in exactly the same place you found it. Good.”

6 JUNE 1955

“Now you see that bottle? All right.”

“Walk over to it.”

12 Now, the oddity is, in this process, is it can be done wrong by the auditor. The process has a great exactness connected with it. Those commands for each of the two items—just repetitively, one item after the other, one after the other, back and forth—must never be varied. The preclear must never be permitted to blow the session, run away, quit. But although the exactness of the procedure must never be varied, it is a bad auditor who does not use two-way communication while running it. And this is quite a trick. Isn't that quite a trick? So it takes a good auditor. And it gets good results when it has a good auditor.

You say, “Do you see that book?”

And the fellow says, “Yeah. You mean that thing?”

And you say, “Yeah, that one over there on the table.” See, you didn't vary the command any. And you say, “Okay. Walk over to it.”

And he says, “All right.”

And you say, “Thank you. Good. Take a look at it.”

And—say, “What do I want to look at this thing for?”

“Oh, go on, take a look at it.”

“Oh . . . I'm not interested in a book like that.”