

# BAD INDICATORS

A lecture given on  
9 January 1964

Okay, how are you today?

Thank you, I like you too!

All right, this is what? The 9th of January, is that it? All right. Nine January AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And this is a lecture on good and bad indicators and such other bric-a-brac as you might be interested in. I probably should put that as an addendum on all my lectures, shouldn't I? The bric-a-brac department! Trouble is I come up with things, you see, that I'm not at all sure you have a good grip on and I have to tell you about them as I go along.

What I want to cover today particularly is good indicators. How'd they do yesterday on that test? Did anybody look at those papers?

*Male voice: Well, I haven't heard the results, but there were plenty of good indicators in the sessions.*

There were good indicators in the session. How do you think you did on that test yesterday? Well, speak up. I can hear you! All right, all right. Now are you getting the idea – you getting the idea of good indicators? All right. Are you getting so you can look at a session and tell if it's a session and not a session? All right. Good.

Now, this will make a great deal of difference to you in running a co-audit, much less make a great deal of difference to you as an auditor. Now, in trying to relay truth it is always necessary to develop some breakdown of auditing or something of the sort, and in trying to get something across to you, why, I ordinarily will develop some sort of a – of a system by which it can be communicated. And we're particularly interested in this system which divides basic auditing, technique and case analysis. And all levels break down to these and you have in each level, its basic auditing its case analysis and its technique.

Now, what's quite interesting here about good and bad indicators and what I've been working on and I've been springing on you here is: is we've broken down case analysis. I've found out this was the weakest point – was the auditor's understanding of what was going on with a case. So we've broken this down. And case analysis breaks down into the general subject of case analysis and the system by which it can be employed at various levels. But case

analysis now – and be alert to this because this is the way it is – case analysis actually breaks down to good indicators and bad indicators. And you recognize that I saw the frailty of case analysis here and actually almost unwittingly got to work on the subject and broke it down into good indicators, bad indicators and the bad indicator system.

Now, case analysis then is something that progresses all the time regardless of what your basic auditing is and regardless of what your technique is. And also regardless of what level is being run. What level of Scientology. These things are always present. Always present. And the running fire of case analysis – the running fire of case analysis is simply a noting that the good indicators are still with us and being alert when one drops out and then looking to see what bad indicator has appeared and remedying it. Which brings us back into the technique department. Do you see that now?

And case analysis actually considers the observation – the observation of a – of the good indicators as a continuous observation. And knowing what they are, and when one of them drops out, then this is a one-two-three proposition – then noticing what bad indicator has appeared and the case analysis at that point will then tell you what technical action to take.

Now, that you take a technical action isn't really a part of case analysis. So basically, the case analysis whereby you find where the pc probably is or where he's located – get some idea of where he thinks he is or something like that. Like he says he's in a present time problem or something like that, and you get his considerations about this and then you find out where he's really located. You actually now, technically a very – very – very – very precise, being very picky about the matter, that is really not case analysis. Because that goes from case analysis, analyzing what the pc's got there, back to technique, which is a process, "What considerations have you had about it?" and then back to case analysis. The technique having been employed to make the case analysis easier. You see that?

So that you have an interplay. An interplay here between case analysis and technique. And the technique you employ depends upon the case analysis that is done. So therefore, case analysis contains programing. It says, "Here is a preclear!" – I mean it's as – it's corny as this, you see? I mean just as plain, simple and stupid as this, you see. "Here is a preclear." All right, that's case analysis. And you thought I was going to say something else, didn't you? That's a case analysis! You got a case there, in front of you! See, that's case analysis.

All right. Now, let's do a most elementary case analysis you could think of, see. Here he is in front of you. All right. So case analysis consists then of the existence or presence of a pc. Elementary, huh? Now, let's go into the subject of bad indicators.

I've been teaching you about good indicators, now let's go into the subject of bad indicators. And let's go in this on a very, very broad subject, just so you get a better understanding of it. These are not to be... Well, of course, you can, if you want to list these things as bad

indicators because they in essence are the very worst. But you don't think of them as bad indicators because they're all accepted on this planet.

But he's sitting in a body! See, drag! That's about the worst indicator you could have! Here's a thetan that's wearing a body! So he obviously isn't an OT! You get the idea? All right, bad indicator. Good indicator: Well, he's there. That's a good indicator. But, until we've done a little more education on the matter, or a little more thought on the case and so forth, we can't really tell if that's a good indicator or bad indicator because he might be not there hardly at all. He might have been carted in on a stretcher. But let's take a look at the fact that he is there and the good indicator – let's get very elementary here – the good indicator is he is there on his own volition. He volitioned himself into your presence. He's willing to be in your presence. He is there. You got the idea, he is there. Now that's a very good indicator that he's there on his own volition.

Now, let's take a bad indicator. Now, here's a way you go about this, see. I'm going to break this down into the most elementary elements you ever heard of, see. He's there. He's there. And he doesn't – he doesn't look like he wants to be there, and he looks like he's going to depart and he looks like he's sad and sorry that he arrived at this point. And he's wondering how he got here and, you get the idea. What is absent here is “there on his own volition.” See. That's a good indicator, see. Well, it's “there on his own volition” that's missing. He apparently is not there of his own free will or free choice. All right. So, we see that he's not comfortably there, see. We see he's not really there there, you get the idea. So we immediately say then, that good indicator's missing.

All right, what bad indicator is present? Well, he has to leave in a few minutes. He actually – he actually has an appointment with Aunt Gertrude at 3:32, and it's now 3:30 and so forth. And really, he'd like some auditing next month, but just now he's pretty tied up... These are all bad indicators. What's he telling you? What's he telling you? They all sum up to an unwillingness to be there. And the case analysis point, simply, good indicator gone. Bad indicator – not there on his own volition, apparently. And the rest of the case analysis then: he must be there on somebody else's volition. See, that's the bad indicator. That's the next obvious bad indicator. And you'll find out that's almost always to be true. He's unwilling to be there himself. Well, he's there because you told him to be there. He's there because you sales talked him into being there. He's there because his Aunt Agatha thinks he's crazy. He's there because of this. He's there because of that. You get the – you get the idea, so forth.

Well, our first hurdle in auditing has been met. And that's on the basis of no free choice. What's the remedy? Well, the remedy – well, your technique. But your case analysis is finished. You see that? That ends the case analysis. It's as elementary as that. You see, that ends the case analysis. Well, what technique do we employ? Well, now that depends on the level being answered up. That depends on the level.

That depends to a very, very marked degree on what level the auditor is at and what level the pc is at.

Now, let's look at this. Case analysis consisted of what? Good indicator that you would expect. Now, understand you would expect this good indicator. You expect it. And the expectation of this good indicator. Now, please, please understand this. A being in his native state, in a cleared condition and all that sort of thing would naturally act that way. So you're really studying in good indicators what is the natural behavior of a being. What is his – his ability to understand is pretty good. Now, he'd know you weren't going to chew him up. If he thought that he needed a few cogwheels adjusted, he'd be perfectly happy to sit there and adjust them. He can recognize somebody wants to help him out. He can receive help. He's in a normally cheerful disposition. He's normally fairly optimistic. He normally is not in an agitated state but is pretty calm and so forth. So you're looking at a subject called basic behavior. And looking at this subject called basic behavior we don't find basic behavior as it was represented in Freudian analysis. Or as it's represented in "psyrology," which is an animated brain pulsing about. We don't find basic behavior of this kind. Basic behavior, *whoaa*, in psychoanalysis, *whoaa!* All due respect to good old Papa Freud, we couldn't do without him. But dear old Papa Freud, heh-heh, he had the idea – and that was the current idea of his day, it wasn't necessarily his idea I don't think – unless you inhibited the living daylight out of an individual he couldn't be happy. Well, let's look at it. Well, he might have looked at it and thought about this, that you should uninhibit somebody and talked about this and so on. But if that was the case why did he talk about this thing called a "censor?" Why was this "censor" necessary?

Well, this censor was to take the basic, nasty, mean, nagging, critical, vicious, ornery, rotten, derogatory, slimy, sewer-brained thoughts of the individual and keep them from coming into social presence. So Freud salted everything down with the idea that you had to inhibit the living daylight out of somebody in order to get a social presence. You show me some inhibited goon, and I'll show you an inhibited presence that compares to, I don't know – I don't know – pretty – pretty grim. Pretty grim presence – 1.1 snarling and sniffing around, and nyah! and so on and making trouble for everybody, and car... This is the social behavior. In other words, what they accomplished there, was a fundamental error. And the fundamental error was not knowing or having any real idea or any decent concept of what native behavior would be. What is uninhibited behavior?

Well, the world has been crashing along on this crashing lie. And that is that inhibited behavior is social behavior. And that any uninhibited behavior is antisocial. So, the criminal is uninhibited. So, you have to take the criminal and punish him and put him in a cell and do this and that to him; you have to take the bad boy in school and you have to do this and that to him; you have to punish him liberally and if you inhibit him enough you will make a social be-

ing out of him. Well, I've seen some of the products made that way and they're not social beings, they're social catastrophes.

This is superinhibition. Now, if you can't do anything about a bad trait, you can, of course, inhibit it. But the net result of this is an inhibited being. A being who can't move, can't reach, can't communicate, to whom nothing is real and who has the affinity of stab everything in the back if nobody was looking and he had a chance. This is your inhibited being. But you can take somebody who has an obvious social quirk, you see. At parties he inevitably – he inevitably will pour his drink on the piano keys. It just seems to be something he does, see. Well, we can make so much disgrace out of doing this and so forth, that he ceases to do it, at parties.

However, a thetan's forward push, or forward force, in any good direction is actually never lost. I was very amused at something that Edgar told me. He had picked up an old pc of his while he was off on vacation and the fellow – he wanted to audit him and he wanted some auditing. So, the guy had an old, failed goal of some kind or another, way back somewhere. So Edgar could hear him about the failed goal, so he went back and picked up this failed goal and what do you know, he got the failures off the goal and the guy did an interesting *resurge!* I think that's interesting, isn't it.

In other words, the goal had failed. He had an old auditing goal, I know, not to be so colorblind or something of the sort, you see. And that thing had failed. He hadn't mentioned it or said it in sessions for just ages. It's a failed goal. Edgar goes back, and he takes the suppressions off of this thing and sure enough, here the fellow has this urge not to be colorblind. Now, Edgar didn't put anything there, he took something off. In other words, a thetan's forward actions, desires and so forth do not fade away. They only submerge. So, we find our fellow... Remember that, man! You could learn no more about handling men and people if you knew that one thing, if you knew that one thing than any other single thing I could actually tell you in a breath of equal length is, their Impulses do not vanish. They only submerge.

You get a mutinous army. You get a mutinous army. And you hang the mutineers. All right, that's great. That's great right up to the time they hang you! *Yeah!* They will, too! The army's all snapping and popping and everything's going along fine, and then they experience a little bit of a defeat, and this old goal will come right up to the surface and they mutiny. It's very interesting, you have to get at the basic causes of the mutiny, not suppress the idea of mutiny. You would have to eradicate the reasons and causes for the mutiny. You'd have to find out who'd been whipping it up. And if they had any real beef.

You know how the Catholic church lost England, don't you? That's one of the biggest losses of more recent times, more modern times, only a few hundred years ago. That was great! That was great, it's Old Henry the VIII. Old Henry the VIII. And he wanted himself a divorce from Catherine of Aragon. Suzie was telling me all about it this morning at breakfast. And I

kept telling her, I said – she’s reading a book on the subject and it reminded me of those times and I kept saying, “Well, my wife really shouldn’t be associating with such people – that’s for sure.” I was shocked at the whole thing.

Anyhow, what happened? Mr. Pope Benedict Pius Innocent whatever he was at that particular time, I think he’d already had a mutiny from his German troops who were now looting Rome and shooting monks or something of the sort. In other words, he wasn’t keeping a very good house – typical Earth leadership. And think he’d gone and gotten himself captured or something and he was all messed up. And Henry the VIII – here was – here was all of England which could have done something for him. So in a typical failure fashion, one of his GPMs went up – not Henry the VIII but the pope’s – one of his GPMs went up into high level of restimulation and when Henry the VIII says, “Hey, pope, give me a divorce from this babe!” you know, or whatever language was used in courts at that time, probably that’s more polite – that one.

Why, the pope says, “Well, fow – wha – we got to think a – our ecclesia – oh, uh – if we, hmm! Hmm-hmm-hmm-hmm! What can I get out of this? See, *woff-woff-woff-woff-woff*” So he sent a gouty old fool of a cardinal up to hold a court with orders that if they granted – if the court in England looked like it was going to grant them divorce to Henry the VIII, why then he was immediately to remove the court to Rome. And they were to continue the hearings in Rome and so forth. And he went on doodle-daddling and monkeying and horsing about and getting no place and so forth and he just had himself a time. The pope did, you know.

And of course, he was dealing with an inhibited humanoid called Henry the VIII. And Henry – Henry had very 1.1 characteristics. He might have done a great deal for England in some direction but he certainly did hold a grudge. And you know, here he was – pope says no divorce – Henry the VIII divorce – so he fooled around, and the court – so on – it goes on for years, and he monkeys around, they won’t give him what he wants, you see. Finally they more or less gave him what he wanted, or he figured it out and they put some penance on him, or something of the sort, I’ve forgotten what they did to him. It’s not important. And Henry the VIII bided his time. And that old goal, “I’m gonna get even with that pope,” that came right to the fore. And we now have a separate Church of England. He showed him! You get that? The pope really disciplined the living daylights out of him and lost England. You got the idea? That thetan didn’t give up, you know.

Now old Anne Boleyn, who still walks around the Tower, they tell me up there, with her head tucked underneath her arm, she, played footsies with Henry for about nine years. I think that’s fascinating. Played footsies for nine years and kept him waiting, and the Duke of Northumberland or the Earl of Northumberland or somebody on tenterhooks and she wanted to marry him and she kept giving the king the business. And if you note amongst the Tower exhibits – you note amongst the Tower exhibits, I think you will find the ax that cut off her ‘ead. He married her all right. But there was only one reason why he ever beheaded her. He just

wanted to get even. He just never lost that impulse of hostility that she had generated through not being reasonable.

Now, you look through history. You look through history and you'll understand situations; you'll understand men; you'll understand people; you'll understand Teenagers an awful lot better; if you realize that those impulses never die. The person wants to do something. He wants to do something. To him it's perfectly reasonable. Probably is! And he gets crossed up. And somebody does something unusually or, arduously, complicated about it, you see. And inhibits him for some fantastic reason or another. You are not now talking about criminal impulse. We're just talking about a reasonable human impulse.

Little boy, he can't ever ride his bicycle because it hasn't got any new tires. Tires are all worn out, and he's patched them up to a point where they're mostly patches and he has to walk every place. And he keeps talking about it. And the family isn't poor but he just somehow or another for the good of his soul never does get any tires. And he'll go on like that. It wouldn't take anything that small. He'd have to be balked not on a havingness basis, which is man's adjudication, he'd have to be balked on an ambition basis. For instance, he wants to take some music lessons or something like that, the family won't let him have anything to do with it. Somehow or another he's going to get even. Somehow or another he's going to get a recompense.

Now, you want to know what teenage conduct is, and the standard feeling toward the parent which customarily, I'm informed takes place in the teens. And a rejection of the family on which tomes have been written. And which the most learned minds have shown how unlearned they were, and the great problem of juvenile delinquency – all those things. They arise out of this particular level of action. It isn't so much. The child actually never forgives the parents for certain things. You'll be amazed how tiny they are sometimes but they tend to mount up. And he really never forgives them. And you say forgiveness is the answer. No, forgiveness is dropping down another tone to propitiation. You've got to get to the source and cause of the matter. It's got to be brought to the fore. Auditing does this easily. All the time.

But he just never, never measures up to this and actually doesn't have it in the forefront of his mind. So in his teens he does a revolt against his parents. And in his teens he gives a kickback and so forth, which is a rejection. Now what is that? He's just on the verge of being able to fly loose and he's saying all of these things. Now there is the heart of man's ingratitude. There's the secret of leadership and so forth. It's the recognition of the fact that a thetan never really gives up.

But when you know that – when you know that, you know more about behavior than were written in all the volumes of the Greeks. And you know something as an auditor. Because what are you auditing. You're just auditing all the nutty aberrated inhibited times when he never gave up. When he postulated something silly. When he tried to do something stupid.

When he wanted to go forward in some direction and couldn't go forward. And when he committed overts. As a matter of fact you can graph – I suddenly realized here, you could actually graph the – where the innocent social goal of the individual dies down, inhibited, to a warped – a more warped form which then is submerged to below that, overts. Which then is submerged below that to withholds. And you could graph that. And you could graph that about any tone or ambition.

Why does an individual have GPMs? Why, so forth. Well, let's take it in the largest order of magnitude. It's on that scale there. And out of withholds we get unconsciousness. And we get unawareness. So unawareness is the lowest level of that scale.

Now, actually unawareness itself has a scale which goes down into actual unconsciousness. You see some pc start to boil-off in a session or something like that. It's usually compounded by a withhold, whether the withhold is actually a part of what you're trying to get off the pc, in other words, he's already put his goal or something on the list, or the item's already on the list, or the assessed thing is already on the list. And you keep him listing. Well, actually that thing that he put on the list becomes a withhold and he starts boiling off, and he gets dopey and he gets drowsy. So there's the scale of how a goal – how a goal becomes warped, becomes an overt, and below that level becomes a withhold, and below that level becomes unawareness and below that level becomes unconsciousness, and below that level becomes humanoid. All right.

So let's look at this boy who has come into your auditing session. You thought I'd gone someplace and forgot what I was talking about, didn't you? I fooled you! Comes into your auditing session. Well, what's wrong with this boy? What's wrong with this boy? What's wrong with this girl? What's wrong with this person? This being?

What are the good indicators? Actually the most – the biggest good indicator is the fact that he is there on his own volition. And that's the biggest indicator there is. Because surrounding him, man, there is nothing but bad indicators. Well, you don't pay any attention to those bad indicators. Let me give you an idea how to handle these things. You don't pay any attention to all those bad indicators because you can do something about them. And what you are going to do is one by one eradicate them. And in any system in which you are using good indicators and bad indicators which is any auditing situation, you note the good indicators present, and think that's cheery-cheery, isn't that nice. You understand? And you can even go so far as congratulating the pc on them. That's dandy. We like all those. That's fine. Pc's more confident. The pc has less PTP. You can even remark on them to a pc. That's fine. Fortify them. Validate them. Three cheers.

When an auditor doesn't, by the way, he's not really putting in a hope factor. What is a hope factor? A hope factor is validating those indicators which – those good indicators which are present. And that is a hope factor. You say, "Well, you were talking much better in the last



few sessions to me.” You know, hope factor. “Maybe we can even improve it a little bit more,” you know. “Well, you’ve seen a little less pain, you say, in your head. All right, little less pain in your head. Well, that’s very good. Now maybe in a few more sessions, why, we’ll be able to handle it a little bit further.” That’s a hope factor, don’t you see. That’s validating the good indicator, which is a lessening of the somatic or the condition.

All right. The best one then is he’s there. The next best one is he’s getting better. Now, how do you mean getting better? Well, he’s restoring the native state. He’s getting more cheerful. He has less problems. He’s less worried. He’s less anxious. And a reverse of all those things which I just described is humanoid. You see? He’s getting better. Well, I don’t care what you’re treating, it’s getting better! Which we mean less present. And betterness to us is “less present.” All right, his bad ankle is getting better. All right, great! That’s three cheers. We’re very happy about that. What do we mean exactly? We don’t mean his ankle is less present but we mean he’s – the badness of the ankle is less present. So that’s a good indicator.

Now, how much less present? The degree of the goodness of the indicator. Well, it’s getting better swiftly. Well, that’s very good. But it’s still just a good indicator. It is getting better slowly. All right, that’s not so good but, so forth. It’s still a good indicator, see. So we don’t bother to grade it particularly. It’s as long – now get this – as long as we can get a lessening of the bad points present we are making progress and that is all we ask for. And if you as an auditor never ask for any more than that, you’re going to know what an auditing win is, and you’re going to get auditing wins and so forth.

It’s been my experience with auditors, they will sit and chew away on something endlessly as long as they are bettering the condition which they are attacking. They will go on endlessly. It’s when they don’t go on that I worry about and that all adds up to the fact it – the condition – isn’t getting any better. They’re – we’re not getting a lessening of the condition. So we’re – because we’re not getting a lessening of the condition we therefore, have loses. So betterment to us is a lessening of a bad condition.

Now, look at this as a new look of auditing. Look at this as a brand-new look. If all – if all you did in an auditing session, and you didn’t do any more than this, was eradicate – eradicate points which detracted from the idealness of the session, and if that was your total program with the pc, you would have some miraculous wins. Now, let me state that in another way. If you looked over the pc, validated the good indicators that were present and then one by one – and this is programing with regard to indicators, and you have to know this to handle the case at all – one by one attack the bad indicators and handle them. See, validate the good indicators and attack the bad indicators and handle them and restore more good indicators – and if you just audited that way. You didn’t have anything to do with whether or not his lumbosis was better or worse, or whether or not you flattened so many processes or added quantitatively up to you’ve gotten in eighteen dozen hours of auditing – none of those – none of

those – none of those things – don't judge auditing that way, that's quantitative judgment and it'll wind you up in the soup.

It's how many good indicators are you restoring. Now, if you looked at auditing that way, and you worked in that direction and only in that direction, as just a picky, put – well, I just say this – it's like – it's like making one of these cross-patch quilts. They used to knit a patch and then they would sew the patch onto another patch. And then they would knit another patch and they would sew the patch – just endless, quilting of one kind or another where they were making each one of the pieces and weaving each one of them. And you just took the case, and you just took all of the good indicators, and recognized those because you see if you don't recognize the good indicators you can't look for any bad indicators and that's for sure. Recognize those good indicators, and then, and then look for the bad indicators. And then instead of taking a broad jump at the case and just hoping the good indicators will get better and materialize, you carefully took each of the bad indicators that were present, and without reducing the good indicators that were already present, turn that bad indicator off and turn it into a good indicator. You understand?

Now, I'll give you an idea of this. If that was all you did, in auditing at – now I'm talking of course, in auditing at Level IV and below – if that was all you accomplished in auditing, at any level of auditing at Level IV or below, that was all you accomplished, you would be the most successful auditor that anybody ever had anything to do with. And that is the secret of it. You'd just be successful beyond all success.

This pc is *always having present time problems*, and so forth. And this you just go ahead. Your pc's perfectly cheerful, perfectly willing to talk to you, got all that handled and so on, and you can go on, but the pc always has had present time problems. Boy I'd just go to bat, and I'd make a project, just out of this one thing. Well, let's see if we can't reduce the incidence of present time problems in this case. Not by eradicating each problem as it comes up – let's get at the root of the problemism of the case if we possibly can. Without, of course, going into VI – Level VI. Of course, you would get at the problem because that's the whole basis of the case. So what you want to do is destimulate the situation. Let's look this thing over, and let's handle it on a basis – we don't care what this pc is talking about otherwise or doing otherwise and so on, let's just get down and let's take this one bad indicator. The pc has present time problems between every session.

Let's then not sit there. Because that's a bad indicator. Well, of course, these problems are serious enough. But what is wrong with this case? What is wrong with this case at this particular time? The most dominant bad indicator present is the pc's having lots of present time problems between sessions. All right. Let's take that up as a project. Let's roll up our sleeves and let's just work on this. How? Well, all right. At Level I, it'd be on the matter of discussions: the values of problems, and what problems do, and what they are, and how one goes about solving problems. Let's just have a high-level discussion on the subject of problems. And

let's go on and on and on. And let's ask him about what might be generating the problems in his life and let's just discuss this. Let's just whip this thing to pieces, meanwhile keeping him talking happily and cheerily and so forth, to us. And all of a sudden you're going to get the darnedest resurge in this case. Now, it didn't matter, you see, whether you did this in a week or ten weeks, or five minutes. It didn't matter how fast this was done. That case going to get a big gain. That case going to get gain that's real to the case. He's going to finally sit down and he's going to say, "You know, I don't have any problems in this session."

He might not make a big deal out of it because it's a negative gain always – the disappearance. You see, that's one of the things that's very interesting. You know once you get rid of a bad indicator or something wrong with a case, the test of having gotten rid of it is whether or not the case ever talks about it again. If a case goes on talking about it then we haven't gotten rid of it. So we've got a negative gain. Therefore, we can conclude our philosophy about the fact that what's wrong with man is his additives, his bad additives. That is correct. Because when we delete them he is better.

So, if we delete them and he is better our bad additives are gone and the fellow doesn't even think about the bad additives anymore. That's one of the things that sometimes puzzles a new auditor. He's just gotten rid of all these – fellow's carbuncles, you know. And the guy was talking very interestedly about his carbuncles just one session ago. But all of a sudden they all went. And he didn't have any carbuncles now and what's all this about? "Well, how's your carbuncles?" And the pc says, "What carbuncles? Oh, the carbuncles! Oh, yeah, all right, well, what – why do you mention the carbuncles?" The auditor says, "Well, I..." You know, the pc has never – never mentioned carbuncles at all. Pc is now interested in the fact that he's having dreams about freight cars. And this is his problem. Negative gain. You're always up against this negative gain. Because the auditor isn't trying to discipline the pc, you see, he's up against negative gain.

So if we just took these bad indicators, one by one, and we sorted them out, maintaining the good indicators and taking the bad indicators away, we'd find more good indicators appearing. And boy you'd have a velocity session. Theoretically you could build a pc up this way to a point where he would actually just blow clear on inspection. Theoretically. He'd become quite a powerhouse. All by himself. And you know your gains at the lower levels of auditing are all based on that. It's all based on that. They're not based on plowing the pc in or eradicating something which the pc doesn't have anything to do with. They're based on, technically, destimulation from Level IV down. The more you try to run anything out at those levels, why, the more trouble you're going to be in. Level IV gets up, there are some things you can run out and so forth. But at lower levels, you're going to run out all of this fellow's something-or-others, and so on, and you're going to run these out. That is a project in auditing. No, that's a lousy auditing goal. We're going to get rid of his bad indicators and build up and en-

hance his good indicators. And that's what we're going to do. Now that – that's a good auditing goal. That's good. That's good for an auditor to do.

Now, look at the things you could tackle and look at the very orderly progress that you could go forward with here. Number one. Number one. The good indicators and so forth, we have spotted and we notice that there is the pc's body – is in an uncomfortable sort of a state. And so forth. And we see in a little examination of the thing that we have this indicator present: The pc's nervous about being audited. Well, that's a blunt enough indicator, isn't it? It's a bad indicator. Pc's nervous about being audited.

Now, let me show you just this – this chart here. I'd give a great deal to have myself three or four months to sit down and get a lot of material together and so forth. I'm having quite a time of it here. I'm faced with fantastic quantities of research compilation and developments, and getting just recording material and getting stuff down, and it's gotten me just a little bit overhumped. And I'd – I'm trying to get around to giving you all the bad indicators and I must apologize for not having these things in a complete scale form. But I'll give you the form in which they are in.

All right. Here's a bad indicator. Number one: Pc nervous about being audited. This is bad indicator number one, see. All right. Level 0. At Level 0, you can explain Scientology and what auditing is to the pc, and see if the pc is there of his own volition and try to get him to come there of his own volition. See, in other words, get him to decide, not come there under protest. Level I. Of course, all later levels have the earlier level in there too. Level I, we reassure the pc that auditing is not an effort to make him guilty or accusation of insanity or something of that sort. To make the able more able. We get other people's ideas, opinions and so forth, of treatment and what it might do to him. On an intellectual basis, try to cope with his various protests, his auditings, his self-determinism with regard to being audited. In other words, a discussion of his being audited is really what this amounts to at Level I. But we assume as I just told you a moment ago, we assume, that well, he's not there on his own determinism. He's there on yours or he's leery of this thing and so forth. He's got to make up his mind individually to have a goal not – to be audited, not to be forced to have an audit, because he won't get anyplace.

We've had – we had somebody around here for a long time that just had a – had – was there because somebody else wanted him to be there, and so forth. It goes this helly, you see. If an organization suddenly says to some poor staff member who has just found the most beautiful girl he has ever seen, and so forth and he's making time here, and all of this looks beautiful in the future and all of a sudden the Association Secretary points a long and accusative finger at him and says, "You are going to go get trained at Saint Hill." And he suddenly sees he's there for a year and his girl is going to run off with another man – he knows what's going to happen. And so forth, and he doesn't want to go, and he gets here and you know he can't really study. And he can't really make case progress. And he can't do anything else.

Why? Well, number one here is being violated. The pc is not there – under his own volition. You can also say the student isn't there under his own volition. The student or the pc isn't there under his own volition.

That's why – by the way – I was going to get out a policy – letter on this and I will. And let's make a policy right now: if you don't have – if you can't get somebody to be audited or trained on his own volition, don't audit or train them. And boy, you're going to – you're going to get rid of all your loses, right there! You'll get rid of them before they begin. And I'd like – Course Administrator down here, if somebody shows up, to go over this rather – rather strenuously with them. If they're here because they want to be here or if they're here because somebody sent them or are they here for some other reason than to be trained or audited? And somebody ought to take this up with them rather strenuously. And if they are such a thing as an organization personnel and we find out that – well, they were sent by the Continental Director and they really didn't want to come very bad, but they were ordered here. Now, the point is do we do anything to alter the situation by furnishing auditing, or do we teach that organization particularly a lesson by simply just putting the person back on a plane and sending them back. And I think the last answer is the right one. Because they had no right to ship this person here under his own duress. Because he won't make any case progress and he won't make any class level progress or anything.

We know this, see. We know this. We've got the records to prove it. Any time anybody was ordered to Saint Hill that didn't want to come or already thought this or already thought that, it didn't matter who, that person is now nattering around. And any little rumor you hear about Saint Hill from – Jack was telling me the other day he said, "You know I hear these rumors about Saint Hill, all bad, and so forth. And everything is so tough and everything is so awful," and so forth. And he said, "It's all – it's all... Come here and find a well – ordered, well – scheduled, well – conducted course and so forth – and very helpful and so on, no part of this seems to be true at all."

Now, where'd he get – what was the source of those rumors? Well, they must have been people – the very few people, it's a very few handful, you see the bulk of the students here, that are here under their own volition believe me! They're climbing over hedges to get to Saint Hill. But because this is so general and because everybody supposes everybody would want to go to Saint Hill and anybody ordering to go to Saint Hill never thinks twice this person might not want to. This person might have some bad withholds or something. He'd be afraid I'd find out about or something like that. And just feel *awful* at the idea of going to Saint Hill. It's *terrible*, you know. And come here and practically get sick and collapse and everything else. You know, all kinds of reasons back of this sort of thing.

The stunt here would be to better this bad indicator. Well, audited under his own volition. And as a subhead of that, is pc nervous about being audited. See? That's your bad indicator. And your bad indicator leads you immediately to suppose that the pc is not there under

his own volition. See, that's the conclusion, and the Level 0 – of course, all he can do is explain Scientology and what it is to the pc and get him to make up his mind. Sell him a little, but we can't do very much about it. But we could do something. And at least find out who wanted him to have auditing. And then at Level I well, as I've already given you, reassure the pc and so forth.

And Level II. Level II, well, Level II. Oh, we can run such – well, let's get real corny. I'll show you how corny this could be. Just figure out some repetitive process at Level II of, "What have you had to do that you didn't want to do?" Or, "What orders have you had to follow about your health?" See, we could just dream one up that would fit the case. All of a sudden it turns out this fellow's been in the army and he was always being sent down for inspections of some kind or another. It was all very embarrassing, and it was this and that and he's got auditing tied in, you see, with nonvolitional responses. He didn't choose to be there.

So we straighten this up. And at that level of course, we can run general O/W. We could run general O/W also as an action. Just general O/W, and we could get in such a thing and well, Level III – Level III we'd pull some missed withholds. Of course, for a person being audited on Level III, he's been over the jumps. But we could pull missed withholds about this and we could choose a suitable subject on auditing or treatment or on past auditing, or on auditing goals, or on past auditing goals or some such subject like that, and prepcheck it. In other words, this would tend to straighten out all of this. And we'd peel a lot of idea about being audited under protest and being forced to be audited and so forth. Such as "On being forced to be audited has anything been suppressed?" there, you get the idea, you see. If you found this was really the case.

Also at Level III, why, you could run what was formerly R2H or run 3H. Just ARC breaks in general or something like this. Person's had ARC breaks. Or remedy it by the early levels. You might find out after a while that somebody's missed this, you know. Person came into Scientology in order to make their husband guilty. Well! They've forgotten it. That's what's the joke. They've forgotten it, they wonder why they don't make any case progress, and *they waff-waff-waff-waff-wa-waff-waff-waff*, see. You've got trouble – trouble – trouble. What is all this trouble coming from? It's coming from their basic ideas about being audited. And they never wanted to be audited, and they never wanted this, and they never wanted that and they sort of drifted along. "Well, Harry would have left me if I hadn't agreed to take the HPA Course." And here's a – one of our poor Instructors down here, beating their brains out, trying to get this person to sit up straight in an auditing chair. They can't do it. You sit them up, rag doll, they fall off the side of the chair, you know. I mean, can't confront, can't run TR 0. Just this – somehow or another it's all kind of missing somehow or another.

All right, some smart auditor looks at this idea, the pc's always late for his session. *Hmm-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu-hu*. Bad indicator. And during session the pc seems to be nervous. And so a bad indicator. What's missing here is calm pc on time for session, see, those are good

indicators. So those are missing, look for this other one. Pc nervous, and he's only late, so forth – wah-de-da, *de-da, de-da, de-da*, all right. Somewhere along the line here we've got audited not on own volition. We've got in Scientology not on own volition and so forth. We're going to plow into that, man, were going to straighten that up.

We give you the idea up here, at Level III you'd be using this kind of a remedy, don't you see. I've just given them to you. And we get over here at Level IV, oh my God, Level IV – we just got the book open. Because we can find out how auditing – being audited would make somebody – or refusing to be audited would make somebody wrong. And would make themselves right. And we've got all the kinds of service fac stuff here, and we've got assess for ARC breaks with auditors, practitioners and ARC breaks with life, or ARC breaks with various processes that the person's been run on, don't you see. And we locate and indicate the bypassed charge on it, and we run routine ARC break assessments for the sessions, and – they've had. You know, that kind of thing. We just keep putting it together here. But of course we've got all these earlier remedies and we – that still goes back to possibility of audited under no volition.

We – if we found at – by the time they got to Level IV, if we just found one session, which they were audited and they were – had a withhold during the whole session they sure as hell didn't want to be audited during that session. We'll get that and what do you know, we're going to get a little resurgence in that particular case. Because this is a *very key point*. Very, very key point. All right, so we straighten it up.

Now, let's take another. Let's take another bad indicator, high-generality bad indicator. And we get pc unfriendly to auditor. Well, that has varying degrees. He's critical of the auditor, or just cool and unappreciative. Now, how many unappreciative pcs do you know? Well, that's a bad indicator. All right, so obviously the good indicator must be that the pc is friendly to the auditor and appreciative of what the auditor's doing. All right, the bad in – well, that's not there, look for the bad indicator, and you all of a sudden find the pc's kind of critical of this auditor and he's very cool about things. And the pc is the pc – the pc is perfectly cool, calm and collected, but never even says thank you for a session. Now, what do you think about that? Now, how many of your pcs, here and there have never done this? All right, that's a bad indicator. Bad indicator.

Now, what's this mean? What's this mean? Well, we're opening the door of course, on the whole phenomena – the whole vast phenomena of withholds. Overts. Communication cuts. Itsa cuts.

Now a cut itsa can be cut by the pc having a withhold which prevents him from itsaing. He's got the withhold, the auditor doesn't have anything to do with it, don't you see. But the pc will be unfriendly to the auditor. Now how does the auditor get this? How does he get this straightened out? And that's the whole subject of how to get by this fantastic, inhibited,

swirling howling mess of inhibitions and still string a communication line. How do you do it? Well, sometimes it's very tricky. But if you just did that – if you just worked on that. Get the pc to be friendly to the auditor. Well, how would we do this? We'd run various processes. We'd handle it in various ways.

We'd say, "Well, in general in life this pc... Well, I mean, we can defeat ourselves. We say, "In general life this pc's pretty cool. This pc's pretty cool. This pc is not very friendly to people. This pc is detached," and so forth. Well, to me that'd just be a challenge. It'd be a challenge, auditing can overcome that. Auditing consists basically of picking up the postulates, incepts, considerations, ideas which the individual has had and the problems which the individual has faced or confronted. And lower levels of auditing you usually address to just the one lifetime. Don't you get too specialized on solutions and so you never – it's true that solution gives you the tone arm action. But if you totally ignore the pc's wish to talk about problems, why, you're not going to get more itsa. One of the reasons why you run out of itsa is because you specialize in solutions and ignore problems. And you've got to sometimes sacrifice some tone arm action, and get the *wham-wham-wham* in on the subject of what problems have you had, fellow, in order to get something to itsa. Remember this.

Actually, if you spent fifty percent of your time on itsaing solutions, and fifty percent of your time on itsaing about the problems the individual has had, your case would stay in balance and you'd be stacking up tone arm action for the future. Even though it was cutting a bit of tone arm action at present. This is something that I'm sure you're hearing with great happiness right now, because you're – been a little bit afraid to attack problems. Well, I'll sure never be afraid to attack problems.

I'm liable to go right on down the track and find some basic problem the pc has had, and I don't care if I was sitting there for fifteen minutes with the tone arm not moving. When I do bit the jackpot, I'm going to get motion! And I'm going to get motion in that tone arm, and then the pc's *yip – yip – yip* on the subject of the solutions and what he's done about that and so forth – that's going to more than make up for that lost time. One of your reasons why your pc runs out of fat and you haven't got tone arm action on him anymore, is you really don't encourage him to dig up problems that he has, in the past, had to solve. It's a fifty-fifty proposition. The reason for that is, of course, at Level VI you will find that fifty percent of the RIs are oppterm and fifty percent are terminals. And they give you an equal amount of TA action actually in running out, and oppterm consist nothing – of nothing in the world but stated problems and terminals consist of nothing in the world but solutions to those problems. The fixed solution to the fixed problem. So you've got the oppterm as the fixed problem; you've got the terminal as the fixed solution.

So you see that if you could get somebody to state the real problem, you would get as much tone arm action, you see, as you'd get if he gave you the fixed solution, see. It's all in the cards that it'd be that way, at an upper level. But if you start working this too hard you move



him back into his GPMs. All right, well, you – so therefore, you handle problems a little less heavily than you would ordinarily, and you don't try to search arduously for problems in the pc. But you don't start specializing – a hundred percent. You really want to spin some pc just audit nothing but problems. The pc talks about problems, and just audit nothing but problems and ask the pc about – “Now have you got any more problems? Uh – oh – yeah, well, that's a pretty bad problem, that one is,” and so forth – and problems, problems, problems, a hundred percent about a problem. You're going to bog the pc.

Similarly, however, you'll bog the pc if you only talk about solutions, without having any problems. Because of course, the pc is going to become an – unfriendly to the auditor if the auditor never gives him anything to talk about. And the pc's basic interest is in some problem he has had or has. Do you see? So you've got to give the pc something to talk about, otherwise the pc can't do it at all. And you might find that the unfriendliness to the auditor is the fact just – basically just the fact that the auditor makes the pc's case a missed withhold. Makes the pc's problems a missed withhold. Because the auditor will work for too long a period of time stressing some particular point in a pc's life, and not let the pc branch off sideways into the ramification of other problems which have accumulated around that particular point. But that's a problem of just cut it out.

We're talking, however, in this bad indicator, the pc's unfriendly to the auditor. All right. Heh! Your Zero trick would be to get the pc to explain the damage the auditor might do to him or her. That's about as far as you could go on the 0 level. What damage, and so forth – and the pc, of course, that's a lousy solution, by the way, because the pc of course, is going to add up a bunch of critical overts and so forth – in the thing, but it is better than nothing. And it will do something.

Now, if I could get somebody to explain why he shouldn't be audited, you see, that's the same question. Just tell me why you shouldn't be audited, I will get the fellow finally into a very, very friendly discourse. I'll finally get the guy into session. So this is actually not necessarily the lowest-level solution, this is merely the crudest solution, but it's a workable solution. You've got old Grandma, she's sitting over there with her ear trumpet, and she's saying “This stuff Scientology, ever since George and Charles got into Scientology and so forth – and *so-so-so and nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyahnyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah-nyah!*” And we know that this is going to be a mess, man! Because we've got an un-auditable person. Well, we choose this pc as an auditor, right away, the pc is being audited not at her power of choice, we've already broke the back of that one. So we've got an uphill climb here, man. So we could kill the two birds with one pc on the basis of saying, “Well, just explain – explain to me why – why you shouldn't be audited.”

“*Oh, pooh-pooh! Nonsense! Uh-ho! Wa!* And so forth! *Yip-yip-yip-yip-yip!*” And the next thing you know she would be sitting there telling us, “Well, actually I have a small pain in the back of my shoulder that I wish somebody would do something about – of course, you

probably couldn't do anything about it, but I wish somebody would do something about..." so forth. This is one of the oldest tricks I ever saw. I heard over the intercoms – listen systems, used in Central Organization one time in Washington. A staff auditor back in those days, giving the business to a sea cook who had dropped in, who was pretty drunk most of the time, and he was clearing help. And boy, this guy just couldn't answer the question, couldn't do anything. He was actually upgrading this; he should have started at a lower level. But he actually walked it in on the subject of help. And I think at the end of one hour – I think at the end of about an hour, the fellow finally found a way he could help the auditor. He finally found it; he got very expansive on this particular thing, and really started to get very friendly and go into communication. "*I could go out and find a bottle, I could find a couple of boys out on the waterfront, see,*" and he "*could really help him by doing that,*" and so on, "*have – have a good time,*" he really could help him. And yeah – he could help him and he started in, and the next thing you know they were – he just felt very friendly to the auditor and everything else – wildest demonstration of something or other I ever heard of! He was just remedying this one point. The guy didn't want to talk to the auditor. He didn't want to be audited either.

All right, so don't sneer at your lower-level remedy. Your next level there, of course, I. You could get the pc to explain any trouble he's gotten into by imparting confidences or talking too freely. That's pretty – pretty clever. Most anybody who is – who is unfriendly to the auditor and so forth – is afraid of talking, that's sure, because it's all based on missed withholds of one kind or another, but let's get him into this, and of course, that gets off a few missed withholds. Get the pc to explain any trouble he's gotten into by imparting confidences or talking too freely. Now, it gets the pc to give you long expositions at Level I, on the subject of the dangers of free communication. And you're going to get yourself some interesting stuff.

This I'm giving you is grass-roots stuff. This is cold, out of the – out of the basic dregs of human relationships. These things have worked – these are the last tools in the kit, ordinarily, and therefore they are put at those particular levels. There are a lot of other such tools. But those things have been very good.

And at Level II, you'd get A: "What would you be willing to talk to me about?" which is a standard remedy or similar processes. And don't get hung up on that as the only process; use your wits and imagination. You're trying to get the guy to as-is various reasons he won't talk to you and run them out, and so forth. So you've got a lot of processes there that you can use at that level. And B, Level II B, would be general O/W on auditing or auditors or general O/W on auditor or auditors. That would be the – not auditing, but auditors. You'll find – you'll find a lot of stuff there, man; you'll find a lot of stuff. You can really dig up a lot of stuff.

Now, number three, Level III, of course, you're getting into more high school actions, you could pull missed withholds about auditors or auditors. What withholds have auditors missed and that sort of thing. And you could prepcheck auditors or practitioners and help or failed help, as indicated, see? You could prepcheck, in other words, help or failed help, see.

And you're getting into this auditor-preclear relationship. That's all the thing you're trying to improve. And then of course at Level VI and so on, why, you start pulling the cork on the subject of help, failed help, on a sort of service facsimile basis and so forth.

"Now, if you were really helped by auditing, if you were really helped by auditing and so forth, if you were really helped by auditing, how would that make you wrong?" Interesting question! And "If you weren't helped by auditing at all, how would that make you right?" Now, the better question of course is "How would you be made right by not being helped by auditing." But that's quite – of course quite accusative. But you've got that and all the lower remedies.

Now, of course, Levels V, VI, VII, we naturally use these lower-level remedies, and they have their own bad indicator systems, and we consider the individual is far above being unauditible and having such problems. And as a result, why, you find nearly all these problems occur at Levels V, VI and VII, these problems occur, you know, unfriendly to the auditor and nervous about auditing, and that sort of thing. But they stem from the root stuff of the mind. And the thing you've got to do is straighten out the track. Where's the missed GPM? You know, where's the missed items? What's happened here? Where's the bypassed charge? What's – that's – that sort of thing.

Now, I'm just giving you some ideas here. You'll eventually get this stuff in the form of bulletins, and so forth, with scales and so forth providing I ever get myself squared around here to a point where I can get you out the scale. I don't know if you realize the level of precision that's required. I worked for some little time to give you just the assembly of stuff on just those two points and so on. It isn't that it took me long, actually, to do it, but it takes time to do. And I like to give them with some precision.

Now, let's take up another bad indicator; the pc nervous about being audited in a selected auditing room. In the selected auditing room, the pc's nervous about being audited in that. Well, that's the auditing environment. Now, we've got the subject of auditing – look how elementary we're getting, see, back to 1955. The subject of auditing, the subject of auditor, the subject of auditing room and the good indicators are present when these things are accepted and cheerful and all that stuff, and the bad indic – and you – when those aren't present then you look for the bad indicators and you'll find out that they run down to – and get this – these things always run down to a magnitudinous present time problem of some kind or another, which you could handle. These things always get into that or they get into some horrendous ARC break on the subject, and you clear those things up you've done a lot for a pc! Don't think you haven't.

Now, I'm not going to give you all the levels – about the auditing room, they're quite obvious. When you get up to Level II you're starting to – your first levels – are environment and havingness is Level III and discussions of the dangers of the environment at Level 0 and

that's of course where Level 0 lives. The dangers of the environment. So if pc's nervous about the auditing room, why, the dangers of the environment. You find mostly it solves on that one spot. "Well, it's all right but the room we're in somebody might bust in any minute and I'm in the middle of a comm lag and startle me out of my wits." Well, all right, dangers of the environment. And number one, why, dangerous environments. That as a subject is perfectly all right, the trouble he's – trouble he's had in auditing rooms and in practitioner's rooms and all of that sort of thing and let him get some of his solutions off on the subject of how he has gone about solving it.

As I said Level III – Level III, you're – Level II, III, you're in clover, you're getting up into your havingness levels. And at Level IV, well, you – the roof's the limit. You've got discussions of associative restimulators you will see in there eventually. Finding things that are not restimulative, things that are safe. Of course, that is quite runnable – quite runnable down at Level II, it's perfectly allowable process. So that one dead-easy.

What I'm trying to give you an idea of here... I'm not trying to give you all the textual material because the textual material of this for heaven sakes is staggering. I mean, the amount of cross-reference and coding which you get into for all of these levels for all auditing bad indicators is quite interesting. And what's horrifying to me is just the amount of work I have to do on it and the amount of accuracy it has to have. And what should be horrifying to you is if I didn't do that very neatly because you're going to have to know them all. I should have it written up very neatly indeed. It ought to be put together very well.

The point I'm trying to make with you is the organization of this sort of thing – the handling of this kind of thing. Now, if you – if you want a mental exercise and you know – you know actually I'd far better that you sat down and extrapolated it for the good of your own – hey what do you know – for the good of your own immortal soul! That's pretty good, heh? By the way, where are you keeping it these days? The – I'd much rather you sort of dreamed it up, and worked over these things. And if I had enough time, and you had enough time in the matter, I probably wouldn't train you any other way, on any other level.

I'm trying to give you the woof and the warp, the put – together of this kind of action and the handling of it. And I'd like to give you now an exercise. Like to give you an exercise. Now, I don't want your papers on this or anything of this sort. But I think it might be good for your immortal soul – I think that's probably an item that one of the earlier saints had or something. He probably had an item called "immortal soul that burned holes in the back of his neck" or something like this. I think you should write down a list of the bad indicators, which would be present at your own level auditing or any lower level. Don't bother too much about the level organization of it but just go ahead on a basis of dreaming up all the bad indicators that could be present if a *Homo sapiens* were shoved into – and now get that advisedly – a *Homo sapiens* were shoved into your auditing room. I said *shoved* in. And all the bad indicators that would be present and what you might be able to do about these things.

Because one of your troubles as an auditor is the trouble any auditor gets into. He hasn't, every time measured up to the bad indicator. He's seen the bad indicator, he didn't – he's too busy coping with something or other to do something effective about it and so he slipped his gears with regard to it. He hasn't paid much attention to it; he's lost his temper instead or he's done something or other that was totally ineffective. And you've seen situations like ARC breaks and that sort of thing that you couldn't handle. And eventually you get less brave in the subject of these. But do you know that it is well, well, within your control. I mean that! Well within your control to be able to take somebody who was dragged into your room at the other end of a chain! And eventually have him decide with the greatest cheeriness in the world, that was just exactly where he wanted to be, not because you overwhelmed him but by picking up his various considerations. Oh, it might take you – might take you months, of momentary meetings with this character and so forth. But it's well within your power to turn him into a high-flying pc.

I don't care how he was dragged in. That's interesting. It's an interesting challenge. And it's all on the basis of seeing that a good indicator is missing and then looking for the bad indicator and – I don't care how many dozens of bad indicators were present – then selecting and here's the key of it, see, here's what's going to give you wins – then selecting the one which is most in the road of auditing, and – using that as a criteria selecting it – one by one, eradicating those bad indicators. Each time using as your criteria the bad indicator, that – you choose it because it is most in the road of your auditing. Always choose that, that way.

You can make out a list on this one pc, let us say, of sixty bad indicators. Oh! It's a horrendous and overpowering list. See, long! Now remember, the key is: handle those bad indicators, that's auditing the pc in front of you, handle those bad indicators one at a time. And how do you find which one to handle first? It's the one which is most in the road of your auditing. And now, how do you choose the second one you're going to handle? It is the one which is now most in the road of the auditing. And what happens if some other one suddenly moves in during a session and gets in the road of your auditing, so that you have to handle that, too? Well, that's your problem! I'll not give you any fixed formula for that. But it will only occur because you've done a lousy job of basic auditing. I don't think I ought to give you a solution to it.

You just go on plugging with a good job of basic auditing, using a technology adapted to the remedy of that bad indicator and converting it into a good indicator that you're working on. It's just – it's like this: "Well, Mr. Smith..." – I saw Mary Sue handle a mad woman one time. It was just fantastic! Woman was throttling her and howling, and so forth, and actually I don't think that there was very much auditing connected with it and so on. But just one bad indicator. The person couldn't keep in mind who the auditor was. Kept losing track of the auditor. And the auditor would give an auditing command about something about the environment and then, the pc would lose track of who the auditor was. And the auditor would say, "Who am I?"

And the pc would say, “Oh – you’re – you’re, uh – Aunt Agatha!” or something. “Oh no, no, of course, I know who you are, of course, I know who you are, you’re Mrs. Hubbard,” and so forth. And it was all very fine. And you know that pc came through a psychosis which had prevented the pc from ever going near her husband or living in the country where he had to work. And she left for the country shortly afterwards and so forth. So don’t think that clearing up one of these auditing points, you see, is a light result. It isn’t.

I ought to get Mary Sue to tell – you get Mary Sue to tell you that story sometime or another because she tells stories very, very well, and it’s really a howl. But that was just this one thing – just this one thing is: identification of the auditor. And it straightened out a psychosis. So don’t think that you need wild numbers of techniques at lower levels. You don’t. All you need is to be able to recognize good indicators and when they’re not present, recognize the bad indicator that’s present and then go ahead and handle the bad indicator. Convert the bad indicator into a good indicator, take your next bad indicator, handle that, convert it into a good indicator maintaining at the same time all the good indicators that were already present. Of course, it’s kind of tricky, it takes some experience and so forth. Boy, you’d have pcs flying if you did that. You’d just have them flying.

What I’ve given you here is a system by which this is worked and evolved. Much more than tremendous quantities of data concerning it. But the organizations of the system is simply that there are many bad indicators, many bad indicators. And bad indicators are bad indicators, until you get up to Levels V and VI they are merely handled differently. The indicator doesn’t change much. The indicators are there. But when you get to Levels V and VI you of course, get other bad indicators of a lighter nature which can block off and prevent other indicators from happening, which are not present at these lower levels.

But you can have some wonderful – wonderful success with cases, working on what I have been telling you. And remembering as you work that no matter how light it is or how modern or how much in this lifetime it is, this person at sometime or another has had a social idea which became thwarted. And if you can trace those things back, no matter how you are working the case, if your auditing is directed mainly in that particular direction – is eradicating these wild offbeat ideas, thrusts and impulses of the individual. In other words, the motivations back of his overts – your original times when he decided this or that about something or other, by George you’re gonna – you’re gonna have pcs that really fly. And then, of course, you get up the upper levels you can run out the GPMs, of course and things that made him have those impulses in the first place.

All right. I’ve shorted you up a little bit here tonight – I overtalked it by five minutes, I was five minutes late, so you can be five minutes late for your sessions. Okay?

Thank you very much. Good night.