

## 6312C31 SHSpec-1 Indicators

This was the year in which we achieved the technology of OT, and in which we laid the bridge, with all the older processes from dianetics on. It is the year in which we had our hardest attacks since 1950. These attacks are losing or have lost. The IRS lost its suit on LRH and MSH. "IRS" means "Infernal Ravening ..."! The work for 1964 should include codification of materials, writing textbooks for the different levels, etc. Several techniques have been developed for a higher-classed auditor to run on a lower-level PC. We are ready to open the door wide on the subject of psychosomatic healing. We could put it on an ethical basis by saying that if you don't get results on a patient, you refund his money.

Anybody who is receiving Level VI auditing [See above, for a description of this level.] from an auditor who flubs, goes through more illnesses and psychosomatics than anyone can count. LRH understands the phenomenon of psychosomatics and is consequently a little contemptuous of doctors' treatment of these conditions. It is rather horrifying, from an auditor's viewpoint, to see what is thought of the illness and how it is treated. The auditor would like to be able to see what goal it is, what RI, what service fac, etc., when chaos reigns, caused by misalignment of the psyche. This is fascinating in its complexity and disillusioning in the simplicity of its cause.

The technology for handling the bank has finally been worked out. It is complex, it takes expert auditing and an educated PC, but the result is an OT. This is a far higher result than was expected before 1962, to a degree that it is unreal to most people. At times, it is even unreal to LRH.

Even when the auditor and the PC have tremendous skill, they can make huge mistakes. For instance, LRH has been looking for his PT GPM for months. He has found seven so far, each one thought to be the PT one. He has been unburdening the track by running them as they were found. He is aware of good case advance since starting out. Now his goals lists go for five or six items, one rocket-reading, then it goes on by stacking it up, putting the GPM on top of it, listing in to the top oppterm, to see if there was anything there, to see if there was a GPM closer to PT. "We handled four of them like they were old sacks of straw." He finally got the PT GPM. For the first time, he looked forward and saw nothing there. He woke up, wondered if a couple were backwards: "Creak:" Got his considerations: no creak. This is a far cry from a few months ago, when he was wrapped around a telegraph pole with regularity.

You made the early GPM's without having a body. So it is tough on bodies to run into RI's, etc. It is nice to be "outside", not subject to the body's intolerance of temperature extremes. The problem LRH ends the year with is "As an OT, how do you drink Coca-Cola?" It doesn't evaporate like liquor, and LRH is too big to get into the bottle. He thought of putting it in a tub, with ice.

If you have wondered whether you will ever make it all the way, while you are making it all the way, you will have many other periods when you will be certain that you will never make it all the way. That is the greatest certainty that LRH can give you. He has "known" many times that it was impossible for you to make it. But he has recovered. The final end product of scientology or of a thetan in this universe has been achieved in 1963, whatever else can be said for the year. Indicators

This is a new subject. Routine 6 [This is probably the procedure given in the last tape. See HCOPL 5May64 "Summary of Classification and Gradation and Certification" p. 4. See also above, for a summary of this procedure.] cannot be run without knowledge of indicators and of the proper actions to do when certain things are present or not present. Indicators are present at every level. There are good indicators and bad indicators. To know about bad indicators, you must know what good indicators are. One needs to know both, in order to have a datum to compare with. For instance, you don't cut the PC's itsa, because you want the good indicator of smooth needle and cheerful PC, not because of fear of instructors. In the field of, say,

music, one has some standards and expectations of how it should sound on hi-fi equipment, etc. That is the comparative datum, the good indicator, the standard. A test for hi-fi equipment is, "How should it sound?" Poor hi-fi equipment sounds like you are in the lobby of the theater when the aisle doors are closed. If you walk down the aisle to about the center of the theater and listen, that is what good hi-fi equipment should sound like. People, watching LRH's auditing on demos, have shown that they don't have a standard to judge the session by. LRH worked out good and bad indicators to make the standards known and explicit. If you know what is right with a session, you can tell what is wrong with one. Good indicators.

People should be happy in session. "The only frame of mind that you can as-is in is a cheerful, high-toned [one]. The PC should be cheerfully itsa-ing to the auditor. If he runs a secondary, he runs grief off of it and comes out of it, etc. We get a picture of what the session should be, with good indicators. If they are not there, then bad indicators are there. These bad indicators should be handled, so as to get the good indicators back. GI's mean that the auditor should continue what he is doing. BI's show that the auditor should do something else. The particular BI's that are present determine what the auditor must do. E.g., if the PC makes a critical remark about the auditor, pull a missed withhold, do a session ARC break assessment, or run O/W. How the PC should look and sound; how the bank should respond; how the meter should behave -- all these are the good indicators.

(Note that at Levels V and VI, the male and female clear reads no longer apply, since a thetan doesn't have a sex.)

The time to do something about a bad indicator is when you can't go on, with good indicators, not just whenever a bad indicator shows up. The broad range of optimum TA range is 2.0 to 4.0. The common range of TA excursion is 2.75 to 3.5. There are three grades of bad indicators: light, medium, and heavy. They compare to the suddenness with which you must take action.

1. The light indicator shows you that something is wrong, so that you can be alert for a need for action, but nothing necessarily needs to be done.
2. On moderate BI's, action must be taken as soon as it can be comfortably done.
3. On heavy BI's, emergency crash action must be taken right now. An example of a grade 3 BI would be the PC not wanting auditing.
4. A grade 4 BI would be something like a car going over a cliff. You hear a dwindling scream. This PC is never going to be audited again.

GI's mean expected, not extraordinary. Wanting auditing is more common than you would expect. It is a GI we take for granted. If a lot of GI's are present, a few BI's don't matter too much.

An ordinary BI, not a VBI, would be the fact that the PC has a PTP. You tend to it promptly, since a PC with a PTP makes no progress. A PC with an ARC break gets worse with auditing, so that is a VVBI. That is the only time that auditing worsens a case. So the GI's are: "PC in session, with no PTP and no ARC break." This is something that one should know for auditing supervision. You cannot supervise by BI's; only by GI's, because when GI's cease to exist, your action must be directed towards recreating them, not just at eradicating BI's.

You could base your expectations of case progress on how many GI's are present. For every GI not present, some BI is present. Do the appropriate thing to remove the BI, and get the GI back. Know GI's more by heart than BI's, since if there is a BI, you can always go to the textbook to figure it out. For instance, you notice that the PC keeps having PTP's. You eventually think of the datum that when the PC keeps having PTP's, his goals must be totally divergent from the auditor's goals, and the session itself becomes the PTP. Don't act when

BI's are not present. Only correct what needs correction! Don't let a win on repairing one PC's BI's become the stable datum for all PCs, who don't have the same BI's.

This disposes of the idea that some PCs are auditable and others aren't. You are an auditor, and the standard procedures on which you are being trained are the way in which you materialize GI's in a session. They are all calculated to bring about GI's in the PC. The gains of auditing are astonishingly automatic, these days. You just audit the PC on a standard program.

If BI's pop up, always take care of the worst one first. Naturally you want to get the heaviest BPC out of the way first and keep patching up the case only until you can get back on the road. The GI on an auditing question is:

1. The PC has received something to inspect.
2. He inspects it.
3. He tells you what he has inspected. He answers the question fully, as far as he is concerned.
4. Then you acknowledge.

It doesn't matter if you gave him one command and he inspected fully and took a half an hour to answer, or if you gave him many repetitive commands and he fully answered the question. He is going through an electronic circuit, and he comes out the other end free of it, having inspected it. If you cut his itsa along the way, he gets lost in the middle of the labyrinth of electronic material. This gives rise to a dirty needle. Just keep the PC going, with GI's, building his confidence and not cutting his itsa, moving him along up the line.