

## 6401C09 SHSpec-3 Bad Indicators

In trying to relay truth, it is always necessary to break it down into a system by which it can be communicated. The system that breaks auditing down into basic auditing, technique, and case analysis is a useful one. [See the tape 6 11C05 SHSpec-321 "Three Zones of Auditing". Case analysis now breaks down into the general subjects:

1. Case analysis.
2. Good indicators.
3. Bad indicators.

Case analysis consists of keeping a continuous eye on the PC's indicators. Case analysis is:

1. Noting when the GI's are still present.
2. Being alert and noting when one has dropped out.
3. Looking to see what BI has appeared.
4. Programming to remedy the BI with some appropriate technique. Actually, there is a shifting back and forth between technique and case analysis. Case analysis contains programming. [See The Book of Case Remedies.]

Bad indicators include the fact that the PC is in a body, not an OT: The corresponding good indicator would be that he is there of his own volition.

The first bad indicator is that the PC looks like he doesn't want to be in session anymore. That is, a good indicator is gone, namely, the PC's being there of his own volition. The bad indicator is unwillingness to be there. That is our first hurdle: no free choice, not there of his own volition. That ends the case analysis.

The above is a simple example of case analysis. From there on, it is a matter of selecting a process to fit the case level. What technique to use to handle this BI depends on the level of the PC and the auditor. So case analysis starts out with the observation that the expected indicator or behavior, i.e. the natural behavior of a being, the good indicator, has gone out.

Good indicators are actually the natural behavior of a being. "The world [particularly since Freud, with his idea of the censor] has been crashing along on this ... lie ... that inhibited behavior is social behavior and that any uninhibited behavior is anti-social. So the criminal is 'uninhibited', so you have to ... punish him and put him in a cell ... , and if you inhibit him enough, you will make a social being out of him. [Actually, super-inhibition brings about] social catastrophes." If you can't fix behavior, you can always inhibit it. You are suppressing it, though, and a thetan's forward actions and desires do not fade away. They only submerge. "Impulses do not fade away; they only submerge." This is Axiom 0: a thetan never gives up trying to create an effect.

("Holding a grudge" is a 1.1 characteristic. E.g. Henry VIII got even with the pope by creating the Church of England.)

This gives you a better understanding of people in general -- seeing what happens when impulses meet with inhibition: people get even. You will understand history, teen agers, criminals, and everything a lot better if you realize that a thetan never really gives up. This is the secret of behavior. This is why teen-agers so commonly reject their families: The child never forgives the parents for certain things, often tiny things. You have to find the source of a "rejection" or a "revolt". Auditing easily brings this to the fore. The child rejects his parents to

get even. Besides, forgiveness, per se, is propitiation. The source of Man's ingratitude and the secret of leadership is just the fact that a thetan never gives up. "As an auditor, you are just auditing all the nutty, aberrated, inhibited times when [the PC] never gave up, when he postulated something silly, when he tried to do something stupid." You can actually graph how some innocent goal or impulse goes through this process of degradation:

1. It becomes inhibited, submerged, and warped.
2. It emerges at a lower level as an overt.
3. Below that, it emerges as a withhold. You could graph that on any ambition.
4. Below that is unawareness, which submerges down to
5. Unconsciousness.
6. Humanoid. That is how a goal becomes an overt, a withhold, unawareness, unconsciousness, and, below that, humanoid.

So when a being comes in for auditing, his being there of his own volition is the biggest good indicator there is. He is surrounded by bad indicators, which you are going to eradicate. The hope factor is put in by validating whatever good indicators are present. The next best indicator is that the PC is getting better. "Betterness", to us, means "less present, in the sense of, 'My ankle is getting better.'" The pain, confusion, etc., is less present. "Betterment ... is the lessening of a bad condition." So the PC getting better, wrongnesses less present, is a good indicator. This is negative gain. If all you did in a session were to validate the good indicators that were present and attack and handle, one by one, the bad indicators that were present, thereby restoring more good indicators, you would get amazing results; you would be enormously successful. The PC would approach Native State.

Don't try to train or audit someone against his own volition, assuming that you have tried and failed to change his mind. It is a bad indicator. All you need to be able to do is to spot GI's, and when GI's are not present, to spot the bad indicator that is present, and to go ahead and handle it. If a case goes on talking about something, he hasn't gotten rid of it, and you haven't yet achieved negative gain in the area. All your lower-level gains are based on destimulation and removal of BI's. Progress on a case is measured by the number of GI's that you are restoring. This applies to Level IV or below. [Note that this is the precursor of grades auditing.] Bad Indicator No. 1:

PC nervous about auditing. Level 0: At the lowest levels, you assume that the PC is not there on his own determinism and work on fixing this up. You want to have a PC who is not nervous about getting auditing. At Level 0, discuss scientology with him. Let him know what it is about. Try to get him there under his own determinism. Get him to decide. Level I: Discuss auditing, healing, therapies, etc. Get his ideas about these things. Reassure the PC that you are not auditing him to make him guilty. You are only concerned with making the able more able. Get what others' ideas or opinions are about treatment and what it might do to him. Try to cope with the PC intellectually.

Get into a general discussion of his being audited. Level II: Here, you could run a repetitive process, which could go as follows: "What have you had to do which you didn't want to do?", or "What orders have you had to follow about your health?" General O/W would also be runnable at this level. Level III: Pull missed withholds on auditing, past auditing, or treatment.

Prepcheck any of those, or something like "On auditing goals ... " or "On being forced to be audited...." You could run R2H [Now renamed R3H]. You could do ARC break assessments or find the PC's basic ideas about being audited -- how he originally felt about it. Level IV: Here, you've got service facs, ARC breaks with auditors, practitioners, ARC breaks that the PC has had in past processing, etc., etc. At Level IV, we can find one session that the person

didn't want in the past, because of a withhold or something. That would be a key point to knock out of the way. You could run, "How would refusing to be audited make you right/others wrong?." "Why shouldn't you be audited?" is a crude but workable process, at this level. Bad Indicator No. 2: PC unfriendly or cool towards the auditor; unappreciative of the auditor or auditing.

This opens the door to a large area of withholds, overts, cut comm, cut itsa, etc. You can run out of itsa by specializing in solutions only, not problems, even though the TA motion comes from solutions. Thus, you sacrifice some present TA motion for a greater amount of future TA motion. You could spend fifty percent of your time on problems and fifty percent on solutions and get more TA by not running out of itsa. It is a fifty-fifty proposition. This is because GPM's are fifty percent terminals (fixed solutions) and fifty percent oppterm (fixed problems). Both give good TA.

Unfriendliness to the auditor could stem from the auditor's keeping the PC from itsa-ing as area of interest, including problems. You must get into problems somewhat, so that the PC has something to talk about at all. The PC will get unfriendly if the auditor never gives him anything to talk about.

Level 0: Get the PC to discuss what damage the auditor might do to him or her. This is a lousy solution, since it asks for more "critical", but it is better than nothing. Get the PC to explain why he shouldn't be audited. This can get him quite friendly and right into session.

Level I: Another low-level remedy would be, "How could you help me?" This raises the ARC of the PC. You could also get the PC to explain any trouble he has gotten into by imparting confidences or talking too freely. That also gets off a few missed withholds. You could use, "What are you willing to talk to me about?"

Level II: You could use similar processes here, as well as general O/W on auditors.

Level III: You could pull withholds missed by auditors. You could prepcheck auditors, practitioners, help, or failed help, as indicated.

Level IV: You work on help and failed help on a service fac basis, using: "If you were really helped by auditing, how would that make you wrong?" "If you weren't helped by auditing, how would that make you right?"

When PCs at Levels V, VI, and VII are unfriendly to auditors, there is some foul-up in the root of the bank. Bad Indicator No. 3:

PC nervous about being audited in a particular auditing room. That's the auditing environment. These things always run down to some horrendous PTP or ARC break.

Level 0: Discuss the dangerousness of the environment.

Level I: Discuss dangerous environments in general, the trouble he has had in auditing rooms, in practitioners' rooms. Get solutions off -- how he has solved it. Level II: Finding things that are safe.

Level III: Havingness.

Level IV: Get associative restimulators.

Here is a suggested exercise: Make a list of bad indicators that could be present if a homo sapiens were dragged in chains into your auditing room. Then figure out what you might be able to do about these things. Given enough time, perhaps over a course of months, you should be able to turn him into a high-flying PC by:

1. Seeing a good indicator missing.
2. Noting all the bad indicators.
3. Selecting the one that is most in the road of auditing.
4. Eradicating that one first.
5. Continue handling the BI's, one by one, by getting considerations off, etc., until no more BI's are present. Using this procedure, you could get anyone, no matter how initially hostile he was, to want auditing, on his own determinism, and not by overwhelming him. Auditing is converting BI's to GI's.

As you work the case, remember that the person has had some impulses. somewhere along the line, that got inhibited and submerged. Handling those by getting back to them will give a resurgence of the case.