

INDICATORS

A lecture given on
31 December 1963

Thank you. Well, I haven't seen you for quite a while. I've been trying to groom in your Instructors and I've been working behind the scenes! My hand will have been felt here, shortly.

Well, it's a very beautiful evening for the old year to be dying. I hope it dies very dead! I don't like to see it - any possibility of it quivering back to life, you know. We can bury it with all the sentiment of a drunken relative who stole all our money. Yeah, 1963 - been quite a year. It's been very successful technically - fantastically. It will go down in history for that reason. But boy, from the standpoint of steady, uninterrupted screech of speed and action and so forth, it - I don't want to see it back!

Actually, that was - this has been the year in which we've achieved the technologies to OT and grooved them in and polished them up; the year in which we have taken all of the various technologies of Scientology developed over all these years, back from Dianetic days, and stretched them out into proper classes and prepared the way and opened the gates and laid the Bridge and done a tremendous number of things.

We've had our heaviest attacks since 1950 in this past year, and these things are folding up. The attackers look like a weak - kneed fighter who has been pulled off the mat the third time, and his manager is standing over there looking anxiously around the sparring partners for a new boy, you know?

And they for instance just, I think it was yesterday, why, Infernal Ravening, a organization over in the United States that practices legal banditry on all the citizens, and so on - the real government of the United States, since it's the one that has the authority over every individual citizen, including senators, congressmen and the president - it lost. It lost. It had attacked Mary Sue and myself, hoping thereby to get through to the FCDC and it lost. And it ran up a small, if somewhat dirty, white flag and that was the end. They were suing us for various things including falsely asserting that we had children. And none of these attacks - none of these attacks actually very serious. They make an awful lot more noise than they have lead in them. They—mostly blank shots - they're mostly shot out for the press, and so on. And then they fade, and so forth.

For instance, I think the last - this one with Infernal Ravening was the last shot fired of the year, and it was a total loss to the enemy. But a week or so ago, why, Peter, down in Australia, was taking care of the situation and there was supposed to have been a public debate with members of the opposition: snarling, ravening, hydrophobic froth, you know, peering around their fangs. And these blokes were supposed to have appeared before a television program and - for a debate on the subject of Scientology, and Peter got down to the station and there was nobody else there. And they didn't show up. And probably died by biting themselves, probably or something like that. But they didn't show up, and this left Peter sitting in front of a battery of television cameras and lights, you see, with nobody to debate with. So very brilliantly they decided that the public should phone him and ask him questions about Scientology. So he sat there for half an hour with the phone in his hand answering the phone, answering everybody's questions on the subject of Scientology. And the station liked it and the public liked it and they got lots of phone calls and traffic and so forth, and we don't quite know what happened to the opposition, but they haven't really appeared since - not only didn't appear there.

But then they're going to have a big hearing of some kind or another and he's got a shot in the locker that is something like dropping a cannonball on an ant! He's sitting there well - armed. And the FDA and so on - this ceased to be serious two or three months ago. There'll

be - still be some uproar and upset but sooner or later they're going to have to run up their dirty white handkerchief, too. But everybody is very optimistic about this now and our attorneys and so forth are all optimistic about it over in the States. All you have to do is just keep winning, see, just keep winning. You don't have to win very ferociously on the legal line, but just keep winning. And the only thing we can really hope for in 1964: that all attacks on Scientology are senselessly brought. They bring a type of charge that they can't possibly win on. And if our luck just holds consistently they will continue to do this, you see?

Like suing Mary Sue and myself because we don't have any children. And because we haven't been in England and are not in England. I think those were the charges on which they were suing. But if they will just go ahead and continue this line of idiocy, why, we will continue to win with the greatest of ease. I hope we don't have to work any harder than we have had to work in 63 in order to keep on winning. But we've actually today, with the disappearance of this old year, got it pretty well in the bag. And of course I - look forward to a tremendous amount of very hard work in codification of materials and laying them out.

For instance, you haven't got a textbook for Scientology 0. You haven't got a textbook for Scientology I. You haven't got a textbook for Scientology II. I beg your pardon, you almost have one. I wrote one years ago - a Student manual and it's been sitting there waiting to be published, and so on. And lo, it exactly matches the levels of Scientology II. So we may have that textbook long ahead of any other textbook just because it was written, I think, back in 58 when all the material was still there and fresh. But then there's Scientology III and that hasn't been codified and Scientology IV and that hasn't been codified and Scientology V. And we got lots of bulletins on that, that's actually better - and lots of tapes - that's better done than a lot of other levels. And then Scientology VI, and it's just now in a state where your Instructors are wrestling at it, see.

So, the essence of the future is the compilation of existing materials and getting it out in a very ready fashion in order to get it assimilated easily. This new method of dissemination - I think you'll find it very, very effective. And the only thing I know that might modify this method of dissemination is that an upper - scale auditor will have certain processes which he can run on a lower - level or class person. Do you see what I mean? So that if you're a Class IV, you have a certain small bag of medicine - man tricks which you can trot out on a I or a II or a III, don't you see, which produces some interesting magic and which they themselves at Level I, you see, would not be able to audit, yet they can receive that level of action. There are several of these and amongst them is this case analysis, of which you have a recent bulletin.

Edgar pulled some off on a brand - new raw - meat fellow and he hardly knew what happened. By the way, that fellow's cough is still off and those were simply a - it was simply a thirty - five - minute application of the basic fundamentals of ease analysis adapted with no instruction or understanding on the part of the person receiving it. And it turned off what was apparently incipient tuberculosis and so on. Well, you take a technology of that particular type and so forth, that would be used by a higher - level auditor on a lower - level pc.

So a small little bag of tricks like this I'll manage to collect up and get together; and there are several of these techniques. And then probably - one more thing - there's probably, in 1963, we probably bent the old idea of "you shouldn't heal," and so forth - we probably bent that one very badly. And the AMA has been getting in our coiffure. They are very decent fellows as far as their membership is concerned, but I think that they themselves at the AMA headquarters are due in for a horrible shock because give us a couple, three more wins of the type we've been getting and give us a nice suit against the AMA, something like this - give us a few little more wins and we will open the door wide open on the subject of psychosomatic healing. And that will be the end, man, as far as they're concerned. Because we can then enforce an ethical policy, don't you see, that if you cannot - if you do not get results on the patient, you must refund his money. And we can put this out on a heavy propaganda line and, of course, that will finish any ineffective healing activity there is. The

only person who can do this, of course, is the person who has very effective healing activities. That's what's known as—in bridge—as “leading from strength.”

We have several of these things now. We have several of these things now which are quite, quite miraculous. And anybody running - anybody running at Level VI goes through - every time his auditor makes a bust he goes through more illnesses and more types of psychosomatics and so on that could be easily counted. All his auditor has got to do is get a couple of goals in juxtaposition and the - start running down the line of a misworded goal and you immediately have thrombosis articularosis of the lumbar - immediately. And you can turn on more ills and turn off more ills than you can shake a stick at to such an extent that I have now become very contemptuous of the whole subject. I mean, I see these guys floundering around. I understand what's wrong with them. I'm not contemptuous of them but I mean the idea of the ills of the human body and so forth. You get a couple of RIs in crosswise and man you've never seen any ills like they can be caught. It's rather horrifying from an auditor's standpoint to look at these fellows and see what this - well look, what is this fellow's coronary? See? Some other bloke, he has a bizarre pain in the sacroiliac of some kind or another. What is this and so forth. And everybody rooting around trying to find the right chemical, you know, the correct chemical in order to squirt into them. Or the proper torsion table on which to stretch them or some of this sort of stuff. And once you get accustomed to what exists on the whole track, it's just a little bit frustrating, because of the complexity of upper - level technologies, that you simply can't say to this fellow, “What would solve this? What's the RI? What goal does it belong to? What is out of shape here on the particular lineup, you know?”

You see this girl, she's crying, her eyes red and streaming, going down to the divorce court, you see, because her husband is a brute and so on, and the children home staring emptily into space - Mama and Daddy are, you know—and chaos reigning in all particular directions and so on. Examine the situation and of course it just - you'll find that she's had a consistent present time problem with the RI, you see, “bad men,” or something like this. The amount of - the amount of difficulty that's caused by the misalignment of the psyche is fascinating in its tremendous complexity, and disillusioning in the simplicity of its cause. And you think of how few items can make so many complex troubles, and there it is.

But of course, I suppose that we'll make advance in that particular direction. But the ardures of Level VI technology and the ardures of running the stuff - you see, we've been at this now for about - trying to run these things for about three years and every time we'd make a decent breakthrough on the thing and so on, why, we'd come up against a small nicety, you see, that has to be observed in order to prevent this and that.

Technology itself has finally worked itself into a pretty confoundedly complex piece of technology. Really requires auditing; it requires an educated pc. But of course the end product of this, for God's sakes, is OT. That you can't sniff at.

Any goal we ever have had in the past went glimmering; some time about 62 it started to go glimmering and it sure went glimmering in 63. I mean the goal for the individual on an assured basis of what he could attain if he simply kept plugging at it and going forward and was well trained in it and so on, shot up factually as a realizable fact to some point which is, well, it's just so far out of order of magnitude of what anybody expected before that it's probably quite unreal to most people. And it certainly every now and then gets unreal to me. I get caught between a couple of GPMs or something like this and we don't find the goal on the list or something of that sort and we say there we are, there we are - and we're all set now except for this creak!

And I take a look at somebody auditing this and recognize the tremendous skill which both the auditor and the pc have to have. Because even when they have that tremendous skill and even when they know all the answers, they make enough mistakes to keep them very busy. But the end product of it's fantastic.

I got a very great reality on the amount of gain which was attainable. Because for some months we've kept looking for the PT GPM on me. See, we've been running GPMS, but every time we get the track beautifully unburdened we find out there's more PT GPM, see. I mean, it's a closer to PT GPM. I think you'll find out this is quite ordinary, see? You find out that the truncated GPM you ran actually had a top, see. Well, if it had a top, then there's probably one on top of it; there's probably one closer to present time. Well, if there's one closer to present time, it probably has a top, too. And there's probably one closer to present time than that. We're now seven GPMs from the one we thought was the PT GPM - seven.

And just a few months ago - just a few months ago in running GPMS—that is, listing for goals and trying to line up a present time GPM - see, I've been running GPMS, and so on. When they run, they run. Because you can usually start in if you've got the right top oppterm and so forth - all it does is leave a little residual charge. You know where it went on the track. You've got it plotted out because you've got the goal below it, don't you see? And you take that chunk out of the track. Well, it unburdens, you see, the case tremendously and your perception and ability to handle them increases.

And a great reality I connected with subjectively last night, was how much case advance I'd made in just about three months. Because about three months ago, boy, we were trying to list on a goal oppose basis up from an indeterminate base trying to get a closer GPM to PT, and I was being wrapped around telegraph poles. It was grim. I don't mean telling - mind telling you it was real grim. Of course, on my track I've done all the research that you're getting the benefit of and it's shot full of holes, you know, and things have been misaligned and so on, and things have been improperly run. For instance, I've got a lot of GPMs that have been run with "oppose." Well, that's unburdened them and taken charge off of them but it's still left tremendous numbers of bypassed items, you see, in the area.

Well, last night we were working at it. I was handing up goals lists amounting to five or six goals with the rocket reading goal on it; stacking it up, putting the GPM on top of it, you see. You know, there it is; all right, the next one. Listing in to the top oppterm to see if it was there, see if you could get anything to read like a top oppterm on the GPM in order to find out if there was a GPM closer to present time. And we handled four of them like they were just old sacks of straw, see. You get into it when you finally attack that particular hill and you think of the idea of just casually listing into the top of a GPM to find out if there's an item that's going to read there, see, will actually practically part your hair in the middle with horror because it just about rips you to pieces, you know. It turns on creaks and bypassed charge and howling ARC breaks and so on. We're sitting there; I just stacked up four GPMS on up to PT, got the truncated GPM and say, "Well, it cuts off right there." And for the first time could look forward into the future, you see, and there was nothing. Nothing. Where did it all go, you know? Just like it had been sawed off with a band saw, you know? And we had stacked up four of them, bypassing all the items, listing into the tops of each one, chopping them all to ribbons and so forth. I didn't turn a hair. Not even a quiver.

I got up this morning and I wondered, "Well, I wonder if a couple of those are backwards," you know? And I went creak and I said, "Well, they're not backwards! Let's see, what are my considerations on this?" - a little bit of self - auditing - and I said, "Well, my considerations on this: there were a couple of them backwards." No creak.

Oh, that's a far cry, man, that's a far cry from three months ago. Ah, I got a big subjective reality on it; tremendous subjective reality. An awful far cry from last spring, man! We couldn't tell whether it was an implant or a splant - of course we didn't even know if there were - was such a thing as an implant GPM last spring, You couldn't tell what was which and who was where and so on. I think I turned out last spring some of the most remarkable line plots, I think, that will ever be seen. Maybe you can do better when you're learning, but that was pretty good, because they have - didn't even know - didn't even know implants existed, you see. So you get things like "being active," you see, solving "somebody or something with the goal to be active." Implant RI sitting alongside of an actual GPM RI. Boy, that must have made plenty of creak, man! Take the middle of a GPM - an actual GPM with great big sixty -

five - foot by twenty - feet by ten - foot mass, pull it down into the Helatrobus Implant area and pin it up against one of their parking meters, see? Wild! Absolutely wild! Incredible! Survived it.

I will say I sometimes felt lethargic. My weight built up very, very badly and is falling off now at a tremendous rate. I mean, about four or five - the last four or five days I've lost about twelve pounds - because these things are

what give you weight. See, they give you a residual body mass. You see, you never created them ordinarily - your early ones particularly - you didn't make these things when you were in the body. And you made them footloose and fancy free. And running them while you're in a body, of course, is not the way most of them were made. And it's a little bit hard on the body. And the body's in the road of the RIs and is expressing and experiencing all the heat and other duress that occurs. And every time you make a mistake, the duress is tremendous and the body goes creak, crack, blump, thud, you know, and you take quite a beating in this particular direction if you're doing an incorrect job of the thing.

Sixty - three was the year I had to do all the research work. I've sacrificed everything now. The other day, the other day - not too long ago - I was outside, taking a look at the dawn and it was a great relief The Van Allen belt is nice and warm and you can sit in the Van Allen belt amongst the radiation that's supposed to be so harmful. It's nice that it's there. It holds in the warm air, you know, and you can put out your beams and warm your hands. And rain clouds - rain clouds are absolutely beautiful there. They're almost as good as a drink of Coca - Cola. And my - you can get into the ice crystals of a rain cloud and it's very nice. It's very nice. It's cooling, refreshing, you know - like taking a cold shower on a hot summer day. And all of a sudden you're not stricken by these fantastic temperature reactions. See, you're in a body, you see, you get a temperature difference of ten degrees up or ten degrees down and you're kind of miserable, you know? And outside, you get a temperature differential of two hundred degrees centigrade up and two hundred degrees centigrade down - it makes a nice change! Slight Variation. Slight difference of aspect.

But I do have one problem and I end this year with a problem. And it's a tough problem; I don't know if I'll be able to solve it or not. But as an OT, how do you drink Coca - Cola? This is! This is operating as a problem with me and I've been trying to solve this in various practical ways and so forth. I'm far too big to get into a Coca - Cola bottle. You see, when you really go bad as a thetan and become a drunkard, what you do is you take a few drops of liquor and you drip them on the barroom table, you see, and let it evaporate, see, in your face. You're wearing a doll body or something like this, you know - you let it evaporate, you know, into your face, like brandy sniffing, and you can get drunker than a skunk! It all depends on the degree of volatility of the liquor you happen to be dedicated to. But alcohol works pretty good in this. And you know, Coca - Cola doesn't evaporate. See, you can pour it on the table and it doesn't evaporate, it just gets sticky. And, so I—I don't know, I - I thought in my various offices in various continents and that sort of thing we could get a small tub and empty a few bottles of Coca - Cola, you see, in the tub and dump some ice trays in, you know, and you could get in! You could get in. Maybe that would be better, so forth.

Yeah, that's operating as a problem. That's the biggest present time problem I have. So that's a fairly good one to be ending the year on. And it's worrisome, though.

Well, we have quite a bit - quite a bit that - ground we've covered, gains we've made and that sort of thing. And we're, in actual fact, we're the gainers; tremendously and all out of proportion the gainers in 63. We actually never really thought we could fly so high so smoothly. The only real drawback is the fact that the technology that takes it to the highest level is a complex technology. But I'm working hard on it so that it's fairly smoothly rounded and can be learned rather easily as I think the Instructors who are—I'm briefing at this particular time will tell you - it's fairly well rounded up.

Not much doubt about you making it. Of course you're sitting there now, you wonder if you'll ever make it all the way. And I can tell you that if you are or have wondered if you're ever going to make it all the way, while you are making it all the way, you will have many other periods when you'll be absolutely certain that you will never make it all the way. That's the greatest certainty I can give you.

You have just been dropped in the middle of a wrong goal at the end of an intensive that is half - run and the right goal can't be found; and for a week or two you'll be very sure that you will never make it all the way. But the nice part of it is, you can pick yourself out of these things, and you do go on and just the action of getting tone arm action actually restores your hope in the matter and you can keep on going. The finite end product results - I was joking with Suzie about it this morning and I said maybe we're going to do a totality of OT on a gross basis: just handling and messing up GPMs, you see, and handling more GPMs and finally we'll get so accustomed to handling GPMs and the familiarity will be so great, we'll never have to run any of the items at all.

Because at this stage I think to some slight degree, I think two - thirds at least of all the GPMs which I have, have either been partially run or placed on the track and discharged to some slight degree. This is not necessarily good, don't you see, because they have been put into considerable restimulation. And you're in the middle of the tenth or twelfth GPM from present time in the goal as an RI and you pack this with you as you come back up, you see, to straighten out the PT GPM. You feel a little jammy. But nevertheless, nevertheless, I hope that - I've been over the jumps on this stuff very hard and very harshly; there's no doubt in my mind it's just a matter of time now, let's get it run out. And I've been - felt horrible and I've felt this way and I've known many times that it was impossible to make it. I've also known that it would be impossible for you to make it. I've known all kinds of pessimistic and very, very sour ideas on how tough it was and that sort of thing. And I've managed to recover from each one of these, so let's hope you do, too.

The final end product of Scientology, or a thetan in this universe, has been achieved in 1963. So whatever else can be said for the year, at least we can give it that. Okay?

Audience: Mm - mm. Yes.

All right. Well, I just wanted to talk to you about it a little bit and get it off my chest and talk it over with you.

This is what?

Audience: Thirty - first December.

Thirty - first of December. The last year, all right, of 1963, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. I'm going to give you a very brief lecture on the subject of indicators as they apply to lower levels. This is a brand - new subject and the Instructors know all about it; they've gotten the lot. And I didn't bring my notes. The whole subject of indicators is a new one. And when you learn something at a Astronomic, stratospheric level, such as Routine 6 and Level VI material,; it of course can turn around and go down into the lower levels. And this is exactly what has happened with indicators.

Routine 6 cannot be run without indicators. An individual - this is not a lecture on Routine 6, this is a lecture on lower levels. Routine 6 auditors must know their indicators - bang! They must know the indicator and what to do - bang! All auditing time is lost if it is lost by a failure to know, recognize and do the proper action indicated by an indicator. You could lose 90 percent of your auditing time at Routine 6 if you didn't know the indicators. That's how serious it is. You probably, if you didn't know the indicators at all, you would never make an OT at all.

All right, so much for that level. Indicators are present at every level. You have indicators at 0, I, II, III, IV - you've got them all - and V. You've got these - indicators are present at every single one of those levels. Indicators are divided into two classes: good indicators and bad indicators. Accuse me of involved technology if you wish, but I don't think you can get much simpler than that. There's good indicators and bad indicators.

The first thing you must know about indicators is that if an auditor doesn't know the good indicators, he does not then know what the bad indicator is occurring into.

Now, let's go over this a little bit slowly. Somebody comes along and he tells you that you must not Cut the pc's itsa. All right, so you don't Cut the pc's itsa because of an Instructor or you don't Cut the pc's itsa because you've read it in a bulletin or you don't Cut the pc's itsa because you'll get an infraction sheet. You get the idea? Well, why don't you Cut the pc's itsa? Well, you don't know the good indicator, see?

Cut itsa gives you the bad indicator of a dirty needle and an ARC breaky or gloomy or not - running - properly pc. Those are all bad indicators.

Well, what's the good indicator? What's the good indicator? Obviously the good indicator is a smooth needle and a cheerful pc. I mean, it's elementary as that. And that's why you don't Cut the pc's itsa, see, because you want a cheerful pc and a smooth needle. You follow it? You don't - it isn't that you don't Cut the pc's itsa because it says so in a bulletin or because the Instructor will be mad at you. It's because the good indicator would not be present and a bad indicator would appear.

Let's follow this now. I have many times had this gruesome experience: I've given an auditing demonstration and had a lot of people sit there and learn absolutely nothing from it except that was how auditing should maybe look when I did it. It didn't look anything like that when they did it, so that was just my peculiarities of auditing. Or anyone with my altitude, of course, with regard to an auditing session, could not fail to have a good pc and have the session look good. You follow what I'm trying to tell you? In other words, the people sitting there watching the session did not know the good indicators. Because I assure you that I learn - every time I turn around at Routine 6 level and so forth - I can have ARC breaky pcs that ARC break much harder than your pcs.

The level, of course, gives you greater stress on the case. And when you get a Routine 6 ARC break, man, you get a nice, juicy, squeezy ARC break. It splatters all over the ceiling. It's big! It's a Cecil B. De Mille production! It's not only a little "Well, you offended me," you know. "Blankety - blank, blank - blank! Pow - pow!" And it sounds like that record I gave Reg for Christmas of the "Overture of 1812," with the actual cannon shots in it, you know? And I gave it to him with malice; I want to see if his new hi - fi set would stand up. It not only stood up to it, it stood up to it very gorgeously, but it almost - the cannon going off sounded so real unexpectedly that it almost blew Jack Horner's head off!

Now, looking at something like that, we know what we're looking at, what should music sound like, see? Well, it should be intelligible and you should tell what's being played and what is playing it and it should sound real as though it's in the room. You've got various good indicators.

But now let me give you an index about music. And you will see something here. A very, very good electronics chap told me this and this is a very good test for "Is hi - fi equipment hi - fi equipment?" and "Can you really - are you really dealing with a good recording" and things of that particular character. "Is it a good microphone?" - this type of test is very simple. And this is what I would mean by a good indicator.

See, this bad indicator: you say, "Well, the hi - fi equipment sounds corny," and you read up what does - "What is bad hi - fi equipment?" you see? Well, it sounds dissonant. It sounds

this and that. You get woof and wow and you get this and that and you get an imbalanced decibelization of the lower condenser areas, you see? And the tweeter - tweeter very poor, it's not matched. Has a different impedance. Didn't tell you a confounded thing, you see, and yet those are all apparently bad indicators and so forth that you have.

Well, the question is - is do these things mean anything, unless they are compared to the comparative datum? Now, you know in the Logics it says for a datum to be understood and so forth, it has to have a comparative datum. So you have to have a good indicator.

Newspapers, by the way, are playing this on you all the time. They're saying how bad everything is, how bad everything is, how bad everything is. I don't know; they don't tell you how things should be good. They shouldn't necessarily tell you how good everything is, but nobody says how things should be good, yet they're apparently always working against an ideal standard. There must be no wrecks, there must be no fires, there must be no, be no, be no, you see - on and on and on. And apparently they're working against the standard which is some kind of a good standard. But they never tell you what this good standard is. So, of course, it's just all bad, bad, bad. Well, let's get back to hi - fi equipment.

You could say the woofers are not woofing and the tweeters are not tweeting and the wow is disgraceful and you can say a lot of things about this hi - fi equipment, don't you see, but how should it sound? All right, there's how it shouldn't sound. Well, how should it sound? That's the important one. How should it sound?

And this old electronics whizzeroo told me - he says, "Now," he says, "it's like this: You walk into the lobby of the theater when the aisle doors are closed and you listen to an orchestra playing in the theater. All right," he says, "that's poor hi - fi equipment, see? Now," he says, "you open the doors, and walk down the aisle to about the center of the theater and listen," he said, "and that's good hi - fi equipment." And you know, you can tune a set with it. You tune a set up until it sounds like the musicians are in the room. And you can keep balancing things until you move the musicians into the room.

And oddly enough you can take a well set up panel like Reg's new hi - fi has down there, and you actually can move them into the theater beyond the lobby doors and move them right back into the room with you. See, you can move them out and distant and away. And in tuning up a piece of equipment, therefore, how should a piece of equipment sound? The good indicator: It sounds like the musician is playing in the room with you.

Well, it's almost indefinable, don't you see? I mean there's no decibels or woofs or wows or any other descriptions in this thing, so actually anybody then can figure out what was good hi - fi equipment. Is it capable of putting a clarinet in the room so it sounds like the clarinetist is standing in the room with you playing the clarinet or does it sound like he's back in the bedroom playing the clarinet, don't you see? That's all you have to know about it.

All right, you take it on that basis. Now, we can go woofs, whatters and flops and you put the condensers through into the ruddy rods and so forth. Well, all that is doing is monitoring the reality or present or nearness or clarity of the sound. So if you're going to teach anybody to do anything - I have just learned this principle very recently, not the hi - fi, but learned this on teaching Scientology.

I've had a barrier to overcome. This is a problem I was trying to overcome. And that is that I've had many people listen to or watch an auditing session and not know what the devil they were looking at. I know this for this good reason that I get their comments afterwards written down and it's some of the wildest piece of commenting I ever heard in my life. They don't - they haven't grasped what occurred in the session. And you turn me in a bunch of criticism of your own sessions as taped and so forth, which demonstrated rather conclusively to me that you needed a tool with which to appreciate what a session was all about. What was a session? What should it sound like? And I finally worked this out on good indicators and bad

indicators. And that's a direct result of it. And if you don't know the good indicators, of course you can't ever tell what the bad indicator is.

So what should a session sound like? And one of the first things that an auditor should make it his business to know is the points which should be present in a properly running session. Not what's wrong with the session but what's right with a right session?

What's right with this session? Now, knowing what's right with the session, he of course can then tell what's wrong with the session. But if you don't know what's right with the session you can never tell what's wrong with the session. And that is the way I have licked this problem. I trust this will be successful and will improve auditing here and there and everywhere.

In other words, heavy concentration on teaching auditors what are the good indicators of a session. What are the good indicators of a session? They're bong and bong and bong and bong and bong!

And if these things are not present, then a bad indicator must be present. Well, what's the bad indicator that's present that cancels the good indicator? So I give you that: Don't cut the pc's itsa. Why not cut the pc's itsa? Well, you're going to get a dirty needle.

Well, all right, that's interesting as a statement. But it already assumes, you see, that this particular auditor knows that he ought to have a smooth needle in the session. See, it's as elementary as that but it makes that assumption. And that's an unjustified assumption because maybe he doesn't know that. And the good indicator is the pc should be cheerfully itsaing away. All right. Pc is sitting there cheerfully going on and happily carrying on and cogniting on things and so forth. Well, that's the way a pc ought to operate.

Well, all right. You say, "Well, if you cut the pc's itsa you make the pc unhappy." Well, this assumes that the fellow knows that a pc ought to be happy in session! And maybe people don't know that at all! A psychoanalyst doesn't know that. No other practitioner ever knew that. So this is unjustified.

How does a pc look in session when they are running properly? Well, they ought to be taking their case seriously, somebody will say, you see. They ought to be really concerned about all the wicked things they have done in life, you know? They ought to be - ought to be - ought to be - ought to be - ought to be, and you get seven thousand different varieties of "how the pc should look in the session," all matching the RIs of the auditor!

What's the good indicator? Pc cheerfully itsaing. Well, you say, cheerfully itsaing? Why - what the hell? You mean this guy's going to run through some - you mean this guy's going to get better sitting there cheerfully talking? Ho - ho! Yeah, he's not going to get better any other way, man! Because the only frame of mind that you can as - is in is a cheerful, high-toned frame of mind. And that's the high-toned frame of mind people as - is in. Now, we're talking about if we run a secondary, of course we'd expect somebody to cry through the secondary or fear or something like that. We don't happen to be running secondaries these days. And you can expect this to occur early on in a session that - or early on in a process that the pc's looking sort of gloomy and he's looking this way and he's looking that way and so forth. But only early on when you're handling the thing he is gloomy about. You're bringing him out of the gloom and the good indicator is that the gloom is decreasing or the tears are decreasing, you see, and that he is moving forward toward the good indicator.

The pc's moving straight ahead toward the good indicator and should arrive there fairly rapidly. You don't want somebody weeping for seventy - five hours. It's all right for a pc to weep. I've seen pcs running a secondary weep a dozen years off their apparent age. There's nothing wrong with this. But that's running, of course, a secondary. Now, the truth of the matter is as the pc rapidly moves on forward, how long should the pc be weeping? Well, how long should the pc be weeping? What's the good indicator?

Well, the good indicator is that it fades away and the pc gets very cheerful with no suppression of the weeping at all. That's the good indicator.

And the bad indicator would be he went on crying for seventy - five hours of auditing. And you would say there's something awful wrong here, man.

So you get a good indicator: here's the pc cheerfully looking at his life and gets interested, talking to the auditor - these are good indicators, you see - tone arm riding at an acceptable range on the E - Meter, you see, with so much motion. These are the good indicators, you know. You can stack these up. I'm not trying to give you a list of them at this particular time. I'm trying to show you what they are.

And we get this picture of what an auditing session is out of the good indicators that should be present in the auditing session. And if these good indicators are not present, then bad indicators must be present. And if bad indicators are present, then certain actions must be taken by the auditor.

Now, certain actions must be taken by the auditor to continue the good indicators in existence. Those are the routine actions of auditing. Those are what you're taught as the TRs and so on. You just go on doing these things and you're not cutting the pc's itsa so long as the session is running.

All right. But when a bad indicator shows up, one or more good indicators tend to go away. And the bad indicator indicates another course of action must be taken by the auditor.

Bad indicator inevitably and always means that the auditor must now do something. Good indicators mean that the auditor must continue what he is doing and bad indicators indicate the auditor must do something else. That's the general picture. But actually, for any given process, the bad indicators give you a precise and immediate thing to do.

This requires more listing and more workout, but you can admit this is pretty clever. See, pc something - or - other and something - or - other; well, you're doing so - and - so.

I'll give you a gross one right now: Pc makes a critical remark of the auditor - makes a critical remark about the auditor. All right, now at one of your Saint Hill levels, of course, that means you do a session ARC break assessment. At a lower level, why run some O/W - or pardon me - at a very low level you'd run some O/W. At intermediate level just pull the missed withhold, or find out what the person's done, see? But there is the action pursuant to the bad indicator.

Bad indicator - you see, the bad indicator doesn't mean there's anything wrong with the auditor. The bad indicator simply means something has gone wrong with the proper form and action of the session. Something's gone wrong here, so it is now up to the auditor seeing this bad indicator to do something about it.

Now, there's several things that - you can overdo these bad indicators and you can get ahead and get all plowed up and messed up and do nothing but remedy bad indicators, remedy bad indicators, remedy bad indicators. And of course, "What's the matter with this session?" Well, none of the good indicators will be present. So if you don't know what good indicators are and don't know that you should continue what is bringing about these good indicators - if you don't know what good indicators are - then you won't know what to continue. Do you see?

How should this pc look? How should this pc sound? How should this meter react? How should this bank be responding? Now, those all have good indicators in connection with them. Now, here's a good indicator. If you don't know this good indicator then the bad indicator makes no sense at all.

Let's give you the bad indicator and show you how it drops you into the soup: tone arm was high. Tone arm on this pc was running consistently high.

Well, what's - what's consistently not high? See, you have to ask that question, see? What—how should a tone arm operate? If a tone arm shouldn't be moving between 4.5 and 5.5, then where should it be operating.? Well, a tone arm oper—out of the broad range of optimum action of a tone arm is from 2.0 to 4.0. That's the broad range. Common range is about 2.75 to 3.5. That's a very nice range; very nice operating range. If you're really hotter than a pistol at Level VI, you'll get the pc operating between about 2.25 - because now you're operating a thetan, and male and female have nothing to do with it - Level VI. It starts in about Level V that you cease to lose the male and female significance of your meter and at Level VI you've for sure lost it. And a pc starts plowing along there, and the pc's running between 2.5 and 3.02.5, let us say, and 3.25—optimum running range. Pc's running in that range. Man, you've got it made! Nothing's wrong. You haven't missed any items, it tells you - so on and so on. It just gives you a avalanche of information just seeing the tone arm moving where it ought to be moving.

Now the tone arm is now moving between 2.75 and 3.75. Well, it still—there's a little something awry but we're not going to bother with it. It's a light indicator, don't you see? It's too light to fuss with. But we've got something crossed up somewhere on the track, and we're not enough sure at this particular time what it is. But the tone arm is running and running like mad between 2.75 and 3.75 and, you see, it's just - it's all right. You don't do anything about it. Just that little bit high. Just that little bit high. Something's been missed somewhere.

Well, of course, the time to use a bad indicator is when you can't go on with the good indicators. Just because a bad indicator leaps up into view - at a very light level of bad indicator - is no reason you knock it all apart, if the session is still full of good indicators, you understand? So the pc's talking cheerfully, everything is going along fine, you're finding items; everything is going along beautifully, and so on and so on and so on. And your tone arm is running now between 3.25 and 4.0. But it is running between 3.25 and 4.0 and 1 do mean it's running. The pc is getting heat on the items; the pc is so on. All the good indicators are present, you see - they're all there, they're all there, they're all there.

Well, eventually you get down to the bottom of some bank or another and you find out that you've skipped a GPM back there and it's just coming into view - heh - heh! And all of a sudden your tone arm starts to run up now around 4.75 to 5.25. Well, this is definitely in the road of the session. You can't operate this way. You can't operate at all. So you now have got to do something about it; and you very nicely put it all together and do the right thing and go on with your action.

This just gives you an idea of a good indicator and a bad indicator. So there are three grades of indicators. There are two kinds of indicators and there are three grades of indicators. Just thought you'd like it nice and neat. There are light indicators, medium indicators, and heavy indicators. The two grades of indicators - I mean, the three grades of indicators are simply the suddenness with which you have to take action. On a medium indicator, action must be taken. And action must be taken as soon as you can comfortably get to it. And on a heavy indicator, emergency crash action must be taken right now. And the light indicator is normally plotted so as to show you that something is wrong. You know something is wrong so that you can be alert to find out what it is without actually interrupting the session of the pc. The purpose of the light indicator is just to show you that somebody is moving over close to the edge. And they may move back onto the main road without you doing a single thing about it. But they're over close to the edge and the auditor had better be alert.

He doesn't want that moment when he hears the rending of wheels on the abutment and the crash of the ear as it goes over the cliff and the long dwindling scream. That's grade four. And he never should get up to a grade four indicator. He never should get up to a grade four indicator; which means no slightest possibility of any more auditing of this pc ever. We don't

even put that in as an indicator, because it would certainly indicate something; because we already have at grade three “pc not wanting auditing.” That’s an indicator. That’s a bad indicator. Now this, of course, automatically assumes that a pc should want auditing as one of the good indicators, see. So you got a pc and there’s the pc: what’s the good indicator? And by good indicator we mean normal or reasonable; not extraordinary or bonus indicator. This is what we expect, you see?

You expect to sit down to a table and eat off a plate. See, I mean that’s the level of expectancy, you see. I mean there it is, you know. You’re not going to eat off the floor off a dog’s dish, you know - at least not on this planet at this particular time.

Now, you’ve got, then: what’s the expectancy. Well, the expectancy is if you’ve got an indicator like a bad indicator - pc not wanting auditing - you must realize that there must be such a thing as a good indicator which is: “pc want auditing.” Good, you see, doesn’t mean superlative or bonus. See, it just means that’s expected, normal indicator, see. It’s just normal. Pc wants auditing - pc wants auditing - that’s normal.

Well, I can tell you how far out indicators are on an awful lot of pcs. See, “Where’s my session? Where’s my session? Oh yeah, when are we going to have my session? All right, fine. That’s good, good,” - not anxious to have a session, but he wants his session; then he sits down, and so forth. You don’t have to go out; whistle and dig and beat up the brush, you see, or anything of the sort. There’s the pc, you know? The clock has wound up to a certain period of time and there is the pc; and perhaps getting a little cross with you for being a few minutes late for your session, or something like that. See, it’s all an indicator that he wants his session.

Not anything you do anything about. It’s almost a good indicator that he is a little bit, “Hmmm, you weren’t here,” and so on, “we lost five minutes of my auditing time!” Weren’t on time, didn’t start the session on time. You wouldn’t attach anything to that as an indicator. See, it’s not really a bad indicator. It frankly is a good indicator. Pc wants his auditing. You see how this gives you a different frame of reference? Normal, good indicator. The pc wants his auditing. That - that’s it!

Well, if he doesn’t want his auditing, that’s a bad indicator. That’s a real, real bad indicator. That’s a grade three bad indicator. So it tells you that all of your devotion to session, and so forth, must be on that indicator. Pc doesn’t want his auditing. Well, you better not do anything but handle that indicator. You can take it up eight dozen ways from the middle and you’re going to eventually collide with the reason why and it’s always going to surprise you. It’ll be some elementary simple thing you should have thought of all the time except it’s very complex and the pc never would have noticed it. But the point I’m making here is the good indicator is: pc wants his session.

Now, our ARC break with governments and that sort of thing is probably because we’re not auditing them. We must remember that Harry Truman going along pertly and so forth, God help us, I certainly would have been much happier to have educated that bloke that did his auditing, but man, he was being sweated over on engrams God knows how long! He practically cleared that man. Every piece of information that came out was immediately snaffled up by the White House psychiatrist. There are even rumors floating about that they were spending time, you see, the President was getting psychotherapy of some kind - a mysterious kind of... Well, we ought to know what he was getting, because we were - we would have been much happier to have given this guy some information instead of him culling it out of bulletins and - and he never even had any tapes, don’t you see, or anything like that. All he had was Book One - Book One and whatever other bulletins and correlative information was issued.

Well, that’s rather interesting. Truman apparently wanted his auditing. Well, possibly - the rest of the government wants auditing and probably lots of people in the world want auditing and we probably ARC break them by not auditing them. They will ask for auditing in

numerous ways, including try to blackmail you and so on. The truth of the matter is, though, that wanting auditing is far more common as an indicator than you would suspect. And, of course, it is the expected good indicator. When it is absent, the pc says, "Well, I don't know if I want to be audited - I don't know, rarh - rarh - rahr..." He's being late for his sessions and he's hard to dig up, and so forth. Man, you're dealing with a grade three indicator. I mean, that's a bad indicator. What's expectancy? All right, what's - you could - I'm just giving you a brief glimpse here: The needle and meter should look a certain way; the pc should look and sound a certain way; the pc's Attributes should be so - and - so and so - and - so.

Now, oddly enough it is a grade two bad indicator that a pc has a present time problem. That's a grade two. It isn't to be considered in the line of absolute, crashing emergency because at certain periods of the session the pc will develop a little PTP which you eventually care for, and so forth, just with what you're doing.

A grade three indicator means immediately emergency action. But this is something you attend to and something you attend to right now. Why? Well, the pc makes no case progress of any kind whatsoever in the presence of a present time problem. How do you like that? Present time problem: no case progress. It just equates that way. That's it. There's no modification on that statement. This is borne out over the years, man; this is really borne out over long periods of time: that a pc with an ARC break gets a worse graph. His graph worsens if he's audited in the presence of an ARC break, see.

In other words, there's an ARC break has occurred; the ARC break isn't remedied, then you can reduce the pc's graph. That's the only thing that will worsen the case - is auditing a pc over and beyond and ignoring the ARC break. That's the only thing that will worsen the ease. And the only thing that will make the case not progress - not one - quarter of an inch - you couldn't put a building jack under the case and have the case advance. Pc with a present time problem: that graph is going to remain the same. Present time problem plus an ARC break: God knows what happens to the graph! But, we've got this, you see?

So, we say, "Well, the pc shouldn't have a present time problem, and so forth. You must always audit the present time problem and this is something that you have to take care of," and etc., and etc., and etc., and etc. This is all very interesting. But where's the good indicator? Obviously the good indicator is the pc in an auditing session should have no present time problems. Well, then, obviously your pc couldn't be in - session if he had a present - if he'd always had a present time problem while being audited, then nobody had ever worked forward to getting the pc into session because the good indicator of no present time problem has never emerged on this case. So if no present time problem - good indicator has never emerged on the case, then we can obviously say the case has never been in - session. That is quite remarkable.

When we put these good indicators up in the framework that they deserve to be in, you see immediately they start to show you an awful lot of bright, bright look here, see. Well, you could check a pc out on good indicators, you see? Well, now, this is particularly important to you because you're actually going to supervise as much, or more, auditing than you will do. You're going to supervise an awful lot of auditing and I mean you, and you - all of you; you're going to supervise auditing. That's for sure; you're going to supervise it.

A lot of these new level programs - don't think otherwise. Any auditor becomes an Auditing Supervisor. So much so, that the hat "auditor" is practically synonymous with the hat "Auditing Supervisor," see.

But, auditing supervision - how are you going to do auditing supervision unless you know how a session looks, man? What are you going to do? What is this thing called a session? We have no descriptive material that covers it whatsoever. Can you walk down an aisle and look at a session and say "Is that a good session going on?" Well, is it a good session, or isn't it a good session? Well, you could say it isn't a good session because certain bad indicators were

present. Pc's cans have been on the floor for the last half an hour, don't you see, and the pc is facing the other direction looking out the window and the auditor is humming. Now, that's auditing supervision by bad indicator. And if you only supervised by bad indicator - now listen carefully - if you only supervise by bad indicator, you will never get any auditing done. If it does occur, it'll occur by accident.

You cannot auditing supervise by bad indicator. You can only auditing supervise by good indicator because when the good indicators cease to exist, your action, then, must be in the direction of re - creating them. But if there's nothing toward which you're re - creating, of course you can't make anything there anyhow.

Let's say, all right, let's say we've got fifteen bad indicators present in the session - let's just be outrageous, you see - we got fifteen bad indicators present. So, very brightly and smartly, you eradicate two bad indicators. Hah - you still got thirteen. You haven't yet got a session going there! So you must learn your good indicators and you must learn to do session supervision by good indicators.

In other words, you can tell everything is running all fine and everything is going ahead and you actually could fix your level of expectancy of how much gain these cases are going to make just on the number of good indicators present. You can look down the aisle and see that so on and so on - just glance down the meters, and the needles are clean and the tone arms are running in the expected course and there is tone arm action going on; the pcs are talking cheerfully about their own case and the auditors are listening to them, and so forth - and it's all these good indicators, you see. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten - good indicators all present, so forth.

Well, you know now that group of pcs—there's going to be an awful lot of psychosomatic difficulties going to disappear, and their difficulties in life and livingness are going to go by the boards and their lumbosis is going to diminish and you can just be comfortable, man - comfortable. There's nothing spectacular going on in the whole length of the room. See?

But all the good indicators are present in those sessions. You could just sit back and relax, put your feet on the desk man, and you just say, "Ah, well, that - all those things are going to happen and everybody's going to be happier and better and they're all going to be cheerful and everything's going to be fine," see; because that's what it ought to look like!

Now, if it doesn't look like that then some bad indicators are present. And for every one of these actions that are going on which aren't going on properly, there is a major bad indicator present. All you have to do is establish what's present - pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow - and give an immediate auditing response to remedy that one. Your good indicators will pick up a little bit; make sure there are no other bad indicators present. Get these things out of the road, weed them out and you've restored the session, then, back to all good indicators and it goes on swinging. That's how to auditing supervise.

Now, therefore - and let me impart this to you before you really get swinging on the subject of auditing supervision - you should know good indicators just brrrrrrrr! What I'm trying to tell you is you should know good indicators more by heart than bad indicators because if you find out that there's a bad indicator present in the session, believe me you can always go to the textbook and try to figure out some more about it. "Oh!" Because I myself sometimes in undoing a case will have a fantastic comm lag. "Oh! That! Oh! Ha - ha! Bhhuuu!" You know? That kind of a particular response. After all, you've been walking around the edges of this case for some little time and you knew there was a bad indicator here, you see? You knew there was a bad indicator. But there could have been four or five responses to this bad indicator. You could have done four or five things in order to make this bad indicator right itself You just didn't quite have the tail of the piece of string; you couldn't quite pull this - the right raveling, and so forth. Well, all right, well that's undoing cases. That's straightening up an individual ease. And all cases aren't like that, thank heavens, and so on.

You finally realize, “Oh! The pc’s goals are directly - the pc is with a PT problem. We’ve run PT problems on this pc for some little time in order to straighten up PT - why is it this pc always has PT problems? Oh ... so and so on, and so on, and so on and so on. Well, it’s... these PT problems all the time. We keep straightening out PT problems, PT problems, they never straighten up on this pc. Oh? Oh, well, Ron said one time or another if a pc continues to have present time problems and always seems to have difficulty and you never can seem to clean up the present time problems, then the pc’s goals must be completely different than the auditor’s goals and the session must be a total disagreement. And it must be that the session itself is the PT problem.”

Pc’s goals completely divergent from the auditor’s goals. Auditor trying to make pc survive; pc trying to succumb. Auditor trying to make pc well; pc sitting there trying to make husband guilty. You get the idea. Must be a divergence of goals here - must be a wildly divergent set of goals between what the auditor’s trying to do and what the pc’s trying to do. So we will remedy it now from that direction. We will get a heart - to - heart talk on this particular subject and all of a sudden you’ll see that ease unwind.

Of course, the bad indicator isn’t present on the next case. Pc doesn’t even have a present time problem. He’s just sitting there talking happily, so you say, “Well, I had such remarkable success with Lisa Jane in finding out a divergence of goals between the...” so on and so on. You see the bad indicator isn’t present in this, but you apply the remedy of the bad indicator and the case suddenly starts picking up a whole bunch of bad indicators and you wonder what’s going on here. Well, you remedied a case that was running.

In other words, you’ve corrected the no - necessity - to - correct. No need to correct it, and you’re correcting it. You get the difference between good indicators and bad indicators?

The auditor will ride a hobbyhorse. Every once in a while you always—you always tend to ride a hobbyhorse. You have a big win, see - wins ruin auditors, man! It’s a tremendous, crashing win, you know? And you found out that Mrs. Snodgrass was putting rat poison in her husband’s breakfast cereal, because she actually had a something or other about children. So you get children straightened out on your next two or three pcs and then you find out that none of them straightened out on the subject of children, see. In other words, you are remedying - you are remedying a nonexistent bad indicator.

So, there are several things that you can do and err in, but they’re all very good sense. And the only thing I want to communicate to you is learn what an auditing session should look like. And when I give you your list of good indicators for an auditing session, snaffle on to it. And when you’re training people to audit, hit them over the head with it, you know. These are the good indicators for a session - the good indicators, see.

Good indicators are more important than the bad indicators because auditing only happens in the presence of the good indicators. Bad indicators are used simply to reassume the good indicators. Therefore, you must know your good indicators.

Now, when you get to be a screaming genius and an Auditing Supervisor like - you can say to this person - like I am; when you really get sharp, as I am, you see, well trained, then you can pick up the bad indicators and straighten them out. But that requires genius. Just for now, you go on with your good indicators and make sure that they continue in the session. Cultivate them. You get this level of approach?

Of course I’m giving you a joke along with it. I can see you now, in desperation trying to keep cases from being corrected that don’t need correction and trying to get cases corrected that desperately need correction but the person is sitting there; the pc is dumped over - bent sideways from the trunk, you know - and you didn’t see how this could happen. The person seems to be out, boiling off, knocked in the head, every single session; never can be really persuaded to come to the session in the first place, and you’re trying to convince this auditor,

“You know, there’s some bad indicators present in this thing and you - you really haven’t got the good indicators of a session because a session doesn’t look like that!”

“Oh! Doesn’t look like that. Oh, the pc is leaned over to the left!”

You wait! You wait! One of the things that’s very disappointing is to give a tremendously effective auditing demonstration, just glass - smooth, you know, every good indicator there, you know, just everything sharp, you know. Everything present that should be there, you know. And realize that some students who were watching it had never seen it. And they tell you what the pc’s withholdings were is the sole thing they learned out of the session! It staggers you, man! You become staggered when you look at it. Because - but then you’d recognize that they don’t know what the good indicators are - what should the session have looked like, so they don’t know what was a good session and what was a bad session.

Now, you’re going to tell this person get in there and run a good session. What do you mean a good session? You only mean a good session, of course, if it has a good - it’s full of good indicators. If it’s got the good indicators in it it’s a good session. As the indicators drop away; as the good indicators drop away you’ll find bad indicators are starting to take their place. And as the bad indicators come in you’ll find certain remedial actions have to be taken. And when these remedial actions are taken your session snaps back to battery.

Now, this throws away the idea that some people are auditable and some people are unauditable. I just look down your throat, and say, “Well, after all, you’re an auditor! How do you materialize all these good indicators in a session? Well, that’s what you’re being trained to do. The standard operating procedures on which you’re operating and so forth are all calculated to bring about these good indicators, and continue them flowing in a session. It’s elementary as that.”

Now, you wonder why Joe Blitz has such an awful lot of trouble with - in the co - audit here, and why is Joe Blitz having so much trouble, and so forth? You don’t understand it. Well, Joe Blitz doesn’t know the pc’s supposed to sit in a chair. See, he doesn’t know what - he doesn’t know what he’s trying to make take place here! So not knowing that, of course, he can’t make it. He can’t create it.

The gains of auditing are astonishingly automatic these days. Astonishingly. You have a series of good indicators present in an auditing session and you audit the pc just so many hours and you use no brilliance at all of any kind. You just keep on and keep the good indicators in - the pc wins! And he all of a sudden comes around, you know, and you’re checking up - their chronic headaches are gone and they now don’t have to be operated on by Dr. Sawbones and you’ll hear all of this stuff. Why, when you’re an old pro, why, you take this in stride. You take this in stride, because all you were doing was just a standard auditing job and the good indicators were present and of course you expected a good result and that’s about the way it was. There’s nothing very spectacular about it from your point of view.

But it looks totally magical to this person, you see. All right, how does it look so magical to them? Well, of course, they don’t know anything that’s going on, because they have no point of view with regard to the situation. They just know they’ve had this wonderful, magical experience. Years and years and years after I’ve audited somebody, I’ll occasionally get a letter from them - they’ve had this fantastic and marvelous change and so forth, and it changed the position and condition of their life, and that sort of thing, and they really didn’t know what happened. What happened? Well, nothing happened very much except just more or less what was then at that particular current time, standard auditing took place. That wasn’t any particular fantastic wand - waving went on or magic occurred. There it was. That was what occurred.

And, if you fix your sights at good indicators and standard sessioning and continue those and then when bad indicators pop up take care of those—take care of the worst one first. That’s the other little rule on the thing; always take care of the worst one first.

I'll give you an idea: you've got a dirty needle. Well, I don't think I'd worry about a dirty needle if the pc was throwing the cans down on the floor and screaming with a bypassed charge of items ARC break. I'm sure I wouldn't be worrying about the dirty needle. And if there's big bypassed charge possible in what you're running, of course I sure wouldn't be worrying about the session mid - I mean I wouldn't be worrying about the session ARC break assessment. Much less mid ruds! My God! In the presence of an ARC break start worrying about mid ruds. That's something like you see, this fellow sees this warehouse full of nitroglycerin burning, you know, and he goes and gets a glass of water to throw on it. Of course each tool has its own position, you see?

Naturally you want to get the heaviest bypassed charge out of the way first - get that out of the way. Then get the lighter bypassed charge session ARC breaks out of the way and when you've got that all squared out, why, get something like a little O/W in - something like that - if you're really still patching this thing up. And at some point you will, by the way, patch it up to a point where the patching starts creating bad indicators, you see? No auditing starts occurring, or something. You have to use good sense with regard to that.

But you'll have very smooth sessions as a result. The results of Scientology - the results of Scientology are terribly elementary in their action. What's the good indicator with regard to an auditing question?

The good indicator is that the pc has received something to inspect. He inspects it, you know; he's itsaing it and telling you what his insp—and then he tells you what he has inspected and he answers the question fully - , as far as he is concerned, and then you acknowledge.

Now, it doesn't matter whether it's by repetitive - that is to say you got the question fully answered by repetitive commands, or you got the question fully answered by giving him one command and he took a half an hour to answer that one command. He's going through an electronic circuit and he finally comes out the right end of this electronic circuit and he's free of it. He's inspected it. In other words, he's walked through the Labyrinth of thoughts he's had crossed up on this particular subject and he's fully answered the question and now you can see this and so you respond.

Now, if at any time you cut his itsa, you of course don't let him walk all the way through the Labyrinth, so not having walked through the Labyrinth, you'll interrupt him someplace and he feels lost. Of course he's lost! He's lost in the middle of an incomplete inspection. And, in this incomplete inspection, it's electronic materials that he actually is inspecting in the mind and it turns on a dirty needle because you have cut his itsa.

Now, you know this, so you let this person insp - you give him something to inspect; you let him inspect this and when he is finished you tell him he has inspected it by acknowledging it. I don't care whether you did that by repetitive commands or otherwise. That's the basis of all auditing. There is no other basis to auditing than that. And that this - this operation is taking place in the knowledge of certain mental mechanics and activities and there's certain types of questions you can ask and so on ... But the person who is answering these questions that are being put to him, and so forth, because he is undergoing conditions and he's doing actions which are bringing him up the line, he will come up with a higher IQ and he'll be brighter and he'll be this and he'll be that - providing you're not auditing him during the presence of a present time problem; you're not trying to press ahead while he has an ARC break; providing these things are occurring; providing you are getting tone arm action, why, the guy can recover from almost anything, don't you see?

I've given you, just in these last few words, the - really the basic essentials of auditing. They're just spit out that fast.

Now, if you can bring that about, you've got all the good indicators present, don't you see - the bad indicators are absent. When a bad indicator shows up you immediately take the

lightest necessary action - quickest, quickly to set it to rights - you recognize it swiftly, you take the action necessary to correct it, you've got it corrected and then you're away and not making a profession, now, out of this one bad indicator. And you've got the session wheeling and it's going and so forth, and you keep that ball rolling and just the essentials which I just gave you: keeping the pc's confidence built up in that you're not chopping him down all the time, making sure the pc doesn't have PT problems, making sure that you're not auditing him—somebody over the top of an ARC break, this type of thing, and my God, you'll emerge at the other end - even at your lower levels of auditing, you see - you emerge at the other end with a brand - new being.

You can keep - you can keep doing this. But, of course, if you don't know what auditing looks like, then auditing is to a marked degree quite downgraded. Do you see that?

Well, I've given you a rather long lecture; you can come back fifteen minutes late and we'll start class fifteen minutes late.

But I wanted to particularly go over some of the points of 1963. I thought you might be interested and amused. Tell you how it looked at least from my point of view and to wish you a very happy New Year!