

GOOD INDICATORS AT LOWER LEVELS

A lecture given on
7 January 1964

All right. Thank you.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, January 7th, AD 14.

All right. Now, I've got something – the reason I'm giving you a lecture today, even though I was apparently a bit under the weather and so forth, is I've got something I'm trying to teach you. And tomorrow in the demonstration you will be able to put this to good use.

Now, you have in front of you HCO Bulletin of December 28th, 1963. And this bulletin here is the Routine 6 Indicators Part I, Good Indicators. Now that bulletin apparently would refer to Routine 6 and apparently only refer to Routine 6. But in actual fact it contains the most complete list of indicators for any session. Of course, there are several of them that don't apply. Now amongst those that don't apply, a – re whether or not the pc thought it was his own goal. You're not going to get that at Listen-style Auditing, Level I. But if you look this over, you will find out that these apply to most sessions.

And I'm going to take this up with you, rather carefully.

Now, if I could teach you – if I could teach you what a good session looks like, and teach you so that when you look at an auditing session in progress, between an auditor and a pc out there – if I could teach you to be able to say, “That's a good session,” or bang, “There's something wrong with that session,” why, I could make a whale of an auditing supervisor out of you, see. And you'd really get a lot of success, as a D of P, or something like that – why, you'd just come crashing down the line there. You'd have gains, gains, gains, gains, gains.

And the reason why I'm teaching you this way is because if I can teach you what good indicators are, you can then pick out of the muck – well, what a bad indicator is. And we will take up bad indicators in the next lecture. But if you don't know what the good indicators are, you will never be able to figure out what the bad indicators are.

Now, the reason for this is an auditor's tendency to look for wrongnesses. He's always trying to find something wrong with the pc. Well, that's the nature of Scientology. We

assume that there's something wrong with somebody. Otherwise he wouldn't be here on this planet. Otherwise he wouldn't be dead in his head. He would be capable of doing a great deal more than he is doing at the particular moment.

When you get down to an examination of what kind of character a thetan is, we find that man has been making a consistent or even intentional error. And the intentional error is that a being is a piece of amoeba or something in the mud, and only by a great deal of punishment, duress, challenge in the environment, upset, holding a gun on him, giving him high taxes and treating him with medicine, is he made into a sentient being. Only by teachers rapping him over the head with a ruler and being put in there, into the grindstone, being conscripted into the army and made to shoot his fellow man – in other words, that's the only way you get civilized. That's the only way you get civilized.

Well now, remember there's an entirely different action involved here. There's an entirely different action involved here. We have a different concept. And until you can appreciate this, you – you'll see what it is. We see an individual, we see an individual as basically, routinely capable. He's basically and routinely good. He is basically and routinely capable of many actions. He's capable of considerable power and so forth. And we see him in, you might say, a state of a free thetan or a native state as a far more powerful individual than when he's been complicated up.

And we conceive here – we conceive here an entirely reverse idea. We conceive that all of this training in the school, all of this being sent to the front and made to shoot his fellow man, all of this being charged high taxes, all of this being lectured to about how he should be good and bow seven times a day due east to where the lodestone is – all of that sort of thing drags down his capabilities and makes him less capable. Now, we have tremendous evidence, overwhelming evidence all along the line that our concept is true, and that the (quote) “biological concept” is – to be colloquial – erroneous.

We tested a series of schools. Now, in the process of testing schools we found out that although the child was advancing in age, his IQ was dropping. As he advanced in school his IQ became less. Understand, that's very important. I think the highest IQ we ever tested in one Central Organization which was testing floods of people, was tested on a ten-year-old boy. Now, that's the highest IQ tested there. That's very interesting. In other words, the harder and longer they were kept in their basic education – the longer they were kept there, the more stable data was shoved down their throats, particularly false ones, why the less their IQ was. That's interesting.

Now, a college student in the United States has been very carefully masked, and the psyrologist – who was the – those are the ex-phrenologists, you know, the bumps on the brain boys. If you look up in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* you'll find – particularly my edition – I have a very choice edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* – it's an old one. I think it's

the eleventh edition, I love it, man. It's got all of the, you know, "what is black magic," what is – and it gives long explanations of spells and it gives the early history of hypnotism and it just gives all kinds of things. And when you – most of its articles were written as though you didn't know.

The modern encyclopedia is written only for the experts, you see. If you're an expert in landscape gardening and you go and look up landscape gardening, why you'll find out all about it – if you're an expert. Well, these old encyclopedias weren't written that way. And there's an article in there on phrenology which is – which is marvelous. And it describes the bumps on the brain – bumps on the skull – and it gives a map of the head. And, all of this is very intriguing. Because down below it says this particular patient had an extra large meatus. We're not sure what a meatus was, but he had an extra large meatus which showed that he was fond of torturing animals – and as a matter of fact he was very fond of torturing animals and so became a medical doctor. You know, when I read that – you know, I bet they'd burn that book, you know; they'd have a law passed in Congress, you know. They'd tell the president "We're going to cut out your adenoids, man, if you don't have that rescinded!" Of course my quote is very liberal – they didn't say he was a medical doctor who was a member of the AMA, trained recently – they didn't say that. They came very close to it, however! Anyway, I'm just giving you a gag.

The facts of the case here is the psychologist inherited phrenology, you know. Only they just went a little deeper into the subject. The phrenologist studied the skull, and of course the psychologist going deeper into the subject went just inside the skull and started studying the brain. And he has just as many superstitions about the brain and its sizes and lumps as the old phrenologist had about the outside of the skull. Now you might say we've gone to the root of the problem and we've gone to the center of the brain and we found a thetan.

Now, this has been much more productive – much more productive. Truth is demonstrated by workability. Now, this is a subject which would be contested in certain philosophic spheres. I guarantee this would be contested! There are those schools of thought which are so enamored of their own falsities that they demonstrate that no truth need be workable. I think this is rather marvelous. There are certain religious philosophies and so forth which say, "workability is not anything we should have anything to do with because actually it is very sufficient for us that Galen – that Galen said that the blood was like tides and so forth. And these fellows – Harvey – these fellows come along and they say it's pumped or something like that or it runs at the impetus of the heart – why, the workability and the fact that you can observe it and so forth actually has nothing to do with it. The beautiful aesthetic, the beautiful aesthetic of the idea of blood tiding back and forth with the tides of the moon or something of

this sort – that is so beautiful and so aesthetic that even though we know it is false there is no reason for us to accept the truth.”

Now, did you know that there were schools of philosophy like that? You occasionally run into one of these sad apples, and he will tell you that workability is no test of anything. He will say that – well, what he means actually is workability so challenges his own favorite ideas or philosophies that he mustn't have it anywhere near him.

Now, let us use this anyway: the idea that we can observe, that we do something and we produce an effective result. Actually, remember all the exact sciences built up to their present stature just on that idea alone – that you put A and B together and you'll always get C. Well, now in Scientology we have that level of workability. We have put A and B together and we get C.

So, we have this fellow with lumbosis. We have this fellow with lumbosis – this is the idea of the additive datum to the thetan, see – and this fellow has lumbosis. Now, we can give him heat treatment, we can operate on his lumbo, we can do all kinds of interesting things to him, and he goes on either having lumbosis or kicks the bucket. Now, this is very interesting, that even Freudian analysts realized that some additive had been added that should be deleted. So the idea of deleting something in order to bring about a recovery is not new with us – but in this particular case we only need ask him what solutions he has had for his lumbosis for him to recover from the lumbosis. In other words, if we could pick up all of his decisions and solutions with regard to lumbosis, then we would pick it up. In other words, that's a perpetuation of an error.

Now, this is all part and parcel of additives. We add something to the being and he gets worse. You understand? Now, we take somebody who is feeling bad. I mean you as a Scientologist can put this to test every time you turn around, so you should know really what the basic philosophy of it is. We take this fellow who has had – he feels bleau and he feels down and he feels *baruahh* and life is pretty *nnnyah*. And here he is and we set him down and we put in the mid ruds, see, for the last week or something like this. Now what are we doing there? We're actually subtracting; we're subtracting actions. It isn't necessarily that we're subtracting bad actions, don't you see – we're not subtracting the bad actions and leaving the good actions which are beneficial. We're subtracting the livingness of the last week and he comes up feeling better. I think this is fascinating.

You can do that. You do it well and don't ARC break him and clean cleans, and know how to read your meter and audit him really, you'll always bring about this same thing. Well, what have you done in essence? You have subtracted something from the being. You've taken something away.

All right. Now I have made this test then. Let's – let's go a little more esoteric here. I have taken an insane person, subtracted from this insane being his body. I mean this is just figuratively, literally and actually – this isn't any other type of description. I've subtracted from him his body and had him immediately sane. And sane, talking, responsive and so forth. Added back to him his body – instantly returned to insanity. That's quite interesting. You say how do you do that? Well, you've walked his body off of him. You do it the same way by moving somebody out of his head.

Now, there is something that you can't argue with. Here's something you can't argue with. You take any insane person, he's rather easily handled or persuaded, even though he's terribly dispersed. He's in a point where anything has an effect upon him and he's very easy to exteriorize. Of course, he's still capable of talking through his mouth using his vocal chords, and that sort of thing. How do you know he was out of his body? Well, that hasn't anything to do with it. He said so, you knew so, and that was the only auditing command that was given to him. So there he was, minus the influence, effects or pushes of the body – and the fellow was sane.

Well, I can always produce five, ten minutes of sanity. It actually is not beneficial, doesn't last, it's just an experimental technique. But that's fascinating, isn't it? That you delete from this fellow his body.

All right. Now let's take – let's take this fellow who has been living... You say how about the good things of life? Well, I don't know, how about the good things of life? Of course we could all be pessimists here together today, and say are there any and so on. Well, yes, as a matter of fact there are. But they are usually cessations. If you look over the good things of life, they are very often positive. Child gets toy or something like this. Well that's fine. That all is taken care of in Scientology under the subject of havingness. But *it's havingness at own choice*. You understand? The individual has this thing he wants. Now, you try to give somebody something he doesn't want and you're going to overthrow his power of choice. So what has happened to this individual is power of choice is the only thing he had to begin with which gave him power, capability or anything else. And that power of choice has been consistently and continuously overthrown by giving him things he didn't want and taking away from him things he didn't want to get rid of and back and forth, and you get the individual pretty overwhelmed and he goes down in power.

But let's take this fellow – he's been getting along fine, he has a goal “to be a great fellow,” see – it's a GPM. He's got the goal “to be a great fellow.”

He's going around patting everybody on the back, and he's a great fellow. And you'd think, for God's sakes, this is the one thing that makes this man a man, you know. The goal “to be a great fellow.”

And unfortunately at the same time he has a bad pain in the back of his skull and he rather has consistent twitches, twitches. And he twitches and so forth. And we audit him up and what do we get? We take away the goal “to be a great fellow,” the twitch disappears and he hasn’t got the pain in the back of his head. I think this is very fascinating. So – but this was apparently something he was doing, apparently something he wanted. Well, what happened to him? What happened to him actually? He solved something that didn’t need solving. There was something he couldn’t confront so he solved it. And he fixed the solution. And anytime you go on and fix these solutions forever and ever and ever and ever and ever, you put an individual down grade.

Now, the only reason under the sun that we have any right whatsoever to educate in the field of Scientology – the only right we have to educate at all, is we are teaching things that are as close to fact as possibly can be made. And the technology or the doingness or how you do it or how it is put together and so forth, is so close to actually how it *is* put together that it runs itself out. If you say to somebody who has a solution for lumbosis, “The reason you’re having lumbosis is because you have this solution for lumbosis,” and sometimes he will get well from just that fact. Now, actually you can make people well simply by teaching them Scientology. So Scientology doesn’t come under this ban of educational aberration.

Why? Well, Scientology is the only thing that runs itself out. Scientology is the only solution in this universe which erases itself. Now, for instance, right now, anything that you are being taught – anything that you are being taught – is in actual fact simply being a truth which is being pulled up through the muck and shown to you. And it actually by being shown to you makes it possible for you to reach other truths.

Now when you consider the power of an RI, or you consider the power of one of these fantastic solutions of medicine or something like that – like a big operation or something like that – when you consider the power of an actual GPM, when you consider the power of a service facsimile, all of these things – all of these things – well, I don’t quite know how to put this to you, because it’s something that I have recently studied and had been rather overwhelmed with. And it’s this – it’s this: The data of Scientology, now the data of Scientology is so minor and so sweet and so pure with regard to the tremendous heavy, crashing, banging solutions like service facsimiles, RIs, GPMs, medical operations, all kinds of those other types of solutions – I’m beginning to be very relaxed. You can do almost anything you want to with Scientology, because it sits on the top of this. And when it has solved something it solves what has solved it. And that’s never happened before.

In other words, these other solutions are so crashingly big and Scientological solutions are so mild that these – these things disappearing of course make the little mild Scientology solutions just go *phhhh!* And there’s practically nothing to it. So we don’t come under the category of adding aberrative data to the individual as a solution of his difficulties, because

even though it might stand there for a while and worry him, it will eventually reach home and uproot the thing it is sitting on, and it blows along with it.

For instance, every one of you right this minute is sitting in some RI of some kind or another. And if anything made you flinch in the data which you've been given in the last twenty-four hours or its administration and so forth, now or tomorrow or eventually, that data is going to go *phoooo!* It's going to blow. Because it's sitting on top of what it is uprooting. You got the idea? So when it blows, the data blows – but you know the data, because the data is truth. And all of this is very fascinating. In other words, the premise here is that an individual – not to wander far afield now – an individual becomes aberrated. He becomes aberrative by additives. His experiences in this universe are usually calculated to degrade and de-power him.

Now, all you have to do is pick up all of these crisscrosses and you return him to power. Now, I've given you a few examples of these. Of course, there are innumerable examples of these things. What we're doing is easily demonstrated. You pick up – you pick up a bunch of data out of this fellow, or know-hows or how-do-its or something like that, he becomes quite bright. You can raise IQ simply by picking up his school education or something like this. And in Scientological data, the data itself is a restimulation of more basic and fundamental truths which restimulated, tend to blow later data. As a matter of fact, some people just study Scientology and they can leap out of bed well. It has happened many times.

Now, what's this all add up to? It adds up that man – man is an added-to being. And everything that has been added to him has decreased his ability to cope.

Now, we've gotten him dependent on tools and that sort of thing. I've studied some of this in anthropology, ethnology and so on. I've studied, I think, twenty-one primitive races including the British and American – and I'm always struck in their history with the fact that they have gone through periods of handicraft which are quite remarkable – quite remarkable. You see them in their museums and so forth. Well, of course, you see these things amongst actual primitive races – the other big joke – you see these amongst actual primitive races down in the Philippines and so forth, and you see these marvelous little pieces of handicraft one way or the other. Somebody has patiently put – he's patiently put little lions' heads on the arms of all the chairs that he was making and something like that. And you see it down there, in – you see it in some of the primitive races as a painstaking job of painting up every stone in the yard with paint. And they're rather clever designs.

You see it – you see it in ivory work amongst the Eskimo – some of the most fantastic things. This fellow's just making a spear, you see. And you see this spear – my goodness, it's all chased and it's got pictures of walruses and so forth. This thing is just a workaday spear! This thing is something that Manchester would turn out zoom-zoom-zoom, you know? And he's got this thing – he has a lot of them, you see – and they got a – they got a walrus there,

and there's a couple of seal or there's a little hunting scene of – depicting one of his activities at one time or another, and that's that particular spear. Well, these things are just spears. Spearheads – he's going to throw these things and forget them, and they're going to get stuck and so forth. Well, why did he go to all this trouble? Why did he go to all this trouble?

Well, he had obviously the patience and the talent and the skill with very, very minor tools in order to do that thing. And you find this in a race prior to its automation or mechanization or being provided with adequate tools – (quote) “adequate tools.” I think it's quite interesting. You can see it in museums very often, if you want to study this particular point. It is – in other words, all I'm trying to say is, is you give him... This fellow up working in Manchester right now, my God, he's got drill presses and he's got lathes and he's got – he's got all kinds of furnaces and forging materials. And he's got everything under the sun, moon and stars. He's got everything there is. It isn't that he's deleted art. The more you give him to work with – the more you give him to work with, why, in actual fact the less he works. And that's interesting. It isn't that he doesn't have to work less – it's that his ability to work has been reduced. I think it's quite interesting.

You have somebody around sometime in a maintenance department, you'll remember what I say. If you've got somebody coming in all the time, all the time, all the time and he's got to have – he's got to have this and he's got to have that and he's got to have the other thing and he's got to have something else and he's got to have something else and so forth. You walk around the place, you're not going to find anything being done. There's a direct coordination between “got to have” and “getting done.” And that's a good datum that you can use in any organizational action. You find the fellow who has to have, has to have, has to have, has to have, has to have, more, more, more, more, more in order to get his job done and so forth, is actually doing, usually, very little.

Now, what calls this to account is, that is an aberrative side of simply some thetan's bent for collecting havingness. I immediately think of my cameras. I collect cameras. I'll collect lots of cameras. But it's interesting, it's interesting that in collecting cameras I pay less attention to any one camera. And just had all of my Christmas pictures wrecked by picking up a camera I hadn't paid any attention to for a very long time and one of its buttons had been shoved over to another point and the flash was no longer synchronized with electronic flash. I didn't get any pictures.

Well, what is this? This – that's just having too many cameras, that's all! You didn't pay any attention to the camera you had, don't you see? I've got five, six cameras of one kind or another, see. And there's a good example – I was getting less pictures by having more cameras. But, of course, I just collect cameras for the devil of it.

Now, this is very interesting. It even follows through then into hobby work, and so on. Now there is some point – there is some point if you're dealing in the field of electronics, for

instance – where you require a minimum amount of equipment or a maximum amount of equipment or a certain amount of equipment in order to get something done. Very, very true. Very, very true. And if you don't have that equipment, you're a mess. For instance, you'd have no tapes at all if we didn't have a nice Ampex 600 running, don't you see. And you wouldn't have any television broadcast if we didn't have some cameras and that sort of thing. But remember, we're using these things. These things are in use. And as far as my cameras are concerned, I do take pictures.

But, you know, the people I'm talking about – the people I'm talking about “have to have.” And never “do.” And it's a good point for you to notice that they “have to have,” but they never “do.” And you'll see this thing. And it's a totally overwhelmed being.

Now one day up in the cold and dust of a Peking winter and so on, I saw a Chinese carpenter. I saw a Chinese carpenter working. And it's the wildest thing I'd ever seen, because there's an old civilization. There's a very old civilization. You expect them to be very sophisticated in all of their tools and so on. This little Chinese carpenter was working out there in the cold and he was mending up the pillars of the British Legation. They were built out of wood and they'd been gnawed at by dust for a long time, and they had some carvings and some things like this associated with them. And he was fitting in – he was fitting in a new beam and so on for one that had been rotted out, and he was fitting it all in very nicely. And I talked to him for a little while. And I stood there just absolutely fascinated!

This man had a little bow, it was about six inches long and it had a piece of string from the two corners of the bow, and he had a drill – he had a drill that he had taken out of a fish that he had had for breakfast. And he had a little piece of stone that he'd picked up in the street which happened to have a little concavity in the back of it. And he took the fish bone and wrapped the string of the little bow around it and then held it with this palm fitting – this stone – and went up and down with the fish bow. And he had a nice auger, and he was drilling holes in the wood and then he was taking – he was taking then a little knife that was hardly a knife at all, it was just a sliver of metal that he had managed to sharpen up, and he was taking bits of wood off of the old beam, of course – he – you know, that he was discarding. He wouldn't have used new wood for that. And he was taking these things and he'd flick up a little piece like off there, and then he'd go so-and-so and so-and-so and so on and next thing you know he had a dowel. And then he'd put the dowel where he had drilled the hole and then he'd tap it in with his – with this same stone. He was building more beam faster than a US carpenter. I looked at this and he was perfectly competent with these tools. And he was taking the greatest of care. And he was making the nicest possible things out of the thing. Interesting, isn't it?

This little fellow in other words, was perfectly capable of doing a job with – of course, you could say tools to which he was accustomed – but using the minimum tools. And you

don't find people who are having a good time of it using a minimum of tools. Now, to him those tools were effective. Those were effective tools, man! I think to do the same job – nobody would have been putting something together with wooden dowels, anyway! They would have been nailing it together with nails at vast expense and so on.

You say, well, what about this fellow? Well, this fellow actually had never really been spoiled by being taught all of the things he had to have before he was a carpenter.

I think all you'd have had to do was added to his education of. "You have to have nails and you have to have a hammer with a five-pound head and then you have to have actually three hammers, you have to have so on and so on, and then you have to have – and you have to have – and you have to have before you can drill a hole." And the "have to have" gets in the road of ever getting the hole drilled, see. It's interesting. In other words, you could have added to his understanding of carpentry to the degree of "you can't do without certain union tools" to a point where he can no longer carpenter. That's the only point I'm making here.

The earlier history of races or the more primitive cultures and so on are fascinating to me, to the amount of time and the amount of skill which is put into odd little bits. And now man is getting up to a point where he can mass produce these things and so forth, all of which is very, very interesting. I'm sitting here looking at a Georgian fireplace of the early eighteenth century, and the amount of work which has gone into chopping up that marble there, probably could not be found, modernly. We could say, "Oh yes, somebody could have made it." No, I don't think so. Because I've seen a lot of modern marble work. And they have better tools today but they don't turn out the same work. I'm also looking at a fire grate and so forth of the same period. Fancy, man – fancy! It's all scrolled and chased and that sort of thing. Why some of the best stamping machines and patterns they make these days don't turn those things out, and yet that was probably turned out with a blacksmith – by a blacksmith, all by his lonesome. He said, "Well, let's fix up a fireplace!" Bang, bang! "I think it ought to have some nice scrollwork and so forth and so on!"

What's happening here? What's happening here? It's just the more you add to the workman, why, the less individual work one accomplishes. You get the better workman, it isn't that he can make do, it's that he does anyway. And you say, well, if you kept taking his tools away from him he might not be as good a workman and so forth, because he couldn't do. Well, there is a point, of course, that we have to remember. He's working in a body; he's working at great limitations. But there is something in which I say – a fellow can have too much – he can have too much burden, he can have too much this and that.

What's this all amount to? This amounts to the fact that we're in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual. Now, because – now understand – understand this very carefully – because we are in the business of deleting wrongnesses from the individual, we darn seldom look at rightnesses. And that's what's wrong with most auditors. They are so

anxious to find the wrongness – and quite properly – that they really never look at the rightness. And if they don't look at the rightnesses that are present, then they aren't appreciating the degrees of truth that are present which can be promoted up into more truth. In other words, they're starting at a level of no truth present all the time, so of course they never make any forward progress.

You must realize – you must realize that there must be truth present, and that that truth must be recognized. And that is hand and fist a part of auditing: the recognition of the fact that a truth is present. If you only look for wrongnesses and only recognize wrongnesses, then you will never be able to pull anything up a – gradient because you won't think you have any rightnesses to work with. It just all looks wrong to you.

Now that's an interesting concept. That's an interesting concept. We have to be able to look at the wrongnesses in order to right them, but we also have to be able to look at the rightnesses in order to increase them. We're only trying to find wrongnesses in order to increase rightnesses. And that's very important. If you have no rightnesses present in a session, you will never be able to make any progress of any kind. Now that's what's interesting. Progress is built on a gradient scale of rightnesses by which you delete wrongnesses and they drop and fall away.

Therefore, processing is an action by which wrongnesses can be deleted from the case to the degree that rightnesses are present in the session. Do you see that? You cannot take a case that doesn't have any rightnesses present and delete a wrongness. That's not possible.

So you have to realize that there are rightnesses present and then you increase those rightnesses. And that makes it possible for you to pick up the wrongnesses. And that's what auditing – auditing really consists of. It's a contest of maintaining rightnesses so that we can delete wrongnesses.

Now if you keep on then deleting wrongnesses, all the while maintaining and increasing the rightnesses, you eventually wind up with a very right being. Now let me state this to you a little bit different so that you really get it. You're trying to get a right being. Therefore, if you don't continuously encourage right beingness, you never wind up with a right being. This actually is one of those things where I realize I'm stacking up little kid's blocks A, B and C and so forth, but I'm always astonished that they get missed.

You see, I've had actually ten or thirteen years of losses of trying to teach somebody to observe an auditing session and so forth, and I finally made a breakthrough here and I'm giving it all we have. You want your pc to wind up right. You know, I mean a right state. He's in a more native, more capable, less overwhelmed, higher power of choice sort of state. All right, you want him to wind up with more rightnesses. Well, therefore, if you audit so that you do not increase or encourage and increase rightnesses, then you won't wind up with a

right pc. I mean, it – I’m – it’s idiotic you know – I feel like I’m yelling in the wind here, to some degree, because I’ve tried to point this out before but I’ve really never had language to do so.

And if – for instance, if you want to pick up a God-awful, horrendous, crashing wrongness – let’s put it in ratio form – we got to pick up this fantastic wrongness here. And we got this wrongness, you see. And it’s something on the order of this big.

Now the degree of action which you have to have, or the degree of rightness you have to have present over here – the degree of rightness you have to have present must exceed the wrongness. In other words, you have to have at least this much rightness. I don’t know if you can see those or not on the screen, doesn’t matter, they’re just two circles of similar size. In other words we’re trying to pick up this wrongness and erase it. Well, to do so, we have to have this rightness present. In other words, you’ve got to have rightness in a session at least as great as the wrongness you’re trying to pick up. It’s a proportional action. Proportional. Now frankly, if you’ve got as much wrongness in a session as you’ve got rightness, you’re not riding on any cushion. You’ve got – you’ve got yourself a comparative situation here that’s going to eat somebody up.

Now the facts of the case are – the facts of the case are that if you want to pick up this little rightness here – this little fellow, this little wrongness here – and you’ve got to have rightnesses – we’ve got to have rightnesses present, which are *that* big in order to engulf it. Now that’s an easy job of auditing. Now these comparable – there’s as much wrongness in the session as there is rightness, comparable magnitude, that makes a very difficult job of auditing – very difficult. But you get somebody who is – oh, he’s singing and happy and cheerful and so forth and it’s all springtime and so on, and you say to him and so forth – you say to him, “Did you know so-and-so and so-and-so?” And he looks at it and his ability to as-is is so great that he simply goes *pphhh* and it’s gone. Do you understand?

Now, you get this fellow and he is worried and he is nervous and he is upset and you give him a little, tiny, peanut-sized present time problem that is very, very little and so on, and the wrongnesses in the session – that is to say the rightnesses in the session – are very minor, and the problem is a very tiny problem but there isn’t enough rightness in the session to handle the problem and he actually cannot erase it. You get the idea?

Now, you – we could talk about banging somebody into a GPM and so on. But you realize that all you’ve got to do is delete good indicators from a session, one after the other, and your pc will not be able to as-is – he won’t be able to as-is a speck of cigarette ash on the middle of the rug. In other words, he can’t as-is anything.

So a pc’s ability to as-is – and here is your rule and your datum and which you should remember well: *The pcs ability to as-is or erase in a session is directly proportional to the*

number of good indicators present in the session. You see that? It's proportional to that – and his inability to cope in a session is also measured proportionally. His inability to cope in the session rises proportionately to the number of bad indicators present in a session. As we delete good indicators of course, we get bad indicators. Except they don't cross one to the other necessarily.

But if we had very few good indicators in a session we would have a very small ability on the part of the pc to as-is. And if we have a lot of good indicators in a session, then the pc's ability to as-is is much greater. And you can actually bog a pc down – you can bog a pc down. Every once in a while you'll find a pc sick. You know, I mean life and so forth, and he's done something or other. Pc's sick, you'll find – I don't say once in a while you find a pc sick, but every once in a while an auditor will have this experience that the pc is sick and the auditor can't continue to run the process he has been running, but has to drop back to a very minor process indeed. Auditors very often overlook this.

They were running this pc on service facsimiles and not for any reason of auditing, because of duress or weather or something of this sort, the pc got himself a stomachache or something and ate something bad or something. And he gets back into the session again and the auditor tries to go on running the process and, by George, the process won't run. Well, the auditor's not on the ball. The good indicators, you see, are inadequate to the running of the process which was in progress. Got that?

So what's the score here? He has a sick pc. So he has to fall downstairs to running something like "Look around here and find something you could have," see. He's got to run the pc's Havingness Process, or give the pc a Touch Assist or something like this. He hasn't got enough sense to retrograde the process to cope with the state of the pc.

Now, what problem is he up against there? Actually, good indicators in the session are inadequate to handle the wrongnesses the auditor is trying to eradicate. Now, that's what's happening in the session. Now, you get yourself a sick pc every time you see the good indicators vanish – and the pc can be considered sick. You've just – you haven't got any good indicators in the session. Well, all right. Good indicators have dropped out of the session – your pc's ability to as-is is going to be very, very, very, very lowered. Going to be much lower than it was. The indicators are much low – the good indicators are much fewer, the pc's ability to handle wrongnesses is much less.

Now, you remember that the next time you see a pc start to bog, start to drag, start to flounder one way or the other. What's happening? These good indicators are not present, therefore the pc's ability to handle a wrongness is lessened. The pc – you've got to get the good indicators back in before you can get the pc to handle what you want him to handle. That's the only thing you can do about that. Now, how you go about that is a horse of another color, and is no part of this lecture. I'm just telling you the good indicator.

Now, I worked all this out, and every once in a while – I’m never – I’m never such a fool as to believe that I can’t learn anything about auditing and so forth. In fact – in fact, amongst you there may be some of you who have no more to learn about auditing and so forth and I congratulate you because that is a very happy state to be in and I have never achieved it. That’s a mean thing to say, but I’ve never – never achieved this happy state – I always have something new to learn about auditing. Always! I can always learn something from any given session. And I’m struck to the degree of my own ignorance sometimes as to what I have been neglecting. I’m sometimes overwhelmed by it a little bit and I say, “Hey, what do you know! All these years I’ve been watching *wah-wah*, and I never knew that a wah-wah – what do you know!” you know, and I get very interested in it. In other words, I can make progress along this line.

And after cursing and snarling about how it was almost impossible to impart to an auditor about how a session was put together – what a session should look like – and after having this problem on my plate for about thirteen years, I solved it – because auditors couldn’t observe pcs. This has been nagging, nagging, nagging and this has been right up front as a research project. You think I’ve been researching only very esoteric things – no, that isn’t so. I always have my eye on the fundamentals and the improvement thereof, see. I was snarling around, and “auditors never learned” – this will – this will give you – this is a good laugh, see – “auditors just never learned to observe pcs,” you see.

And I finally figured out this system: good indicators and bad indicators. You see, when a good indicator disappears a bad indicator doesn’t necessarily show up. They are not – they are not a justice scale, where you put so much on one side and take it off that side and put it on the other side, you know. That’s why they’re released here in two different sections.

Good indicators are good indicators and they don’t become bad indicators. Bad indicators are something else entirely different. And good indicators are something else. Good indicator disappears – another breed of cat called a bad indicator shows up. And they’re usually not at once translatable. You have to memorize them in their own categories.

But anyhow, I worked this over and I got it all worked out and I saw what it was and so on, and I thought, “Now,” I says, “that will show them something – that will show them something,” and so-and-so. I was very happy then because I realized that I could show you without a lot of trouble what an auditing session should look like and so that you could correct some of this and so you could get a raised workability out of auditing, see, so as you could make your auditing of a pc work better. I was very happy about it.

Here’s the joke: I was sitting in a session I was giving, and all of a sudden I noticed that a good indicator was missing – pc cogniting. Pc had ceased to cognite. So slight a difference here, you see. I just said, “Hey, there’s a good indicator missing. Hm-mm!” So I said, “I’m going to find out what’s wrong here, right away.” Pc hadn’t even begun to dream that there

was anything wrong. And – see, auditor finding out – you – auditor, by the way, you know – here’s another rule: The auditor must always find out what’s wrong in a session before the pc finds out. That’s how you hold altitude as an auditor. That’s how you hold control. You must always find out what’s wrong in a session before the pc finds out.

When the pc finds out and has to tell you why, your – your altitude suffers and so forth, and you have less control over the pc.

Now, in this particular instance and so forth, I – very clever indeed – I said “A good indicator’s missing. Ah!” And I looked at the list which I had in front of me and noticed that it was a very, very short list indeed, and that nothing had fallen on it, and the pc was just about ready to make a critical remark or say something or other and introduce some new bad indicators into the session, and didn’t get a chance to introduce them. I said, “Complete the list!” That was obviously what I said. Pc says, “Oh! Oh! Oh, yes! Yes!” Completed the list and so forth, and we got the list complete and went on cogniting. Started cogniting again!

And we – pc and I laughed about this a great deal, because it was – it was so quick. It was so quick off the mark that the pc really didn’t find out what was going on until it was all over. And yet was probably saved – probably saved a half an hour or something like that, of patch-up, ARC break, that kind of auditing. See? It undoubtedly saved a half an hour’s worth of auditing, just that.

So right away I dreamed this up so as to make you a better auditor, and I’ve become a better auditor as a result. So thank you. But anyway, that was very good and it saved me just like that – bang! Just a half an hour’s worth of auditing. Because that cognition drop out, that would have been followed by something else and that would have been followed by something else and the good indicators would have dropped out and dropped out and dropped out – and, of course, that’s a very light indicator. The bad indicators would have shown up, then I’d have gone and had to figure out what was wrong – and I’d have had to backtrack where we were at the time when it went out and then I would have found that we’d had an incomplete list at that time.

Well, obviously it only – could have been only one thing wrong in the session at that moment because all I was doing was trying – was just doing a short list. So there was only one thing wrong and it must have been an incomplete list. You could just get off the mark like that because it wasn’t overlisted; it wasn’t long enough. So, bang! Good indicator disappeared, I say something’s wrong with exactly what I’m doing because the good indicator disappeared right there, and it was right there while I was doing it and I hadn’t cut the pc’s itsa and my observation of my own auditing was high – so I said, therefore, we have an incomplete list. So, complete the list. The pc was just getting ready to say, “You *wah-wah-wah* and-and-and it – oh, all right. I’ll complete the list!” That was the end of that.

In other words, there are three degrees of indicators: There's light indicators, there's medium indicators and heavy indicators. And the very unobservant auditor only uses heavy indicators. Screaming ARC break. There is a fourth grade: Pc won't come near an auditing session. And we never let it go that far. But the medium indicator – that's pretty darned obvious. And the light indicator is something you either do something about or merely get alert about. It's an alerting thing more than a using thing. A medium indicator is something you use and must do something about right now, and a heavy indicator means you've missed the light indicators.

Now, any process has its own series of bad indicators. And the bad indicator moves in when the good indicator moves out. So you have to have as a primary knowledge – this sounds odd – but you have to have as a primary knowledge, a knowledge of good indicators.

Now, you never look – don't look for a bad indicator. Don't look for a bad indicator on and on and on. Don't look for bad indicators all the time, all the time – you'd drive the pc round the bend and suppress your good indicators. What you want to do is to know your good indicators so well that when one of them disappears from the type of process for – that's for the level you're running – know the good indicators so well that when one of them disappears out of a session, your ears go up *spannngg!* and you instantly look for the bad indicator. And really, don't look for the bad indicator until you see the vanishment of the good indicator.

When you see good indicators vanishing, you look for the bad indicator. Otherwise, you are always continuously prowling around looking for wrongnesses in a session and you keep the pc very upset and you get no auditing done of any kind whatsoever. So this other system is far better, and quite usable and quite a good system.

Now rapidly, let's go over the Routine 6 and Level VI indicators. These are all good indicators. And I'm merely going to read them off. You've got them in your bulletin of December the 28th and can copy them from them so I'm not going to bother you with making notes of this particular set because you have no business being separated or away from that bulletin.

“Pc cheerful.” Now, what do we mean, pc cheerful? Well, we mean the pc's cheerful. That's what we mean. The degree of misemotion that the pc is indulging in must be a diminishing degree. Interesting, isn't it? A diminishing degree. Pc hits a grief charge or something like that – now, these – remember, Routine 6. In Routine 6, pc cheerful. Your pc hits any misemotion of any kind whatsoever – that's all under the heading of bad indicator. So when we say pc cheerful, pc should be running like a grinning idiot. You understand? Cheerful! You know? Teeth! Smiling! You know? Happy! “*Ha-da-da-da-da-da-da-da. Bowwow-wow-wow!*” You know? “Oh, it's a dog and a bog and a bagitibog and a pokata wog. Oh, and that – ha! And what do you know about that! That's a wudiwum! Yeah, all right! Bang! *Kow-chow-pow!*”

Chapow-pow-pow! Pow-pow! Cheerful! “Oh, a gugfrog! Oh, my – all my life, all my life I’ve been worried about gugfrogs!” You know? Bang! You know? *Pc cheerful!*

So – at other levels, however, you have different actions. R3R, if your pc is laughing all the time he is having a grief charge, we would say something is – weird’s going on. We’re trying to run secondaries on the pc, we don’t expect the pc to be cheerful. But your misemotion should be diminishing in a session – diminishing. It isn’t that you have to suppress the pc’s misemotion, but you’ll find a good grief charge off at certain levels of auditing is a very fine thing indeed. But it must be diminishing and working back up toward cheerful. So it’s – other levels of auditing, “pc cheerful” would become “pc working in a direction to becoming more cheerful.” So at other levels you would have “pc getting more cheerful” as your indicator. It would be the change of degree. That’s for lower levels.

Now, we don’t, of course, have at lower levels “pc cogniting on goals and items,” but we certainly do have “pc cogniting.” And if you’ve got a noncogniting pc... John Sanborn once said very wisely – he said, “You know,” he said, “I’m suspicious of this guy. I’m suspicious of him. You know, he never looks around and says, ‘Well, what do you know!’ you know? He never looks at anything and says, ‘Well, what do you know!’” And he said, “I’d feel an awful lot better if sometime or another he’d look at something and say, ‘Well, what do you know!’” Well, what he’s spotting there was a pc who was not cogniting which would be a sure symptom that the pc was running in a present time problem, an ARC break, was running at a level above his level or ability to handle. Pc not cogniting.

“Pc’s items found are the ones pc thought they were on the list.” Well, of course, that is relatively inapplicable at lower levels except for this: You very often find that what a pc thought was wrong early on in his life turned out to be what was wrong. And if he – if he’s coming up with things like this: “You know, as a little boy I always suspected it was because my father was – was so on, so on, so on, so on, so on, on – and, by George, you know that’s a fact!” The rightness of the pc – the basic or fundamental rightnesses of the pc – are asserting themselves, is the way that could run at lower levels.

Now, you have “pc listing items briefly and accurately.” That would apply to listing – any listing activity. But in other levels – giving things to the auditor briefly and accurately.

“The early items on the list turning out to be the right ones.” That – that’s – doesn’t even apply anymore to Routine 6. Just scrub it.

“The right” – well, if overlisted it takes the pc too long to find out anything and so forth. You’d say pc finding out things or finding things rapidly is your good indicator. Pc is finding things rapidly. Takes the pc a long time to find something. You’ve seen a pc sit there and say... The obvious answer, of course, is the fact that he’s been beaten, you see? “Why do you feel bad?” you know, and the pc says, “Ohhhhhh,” and so forth and it just takes him –

takes him a half an hour or forty-five minutes to come up with the fact, “Well, I guess I feel bad because I just got beaten.” In other words – in other words, the speed of turnup – the speed of the pc finding something or giving up something.

This next one could be translated as “a proper reading meter.” The next one, “items found not rocket reading,” well, that has no applicability to anything except you’ve got to have – what’s being done is giving proper meter responses. And you’ve got your “goals found rocket reading” – well, what’s found gives its proper meter response.

And this next one could be determined as – “short item lists” – could be determined as “it doesn’t take long periods of time to get something done with this case.” This, by the way, is an indicator that a lot of auditors should pay more attention to. They – they – they themselves think it just takes forever.

I used to scare – I had an auditor one time that I used to scare half to death. The auditor would run something and I’d change and it’d get over and it’d straighten up and so forth and that would be that and the auditor was just settling down. And the auditor actually didn’t like to audit me very much – I changed too quickly and had cognitions too fast and this was very tiring because he had to think up a new process at once, of course.

And you’ll see – some auditors sit down and they’re going to run “I see the cat,” you see, and they’re sitting that down for a nice long intensive and then it’s flattened off in twenty minutes. We just had it happen out here. I gave a process over to an auditor to run and it was reported to me from all sides that the process hadn’t been run. And I found out the facts of the case were the process had been run on the pc but the pc had been able to cope with the process and handle it and come up to a final cognition on it in a half an hour.

Now, the expectancy on every hand, then – that was going to take a long time to run that process. Well, it takes as long to run a process as it takes to run it. And a pc running processes easily and rapidly, and flattening them on comm lag or cognition or meter thing, is a good indicator. An indicator that’s very often missing in sessions and you never notice it. The pc is taking forever to flatten something. Well, that’s not necessarily a good indicator at all.

“Items being found rapidly without a lot of hassle, even though the right item was hard to make read.” Now, that only applies to Routine 6. In ordinary auditing, it translates over into – into this: Being able to get the datum for the pc without an awful lot of wrastle. You ask the pc, “What’s your name?” you know, and the pc three hours later finally guarantees with a giggle that he’ll let you in on the fact that the first name begins with J. I wouldn’t say that that was a good indicator. Pc giving the auditor information easily is the good indicator. See? Easily.

All right. Now, “tone arm continuing in motion – not stuck.” Now, that’s a good indicator. But that’s an indicator which can be overdone. If you’ve got some other good indicators

present, like pc flattening processes rapidly – if you’ve got these present and he’s coming up with new things easily and rapidly and so forth, our action here is cancelled out. In other words, the tone arm keeps going flat. Well, it would be very dumb auditing indeed that would try to get a flattened process to produce more tone arm action, you know? “Well, yesterday he got beautiful tone arm action on critical thoughts of his father. But today we just keep trying to run this process and trying to run it and, you know, I don’t get any tone arm action.” Well, never occurs to him the – another good indicator was present, and that was that the pc was easily and rapidly flattening processes given. That – that’s a good indicator. So if that indicator was present, then we don’t expect the tone arm to keep moving forever on the same old hassle. We – we’ve got to – we’ve got to – we’ve got to change our sights here on this case.

Now, “the needle active.” Now, that’s something in meter reading that you seldom see – you seldom really watch for. You’re so worried, usually, about dirty needles and that sort of thing that you don’t – don’t really watch for an active needle. What’s meant by an active needle? Well, it’s a not s... – it’s a needle that’s not stuck, but it’s a needle that is fluid or fluent. It’s a needle that moves around. It’s a needle that – that is pretty easy to handle.

Now, these new Mark VIs – new Mark Vs, meters and so on (and there is a Mark VI too), but that meter is so easy to set up to a high, high, high sensitivity that you can very easily lie – get it to lie. You can get it to tell you a lie. That it all – it looks like it has a more fluid needle than it has. And in a great – if I’m – if I’m trying to pull withholds or something like that, well, I pull out my crank on one of these new modern meters and I crank it all the way up. Sensitivity 128 and the sensitivity knob set over to 32 and everything on the fire, you see, and my trained and educated thumb having an awful time trying to keep that needle at Set. Because I want that thing to read all it’s going to read. But that’s – that’s trying to clean things, you understand? That’s trying to clean withholds. That’s doing a very picky, particular job of the kind where it doesn’t matter if you clean a clean once in a while. If you leave the withhold on the case, you’ve had it, don’t you understand?

So, that kind of auditing – yes, yes, crank it up, man! That’s what it’s made that way for. And all other kinds of auditing *deeeowww-down*. I run one of those meters ordinarily – at Routine 6 – never run one of those things higher than sensitivity 8. Never. Never run it higher than that – for listing and items and that sort of thing. Crank it way down and get – make sure – sometimes you can be fooled. You can get that 128 button down there and it’s all over to 128 and you’re trying to crank your meter down and yet you’ve doubled and tripled and quadrupled your sensitivity down below. So get that thing set over at minimum and your tone arm set about 8.0 and you can do almost any reading you want to read. And then kick the sensitivity – I said tone arm, I meant sensitivity knob – kick your sensitivity knob to about 16 while you’re doing a mid rud. And just move it up and down between 16 for doing your mid

ruds or since mid ruds and move it back to 8. And frankly, that's about as high as you would ever expect one of those meters to have to perform. Performing them wide open causes a lot of trouble, causes the auditor a lot of trouble and causes a lot of comm lags in the session.

Now, there's about where your meter ought to read and where you ought to be handling your meter. And now, I'm talking now about the sensitivity 8 set meter when I say an active needle. And that – that needle shouldn't be stuck. That needle shouldn't be hanging up. That needle should be moving.

And it drifts easy. And when we mean a needle active, we mean that it drifts easily or moves easily. The pc has a big think, you see, and the needle goes *pprrrrr!* And the thing is rising and all of a sudden strikes back a couple of divisions. And it ticks and tocks and it sweeps up and it goes down and so forth. Your needle isn't sitting around – your needle isn't sitting around stuck. Your needle doesn't – you haven't set your needle at Set and then it just sits at Set and it just goes on sitting at Set. Well, of course, this would mean tone arm action was out, too.

But do you know you can have tone arm action present and the needle not active or fluid? You can have tone arm action with a gummy needle. And you want to get educated enough so that you can see this because it's an important good indicator. You're getting some tone arm action, the tone arm is going up and down a little bit and so forth. But that needle's kind of going throb-throb clockety-clock – dirty, see, that's one of the symptoms – but actually doesn't move much. It'll go on a reaching upsurge or it – or a climbing surge or it'll do a fall and so forth on the things it's supposed to fall on but it – it acts gummy. And when you see it there that is a good indicator gone. A good indicator is your needle ought to be cleanly swinging about. And if you've got a cleanly swinging about meter, then your pc – your needle – your pc is running very smoothly and there's probably very little wrong in the session. That's a – that's a good indicator. Good indicator – that clean, active needle.

Now, going on down the line here, taking up a few more of those things. Here it gives you “pc not troubled with new mass appearing when item is given.” Well, that's a Routine 6 indicator. But I would say “the pc is not being troubled with new pains and somatics and pressures and upsets by reason of an auditing question or its repetition.” I'd say it was a good indicator that your pc was running easily. And if he is hitting somatics, they're discharging. Your good indicator is that any somatic the pc runs into is fluid. It is in and out. It is momentary. It's a twitch. Any pressure is a *prrrrrp* – and then off and so forth. Those are all good indicators. The pressure or pain or somatic that moves in and gets heavier and then stays there and so forth, inevitably and invariable means something is real wrong. You're doing something wrong.

But what – what you want, the som – when you get rid of somatics on a pc it ought to be flick and spick and swish and pang and – it's in and out, don't you see. The shoulder – all

of a sudden he's got some pressure on his shoulder and then all of a sudden he gets hot and it's gone. That's a good indicator. You've given him an auditing command and he gets pressure on his shoulder. You give him another auditing command and he's got a bit more pressure on his shoulder. Give him another auditing command, he's got the same pressure on his shoulder. Another auditing command and he's got the same pressure on his shoulder. Another auditing command and he's got the same pressure – ohhh nuts, man! There's a good indicator has started missing. Somatics aren't – aren't fluid. They aren't going in and out and so forth, turning on and off. You want to get changing somatics in a session, in other words.

And this, of course, is an R6 indicator – “RI given the pc blowing tone arm down when pc asked if it is it.” Well, that's normal. But you ought to have your tone arm go down when the pc hits a cognition, and that's a good indicator. Pc cognites – needle down, tone arm down. Good indicator.

Now, “a further blowdown of TA as the pc goes on talking about something.” That doesn't matter – it's just right here in the good indicators, but actually there's a normal session indicator that's comparable to this, which is that you're getting more action once a pc's talking. If you're not getting tone arm action when the pc's talking, there's something wrong. There's something wrong here, that's not – not too – going too good.

“Distinct needle slash two inches or so when the pc is asked if new item solves or is solved by RI found just before” and so forth. In a normal session it turns into the same indicator I gave you before, which is simply expected meter behavior. Nothing unexpected in this meter behavior. A full-dial slash comes under the same one, the next one, nothing unexpected in the meter behavior. Meter's behaving the way it ought to behave.

And “heat on an item list” – now, a good indicator is pc gets warm and stays warm in auditing. Or gets hot and unheats and so forth while auditing. Pc does not get chilled in auditing – that's a bad indicator. And these – all these heat items are the same.

Now, of course if you could audit somebody with no pain ever and so forth, this would be very unusual indeed and is not even desirable. So at lower levels you run – and if the pc never gets a somatic, never has a pain and so forth in auditing, you wonder what's going off. So in lower levels it's “occasional somatics” is a good indicator. Somatics are a good indicator. Any kind of somatic – pain or so forth. That's a good indicator. Routine 6, we change horses: you get pain, there's something wrong, which is a vast difference in these things.

Now, we get “tone arm riding between 2.5 and 3.75 acceptable or 2.25 and 3.0 which is excellent.” And you will find that that is a good indicator at any level. That's fine for any level.

Now, “good tone arm action on finding items” or good tone arm action on spotting things for any level. Good tone arm action on spotting things. But you already got your divi-

sions for various levels of auditing and so on, and they all hold good and that you're getting that expected TA action is a good indicator. Getting the expected TA action for any level of processing is a good indicator, of course – the best.

“Good tone arm action” is – I just gave you that.

“The right item reading with only some coaxing.” Well, that's peculiarly Routine 6. I would say that, you're getting reads on what you and the pc think is wrong – I'd say that was a good indicator. Getting reads on what you and the pc think is wrong. You've agreed that something or other – that there's been hell to pay about little brothers or something of the sort, and you're busy discussing this, and you suggested it and the pc followed in with it and you've discussed it back and forth and lo and behold! that subject is giving needle and TA action. That subject is giving needle and TA action. Well, that's a real good indicator.

You – you're dealing with things that the pc thinks it is and that you think it is and you're getting tone arm action. Now, if you're dealing with things that you think it is and the pc thinks it is and you're not getting any tone arm action and so forth, then somebody is wrong. It may be you and it may be the pc, but certainly a good indicator is missing from the session. And the good indicator is: is that you and the pc in thinking over what the score is about his case and so forth, get tone arm action on what you think it is, not something else.

All right. And this is a very important – very important indicator for any level: pc with no PTP. Doesn't mean that it's a bad indicator that the pc has a PTP, but if the pc is running along between sessions and during sessions with no PTPs, it's a good indicator. Unless, of course, the pc is in total propitiation and can't even compos mentis. Then, of course, that's another horse of another hue. But there's – there's what that is with – pc isn't developing horrendous PTPs. Pc that develops horrendous PTPs between sessions and so forth – that's a bad indicator.

Good indicator: The pc isn't developing a lot of balderdash between sessions and isn't developing PTPs in session and so forth. That's a good indicator. You can take a look at the pc and you find this pc isn't developing a lot of PTPs, but just cheerfully happily cogniting and going on and so forth and so on. It's a very good indicator.

Pc that develops PTPs in session about session – ha-ha! Bad indicator – which has its own story, because we're only taking up good indicators here.

And “pc with no question as to what was the right goal or item.” Now, that works out in all levels this way: Is the pc afterwards doesn't come around to the auditor and say, “Do you think that was really the reason I had the lumbosis?” see? The pc stays certain of the auditing solution. PC remains certain of the auditing solution. That's a good indicator. It doesn't mean terribly much that they are uncertain of the auditing solution – that's not necessarily a bad indicator. But it certainly is a good indicator that the pc remains certain that that

was the solution to the situation. And they said, “So-and-so and so-and-so and so on.” They don’t afterwards say, “Well, *wah-wah-wah-wah-wah-wah-wah*. I’m not sure, sure, sure. Whether the – because *wah-wah*.” That – that’s all the reverse of the good indicator. So the pc remains certain.

And of course this is a Grade III indicator of any level: “Pc not critical or ARC breaky.” Any pc that is critical of the auditor is ARC broken. Now, I can guarantee that. And I don’t know how many auditors I have been dismayed that I couldn’t quickly teach this to. They learn it eventually, but it’s – it’s just pc says, “Well, I don’t know, I so on and so on and so on. It was this – that sharp tone of voice that you’re using” and so forth. And the auditor is always so willing to be reasonable. I don’t know why you run yourselves down like this. They’re so willing to be reasonable.

I’ll take that much chit-chat in a session for exactly – measured actually, measured actually by astronomical instruments – one-thousandth of a millisecond. I’m right in there – bang! boom! zoom! Because it’s not reasonable to me that a pc would be critical of the auditor in a session. I don’t care if I’ve just dropped the silverware on the floor! You understand? That’s not reasonable to me. Why isn’t it reasonable? Because the pc is there to be helped and I’m there to help the pc and I am doing my best to help the pc and that the pc is then critical – well, I don’t find that reasonable. I don’t care what mistakes I made – it still is never reasonable to me. And it never will be reasonable to me, because every single criticalness on the part of a pc can be run back to an ARC break that the pc has just had, or to an overt the pc has on the auditor or a withhold the pc has not disclosed. And those are the reasons for the critical pc.

I’ll tell you what’s happened. I have actually committed horrible blunders in a session, see? I mean almost tipped the desk over type of thing, don’t you see? Just whoa! You know? And a pc would just say, “Oh, well all right. This is – so what? And so on. So you tipped over the desk, you know?” You know, “Let’s get back to what I was running here.”

“Well, did it distract your attention...?”

“No no it’s all right. Didn’t matter. Now, what I was talking about here is my father...”

Had this happen too often, see? The pc didn’t pay any attention. But this time, you see, I just adjust my tie and the pc says, “I can’t stand this terrific motion that is going on in this session.”

Heh-heh-heh-heh-heh. Then I’m expected to believe that it’s because I adjusted my tie that upset the pc. Hey, come off of it! This is why you need to know good indicators, see? That would never upset anybody! So there must then be one of the other things which I just mentioned present in the session.

So – “pc happy with, satisfied with auditor, regardless of what auditor is doing” is a good indicator. And you state that for all levels and you won’t be wrong. And that’s a very extreme one and you won’t be able to understand it sometimes or anything of the sort. I’ve seen auditors committing the most horrible blunders and their pcs perfectly happy with them and so forth. Well, that’s because auditor behavior and activity actually doesn’t influence to any great degree the attitude of the pc. What influences the attitude of the pc is an ARC break that, of course, is influenced earlier by the auditor’s behavior or the pc’s got an overt on the auditor or the pc has a missed withhold of some kind or another. And they influence the pc’s attitude toward the auditor, but the auditor’s actual activity, as long as that auditor is even halfway trying, as long as he’s in there sweating, as long as he’s working, as long as he’s trying to get his job done at all – doesn’t influence the pc’s attitude. How do you like that?

So you can broaden this to “pc happy and satisfied with auditor” is another good indicator. Of course, this is aside of the fact the pc is cheerful and so forth. You got it? Pc says, “Oh, and so-and-so and so-and-so” – well, there’s something gone wrong in that session, man, that has to do with the pc’s case, has to do with blunders of some kind or another – and any auditor that’s reasonable about how he, of course deserves to be criticized for the horrible things he has done, of course, is just missing the best indicator of all. He’s got a – that’s a bad indicator. And something wrong. Doesn’t matter what the pc’s saying, there’s something wrong in the session and it isn’t actually the auditor’s tone of voice. There’s something else wrong. And if the auditor starts monitoring his tone of voice and so forth, he’s a total chump. Then he never gets in and finds out what’s wrong in the session, don’t you see? So the reasonable auditor messes up pcs like mad.

All right. Now, “the pc not protesting the auditor’s actions” comes under the same heading which I just gave you.

“The pc looking younger by reason of R6 auditing.” Actually, that’s true of almost any level of auditing. Pc looking younger, better, skin tone, eye color – these various things are good indicators, but not very common ones. But they are good indicators.

“The pc without weariness.” In other words, the pc feels more energetic is the good indicator.

“Pc without pains or aches or illnesses developing during auditing.” Now, always regard any pain, ache or illness that a pc develops during auditing as due to some error in auditing. Some bypassed charge usually has occasioned this. And a pc should actually be without pains, aches or illnesses developing during auditing. Now, we don’t mean that he shouldn’t have somatics – we mean that he shouldn’t get sick. He shouldn’t have a terrible pain in his stomach which lasts for a day or two. And at midnight last night, why, he all of a sudden was taken with an awful pain in his chest and that sort of thing while he was being audited and so

on. That means something was missed in the auditing; something is wrong and that something needs correcting.

Now, “pc wanting more auditing” is a good indicator, as you already know.

“Pc’s confidence” – now we can just – in finding goals and items and so forth, we say pc’s confidence. Well, pc’s confidence – we’ve got a good indicator. Pc is getting more confident. Pc is confident is a good indicator. Pc getting more confident is another good indicator. There are two indicators there which are both good. Getting more confident about what? Well, actually I can get a pc so darned insouciant that he’s practically insulting to me as an auditor – I’m perfectly happy. You know a pc saying, “Look at all the – look at all the stuff I found in the sess – .” You know, you’re sitting there and the pc wandering around in a rat maze, you know. And the pc saying, “Well, I’m getting pretty good, I don’t mind saying, but I found fifteen – fifteen items that fast in the session and so forth and so forth and yesterday I only found ten, you know. And today I found... So, that’s fine. Oh good, great, great!” And, of course, they just forget that you did anything at all. That’s all right with me, man! It’s all right with me. I don’t have to be told I’m doing a good job. I know my good indicators now.

Okay. This, by the way, is the best thanks an auditor gets and the best guarantee that he’s doing a good job of auditing, you see? If all these good indicators are present he knows he’s doing a good job of auditing and doesn’t have to be thanked.

Now, “the pc’s itsa free” – that’s good. That’s a good indicator. But a pc’s itsa so extensive you can’t get any auditing in – that is not a good indicator. See? In other words, the pc’s itsa is free but just covers the subject; doesn’t beat it to death. You know, pc says it and that’s it. Pc’s itsa can be so extensive that it becomes a bad indicator because the pc is using his itsa to stop the auditor from auditing. And that is a bad indicator: too extensive, too involved and too disrelated an itsa. It betokens various things. And there’s various grades of bad indicators there. So we’d say pc’s itsa is free but not too extensive. That’s for any level, and that’s a good indicator. That’s two good indicators actually.

And “the auditor seeing how – goals, goals, goals” – well, we can just reduce that to the auditor understanding how come that’s that way in the case. The pc says, “Well, the reason I really have a bad foot is because there were all these moon rockets, see, and they kept going overhead all the time and so forth. And then my name – my name at that particular time was Israel and so forth. And we had a big library and it had ten tomes of tums in it and so forth, and that’s how I have a bad foot.”

And the auditor says, “What the hell? Where did – where did we get – how – why – what – which – which door? Where did he go? Where did he go? Where did he go?” Well, the auditor didn’t understand what the pc’s talking about. The auditor didn’t understand the pc, that – that’s – pc’s not saying comprehensible things, which is a bad indicator. But the fact

that the auditor can see how it was, is the good indicator. That applies to any level of auditing. The auditor can see how it was. How it happened that way. Can see – can see that that is the way it was. The auditor can see that. That's a good indicator.

Pc says, "Well, I don't know, I got into this car and it went down over the hill and ran into a tree and it certainly pushed my chest in for a while and I was in the hospital for a while and I had a plaster cast on and we've just found out this whole incident and so forth." And the auditor sees, "Oh yeah, that's how he'd – that's how he'd have a restricted feeling chest." Plaster cast – restricted feeling chest; that's a good indicator. In other words, the pc is saying things that make sense. The pc's add-up makes sense. If the pc's add-up doesn't make sense, that's not a good indicator.

Now, "the auditor sees how" – and this is just some more of the same thing – "auditor sees how RIs solve RIs." That's just – comes under the heading of the one I just gave you.

And "the life of this person making sense." The way this person tells his life and adds it up and that sort of thing, it makes sense. It makes sense. That's a good indicator. But you have somebody who tells you, "Well, you see, actually, actually, I was for a very long time a page boy at the Catfish Hotel and then I quit and that's how I became bank president," and you don't make any sense out of this, well that's – that's a bad indicator.

Now, that just – the rest of this is more or less the same but – and you've covered the last one there of pc not developing heavy PTPs or somatics between sessions or in sessions.