

SEVEN CLASSIFICATIONS

A lecture given on
28 November 1963

Your applause is well received. Thank you. All right, what is the date?

Audience: November 28th.

Twenty-eight Nov. We're still in the month of the Russians. Your Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, AD 13. You notice that the daylight is fading and so forth. Daylight's fading, and that has nothing to do with the communist plot. They-purely coincidental that they never have any sunshine in Russia and so forth. I just wanted to reassure you. And the missiles-the missile situation is very good just now-very, very good just now. They used them all up on Guy Fawkes Day, so they have ...

I want to talk to you for a moment-this lecture's going to concern most anything. It's one of these potpourri type lectures of all ingredients that you can never realign in your notebooks; that you can never assign on a checksheet.

I wanted to-I ended your last lecture with a remark on classes-new classifications. And this might-you might find very, very interesting. And I'd better give you some rundown on this and so forth, because we're off for the long shoot now, you see? And I said that Scientology would go as far as it worked and not as far as it was administered and that I could have gotten very busy on administration many, many years ago and administered it out to some considerable distance and so forth. So administration, actually, while getting a great deal of attention, and many instances very ably done in general, has suffered for a concentration.

Because until you had the full technical picture, I suspected, all the way-we're not now talking about clearing; we're talking about all the way - until you had the full technical picture, you could not lay out the administrative picture, you see? And I just had a hunch without even thinking about it or articulating it, that it would be impossible to lay out the administrative pattern of Scientology, and all of its administrative angles and designations, without having clear-cut and across the boards, the technical data. And this is very fortunate that this came about and was done this way because the technical data turned out to be no pill that you took after breakfast or a sudden shot in the gluteus maximus to make you Clear or something or grow wings. It turned out to be a highly precise, fantastically coordinated activity at the highest levels. And it also turned out that individuals could not actually be audited at these levels unless they had been brought up to that point in gradients. And it turned out that this was the case.

I'll give you what I'm-what I'm talking about here, now. I think you will agree that this is it, because it's not only just at the highest levels; it also falls in at the lower levels.

Let's try to pull some missed withholds on somebody who doesn't know what one is. You say, „Has anybody missed a withhold on you?“ Well, you know what a missed withhold is. So you say, „Well, a missed withhold is a so-and-so and a so-and-so and it's a such-and-such and it's when you did this and when you did that, and so forth, and that is because of this and that. And then there's a double stimulus-response cycle in Scientology. It goes like this: The psychologist, you see, he thought that there was stimulus and response. And he thought there was one cycle: When you stimulated you got one response. That was the limit of his

thinkingness. If you pushed a button the button got pushed, and that was all he thought ever happened. And that's why psychology was limited, you see.

„But there is actually a second curve. You can't have in this universe a stimulus-response without getting a stimulus-response. So it's a double cycle, you see, and this is all very simple, but actually when you push the button - when you push that button-even though it only said „click,“ remember, when it clicked, it was a stimuli, and your ears or hearingness responded to the click of the button, didn't it? So when you pushed a button, you got one stimuli response, you pushed button, and then it clicked. Well, that was a stimuli to which of course you get a response yourself. So there are always, no matter how slight the situation is, you always have a second stimulus-response cycle going on for every stimulus-response.“

And the pc will sit there looking at you wondering ... Well let me assure you, the middle of an intensive is not a time to take up this information. You've thrown him a philosophic conundrum which has never before been propounded in the literature and philosophy of this planet-which is to say, you cannot act without consequences. That's a philosophic, see? There must be consequences for every action. The Buddhist ran up against this same thing and he answered it in an entirely different way. He said, the Buddhist said , Well, in view of the fact that you get a consequence for everything you do,“ he dimly understood this was the case, you see, he didn't articulate it, „why, you better not cause anything.“ And his answer to it is don't cause. In other words, the only way to avoid stimulus-response consequences of another stimulus-response occurring, is of course, start no stimulus-response mechanisms. Push no buttons. Do nothing. Cause nothing. And that was his answer to the situation.

Well, the world-and believe me, the chaps who are walking up and down the highways and byways and sitting in the palaces and at the-in the day of Gautama Siddhartha-were as reasonable, if not more so, at the raw-meat level, you see, than they are today. I mean, you've got the same breed of cat. There's no reason to downgrade the people he was talking to, you see. And he came to this conclusion and from that day to this the Buddhist, you see, tries not to cause anything. That was his solution to a problem.

Well, we have another solution to the problem, is you can audit it out. That's a much more forward method of doing so. But at what level is all this taking place? I'm afraid that you're really not talking to the man in the street. You must be talking to a trained Scientologist. And I don't think you'll even put this across at Level II. I think this is a Level III proposition, according to my new levels here. You get the-you get the idea? This is pretty profound, actually. It's the question of right conduct. Is it right to cause things? Can you really cause anything? If somebody gets into total chaos, he says-he gets this proposition, „Can you cause anything? Do you ever really cause anything?“ You find some birds wandering around, and they will tell you, well, by association, you never really caused anything. Because where do you find the start of the cause cycle? Of course the start of the cause cycle's very easily answered. The start of the cause cycle is where you say the cause cycle started. You just nominate it.

But you'll get this: And if you want to really throw somebody, say, „All right, take a rifle. All right, now, somebody gets killed. Now, if we examine this very carefully from a stimulus-response mechanism we find out that the trigger of the rifle-well, we say the rifle really killed somebody because that actually, you see, had the bullet and the powder and had the barrel to direct the thing, you see, and so it actually was the cause-point, wasn't it? It's obviously because it's the start of the cause-point, so your comm cycle there is cause-distance-effect; it naturally starts with a rifle.“

All right, the fellow comes along, and he says, „Well, this couldn't possibly be true because somebody squeezed the trigger. And therefore it was the impulse that squeezed the trigger that caused the rifle to fire, and therefore the finger was the start of the stimulus-response cycle.“ Somebody else comes along and he says, „No, that isn't so. It was the

thought, 'pull the trigger,' which caused the finger to pull and which caused the rifle to fire, so therefore the stimulus-response cycle takes place at the thought 'pull the trigger.'" And then somebody comes along and he says, „It couldn't be that at all, because obviously there was some motivation for this. It must have been the motive. The person thought that he had reason to do this. So therefore the reason he had to do this was actually the start of the stimulus-response cycle."

Somebody-behaviorist comes along, and he says, „No, that couldn't be the case-couldn't be the case at all because the fellow got that reason from his early childhood, and so forth. So actually what started the whole cycle was the person's early childhood, you see. People were mean to him or something of this sort, and they complained when he threw spitballs at them, you know. And so therefore, it was really his early childhood that caused this whole thing."

And the child psychologist comes along and he explains to you very rapidly that of course you can't just say something nebulous like „early childhood," you see, you must assign it to something. So therefore, whose influence was the greatest over him: was it his mother, or his father? All right, and they finally figure it out that his mother pulled the trigger with ... You see the nonsense we get into as soon as we start-well, actually, you just take anything in this universe, of course, is so tied in with the rest of the universe that you can just keep tracking back endlessly, and so on.

Fortunately for us there is a prime thought. And it's way back there on the track at the beginning of the actual GPMs and you could track all cause for the individual back to prime thought. Well, that's great. There is a stopping point somewhere. But without knowing that particular data the rest of this data gets very esoteric. And the philosophical conundrums which it gives and the number of humanitarian (quote) „sciences" which it gives birth to-genetics, behaviorist philosophies and so on. You can just start counting these things on the fingers of a five-armed wonder, see, and there's just lots of them. And you've got yourself a-you've got yourself a „Where did anything start?" And then you must then conceive that it must have started nowhere. See? Must have started nowhere and it was all out of everybody's control to begin with so you better not do anything about it.

Well, the people get so intrigued, you see, trying to trace this cause, this initial impulse for the stimuli back, that they never realize that that stimuli actually causes another stimuli cycle right in front of it. You squeeze the finger around the trigger of a rifle which then fires and there's going to be some repercussions. It might only be the recoil of the rifle, don't you see. But in actual fact the puller of the trigger is going to receive something from the act. It might only be the recoil of the rifle. It might only be the responses which-or pardon me, the stimuli which then start at the other end, which come back and hit the individual, don't you see? We've recently had a very gruesome example of this. I think in twenty-four hours the guy was dead. See? He fired a rifle and twenty-four hours later, boom, he's dead, you see - stimulus-response. Well, if he hadn't fired the rifle he wouldn't be dead. See, that's very interesting to examine from a philosophical standpoint.

All right. Now you get your overt act-motivator sequence. And now we can go into a whole bunch of other think-think on this thing. Did he get shot because he shot? Was it very involved? Wasn't it just that he delivered an overt of shooting and received a motivator of shooting?. Wasn't that just about what that amounted to? Or was it wider than this? Would the word „consequence" have to do with the moral values of his act? See, we can go into another big, wide perimeter of think, here, see. Moral values of his act, *dluhh*, so on and so on and so on. We can get awfully spread out.

Truth of the matter is you can't pull the finger of the rifle without receiving another stimulus-response cycle. It can't be done. In this universe it's impossible. Simply that. It doesn't matter if I ... Now, I'll give you an example.

We haven't said how much stimuli and how much response, don't you see; how much cause and how much effect, we put it into Scientology language. Now we take this E-Meter and now I am going to turn on the sensitivity-I mean, the on-off switch of this E-Meter, see? Now, listen. All right, that's fine. I turned it on, and then that click occurred at this particular point and it itself was a new cycle of stimuli which then I heard and impinged on my eardrum, see? I'm not talking about the seriousness of things. We're not even really talking about the comparable magnitude. We're certainly talking, however, about stimulus-response mechanisms are met with stimulus-response mechanisms.

A cause and effect cycle is always met with a cause and effect cycle. You can't have a cause and effect cycle without receiving a cause and effect cycle. Then it gets to be a contest of how tough are you and how much can you confront.

Therefore, what you cause is monitored only by how much you can confront. If you can confront getting shot, shoot. You see? If you can't confront getting shot, don't shoot. And actually, moral conduct would simply be only causing those things which can be confronted by those they're caused to. And there in Scientology is an actual route around the overt act-motivator sequence. There is an answer to this. Don't cause things others can't confront. This way you certainly minimize the stimulus-response stimulus-response curves.

You go around shooting people, you're liable to get shot. All right. Maybe this would be all right if you can confront getting shot yourself; maybe or maybe not, but that's a very first dynamicity proposition, let me assure you. Exclusively on the first.

The trouble is we do not live alone. You can go out and sit on a satellite for umpteen trillion years. Sooner or later you're going to-you're going to meet somebody else. Sooner or later. I can guarantee it. I've sat on some satellites and things for quite a few years. And sure enough, somebody always turned up. You wait long enough, somebody always turns up. That you've got a guarantee of, see?

Now, if we look over the proposition which is put before us here, we find out then that if you cause things which others can confront, or which others wish to confront and so forth, why, you lead a rather unstimulated existence. But if by your acts of omission and acts of commission are causing things others can't confront-that is to say it'd be greatly to their detriment if they even tried to confront them, such as of course, starting a war or something like this with its fantastic ramifications-if you set yourself up to be directly responsible for this particular type of cycle, why you can expect to get your head knocked off, that's for sure-eventually-even though you think you could confront it, you see?

You could say, „Well, I can confront all the effects of a war so therefore it's all right if I start a war.“ No, it's going to generate some effects you can't confront. Because you generated some effects they couldn't confront. The overt is generating effects which are unconfrontable. And the motivator is inevitably going to be the Generation of effects which are unconfrontable.

So you see, the limited first dynamicity view of, „Well, I can shoot somebody because I don't mind getting shot. Therefore it makes it all right if I shoot somebody.“ That doesn't hold good. Because actually the overt isn't shooting somebody, the overt is causing an effect somebody else couldn't confront. And the motivator of it is going to be the cause of an effect that you can't confront. I don't care, it might be some entirely different type of effect. But it'll be something you can't confront.

Well, that's the story of this universe. What's omitted from all this-that any given instant the thetan can get an idea totally independent of all other ideas. And that's what puts in randomness into the whole situation. And any given idea, any given moment, any given thetan can „think“ one, independent of everything else that's going on. Now the psychologist didn't believe this, so his work is limited. Other earlier philosophers didn't believe this. The idea was never really envisioned, which was independent postulation. He always thought you had to do it on association and they set you up a trap.

The old idea of you will always make gold-the alchemist joke-you will always make gold if you go to the top of a mountain at midnight, and you get on the top of this mountain and you take an old stump. And you put three pieces of lead in the stump and you say this charm over those pieces of lead, providing the phase of the moon is full. If you do not think of the word „hippopotamus“ the lead will turn to gold. You can see it now!

All right, somebody will always think of the word „hippopotamus“ because he's not supposed to. All right.

Similarly, they'll set up a proposition like this-they'll prove it to you conclusively. You cannot think of an independent thought. The reason you can't think of an independent thought, you see, is every time you try to think of an independent thought you will see that it is associated with some thought that has already been thought. Then they'll look at you smilingly like Cheshire cats, having set up the „hippopotamus“ mechanism, you see. And just leave you, in vain, struggling through trying to think of an independent thought that is not associated with any independent thought. Well of course, that's silly, because you are already in association by having the idea that you should think of an independent thought without associating it with any other independent thought, so that is the independent thought. You get the trickery and trappery involved in this kind of stuff?

Well, just because you could always do weird tricks with association is no reason association is a total all of everything. And association, the idea of association, you think of ice cream, you think of a hot day, you think of a child, see? Stream of consciousness, writers call it. And you think of a this and then you-cause that, you thought of a that, and everybody's got his life all dreamed up as all thoughts were consecutive to an associative base someplace or another which in itself didn't exist. So they don't ever look for a primary or independent base, therefore they start to predict human behavior in a very interesting and peculiar way. They predict human behavior along this particular line and say that it is predictable.

See, they want to predict human behavior so they never recognize that human behavior can be unpredictable as part of its prediction. Part of the prediction of human behavior is the fact that it is unpredictable. And the reason for that is any thetan, at any given time, in any given place, can get a totally independent idea all off his own bat, without any assistance from anything.

Now that's a rather weird and wild proposition which exists exclusively in the area of Scientology: that somebody can think an independent thought. Well, of course, you can prove to everybody conclusively that people can't think independent thoughts by telling them that any thought they think is associated so try to think of a thought now that is not associated with any indepen-with a-with a ... A guy will go, „Let's see, I can-all right, I'll think of that door. No, I couldn't think of that door because it's there and of course the fact that it's there made me think of to think of the door.“ You eventually go down scale. You say, „Well, I can't think of an independent thought.“

In other words, self-determinism of think is taken away from a person in this particular universe. And then we get up to the proposition, then, of how much think can a person tolerate. How much think can a person think he has „think“? We see that all the time in the overt-motivator sequence. We start running somebody on, „What have you done? What have you withheld? What have you done? What have you withheld?“ and that sort of thing, and they give you motivator, motivator, motivator, movitator, motivator. Motivator, motivator, motivator. You say, „What have you done?“ And they will say, „Well, I sat down here so you could ask me-I've done something to myself by sitting down here and letting you ask me these horrible questions.“ That's the overt, see? You'd be surprised. We've got quite a catalog around here of „overts“ that are motivators. We used to keep lists on them. Some kinds of questions that students would answer in a motivatorish fashion, see?

„Now, what have you done since you came to Saint Hill?“ don't you see?

„Well, I made myself come to Saint Hill and I've done something to myself so therefore that is an overt, you see.“

They go on this way by the hour And of course they're giving nothing but motivators, motivators, and not really answering the question. They're making it very reasonable, but they're really not answering the question. It gets worse and worse and worse and their tone arm will get stickier and stickier and they'll plow in harder and harder, see? Until all of a sudden they say, „Well, I did this and I did that and I pinched another student's biscuits and so forth,“ and all of a sudden they'll start coming up the line again, don't you see?

Well, this is concept of responsibility. So what is the relative concept amongst beings? Well, you find the fellow out there in the street, and man, it's all been done to him. This was the great appeal of Dianetics. See, it's all been done to you. Somebody tries to tell you Dianetics and Scientology are the same thing you might bring up this fact of responsibility. In Dianetics it was all done to you, and responsibility level of Scientology is „you done it.“ Makes Scientology relatively, not unpopular, but makes it higher toned. Somewhat different. But there is a difference between these two subjects. One concerns the mind and the interrelationships of mental image pictures and the other concerns the adventures of the human spirit. But man is a spirit; he is not an animal. These are entirely different subjects, if you want to look at it bluntly.

All right, so we are faced with a problem, then, of the tremendous popularity of irresponsibility: „It was all done to me.“ The individual then can conceive so easily in this universe that it was all done to him, that he never had an independent thought, that he never thought of anything that ever had anything to do with anything, that he himself never started an action. You'd be surprised. Kleptomaniacs are always pulling this as a defense: that the garment just moved off the counter and into their bag. And they actually say this, and people think they are joking. See, they don't realize that the kleptomaniac thinks that's what happened. He'll see his arm-he'll see this independent arm go up, and pick the article off the counter and put it in the shopping bag, you see? He sees this happen, very detachedly, see, he had nothing to do with it, you know? Arm comes up, arm comes up ...

The common criminal, the common criminal, knows at levels of responsibility which are quite interesting. They watch themselves do things. And they see these things have happened, but they know they didn't do it, that it's due and owing to some other factor or force that it occurred. They have all sorts of ideas. For instance, they think that everybody pretends that people own things. See, they know this-they know this is a lie, that everybody else knows is a lie, and that has been dreamed up everywhere, and that everybody has agreed on for one reason only: to get them.

To give you a slighter amplification of this, the fellow knows that nobody owns anything, you see, he knows that nobody really owns anything anywhere, but they have entered into a conspiracy which they pretend, See, they pretend that people think people own things. And this is done for only one reason: These other people pretend this to get them personally in trouble.

That is actually the thinkingness level of a criminal. That accounts for the little sly sneer you see on their faces sometimes. They know everybody else is just pretending that it was a crime. They can be gotten to just because everybody else pretends it's a crime, see? Everybody else is being very nasty to them. They say certain things exist, you see? And that's just to get them in trouble. These things don't really exist. And people believe these things just to get them in trouble. Courts and that sort of thing only exist-not because there is such a thing as crime-they just exist so that they can pretend outrageous and unreasonable things so that they can get this poor guy, you see, and they know that's the way things are. And of course, operating in that frame of work, why, they then have the total reality of the uncriminalness of all criminal acts.

Now, the police are going up against a mechanism of this particular kind and character in order to stamp out crime. Now that's one of the most remarkable situations in the world. The cop actually, they have rather widely, particularly in the US, borrowed a lot of our definitions with regard to crime. „Criminal can't work," criminal *rah-rah-rah*, that I wrote some little essays on at one time or another, and they've gotten about. I've heard them echoed back.

But they don't realize this horrible fact: That anybody they're arresting for stealing the car-the guy just overtly stole this car-the person that they are arresting would horrify them if they could look into his head and find out what he was really thinking. He knows, he knows, this fellow who stole the car, that the police are just a bunch of frauds. That the car really never belonged to anybody and that the police are fraudulently pretending that cars are owned in order to get the fellow who drove this one off in trouble. And that somebody else who owned the car is just pretending that he owned the car.

This is one of the reason MEST goes to pieces amongst criminals and so forth. They know nobody owns it. Doesn't belong to them; doesn't belong to anybody. This is a very fantastic frame of mind. Of course that's a total unreality; total this and that. Maybe at the highest levels and so forth, maybe it is kind of a joke that everybody owns everything-no-that anybody owns anything, and so forth. Nevertheless, these are the agreements upon which this society is built. And failure to recognize the rights of other individuals with regard to their zones and spheres of ownership is bound to bring about Chaos of magnitude. And to not respect those spheres of ownership, of course, is to sow overt acts that are just madness themselves. Nothing can operate.

Actually, communism gets a very accurate designation because it really believes, nationally, that nobody really ever owns anything. And of course they enforce it as a state. That's why it tends to attract so many hot rod criminals into its commissar ranks. And they got plenty. This idea is basically a criminal idea.

All right. Now let's go a little bit further than this. There, of course, is a very subnormal-subusual I should say-idea that is much below the social level. You're getting into ideas which are down into the bottom of the sewer, you see. They're way below what you would consider a normal. Now you're dealing, however, with what is basically a psychosis. „It's perfectly all right to kill people because they don't exist," is one of the homicidal characteristics of thought. „I didn't shoot him. I didn't shoot him." And one of the reasons he's basing this-"I didn't shoot anybody," he's more likely to say because, of course, the other person didn't exist, so therefore, you know, how could he have shot him? His reasonability-person will be lying there in a mass of blood and he'd say, „Well I-I didn't-I didn't do anything to anybody," see. Why? Because there was nobody there.

Everyone around that person is a figment of his own imagination and he recognizes the delusory nature of his own imagination which gives him a universe, which is quite interesting. But we are not talking, actually, now, in classification about such subnormal levels of thought, we're not talking about psychosis, we're not talking about neurosis. We're just talking about this guy out here in the street. And this boy out here, he's walking around, he has his own difficulties. The most common difficulty at this particular time and space common to most nations of the planet is that „it was done to them." This is pretty much the common denominator of their think. „It was done to them."

The way they are-as they are right now-is the way they are because something was done to them that made them that way. That is their big think about it. The responsibility for their state of beingness is exterior to their own control. They cannot control their own state of beingness; it's always exterior to them. I've-as a writer I used-my hair used to stand on end on one peculiar little phobia I used to have. I have just published a story or something like that and it'd be all over the newsstands and I'd be all swelled up on myself, something like this,

and-never seem to wear off, no matter how many stories you publish, you're always glad to see them, and-I don't know, it's probably a second dynamic manifestation-thetan's always happy to see his creations around, you know, for some reason or other.

And some fellow, you know, one of these lip-moving writers, you know, tongue in-held between his teeth, you know, and little stub of a pencil, and you know, fellow's-to sign his name, you see, or make out a bill or something like that, he'll say „Oh,“ he says, „I always wanted to be a writer. I always wanted to be a writer but the trouble was I didn't have the education.“ It always used to strike me as peculiar because not one fellow said it to me; this is a totally generalized remark. I heard it everywhere. It was inevitable that this remark would be made in the course of any conversation. „Oh yes, you're Hubbard. I saw one of your pictures recently,“ or something like this, see, or „I saw something or other“ and so forth. And you just wait for a moment, because here it came, you see. „I always wanted to write, but I didn't do so because I didn't have the education.“ You know, I never really figured out the pat response for that stimuli. I could be counted on to change the subject or to ask them how the weather was going to be or how their wives were or something of the sort. But it was almost inevitable.

This was, of course, from one point of view on one profession. But the generalization of this particular activity-it didn't mean that some of them wouldn't have written, don't you see? It didn't mean that they were being in contest with anything, it didn't mean they were probably doing anything but agree. But what I'm calling to your attention is it-the reason they didn't write had to do with their education. And this made to me, in the first couple of years as a pro writer, particularly stood my hair on end because all during that period of time I was hectically, fiendishly, frantically trying to jettison and throw overboard all of the education I had gratuitously and horrifyingly been given on the subject of writing.

I was writing in spite of very good training in this particular field. Almost killed me. By the time you get over all these instilled phobias from somebody else, you have a hard time.

Now, what's this mean? It means that in a little banal, ordinary type of conversation that didn't have anything to do with anything, somebody else had the responsibility. That person-person wasn't writing because they weren't writing or because they were too lazy to write or they didn't have time to write or they just weren't writing. They couldn't say this. It had to be an exterior stimuli of which they were the response. It had to be an exterior cause of which they were the effect. You bring up almost anything with the average being and he will always handle it in this fashion-ordinarily handle it in this fashion. And then he will say, „There's an exterior cause that - which I am the effect.“ His conversation.

If you want to-ever want to read letters exchanged by members of the American Middle West-those are the most educative letters on the subject of health I think I have ever really read. I've read lots of them at one time or another. I've seen lots of them around. For awhile I was so horrified that I had the fixation of the „you couldn't stand to look at it so you went and looked at it,“ you know, this kind of a fixation on the subject. And I'd see letters from Mrs. Johnson, you see, to Mrs. Brown-and Mrs. Brown in Sioux City was being told by somebody in Kansas City just the common news of the day, you see. And „Uncle Ralph, you see, has his lumbago and so forth and so forth, and they had to take poor Irma's blah-blah out the other day, and so forth,“ and it runs off this horrible medical catalog-the letter, you think of holding it up, you know, and the blood just drips off of one corner of it, you see, and the rest of it is unreadable because of the disease germs.

Effect-they're just fixated on the idea of effect. Causative, cause is just lost to this wide, greatest majority of people-anything causative. Now, one of the things which you err in when you try to disseminate Scientology is not estimating this exact aspect where it comes about on the-this mythical character-the man in the street. You don't estimate how much cause he is willing to be responsible for, see? You hit him at where you live, which is you're willing to be responsible for some cause, don't you see? Well, he's not willing to be

responsible for any cause; he's effect. Life has done it to him. If he had just been left a million dollars then he would be able to go down and look at the ocean once in a while himself. If he had-if he had-you see. If it hadn't happened to him that ... If his Uncle Snodgrass had not died then ... If... You see, he's effect, effect. He's telling you all the time, „I'm the effect of this horrible thing called life. I'm effect of all this trickery. I'm the effect of all this nonsense. I'm the effect of all these other things.“

Well, he gets into that mood quite honestly because, believe me, he *is* the effect of an awful lot of interesting things, you see? There's not some lack of truth in this, see? At any given instant, why, his boss can take a sudden dislike to him or something like that and he's out in the rain, don't you see? At any given instant, why, some bug comes walking down the boulevard, you know, and gives him a nip, and he's up there in the hospital with a four thousand dollar bill facing him, you see? Wild and horrible things can happen to this individual. He can be the effect of so many things that he actually can't think of himself as ever being cause of anything at all.

So you have some mother whose boy has gone zig-zag down the bad road, or something like this, and she can't think of herself as ever having any part of any of that, you know. Can't think of herself as having caused any part of it. Can't take responsibility for anything that ever happened to this fellow, you see? She'd take refuge in such things-all famous criminals' mothers, incidentally, almost uniformly say at the time the criminal is executed, „He was a good boy.“ It's just happened again in America. „He was a good boy.“ That's right. Oswald was a good boy. That was the adjudication of his mother.

See, they don't think any further than that, but they can actually go into an inversion of this and just try to deny all reality with regard to any of the existing situation. One doesn't say that she should take full responsibility for the matter, but why is she interested in being an effect of it if she couldn't cause it? And one of the errors which you make on dissemination, of course, is try to make the fellow take hold of any cause at all.

Dear old Peggy Conway told me one time or another, „I was going along in life,“ she says, „I was going along in life and I was doing all right and I was doing okay. I just knew that everybody else was the reason for all of my troubles and difficulties, and that I had nothing to do with it whatsoever at all, and I knew that if I believed in certain things and I acted in certain ways and so forth, then somehow or another I would get through somehow, not very well. And all of a sudden you come along and you tell me just, 'All right, stand out there in the open. Now stand on your own two feet. Now be responsible for what's going on in your life.'“ She says, „It was a horrible shock!“

'Tis, too! You just-but look. Look at how low this level is. Look at how low this level is. If you just intimated-this would be a gradient on it-if you'd just intimated, „There may be certain zones and sections in your existence which, if you think them over very carefully, you may find you have had a causative action in. If you think them over very carefully and sort them out, you may find that some zone of your life you have actually caused something.“ We don't say it very much. We say, „At one time or another you decided to read a book and you decided to read the book and your cause there was deciding to read the book, see.“

Well, perhaps they'd buy it on that. But ordinarily, if you just dump it on their heads, say, „Look you're responsible for everything that ever happened to you, what's really wrong with you is you've been doing so many weird things with your bank, and coming along and thinking of postulating this sort of thing and so forth, and moving on up to present time, and so forth, no wonder you're in a horrible condition, see?“ And they go „Uhhhhh.“ Well, they want to be an effect. That's the comfortable agony to be in. That's the most comfortable conceivable agony, is to be at the total effect point of all of existence.

Now, you take this fellow and you show him, or her, you show them this little, little bit, that-you show them there are a couple of rules in life. And you show them something or other, and they get a bit wiser suddenly. They look at these things. And then they apply a rule

or two of this. Well, you tell them about communication, ARC triangle, or something like this, if you've got them up that high, and they apply this. Or you show them how to do a Touch Assist, and train them up just like you were training a pro auditor, you see, until they could really stick there, and you know, „Feel my finger.“ You know? Do that Touch Assist real good. Give them a very disciplined run of a Touch Assist and so on.

And they all of a sudden are working on somebody one day and horrible shooting pain goes through the guy's skull and he suddenly snaps out of it and he's okay, see? Fantastic. He's caused something. The person who did that Touch Assist has caused something. Entering it philosophically, saying, „Look old fellow, you, in actual fact, are the cause of certain things in your life. Just to think it over.“ He might be able to pick this up on a think-think basis. But in actual fact he won't believe it. If you show him-if you show him that he can talk to his wife or he can do a Touch Assist on his friend, or something like this, it gradually starts dawning on him that he can cause something. He doesn't really wish particularly to look back that you're the one who taught him to do it because he is doing the action. And at that entrance-and he can cause an effect. And he realizes that he is causing the effect.

Now, people who are the most saddled with religious superstition are the hardest to bring out of this rut. Ireland was a terrible example to us in that particular line. Because the one lecture that laid a complete egg every week was the lecture which was devoted to creation. And of course this ran straight into the eighth dynamic and went up beautifully, exploded and fell to the ground in little bits and pieces because nobody could create anything. And finally, the Instructors over there got very clever, and they got up to a point of saying, „You could make a chair. Could you make a chair? Therefore, you have created a chair.“ And eventually it'd get around, it was heresy, don't you see? Utter heresy. God had created everything and therefore they could not have created anything without actually running into heresy.

It's the first time I noticed this principle at work. Actually, create is the wrong word to use. It's „cause.“ „Cause.“ Did they cause anything? And we wouldn't have had that much difficulty. But you can argue with the man for a long time as to what he can cause. You can process him in this direction and so forth, you might get someplace-would get someplace.

But you could be very philosophic and you could be very involved without making very much progress.

Can you cause anything? Do you cause anything? Ah. But the areas where he knows everybody fails are the areas of human relationship, communication, health, well-beingness-these particular areas. These are very desirable effects. These are effects that somebody else wants: good communication, feel better and so forth. All right. Well, he's then obeying this original rule that I gave you: „Cause only those effects which others can confront, or that want,“ see?

Now, you've given him that and then you give him some tools and train him up well in the use of these tools and let him find out that he can cause an effect. And you have snapped him out of this endless cycle of stimulus-response stimulus-response; everything has a consequence; anything you do you'd better not do anything because if you do do it then you'll get your teeth kicked in, therefore you better be very idle, therefore you'd better be nothing but an effect because your teeth have been kicked in already. Think-think-think, figure-figure-figure, does anybody ever really start an original action? See, all of these-all of these questions.

You see, the point is, it isn't these people are ignorant of philosophy, these people have failed in the field of philosophy. It's not that anybody doesn't want philosophy, they just don't believe it could exist anymore. You see, these men, out here on the street, we don't care what the savants up in the university are saying about matters of life and death, „. . . and is it true or isn't it true that eight needles can stand on the head of an angel.“ We're not interested

about any of their philosophic conundrums, we're not the least bit interested. Nor in their opinions, because they are not the living world. They're a pretty dead one, if you want to know the truth of the matter. I went into a university one time, dusted off a professor and talked to him for a few minutes. Put him back in his chair and left. I suppose he's there yet.

That's very, very cruel of me, actually. That particular university, they were very, very anxious to see me-they were very, very happy to see me because they'd been trying to write science fiction stories around there too, and they'd never made the grade. That's far from the totality of my writing, but that was why they were interested.

Anyway, these savants and their definitions and so forth seem to upgrade the field of philosophy to a point where it is an untouchable area. It's a plateau that nobody could ever ascend to. One must know propounding words and propound words like „telekinesis,“ and must be able to have an insight into the writings of Hume as *locked into* the writings of Locke, as modified by „he-couldn't“ Mr. Kant, see? And one must be able to give forth verbatim a whole page, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa of Lucretius, you see, without even pausing for colons, in order to be a philosopher. And actually this is their zone and area of philosophy and that isn't the zone or area that philosophy was ever designed for, that isn't the zone or area where it's ever bought, and it must be that they're studying some kind of dead philosophy that nobody wants for it to reach a plateau of this particular kind.

So it leaves the whole world open to this very, very marketable commodity called „philosophy.“ I say marketably, not for financial reasons, but everybody wants this thing. Because the philosopher, the fellow, is that little guy out in the street. Except he's failed in this particular field. He wants to know, vaguely, dimly, almost forgotten wanting to know it, „Who am I? What am I? What am I doing here? What are people? Where did this universe come from? What happens to me when I die? Where am I going? Why is it that you really can't succeed in life here? What is tha-what happens to people? Why don't they like me? What is the truth about *raow*.. .“ And actually, some circuitry in the head of every skull on this planet, and the guy himself, is going around at some low level, saying those exact questions. And those are the basic questions of philosophy. And that philosophy hasn't answered them has put it on a plateau so that everybody can pretend that philosophy has answered it, but can't ascend to the plateau to find out.

The greatest defeat philosophy ever had was Immanuel Kant saying, „Oh, well, there's the knowable and the unknowable and some things are so unknowable that nobody ever knows-is going to know them and so forth. The unknowable is just unknowable and that's all.“ That's insanity, man! Will you please explain to me how he would ever find out there was an unknowable if nobody could ever know about it? And as far as religion is concerned, and its answers, are very unsatisfactory, because „God made everybody.“ That's a wonderful thing. I mean, it doesn't take any time at all to say it, „God made everybody,“ see. And people go running around with this one, „God made everybody, God made everybody,“ you know, that's wonderful. Glib. Prime cause is announced right there, bang. Ecclesiastical councils can sit around and propound this for thousands of years, don't you see? „Boy, are we learned! Marvelous!“ Learnedness here goes out by the ream and they say it in Latin with organ music. Awful waste of good organ music. Anyhow, what this all adds up to here-what all this adds up to-is one question from a little child can puncture the whole thing. Little child says, „Who made God?“

So, we go on this stimulus-response track looking for answers, forever, you see, and we're just on an endless treadmill. Of course we come to no full stop until we realize that every being is an independent being who is himself capable of expressing a thought or intention independent of all other thoughts and intentions at any given instant. As soon as we recognize that every individual is capable of himself being causative, we have no, no slightest approach to answers. We can't answer anything. But as soon as we accept that as a basis for action, a basis for thought; as soon as we realize that it's the degree that an individual can

accept or execute causation independent of other influences that brings about his state of case, we then have cracked the whole riddle of philosophy. There's nothing left to philosophy to be stupid about.

Now, if we introduce physics into it and say all things are relative to all things in a time stream, and the time stream is invariable and uneradicable, and so forth, we've already accepted our distance into a prime thought. We're that far from prime thought. We've already postulated time. Now, of course, you're on the treadmill of „you must never be able to escape this time.“ So all things happening in the past must influence all things that happen in the future and then everything is inevitable and let's all go down and die quietly in the barn together. See, I mean, that becomes utter nonsense.

As soon as we got a time stream, don't you see, then all befores influence all afters, and then we can prove, because the time stream exists, that nobody can be cause. Until we realize that the time stream is capable of postulation. A time stream can both be caused and escaped from. And if this is possible, then of course, we get another higher level of cause.

So, I tell you-listen to me now-the only thing I'm giving you all this about-you might find it useful, you might find it entertaining. In the field of dissemination it might give you some answers-you say to somebody, „All right, now you realize that you're the cause of this bad marriage. Now just be more causative and straighten out the bad marriage,“ see? Bloomm! That isn't just an error; that's an ARC break. That is so far from this individual's reality on the subject, you see? So you might have some answers to dissemination along in this particular line, but what I'm trying to tell you here, what I'm trying to tell you here, is the basis of classification.

Now, we've had-gotten a lot of technology, and technology is very valuable, and anybody tried to swallow it all off one spoon he'd get an awful bellyache. There's one rule about it, by the way, there's one rule in dissemination-before I leave the subject of dissemination, I will give you one little tip on the thing: If you only tell people things about Scientology that you yourself have an excellent reality on and have experienced, you'll find you'll just communicate like a shot to almost anybody because your R-factor in you is so high that you cannot help but put it across to others. It's an interesting rule in dissemination. You'll hear more of this later. And it probably could be stated much more aptly than I have just stated it because I haven't worked it over at all for a good statement, but it's just more or less that. If you talk to people about things that you yourself have an excellent reality on-and the best way to have a reality on it is of course to experience something-well, you'll find out you'll communicate like a bomb, and nobody ever doubts you then. They say, „This Scientology's wonderful, wonderful stuff. I mean the fellow and so forth just look at him, you know, and there he is,“ and so on.

I was very interested at a level of reality that Charles in here, my man there, he's an old sailor, and he'd been everywhere and done everything, you know, and so on. He met somebody up in a pub and some student or other had not really acquainted this fellow with the facts of Scientology. And he was able to communicate to this person and he had this person swinging over from their bunch of bums and rats over in no time. He actually was unconsciously applying this rule. He said, „Well, I've been down at Saint Hill,“ he said, „for several months, and I feel much better.“ That was his total argument in selling Scientology. „Been down at Saint Hill for several months and I feel much better.“

I think that you-I think that you will consider this an interestingly mild little piece of dissemination. But in actual fact that was his reality. See? He does feel better for having been down here for several months, see? But that, of course, carried fantastic conviction. It was just like a bullet. That was his total reality on the subject and he just delivered it across and that was all there was to it. It arrived with complete truth because it was complete truth from its point of origin. Don't you see?

It isn't the startling thing you say; it's the real thing you say. And it isn't whether or not it's real to the fellow you're talking to but whether or not it's real to you. You'd be surprised how well you could communicate if you had a wart in your left ear at one time and you had some processing and it disappeared. Tell this person all about this wart disappearing, you know, and they say, „Scientology's a good thing, you know, and you're a good communicator, you know, you're really talking.“ Sounds wild, see.

Or maybe, „I had a-I had a-I used to worry all the time, I used to worry all the time about whether it was a good or bad thing, or I'd been a bad boy for not going to church. And I don't worry about that now.“ The guy's-a benefit he's had, see. And the fellow hearing it at the other end will.

„What do you know!“ You'll find out it'll arrive in every case with terrific impact.

By the way, this was called to my attention by people talking about things on which they had no reality, and I suddenly got a codification of exactly how you could talk to somebody with a total reality. I thought that was helpful. People don't often tell me things that are helpful, but that one did.

All right, in this other particular-that's enough of that. I want to tell you about this classification scale. Because it does-I've had to work it out one way or the other and I've seen the necessities for it and so forth. But all a classification scale is, is willingness to accept cause over one's destiny and that of others. That's all a classification scale is. It's a scale of willingness to accept cause over the-one's own destiny and that of others. Be at cause, in other words; degree of being at cause.

Now, of course, down scale, madmen get into an obsessive „cause,“ you know. And every once in a while somebody will come along and consult me on the fact that he has to have processing because he's got to take over control of England, or something of this sort, and wipe out Europe, you know? It doesn't seem to me to be very real. Then we try to find out if the guy can remember what he ate for breakfast and we find out he can't. So this, of course, is susceptible to various reinterpretations. But in actual fact, you could get it every time just by a test of O/W. What is the fellow-what has he done and what has he withheld?

Now, of course, this of course is also susceptible to misinterpretation, because some fellows have done horrible things and they tell you these things without any responsibility whatsoever. But there you are merely looking at a lack of social sense. We are not discussing, however, how you measure this. We are not discussing how you measure this. We're just giving it to you as the basic formula on which classification is founded.

And cause is not expressed in actions in life but in case responses. You understand? It's cause over, or in, one's own case, that we are discussing. We're not ask-talking about the person being causative in various zones and dynamics and areas. We're just talking about his level of responsibility in his own case level. Now a lot of these factors can shake out, and they can actually be plotted. A person of very high levels of responsibility has certain abilities and perceptions, mentally, which are very evident. They're quite evident. They're processing of one kind or another. These-you only get fooled with these for lack of experience.

Some fellow who apparently never ARC breaks may be totally incapable of assuming cause. See, he never ARC breaks. He's a very quiet, good pc, but never makes any case gains, see, unless they're very carefully processed. And you don't realize this until after a while you see that this case is not making any progress whatsoever; his level of cause is not increasing or improving. And he eventually may come up to a point where he will ARC break. This is your propitiation case, of which you are well acquainted. Always tell the auditor in a sort of a sad-looking-from a sad-looking eye-about his case, „Oh, yes, I made some good results in-session, thank you,“ so on. You hear him afterwards saying, „Well, yes, he isn't so good, but I have to be nice, you see.“ It's all sort of washed out. I've even seen a propitiative manic the like of which you never saw, you know. Process the person, gets no better, gets no tone arm action, nothing of the sort, and at the end of the session, you know, tell you brightly, „Oh, it

was a wonderful session! A wonderful session!“ and so forth. But these are just variations of lower harmonics of the same thing. People make progress in processing or they don't. And you quickly get so that you can plot up a case as to whether or not that case is doing well under processing or isn't doing well under processing.

Let's take one level of case that can't sit still and answer an auditing question. That's a pc manifestation in processing. You say, „Do fish swim?“ and they say, „*Whooo*“ wiggle, wiggle off and so forth, cans raow and so forth. „Yes.“ And you explore it afterwards, they answered the auditing question, and they were answering the question, „Is any sun coming in the window,“ you see. I mean, this thing is all disconnected and they really never answer the auditing question and they never seem to get any this; they never seem to get any that.

And they don't get over this. They don't get over this manifestation. In other words there's no change. One of the ways you tell this is they always set the same goals. You can look over goals lists, and when an individual starts setting the same goals session after session after session after session after session, this individual is not making any progress in processing. It's one of the ways you tell. You want to look for the ARC break session and so forth. You look at the goals set in that session and set in the next session. And violent changes between these two things-not a gradient change, but a violent change-will denote that that was the session in which you should look for the ARC break. And then you see what was done in that session and you can straighten the case out accordingly by inspecting the goals for the session.

All of this is very interesting, but it means that a case under processing follows up a rather smooth, steady gradient. Cases do not leap up suddenly. What the case is doing is becoming more at cause over matter, energy, space, time, forms and other beings. And the individual is assuming greater and greater cause. He isn't being necessarily more causative, he is simply assuming greater cause and he's more capable of cause. We aren't asking him to throw bricks around and keep them hoisted up in midair at a glance. We're asking him whether or not he would be *willing* to do this, don't you see? Would he-willing to cause that?

But it actually is not even the-not even the single act that we're interested in. It's just he is more causative. He can handle his mind better. As he handles his mind better, he is more capable of handling other things around him better, and so forth. And his responses in processing are your very best possible indicator. This is not, then, a quick test so it tends to be neglected. And you actually have to process somebody for a while to find out if they're making some progress in processing. You can't take some fellow, and in the absence of his case folders and in the absence of everything else and so forth, just suddenly test whether or not he can do this, do that, and the other thing. It would be nice and maybe we could devise a set of tests of this character that would give you a good index.

However, they don't exist. You can, however, take somebody's case folder and find out how he was last year and how he is this year. That would make a marked jump, or somebody has had two or three hundred hours of processing and how was he before these two or three hundred hours of processing, how is he now? Well, that jump is big enough so that he knows and so forth, and you actually have to plow around for a little while to find out how he was two or three hundred hours ago because it's all negative gain.

The things that were wrong with him, two or three hundred hours ago, are not wrong with him now and so are not occupying any attention as far as he's concerned. And sometimes a fellow would have to sit there and think it over for quite a while to tell you if he's made any progress or not. But he has.

Case progress. Case progress. That is a direct index of cause. Take this fellow out here in the street, this common fellow, he's totally going to be an effect of everything. He wants to be told he's an effect of everything and so forth. Wrong thing to do is tell him to get causative. The right thing to do is to give him a little training and give him some tools, which when he applies them will demonstrate to him that he is now a little bit more at cause. Now he

finds this out, and in the course of being processed and processing, he becomes more and more causative. He comes up higher and higher. He can accept more responsibility. Life in its zones and areas does not find him as a puppet or a marionette dancing at a set of strings, he's likely to have snapped a few of the strings, you see, or he's likely to stand still when somebody shakes the crossbar.

In other words, he's moved up to that degree. He's become more causative, therefore he's less of an effect of life. And these things are the things on which this class scale is drawn. That's all. That is the index, one to the next, within the ramifications of the things I've given you here as indexes as to how to measure it and that sort of thing.

You don't realize how far you've come, you see, until you get ahold of Joe Blow out here someplace working in a garage, and try to ask him if fish swim. Now that's not a particularly educated process or another. Let's not ask him a process. Let's just ask him if he has any problems, and listen to some of his answers. This is quite interesting. Fascinating, what he considers a problem. What is bedeviling his days and so forth. It's horrible. I mean, the fellow is living in a madhouse, from his viewpoint, don't you see?

All right, you just tell that fellow, be more causative, and that sort of thing, and he's not likely to love you for it. But if you can bring him up the line and you can teach him a little bit about processing, you can teach him a little bit, and you can get him processed and work back and forth at a very, very low level of processing, you see, why, he will assume more cause. And at that time he's quite capable of assuming enough cause to assume a new level of processing others and being processed. And when he's completed that he would be at another level where he was quite capable of assuming a new level of causativeness and being able to handle processes at that particular level. And so on up the line, all the way to OT.

This gives us, essentially, seven classes. And these seven classes are in actual fact eight. Now, you think we went up to the eighth dynamic, but we didn't—we went down to zero. There is a zero classification and that's the person who isn't classed. So you see, you have an unclassified class that you can refer to as Class 0, and seven classes, which makes the statement I gave you in the first place quite accurate. But in actual fact there's another class. That is the unclassified.

Now, if you wanted to be very precise about this thing you would say that a person who was a Class 0 was higher than an unclassified person, if you wanted a person who had never heard of Scientology at all, and wasn't in any direction whatsoever, you could maybe call that „unclassified,“ or something, to differentiate. Actually, we haven't really got any word for that but „raw meat.“

But an unclassified person, a Class 0 - however that gets divided up - finds the person putting his rung on the ladder when he leaves Class 0 and becomes a Class I, HAS. This certificate is restored for good and adequate reasons that it's a different route now than a Book Auditor route.

Class 0: A person could be a Class 0 and have a certificate which had not yet been classed, don't you see, because he's only classed by the classification, not by the certificate. He can have a certificate without being of that class. That's important because in training activities, you will have a certain number of people who absolutely get their hearts utterly broken if they do not get a certificate or something to show they have been there and worked at it, and they've tried and they've passed their checksheets and they've done what they could. And all of a sudden you turn around and say, „We're going to give you no recognition for all the work you've done.“ Well maybe it was ten times as much work as somebody who did pass it all, don't you see. But we've done nothing for this chap.

So therefore, we make the certificate—the piece of paper—the certificate is inevitable for the completion of a certain course of study. But it doesn't make it inevitable that the person would be of that class. They would remain in the class they were in until they have their classification requirements met. Classification requirements, absolutely cut and bang, right

on. No monkeying with it. No fooling about with it. You'll find out then that you can hold your classification requirements much more tightly if you do not try to hold your piece of paper certificate requirements so tightly. You understand?

Nobody will argue with you, particularly, you're training some people - you're training some people up through Class 0 and I. All right, you're going to give them a certificate when they're Class 0. They're Class 0 and they completed a certain course of study and that sort of thing, and there they are with a Class 0 certificate which is HAS, but it hasn't got any class on it. They can still run those processes that they were permitted to run at Class 0, which is practically everybody processes, and the Class 0 level of processing is a Touch Assist. See, he can do a Touch Assist. He can do something of that level of process at Class 0. Nobody really requires anything very desperate of them to do so, don't you see?

Now Class I becomes itsa. Now we've got itsa for Class I. That's the process of the class. Just to give you-just as a-not necessarily total final processes that belong to these classes, but it'll give you an idea of this gradient. Itsa is processes; they're Class I.

Repetitive processes: „Recall a communication,“ that sort of thing, normally the first processes taught in an Academy course. But this tremendous panorama of repetitive processes, they're not complicated beyond repetitive. They're not even complicated with a meter, don't you see? They'll have a meter at this stage, but mostly for reading the tone arm action. The meter is not significant at this level. And that is a Class II, with the repetitive process. And they get all of those old-time repetitive processes that are way back. They're strung out across the years and they're so valuable and that have done so fantastically workhorse a job, don't you see? They all belong in that particular class.

And we relegate missed withholds and overt/withhold processes and all Prepchecking, to Class III. That's missed withholds, O/Ws, Prepchecking, that would be Class III. I have learned by experience that it's pretty hard to teach a meter with great accuracy in an Academy and so forth. It leaves a lot to be desired. So it had better be grooved up into its own class, and that sort of thing. Well, they're taught about a meter in the Academy in a cursory fashion. This is the tone arm, this is how you switch it on and off. But the real hammer and pound on meters comes in here at Class III. They really start using meters at this level. And they can prepcheck. And at Prepcheck levels of course you've got tremendous numbers of processes again. This carries with it a little bit of an assessment. Not much of an assessment, but enough assessment to carry through in these things. You can find out what was the principal problem of this guy's existence, and then prepcheck the old HGC twenty-five-hour intensive. All of those processes belong in this thing.

See, here's what's funny, it's this whole thirteen years of research is suddenly coming alive before your eyes. It is not just deserted and neglected and lying there never to be seen again and your skills will never again be used. As a matter of fact, that stuff had value, value, value. What's happened to everybody is they followed the research line up, you see. And they moved on up, and tried to move up to the top of the research line doggedly with their tongues hanging out, and that sort of thing. And in many instances have actually never gone through thoroughly any one of these levels as they came on up.

Therefore they get to the higher grade and they find the door barred. They actually never completed one of these lower steps. And they get up to the upper level and they're moving like the dickens with the research line and it has unsettled them to that degree. That doesn't mean we're just throwing everybody into Class 0 either, I'll take that up in a moment. But this is essentially what happened. But there's tremendously valuable processes lying back along those lines. There's fantastic things have been done, in times. Well, the old „Hello Mama,“ for heaven's sakes. You take a guy with a toothache and have him say hello and okay to it, have the tooth say hello and okay to him for awhile, and the most remarkable things can happen.

In other words, there's all kinds of processes-tons of them lying back along the line-and they fit into these various slots just as they were, you see, and grouped up and made neat. But just as they were. There's no vast reformation or change what the process was. You'll find, for instance, Class II will be studying a comm lag on comm lags of equal length, as to when to end the process. Remember those old ones, you see? All that stuff is all back in action, see.

Anyhow, here's Prepcheck at Class III, and service facsimiles and assessments, and doing assessments and supervising the doing assessments and all that sort of thing, service facsimiles, all of that kind of work, you know, assessment-real heavy assessment work-and so forth, belongs at Class IV. In anything we've ever assessed or done, except 2. I don't think I'll ever let anybody run 2-12. 2-12 was interesting training ground, it taught people a lot of things and so forth, but in running a case I have found out that 2-12, of all the processes we had, was itself about the only one capable of pulling an RI out of place in a GPM. Process just has just a little bit too much smoke to it. It's just a little bit too hot. Because I've refound misworded 2-12 RIs in running a case to OT. And I found them, man. They were sitting right there and they had an RI pulled out of line. The case jammy at that particular point. In other words, it's just too powerful a process, it just reaches a little bit too deep into the case. So just skip your 2-12, and 2-12A and so forth, they don't fit in this hierarchy at all.

But there are tremendous numbers of assessment processes even so. And they were the old processes of the Prehav Scales, and you assess people on the Prehav Scales and ran brackets and all this kind of thing and so forth. Well, they belong-they're terrific, you know-and they belong at this level of IV-Class IV.

Now, Class V: implants, the whole track, case analysis-all that sort of thing-running implants for practice and so forth. Class V. You don't just run implants for practice. You can make considerable case gains from running implants. What we now call R3R and so forth can swing in at that particular level. But R3R might as easily go into service facs so I haven't made up my mind about that, don't you see? Might crowd the level too much. We might be able to put engram running as an old process, you see-it was a wrapped up process; we ought to preserve it. So it goes at one or the other of those two classes, and I won't tell you at this time which one it goes in.

But implant running, definitely, definitely. Implant GPMS, that sort of thing, at V. And your present, what you're calling now, R4 material-and it was R3 material, now R4 material-goes to Class VI. That is the actual running of actual GPMs for OT goes to Class VI. And then at VII we have old Route One with frills-thetan drills, so forth.

Now these, by the way-just in rapid summary and review-these, by the way, will have certain designations for classes. For instance, there are three types of pin that give this type of thing. There's the small „S“ and double triangle, which is your normal thing and that serves in your earliest classes, the first two or three classes, you see, just have that plain „S“ and double triangle, don't you see? But it has a little enameled plate in the middle of it. I don't know if you've seen the release pins that were issued at one time or another. But a little disc there, which is a colored disc in the middle of the „S“ and double triangle with a Roman numeral on it. Of course with Class 0, they can wear that, but it's-the circle itself makes a zero. But your Class I of course has a Roman numeral I on it.

Now there's a color scheme brought up the line for each one of these classes, for designation, and it has in addition to that-your second type of pin covers the next two or three classes, got a small circle around the „S“ and double triangle with the colored plate in front of it and the class number on it. And then the large circle-a great big circle around the „S“ and double triangle-for the very upper classes on the thing. Just to get everything neatly in line. I'm just reading that, not to sell you some pins, because they'll probably be given to you. But just to give you an idea of how far the planning goes and this sort of thing.

Your-certain certificates will move on up the line. We'll probably reactivate every certificate we've ever had. You know, there's certain designations were dropped out. There was an Hubbard Advanced Auditor at one time or another, and so forth. Exactly how we pattern these certificates against these various classes, we're going to have some certificates, that's all. Going to try to follow this.

Now, exactly what is happening? Exactly what is happening here? Of course, your key main certificates of Hubbard Professional Auditor and HGA and so forth, those things are definitely preserved. But we may have to fill in some slots here in order to keep this thing neat.

Now, we've got the-the whole situation here, what we're trying to do, is we're trying to open a bridge. If anybody says to you, „You see, they're getting class-conscious“ yeah, you bet we're class-conscious. It's a limitation and scope of processes. And an auditor should be audited inside his class only. And he should be audited by auditors of his class only. An auditor should not be audited outside of his class. Perfectly all right for somebody in practice - we're not trying to knock people in the head for processing for fees or something like that, and we're not particularly interested in whether or not some Class IV or something audits some people of lower classes and so on. But if he audits them outside their class levels, he will be hearing from me. Because he's not going to make a case gain with them.

This is an effort to graduate cases up the line and I have found out that they do not advance further than they are trained. And it's an effort to advance cases up the line to-and a preparatory step level with information and skill and auditing availability, right straight on up the line. And the way we've got it rigged right now, people don't know where they are, they don't know where they're going, they don't know what's expected of them. We've got professional preclears from 1950 standing around waiting for somebody to process them to OT, don't you see? And bless these people, they have been of benefit to many of us in many ways. But at the same time I notice their cases aren't running much better than they were running. I consider this quite interesting. It's because they've never really learned anything. They've hit a certain ceiling, and the door is barred.

Well, this is an effort to bring people all the way through all the way up the line. So that makes it easy then. You take an HCA, HPA level process, this fellow then, yes, what's he going to do? Is he going to process people? Well, he wants to process people, that's all right, and we're not going to raise any devil with him about processing people. But we're going to expect him to train Class 0 and we're going to expect him to be able to award Class I. And we expect him to do just those things and we expect him to do that to people and expect him to get them to co-auditing with one another, at those levels of process, and teaching them to do the things necessary for those particular levels.

And then we expect those people to go and get themselves a real fast training course, and be able to answer up. We're not asking for vast lengths of time in training, because you notice there are more courses involved here, so they can afford to be shorter courses. And so the fellow can get himself a piece of training of some kind or another and make sure there's someone in his neighborhood and so forth that's also trained and he winds up with somebody to audit with. In other words, we're not trying to cost somebody a fortune to get up to OT, because if he's laying out the money to buy all the processing necessary to get to OT, he'll never get there on educational basis alone and it's going to cost him a fortune in order to get there. Whereas by audit inside your class, the guy will inevitably eventually get there.

Why? Because his auditing isn't limited. He can have unlimited quantities of auditing. He normally will get auditing as good as he gives. So therefore it's of very, very great interest to him to be as good an auditor as he possibly can be. Otherwise nobody will audit with him. I mean, it isn't whether or not I say so! You see what I mean?

All right. Well this opens the door, and this opens the channel all the way up and by giving these classes, we're not interested in whether or not we're class-conscious, we are

extremely interested, however, in people knowing where they should go and what they should do next.

We're going to give you a chart very, very soon which carries all of these classes and all of the processes and training skills of each class. And sometime after that, much, much more distant than that, we will have a textbook for a class, and a question-and-answer book for the class, and so forth, all the way up. And that will be a very, very neat package indeed.

In other words, there's the whole road, it's all laid out, and the person can go from this level to this level to that level to that level to that level, that level, and they can move on up the line. Well, it'll take some of them ten, twelve, fifteen, twenty years. What's the hurry? They've been in this universe this long, we got the gate open, why should we expect them-why should they expect to kill everybody in the rush, don't you see? Well, it's no leisurely, leisurely proposition whereby we're simply saying time isn't valuable or something like that, it's just what can they do within the framework of this? Well, possibly somebody could go all the way through this. There's a possibility that somebody could go all the way through this in about eighteen months or two years, you know, just flat out, all the way. Somebody could go through this. But in any event it would take him that long.

Look at us. It's taken you years, it's taken me years, and so forth. You suppose somebody's going to better that? No, I don't think so. The stuff that got bred in the bone in you as a Scientologist on your way along the line, you've still got at your fingertips and that sort of thing. And you're rather surprised-some Johnny-come-lately and you say, „Well, what he needs is some Op Pro by Dup. That - I think that . . .“ And the fellow says, „Huh?“

„Oh, yeah, well, that's a process, you know, Book and Bottle.“

„Huh?“

No latch. He missed it someplace along the line. And you'll find big gaps and holes and stuff like this and actually his duplication is terrible and it's just a hole in the fence. And his case will leak out through that hole; he won't go on up.

Now, this gives us, this gives us in essence then, a ladder that can be climbed, a line that can be followed and it tells people where they can go to the next step. It puts auditors in the picture all the way on up the line. And rather than knock everybody in the head, we're toying with exactly what we are going to do with the pre-1963 Scientologist. And we've had under discussion a title or designation, a type of class for this particular individual. Having lived through the period, this us-see-why, he's permitted a certain amount of liberty and scope in that zone and benefit of the information which has been developed while he's been coming along the line. In other words, we aren't leaving these people out in the dark or throwing everybody back to 0. That's not the point.

But we are pulling this foul and terrible trick-this horrible trick. I say „we.“ That's because I don't want to be that causative just now. I'm halfway through a bank and I'm not being causative at the moment. It's I don't want individuals to get pitched out on their ear, but I do think in all fairness that people whose classifications exist as of now should not particularly be changed until they've earned them. Now that's a horrible blow to some people, but I-my candid opinion is, is they're not doing too well with the material which lying right under their hands and it gives them a chance to catch their breath, and level out at their particular level that they are in, catch up a little bit, get themselves oriented and move on up the line. I think it would be unfair to them.

I think anybody right now, out in the field, running what we have been calling R4, is going to fall on his silly head. I just don't think he can do it. I just don't think he can do it. It's-I don't care if he was even trained some on it here, he just isn't going to do it, that's all, he isn't going to make it. It's a very, very precise piece of technology. This is awe-inspiring, man, I'm not trying to tell you how horrible or how hard it is. I'm just saying it's horrible and it's hard. This is a rough piece of cake to try to get down. And the Instructors around here right now are just getting their hands in on the line on this, and trying to pin this down. Oh

man, if a Saint Hill Instructor's having trouble with this one right now, I don't expect anybody out in north Poughkeepsie is going to be having a good time of it. Do you?

So I think it'd be unfair to throw the class level up on everybody around the thing, but there'll be a certain latitude in this particular lineup. Some of the HCAS, HPAS, perforce will have to be classed to Class II, and so forth. Well, that means that you're pretty lucky right here and right now. You will get, of course, the class that you have earned.