

6311C28 SHSpec-324 Seven Classifications of Auditing

Scientology will go as far as it works, not as far as it is administered. Therefore, LRH has focussed on full technological development first, with the administrative picture to come later, when the technical data was completed. The administrative pattern could not be let out without having the technical data together. The tech data turned out to be an account of a highly precise, coordinated activity. It turned out that people couldn't be audited at high levels unless brought there gradiently. This turns out to be true at lower levels too. People have to understand what is being asked.

There is always a repercussion to any stimulus-response cycle (or cause-distance-effect cycle), the response being a new stimulus-response (cause-distance-effect) cycle. So every stimulus response cycle has a return stimulus response cycle, where the first response acts as the second stimulus. The philosophic conundrum is that you cannot act without consequences in this universe. The Buddhist answer to this conundrum is, "Cause nothing." [I.e., by not building up Karma] We have another solution: audit it out. But only a trained scientologist will grasp this. The questions of "What is right conduct?" and "Can you ever really cause anything?" come up here. If you try to trace back the cause of something, you can get into difficulty. Say a guy is shot with a rifle. You can try to trace back the cause to the finger tightening, to the thought or intention behind this, to the motive, to early childhood, to mother, ad absurdum. To solve the problem of where cause started, you could say it started nowhere. But that doesn't really solve anything.

People get so interested in the cause end of the cause-distance-effect line that they never look for the other end. They never look to see what cause comes back from the effect point. For instance, Oswald fired a rifle, and twenty-four hours later he is shot dead. "A cause-effect cycle always leads to a cause-effect cycle." There is room for lots of think about it, but one simple fact applies in this universe: you can't cause something without receiving some sort of effect in return, in this universe. The magnitude of the effect may differ. There is the question of how much you can confront. How much you cause is monitored only by how much you can confront. If you can confront getting shot, shoot. Moral conduct would consist of only causing those things that could be confronted by those to whom it is caused. That is a route around the overt-motivator sequence: [Cf. the "two rules for happy living" in Scientology: A New Slant on Life, pp. 23-28.] [Cause only what others can confront." If you do this, you lead a rather unstimulated life. If you are causing things that others can't confront without great detriment, such as starting a war, you can expect to get your head knocked off eventually, even though you think you could confront it. An overt is the generation of effects that are unfrontable, and the motivator will be someone causing an effect that you can't confront. That is the story of this universe.

Self-determined thought is "not permitted" in this universe. The message of this universe is "All thought occurs by association." But this is not true. What is omitted from this is that at any moment, a thetan can get an idea, totally independent of all other ideas, by an independent postulation. [Not by stimulus-response; by prime motion.] That is what puts randomness into the whole picture. Psychologists and earlier philosophers didn't believe in independent postulation, or they missed it. Lacking independent postulation, there is a trap. They will argue that you can't think of an independent thought because whenever you do, you will find that there is another thought with which it is associated. In trying to disprove this, you go into agreement with it, so you can't disprove it. This is the old "hippopotamus" mechanism: "Don't think of the word, 'hippopotamus'," was part of the alchemists' formula for the transmutation of baser elements into gold. [Cf. the "Think a thought" process, in PAB 54, pp. 2-3.] People want to predict human behavior, so they never look at the fact that human behavior can be unpredictable and take this datum into account as part of their predictions. This denial of the human being's ability to be unpredictable takes away self-determinism of think in this universe.

Now we get up to the question of how much think a person can tolerate. Running overts on the man in the street, we get motivators instead of overts, all put forward as “overts on self”. This relates to the concept of responsibility. The man in the street thinks that it is all being done to him. That is why Book One has such appeal. In scientology, the emphasis is on “You done it.” Thus scientology has a higher responsibility level than dianetics. This makes scientology higher-toned. However, it is harder to attract people to scientology, on that account, than to dianetics. Irresponsibility is very popular. People prefer to think that they never started an action, that they never really caused anything.

This relates to the thinkingness of a criminal. The criminal “knows that nobody owns [anything] anywhere, but ‘they’ have entered into a conspiracy [by which] they pretend that people think People own things. And this is done for only one reason: these other people pretend this to get [him] in trouble [and to] be nasty to him.... Courts ... exist, not because there is such a thing as crime, ... [but] so that they can pretend outrageous and unreasonable things, so that they can get [him].” So criminals have a total reality of the uncriminality of criminal acts. Criminal acts aren’t criminal to the criminal. The cops have picked up some of our think on this, e.g. the idea that criminals can’t work. But they don’t realize that the person they arrested for overtly stealing a car knows that the police are a bunch of frauds. The car never belonged to anybody, and the police are fraudulently pretending that cars are owned, in order to get this fellow in trouble. MEST goes to pieces around criminals, because they “know” no one owns anything. The criminal’s reality is basically a neurosis which, at lower levels, becomes a psychosis. For instance, another characteristic of the criminal is the notion, “I didn’t shoot anyone because there is no one there.” Everything is a figment of his imagination. [Solipsism]. His imagination gives him a universe, which he knows is delusory. Even the guy in the street has the idea that something was done to him that accounts for his condition. He feels that all responsibility for his state of beingness is exterior to him. The common denominator of most thought is, “It was done to me.” Responsibility lies without, not within this individual. Failed or would-be writers used to get LRH’s goat by saying, “I always wanted to write, but I didn’t have the education.” They were saying this to LRH, who was trying to get rid of the phobias had instilled in him:

When you disseminate scientology, you err by not estimating the amount of cause that the person is willing to accept. You are willing to assume some degree of cause, but he is not. And he will find the thought of overt causation and responsibility to be unreal. He believes that he is the total effect of life. There is some truth to this: the PC can be the effect of a tremendous number of things, to the extent that he can’t see himself as cause. You might be able to reach him at this level: “At some time in life, in some area, if you look it over very carefully, you may find that you had something to do with what happened. For instance, perhaps once you decided to read a book and did it.” That he might agree with. You give him a rule he might apply, e.g. communication, or how to do a touch assist right, and he will find that he has caused something, by experience. This approach is more effective than that of giving him the theoretical, philosophical data. He realizes that he is causing the effect.

People mostly want “the comfortable agony” of being at effect. Catholics get to thinking, “Heresy:”, if you tell them that they can cause effects or create things. They are the toughest nuts to crack: people who are saddled with religious superstition are the hardest to bring out of this rut. In Ireland, the lecture on creation laid an egg every week for this reason. “Create” is the wrong word to use. “Cause” would be better, though even that is hard for people to admit. The areas where one knows everyone fails are those of communication, relationships with people, and health. Those are desirable effects, so if you give the individual tools and let him find that he can cause an effect in these areas, you have snapped him out of the cycle of “Be nothing but an effect. To cause is impossible,” etc. It is not that the man in the street isn’t interested in philosophy. It is just that he has failed at it. The savants have made the field seem unapproachable, but what they are concerned with isn’t live philosophy, anyway. The real philosopher is the little guy in the street, who actually is concerned with questions like, “Who am I?”, “What am I?”, “What am I doing here?”, “What are people?”, “What happens to me when I die?”, “Why don’t people like me?”, etc. In short, the real philosophers are people like you and me. And those are the basic questions that philosophy hasn’t answered, but pretends

to have answered at an unattainable level. For many, this failed attempt to arrive at answers to these basic questions led to the service fac, "God made everything." [Cf. "The why is God."]

We come to no full stop in this search until we realize that every being is an independent being, who is himself capable of expressing a thought or intention independent of any other thought or intention at any moment. The idea that Man is or can be cause cracks the back of philosophy. When we recognize that every individual is capable of being causative, we have no scarcity of answers. When we realize that it is the degree to which an individual can accept or execute causation, independent of other influences, that brings about his state of case, we have then cracked the whole riddle of philosophy. And training a person gives him the idea that he can cause an effect.

As soon as we've got a time stream, then all "befores" influence all "afters" [Post hoc, ergo propter hoc fallacy]. Then we can prove that nobody can be cause, because the time stream exists. This holds water, until we realize that the time stream itself is capable of being influenced by postulate. The time stream can both be caused and escaped from. If this is possible, then we have a level of cause that is senior to the time stream.

In disseminating scientology, if you only tell people things about it on which you yourself have excellent reality and which you have experienced, you will find that you communicate like a shot to everybody, because the R-factor in you is so high that you cannot help but put it across to others. Complete truth from the point of origin does get across, with effect. It isn't the startling thing you say; it's the real thing you say. And it isn't whether it is real to the other guy. It whether it is real to you.

The classification scale is a scale of "willingness to accept cause over one's destiny and that of others." It gives the degree of being at cause. Madmen get into obsessive cause, as a lower-scale mockery. But you could find where someone is on this scale every time, by finding what he has done and withheld and feels responsible for -- i.e. what his O/W's are.

Cause is not expressed in actions in life, but in case responses. It is cause over one's own case that is important, where we are concerned. People make progress in processing or they don't. If they don't, they set the same goals, session after session. If the PC's goals change violently, from one session to the next, there was an ARC break. Cases don't leap from one case state to another. They gradiently and smoothly become more at cause over more matter, energy, space, time, and other beings. The person isn't necessarily becoming more causative; he is more capable of cause. He can handle his mind better. He is therefore capable of handling other things better. His responses in processing are your best possible indicator. This is not a quick test, however, so it tends to be neglected.

Case progress is a direct index of cause. You don't realize how far you have come until you ask someone on the street whether he has any problems, and you find that he is living in a madhouse, from his viewpoint.

The seven classes of auditor are really eight, because they start at zero, an unclassified class, plus seven classes. [See HCOPL 26Nov63 "Certificate and Classification Changes: Everyone Classified" for a description of the classes.] A person could be a Class Zero and have a certificate, without being of a class. That is important, because there are always some people who work very hard and pass their checksheet [but don't make the grade]. They get a certificate, showing that they were there. Classification means more than just getting the certificate. A Class Zero certificate is not a sign of being classed. There are all sorts of valuable processes lying back along the line, and they fit into various slots. For instance, a Class II will be studying comm lags of equal length, as a sign of when to end a process.

This is all an effort to graduate cases on up the line. LRH has found that they do not advance further than they are trained, so this is the creation of a bridge from lower to higher levels. This increases information and skill and auditing availability right on up. The way it is now, people don't know where they are or where they are going or what is expected of them. There

are professional PCs from 1950, waiting for someone to process them to OT, whose cases haven't improved much.

There will be a chart with all the processes and training skills of each class on it, all the way up. At some late date, there will be a textbook all the way up.