

Axioms and Logics Further Data

A Lecture given by L. Ron Hubbard
on the 6. December 1952

And this is the Saturday night lecture, December the 6th. Take up here in the first hour a few more of these axioms and logics. See what we can get out of these things.

I've already covered gradient scales and found out that gradient scales had a considerable importance in auditing. The whole background of creative processing could be said to be the proper understanding and handling of gradient scales.

And, really, a gradient scale would be a little more of what was. And then a little more of what was a little more of and then a little more of what was a little more of a little more of. And so we could reach out then from the tiniest point into the widest possible sphere.

Now, talking here in these logics about very shifty words, things like truth. You start talking about truth, uh... well, you start talking about truth. And you start talking about anything in this stratosphere of knowledge and it's susceptible to many opinions and so on. A lot of people have been going around saying this was truth, and that was truth, and so forth.

We had two truths we were working with. The possibility of their being an infinite truth, but which to us at this time is not definable and so is itself a possibility. And the other is a workable truth, another kind of truth, just a workable truth. Therefore anything is true which is workable. And what is workable? Workable is... workability is the capability of starting changing and stopping. And the degree of capability of starting changing and stopping would demonstrate for this universe workability. And when you say, „Starting changing and stopping what?“ you have immediately gone too far and uh... you should just drop that and sort of back off rather abashed, because it's... really applies to anything in this universe. This universe is built almost wholly upon the principle of start change and stop.

Well now, I don't know what the workability of a truth would be outside of a cycle of action, unless it would be the workability of a postulate. So you say, „Let there be light“ and uh... there's light. Well, that was a workable postulate, wasn't it? And uh... you say uh... „Let there be uh... camels with spin-horned hectacles on them“ and uh... there are camels with horn-spinned rectacles on them and uh... you say, „That was a workable truth then, wasn't it?“ Now we're moving into some other little sphere here, aren't we?

And so uh... you say, uh... „Let there be darkness. Let there be a god. Let there be a devil. Uh... let there be a General Motors and Westinghouse.“ Anything you care to say, and if that was immediately demonstrable as a workability, then by our definition, it is a truth. Quite simple, isn't it?

If you were operating then in a vacuum of no space, uh... that's a pretty trick thing, a no space vacuum operating in a no space area, uh... where there is no space, but only the capability and potentiality of space. If you had all these things then and you didn't have anything there, and you had a true static, no motion, no wave length, nothing, why one could theoretically postulate anything and have it become a truth. Well, now it gets out a little bit further and it says a truth for whom? Well, for him. Now he's operating from a uh... no space, no wave length, no mass, no velocity, no geographical location and he makes a postulate and it comes true. And who is it true for? It's true for the individual that makes the postulate. Well now, oddly enough a fellow has to be in pretty good condition in order to make a postulate and have it be true for him. In creative processing uh... he'll be found to have a little difficulty there then. You'll make this postulate or you've made this postulate and it is either too true, or you can't make it come true.

Now there's uh... there's several squirrels – squirrel is a technical term, uh... a squirrel is somebody who in... who invents something that he knows won't work in order to... to uh... uh... uh... get some nut to audit. Uh... and uh... that's a squirrel and uh... there are some squirrels who go around and they pick up a fragment of the subject and they go around and they sell this thing like mad. And they'll just overlay it. Well, one of these squirrels uh... not too long ago listened to the first half of a lecture tape. And this lecture was concerned with self-determinism and it tried to treat this whole subject of postulates and said there is no... really no reason why a person couldn't simply say, „I am now a self-determined individual“ and it'd come true because that's a postulate. There isn't any reason why he couldn't do that.

And the first hour of this two-hour lecture was devoted to why you couldn't simply say you were self-determined, be self-determined, speed up your governor and knock everything together the way you want it to and have tremendous effectiveness thereafter. And the second hour is devoted to why that can't happen. Well, they threw away the second hour and uh... Machiavelli wrote a book once called THE PRINCE and THE PRINCE has as its first uh... part, How to become a Great Ruler, and the second part, it says How to Stay There. And Napoleon, Napoleon and Hitler and... and all sorts of people down through the lines have... have been saying... uh... well, they've been reading Machiavelli's PRINCE and they've been putting it into action like mad, and... and they take the first half and then they never read the second half. They never have and they don't stay there.

Well, the second half of this lecture is... was devoted to and contains some of this data. Devoted to why that postulate couldn't suddenly stick. Ever since that time we've been having people spin like mad around the various locales. Uh... they... they say, „I'm a self-determined individual. Rrrrrr. You say I'm not? mmmomm rrrrrr.“ That's what's known as circuit determinism. A little bit different than self-determinism.

What they do is set themselves up. You get this fellow and he drags himself out of this river and he's just got through swimming steadily and solidly for eighteen hours and he's all worn out, and he's just about to... to... to uh... hand in his chips and so forth, and then just as he comes out of the river, you... you get ahold of him. You take him by the scruff of the neck and you say, „All right. Now tell yourself that you're well, that you feel good, that you're not cold, that you're perfectly rested, and uh... come on out here; we've got a quarter horse for

you to race.“ And in this he... he'll say, „All right. I'm all rested,“ and he's liable to agree with you and he's even liable to do it out of agreement, but there isn't very much going to happen. And that's because he's making a postulate while still holding on to the composite of postulates which bring him into the reality in which he insists on existing.

Now if you make a postulate out of no motion, no space, no geographical location, or any other influence, why sure, you can make any postulate you please. But after you've made a hundred thousand million postulates and you've got yourself nicely stacked around with cycles of action and MEST and agreements and responsibilities and subject to forces and you own this and something else has you, why uh... then you suddenly say when you're in that state, „Now I change my mind about this whole thing, and while still sitting right here and being very insistent on holding on to all that I have which I acquired solely by the process of making postulates, I'm now going to hold on to all that and I'm just going to sort of sneak over here covertly and I'm going to say – well, I'm holding on to that, but I'm going to say uh... „I am now self-determined as an individual. And then I'm going to make that stick.“ As long as the fellow held on to his havingness and the substance of the MEST universe, the identity which has been assigned to him and all these other things, he of course is holding on to a large mass of postulates. He's holding on to an enormous number of them and insisting then by holding on to them that these other postulates have complete validity and while he insists on this complete validity he goes out and says sincerely, „I am now a self-determined individual and just by making a postulate I can make it come true.“ And he's saying, „You better not invalidate me.“ Well, he's invalidating himself. He's insisting on going along and remaining in the unchanged status quo of being where he is, what he is, owning what he does own and responsible for what he has.

Well, these boys found this out immediately, really, uh... only they didn't observe what they found out. They found out immediately that all you had to do was postulate you were self-determined. And in the process of trying to make it stick you had to kick all your friends in their teeth; you had to leave the family; you had to change over any possible method of life in which you were operating. They did the same trick however in spite of all of these changes that would take place; they took place chaotically, catastrophically. The changes occurred because they couldn't regulate the thing. They... they didn't know what was occurring to them. And here suddenly they wind up in terrible condition.

Well, this is the magician here, he makes a... he goes out and he says, „Well, let's throw a... a little bit of spiders' brains in here and a few threads of dawn and let's mix them up with a frog's cough and expose them out very nicely to this Diogean core of blackness. Say three chants over them and now uh... let's see, what was I doing here? Oh yeah, well, let's pour some of this on the ground. Well, look at that, imagine that, a tree starts growing. And uh... uh... well, well, it just keeps eating everything up and so forth. Well, isn't that interesting?“ And uh... all of a sudden he says uh... „Gee, it's getting dark around here, uh... wonder what's taking place?“ and he looks up and he says, „Well, this tree is sort of swamping everything and it's cutting out the sunlight in all directions. And I'd better find my cave, if I can find my cave. But no, it's now too dark and there is no cave and – gee whiz, that tree so and so.“ And he goes on. And then he starts cursing the tree, and he says, „Look what that tree did to me. look how mean and ornery that tree was. Look... look... look at all these hor-

rible things this tree is doing.“ And another magician sees him one day as he’s ruined, hobbling down along the road and this fellow complains to him bitterly about what the tree did to him.

He did several things wrong. The first thing he did wrong was to mix up a lot of things without postulating why he was doing it. He didn’t say what the end product would be. The second he failed to say what the end product – what his goal was and how... why he was trying to achieve that goal – he immediately abandoned the plateau of cause and stepped down to the valley of effect. The moment that he was there in effect, then what he had already caused grew up, shut out the light, and he said, „Well, I have no responsibility for it and... and it’s... I’m... I’m being affected by it badly.“ He goes downhill further.

Now if something else happens to him he complains about that, he complains about something else, he never makes a statement to himself what goal he is trying to achieve, what he is trying to do, he just goes on. One day he suddenly mixes up a Las Vegas, a little bit of furrow and a blond in New York and takes a train and says „Well, we leave it all the chance and I guess I got this job, I don’t know what I’m doing but I can hope“ and he is a member of Alcoholic Anonymous because they tell him he can live for the minute or I don’t know maybe they give him more than a minute, the Alcoholic Anonymous, maybe they give him 5 minutes or 24 hours or something the like, they ration their time – gosh, this guy is in terrible shape, he is become homo sapiens.

Now all... all his fellow has to do... he hears one day... he says, „Now all I’ve got to do is just postulate that I’m self-determined.“ Of course, he doesn’t know what self-determinism is – he has no definition of that, or anything of the sort. He merely says, he postulates, „It is a state in which I can do what I please without incurring any penalty. Therefore, if I say I’m self-determined, then I don’t have to take any responsibility whatsoever for anything bad that I do. Because it’s on my self-determinism. And that well worked out; that equates perfectly.“ Uh... he says, „That’s a wonderful state of affairs,“ and of course people keep hitting him with axes, and throwing him into gutters and throwing him this way and that way, and it’s all backwards.

You get the difference then between a clear-cut series of postulates which could become truths and a clear-cut chunk of chaos which uh... most men consider their lives should be – not could be, but should be. There’s a big difference there so when you’re talking about truth, we’re just talking about another level of truth when we say postulates.

All right, let’s take another level of truth now. Let’s take the truth called MEST universe. This truth is composited out of a series of agreements. After this fellow’s made a few postulates he gets ahold of a few friends and for the sake of randomness they all agree that such and such is going to take place and that when so and so makes a postulate and when they all agree upon this postulate, then this postulate is there and then going to become common to all of them. And they think that’s grand, and that’s a good game and we can play this game with impunity.

Well they can play it just so long, and then the randomness starts to set up.

The postulate then is losing its value as single truth and becomes relative to those agreements which have been made amongst them. Now this fellow one day says, „I’m now going to postulate... postulate that I’m going to have a new palace.“

And the others say, „That’s out of agreement. You know very well that we invented a labor union and the labor union gets us so much money an hour and all that sort of thing and they have to go over it and we’ve got to have a quarry. And you’ll have to own the land to the quarry and you’ll have to get a permit in order to quarry stone. And you’ll have to get an interstate trucking license in order to haul that stone over here and we’ll have to hire masons. And there’s unemployment tax and there’s social security and everybody knows that you can’t pay anything like that for anything of the sort. And you don’t have any chips.“

And the fellow says, „Well, I’ll... I got here, not too long ago I used to say – well, I make a stack of money and so forth I could pay all these things with.“

„No,“ they say, „on this agreement – why we’ve agreed that the only currency is that currency on which we’ve agreed.“ And he’ll say, „Well, I di... I didn’t agree to that currency; I wasn’t there.“ And they said, „You agreed to an army to protect our property, didn’t you?“

And the fellow says, „Well, yes, I did.“ And they say, „Well, they protect the currency now. Let’s... let’s have no more of that.“

And so you’ve got a cycle going in which the postulate... the postulate is actually as valid as it is related to the agreed subject. And after a while his postulate gets very weak indeed.

He says, „I think I will have a glass of water providing nobody objects and to have a glass of water the best thing to do... you walk over to a tap and you turn the tap on and you have a glass there, imagine it, you have a glass there to catch the water in, and you have to have a stomach and a mouth to drink it with and so forth, and you’re all set then.“

And this big agreement becomes what? Natural law or truth. That’s truth. What is truth for this land? They have a standing army and trade unions and all the rest of this. That’s truth.

Now, an engineer comes along and he decides in this land to build a bridge. And there are so darn many agreements that he’s lost all track of, that the first time he puts up this flimsy structure and so on, why the first passenger as he starts to go across, the thing goes boom!

So the engineer says, „There are other natural laws which I now have to follow. And these laws must be this way and this way.“ And so he’s doing a blind job of tracking agreements about gravity, about wave length, about uh... strength of structure, about the growth of trees. All of these things – he’s tracking back agreements, and he’s working it out to find out what agrees with this chunk of whatever it is – alabaster, mud, whatever he’s trying to build uh... the bridge across uh... or out of – he’s got to find out what this score is straight through in order to build something which sufficiently agrees with the environment to permit its continuance in the environment.

And his study becomes a study of, then, what has been agreed, although most of that has been lost. And so he does it by test. He puts the bridge there, and if it stands, it doesn’t

stand, he... he's investigating the environment continually; he'll make little mock-up bridges and he'll hit little mock-up bridges as nice as you please uh... to... to find out if they break, and then he... then he does a calculation to find out how much stronger he's got to build the main bridge that goes across this stream. And uh... he finally works it out and how strong are the girders? What's the uniformity of construction? What are the metals; what are the refining processes? Uh... how skilled do the workmen have to be, and what are all these things? And finally there he is. Then he falls into a delusion. He starts thinking, „Well, now look, I was agreeing with reality. This was really real because working out that bridge was a real tough job. And the funny darn part of it is, is every time I build a bridge, it doesn't build according to different laws; it builds according to these same laws. There is the coefficient of expansion, there's friction, there's all these weights and stress analysis of structure, and... and there's torsion and tension, and all these things. And there's... there's the vibration of foot traffic and the vibration of vehicles. And these things don't vary and I built this bridge and that bridge, and another bridge. And gee!“ he says, „You know, we're right here in the midst of a method of building bridges and we have agreed with natural law thoroughly and completely, and we can keep on building beautiful bridges so long as he keep on agreeing.“

It's a funny thing about his bridges. The only thing that happens – that's a wonderful thing that he can do that – he then has... he then has a hatful of the most beautiful worked-out technology. And he has in his possession the only thoroughly tested technology which agrees with natural law. Because he's working with the most basic natural law there is, and that is structure, gravity, materiel. And that's as close as he can get to natural law and that's about as close as you can get to the natural law of any universe, is with the very woof and warp of that universe itself.

He should never, however, make the mistake of thinking that that is reality. That is agreement with the agreement which is the reality of that universe. It would be with a horrible shock that he would suddenly find himself in another universe starting to build a bridge which used the coefficient of expansion, which used this, which... and find out that bridge went down. Brrroom!

And somebody'd come along, some old man'd be coming along there and he'd say, „What you trying to do, bud?“

The engineer would say, „I'm trying to build a bridge.“

„You're trying to build a what?“ „I'm trying to build a bridge.“ „Well, what for?“ „Trying to get across the chasm.“

And uh... the old man would say, „Well, what do you need a bridge to get across the chasm for?“

And the engineer would say, „Well, obviously it's empty space.“

And... and the old man would suddenly say, „It is? For heaven's sakes, I'll have to go tell my father about that,“ and would walk across the empty space, uh... very neatly and very nicely and the engineer would be very puzzled until he found out that in that area... in that area, uh... the shoes of everybody concerned with everything was adjusted to core-gravity distance. That is to say, the distance to the core of any planet on which they were operating

had an adjustment in their shoes. And the way this was put in was by baking up something that looked like a mass of taffy. And he says, „Oh no!“

But that's actually about the way it would be. Now it... it's an incomprehensible thing perhaps to look at these things. And if... if you've ever run a car into a brick wall, or seen a train go off a girder, uh... off girders into a river, or seen any of these horrendous things happen, it's sort of difficult to say it happened because of an agreement.

It's... that's... look, makes a flimsy look, but uh... very funny thing about the whole deal is, is that the engineer cannot obtain an absolute anywhere. And the harder he works, he just can't obtain an absolute. He's almost there, on any one of his natural laws, but not quite.

Fortunately, there is never a hundred percent agreement. There's always a hole in the natural law. There's always a hole in the atom, always a hole in the structure. Uh... he starts into the actual complexity of this matter, and does he become complexed. He is complicated beyond measure because its consistency and so forth keeps shifting under his hands as he examines it. Now he... he becomes very puzzled after a while.

You know, it's a strange thing that the search after truth, then, could lead some men to disaster and some to glory.

It could lead uh... Newton into great renown. It could lead Hegel into disrepute. It could lead uh... Lenin into an early tomb. They're all going after what? Different kinds of a datum.

A truth is something which would exist without much contest, something which is triumphant. A champion who stands up after a battle with bloodied shield and sword and yet has won is himself truth in the force universe. A datum which itself sweeps all data before it, in another universe, is truth. It is that which works. And that which works most broadly to that which it is applied.

Don't have pity upon some of your preclears who are still scrambling in some direction and haven't ever classified the field of truth in which they're searching for the truth. Some are searching for it in the MEST universe, and some are searching for it out in the stars, and some are searching for it in their own hearts, and others are searching for it in the lives of great men. And sure enough, they will, every one of them, find a truth. And all they need to do to find the ultimate truth, is simply find the winning truth by which all other truths proceed in that field.

And if you ever built yourself a universe, go park the truth on which it is built on the first piece of structure that you may build, and engrave it well, and don't make it mysterious. Because the only way to make your universe survive forever and last forever, and be there and be at last in command of you, is to invent the truth that started it and then hide that truth. And if you were to do that, then neither you nor any inhabitant in the universe would be able to undo the universe or alter it in any way. But it would simply go out on an inevitable average proceeding from that truth. And that first truth would simply be a postulate made out of the zero of no motion, no space, no geographical location and without time. And it's made there; it is not associated to any other times, places or agreements. Now it's the first agreement on

that sequence on which you would then compound all other logic. Oddly enough it can be any first statement.

You can go out here and construct a whole mathematics, a beautiful mathematics, a gorgeous mathematics, on the whole system that anytime Y and Y appear they are pluses and minuses. And that anytime they are used or equated in equations they will always be pluses and minuses. And if the action of pluses and minuses is, that they come together but repel them... from themselves... each one of themselves. Interesting mathematics.

Uh... the... another one. That every ten when divided by two equal fifteen. Anything... anything idiotic. It doesn't matter what it is. Suddenly carved out of the nowhere of a beginning, you see there is no beginning before a beginning. But any one of you can assume in any field of ideas, instantly assume, that without recourse to any prior idea, we are now going to postulate that so and so is going to regulate and regiment a core of proceeding fact. And unless you forced it into agreement with some other body of information, you could have a tremendous body of data.

You say, it'd be idle – oh no, it wouldn't be idle. It could keep on going to a point where it became relative to itself, and becoming relative to itself, could itself be a universe. It is symbolical, that line in the Bible; it says, „In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.“

The day when you state a postulate to begin a universe, you are creating a God as well. And it is the God of that universe.

Now relative truths would have then to do with a relative workability and what could be true in any field could be true for that field. But it's not necessarily true for another field. What's true for one universe is not true for another universe. What we have scouted in Scientology, what we've looked over, is the MEST universe parade of agreement stemming from the first capability, the first Q that we can discover which describes the capabilities of theta, as we can view them from this point.

We see that from that all other capabilities could have proceeded which brought about the MEST universe. And we understand by that immediately that the capability of theta at the level of Q1 could consist of the ability to create space and energy and time or to locate energy and matter in time and space. We could... we could take this level of workability, then – we can cite that here – and we find out it applies through all of these various mechanisms in which anyone is engaged in this universe and so we have a senior truth. That truth is probably a little bit senior to any necessary for this universe. It's probably just a little bit because this universe has immediately omitted creation of space as a capability of theta. It's omitted that. And it is an enforced problem.

Theta does not recognize... the thetan in this universe doesn't recognize his capability of creating space. And yet he has a lot of trouble with space. You start to ask most thetans, „Now let's create space. Let's put out a couple of anchor points. Now, let's swap them around.“

He says, „Oh no, no you don't.“

You say, „Come on, let’s put out these two anchor points, and let’s swap them.“ „Oh, no, no, I got them out there.“ And you say, „Well, all right. Swap them.“ „No, no.“

I just had a rather amusing... amusing session a short time ago where we put out two anchor points which of course would be the first two points from which you would create the dimensions of space. You just postulate these two points.

And I said, „All right, let’s turn those two points into black cats.“ And after a great deal of persuasion, we got those two points turned into cats. And when we got those two points turned into cats, we tried to turn the tail of one of the cats, just the tip of the tail, just one hair on the tip of the tail of the cat, a different color than the other cat’s tail. Noooo, siree. Uh-uh. And yet the preclear on whom this was being worked had a capability in mock-ups that most of you would envy. Isn’t that remarkable?

The second that we started to put out the first two requisites of space, there was such an insecurity an that whole thing that the preclear couldn’t hardly bring himself to go forward in any way. And it took an awful lot of practice, it took an enormous amount of time, in order to get anything done about those two anchor points.

And the funny part of it is, is the GE is still operating on his anchor points. Any one of you have two points and the GE is working on these two points. If you want to locate them sometime just look out that-a-way from your head and look out that-a-way from your head and you will find a ball out there and one out there.

You start to shift those around and you can just feel the whole beingness of the fellow just start to go to pieces. „You leave those alone,“ it says. „That... that... that’s space; that is how the space gets created so that we can have energy.“

But actually, they’re just anchor points. That’s all they are – there isn’t any reason why you couldn’t have fifty or a hundred or one. And yet the preclear doesn’t want any of these. He has the self-imposed two in order to get an electronic flow.

Well, now, therefore, we’re dealing just slightly above the MEST universe and we know the capability of theta is a little bit wider than that which we see encompassed here in the MEST universe. And knowing this then about truth and the primary postulate, we can also know that so long as an individual is willing to abandon havingness he can change a postulate with ease. But when he is unwilling to abandon havingness, unwilling to abandon the possession which accrues to him solely because of his agreement, then he is going at the same time to maintain and hold on to his postulates.

And the trick in processing would be to keep your preclear there in this universe and yet let him slide sideways into the creation of his own. That’s quite a trick because he’s insisting on a continued havingness in the MEST universe and you’re... you’re trying to knock out postulates which are contrary to the MEST universe. And you can do that with mock-up processing, but you’re not likely to do it with much else.

All right, all of these data have been covered before. You’re quite familiar with them... Logic nine is „A datum is as valuable as it has been evaluated.“

Poor old... poor old homo sap. Where he was the sap beyond saps was believing that data as itself was worth anything, and data is worth absolutely nothing. Data is worth nothing until it has been evaluated.

People keep coming around to you and they keep saying, „You know in Scientology there is a so on and so on and so on.“ And you say the so and so and so and so and so. „Well, do you know that there was a fellow by the name of Pittsquealer in 1726 said, and oh, how clearly, he said, „Yap, yap, golla walla walla,“ and he said the same thing that you’re saying today.“ And you say „What’s the same thing he said?“ And they give you some vague approximation. They say, „Truth is that for which every man thinks, uh... worthwhile,“ or „Truth is that toward which every man attains.“ Or... or he... he says something about this line, you see. I mean it will be... or it will be uh, „Self-determinism is the right of any man.“ And you say, „Well, gee whiz, he did, didn’t he?“ Uh... be very careful of one thing. The more you look at that line in that book be careful not to read the line above it or the line below it. Remember to read just that line.

There sits the datum, but it has not been evaluated, and evaluation is relation to other datum... other data. And evaluation in our frame of reference would be how well in this universe it assisted survival. So your evaluation would be its comparison to other data and the magnitude of its ability to clarify, codify or... or permit the persistence in surviving. So we have evaluation.

Now, it’s very true that you can dive headlong into almost any text on any subject under the sun and look through it. Read a few billion words if you want to, but you will find practically everything that is worth knowing said by some man at some time somewhere.

Everything that has been said in Scientology, I am sure, has in some fragment or another been stated in the past. If you put that together, you would have a library there which would be a very big library.

Now, don’t make this mistake after you’ve got the library formulated. You know very well where those books are. You would have a slip in each book, you would have that perfectly underscored, you would know exactly where that line was. Now don’t... don’t let anybody come by and take those slips out. Because what would happen is, you would pass down the library stacks and you would pick out a book and it would be a book called Phronology, The Rise and Fall of the Human Coco. And uh... it would say in there... it would... you’d say, „I know there’s one of the data of Scientology in this book.“ And you open that book up and you look through it, „Well, I know it was in here someplace.“ Well, you put that book back and you go and you pick up another one of these books that you know very well had been marked and it would be German Imperial uh... Frantics: The uh... Phoneticism of Emmanuel Kant, and written by his housekeeper. And uh... you... you would get in... you’d say, „Well... I... I... there was one in there too, but I’m sure we’ll be able to patch this thing up.“

That’s not the way to research, and you could walk through that library endlessly and endlessly and you’d never get Scientology back. And the reason why you’d never get it back is because the data was not evaluated. They weren’t related one datum to another datum, to an organization. The evaluation of a datum is, if anything, more important than the datum itself, because you can always get a datum.

We could sit here and make a postulate and then try to evaluate the postulate. We could say, „Why is it that blackberries are red when they are green?“ Or we could simply make a statement that „Hereinafter blackberries will be purple when they are green.“ And then try to evaluate that datum in the berry industry and get people interested in the culture of berries to finally force this into being. Uh... you're just zzaaw Wrong Way Corrigan. What are we going to do then in order to construct a science for anything? The same thing you're going to do in processing a preclear. You know I'm not just airing my teeth and talking about philosophy for the sake of philosophy. I'm talking about it very specifically with regard to auditing and in regard to learning material and data.

And that's this: you're going to take the highest truth which you can state understandably and with accuracy and which you can relate to the remainder of the body of data which confronts you, and you're going to try to evaluate with that datum.

And if it has limitations and doesn't expand the scope of what you're trying to do, you're going to have to find a higher level truth. You're exploring a preclear. You want to take this preclear apart. You would find the highest level of certainty which you could then attain. The highest level truth which he could attain. And you would evaluate that preclear to a marked degree with that. If you wanted to put him together again, you could do that.

And let's go look in the opposite direction; we find out we're going to make him capable. What makes him incapable is an inability. So let's just look him over and let's find out the specific incapacities. If we remove those, his native ability should restore itself. So we've got the opposite way of looking at it.

Let's look for the lowest level of falsehood we can find in the case. and that would be the falsest datum. And let's turn it into a little bit truer datum, and a little bit truer, and a little bit truer until you had something sitting before you which much more closely resembled truth for himself.

We don't want him much as truth for the MEST universe because that's MEST and we've got plenty of MEST. Any time you want to go out here and dig a hole, you can get lots of MEST. So we want him for himself, not for the MEST universe, and he is himself a universe.

So the seeking for the highest level of workability would be seeking for the highest level of evaluation. What's the greatest certainty in this case? Well, that greatest certainty will tell you the highest datum that the preclear can reach at that time. And if you can find that certainty for him you would be amazed. He'd probably turn on and glow like a Christmas tree and walk out of the place. And you'd say, „Now wait a minute, we haven't done any more processing... we haven't done enough processing. I mean he's... he's supposed to be... we're supposed to go through this ritual and that ritual and some other ritual and do something else. And you haven't done that.“

All you did was reach in somewhere in the vicinity of his beingness and found out that he knew one thing above all other things. He just knew that and you just all of a sudden showed it to him, and uh... he... he... he didn't know that he knew this. And you say, „You know that you knew that?“

And the fellow looks at it and says, „My god!“ A guy can get pretty excited.

Now you get a lesser reaction when you demonstrate to him, „Do you know that you believe that uh... all coconut trees uh... all coconut trees have the Empire State Building in them?“ Uh... you could... some ridiculous datum that's as silly as that and he takes a look at that and he finds out he's been forming up a whole lifetime on it.

But that's invalidation to go at it that way, really, So you just sort of take it by mock-ups and let it work out. But as you work it out, you will find that as you're attaining recognition in him of a higher level truth toward his true capabilities, when you're getting him up toward the higher truth of his own self-determinism, what makes his being tick, he's becoming freer and freer and more and more of an individual.

A lot of people think in processing that the more you process an individual the less individual he becomes. Now you think he returns to the great swim, uh... the big dunk, uh... I use those reverent terms to describe Nirvana. Uh... this is a pool in which all individuality and identity, those two things not even vaguely being similar, but they're put together with a uh... like that and then they're dumped into this big pool. And uh... after that all is lost. One... one floats in complete serenity and peace with the universe. That's right, with the universe. Only one difficulty with it: that's perfectly true. There's nothing truer than nirvana. But you're walking on nirvana. It's mud! And it's mud from there on down!

Now any time that you want... any time that you want to fix up a preclear so that he joins the infinite allness of allness in this universe, why zap him with a zap gun or something and disable the thetan so he can't even think himself elsewhere, junk the body and throw it in a lime pit. You've got him. That would be it.

And by the way, this is supported by empirical data. You go out here and you look. And you... it... you know it's sorta hard, once in a while I run up against one of these communication breaks. Uh... I tell you, go out and look, uh... you. you'll all be able to do this some day. But there is a point where experience gaps. Now I'll tell you what I mean when I said you go out and you look.

Uh... I went to a theatre, Queen's Popular Theater, one of the old theaters. I was sitting there. All of a sudden I felt vaguely uncomfortable uh... and realized what I was doing – I was uh... I knew what I was doing. I didn't suddenly feel uncomfortable – what am I talking about? I just suddenly decided to fish around and feel all the lords and ladies that had been in this joint since the beginning of time. That was way back from Queen Anne's time or something like that, this old theater.

And uh... I was fishing around and all of a sudden I fished through the floor of the theater. Just put a beam down through the floor of the theater. Neeooww. No! And I shuddered and kind of cringed into myself and I went home that night and I thought, „Boy, that... that's really rough.“ And I did a lot of mock-ups and so on, and tried to get it straightened out and so on. Every once in a while I kept shuddering over this stuff. And that's the first time that anything had made me shudder for a long time and I didn't quite understand what it was because I didn't stay with it long enough to find out what it was. And I finally asked one of the boys; I said, „Say, uh... what's wrong with the Queen's Popular Theater?“ Well, he

thought. „Oh,“ he said, „in the days of the great plague that was one of the plague burial spots. They just brought them there in wagons and dumped them in.“

Well, here all this time later, the ground of the Queen’s Popular Theater, it’s not imaginarily at all, that is quite... this is a lot realer than looking at things with MEST perceptics, they’re pretty weak, is... is so soggy with... with agony and sordid putrifaction, and death, and so on, that it’s an awful jolt to come into contact with it.

You see, there’s a lot of livingness still there. How do you like that? I mean, that ground isn’t dead. That ground still has life. That’s one of the many nirvanas you can reach by going on into the MEST universe.

I say go out and take a look. You could go down here past one of the graveyards – amuse myself every once in a while – go on over to the graveyard and see how many thetans are stuck in the skulls. You know, they... they do this horrible thing these days – they embalm people. They take them, put them on the table, they cut them open and nobody... never occurs to anybody, I guess, really, to chop the tops of the skull off and empty the skull or do something about that or anything. No no! No, let’s pack them all full of formaldehyde and preservatives, and let’s paint the face so they look very alive, and let’s be very kind to the body after it’s dead. Particularly after it’s dead. Hell... And let’s take it out and bury it in a nice lead coffin which will protect our loved one from seepage.

And uh... the body is very lifelike and quite often a thetan cannot make up his mind whether or not that body’s dead or not. He knows it’s been sick, uh... but he... he’ll... he’ll be groggy himself and... and he’ll... it’s obviously still alive if the smell of formaldehyde is... can get pretty overbearing really.

But you go down past the cemetery and uh... usually most country cemeteries, where they sort of wrap them in a blanket and dump them in on their heads and say, „God be with you, rest in peace, uh... planted by his loving wife Agnes“ or something of the sort, now that... that’s really very calm. They’re no thetans left around there.

Uh... but you go in one of these modern cemeteries, one of these nice modern ones. Boo! There’s more trapped thetans around that joint than you care to measure up in a long day of Sundays. And if you want to amuse yourself, uh... put out a line on them and say, „Hey fella, why don’t you get on your way?“ And they sort of feel groggy, „Huh? Voice of God, huh? Must be the voice of God.“

So you want to play god? Well you ought to go down and do this sometime just for kicks. And uh... yeah, put a little bit of an energy beam on them and... or plant the thought, „You are now on top of the grave.“ Or, „You are now on top of the headstone.“ And if you really want to pour the juice into them – it’s kind of bad to hypnotize thetans; I usually feel sorry for them – if you want to pull the... if you want to pour the juice in on them and go just brrwhack! „You are now on top of the tombstone.“ There isn’t any doubt about your getting them out, truth be known.

You can put out enough energy. Beam in, sort of bore a little hole in the guy’s head and then... and then put the energy concentration flow into the center of his forehead, in in in

in in in in, and his skull will go spatter, brains and all. This is no joke. I mean, I'm not joking about this.

So there isn't any doubt about your getting somebody out of his head. It's just how tough do you want to get as an auditor? So anyway, you go down and you fish out... you fish out a thetan or two and you feel real good. You've done your boy scout trick and the loved one then ceases to be troubled with seepage.

Another interesting place to go; we got on this last night, that's why I was mentioning it – another interesting place to go is down to the morgue. They come in there, charred bodies, and they come rushing into the morgue with this and that and fragments and bits and bones and things like that and throw them into these big slabs that are on drawers. Open a big drawer, body size, and they dump the body in there. And they sometimes will lay them and sometimes on marble slabs and they tie a big tag on their big toe. And it has whatever identification, where the body was found. I don't know why they insist on doing that to a body. But they... they do... they take the big toe and they tie the tag on there and put it on a slab. Well, anyway, in these drawers, they push the drawer back in again and people come in, weep, weep, looking for their dear Charles or something of the sort. And the attendant drags open the drawer – „Nope,“ next drawer. „Ouch,“ you know, slam! Next drawer – by the time she's looked at four or five of them, she doesn't care whether she finds Charles or not! And there's rarely any refrigeration in these places to amount to anything.

But uh... you go in there and you talk about a bewildered lot of thetans! They come in, the guy's still hanging around, saying, „Gosh, I'm dead; I'm dead, I... what about... what about the wife and kids, uh... uh... gee I... I... I haven't paid the rent and uh... Oh why, oh why did I ever get mixed up with that steam boiler in the first place? And uh... I should have noticed the name plate on it was such and such an electric company, and... uh...“

And he... he gets... gets in and you say, „Hey, why don't you... why don't you shove off?“ And the fellow says, „Huh? Huh? Who's talking? Somebody talk to me? I got ideas, I guess I'm hearing voices“.

Big confusion, see? He's already real confused and uh... you push him around a couple of times. And you... you, once in a while you... you feel like telling him, „Look, why don't you go back to the house and take a look? And if you're so worried about where everybody is, just why don't you go back and take a look?“

And they just – communication level – and go back and take a look. „I'll take a look. The body's here and I need the body to walk back with. And I couldn't do that because here's the body.“

Boy, that's really idiotic when you come down to think about it. The guy's got a charred piece of humanity, that's got... just got through being blown up or something of the sort, and he knows very well it can't walk back to the house and pat the wife on the head. So you argue with him for a little while, and in most cases, why, zip! He's gone to some between-lives area. And back again you go over to the hospital and you say, „Well,“ you meet a couple of them around, and so on. And you think, „Well gee, you know, that's real good.“

Uh... uh... they come in and you say, „Hey! Psst!“ And uh... they... question mark, question mark, „Who? Who? What’s this? What’s this? This isn’t on schedule. Uh...“

You say, „Hey, uh... uh... you uh... trying to pick up a baby here?“ Something like that.

Big guilt feeling. „Yeah, yeah.“ You say, „Why don’t you take that third one over there in the crib?“ Something like that, so on.

“Oh, are you the fella that’s supposed to tell us here? We didn’t know that, I mean...“

But mostly you... hard... you’d have a hard time attracting their attention. They’re very down tone scale and they just go on in saying, „Ah well, I gotta be a baby, I gotta be a baby, I gotta be a baby, I’m a baby, I’m a baby, I’m a baby“ – Bong! And there they go.

Fascinating. Very very interesting. But they’re pretty confused actually... the... actually a thetan can straighten himself out if he’s got the educational background of a few years as a stability. And he suddenly steps out on a gradient scale of reality. He knows he’s here. He just hasn’t been killed. Uh... he knows he’s here. He’s... he’s uh... walks out, he’s still got the body. He can make up his mind. He has a power of choice. He can carry on with it and he... he straightens out just fine. He doesn’t have any difficulty.

But you catch him off guard at times when he’s already shocked and upset. Well, what’s the difference between taking a thetan out when he’s in fairly good condition, and is there any relationship between that and processing a preclear when his body’s in pretty good condition? And doing something for a thetan whose body has just died? Or who has just got to have a body?

Well, yeah, there’s gradient scale. Uh... your thetan who has just lost a body – the highest level of truth which he thought he could attain was, „I am a body.“ And that’s pretty high compared to the state he’s been battered into as a thetan. So he’s... he’s’... he’s got a low-level actuality. A low-level decision, postulate or agreement, or whatever you want to call it, and... and he’s got a body. And that has not been broken. But if he’s... if he’s just died, he’s just LOST that low-level beingness. He... he... hi... his level of truth is just out – is just gone. He has no certainty. He hasn’t single datum of which he’s now certain. He knows he’s dead, somebody’s been telling him he should go to heaven, somebody else has been telling him for sure he ought to go to hell. He’s known all the time that he’s got to go to Station 862 and report in. But he’s... he’s in a complete state of confusion.

All right. Now what... what do you solve? How do you solve this... this terrible confusion? Well, there’s still another level of certainty much lower than the certainty „I am a body“ that could actually be contacted. You’ll have to figure out what it was.

You take a psychotic or a neurotic. There is still a level of certainty exists, and one could almost say that where a level of certainty ceased to exist, the life and beingness cease to exist as well.

Whether it’s true or false, a certainty is a certainty. And so there’s some terrific analogy then, isn’t there, between this word truth and the word life itself? And it all boils down to really one thing, one thing. When he’s completely free, actually the highest truth that one at-

tains to is a truth of a certain sort. He can attain to higher truths than this, and they exist, but, before there is space for him, he does have a truth, and that truth is, „I AM“.

And as he goes down the line it becomes „I am something“. There's still „I am“, but the „I am“ is less then and the „I am something“ – the „something“ becomes greater. „I am the something“ and the „I am“ becomes less and the „something“ becomes greater, until at last he winds up in the conviction that the „something“ is all the „I am“ there is.

But as long as there's even a „something“ that you can contact and communicate with, you can still start him back up the line toward „I am“. But you take off to restore „I am“ or his high level of truth by restoring it on the gradient scale of the „something“. And so he's less and less the „something“ and more and more „I am“. Until he finally comes up into full awareness and it's very hard for somebody who's saying „I am the something“ to realize that the „something“ is really one of the things which impedes his being „I am“. But that „he is something“ still and still knows that „he is something“ is enough to keep him from becoming „nothing“, and he holds on to the „something“ in lieu of being „nothing“. But as he goes back up the line, he gets more and more „I am“ „I am“ „I am“.

Now then, the highest level truth that you could attain with an individual would be the springboard from which you started out to reach the highest level that you possibly could attain for this universe, which is „I am“, with no need to be „something“. Let's take a break.

(TAPE ENDS)