

AXIOMS - (Part 4)

A lecture given on
20 August 1954

Having these Axioms we are now particularly interested in this whole subject of truth and its actual use in auditing. We see immediately that any problem of any character or scope is the basic business of a Scientologist. If you have someone who wants to know about solutions, you had certainly better give him not a solution to a problem but the solution to problems, and that of course would be a basic and ultimate truth. Well, if you can describe a basic and ultimate truth, and describe it exactly, you have no problem at all in solving problems.

We see that failure to discover truth brings about stupidity. A person begins to believe he's stupid if he can't As-is.

We see that the discovery of truth would bring about an As-is-ness, by actual experiment, and thus we see that an ultimate truth would have no time, place or form. Whatever we had there would simply disappear if we discovered an ultimate truth. The ultimate truth is a perfect duplicate and therefore a Static. And, operationally, to achieve a Static would be to make a perfect duplicate.

We see that a lie as we understand it is an alteration of time, place, event or form, and that only lies persist.

We have to have a basic postulate, and then another postulate, before we get time. Two postulates. We can't have time with one postulate unless it is the postulate that there will be time. That could be one postulate. But normally in operation we find that two postulates are necessary to achieve time.

Now which one of these postulates is going to persist if the two postulates deny each other: the second one is going to persist, because it is the time postulate.

Lying becomes an Alter-is-ness, and becomes stupidity. In other words, we don't discover where the thing is, we don't discover exactly how it is, so we can't unmock it, and there we are. The only thing that we can do with it possibly is to Not-is it or Alter-is it some more or do what a Black V does - just stir it around and hope it will disappear. He doesn't As-is it. It doesn't disappear.

Oddly enough, lying will develop into a stupidity. It also develops into a mystery - into this blackness which individuals are so upset about. It's just an alteration of time, place, event or form after the fact of its having been created.

There would be two kinds of lie here. A mechanical lie does not lead to blackness. Mechanical lie: we mock up some space, and we put an object in that space and then we move it. The moment we've moved it we've lied about it. We've said it's over there when as a matter of fact it was created in the first location. Now in view of the fact that there is only consideration this of course would bring about mechanically a lie. It doesn't disappear, it doesn't do anything peculiar simply by moving it around. The mere handling of energy does not bring about a stupidity. It takes another consideration than simply moving something to bring about an occlusion.

Now, anything to persist must avoid As-is-ness, and thus anything to persist, really to persist, must contain a lie. And we get the next Axiom:

AXIOM THIRTY-NINE: LIFE POSES PROBLEMS FOR ITS OWN SOLUTION.

Now what do we find here, in a problem? We find something which is persisting, the As-is-ness of which cannot readily be obtained, and would be the definition of a problem. Now to solve that problem it would be necessary to get its As-is-ness. Well, how do we prevent something from being As-ised, in other words vanished? We introduce a lie into it.

AXIOM FORTY: ANY PROBLEM, TO BE A PROBLEM, MUST CONTAIN A LIE. IF IT WERE TRUTH, IT WOULD UNMOCK.

When the preclear is being a problem, we know very well that there's a lie somewhere on the track that he's trying to obtain the As-is-ness of. It's not necessarily his lie, but it certainly is a lie. And under Axiom Forty we get:

An "unsolvable problem" would have the greatest persistence.

It would also contain the greatest number of altered facts. To make a problem, one must introduce Alter-is-ness.

In other words, this problem must have been moved and shifted and shoved around considerably to be unsolvable.

AXIOM FORTY-ONE: THAT INTO WHICH ALTER-IS-NESS IS INTRODUCED BECOMES A PROBLEM.

Any time you Alter-is something you've got a problem on your hands.

This whole universe, then, is a problem. Therefore this whole universe must contain a lie to go on persisting the way it does. It certainly does contain Alter-is. It certainly does contain a lie. It contains a variety of lies about its creation, and there are all sorts of things about this universe which cause its persistence, and all of those things boil down to the one fact that it must be based upon a lie and it must be very definitely altered.

Axiom Forty-one tells us that it was alteration which brought the preclear into a problem, thus we find any child who has moved extensively, who has had his home changed, who has been shoved around to various parts of the world, eventually becomes a problem, first to the environment and then to himself.

AXIOM FORTY-TWO: MEST (MATTER, ENERGY, SPACE, TIME) PERSISTS BECAUSE IT IS A PROBLEM.

It is a problem because it contains Alter-is-ness.

Your physicist is busily at work trying to unmock it but he is unmocking it by Not-is-ness. He's using force to alter force, and because he keeps altering it, it all naturally just gets worse and worse. He will solve nothing with an atom bomb. He will simply make things go worse, more complicated, more confused, more dispersed. The atom bomb is a dead-end track and is folly, it is great folly.

If an atom bomb were introduced into a war the number of particles and the amount of MEST which would be altered, we would discover immediately, would have introduced a great number of lies into the situation, it would have deteriorated the society and everything else. If we were foolish enough, for instance, to atom bomb Russia, or if Russia were foolish enough to atom bomb the United States, enough confusion would have been introduced into the cultures of earth so that probably there would be no other choice but to sink into a barbarism, in the absence of an understanding of life itself.

AXIOM FORTY-THREE: TIME IS THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF UNTRUTH.

Time states the untruth of consecutive considerations.

I call your attention to interest, as an interesting thing to observe. There are two classes of interest, and we want to know why we're thinking about this in terms of time, and this is because time is the basic lie behind all lies. We believe there are consecutive moments. We see consecutive motions and this all very pleasant - we agree to this - and it's only when we have masked them with some vicious intent that we really get a kick-back from the progress of time.

But we discover here in the matter of interest that we have two facets: one is "interested", and the other is "interesting".

A thetan is interested, and an object is interesting. A thetan is not interesting. He is interested. And when a person becomes terribly interesting he has lots of problems, believe me. That is the chasm that is crossed. That is the chasm which is crossed by all of your celebrities, anybody who is foolish enough to become famous. He crosses over from being interested in life to being interesting, and people who are interesting are really no longer interested in life. It's very baffling to some young fellow why he can't make some beautiful girl interested in him. Well, she is not interested, she is interesting.

AXIOM FORTY-FOUR: THETA (THE STATIC) HAS NO LOCATION IN MATTER, ENERGY, SPACE, OR TIME. IT IS CAPABLE OF CONSIDERATION.

We have put it right in there again just to drive it home well. There's no time in this Static. Time is a lie.

Time can be postulated by the Static but is only a consideration and thereafter a thetan gets the idea that he is persisting across a span of time, and he is not.

He is not persisting. Objects are going across time, and energies and spaces are changing, but he is not. At no time does he actually change. He has to consider he is out of his head before he can be out of his head.

A Step V, or Black Five, is quite interesting in this regard. He is always thinking the auditor's going to reach in and pull him out of his head. He's waiting for something else to do it! Of course you could probably hypnotize him and tell him that he was, and he'd probably react in various ways, but he has to say, "I am now out of my head," and then he will be out of his head. But "waiting to see" whether or not he's out of his head is complete nonsense. The only way that he can get anything done, is to consider that it is done, or consider that that is the condition which exists.

AXIOM FORTY-FIVE: THETA CAN CONSIDER ITSELF TO BE PLACED, AT WHICH MOMENT IT BECOMES PLACED, AND TO THAT DEGREE A PROBLEM.

Any time we fall away from Axiom One, which is repeated as Axiom Forty-four, we discover that we have less of a Static than before. In other words we just place this Static, and it's less of a Static. A thetan, then, can have a problem, just by being placed. Quite in addition to that he ceases to be quite as interested.

He himself, placing himself, can get away with it. This isn't very hard for him to do. And he can perceive from this new place, and so forth, but as long as he is placed, he will be less than the Static. Just remember that. He is to that degree a problem.

AXIOM FORTY-SIX: THETA CAN BECOME A PROBLEM BY ITS CONSIDERATIONS BUT THEN BECOMES MEST.

A problem is to some degree MEST, MEST IS a problem.

What is this MEST? We find that an interested thetan is a thetan, but an interesting thetan has become MEST. What is MEST? Well, it's actually simply a composite of energies and particles and spaces which are agreed upon and which are looked at.

We have the difference between inflow and outflow. A thetan who is being interested is simply outflowing. Interested - outflowing. Interesting - inflowing. He wants the attention of others to flow in to him: interesting. That's MEST. Attention of others flows to it. That doesn't tell you that all MEST is is a series of trapped Thetans.

It says that it is a type of life which is being interesting, as opposed to something which is being interested in it.

Now, Number Forty-six: Theta can become a problem by its considerations, but then becomes MEST, is followed by this, that MEST is a problem, and will always be considered a problem, and is nothing else but a problem. MEST is that form of theta which is a problem. That's all. Therefore, it is that form of theta which has a lie introduced into it. And so, of course, it is a problem.

AXIOM FORTY-SEVEN: THETA CAN RESOLVE PROBLEMS.

AXIOM FORTY-EIGHT: LIFE IS A GAME WHEREIN THETA AS THE STATIC SOLVES THE PROBLEMS OF THETA AS MEST.

Now that means that theta is the Static, and theta is the object? Yes, indeed. It can be both ways.

It all depends on which one is being interested and which one is being interesting. And we find that a preclear gets more and more solid the more interesting he becomes, and the more problem he becomes, the more problems he has and the more figuring he does on his problems, the more solid he is going to get.

AXIOM FORTY-NINE: TO SOLVE ANY PROBLEM IT IS ONLY NECESSARY TO BECOME THETA, THE SOLVER, RATHER THAN THETA, THE PROBLEM.

That is a very, very important Axiom. That tells you why SOP 8C Opening Procedure works. It works because the main form of theta which we find desirable, which has mobility, which has freedom which is happy, which is cheerful, which has all those qualities on the top of the Chart of Attitudes is an observer of problems and a solver of problems. So if you get somebody to simply look around the environment, he will cease to be a problem and will become the solver of problems. That's all. Just looking.

Get him to look around and recognize a few problems and he will feel better. Somebody then who is worrying about himself constantly, well, he's all mixed up in a problem and his affinity is at a closure with this problem. He's having an awful time. Well let's take this and turn it around the other way and let's have him observe himself as a problem, and we get that part of the process which is "Problems and Solutions". And naturally, if we asked a thetan to be a solution often enough, he would eventually become a Static. That's all. If we asked him to observe problems long enough he would simply become a Static. In other words he would go out of it both ways.

A Thetan could become a problem, more of a problem, more of a problem, more of a problem, more and more and more and more and more and more - static. You see he could go "out the bottom".

Or, he could go: less of a problem, less of a problem, less, less - static. He could go either way. So there's no avoiding it, you're going to survive anyway, and so are your preclears, but we're going to have a better world doing it.

AXIOM FIFTY: THETA AS MEST MUST CONTAIN CONSIDERATIONS WHICH ARE LIES.

In other words, there isn't a single piece of MEST in the world which isn't to some degree lying.

Looking at that, then, we find that the only crime that you could possibly commit in this universe is being there. It doesn't matter where. This is the only crime that you could commit. And this is all your parents objected to, and this is all the preclear objects to when you're auditing him and he growls at you. They add tremendous significances into this, but all they object to is being there. Now if you ran SOP 8C, Opening Procedure, and you ran it very, very definitely with that postulate: to get the fact that the wall is there. Get the fact that the chair is there, that something else is there, etc., you'd be likely to knock your preclear flat at some point. I am not advising you to use this form of Opening Procedure. It's a violent process. If you get almost any preclear and just have him stand in the middle of the room, and say "get the idea", to that empty space out in front of you there, "that it's there", it's there, it's there - his mother will show up and eight or nine of his wives and all sorts of other things will show up all the way down the line. He'll have all kinds of people standing in front of him. They're all "there". But that's the only crime a thetan can commit. It's a lie, you see. That theta can be THERE is a lie, and that's the only bad thing that anybody has ever done is to be there. Now, that's all, actually, that the body is doing. He's got a body and he's visible. He is being there. And we must have introduced a lie. And the basic lie which is introduced is Time.

It is interesting to note that it is the second postulate which persists, because persist means time, and it's the second postulate which introduces time, and this becomes elementary. Now let's look at this one: let's take this fellow who's awfully sick. He's terribly sick. Boy, is he a problem. He's a problem to himself, a problem to his family, and a problem to his auditor. He is a problem. He's terrific.

You know that he must have had an original postulate that he was well before he could make the second postulate that he was sick. And you know the postulate that he was sick must have denied the postulate that he was well, and so his original sickness was a falsity and he knew it at the time he made it - he actually knew it well. He knew - when he said he was sick that day to keep from going to school - that it was a lie. He knew it was a lie and he got a persistence of the sickness and now here he is eighty-nine years of age and all crippled up and we find out that the basic postulate was the fact that he was well. How could sickness ever get any power except through wellness?

Now we look underneath every lie to find out that it was the truth - the Static itself - which gave it power. The lie has no power itself because it is a perversion. Persistence has no power that is not based on the Static itself. So we have the basic lineup at all times and in all places, that the lie is empowered by truth. Truth must have existed and a good condition or quality must have existed prior to a bad condition or quality.

As we study the problem of goodness and badness in the world, we find out that we must be studying the second postulate, because that is all that persists.

Now let's take a situation where something is persisting - and it's good. We could say that that looks as if it must have been based upon a prior postulate which was bad. But you can't make a prime postulate which is a lie. If you'll just get the idea that there are no postulates, that you've made no postulates of any kind, that there are no postulates which have been made - now make a postulate. That would be a prime postulate. That postulate can't be a lie. Now make a second postulate denying the one you just made. That's a lie. Now which one of these two is going to persist? Of course the second one. And it is going to get its power from the first postulate.

It would not matter what the prime postulate was. That is not the point, here. We're not going on the basis of badness or goodness. A consideration is a consideration.

Now, do we mean reach back on the track, and find these postulates? - reach back and run it out with straight-wire? No, because there is no time, and all address to the past - every address to the past and every address to the future actually is validating a lie. There's only now. There's never been anything else but now. There's a consistent change and a consistent series of postulates going on which give us a continuance of now, but the continuance of now is a lie.

You can move objects around, and that's quite honest, that's not bad. But we're looking at two kinds of lie here, and we discover that when we are trying to make a condition change we simply have to postulate, as though it exists in present time, the opposite condition. So somebody who hates the human race - he must have loved them desperately by prior postulate. There's no hatred like that which can exist between two brothers or a nation torn asunder in war. Well, that's because they loved each other so well, you see. And so they can hate with violence. But what is their hatred depending on but the fact that they loved each other? So if we have somebody hating madly somebody named Bill - we would say, "Now, get the idea of loving Bill." Grrrrr, he'd go. "Now, get the idea of loving Bill." Grrrr. "Get the idea of loving Bill." Grr. "Get the idea of loving Bill." "Well, he's not too bad a guy." We wouldn't necessarily restore love, but we'd certainly run out the hatred for Bill.