

## THE AXIOMS AND HOW THEY APPLY TO AUDITING

A lecture given on  
4 March 1952

Well, this is the third lecture of this series. You had two last night. You're going to get three tonight if my voice holds up.

Now he has to cut all that. (laugh)

I'm going to give you a rundown here on the Axioms - not the Logics. You perhaps can get a great deal out of the Logics, but what we're taking - material very, very pertinent to processing.

And I'm going to pick up, here, Axioms and point them up as they relate to thought, emotion and effort. And some of these Axioms I will detail at considerable length because of their importance to processing itself, and some I will merely read.

The first Axiom is: The source of life is a static of peculiar and particular properties. That constitutes a discovery of not too long ago which is borne out by the fact that an individual can return to any point in the past without moving through time.

Now, you can go back into the past - you saw me using a piece of chalk, perhaps - and you go back into the past and you could actually pretend that you walked up and took the piece of chalk and broke it, and then come back up to present time and you'll see the chalk is still whole. You have not moved through time; you have moved through facsimiles.

Facsimiles, additionally, do not themselves contain wavelength. The wavelength is in the physical universe, and the facsimile is a mirror image of the physical universe.

In addition to that, you can demonstrate this very clearly with a preclear on a couch. You run him into a sperm sequence, and some preclears when you run them into a sperm sequence cannot resist wiggling. They will wiggle, and they'll - they don't know what they're in very often. And they'll wriggle and wriggle and their toes will move back and forth and their body bend at the strangest contortions.

Well now you see, if theta, the symbol of thought - if the facsimile had anything to do with size, you see what would happen? That little tiny sperm facsimile is microscopic, and here you have it influencing and affecting somebody weighing maybe 150 or 200 pounds. In other words, this facsimile doesn't care whether it's large or small. It is related to the organism, so it fits itself very nicely over the organism.

Now, to some that is an oblique proof. But there is a better one. The cell does not contain the energy; it does not store energy. All the cells of the body renew themselves about every seven years. The longest it takes a cell to renew itself and change utterly is seven years. You have a complete new body every seven years.

If you have ever seen a preclear go into a convulsion or become active, you can understand the force and fury that is evidently contained in a facsimile. If you add this up in terms of ergs of energy and you add the amount of insulation necessary to store this much energy in a condenser so that you could release it, you'll find you're up against a physical universe impossibility.

You see, it just doesn't store that energy. We know of no condenser or condenser arrangement which will store energy to this degree. And actually, if as much energy was

stored in a cell as that cell is capable of releasing in terms of a facsimile, you would have these cells shortcircuiting.

It's very interesting that you can pull a large number of analogies, saying the cell is charged up with energy, and the engram, the facsimile, the memory, is in the cell. But if you take the ordinary perceptions of a human being and multiply and subtract them as to how many perceptions he has, with something on the order of one thousand memories per protein molecule - one thousand recordings per protein molecule - and there's 10 to the 21st binary digits of neurons made of these molecules, you will see immediately that a person has insufficient memory to last him three months. You can't remember three months back, if there is a cellular postulate.

So, we take this life static and we see that if it is regarded as a facsimile of physical universe, the problems resolve. If you regard these energy impulses which you see in memory as charges, actual electrical charges, something of the sort, you're up against so many imponderables so quickly that there is no solution for it,

Another proof, which would not much be accepted as proof until a person had subjective reality on it or had seen the matter registered on a psychometer, is the fact that memory extends earlier than a lifetime. In other words, it extends into an earlier life. And this is too common a phenomenon in Scientology - and was in Dianetics so often observed - that an individual, of course, may neglect this fact on everything but what's happening to his body. How did his body get that way? How did the body build itself?

And we find biology sitting out on a limb unable to explain how any pattern or instinct is carried through, unless we include an earlier existence. As soon as we include this earlier chain of incidents, facsimiles - in other words, a blueprint to build by ... Then, you just sort of "happen" by the grace of God and laws that not even a good biologist, if he stopped and thought for a moment, could accept. Nobody can accept this postulate that all of a sudden from just nowhere, sort of, you have this little sperm and t,vum, and all of a sudden, boom! it grows up and every time this species reproduces, you get the same style of body. Well, he has no explanation.

The theta-line explanation is not only demonstrable, it happens to be very simple and it happens to be very logical. Quite in addition to that, an individual would find it very, very difficult to explain form and shape without including the experience of death. The experience of death is terribly valuable, and you can be very certain that life in its economical way would not neglect to utilize all the experience it could utilize. And to say that everyone ceases to be on the genetic line at the moment of procreation - which is to say, twenty-one to twenty-five - is an incredible thing, and that is what a biologist supposes or a cytologist supposes.

He supposes that an individual is born, grows to the age of twentyone, twenty-two, something like that, and then he is lost as experience thereafter because, you see, he has reproduced himself and you have the body going along the next line. And it just doesn't make sense because obviously everybody, if you - the only experience the body would have, then, would be the experience of youth. So you'd all be young. It's kind of obvious. You couldn't ever get old if that was the way it was, because there would be no recorded memory of it. And you see how tenaciously the body holds on to these facsimiles.

This logic may not appear to you to be completely sound, but the reason it is not completely sound is because I'm comparing it to logic which is not sound. That's fairly obvious.

Now, in other words, this static of life is demonstrably - very demonstrably - a real static, and there's never been any real static found before. And the mathematician talks a lot about a zero or an infinity. The other sciences talk about statics. Physics is very fond

of talking about statics. Oh, wonderful - you never saw such a live static in your life as a physics static. They say, "Well, this ball - static. That's a static." Yeah! That ball has electrons, protons, neutrons, atoms, molecules, all in motion within it; and just as it sits there, as being part of this galaxy, has some eight hundred different motions. That's in addition to its atomic motions. That's not a static. Life is really a static.

A static would be something which was zero, which was infinity, which was zero, which was infinity. Either one.

(banging sounds) > male voice: Dale Carnegie > another male voice: Yeah > (other comments from the class - difficult to make out) > Great stuff. I hope he left one or two alive, I would hate to see that cult die out. That's what's known as the low tone scale cult. > Dale Carnegie's postulators will be hollering next door until 11. It is recording. We can move next door one door down. Each student pick up his chair and walk.

[R&D - Noise coming from an adjacent room disturbs the lecture. The course takes a break to move to another room, and LRH resumes the lecture in the new location.]

The reason this is important for you to know, if you think about it for a moment, explains quite a few things to you.

It tells you that what you are processing are mirror images of the physical universe, and as long as you process these images of the physical universe, you're on very safe, solid ground and you don't have to worry about anything outside this sphere.

It also tells you, immediately, what language is. That seems to be a little bit irrelevant right there, but it's not. Language is a mirror image of actions or states of being or states of not being or motionlessnesses in the physical universe. And language is very precise, but in order to communicate from thee to me through the physical universe or me to thee, we're going through the physical universe. [marking on blackboard] You see? So that you could have "I" here and "I" here and we're communicating from here to here, and this is the physical universe, you see?

Now, there's no reason why "I" can't communicate to "I" straight across without going through the physical universe. Now why is this?

Well, you see theta doesn't have space or time. And therefore it's very simple: theta can just as well be in Milwaukee as Paris, simultaneously. And the only reason why you are this size conceptually and not the size of the galaxy conceptually is because you find it handier to conceive yourselves to be this size. And you're actually looking at a piece of the physical universe - you, your body. But as far as your mind is concerned, there is no reason why it can't only stretch through this galaxy but could go through all the island universes. You see how that could be?

There is no limit, then, on how wide a mind can expand or how small it can contract, because it's not size and it's not time or space. Also, there is no reason why I can't think something today and have you pick it up six months ago.

Male voice: Right.

Right. Now, this is a conducted experiment and has baffled many people because they will send - like Rhine's work. He is occasionally baffled by this on what he calls "prediction." Well, there's no reason why you can't read the next card to the next card, to the next card, to the next card, to the next card - because, you see, there is no time involved. There is no reason why you can't read future, because there's no time involved in thought. You see? But just for your own sense of orderliness, you've actually trained yourself to read present. You read present. And you've gotten

yourselves fixed up so that you're present and this is it, and we've agreed that this is the way we should think and therefore we can communicate if we think this way.

But as far as all this phenomena of reading is concerned, the second that you realize what life as a static means, it'll show you immediately that size and time have nothing to do with it. There is no reason why you can't rethink a thought, actually, which you thought a long, long time ago. And there's no reason why you can't think a thought which could actually be impinged upon the Roman Empire a long, long time ago. But the Roman Empire can't change. You can think that thought at the Roman Empire, but it's already gone by on the time stream, So the physical universe is marching forward rather onerously and regularly and consistently on this time span, and it goes along on the time span. And so the time span goes by, and we have elected to elect a point on the time span as "now" and we agree it's "now" and so we can all live in it.

But every once in a while you will find a preclear who won't do that and it becomes very puzzling - it becomes very puzzling. Every once in a while you will find a preclear who insists on running futures. There's no reason he can't run futures because he's running in theta, not on a time span. So separate the two things: the MEST universe, which has time and space, [tapping on blackboard] and the mind, which is no time and space, So there's no reason why your mind can't go anyplace and do anything it pleases, but we have elected to have the mind effect this moment of the time passage of the physical universe. So we effect this moment and we continue to effect continuous moments so that we get a coordinated action. Otherwise, we'd never be able to do anything in terms of doing anything with this physical universe. Of course, if you're not interested in the conquest of the physical universe, you can do something else with your mind.

(The R&D includes the following footnote about Rhine: Joseph Banks Rhine (1895-1980), American psychologist. As head of the laboratory of parapsychology at Duke University, in Durham, North Carolina, he investigated extrasensory perception (ESP) and tried to find scientific explanations for "supernatural" occurrences, e.g., telepathy, etc. His ESP tests were done using a special set of 25 black-and-white cards the size of playing cards, 5 of which were marked with stars, 5 with squares, 5 with circles, 5 with wavy lines and 5 with crosses. The person being tested wrote down the sequence of the cards as he expected them to come up, then the cards were shuffled and turned face up, one by one. By the laws of probability, a person would have named 5 out of 25 right; if a person did consistently better than this, he or she was said to have extrasensory perception.)

Now, perhaps some of you, in looking at this "Life is a static," have not appreciated how workable this theory is and how many things it embraces - how many things it brings into account which were way out in the blue. You have a very, very neat package there with which you can work, And the things which you find in the facsimiles of a person who has existed in the physical universe are the things which exist in the physical universe - their images - and those are the things you process. So there's nothing very strange to process about it.

Now, you would not stand much of a chance going out here and taking a cloth and erasing a tree. That would be hard to do. You could rub on this tree for quite a while and you wouldn't erase this tree. But if you look at the tree or get hit by the tree, you can take the facsimile so received and you can rub it out. Very, very simple. That's why you can change a facsimile with such ease and change the physical universe with such ardure.

Now, the facsimile - because you are operating it, and for no other reason - can affect your body and the physical universe. But what can you do with this facsimile? This facsimile you can make large or you can make small, because large and small - that's physical universe, isn't it? And the facsimile doesn't have any size, so it's just your concept of how big it is. You would be surprised at the variability of people's recalls in

terms of size. Some people see men and other people see MEN. You can do that very easily.

Now you should recognize, then, what we're processing. It's just a static which we can take out of or put into, with great ease, mirror images of the physical universe. Whatever we find in the physical universe we can process out of a facsimile. A facsimile, you see, is just a - and again, we have to use a physical universe term solely because language travels through the physical universe - we use "a piece of theta." Of course, how can you say "a piece of"? And yet it is a piece of theta, and we engrave on that, energy, action and so forth, and file it. A very self-determined action.

You, because you're handling it, can then take this and impinge it on yourself and do something with the physical universe.

And this is poltergeist, when you don't use it inside yourself or on yourself - when you start using it somewhere else. And if you want to know the complete ramifications of the poltergeist phenomena whereby an individual can move matter at some distance from him or do something with matter, it's merely a development of these rudiments. I have seen it done, by the way. And occasionally you have, too, but you haven't quite noticed what you noticed about it. It's fascinating.

By the way, about eight priests were having a wonderful time with a little boy in the East who had the poltergeist down pat. He would lie down on a rug and the rug would shoot across the room, under the bed, under chairs, out into the hall - wham! wham! And they were running around after him exorcizing the demons. This, by the way, was just a year and a half ago and it was making the newspapers all over the place. The reporters would come in and take a look at this little boy shooting this carpet all over the place, and they didn't quite know what to make of it. Well, actually, it was very simple. It was an individual who had become so detached from himself as to set up circuitry which moved himself and moved other objects. And the object he had elected to move was a carpet.

Now, you don't often specialize in that, mostly because you - people think it's peculiar. That's the main reason. The best reason why these manifestations don't occur often is because of stage fright. (laughter)

Now there's hardly anyone present who doesn't occasionally have a little tremble when they realize that somebody in the society is looking at them and they might be doing something peculiar, such as walk down into this - a fancy restaurant in a bathrobe. Well, people would think that was strange or odd. And so it'd be like that if, instead of reaching for an ashtray, you developed the technique of just snaking them to yourself. (laughter)

Another thing is, the individual doesn't trust himself with that much power because he has distrusted others with it so often, I'm not trying to teach you metaphysics or mysticism; these aren't in that field. They happen to lie, right now, just in this field of static and the physical universe. And after you get up the line a ways, you'll be amazed what you can do - without much trying. You were very thoroughly educated in it once. Of course, anybody listening to me at this moment probably thinks that I am pulling a longbow, but actually I'm not. There isn't much to this. There isn't any reason why you can't detach yourself or part of yourself as a personality and do all sorts of remarkable things.

In the first book it's mentioned that people talking to other people seem to fit in the right parts of the engram as they talk back and forth. That's mentioned in the first book. Well, it's worse than that. A demon circuit will actually go around and influence people against you. It'll actually walk out and influence them - "for your own good," of course, or some such thing.

So that if somebody is afraid of you, they keep on being afraid of you - you've noticed these manifestations; all I'm doing is commenting on sub-manifestations - somebody's afraid of you, afraid of you, afraid of you and they keep doing things, evidently, around you, that eventually you give them something to be afraid of.

Have you ever sort of noticed this? You're afraid of something and it seems to become more powerful. This isn't just validation. This is the fact that you actually can take your fear and you'll fix it up to justify the fact that you're afraid. And how will you justify it up? Influence somebody else. Now, you can influence them in a number of ways, But we haven't stepped out of the physical universe and we haven't stepped out of the concept of the static.

I'm not asking you to swallow anything very hard. Wait till you're processed a ways and you'll find out that a lot of these things are automatic. And you'll find out you'll be reaching out to stop yourself from doing some of them - pulling ashtrays at yourself or something.

Axiom two, here, demonstrates again the difficulty of language. At least a portion of the static is impinged upon the physical universe. A portion of the static. It's a piece of the static. There can't be a piece of something that has no time or space. But this infers, this infers that maybe you, as a life, do not have wholly and completely the mission of being in the physical universe only. It says - this makes allowances for the fact there might be other universes. I don't say there are; I just said make allowances for it.

Maybe they're a universe that have gaweup, pah and sta instead of matter, energy, space and time. And if so, it's gaweup, whatever I said - whatever I said there, that are impinged on the facsimile. And if you get into this other universe, process out those out of the facsimile. So you can be an auditor in many universes if you want to - if there are many universes.

Now, whenever we think of this static in the physical universe and we say it has a mission in this physical universe, the one thing which seems to be demonstrable in all of its activities is survival. But this survival is an intent. It intends this to survive. Now, that's important - it intends things to survive - because it can't do anything else but survive. There is no question about the survival of theta. It has no time, it has no space. How can it do anything else but survive? It can't erode or corrode or blow away. You can't get up to its capacitance; you can't fill it up with too many memories or study too hard to occupy your thoughts and mind too solidly, because there's no capacity. There is neither zero capacity nor an infinity of capacity - it's just, there's capacity - unlimited. So you see again what happens when we use this concept of life as a true static.

Now when we say "survival" we mean the intent of survival and we mean it for such things as carbon-monoxide motors running at 98.6 (low-heat engines, they are) commonly called bodies. Now, these very, very solid, common affairs are intended to survive. You intend for that to survive, because that is one way of manipulating the physical universe, via the medium of a body. It's handier, easy to do; it's accepted; people approve of it. And so there's nothing much to it; you just influence the physical universe with a body, and you have to do with all of these other bodies that are around you.

Now, the remaining parts of the universe are described in the dynamics - the eight dynamics - and one right after the other, these eight dynamics form up the portions or entities or things which you want to survive. So that every organism natively has an intention of what we might call "pan-survival" across the eight dynamics.

"Good" is then determined as what determines survival along the greatest number of dynamics. That's very important, because it gives you what an optimum solution is. And you can actually sit down and figure out a problem, and you'll find out that you're

counting up the number who will be benefited by this answer, the number that will be benefited by that answer, in the time which is given to you to solve the problem and put it into action. If you do this, it will tell you what the best solution is.

So again, we have, out of survival, greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics; we have, also, optimum solution, and we go right into how we can most perfectly approach reasoning. That's quite important.

Reason, then, is the combination of thoughts into the resolution of problems relating to the survival of entities in the physical universe in which you are interested. That's modified to some degree by viewpoint, but not modified to the extent of declaring war. That would be very bad because it cuts down the survival of an entire nation, as well as your own. If you don't think war cuts down survival, look at the economic status of any nation after it has completed a long war and you will find, rapidly, that it has inhibited its own survival, it has come down the Tone Scale, it has inhibited its own freedom.

We're suffering right now for having gone into a psychotic rage in 1941. And we suffered that psychotic rage in '41 because of another psychotic rage in 1917. Any time a nation goes to war, means that it has not accepted its responsibility - which is high up the Tone Scale - and it has not acted for the greatest good for the greatest number of people, which is, after all, the definition of democracy. So democracy is a fairly solid form of government, because the greatest good for the greatest number is expanded to mean, in a broader sense in Scientology, the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics.

And the dynamics, of course, are: one is self; and two is progeny and the act of sex; three, groups; four, mankind; five, life - including vegetable life...

[At this point there is a gap in the original recording.]

..five is life; six is the MEST universe itself; seven would have something to do with the survival and predominance of theta - but we're moving out far when we get there; and then we run in another dynamic which we call an infinity dynamic. That's sort of a catchall, or it could be the dynamic of the Creator, when and if found.

Now, evidently, these things are aberrative when broken, because you start to process somebody who - with grave religious breaks and so forth, you'll find they're in pretty bad shape. There's something to do with this.

Therefore, you have reason moving in: the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics in any solution. And how can you tell how aberrated a preclear is? It's where is he letting a dynamic succumb? Where is he letting a dynamic succumb? Because that's bad reason. And this, by the way, bears out very easily and beautifully. It's so simple.

If you talk to a preclear for a few minutes and start discussing right straight on up the dynamics - one, two, three, four, five, six, seven and eight - you will find where he is failing. Somebody who goes on a ferocious rage on this, or wants to destroy that and so forth, you can tell where he is on the Tone Scale. And people who don't want any of them to survive, you know where they are.

But it's the quality of his reason which you're measuring. And when we say tone, that again is the quality of reason. "How sane is he?" means "How well does he combine facsimiles?" as well as "How clear is he of facsimiles?" You're processing, then, a person up the line and they automatically recover their ability to reason. So these things are very, very basic, elemental; sometimes they're so elemental that perhaps you overlook them in processing. They're that simple. But they're that pervasive.

Now, I talked to you before about the reducibility to motion of energy operating in space and time of the physical universe. And that's all that's there, by the way. It's just motion in space and time, energy combined into various forms.

The life static, it says, is engaged in a conquest of the physical universe. It's demonstrably a good goal. Demonstrably a good goal because races which engage upon this seem to be quite sane, quite easy to get along with. They think well, they're purposeful and so on. And this would not only mean that they were pervading the material universe itself and carrying on with their goals and missions in the material universe, it would also mean that their theta was fairly unenturbulated.

Again, "enturbulated," in terms of theta, we're speaking of motion. But nevertheless, the life static quite often presents the view of being enturbulated, mixed up, confused.

Now: A fundamental operation of theta in surviving is bringing order into the chaos of the physical universe. You see, the physical universe is actually chaos, but it's a chaos that follows certain orderly chaotic performances. You can predict what it's going to do.

And people will get the idea - and you should know this very well - people will get the idea that when they're looking at the physical universe and when they're looking at thought, they're one and the same thing. They don't differentiate. The idea is the same as a MEST object, a physical universe object. And there you get the literalness of some lowTone Scale people. They think words are MEST objects. They think that when they see something, the memory of it, then, is as hard to handle as this thing they were looking at. They confuse the facsimile with the actuality of the physical universe.

Now, when we say "chaos" we also get the state of some people: They will apparently take their facsimiles and mix them all up and pack them all together and do the strangest things with them. But they're actually not moving a facsimile into a facsimile; they're not actually doing this. What they're doing is taking some model of the physical universe which was very chaotic, and they're confused about its being it and memory being memory. And therefore all of their memory straightens out the second that you take the chaos and the unknowns out of that. You don't have to park their facsimiles evenly along the time track and process each one. They'll all straighten out the moment the selfdeterminism of the individual is extended to straightening them out.

But you very often will find a preclear whose entire time track is a complete lump. He'll get this illusion sometime when he hits a grouper; evidently everything collapses. And there's also a "stretcher," but people often miss this one. The fellow seems to just go forever between these incidents; he's going on, on something that is very long. Why, he's stretched his theta. What he's done is parked his incidents on a time track and he's assigned this time track, for his notation's sake, to orderly positions. And it's a very interesting mechanism for him to do this, but it's not at all necessary because, you see, there's no stretching or putting the facsimiles anywhere.

As far as handling these facsimiles is concerned, the individual who is mostly MEST force, low Tone Scale, who is very badly mixed up with the physical universe, is being beaten back by the physical universe, is losing, his facsimiles all demonstrate failure and defeat to him - this individual contains, apparently, more of the manifestations of chaos. So that as you go down the Tone Scale the individual is more and more mixed up, his facsimiles seem to be more and more scrambled. All you'd have to do is bring him up the Tone Scale and he would unscramble his facsimiles. Quite important for you to realize that: that you can bring him up the Tone Scale and his track straightens out and his facsimiles straighten out and everything straightens out.

It's not just, then, dependent upon the location of one incident. It may be you can change a person's point of view educationally to such a degree that they do an enormous leap up the Tone Scale. You could do this, theoretically. Sometimes a person

will remember, straightwire, one incident, and go up the Tone Scale two or three points, just bing! You've seen this. Very interesting. So it isn't how much charge you get off a case - that's slang. It isn't how much charge you get off the case, it's how high the tone goes.

If you were to take off every incident of grief or terror from the entire life span of an individual, you would be processing him for approximately as long as he'd lived. And who knows, that might be a million or a billion years. That's a lot. So, one incident with (quote) "charge" on it - tears, grief, misemotion of some sort - processed off a else, may not be as beneficial as a new computation for the case. He suddenly recognizes the computation, he goes up Tone Scale.

On the other hand, I know of no faster way of bringing up the person, in this lifetime, up into higher levels of the Tone Scale than processing out one of these secondaries: an incident containing misemotion like a death or a loss - a severe loss.

Now, so you see, there are various ways of approaching this problem: One would be through better reasoning. Another one would be through a better concept - that is, a new idea. Another one would be through loss of aberrative incidents. And actually, when you don't get all three you aren't getting results.

If you take out an aberrative incident and it immediately produces a better concept of existence and produces at the same time better reasoning capabilities, then you've won. But if you take the incident out without producing the other two, you've not won. And you could theoretically keep processing a person ad infinitum on the wrong incidents and the wrong things and so forth, and his computational level will stay the same and his concept of existence will stay the same. Well, that means you're losing ground and you're just wasting time. You see how this would be?

So there's your test - an interesting, simple test to know. Is this person thinking better? Has his concept of existence changed? You, as an auditor, can very often be completely disheartened after you've run out an incident that was very convulsive and it was apparently productive of - should have been productive of great changes, to find the preclear's viewpoint, his concept of existence, unchanged. That is not your signal to bawl him out. Nor is it your signal to feel very downcast about the whole thing. After all, there's always tomorrow and there's the next billion years.

But completely aside from that, it means you haven't hit the button. And you should maybe set up some sort of a little arbitrary for yourself. Say, "Well, if I hit this case ten times without doing a change of concept or an increase in reasonability, well, it's a lost case as far as I'm concerned"; go on to something else.

But use those as your tests, not how many hours you put in or how hard you work on him, because some cases will resolve in fifteen minutes and some will resolve in perhaps as long as fifty hours. Mind you now, you can sometimes pick up reason or concept, and with those two things - either one of them - produce a tremendous resurgence.

I used to take the first auditors I trained and demand that they practice Straightwire. The first ten auditors in Dianetics could do it pretty well. I had them right there and - thumb on them and all that sort of thing, And one of the reasons they could is because they never learned they could fail. They never learned they could fail. Because any time they would fail, they would see it was a lack of knowledge which was skidding, which was making it come about. It was a lack of knowledge. It was a lack of an important piece of information they should have about this subject, and so they would quickly repair that. And they were under constant supervision of each other, and they were vying with each other as to how clever they could be on changing a person's concept or changing his ability to reason.

Somebody would come in from one of the night courses, and the people who were going through the Professional Class at that time would be around. The person from the night course would say, "I just can't go on. I'm - I'm just in such terrible condition. I - I can't go on. I'm all upset" - they had been badly restimulated by something. Take one of these boys and say, "All right. Take her out there in the hall, I give you ten minutes, and I want her right back to battery and all fear of this resolved." Hold a watch on him. Twelve minutes. He won, but it took twelve minutes. Awful, mean. But you know, it got in a very short space of time so that it was eight minutes and then six minutes and then five minutes.

They'd go in and some certainty in themselves would demand the computation, and the computation would just fly out in their faces - bing! The person would recall what they were supposed to recall and the person would be in pretty good condition. Of course, what they were doing was breaking people between the psychotic and neurotic bands, or the neurotic and normal bands. They were very expert in bridging those gaps because they're very precise gaps between the psychotic and the neurotic, so on. They're very close together.

If you get a psychotic to remember something that's absolutely real to him and a time when he was really in communication and a time when he really knew somebody liked him, (snap) he'll go into the neurotic band - just like that. It's very fast, and Lord knows, we had lots of psychotics in those days!

So... By the way, I'm stressing this point here and I will mention it again for an excellent reason: because we had one down at the Foundation not too long ago who had never remembered anything real, and people had been processing him on Effort Processing. Oh! Here was a case that could have been solved in about - oh, five, ten minutes. And I sat there and solved it. Nothing to it.

People had stopped thinking in the application of the processes. Auditor after auditor had processed this case and nobody'd ever tested him on the most obvious point we have - very obvious point.

"Okay. Have you ever remembered anything real?"

"No, I don't think so."

"Well, go ahead. Remember something real."

"All right." Line charge - bing! He's neurotic, not insane anymore. It's magic - yeah, very magical.

Now, I'm not going to go on ad infinitum down through these Axioms. I'm pointing out to you some of the things that are most vitally important to you as auditors. There's a great many of these Axioms are simply developments - greater and greater complexity of development - so that, actually, with these Axioms, we're making a sort of a complex pyramid which starts as a simplicity at the top and extends down into greater and greater complexity. And we see this complexity develop.

Now we get down to one which might puzzle you one time or another, and which you certainly had better not be puzzled about: Theta and thought are similar orders of static. We're using theta as "life." We can't say "energy" - because they say that's part of the physical universe - and be truthful. A facsimile, a thought, in other words, is not the life, but is quite similar to it. They're similarities.

It's as though you were actually operating with two levels of the same thing. [marking on blackboard] Here is life and here are the facsimiles. Life can be natively completely pure, completely unremembered-in. You follow me now? It can be unremembered-in. It

can be unrecorded-on. It can exist without that and it apparently has the characteristic of not being recordable on, in some of its portion. In other words, you can say there is a kind of theta on which facsimiles are recorded, and then there is a kind of theta which is life.

Don't think that all the individual is, is a combination of facsimiles, because he's not that. His physical being is that. But he, as a mind, is not that. He is "to be." This order of theta has very specific characteristics. There are twelve high-level descriptions of these characteristics in the Handbook for Preclears in its chart. There are two more which ought to be on that chart. There ought to be a column which starts at the top with "win" and goes down to "lose," and another one which goes through "freedom" at the top down to "restraint," and below that the complete restraint of death. Death is complete loss, restraint - complete restraint is death.

But those (quote) buttons (unquote) characterize this primary order of theta. They characterize it. It is it. These fourteen descriptive intentions or identity factors describe what life natively is, and it wouldn't matter whether it had facsimiles in it or not, the fourteen buttons would still describe it.

So that you have something such as a code of honor therapy. Every time a person has broken, to himself or others, points of honor, he has actually broken down his own concept of life, and he becomes less alive. The Tone Scale is built on this.

So, you see, this is not to be recorded on and isn't recorded on and could go on forever without ever being recorded on, and here's this other order which is recorded on.

Now, every once in a while some preclear is going to come up with the beautiful computation "But if I erase all these incidents, I'll disappear," or something. Regardless of whether or not you think this is beneficial, what you should do is inform him - I know, sometimes when preclears come up with that you have nasty overt thoughts! (laughter)

You have these facsimiles over here - well, what he's doing is doing a terrific hold on to information, you see, and he's just giving you a justified rationalization of why he mustn't permit anything to leave him.

There's an infinity of these recorded facsimiles already there - almost an infinity. Completely aside from that, if you processed all of them, you quite evidently would have this "to be" part of life static.

Now, it's as though this is "intention" and this is "file system" - two different factors. Don't ever let anybody confuse the intention with the file system. When they do that, they go down Tone Scale and they may even go to a depth whereby they're "normal." The conflict of a file system with an intentional system.

Now this works out to this degree: A person may go into an incident with a facsimile in full restimulation. He's got it right there. It obviously is affecting him greatly when he goes into this incident. And he goes through this incident with that facsimile in full blaze. No great effect; it doesn't matter. But let him go into an incident with intention A or intention B from this column - let him go into this incident with one or another intention, and you have the whole flavor of the experience altered for him.

He intends to go out and see a movie and have fun; that's the intention. He intends to go see a movie and not have fun; that's intention.

This facsimile column is laid down but the evaluation is from the intention side, the beingness side. And all intention is, is degree of relative beingness which an individual desires to assume, as plotted on the Tone Scale. [tapping on blackboard] "I'm going to

be dead” to “I’m going to be alive forever” is the intention span, but it’s an actual input into incidents and is what you commonly refer to as “conclusions.” You say, “My conclusions regarding this and this and this.” Well, the conclusions are colors given to the facsimiles, and these conclusions are twice as important as the facsimiles. Twice... Impossible to give a numerical evaluation, but relatively maybe thousands and thousands and thousands of times more important.

Intention. You can watch this. When you are processing a person it sometimes will pay you very, very well to ask him what his intention was before this happened to him. “What were you trying to do before this happened?” And you will sometimes see the remarkable thing of having a whole rough, mean, ornery facsimile go boom! and it’s gone. Why? Because you’ve hit the intention, and the intention was that it wasn’t going to be important.

Now, sometime or other you’ll find somebody who started into a dental operation, let’s say, and he says, “This is going to hurt and I’m going to have to do something about it afterwards.” Horribly enough, an auditor will sometimes go into a dental operation or something like that by saying, “I will run it out afterwards.” He’s got an intention to run it out afterwards, and he’ll kick the thing already up there to be run out afterwards, and then he’ll wonder why it stays in restimulation,

What did he want to do with this facsimile, is more important than the facsimile. That’s why Postulate Processing came into existence. Theoretically you could pick up one postulate on the case and blow the bank - theoretically, I don’t know what the postulate would be that would do this. Maybe you didn’t quite decide “to be” at the beginning of track or something, and if you could alter that so you would decide “to be” at the beginning of track, yodd probably blow all the rest of the postulates. You see how that would be?

But this is decision as to beingness, state of and condition of. That should open to you a very wide range of therapies right there, just in examining people. And you will realize, whereas a person’s intentions are modified by their experience, experience is a trap on which old men protect their positions. It is a scheme, because at the top of this band of intentional theta is “know” and you don’t need any experience.

The girl who sits down and types twenty-five words a minute might as well have typed a hundred. Only she probably thought this would have shown off or been affected in some fashion.

If a person goes into training with the idea that he needs lots of experience before he can apply it, you can be sure that he’ll have an awful hard time learning it. And if you can postulate to yourself right now, well ... You see, gaining data is one thing, gaining experience with the data is quite something else. It’s pretty hard to fly a bomber just by walking up to the bomber and say, “Yes, I know how to fly bombers,” and get in and pull back the stick and push on the throttles or something of the sort. This would - is not considered healthy.

But there’s no reason why you couldn’t walk up to that bomber and gather data, data, data, data, data, as far as objects and actions are concerned, and then go ahead and fly the bomber. There’s no reason why you couldn’t do that, unless you had the idea that you couldn’t figure out all possible situations into which this bomber could get. And if your state of beingness told you that you would be incapable of imagining all the conditions into which the bomber could get, then you would have to have experience.

But that is what you know; that’s what’y’our imagination is for; that’s what your reason is for. You can figure out immediately at one flash, all combinations of situations.

And I'll tell you one of the ways I know this to be true - gruesomely true. As a writer, many a man has seated himself at a typewriter and described to its fullest extent some highly modern operation, completely out of imagination, and then had people swearing and declaring up and down that he must have been of that profession. He'd imagined all situations which these individuals had required many, many arduous years to acquire. The writer had figured them out in the space of ten, twelve minutes that it took him to write this - the data of experience.

That's - should be very interesting to you, that there is a difference between gathering data and getting experience, and the borderline between the two is a relative thing. When you're gathering data, when does it cease to be data and become experience? Well, the test for that is, is "How much data do I need to imagine the experience necessary to operate?" Now you see, how much data do I need? Well, in this series I am giving you now, I'm giving you the amount of data that you need to experience the auditing of all preclears.

Needing experience is a terrible excuse - a terrible excuse for not getting something done - and that's about all it is. For instance, you should be able, as you run over these things - and you could if you had the intention to do so, as you run over these things - imagine every situation a preclear could possibly get into and apply each process which you're taught here; imagine how it would act. But you only limit yourself when you say, "Well, now I have to go out and process twenty-five preclears and then I'll know." No, you have to know at the end of this short course, and apply it as an expert. And you can do so if your intention at this time is to do so. But if your intention at this time is to "wait and see," then these facsimiles are all being evaluated on "wait and see." And how will you eventually use these data facsimiles? With a "wait and see."

But if you are - your intention is high on them and you suddenly say, "Well, all right, so-and-so and so-and-so - use. We'll use these," then as you take them in you're assimilating facsimiles of data for use and your imagination can be free on them. Because if you say, "I need experience," then you say, "I can't imagine." Same way. Not very complex, but a very interesting point of learning and a very interesting point of therapy.

Therefore, you can fully expect some preclear's last eight lives to have been utterly miserable because somewhere along the line he decided that earth was hell. And in spite of the fact that he decided perfectly correctly, all of his experience lay on top of this conclusion and this evaluation of data.

In the past, people neglected the evaluation of facsimiles. That's back in the Logics section. You cannot too heavily stress the value of evaluation. How important is a datum? What is its relative value, its evaluation?

All right, what is evaluation? Evaluation is the intention [marking on blackboard] underlying the datum, as far as you're concerned, or the intention that the datum will suddenly point to. You see?

Evaluation has been almost horribly, completely neglected in science. You don't have to keep going out and finding data, data, data, data, data. Let's find the important datum and evaluate it and then align it with other data. And you don't have to say, "Then we have to draw the inevitable conclusion," You intended to draw a conclusion already, and that is what science doesn't do.

Your intention over here should be "All right. I'm going to go find data so that I can know. And when I get the data I will know." And you will! But if you start in down here low on the Tone Scale and you can say, "Let's see... Let's see if we can't evaluate and try to understand and maybe learn and collect all this. And then if we read some big books on it and then maybe recompile them and write some more big books on it,

maybe someday we'll know." Not with that data you won't know! Why? Because it's on the foundation of not-knowingness.

(Recording ends abruptly)