

P.A.B. No. 64
PROFESSIONAL AUDITOR'S BULLETIN

The Oldest Continuous Publication in Dianetics and Scientology

From L. RON HUBBARD

Via Hubbard Communications Office
163 Holland Park Avenue, London W.11

28 October 1955

FIRST POSTULATE

We've got ourselves a little piece of data here that you might be interested in. It will make this first postulate a little clearer to you.

The native state of a theta would be the first real postulate, wouldn't it? There is an oddity that occurs: He continues to insist on this native state clear down to the bottom of the scale.

Let's take a look at this. Actually, in his native state, he knows everything without looking, or anything, but he doesn't know any particulars of data. These are all invented. So what you would really call this would be a potentiality, or Pan-Knowingness.

Now as we go on down the scale, he insists upon knowingness, all the way downscale, only he puts it into the form of data, and he gets his knowingness inverted so that all he knows is data, and he loses his capability of knowing.

Another thing that occurs as he goes downscale from top to bottom: He is not looking at anything, and we discover that eventually he begins to insist upon this condition. He starts wearing glasses, not seeing, seeing blackness and so forth. All he is doing is insisting that he is not looking at anything.

We take another one of these things: In his native state he didn't have any space, and so he goes all the way down the tone scale, clear to the bottom, insisting on no space. Only, how does he make "no space," finally? He begins to pull in all the energy upon himself, and crowds himself in real tight, and he is making "no space" by getting everything jammed together. But he is still insisting on the native state.

There are a lot of these native states that you can look over, and you will see that you get a whole string of first postulates out of them. Here they are, native states, and they actually are first postulates.

This is peculiar, to note that thetas insist to each other that they be in their native states, and the way they do this is to say "You're stupid," "You don't know about it,"

FIRST POSTULATE

"You don't know any data," "You ought to be in jail," "You should have no space at all," "You shouldn't be moving" (cops are always objecting to people for moving, you know). And they insist, one way or the other, that he doesn't have anything. They say, "You can't have anything."

In other words, the whole society will dramatize this native state to some degree, but on what a horrible harmonic! So a thetan, after a while, begins to believe that all these native state postulates are bad. Therefore, he must avoid them, so therefore, he gets entangled, and trapped.

We look this over in processing, and we then move from the locational process up through Two-Way Communication, up into the subjective processes. The subjective processes, therefore, should all be first postulate processes, and the lowest of them would be **"Something you wouldn't mind forgetting."** You wouldn't ever run **"Something you wouldn't mind remembering."**

All right, there are two other processes that go along in this subjective band which are intensely interesting. They are quite workable.

Now you understand that you do "Union Station," or objects on locational processing, on **"What don't you know about that object?" and "What doesn't that object know about you?"** But now we have other places we can go, and one of the places we go is, of course, up into the subjective process band, which lies above Two-Way Communication.

Some of the subjective processes which are the most interesting are **"Find some no-space," "Tell me some things you are not looking at," "Tell me some things that are not looking at you."**

You see at once that these are native state situations so these are very, very good subjective processes. They are run on a straight wire basis. So you see what a neat group that makes. But the ones that run fastest are these first postulate processes. **"What aren't you looking at?" "What isn't looking at you?" "Locate some no-space," "What don't you have to locate?" "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting"** – all these are intensely workable.

We would move up from there into a new oddity, and that would be 8-C. Did you ever hear of 8-C before?

Do you know why 8-C works? 8-C works very interestingly. It is totally on a tolerance of command, and the continuous postulation of feeling or seeing something. 8-C, as a process, assumes the native state in a thetan and then tells him to go to the second postulate.

Here is a thetan. You are processing him. You are evidently assuming that he is in a native state, because you are saying **"Look at the wall."** So you assumed that he wasn't looking at the wall before you said, **"Look at the wall."** You are taking over the automaticity of the second postulate. That's why it works.

FIRST POSTULATE

The third part of 8-C is just taking over more second postulates. He says, "I'm not looking at anything. Now I'm going to look at something. Now I look at that thing. Now I see it."

We could probably dress up 8-C a little more workable just on this basis, but I don't think it's necessary, at this time, because it works, just the way it sits. But maybe you should understand it a little better just on the basis that we are assuming, all during 8-C, not that the guy is crazy, but that he is in a native state, and that his attention has to be directed to things.

So we take over all these automaticities, and he comes upscale.

Now let's apply this native state principle to Opening Procedure by Duplication. We are again telling him to look at one object, and telling him to look at another object. Natively, he was able to totally duplicate the object. Now he doesn't know anything about the object, so we could run "don't know" in here again. We could say, "See that book? Walk over to it. Pick it up." And now we run a higher first postulate on him: "What don't you know about it?" "All right. Put it down in exactly the same place. Do you see that bottle? Walk over to it. Pick it up. All right, tell me something you don't know about it."

You could run this on this same basis on a first postulate, too, and it would be an intensely workable process.

Of course, when we go up to Remedy of Havingness, we are assuming he doesn't have anything, and we are giving him something. So we are taking over the automaticity of having something, but we are again assuming that he is in a native state. The process assumes this, and then makes him dramatize, knowingly, the second postulate. Have something. He hasn't got anything – now he has something.

As far as Route I is concerned, Route I is a far more native state than being in a body, and just drills on it, all by itself, of course, would accomplish a great deal. But you could take Route I and ask him what he didn't know about these various locations on the Grand Tour and these incidents, all up the track, would blow.

Our assumption, as auditors, that the theta is in a native state, and that we are then going to make him take over the automaticity of living by doing it himself, is a very valid one, and is evidently the one that produces the greatest result at this time.

So here is just a little change of mind in the way you look at processing. We take the native state of a theta. We figure out "What is the theta's native state?" He is not in contact with space, energy, mass. He doesn't have any dimension. We take this as the first condition. He can make a postulate out of this condition, and then he makes a second postulate, and the second postulate is a lie.

You can assume that he is in a native state, and make him make the first postulate, and you will have an intensely workable process. We assume he knows all there is to know about people, and then we say, "All right. Tell me something you don't know about that person." We are running the first postulate, right away.

FIRST POSTULATE

Now if you assume a theta is bad off, plowed in, and is not even vaguely in his native state, you will tend to run processes which will spin him in. If you are running him from the attitude that he has to come upscale to feel a wall, this is a bum deal.

The attitude you should run him from is: Here's this poor little theta, all stupid, and we're going to show him a wall. We will find out that understanding of him, then, proceeds at a much higher rate.

You will get, sooner or later, a very important thing here. It is actually the auditor being there, two-way communication, and the assumption about the native state of the preclear that produces auditing.

When you particularize too solidly on a process, without paying attention to these three things, you don't get any auditing done.

L. RON HUBBARD