Postulate Processing

L. Ron Hubbard

The success of any organism in any environment is determinable by the measure of the degree the organism can change to control a new environment. When a higher organism accepts the obvious fact that its mind is practically the sole means for environmental control it must, to deem itself successful, possess an ability to change its mind, for as environment changes, thoughts must change. Unless that organism is constantly moving, erasing old conclusions and postulating fitting new ones, it becomes static and moves towards succumb.

An individual can thus become a product of his own statics, regardless of their point of origin; he makes a conclusion and is subject to it as long as he holds onto it as a belief. Non-optimum randomity is established when his data, beliefs and decisions are not in constant review and re-evaluation. The main point of tension in any engram or theta facsimile is the moment the individual made a postulate, drew a conclusion from his existing data, or made an agreement between himself and another entity at the height of pain. His self-determinism is tied up at that point.

AREAS OF STATIC THINKING

The auditor's objective when applying Postulate Processing is to raise his preclear from the state of compartmented static into a state of motion. It cannot be achieved simply by giving new postulates to replace the old. A first essential is to process the old conclusions and beliefs. Merely to make a new conclusion which violates an undetected static in one's past sets up non-optimum randomity; confusion exists between the new and the old. Actually, earlier postulates are to the individual the valid postulates, and will cancel succeeding ones to a great extent. Until the basic postulate is processed out, a later one is unalterable, and a new one laid on the same subject as the basic cannot but be invalid.

A baby lies in his crib and is unhappy about something the mother has done. "I'll get even with her," he postulates. "I'll not drink my milk. I'll be sick." Twenty years and many postulates later his wife asks, "Now dear, don't you think it's time you had a glass of milk?"

"No!" he answers. "Milk makes me sick! I have an allergy to milk."

And so he has; it began with that basic postulate back in the crib.

GENERAL AREAS OF POSTULATION

Every individual has made literally thousands of postulates in all areas of life. Of basic importance are those concerning decisions to survive, to know, to understand, to experience, to communicate, to agree to love, to want all emotions, to want all percepts and desires. There are as well the opposing decisions not to survive, not to know, not to understand, not to communicate, not to agree, and not to want emotions. Decisions concerning any of these areas may be statics for which the individual has become effect.

A central aspect of any case is the desire to experience; life has to experience in order to maintain itself in motion. Security and position are statics. When an individual's desire to experience fades away he begins to seek a static, a never-changing vista of what he believes to be security. He feels that once he has attained "security" he will then be better able to "experience," and yet he cannot attain his security goal without experiencing. He faces a paradox. He puts forth valiant efforts to climb to a "secure" position in life, unaware that he is climbing towards a static. To arrive is equivalent to death even though it means five million dollars in the bank, eight yachts and a fleet of Packard motor cars. From his "secure" perch he will not be able to experience life as he had imagined it, but instead will be spending his time defending and maintaining his hard-won position.

Some who strive for years toward such a goal reach it only to discover that the best way to experience life is with empty pockets. Experience is motion; reality. Security and position are illusions, achieved only by going through static cycles. Some men will shadow-box throughout the best years of their lives for the "security" of a dull, monotonous job. Not infrequently someone (who is truly experiencing, in all probability) invents a machine that does the job better, and suddenly the "security" vanishes. Self-confidence is self-determinism. It is one's belief in one's ability to determine his own causes. There is but one security and that is the security of self confidence.

The auditor's objective in the use of Postulate Processing is to give the preclear back to himself. The times in the past when any individual has desired others to create his security for him are abdications of his own post-of-command. The preclear has postulated away his self-determinism by deciding not to have himself. He will rise on the tone scale in direct ratio to the degree to which he assumes responsibility for his own problems.

Postulate Tone Scale

Above 4.0	An I-they-I series.
4.0	I am.
3.5	I am and they need me.
3.0	I'm working with them.
2.5	I'm even with them and I don't like it.
2.0	I'll be to spite them.
1.5	I'll be if I destroy them.
1.1	I'd be if I could get around them.
0.5	I'm not because they won't let me.
0.0	I'm not.

Processing moves a preclear up the tone scale from all the "I'm not's" to the "I am's," restoring basic self-determinism. At the bottom of the tone scale the organism is existing under another control center than the "I," accepting a postulate that it is MEST.

At 0.5 the organism is accepting the role under which it is MEST for another control center, and is not rebellious at the situation.

At 1.1 the organism is making some resurgence and effort to regain control.

At 1.5 the individual begins to make an obvious fight against the control center or environment.

When a person is at a point when "I" has control about one-half the time, he may be considered to be at about 2.0 on the postulate tone scale. At this point he argues with himself and with his environment.

At 2.5 the individual begins to feel he can stay in the game and pitch even though he is but a tiny cog in the great machine. His attitude, if expressed in his own words, might be, "I don't like it but here I am."

Not until one has reached 3.5 can he be assured of his own control.

At 4.0 the individual has full direction of his own command center. The person in

this bracket is almost entirely extroverted, and the body acts almost as an automatic response mechanism towards the environment.

Above 4.0 the auto-control center is far ahead of the environment, and not at all introverted. It is in this range that one would expect to find creative work rather than a more expert handling of the environment.

Any time anyone conceives that he has failed in any way he advances a conclusion as to the explanation of his failure, picking up a theta facsimile and presenting it as an excuse for failure; "Why, I thought the gun wasn't loaded," to quote an all too common excuse for failure. Another often heard is, "I had the right of way!"

The auditor assists the preclear to release these theta facsimile excuses to which he has been holding, not by handing the preclear's "sins" out to him, but helping him to recognize that he himself made the decision which resulted in an engram.

PROCEDURE

Simple questioning is sometimes the best method of going about the business of giving the individual back to himself. It helps him see the situation and come to understand that he is aberrated by his own choice. A computation such as this must not be forced. Rather, the preclear slowly comes to see the truth as he contacts his own decisions to be aberrated, giving a man a new respect for himself. The auditor, for example, asks, "When did you first make up your mind that you were going to be sick?"

"*I never* made up my mind to be sick. Nonsense!" the preclear usually answers, astounded that anyone might think he had wished his illness upon himself.

"Well, when might you have done so? Is there someone around whom you are sick more often than with other people?"

"Yes, my wife. When I go home I seem to get sick. That's funny; I never realized that before. I wonder why that is."

"Did you ever decide actually, analytically, to be sick around her?"

"No! But yes, yes—we did have a quarrel one day and—I remember now—I told her I had a headache and that I didn't want to fight with her any more."

"Is there any other time in your life that you decided to be ill?"

"No, I don't think so. No."

"What about your school days?"

"School? Well, that's different. As a matter of fact, yes. I remember—I can hardly place it, but there was a time in college I said I was sick so I couldn't take the final exam. In fact, I went around for two or three weeks showing everyone how sick I was. Sort of an out-of-valence feeling."

"How about grammar school?"

"There was the time when I told the coach I couldn't go out for gym because I had sick spells. I get a good memory on that one. It always worked!"

As the preclear proceeds he thinks to himself, "Am I doing this to myself after all? Why should I treat myself this way? Ridiculous! Incredible!" Suddenly he may recall some other data:

"My first day at kindergarten I was very sick. They had to take me home. I had decided I wasn't going to stay there because I didn't like the teacher. I really *did* get sick in kindergarten ! "

He will, if expertly questioned, turn up many more times when he concluded it was better to be ill than otherwise.

In working with the very common aberration of glasses, the auditor may ask the preclear to remember a time when he did not want to see, to remember a time when he decided he could not see. He may offer some version of the following:

"My eyes have been bad ever since I was fifteen, but I never decided not to see. As a matter of fact, I was just never able to see.

"I do remember in prep school, though, I complained that the lights were hurting my eyes because I didn't want to sit in the study hall. The headmaster asked what was wrong and I told him, 'My eyes are bad.' They had me fitted with glasses. . . I had forgotten all this until just now."

There will be many postulates on the communication of seeing. Processing one or two postulates on one subject is not ordinarily enough to cause the aberration to relinquish its hold on the individual. There are dozens of them, and getting the earliest is essential.

There is a lie factor in the mind on the recovery of data which sometimes causes z delay of a day or two for asked-for data to appear, particularly in the case of the deep-agreement postulates. Times when the preclear as a child was beaten down into apathy until he had to agree created blind spots on the time track. Such postulates made on an obedience basis lock in data rather securely for a while. The auditor, by simply unburdening the preclear's decisions to obey, his decisions that other people knew best, can often open up great sections of the preclear's life.

Processing an individual's postulates is done mostly by Straight Wire. Whether or not the preclear has his full quota of perceptics is of little importance. Behind most postulates, however, is an enormous amount of effort and emotion which may have to be run before the postulate can be contacted; or on occasion the effort may be run simultaneously with the postulates. Often, merely contacting the postulate collapses the emotion and effort tied into it.

If a postulate does not de-sensitize on first recall, Repetitive Straight Wire is used. Help the preclear to recall a decision again and again, or try to get an earlier one on the same subject. If he does not experience relief, there is an even earlier key-in on the track. Later postulates are lying as a sort of burden on the earlier ones.

Sometimes postulates can be located by flash answers if not by Straight Wire, although only in a case reluctant to offer data would this be necessary. Ask: "What postulate do we need to resolve the case?" "What's the age?" "In the house?" "Hospital?" "Where are you?" The preclear may soon recall the incident, as did a preclear when he offered this memory data:

"My parents used to take me to my grandparents' home, and I hated to go-I was miserable in the house. I couldn't move or go anywhere." The auditor in this case went after the postulate concerning the first decision involving the desire to remain away from the grandparents.

As long as a preclear rationalizes as to why he failed, as long as he presents all sorts of reasons why he has to have a particular postulate, or as long as he blames somebody else for it, the central computation has not yet been reached. Work on emotional locks with Effort and Straight Wire. By feeding a person's postulates back to him he will come to see that he is in command of himself.

When a preclear comments about a situation look for the postulates causing him to make such comments. If he says he never did like other people, the auditor might reply, "When did you decide not to like other people?"

"I didn't decide at all," replied one particular preclear to this question. "I feel like this just because people are the way they are."

"When did you first decide they were the way they are?"

"Maybe I did decide at one time. I don't know when it was, unless it was in the army. And that was because I hated the cook."

"Do you recall when you made up your mind that you hated the cook?"

"I didn't like the cook because my mother . . . but that's silly."

"When did you first decide not to like your mother?" the auditor asked.

"I never decided that!"

"When did you decide that you had to honor your father and mother?"

"That was when I went to church. It's one of the Ten Commandments."

Thus it was found that the preclear was agreeing to obey and disliking it since he was three years old.

SCANNING A-R-C

Standing behind each enforcement or inhibition of A-R-C is a postulate concerning future action. Help the preclear to scan every time he decided to feel affinity for a person—the *instant* of decision—because the static lies at that point. Contact the times

the preclear agreed with anybody against his will. Exhaust the times he decided to go into communication with anybody by word of mouth, by writing, etc. Scan all the decisions on reality. And then, having finished scanning each leg of the triangle once, re-scan it. Applying Postulate Processing to A-R-C alone will knock out many somatics accepted from another person by the preclear. In order to make a systematic session, scan the A-R-C, inhibited and enforced, on each dynamic, using Postulate Processing.

BASIC GOALS

A basic purpose postulate lies at the beginning of every life. Each preclear should locate and re-experience this basic postulate. Straight-wire of the individual's goals and fears will often uncover this particular postulate and will materially assist the preclear to re-define his goals. Briefly, an outline for procedure could be summarized thus:

Future goals	*Future fears*
Present factors	*Present fears*
Past goals (specific in time)	*Past fears (specific in time)*
Past conclusions	*Past conclusions*

Straight-wire the preclear over these six areas, beginning with future goals. What are his main goals which concern his activities in the future? Sometimes he may say he cannot resolve a goal, and such being the case, ask what things he might be afraid of in the future (such as losing his job). Whether a future goal or future fear is found, trace out the present factors which make such possible or probable, and then ask what he is now doing in order to bring such goals into fruition, or to remove the fears from his horizon. It might be well to consider what factors if any are present in present time that are making such a goal possible.

Next, seek the past goals, specific in time. The question might be asked: "What are some past goals that compare with the future goals?" The points where the preclear concluded (in the past) that he could not have such goals are rather stickily fixed conclusions. Straight-wire these fears. Find what he has to be afraid of "right now." Is there anything of which he is afraid in present time? Is the boss unkind? When did he conclude the boss was unkind?

Nearly any preclear will find goals in the past which were in conflict. Locate these goals and the times of decision concerning them. Straight-wire on conclusions inhibiting his attaining of any goals, seeking always for the *instant* the decisions were made.

If there is but little response the first time, go over the six areas again, working the preclear's goals on all of the eight dynamics, but cleaning up the First Dynamic before going to the next. In this manner the preclear is assisted to regain his self-determinism, placing him in a positive approach to the future by removing fears and redefining his early goals.

DEEP AND LIGHT PROCESSING

There are now two kinds of processing in which we are involved: Light processing and deep processing. Light processing deals with postulates and effects and can be done either on an individual or co-auditing basis. Deep processing calls into use Effort and Advanced Procedure; and with it an auditor is mandatory. Postulate Processing combined with Effort and Advanced Procedure helps the preclear to pick up very early postulates, incident by incident.

Whatever the method, deep or light, by which postulates are reviewed, the individual eventually comes to the realization that he is the effect of his own postulates. He postulates a conclusion; he moves forward in time and becomes affected by that conclusion. An individual who can remember all the postulates and decisions he ever made is a well person.

"that won't do you any good, it won't do you a bit of good." When papa isn't looking, he tries to light that firecracker anyway. If he fails, all the way down the scale he goes into apathy: "I don't want to light that firecracker. I don't like firecrackers."

Then a simple example of theta endeavoring to occupy space: A fellow wants to open the back of his car but the key will not move in the lock. He goes down the tone scale, eventually kicks the car. He is furious with anybody in it too (including his wife when she offers, "But, dear, if you will just operate it smoothly; Junior and I have no trouble.") He may even get a crowbar and-when the car isn't looking-try to apply it. That failing, he goes down further in tone about the whole thing, and, although he will not manifest grief (because men in this society don't cry), he will walk away and say, "I didn't want to get in the back of that car anyway." As a matter of fact, he did. All his clothes are in there. Theta has failed in its survival attempt to conquer MEST.

THETA'S TENDENCY TO OWN OR BE OWNED

There is an additional theory underlying MEST processing. Theta has a tendency not only to extend itself but also to be extended over; that is, it is able to manifest itself as theta over the organisms around it or not able to manifest itself as theta over the organisms and MEST around it. An individual then is either self-determined, which is to say, theta controlled in his own right (in which case he is healthy and sane), or is controlled by organisms and MEST in his environment to the point where he himself is MEST. The individual, in other words, could be said to own or be owned. (When one starts owning MEST, the MEST starts owning him. Did you ever have to mow a lawn?) Ability to own and control and fulfill the various efforts of theta indicates self-determinism.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

Ordinarily persons below 2.0 regard the organisms in their vicinity as MEST and this initiates the battle of the weak and the strong. Here is the general at 1.5 who treats Private Jones as MEST: "Stand at attention! Sit down! Stand up! Salute! About face! To the rear march! To the rear march! To the rear march!!" MEST! In other words, the attempt to dominate by nullification is to treat individuals as though they were MEST. And at some point on the tone scale individuals react to this domination as MEST. Above 2.0 a person tries to understand people, what they are thinking, what they are talking about, to reason with them in spite of the difficulty in trying to maintain a level of agreement with those below the 2.0 band.

Human relations are often worked out in this society on a 2.0 basis; worked out almost exclusively on a MEST basis with little attention to theta. It is a matter of who dominates whom. Not too long ago women were regarded as MEST, chattel. Racial prejudice is another fresh patch of blood on the nation's history. In husband-wife relationships often one or the other considers the companion MEST; one is made to function as a physical universe entity and ARC is lost. Children too fall into the category of MEST, except for a few rare cases raised in high-tone environment. "My child," is often the parent's fond manner of alluding to his offspring. But that isn't "my child." That is Bobby—a person in his own right. Socialism sounds logical but seems never to attain its principles in practice because, low on the tone scale, it becomes a fine mechanism for the few to take everything away from the many. So we have the concept of interpersonal relations on a MEST basis, which is not at all a solid basis for survival. No one succeeds in owning another organism. It cannot be done.

Parents rarely give children a chance. To get angry with a child that is angry is rather unfair. The parent is a giant who, compared with the child, is about twelve feet high. The child acts in a "Little David" fashion in order to impress the giant and to hold his own against it, but the huge monster slaps back at him, saying, "Get mad at me, will you?" The child's will is quickly suppressed.

Perhaps a child will say, "I want to go swimming, daddy."

The parent answers, "No, you can't go swimming today."

"But Jimmy Jones goes swimming all the time."