OPENING LECTURE - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on
14 July 1958

Question period, first ACC lecture.

Yes.

Male voice: This question of a person not-know, not-know, not-know - that seems to me that's an apparency. Actually what he's doing is create-cease create, create-cease create, cease create. Is that correct?

Yeah, but after a while he takes the apparency as real and he not-knows with mass, or not-knows with space. You get a track stretched out at time intervals which is a method of not-knowing. You know? And he - it develops a methodology of something which doesn't exist in the first place. That's very well asked because it brings up this point: that is probably the basic reason why you can neglect not-know and still clear somebody.

Male voice: Thank you.

Because it ain't.

Male voice: Thanks.

It's all right.

Well now, this is your question period and it may be on the lecture or it may be on your current auditing. This is your chance to have a crack at me here on all the horrors of war that you're experiencing. Yes?

Male voice: Ron, I'd like a little more on that tolerance of violence, if you could, as versus responsibility.

Well, if you have a tolerance of violence, you don't need a stable datum to hold it back. So as a person becomes intolerant of violence he begins to assume more and more stable data, doesn't he? Now, if a person is being irresponsible for the violence, it of course is far more impressive to him.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

So the less responsible he is, the more stable data he has to get and the more protective he has to be of the stable data. Don't you see?

Male voice: Yeah, I see that.

So that some fellow eventually will take a rifle and it will be the one thing - it's the stable datum for all violence, a rifle. You get the idea?

Male voice: Yeah.

After a while it'll become so valuable that he won't fire one and you get a collector.

Male voice: I see.

Female voice: Wow!

You get all sorts of manifestations of this nature. It's quite an amusing look at life.

Yes, Miriam?

Female voice: I want to see if I understand what you were saying. In this association: we may agree to an association. Then we will find out that we have agreed to more than we thought.

Yeah.

Female voice: They say, "Skip a grade. I'll teach you a little." That means you don't play with any of the children all summer. This spring, in working, I came across that thing with preclears and with myself a dozen times. So here was association without consent suddenly and then you were trapped.

That's right. But you must realize that the only associations that are valuable - and this is the reason we are clearing people - if we took all unwanted or all apparent associations without consent and started to run them out of a case, oh wow! See? This is one of these tremendous tasks because it's just gone on and on and on.

What you have to do is take something which assisted somebody to create, to cause to survive and to (as he thinks) not-know things; and we take this assistant creator, you might say, which became the individual, became definitely associated with him, and then by some betrayal mechanism became unusable. Now, by this mechanism we have now blocked out a whole zone of creation, see? We had a dependency and we couldn't do it without the thing.

There's many a writer today, for instance - I know this personally - who are unable to tell stories verbally. As a matter of fact it's rather symptomatic of our age, but these boys all need paper and pencil and solitude to tell a story. Well, that's a funny thing to need to tell a story, isn't it? Huh, if you think it over? The thing you've got to have to tell a story is an audience! And so these boys write themselves out and run downhill in two or three years, and they talk about writers these days getting all burned out.

Well, that's fascinating when you look at the career of Alexandre Dumas, and he was telling stories to the world and association to him was a thing of joy, certainly. You never saw a guy associate with Paris with quite such intimacy. And this fellow - this fellow was writing all of his days. See? Well, you could take almost any art and separate out the things which are associative with the art, run it on a whole track basis and find the reason for failure. Now, it won't be what the fellow tells you, but you, a Scientologist, could just work it out on a writer with paper, a painter with canvas, and either (or any artist) with a critic. Critic's very valuable and then he cuts your throat.

And you could run this, and although it would be merely a surface computation on the case - see, you're not really clearing this fellow, you're giving him an assist; I want you to get the difference between clearing somebody and giving an assist - you can run these same mechanisms on any given subject on a case and get a tremendous resurgence of ability, and if you handle the present lifetime, all you're going to do is give the fellow an assist.

A present lifetime set of auditing is merely an assist, that's all. You could get rid of all the unwanted associations in the present lifetime - if you could; I doubt it. But you certainly could get rid of all of the dependencies on help in the present lifetime and get some resurgence of a skill. You could make a painter paint better, an electronics man do work better and so forth, just by getting rid of all of the little odds and ends and people that he depended on to help him.

Now, you're not going to clear him because it was eight or nine million years ago during a period of space opera that he got zapped thoroughly by his assistant who up to that time had done all of his construction. You get the idea. Every time he wanted to invent some electronic gadget, why, his assistant was an absolute genius on the subject and he'd just mock up all the wires and connect everything and put all of everything in a proper place - and very well

educated, terrific technical man, and a pal, you know, and they were good friends. And then one day - the fellow didn't even know that there was an affair between the assistant and his wife or something of the sort - and one day he told the assistant to do something and they were rolling ahead on this big project and the assistant picked up a zap gun and killed him deader than a mackerel.

See, it wouldn't happen every lifetime but it certainly happened that time. And so we find this electronics man in this kind of a state of mind in this lifetime: he absolutely has to have somebody to help him wire things, but if he does he'll get killed. See, and therefore we could unburden all of the help he needs and we would make him just a little bit better an electronics man, see? And it would be a measurable difference, but it wouldn't clear the case.

So we have a choice of giving people an assist and clearing them. And that difference is: handling the present lifetime and handling the whole track.

Now, association with education and learning, or anything of that character, is very long because the one thing he has done since the beginning of the universe was teach and learn. He has done both. You can get anybody by saying, "Have you ever taught anybody anything?" Oh, wow! See, this goes right on back to beginning of track.

Yes?

Male voice: Changing over to this question of violence, what about a process which would clear the person's understanding of violence as you clear the understanding of help, in the same manner? How would that...

Well, you could, but there is a short process that I didn't mention which does handle violence. Raising his tolerance of violence and so forth by various mock-ups and that sort of thing is very limited. But you can run Help on violent terminals and you will find this as you start analyzing people, that violent terminals are themselves... So that Help on a soldier, "How could you help a soldier?" is one of the killers.

You got the pun all right.

Male voice: Ron, as the preclear's acceptance of violence comes up to a high degree, what would violence be, then, as a definition?

An unappreciated series of particles.

Violence has been the servant of a preclear, you see? And he has caused violence and then has withheld causing violence. One of the favorite methods of mothers the world over is to teach children they should not be mean to animals or their brothers and sisters because it hurts them too. Did you know that? The little child slaps his baby brother, so Mama slaps the little child to show that it hurt the baby brother. You got that? Well, she's showing an association which will inhibit the child's use of violence. Well, I suppose there's nothing else they could do because the child already has a very deranged idea of the uses of violence.

There's another interesting mechanism on this violence thing that might interest you offhand: is a person gets into violence and confusions by associating himself with one particle and watching all the other particles. So therefore apparently the particle with which he's associated isn't moving and all of the other particles are moving.

Now, he's just part of a confusion and a chaos, you see? But he thinks this one particle is not moving because he's viewing all other particles from it.

Male voice: Yeah.

All right now, if there's plus or minus randomity in the remainder of the particles, he's liable to object to it. When the courts, for instance, counter violence with "wait," you wonder why wait is such an integral part of an aberrated justice. They always put everybody on wait. The wait actually is as trying as the violence and can become actually quite as painful. So it's plus or minus randomity or objected-to association.

The association's too slow: everybody in this neighborhood is square, see, they're all a bunch of squares; don't want to have anything to do with them; they're all a bunch of slowpokes, you know? So the kid leaves for the big town. You get the idea? That's his computation.

Now, he's actually refusing to confront a slowness of particle, isn't he? Well, his reverse computation on it would be: he moves into a neighborhood of - oh, a bunch of criminals and guys that are very fast, savage, high-impact people. See? And he leaves that area because these people have too much speed to them; there's too much motion there. So, in either case you have an aberrated condition where the individual will not confront. But his idea of plus or minus randomity is what causes him to confront.

Now, the individual associates himself with one particle and it's moving just as fast as all the other particles - or just as slow - but he views the others from it. And we get the basic idea of confusion, violence or lack of it.

Now, an individual could associate himself with one particle in a mass of motionless particles and see no motion on the part of other particles, and he gets the sensation of boredom and other such things. You get the idea? He thinks there must be a certain amount of change, see, or absence of it. It's just his opinion.

Now, it's the help on the part of the particle with which he associates himself that causes him to associate himself with that body of violence. You see? So help unlocks him from these single-particle connections.

It's an interesting picture. If you look this over, there's a lot to know about that one fact there. If you're driving down the highway, you're in your car and your car is relatively motionless and all these other cars are going fast. They're passing you, they're coming the other way, they're all in motion, but your immediate confine is not in motion. That is a gross look at it. You have hold of a body which in itself is a center point of view, and other bodies and things are in motion in relationship to that body.

Now, let's look at this: you think you need a body to do things. To knit, you think, well, you've got to have a pair of hands and a body. You've got to have a lap to put the yarn on and all that sort of thing. I don't know why; used to be able to knit without anything. Well, as a matter of fact, why should you need needles and yarn to knit? See, why don't you just mock up the knitted object? You get the idea? Here's doingness entering into this thing.

So, old Dianetic expression: You learn how to knit, see, and you're knitting away and you're being very happy about knitting and you can handle knitting needles - you a thetan, no body, see? And you could take some yarn and a couple of needles and you can make the needles sing around in the air and they knit like mad and it amazes your friends and it's very interesting. This is in no wise aberrative. And then you go along the line and get associated with a body and during an embryonic period and so forth, you get a knitting needle through the chops. Think that over, see? That's very noncomputive. See, you have to have a knitting needle because you depend on that, but a knitting needle kills you. So it's a noncomputive situation; doesn't work out. That's true of all aberration; it won't compute.

But what is noncomputation? If you just said, "All aberration is noncomputation," and washed your hands of the whole affair, you'd never cure anybody or clear anybody of anything. See, you'd have to do a lot more than that. What it is, is help, assistance in creating. That's the thing that makes the whole thing noncomputational. It assisted you to create or to survive or destroy,

but mostly create because that was the beginning of everything and that's all survive and destroy is, is subversion of create.

So you have this create - item A is absolutely necessary in order to live. General - absolutely necessary he has an army. That's the one thing he's got to have. He was going along for just generations. He had an army, a wonderful army, and the - army after army and the one thing he had to have in order to live was an army, and the more army the better. And he just went on that even to this day, generals and admirals do nothing but collect armies and navies. They don't do anything with them; they just collect them. And he just had to have them, see, and it's absolutely necessary till it's so associated with his survival that he can't imagine himself getting anything done without an adjutant and a Quartermaster Corps and an engineer corps and all this sort of thing. That is the way to do this.

You give him - one of these fellows - a civilian job and he goes appetite over tin cup because he doesn't have his army with him, see? Yeah, right now we've got the Washington hospital center over here with an admiral in charge. And he's a lost dog! He doesn't know whether he's coming or going. Everybody is doing so much paperwork they have no time to take care of any patients. That's true. I mean I'm not being just sarcastic.

Nurses are sitting there at their desks through their whole watch - see, their watches - and they sit there and they make out forms, make out forms, make out forms and make out forms. Well, he doesn't have a hospital administrative corps, so he knows all this administration has got to be done, so he saddles all of it onto the people who are supposed to take care of patients. You could be in there for a week and a nurse - and flat on your back in a bed unable to move and nobody would come in and give you a bath. See? That's the way that place is.

All right. Now, what happens to him? This general, he's going along and he - generation after generation he's got this army and he's all set and he has to have an army and that's what you need and all this sort of thing. And then one day - damned if they don't mutiny! See? And they string him up and burn him in effigy and he reads in the history books in the next lifetime about what a bum he was. Imagine Benedict Arnold reading again for the fifteenth or twentieth lifetime now, that he was the greatest traitor that ever lived.

See? He'd get an idea not only that armies were bad but that governments were bad, that everything was bad that was connected with his organizational pursuit. You get the idea? And you get, then, this dependency interrupted by pain and unconsciousness, see; interrupted by impact, interrupted by duress. You get injustice, betrayal, all of these things entering in and they end that line.

Now, the guy is persuaded that he himself has lost all the skills which he was dependent upon an army to perform. See, he got the idea that he didn't himself any longer have the power of doing these things. The army did but he didn't. Now, when they betray him and he can't have an army, therefore he loses all those skills.

Now, you start running Help on an army and his cognition is that he didn't need an army in the first place, which is true. And therefore he gains all the skills that he invested in the army and at the same time loses the injustice and loses the betrayal computation. It just goes away, because it's not important anymore because he doesn't need the association. So you're really curing people of associations and identifications.

The first book ever written on the subject stressed identification. Well, we're right now to the heart of identification and that's necessary to live, create.

Somebody back there had a question.

Female voice: Oh, no, it's okay. I'll let it go and I'll think about it, think it over.

Okay, what have you got?

Male voice: Can you say a little bit more about the ways that a thetan gets rid of the things he has around him that he wants to get rid of? How does he get rid of them?

Well, he doesn't. If he continues to obsessively create them, then he lays over the top of them some sort of a shield that's a solid not-knowingness. He's obsessively creating over here and obsessively suppressing over here. And when he's got everything that he is creating suppressed, then he says he's gotten "rid" of everything. And when all of the things he himself is mocking up in order to live he considers highly antipathetic toward his survival - see, this is noncomputational: the individual has to mock up these things in order to survive but if he mocks them up they'll kill him, see? So his answer to that is he continues to mock them up, but to make sure they won't kill him, he suppresses all of them and renders them to zero.

Now, that person is anxious about getting rid of everything. One of these things might turn out to be the thing which he knows he had better not confront, so therefore he has to suppress everything. You get somebody, then, with an obsession of getting rid of everything. He gets rid of everything everyplace. And you'll find a lot of preclears with this.

Now, you say, "How does he do it?" The way you, an auditor, make it possible for him to do it is simply cure him first of his belief that he must go on mocking this thing up because he has to have it to survive. You get rid of that with Help, don't you see, and then the obsessive creativeness you get rid of with Step 6. See? So you cure him of obsessive creation and so on. So, therefore you run Help, Step 6, Help, Step 6.

Now, that's how you can actually get him up to a point where he has gotten rid of these counter-conflicts and that's all that you're trying to get him rid of.

Male voice: So eventually he gets so he could destroy the things directly without having to bury them...

Yeah, but look. There wouldn't be anything there for him to destroy if he wasn't making it.

Female voice: No.

So, therefore, you never do any destruction; you never worry about destruction in auditing. You don't run this process: "Mock up something. Now get rid of it. Mock up something. Now get rid of it. Mock up something. Now get rid of it." Because the "Get rid of it" is a mirage. It's a chimera.

That's denial of self. You've heard me speak for years about the only thing you can really do that is aberrative is to deny yourself. You've heard me say that. Well, what is destroying one's own productions but denying yourself? So of course, he invalidates himself by destroying his own creations and the more he invalidates himself, the more he destroys his own creations. You get the idea? And he gets into this rat race and he doesn't know whether he's coming or going. He doesn't know whether he is the thing that is destroying him or that he is the thing which is being destroyed or - after a while why, he just says, "It's all so confusing. I don't know what to do." Well, he doesn't know what to do because he can't compute. See, he's got to mock it up in order to survive but he can't have it because it'd kill him. And he's - gets caught in this mess and then he becomes the thing which is destroying him, becomes a circuit and you get all of these various computive mechanisms. But truthfully and basically, when an individual is Clear, there would be no sense in destroying. All he'd have to do is not mock it up. See, it's just this elementarily stupid.

Right.

Any other question here?

Yes. Yes. Harold.

Male voice: You mentioned assist processing. Let's say you have a preclear for a very short time, not long enough to clear him. Would you run assist processing on him?

No. No. Assists - let's - don't have it - I've - see I've introduced a confusion in terms. Assist - an assist is something that you do just temporarily because you can't do that. But let me make this very clear: You will make greater gains with a preclear just by running Clear Procedure straight from scratch than by doing any other thing with him.

Oddly enough, if a guy is lying there with a broken leg, you could actually make greater speed with him by just starting in at the beginning and clearing him than by patching up his broken leg. This sounds utterly odd but of course this takes in a broken leg with problem - a PT problem, you see? That is a broken leg and so forth. So that handling a PT problem and an assist are the same breed of cat and you wouldn't get any further than that if a person was in bad shape, anyhow.

Male voice: Right.

See?

Male voice: Yeah.

So you can lay down this truism, although it just appears a little shaky to you at first, you just say, "The thing to do to audit somebody is to apply Clear Procedure."

Male voice: Yeah.

See? And the reason the public is told to assist somebody or told how to do Touch Assists and things like that is it doesn't get them all gummed up into any serious auditing. It's something that you can do, miss-do, abandon, you know? And we don't find people stuck in assists. People don't get stuck in assists if they're this kind of an assist.

But if you, an auditor, just went in to help somebody and you're only going to have five hours to audit this guy, easily the best thing you could do is just start out from scratch and go right straight up the line with Clear Procedure. At the end of five hours he would have made a higher gain than he would have made if you just patched him up...

Male voice: Right.

.. with something else.

I ran some tests on this you might be interested in. I had Step 6 and nothing else run on some HGC pcs at a time, some little time ago - and I didn't think we were getting an adequate gain during an intensive - so I just assigned three or four to run nothing but Step 6 on the supposition that they would get more gain running Step 6 - stone-blind, couldn't see anything, couldn't feel anything, didn't matter, but just try to run Step 6 for twenty-five hours - that they would get a greater gain than they were getting on old-time processes that tried to unlock some mysterious computation in the case. See? And in each case we got a greater gain. Boy, that was certainly sailing out into the blue, you see? Okay, we've had it here.

For the rest of today I want you to check out people and if you run out of checksheets, let's not stop checking out people. You just check out the next person, write his name under it and put a little asterisk and you check him out by putting an asterisk down the list. You got it? Using the same checksheet as you already have if you run out.

Now, I don't care how many times any of you are checked out for Clear. It won't do a thing to you or for you. It won't stick you in anything that you're not stuck in already. Now, if a person does get too involved and too stuck and the needle was fairly free before you "Clear checkout"

him, if you have a kind heart today, if you want to do a nice thing or something of the sort - mind you, this is somebody that you stuck in a Clear checkout - just run a little Connectedness on him. "You get the idea of making that wall connect with you. You get the idea of making that floor connect with you," and so forth, and it'll unstick.

But we don't care how gummed up people get here at this state of the game. Oh, brother, if you've got a free needle and you've got a potential stuck needle, see, if potentially on your computation of the thing it's going to be absolutely rigidly stuck and momentarily your needle's free and everything's happy - you're just in a dispersal anyway, so the hell with it.

All right. I'm very glad. You know, I've had some very excellent reports on your past week, very excellent, and I want to thank you very much for buckling down the way you did. I didn't think as many would make this as did.

Now, those who are still on the TRs, I understand for the most part, just have fragments of the TRs to straighten out and you will be out of that in very short order, probably by Wednesday for sure, and then you go straight over onto this.

I'm having mimeographed the procedure which you will use in order to accomplish this clearing that you're going to be doing in this course. And it starts out with: Check out a lot of people with a Clear Check Sheet, see? So, when you start in auditing - as soon as you come off the TRs and go into auditing - why, there'll be a bunch of people brought off at the same time, why, just get together and check each other out ad nauseam on Clear Check Sheets and get started. So you won't miss any of this and you're not missing anything by still being under TRs because as I told you before, it is better to have skilled auditing going forward than auditing. Better to have skilled auditing, so we want to be sure.

For instance, it's a very silly thing to go ahead and audit people and worry about auditing and try to grasp theory and try to grasp what the preclears are all about, and so forth, when you're falling over TR 3, see? TR 3 is busily flubbing and invalidating everything you're doing; therefore, you'd never find out what the auditing was doing, you see? It's TR 3 that isn't doing it. Got the idea? So we want those real smooth, so get with it. I don't want to see anybody in that TR group by the middle of this week, so get with it.

We didn't have anybody that checked forthrightly out to Clear, so we didn't have a third unit. See, we've only got two units going. But if in a few days we don't have somebody in the Clear group, why, I'm really going to have to buckle down here.

Yes?

Male voice: The one point of confusion about Clears - I've had a chance to look over some people on a meter who've got bracelets and they don't always read at 3.0 or 2.0 respectively, and this is a point of confusion.

What meter are you using? You see...

Male voice: The old...

Yeah. This meter varies with heat. Now, that's one thing. The other thing is that the individual - as he's going along, plowing along one way or the other... We had a case of this at the congress. We had a girl that was no longer reading properly. She was pregnant.

What is going on with this case? Do we get a variation? You should not consider an absolute, see, from hour to hour and day to day with this. You should only be pedantic about their exact reading here for the purposes of auditing. If it's up here it tells you male valence, if it's down here it tells you female valence; and you get a girl reading up here, you know what to do: Get some male valences off the case. And if you get a guy reading down here on female valence, you sure know what to do. It's some variety of female. This is about all that tells you, see? Now, the

actuality of what the reading is - if you will read in the original instructions - it says apparently this is the case. It says apparently this is the resistance. Now, these happen to be the resistances of a dead male body and a dead female body. So, it is a body without a thetan attached. It's a thetan that's running the body by postulate and without very much association. See? Get the idea? All right. Now, all you'd have to do... I can knock this myself. You put me on a meter, I can knock it down to female Clear, knock it up to male Clear, knock it up here to about this high or knock it down off the bottom. By doing what? Just by adding a few beams to the body. See? All you had to do is add a few masses into the body at odd angles.

Now, all I've got to do is to go out and look at something and make a ferociously heavy copy of it and this thing goes appetite over tin cup. It no longer reads.

Now, what an individual is doing who is Clear and who is varying on this reading is still a matter of study. All we're interested in is that the individual is really free on Help and Step 6, see, and that he isn't looking at a bank all the time. He thinks of cats, he gets a picture of cats, see, but he isn't doing this now. Well, that's what we're interested in as a Clear. It's a bankless person, rather than a constant or absolute person.

Male voice: Thank you.

You betcha.

Any other thing here? I think you ought to give your Instructors a hand.

Good.

Say, "Thank you."

Audience: Thank you.

All right.

I'm glad you're here. I think it's going to be the best ACC we ever had. It's certainly starting out that way, so I want to thank you.

Audience: Thank you.

Okay. I think you've even got two or three minutes left of your break.

[end of lecture.]