

ACC PROCEDURE OUTLINED - E-METER TRS - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on
15 July 1958

You can make a man into a good soldier by showing him the necessity of it. Get him shot over a few times, show him a few dead bodies, and he'll become a good soldier. Not because he wanted to be a soldier in the first place. So he'll never become as good a soldier as he would if he was willing to become a soldier.

You can really do some remarkable things if you're coaching somebody and you want to get him over the hump, and you're really interested in your student - on good old confronting. Is just get him to - "What part of it's all right to confront?" see, I mean, "What part of me is all right to confront? Is there anything that's all right to confront?" you know, "Is there anything about what we're doing here that's okay?" And you'll discover in a student that's having a hard time of it quite often, boy, he'll just sit there and say, "I'm glad you asked me because - whew! I - I - that's funny - I - never occurred to me before, but boy, I'm not even vaguely willing to be here," you see, "much less, confront somebody." Remember, ability hinges upon willingness. Ability is indestructible. Ability is always there. You can always do things. A painter can always paint as far as his ability is concerned, but when he becomes unwilling to paint, he then mocks up some specious inability to paint. See that? And he dams up his ability to paint with an inability to paint. Got the idea? Because he now considers that although he can paint, he'd better not.

Some people who are fixedly fixed - you know, like your catatonic schiz or somebody like this, you know - they are able to move. And it's a comment on the inability of - I forget the science - alienism, I think it is - that they disprove the condition by such a trick as walking in the room and say, "Well, we're evacuating the hospital now," and this fellow's lying there; he's totally rigid; hysterical paralysis. Guy walks in the room and says, "We've got to evacuate the hospital now, and there's no sense in carrying this fellow along. He'll never be good to anybody," and takes a gun out of his holster and cocks it.

And of course, the patient leaps out of bed. So, he says, "You see, he wasn't paralyzed at all." Nuts! The only paralysis there'd be would be a mental paralysis.

Even if you busted every bone in the guy's body, it wouldn't keep him from moving. But when he knows better than to move, he then prevents himself from moving.

He hasn't lost the ability to move; he's lost the willingness to move.

Therefore, the rehabilitation of willingness is quite senior to just the rehabilitation by drill, education and so forth, see.

Willingness. Now, that is why we sometimes take a psychologist and we herd them into class; they go through the HCA Course every now and then; they've heard about it; they've been teaching it; they've been teaching Dianetics or something in the psychology classroom. That's right. Oh, it's done an awful lot in the country today. Dianetics has almost totally been taken over by psychology and medicine. We're running into it more and more and more and more.

Some guy up in Chicago or near - or Michigan or some other such place - the other day a medical doctor told a patient that came in that, well, he'd better be careful about letting people practice Dianetics on him because it was now totally the property of the medical association; only medical doctors were permitted to practice it.

The patient wrote me at once in great hilarity.

William and Mary - the professor of psychology - chair of psychology at William and Mary, has within the last couple of years written me for more information because he uses it in the classroom all the time and he found that he didn't know a couple of things. Boy, I said, this man's concept of his own ignorance is certainly wonderful. He didn't know a couple of things. Gorgeous.

But we get these boys going through, and their willingness ends with a willingness to investigate something. And it doesn't include - this is awful hard for a guy to get sometimes, but once you've got it, you can understand a hell of a lot about these guys: they're willing to investigate but not to learn. See, they're willing to investigate but not to learn anything from which they're investigating.

See where their willingness ends? And you get these huge research projects like those operated by Nelson Rockefeller and so forth. And he gets all kinds of people in there, and they're all willing to investigate, and they write papers, and they describe, and so forth, but it never reaches them.

Their observations never materialize. See, their observations never amount to anything because they're not willing to learn anything from their observations.

And you'll find some of the most remarkable things in these papers. It's quite obvious that they were willing to investigate, but that was the end of their willingness.

Police officers are very often like this. They're perfectly willing to investigate a case. You know, they're willing to go out and find out this and find out that. They're willing to do that. But not willing to find out what they found out. And you'll get one of these boys describing the case later on to you. I've had this happen. And boy, he's not talking about anything that ever happened.

See, he investigated it. But then he totally hallucinated about what went on, and you get this fairy tale. And most horribly enough, newspapers are more and more and more in this category.

A good legman used to be a fellow who went out and found the facts and wrote them down for the rewrite man, see. And they made a story out of it. That isn't what they do these days.

The legman goes out and investigates. And then he thinks up what would be a good news story. And boy, it's almost impossible to recognize the actual happenstance. You read about all these things that are happening to other people, you see, and you say, "Well, those must be true," and then one day you're involved in an apartment house burning down or something like this, and you read the news account of this thing.

And you say, "Where was that apartment house? On Mars? It had nothing to do with the fire I was in." See? They're perfectly able to learn, but they've got the Effect Scale in operation, see. When they're very low on the Effect Scale, they can look at something but not receive what they saw. You got that? Now, this is the case of your pc who has a busted leg and doesn't know it. He tells you he has a broken leg. He can tell you that.

And you say, "Therefore, he knows he has a broken leg."

No, he doesn't or it wouldn't be broken. That is psychosomatic illness, in a nutshell.

Fellow says, "I have sciatica. Well, I know I have sciatica."

No, he doesn't know he has sciatica. If he knew he had sciatica, he wouldn't have sciatica. See, it's as simple as this, because he'd be in total communication with it. So to the degree that he limits his communication is the degree that he doesn't learn.

Female voice: He'd see it

Yeah. He'd as-is the whole works. This is one of the gorgeous commentaries. When you finally understand this about psychosomatic illness, you - you get in...

By the way, I found out something the other day that I'll just mention in passing to you - you might find a little interest although this is your half hour, and that's epicenters.

Do you remember epicenters?

Audience: Mm-hm. Yup.

I found out a process the other day that turned on an adjustment of epicenters which would undoubtedly be of great use in the treatment of stroke.

You see, thetans came after epicenters. See, we didn't quite know what was in communication with the epicenter. Well, evidently, a thetan who exteriorizes - he's kicked out of his head somehow or another, you know, in an operation or something like this or heavy shock - he's booted out of his head.

When he comes back in, he doesn't hook up to the proper epicenters. Thus you get operational shock and all other things.

Well, that part of the body he is not in communication with will hurt. That, by the way, is a technical definition. That part of the body he's not in communication with will hurt.

Now you can ask an individual about various parts of the body and on one of them, you may pick up a theta bop. Well, it's a compulsive exteriorization from that part of the body. Isn't this cute? You don't just exteriorize from the head, you see, you can exteriorize from your left big toe, too. And after that, there being no communication in the left big toe, his hookup is wrong, and he'll get pains in his left big toe. This is quite - quite amusing. But not to the patient.

All right. The epicenter situation was that evidently an individual who is suffering from heavy shock will get what is medically diagnosed as a stroke. Now you could have a stroke in your arm or your finger, but it's normally half the body, or something of that sort, you know. That's a stroke.

And what it is, is a failure to stay hooked up or to return to the hookup with the epicenter. And so you get a whole side of the body numb. One of the ways of checking this is to get a person to sense the feeling in his right hand, and then sense the feeling in his left hand, and ask him, "Are they equal?" Sense the feeling in his right foot and his left foot and find out whether or not they're equal. An individual who's had a heavy shock very often will find a disparity between the feelings in one side of his body and the other side of his body.

Well, if that's the case, he isn't hooked up on the epicenters there.

And the process that does this is you pick out a prominent part of the portion he is not connected with - you know, this numb, dull, hurts. And you ask him for a condition, just, "Tell me a condition," not invent one. Just "Tell me a condition worse than that hip." See, not worse than that pain, not worse than that broken bone. And this came from this fact: that individuals when they are very, very soggy into a present time problem will only give you conditions. They won't give you problems.

So I decided to use this as an experiment and just have a person give me conditions. And what you're really doing is running "a problem worse than" that hip. Well, that you're running a terminal then makes it quite valid. The actual case on which I first discovered this, by the way, was in agony and was lame and was nonfunctional. Pretty bad shape. And about an hour and 15 minutes or an hour and a half or something like that, of "Tell me a condition worse than that hip" straightened out the epicenters. The individual was now again in communication via

neurons with all of that side of the body. But I picked out the most painful spot and then didn't shift just because other spots started to hurt.

And in the running of this thing, we got this amazing fact: The person realized she'd had a headache, a very severe headache, all the time the hip had been hurting, and that the headache was much worse than the hip. Now, it'd been a bad auditing blunder - as demonstrated in the actual fact that the blunder was not made - would have been to suddenly start running a condition worse than that head, you see. I just kept up with the hip even when the hip would go through periods of not having any pain in it.

All of a sudden, the person went flip. You know, he eased right in and then click. You know. And then all of a sudden were in communication with that side of the body. The lameness vanished, the soreness vanished, all the somatics vanished, several somatics, as I just mentioned, showed up and disappeared that the person had been aware of having but didn't know it. You know? And we got an adjustment of epicenters.

It could be said that the world is a painful place simply because a person is out of communication with most of it.

I woke up the other morning and felt very bad - I hadn't had very much sleep, had been working very hard the night before, and it was somewhat unusual to feel so bad, you know. I mean every time I'd communicate knowingly and directly with the body and so forth, there'd be somatics, and so on.

I sat there. I'd just awakened, and I myself had been asleep. I thought wow! What's this all about. You know? What am I - I'm more thoroughly coming apart today than I usually am, you know.

It suddenly struck me that I wasn't communicating with my body. I woke up to the fact that I very often make this mistake.

You know, I'll drop the mock-up and go out and prowl someplace or do something or other, and I don't continue to be in communication with the mock-up.

I took a look at it and looked over the situation. I simply hadn't postulated communication with the body. That was all. And so I just said, "Well, I'm in communication with everything in the room at least," and that was the end of those somatics. Get the idea? I mean, I'd gone, and I'd thought that when you left a room, you should go out of communication with it, see. Slight little error. That's hangovers, totally.

You spend all night drinking to go out of communication with your environment, and then wonder why going back into it the next morning is so painful.

Yes.

Male voice: Well, I found exteriorizing people a few years ago that a stable datum that most thetans seem to have is that if you exteriorize, you're out of communication with the body, naturally.

Interesting, isn't it?

Male voice: Yeah.

Interesting. Not true, is it?

Yeah. I had a cognition the other day - while I was speaking of cases, my own case - it was an interesting cognition. But it was a cognition, you know. I hadn't thought of a certain area of things for a long time and the cognition added up like this: No wonder things are going to hell

over there, you know. Haven't taken any responsibility for it for ages. And then I says to myself now, who the hell do you think you are that you yourself think that you would be causative on all of the upset in that particular little sphere. And then I realized that the second thought was the betrayer, see. It was the inhibitor. It was the fact that I would think I was too much if I thought that going out of communication with an area would bring a disturbance into that area. Isn't that cute? Cutest little mechanism you ever saw.

You probably all of you, possibly to some degree, believe that it would be awfully cheeky of you to think that things were so bad on earth because you weren't taking an active communication look at the thing. You know, you were letting them go to hell over in that quarter. And you'd think that was awfully cheeky of you, wouldn't you.

You'd think, boy, am I swelled up on myself, that the Far Eastern situation is as bad as it is simply because I don't stay in communication with it. See, boy, tha-a-a-that's - that's - oh, boo. Boy, I'm going nuts now for sure, you'd say to yourself.

It's that thought that lets the Far East go to hell. Got that?

Audience: Yes.

There is an awful lot to know about communication, and the greatest thing to know about it is it's so simple.

Well, come on. Let's have some questions.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, when somebody's always seeing white - pure white spots in their head and body, and they can't do anything about them, they're just around all the time. What is this? Field.

Male voice: Field.

Mm-hm. This is a definite - this is a definite manifestation of the Rock.

I'll tell you something which was a dirty trick. As D of P, preclears sometimes look on you... You see, the D of P, the Director of Processing, is not the auditor. And the Director of Processing is merely trying to get the show on the road and keep the case straight and form a liaison there and keep things running, and so on.

As Director of Processing, she has an awful hard time keeping her hands off cases. After all, there's somebody sitting there with E-Meter cans in his hands, you know.

The HGC sometimes gets a little upset, I imagine - I've never heard any of them getting upset; possibly they don't at all - to have worked on a case for four or five days, you know, with sweat and blood and tears and all this sort of thing, and then have somebody else come along and hit the Rock right on the head with a crash, you see, in five minutes. Terribly invalidative.

Although the most I've ever heard an HGC auditor say about anything like this was to laugh like the devil at himself. He'd just laugh. He'd - wow! Of course, the truth of the matter is he probably had the case all loosened up in the first place. They don't look directly at that. It just appears to be invalidating.

Well, anyway, she was fooling around with this case, answering her question directly, and just wanted to find out how the case was getting along; and the case talked about spots and a field, and conversation went vaguely - this is not even probably a good paraphrase - something like this.

“Uh-well, uh-wh-what is that?” Asked the preclear, “What is that?”

“Well, I-I don’t know. It’s-I can’t see anything. It’s just these white spots, you know, and so on.”

“Well, what is it?”

“Well, it’s just these white spots with these black lines over here.”

“What is it? Yeah, but what is it?”

The fellow says, “Well, it’s - uh - it’s just these spots, and they keep flying back and forth.”
“Yeah, but what is it?”

The fellow looks resigned for a moment and says, “Some African shield.”

And that was the Rock. The case is back in auditing this morning. That’s the end of that case.

Yeah, well, it’s just - the answer to the question is just: you’d have to get the preclear to tell you what they are - what these white spots are.

“Well, what are they?” or “What is it?” is probably a much better question. And he might on some gradient scale eventually drag up something and tell you.

After all, he’s looking at what he is mocking up, that’s for sure. But the white spots or the field, or something like that, is a mask over what it is. And that’s the obfuscator. That has a technical term, by the way. That’s called the “inhibitor.” There is the mock-up, and then there’s the inhibitor, which is a second mock-up. You see how you do this. A fellow mocks up a giraffe, and then he mocks up an inhibitor over the giraffe, so there’s a mock-up, and the inhibitor is a special kind of a mock-up that prevents the preclear from seeing the mockup, which he is making.

And it’s liable to be in motion, it’s liable to have spots, it’s liable to have almost anything. It’s liable to be solid black; it’s liable to be totally white and clear and invisible.

Fellow walk up the other day and tell me he was Clear, he said, perfectly seriously, because he couldn’t see any mock-ups.

And so I checked him out. I said, “Just where aren’t there any?” Of course, that picked up the inhibitors off of a half a dozen, and the next thing you know, he was surrounded by a menagerie.

By the way, it’s not good auditing to pick up those inhibitors. It makes a pc very uncomfortable. Therefore, these “not-do” processes are quite limited.

There’s a terrific rationale back of running not-do. “Tell me something you’re not doing.” “Tell me something you don’t have to do.” “Tell me something you don’t have to have.” “Tell me something you don’t have to be.” These are all of the CDEI Scale not-do’s, you might say. Not-be’s. Not-have’s. Terrific rationale back of this, but it’s evidently too much for the preclear to cut all at one scan.

You take the inhibitors off without taking the mock-ups out first, and he starts up for that hump, but he never makes it. Wonderful processes. Theoretically exact, but they kill the preclear before he gets Clear.

Yes?

Male voice: You said that a person had to do a certain amount of thinking before they could cognite. Is that what you said? Did I get that right?

Yes, you got that right. Let me phrase it this way. A person had to be capable of a certain amount of thinking before he could think.

A person had to be capable of a certain amount of thinking before he could cognite.

Male voice: I got it.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, is there only one Rock on every case to clear it?

Oh, this is a point of speculation. We hope. We hope there's only one Rock. I would say it was something like this: that one item is so much more serious than other items that all other items appear to be identifications with or locks on the Rock. And this would give us a view something like this: that you could pull off several apparent Rocks, and then get the Rock. But this would make it appear to you as though the case had a half a dozen Rocks, you know. And that the case would be much freer after the last Rock would only seem to be the result of having pulled off several Rocks. And I don't like to pound it home too hard for this reason: it is not susceptible at this time to exhaustive proof. This is to a marked degree - this is my opinion. This is what it looks like. Okay? Yes, Dan?

Male voice: This note that you said about something you're not doing. Does that apply to a process like "don't look at the ceiling"?

Mm-hm. There are a whole bunch of these processes ever since I came out with this rationale some time ago. The earliest ancestor of this rationale is SOP 8C, of which we merely have the opening procedure these days, but that was "nots." The whole thing was negatives - terrific number of negatives. And that eventually was evolved into not-do's and so forth. But this appears so right except that it violates communication to some degree.

"Somebody you don't have to stop." Somebody was running this the other day, and for a dozen commands it changed the case forever for the better.

Fortunately, the auditor dropped it right there on the dozenth command. By the time the preclear had discussed it and done it a couple of more times, why, the case was pretty "cavey." You get the idea? Appears so good. There isn't any reason why a thetan has to do anything. But for sure, while he's mocking something up, he ought to stay in communication with it.

His main difficulty is that he mocks it up, says, "I'm not in communication with it," and - oh, boy, can that go wrong. Now that's what's wrong with a case, rather than that the case is doing something. That answer it?

Male voice: Yes. Does that tie in with the note you said yesterday about running "not-know"?

Yeah. This is an interesting aspect of running not-know. This is another not-do process.

Yes?

Male voice: Ron, have you tried that aspect of "not" as applied to help?

"Not-help?" People you did not have to help? Yes. Yes. It has a limited value, but it's again this whole class of processes we know as "not-do's." We call them "not-do's" because doingness is obviously obsessive change. An obsessive doingness is an obsessive change.

Now, if you get an individual out of obsessive doingness, you would theoretically get him out of all obsessive creation. It's apparently a wide-open door, you know. But it's one of those doors that you go out of, and it was a wide-open door, and you're glad to be out of jail, but the only thing outside is thin air. Nothing to walk on or something. There's more to be known in this particular area, by the way.

Yes, Adele.

Female voice: The process "Mockup a barrier in front of your nose." Would that be called the same category? You've written about that.

Yeah, yeah. That's not quite the same category.

Female voice: Tends to send a preclear down scale though.

Yes, it does. It does. It's not quite the same category. That's definitely "limit communication," and yet a preclear's unhappy if his communication isn't limited. This is one of the weirder things. You know.

If your communication wasn't somewhat limited, you could never see a wall, see, I mean... But therefore, communicating with a wall or being out of communication with a wall winds up - and you're so close to the top where it's merely a consideration, that it begins to look silly after you've done it for a while.

Now, theoretically, if a person had nothing to communicate with, he obviously would be in better shape if he mocked up a barrier in front of his nose. But obviously, it's cutting his potential communication with the rest of existence.

So what's right, but the person goes down scale. That's more of a communication than a not-do. Got it? All right.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, in relation to what you said on those questions of "would you be willing" today, in our coaching of the TRs, instead of saying, "Could you take that smile off your face," or "Take that smile off your face," couldn't you say with more effect: "Would you be willing to?" Wouldn't it be better coaching?

Yes. Remember something. The TRs - it would be longer and possibly more stable coaching. Let me answer it that way.

Remember that your TRs are artificial drills. They are artificial. They are not something a thetan does natively, see. They are a new consideration. In this particular case, he has an ability to do them, however, and the short instructing route is something on this order - although we're on very unsafe ground here when we're talking this way because it's a subject that is wide open to opinion.

When an individual finds he can do something that is quite new to him - he never thought he had to do it before - he then will become willing to do it. And we have the ice-cream cap on top of that pie, which is simply this; that the individual, with processing, finds out he's also willing to do them. So we're perfectly willing in instruction to make somebody do something. And then later on he finds out he's perfectly willing to do it, and his modus operandi increases.

I have several times worked with this in coaching somebody that I found was having a terrible time. I would pull him right up in three, four minutes with a gradient scale of what part of it was he willing to do, and so on, and have used it. And it's a perfectly valid coaching mechanism, but has not to my thinking been sufficiently valid to throw away the benefit of just doing the drill.

See, this is a point here. This is a point where Scientology theory and the processes of teaching Scientology are themselves trying to reconcile one with another. A drill is a drill. An individual should be able to do a drill. He should be able to do a drill for no other reason than being able to do a drill.

And the funny part of it is we throw out even whether he's willing to do it or not.

But you can, with coaching, bring a person up scale rather rapidly, with willingness, but I would not consider this the basics of it because somebody who is just about to blow or something like this can, by doing it, discover that he can do it. See, there's another method of going about this whole thing. Got it? That answer it?

Female voice: Well, it seems like pretty heavy attack the way we're doing it.

It's a heavy attack all right.

That's right. It's heavy.

Female voice: It does seem like a serious...

Do you know why it's a heavy attack? Because the preclears make a heavy attack. Every time you audit a preclear who is saying, "No effect on me, total effect on you," it's worthwhile to have a little steel in your back pocket that consisted of this fact: "Whether I want to or not, I can continue to do it." You know, and that's the lesson which is being driven in with the TRs. I'm sorry if it's sometimes onerous.

Yes, Connie?

Female voice: When we had a rising needle on the meter, and the preclear was pushing stuff in or avalanching it in or something...

Yeah.

Female voice: Isn't that what we used to call Repair of Havingness?

No, that's by avalanches. That's avalanches. You always take over the automaticity of an avalanche. An avalanche itself was never considered therapeutic.

Female voice: I think I used to think that you just if you didn't feel good and you pulled in a whole bunch of bank, why, then you'd have your havingness up again.

Oh, yeah. That's perfectly true. That's the thetan for you. Anything is better than nothing. The things that make a thetan feel good are not always therapeutic.

Female voice: No, that's ...

That's right, isn't it?

Female voice: Yes. I don't know. Havingness eludes me sometimes.

Well...

Female voice: Okay.

Get her straight some of these days. Look, we're already running over our time.

Yes, Dan.

Male voice: What happened to the process “Wasting help,” below the order of help?

Oh, you’ll run into it here. It hasn’t been forgotten. It’s just nobody can handle it very well. They have the awfulest time handling it.

I’ve seen a couple of auditors getting together and co-auditing, you know, and they get so involved over wasting help they forget to help each other.

Yes?

Male voice: This thing about willingness and ability.

Right.

Male voice: Isn’t it an actuality that the guy is willing - it’s only apparent that he’s unwilling because of all this junk he’s got against it?

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

After all, a thetan is trying to live his life according to a pattern that he, at one time, believed was desirable for some environment, somewhere. And he hasn’t noticed that he has moved.

When you call to his attention, with just spotting spots in the room, in some such process, that he has moved, he is very often much more willing to change. He thinks he’s still living in the tournament age, you know.

And here the highest adventure he is having is eating hot dogs or something. That’s as close as he can get to a tournament.

He notices that he isn’t in the same environment anymore, so he says, “Well, I’d better shift things around.” So he tries. He’s liable to get awfully confused in trying. His values are all upside down and different and backwards and so forth.

The world is constantly changing, and a thetan believes that if he can just achieve a complete static, then he’s set for all conditions everywhere. And then, the next thing you know, they invent three-dimensional TV or something, and this is all that anybody looks at everywhere, but he was a vaudeville star.

And he was a vaudeville star, and the only thing - the only act that he could do was just one act and after they’ve shown this once over TV he’s through. But in vaudeville you did the act twice or three times a day in different towns for years and years and years, you know. So now you ask him this new thing which he thinks is very bad.

He’s supposed to invent a new act for every TV show. His stable datum is: you always do the same act. Now he can’t reconcile the things and you get a noncomputive situation. So he’s up the spout.

Now he knows he must change, but he’s forgotten how. You must teach him again the lesson that that which can best adapt the environment to it survives. You don’t teach him the Darwinian lesson: that which best adapts to the environment dies. Of course, that is the Darwinian lesson, only Darwinian says “survives.” That which is best adapted to the environment survives. Survival of the fittest.

If you have nine kittens and one has four fits a day, and the others don’t have fits a day, you have the survival of the fittest.

Male voice: Ohhh.

Why, it's just as technical and accurate as Darwin.

Anytime something starts adapting itself totally to the environment and never adapting the environment to it, it's had it. And this society right now is suffering from that stable datum. It thinks it must adapt to an environment when there ain't none.

The government itself is murder on the subject of anybody who is trying to change the environment. They get very upset.

Any production mechanism is under attack. Isn't this fascinating? You may think I'm pulling a long one, but what's an internal revenue tax but an attack on somebody who's producing? Well, what does production and improvement and progress do but change the environment? Now, I'm afraid we all, as a nation, believe we should adapt to an environment without having decided upon one. That would lead to confusion, to say the least.

Okay.

We've had it here. So thank you very, very much.

Do a good job this afternoon, will you?

[end of lecture.]