OPENING LECTURE

A lecture given on 14 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

And here in this first lecture we're just going to talk about where we are going. We are going to talk about where we are going and to which we can be expected to arrive at maybe. Nothing like being definite.

Personally, I don't think probably any of those people present will arrive at this goal. But you have the great honor of sacrificing yourselves for the cause.

One of the first exteriorization processes, developed by an auditor in California - it was not developed by myself. He heard all about exteriorization and he read my lectures on the subject; he knew about it and he invented a process, and that was a very interesting process. It was: Try not to be three feet back of your head. That was the first open-and-shut exteriorization process.

So he came over and he sat on my lawn in Phoenix for some little time demanding to see me. And when he did he told me about this thing. So nothing would do but what I ran the process on him. And he blew three feet back of his head.

We didn't have a one-shot process at that time. One of the few bits there that wasn't originated by me. We had an awful lot of wonderful processes but none of them produced an immediate and sure exteriorization like this one. And you can still run this on people. It's very damaging but you can run it on them.

And after I'd run it on him for a little while, why, he had a big cognition. And the reason he couldn't possibly be stably exteriorized is because he had a picture of himself as being the last trapped thetan on earth sacrificing himself so that all others could go free. Isn't that wonderful? A lot of you've probably got the same computation, but of course I wouldn't generalize or evaluate.

But we've gotten over even that one. Obsessive help or obsessive being helped, alike, arrive in an entrapment.

Now, the method of trapping somebody is not this: Get his agreement to be loyal, get his agreement to be part of something, get him to join up one way or the other for the

good cause and then hit him over the head in some electric machine or something. That's not a method of entrapment.

It is used, but it is subordinate to this one: Help him, help him, help him, help him; then get him to help and help and help until he totally loses sight of what he is helping and why and who is helping him and for what.

There is nothing whatever wrong with help, nothing at all wrong with it, until it becomes unknowing. Now, you could say that there's nothing wrong with anything until it is ducked out of sight into a reactive computation. It is that thing which is out of sight and unknown which is aberrative.

That's the first thing you should know about clearing, Clear checkouts, auditing or anything else.

We have a little gimmick, a gadget known as an E-Meter, complete with cans, which tells people what other people don't know and which tells on you or your preclear, and will register these unknown areas. Because when a computation ducks out of sight analytically, it ducks out of thought into matter. So you might say that all unknown computations are involved with energy.

The way to get something unknown is to bury it in energy in its space, on some other time track - on some other time track than the one on which the preclear is knowingly proceeding. So you have to have - really, for an aberration and an unknowingness - you have to have a different time, a different space, a different energy and a different matter than the preclear thinks he is involved with. And these spot these different matter, energy, space and time computations.

Now matter, energy, space and time is not a description of the physical universe alone. It is also a description of every other universe there is, particularly including the preclear's. So when thoughts duck out of sight they become solid or located and therefore they are unknown because they are protected in some fashion.

Now if you know your Dianetics, you know that an engram is one of the sneakiest things you ever had to do with. You start running this engram along the line and it goes something like this: *„Oh dear, oh dear, I don't know what will happen to me now. I'm just stuck with this and I will never be able to get rid of it."* See? It runs that way.

But what does the preclear get the first run through?

He gets, *„Darling, I have something to tell you." „Oh, that's all right, honey, we will get along somehow if we stick with it." „Life isn't too bad."* And this is all Papa's dialect. Some people call it dialogue but it's usually dialect. This is all Papa's dialect through the engram. And it's apparently right on top and the preclear has always known that Papa was a cheerful and reassuring character. So that's not very unknown.

He has no real recall on Mama who has always been a despairing, messed-up person on the subject of the second dynamic, you see? But if you ask him for a description of Mama his first reaction is to say, *„Well, she was a quiet person; she didn't ever have much to say. She got along all right. She did what she could."* You know? And he has - he hasn't a clue! So we run this engram and we get Papa's dialogue. And then we run it again and

we get some little scrap of the aberrative content. And then we get another scrap of the aberrative content the next time through. And finally the last thing to come off of the engram is the most hidden and unknown part of it.

That is the most aberrative, not because of its word content but because of its submergence. It is out of sight. And it is, incidentally, that phrase most surrounded by M-E-S-T. There has been physical injury at the moment of utterance which has buried the thought on another track in another energy. You see this? It took an impact - and by the way, don't you ever let me catch you auditing a valence off which is all sweetness, light, no punishment, nothing - and you say, *„Oh boy, I'm really getting there now. This - that - that person, that professor he had just dominated his thinkingness, you know, and got him all sold on English literature and he's been crazy on English literature ever since. And I'm really getting to this case now."* You know? One, he told you about the professor. Two, there is no instance in the entire track where the professor hauled off and bopped him in the jaw. And that, in itself, the lack of injury, outlaws and wipes out the professor as an aberrative individual. You follow me here?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All valences which are aberrative must include physical duress.

There are only two ways something can get buried. One, the postulate that it will now be buried. See, that's first and foremost. And that has to be decided way on the backtrack someplace before it consequently can happen.

A person can never be injured unless he consents to it. That's one you can write down in letters of fire on the inside of your forehead. He's got to consent to it before it can happen to him.

All right. And as we look on the backtrack, then, we discover that the individual feels himself compelled to continue to mock up those things which have overwhelmed him. Above all others, these things must be created, be survived and do the destruction. The active dynamic factors of life are then assigned to these impact points on the track - deep areas of unconsciousness. Other such items are cloaked in matter, energy, space and time.

And when we say matter, energy, space and time, there isn't just this matter, there isn't just this space, there isn't just that energy and there isn't just this one time track. There's a time track for every preclear, there's energy for every preclear, there's space for every preclear and there's matter for every preclear. And there's matter, energy, space and time for every universe there is anywhere.

Therefore, an E-Meter will show you unknown and buried items. Therefore, it will.

All hidden things in a preclear's life are connected with pain and unconsciousness - those two things - but certainly also with effort, emotion, other thinkingness, a lot of other contents. But the first thing there, is this thing called duress. He must have been injured. And when we say injured, we mean that matter must have met matter, energy must have met energy and space must have gotten mixed up with space and the time must be as wrong as a Republican regime.

In other words, this computation that is holding a person non-Clear is not known to him. If it is known to him, it isn't aberrative. It can only become known to him if he dare confront the duress.

So one way of Clear, one route to Clear, one of the more interesting routes, you might say, and one of the less workable - you know, there's tremendous amount of theory can go back of these sort of things - it's what works that counts and that's all that counts - is tolerance of violence. If you could increase a person's tolerance of violence to infinity you would, of course, have an OT.

Now that's just theory. There is at this time no known way of doing this. This process does not work. Obviously it's a wonderful process, but it just doesn't work. What violence could you tolerate? Thank you. What violence could you tolerate? Thank you. What violence could you tolerate? Thank you. You get the idea?

Male voice: Mm-hm.

And one of the reasons it doesn't work is because it has the preclear at effect. Now this has a small and limited workability. This is a small and limited workability. On some isolated preclear someplace in the grass roots you're going to find somebody go Clear on this one. Pssshew. And then you're going to find ninety-nine more that won't.

Beware of processes which work on somebody but not on other people. The processes you want are the processes that work all the way, top and bottom, at any case level. Then that's a valuable process, see? Route 1 processes work on a tremendous number of people. You say, *„Why did we abandon them?“* Because they don't include 50 percent of the human race, that's why. And for another 25 percent they only work for three days and then the guy goes back in his head and that's that. The old Route 1 processes worked then for a certain number of people but didn't work for all. So therefore, there must be some missing truth in the matter.

Well, this is one of these workable processes: What violence could you be responsible for? See? And this is an even more workable process: What violence could you admit to having caused? Now, when you're running Problems of Comparable Magnitude or PT problems or something of the sort, you want to keep that one in mind: The fellow is dodging back from the potential violence of this situation.

A problem is terminal-counter-terminal, postulate-counter-postulate, idea-counter-idea. Idea A is versus Idea B. They are in conflict with each other and you get the anatomy of maybe. So a problem all by itself is a generated unknown because the solution is not known.

The rarest thing in the world are solutions. That's why your preclear clutches them to his bosom. That's why when you have him solve something, solve something, solve something, solve something, the problem walks right in on him. And he becomes tighter and tighter and tighter, glued to the situation.

Well, don't think there's any other mechanic involved in this than the mechanics of Scientology 8-8008, which is as true today as it was when it was written.

Somebody just told me last night they'd just read it and found a brand-new book. Read it years ago, but read it again and found a brand-new book. And it was quite true, and he knew all this now! You know? Scarcity and abundance. Remedy of scarcity and abundance of all things, it says in Scientology 8-8008. When a preclear holds on to it he hasn't got enough of it; that is the golden rule of all auditing and is true today. So obviously, he hasn't got enough solutions. He's got a tremendous number of problems without enough solutions. He thinks he has problems in great number, but has no solutions to them - so his scarcity of solutions.

Actually he picks up masses after a while and calls them solutions, and the reason he starts getting glued to masses is because masses themselves solve so many things.

Spaces. The fellow who says, *„Well, the only thing to do about it is leave it.“* The car's all smashed up, run into a lamppost and it's in beautiful secondhand condition and that's it. And so he walks off and leaves it. He's using a space solution. See? Now. He's - has various methods of solving things, but the scarcest thing in the world is a solution. Solutions, therefore, get held on to, buried and we have what's known as the stable datum and the state of confusion. And all a stable datum is is a solution. That's it, see? And you'll find people holding on to these solutions. Come what may, to shake them loose from a solution is one of the triumphant things.

Now there's another way of going to Clear then. And one of these is to simply get him to solve it and solve it and solve it and solve it and solve it.

Now, the only thing wrong with this is that it will probably kill him halfway through the process. Why? Because solutions were so scarce that as he begins to dream them up and as they begin to walk in on him they carry along with them and free all of the problems. And he finds himself in this spinning mass of released, unstabilized energy in missing space and so forth.

I'll tell you one of the ways of getting a preclear into that condition. Now, this is a method of getting rid of solutions: tell me something you don't know, such a process as that. In other words, run *„don't-know“* on the bank. Not-know something on the bank. And let him particularly specialize in things he doesn't know anyhow. See? Get the fellow into some kind of a condition... The way of running old Not-know, running it very wrongly, is point out somebody on the street and say to the preclear, *„Tell me something you could not-know about that person.“* And the answer the preclear tries to give you is, *„Well, I could not-know his name.“* Well, of course, he doesn't know his name. You get the idea? Well, what does this do? What does this do? One of his best solutions is to not-know. So the best solution the preclear has is to get a stable datum about something, then not-know it and get it beautifully buried in the middle of matter, energy, space and time. He not-knows obsessively.

The only way you can keep going on this time track is to not-know its past and future every given instant. And you're doing that automatically every given instant. You're not-knowing, not-knowing, not-knowing, not-knowing. Pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. I'd keep talking to you about this until every one of you had amnesia. That's the truth.

Now, the preclear's method of getting rid of confusion was to bury and get out of view both the confusion and the stable datum which kept it from being a total confusion to him. He just not-knew the works. So as you audit him - as you audit him, the stable data come up - comes up. If you let him wipe out that stable datum then he becomes the heir to all the confusion. You following me here? A little more difficulty, I see. But this is real easy.

The individual has as his greatest accomplishment not-knowingness, the first postulate. This he already has on automatic. So the only thing, you could say, that makes a person totally unclear is a not-knowing automaticity which wipes out and buries every unsavory datum and confusion and violence in the whole bank. Do you get the idea? This then apparently is the product - this not-knowingness - of some exterior entity to himself. And you can count on those things which are aberrative in the preclear, first and foremost, of being not-known by the preclear. They are the first things he targeted as not-known. They were painful.

This in itself is unconsciousness. This is unconsciousness. A person withdraws, withdraws, withdraws and the action of withdrawing from his environment brings about a state of not being in communication with his environment, which brings about a state of total not-know. But the basic postulate back of anything is not-know.

What does the dentist tell you when he starts reaching for the natural gas, hm? What does he tell you? He says, *„You won't know anything about it."* Right? Well, you know all he's got to do... and people are so wonderful in their experiments with hypnotism. I just love these experiments with hypnotism. America and the Western world is still experimenting with hypnotism; it's been abandoned in the Eastern world for a couple of thousand years. It's one of the earliest therapies. In fact it's the best therapy your pc thinks he has. And it's the most stupid. Because, what is it? It's a total nonconfront.

So what's hypnotism? All hypnotism is, is get him to not-know anything he knows and get him to know anything the hypnotist knows; and then get him to not-know what the hypnotist just said. And you got it made.

Actually, there's a much better definition. I do have a definition for hypnotism which does permit anybody to hypnotize anything - practically. Hypnotism is that system which brings about a total irresponsibility on a given subject on the part of the person being hypnotized.

Now all you've got to do is figure out some way to make somebody totally irresponsible for something and you have him in an hypnotic trance. I don't care how (quote) *„resistive"* he is.

I'll give you an example of how you could go about this. *„You see this front wall? Probably hasn't occurred to you lately, but you didn't make that, did you? Did you paint it?" „No. No. I.."*

„Well, you didn't make it either, did you? You didn't build it. No carpentry tools; you didn't ever have a tool in your hand and build that front wall did you? Ha-ha-ha-ha-ha. You didn't, did you, huh?" „Well, as a matter of fact-as a matter of fact, the organization, you know, rents this building doesn't own it, and..." „You're a member of the organization, you don't own the front wall, do you? No, you don't, do you?" „Now tell me, if an H-bomb went off at this moment in this room, you

couldn't prevent that front wall from being injured, could you? You couldn't, huh?" „*If it were to fall down at this moment, there isn't much you could do about that either, is there?"* This is hypnotism. Do you see that? It's explaining to somebody that he can't do anything about it. And if you finally work this in in enough of a gradient scale, you'll have that person sitting there with his eyelids fluttering in the greatest hypnotic trance you ever saw. In other words, we now have the common denominator of hypnotism, which is quite a trick.

And a lot of hypnotists out there who are hypnotizing people all over the place and themselves unable to be hypnotized, could be pulled right into this. All you'd have to explain to them was that they really had no responsibility for anybody they had ever hypnotized. And if you convinced them of this on a gradient scale, your hypnotist would just go into a total trance. Get the idea? Now. What is responsibility?

It is the willingness to control - was one early definition. But also the taking the blame for having created might be a more agreeable definition to some preclears. In other words, cause-point on the cycle of action would be an excellent definition for responsibility. Willingness to be cause-point on the cycle of action. Willingness to have created, to make it survive, to make it a destroyed thing, to destroy it, make it survive, to continue it, to create it. Willingness to have caused these things.

Now subordinately, willingness to have controlled it, started it, changed it and stopped it, which you will also find will work into the cycle of action. So the first definition is quite valid. You see this? All right. Now we're talking and have been talking all the way through here about an uncleared state. And I'm just laying it down to you as rapidly as I can.

What is an uncleared state? An uncleared state is an obsessive not-knowingness which has buried stable data which then guide the individual in the course of his life. And each one of those stable data was received in a moment of duress.

You have an individual who is otherwise motivated than by himself since he has not-known all of these stable data and has refused to take responsibility for them after he has not-known them. So his responsibility factor is low, his not-knowingness factor is high. His impact, fear of, is high. His willingness to be responsible for creating is high - in the black bracket - it's a high „*know.*" His willingness to cause something to survive is very, very poor. His willingness to destroy something is nil. And the funny part of it is he started all this on something he could not confront.

And he couldn't confront it then so you as an auditor have got to make him confront it now.

Now, knowing this and knowing these mechanics, we see then that clearing in a half an hour is not possible unless in a half an hour you could suddenly graduate somebody into a confrontingness of all those things he has refused to confront. Now, that's probably a lot of things. You see that? There is then a little time entered into clearingness. See? It's a little time is entered into it. By this: the thing that you can do for him is to bring him forward on a gradient scale to a confrontingness of all of those things he would not confront.

Now, there are slow ways to do it and fast ways to do it.

But let's go back and look at this anatomy again. And let's find out how he came to refuse to confront things. One of the biggest tricks was helping him confront things. And we get into the basic anatomy of this and we find that that on which a person has depended utterly, which then betrayed him, became his unknown master. Perfectly all right for anybody to have a known master. Perfectly all right for you to be the known master of anything, everybody. It doesn't matter as long as you don't get yourself buried in the bank.

And one of the ways of getting yourself buried in the bank, of course, is to beat the fellow up. That's why an auditor must never use physical duress on a preclear so as to actually beat, punish or intentionally injure a preclear. Even getting angry with a preclear during a session can actually serve as a key-in of earlier physical duress.

So, the whole proposition around clearing is all wrapped up in the fact that he is a package of not-himself. Things have assisted him and then betrayed him. It isn't enough to have been assisted. If a person were only assisted from here on out he would never become aberrated. If he only assisted and was assisted for the next ten billion years he would never become aberrated. Betrayal must enter into this picture: injustice. Those factors must enter into help.

For instance, let's say, well, let's take an athletic coach and he was going to help this preclear become a great athlete - and this was a few lives ago or something - and he was going to help this preclear become a great athlete and he was going to do this and that for him. And he did. He helped him a great deal. And the night just before the fight he got mad at him and hit him in the jaw and kicked him in the ribs and said he'd never have anything to do with him anymore because he wouldn't throw the fight or something of this sort. See? Here was betrayal, injustice. Here was a dependency; the fellow was his friend and all of a sudden you get the friend shooting him dead. You get the idea? There had to be help, help, help to a dependency level and then a demonstration that this help could never afterwards be confronted. So we get the person not helped on this angle.

Now, we pick him up three lifetimes later and we decide to coach him a little bit so that he can become an athlete. Oh-oh-oh-oh-oh! Every time we try to tell him, *„Now if you'll just get out and run around the block in your shorts every morning, you know, if you'll just get out and run around the block every morning.“* And he says, *„You're trying to make me catch my death of pneumonia.“*

And you'll say, *„What an outrageous statement! I just don't - summer, it's usually quite warm in the morning. All we said was to run around the block once and this fellow is upset.“* Now we know why high school and college athletics have such a hard time of it. Because the coach says then, *„Well, if you do not do exactly as I say (to this fellow) why, of course, we're going to flunk you physically, ostracize you, fix you up so your parents will never speak to you again, fix you up so your whole life will be a failure, you won't be able to get married or anything, you know. In other words, we're going to give you a bad grade unless you get out and run around the block every morning in your shorts.“* Now this fellow knows what happens if you give him help on coaching. Just before the big fight when you've got to get in there and pitch, you're

going to get hit in the jaw and your ribs are all going to be busted. And you're probably going to have to step into the ring already mutilated. See? This is what happens. His stable data on help, then, is that it kills you. So you have the confusion of coaching held down by the fact that help is murderous. And that's this solution.

The solution to living then - this then is never to accept help in an athletic endeavor. And he becomes a great star of Notre Dame or something of the sort because he can't play with any other teammate. You get all sorts of interesting athletic personalities that cannot cooperate.

In bands or something like this you'll find somebody who is a wonderful soloist but he cannot play with other band members. Now, in that person you may think you have found a great musician because he is aberrated. That's what Sigmund „*Fraud*" declared. You couldn't win unless you were crazy, he said.

You'll find out that when somebody helps you play, they wait for you in the alley and shove a knife in your ribs. See? The stable datum. So anybody who helps you carry a tune will kill you. So therefore, the stable datum and the solution to life is: Don't ever help anybody and don't ever let anybody help you carry a tune. See? And that's a perfectly reasonable thing, isn't it? Now, the funny part of it is all a preclear knows is that he feels uncomfortable when tootling on his trumpet, somebody tump-tumps a drum or even keeps time on the edge of a desk. He could look down at an audience that he was playing for, soloist on a trumpet, and see one person keeping time with his foot and go, du-u-u-u-u. Get the idea? So all of these aberrations boil down to a third dynamic situation. All aberration is third dynamic. Horrible fact, but very true. And all auditing is a third dynamic activity.

If you want to know the full explanation for that, go read The Factors again. And you'll find out a universe gets composed when you start confounding other people's anchor points for your own and so forth, and you get the basic confusion. And therefore, you get a continuance because you don't ever figure it out.

But the energy, the matter, the space, the time are themselves not important. They are not what the thetan minds. It's their disarrangement, disobedience, refusal to take proper pattern and what they hide that he's upset about.

Now, you can go at it directly and try to clear a case on the basis of clearing him on matter, energy, space and time and you'll get quite a little distance, that's for sure, until you find out and run square into the fact that he likes this stuff. And you're trying to wipe out something he enjoys, he likes. It's - his favorite game is being a nothingness trying to confront a somethingness - through a void. If you don't let him do that, he gets unhappy.

You can even cure a psycho by taking him out and showing him just a little more space every day, you know? And get him to confront just a little more energy. Gradient scale.

Don't think that the sixth dynamic is the only aberrated dynamic in spite of the fact there probably isn't a person present could answer this question: How could I help the physical universe? Just try and answer that question for a moment, will you? And

think of a way you could help the physical universe. Come on. Now, has anybody come up with an answer? You got an answer? Or are the rest of you in a fog? Did that fog you?

Female voice: What's it trying to do?

Of course that's a stuck flow. See? The physical universe helping you. See, it helps you all the time. But whatever gave you the idea you didn't help it? You must have this idea or you would have come up with an answer just that fast. You must have something to do with helping the physical universe for it ever to have helped you in the first place. Do you know of ways you could help the physical universe now? Have you thought of one? Huh?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Well, here's - just skip it. Here's the thing - here's the thing about that. Apparently, then, that's a magnitudinous question. And that, by the way, is about the most confounding and stumping auditing question you can suddenly ask a preclear: *„Well, now, tell me one way that you could help the physical universe.“* And you'll sit there for some time.

Now, you get the reverse side of it and you get an automaticity. Now, I'll ask you the reverse side of it now. Now, think of a way the physical universe could help you. Are there a few of them?

Female voice: Yeah.

Well, that's quite interesting because you're looking at - directly at the solidest matter, energy, space and time on which we have agreed. See? Naturally, it can help you in billions of ways. But if you've got the idea that it just sits there and you never had anything to do with it at any time and yet you're able to communicate with it, you got a couple of wires crossed someplace. That all by itself must be a buried datum someplace in the bank.

There must be something not known concerning your participation in the creation of this universe. Because let me point something out to you: it's here right now; it is created and is surviving right this minute. But the physical universe of an instant ago is no longer here, is it? So it must have been destroyed in some fashion.

We get the phenomenon of continuance by constant creation and destruction by not-knowingness. Just look at that wall and realize that you must be going not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know, not-know. But what else are you doing? You must be saying, *„Wall - create it,“* you know, *„Wall, wall. Wall - not-know it. Wall - not-know it. Wall-not-know it.“*

Now, the number of seconds - the number of seconds or milliseconds of duration of your creation with no effort on your part at all gives you the present time span of attention - which, what do you know, is different preclear to preclear. And the fellow who has a tremendous reaction time is only operating in more present time than somebody else. It's a wider present time, don't you see? So he can, of course, forecast

what he's going to do because he has already done it. See? The extant of the physical universe is wide enough for him to forecast because it is.

Now, somebody who is spinning has an entirely different reaction on this basis, entirely different reaction, and that is: it is so infinitesimally brief and fleeting that it isn't even solid. Do you see that? And eventually it disappears entirely and he is now doing a total not-know of the physical universe.

In other words, he no longer creates it, you see, observes it and not-knows it. He no longer goes on that cycle. He goes on the next cycle, which is: He not-knows it. You see, he not-knows it, he not-knows it and he not-knows it. Get the idea? So it has become unreal to him.

A blind man who is not blind because of physical impediment just is looking at a total unreality. It isn't there; he can't see it anymore. Well, what he - and he's one of the roughest boys to process you ever had anything to do with. It's a total unreality because he isn't creating it. His responsibility for its creation, its survival and its not-knowingness or its destruction is zero. He doesn't even take responsibility for the not-know. But he's just doing this one thing: he's not-knowing.

Therefore, you'll find the less able people are the more stupid people. Stupidity is just a condition of obsessive not-knowingness.

You try to teach this fellow: *„The cat's name is Roger."* So you say to him, *„The"* - got an IQ of about 30 or something like that; he's part of the State Department - and „The cat," you say to him, *„The cat's name ..."* (You ought to make this experiment; this is an actual experiment you ought to make as a test of stupidity.) *„The cat's name is Roger."* Now you say, *„What am I talking about? So let's go over it again. The cat's name is Roger. What am I talking about? The cat's..."*

All of a sudden he says, *„The cat's. The cat's. Yeah, the cat's. You're talking about a cat. Talkin' 'bout a puddycat. Oooh."* Now, if you don't hammer it any further, this guy will go off and claim that your conversation has totally concerned the fact that cats exist. He won't have *„The cat's name is..."* What's the subject of your conversation? The subject of the conversation is the cat's name, not the cat, and what the name is. In other words, he's unable to learn this datum: The cat's name is Roger. He has an awful hard time with this. He's stupid. Therefore he's hard to teach.

What is he doing? As you give him a stable datum, his not-knowing machinery overwhumps it. As he presents himself with a wall, his not-knowingness overwhumps it. Got the idea? The old first postulate proposition at work.

Now, if this is so valuable, then why isn't it part of the road to Clear? It could be, but it's too tough. To ask an individual to take over his not-knowingness machinery is to swamp him with everything he's creating and not-knowing. And the bank almost kills him before you get him - get him through it.

In other words, it's a rough way over the hump, because there is a hump to cross. And that hump is this: When an individual becomes proficient in mocking something up, his bank becomes proportionately solid. Every engram he has in restimulation or

is obsessively creating becomes as strong and as tough as he can mock up. And if he could mock up a solid object out here his whole bank and all of his past and all the jammed tracks and everything else would become solid.

The dentist who - would still be operating on his teeth and actual teeth would start coming out of his head. You get the idea? You see this? The automobile would still be going over the cliff and he would have all of that space that he was falling through. Don't you see? Because he is so associated with these experiences, his obsessive not-knowingness of them, which was his basic method of getting them out of the road, is his only answer. He is so associated with them, he's so third-dynamicked and fourth- and fifth- and sixth- and seventh- and eighth-dynamicked. He is so involved, he is so associated with every part of his past and perhaps even his future, and he is so thoroughly and obsessively creating it and not-knowing what he is doing - this uncleared person - that when you try to improve his case you practically kill him. Do you see this? Therefore, it is not not-knowingness that is the common denominator to not-Clearness. Not-knowingness is the method by which he is preventing these things from victimizing him. That is merely a solution. And if you ran out the solution you would cave the bank in on him. Why? Because he has a solution. His one solution. First, his solution to being just a thetan with no universe was to not-know everything he knew and start in all over again. That's the first postulate. That was a great solution. The only thing wrong with a thetan is a thetan.

So, we have this situation then in which the individual has a stable datum which carries through all of his days, by which he prevents the confusion of past associations from bedeviling him. And the solution to his basic problem of confusion, disrelationship, pain, unconsciousness, all the rest of it - his solution to all of this is to not-know it all.

And when you try to pluck this solution off the case, he of course gets all of the confusion which the solution was holding in abeyance. You got that? Now, all a bank is, is a method of not-knowing gone solid. See?

But much more importantly, you will run into fields. You'll run into fields. How did he not-know his father? Well, actually, he not-knew his father by burying his father with his mother, or something. See? Get the idea? He used mechanical not-knowingnesses. See? He not-knows his early childhood by burying it under a number of teenage triumphs.

Male voice: Mm-hm.

You get the idea? So he's got a not-knowingness system going on here, which is a solid system. So he buries the unconfrontable with the barely confrontable or the real confrontable. See? See, his non-confrontables are buried in confrontables. You got the idea there? All right. Now, if that's the case - if that's the case - then when you run the solution out you get first, a bunch of confrontables, and then you get some non-confrontables. And with the non-confrontables you get solid not-knowing-ness, which is a field. The invisible field, the black field and so forth are just mechanical ways of not-knowingness. Again a mechanical way of not-knowingness: burying the unsavory past with a triumphant present.

All right. Now compare that mechanism, same way, with: he's got all these horrible things that would attack him so he puts up a total and constant not-know he calls a black screen.

But the whole of a case does not go back to not-know. Not-know is simply a solution to livingness. We have to ask: What is wrong with livingness? And I can give you that. So far as clearing is concerned, it's a good definition. Don't jump out of your seats now. This is very, very clear: association without consent. Think it over for a moment - association without consent, without choice.

An individual created something and he didn't intend to go on associating with it forever, but something countered and he started to associate with it. And then he didn't like associating with it and he started to separate from it somehow or another. But then he was forced to confront it again. Don't you see? He went on associating without choice.

But regardless of personally himself versus MEST, which is not the clue to it, MEST and people and beings get associated with MEST and people and beings into such a confusion that he can no longer tell them apart or differentiate in any way. And he uses them to not - he uses not-knowingness to get rid of these unbearable conflicts, impacts, confusions. And what is an impact but an association without consent? See, that's an undesired impact, association without consent. A face gets associated with a fist.

Pain is nothing more than objection to association. You could make - you could send some boy to school where he didn't want to go, where his companions were all not of his social order - lower or higher, it doesn't matter - where his association is without consent and actually get the sensation - now, I'm not talking about a mental idea of - you'd get the sensation of pain in the boy. Nobody would ever lay a hand on him, but continuing in that school he could actually go on feeling a sensation like pain.

Now, the only thing wrong with pain is that a person doesn't consent to pain. But he must have consented to pain if he afterwards cannot consent to pain. See, he must have liked pain before he could experience pain. But then through scarcity and abundance he decided that pain is bad. So he's got something rigged up as a warning system and he does it in an intricate way whereby it'll tell him something is bad because he feels pain. So therefore, pain should cause a not-know; so you get pain being succeeded by unconsciousness.

Pain is that red light which tells you to not-know it from there on out if you can. See? He's got himself a signal system. But pain is simply an association without consent.

A lot of people are walking around in life actually in a sensation of pain. They are in pain. And nothing is hurting them now. See, there isn't any reason they should be in pain. This drives medical doctors nuts! People walk in and they say, „*I have a dreadful ache in my back.*" And the medical doctor looks it all over, finds it's perfectly good shape, can't find any disease or something of the sort. The fellow really does feel a sensation in his back.

Well, the medical doctor could possibly trace it back and take a lock off just on the basis of somebody slapped him on the back painfully, a couple of months ago. Came along and just gave him a hearty slap on the back, which really wasn't quite friendly. It had the element of surprise and so forth; it's an unwanted association.

Well, all this keyed in was the times he was hit in the back with a club, the times he was shot in the back with arrows, the times he was stabbed in the back, the times his back was merged with a few dozen other backs on the rack. You know, backs, backs, backs, backs, backs. He gets an unwanted association. It keys in a line.

Well, how come he's obsessively creating them? He's obsessively creating them because he says he isn't creating them. See? He's not-known the thing. So you get an irresponsibility, an obsessive creation, obsessive not-knowingness. It all boils down to a man's protest against association to which he does not consent.

So therefore, you have to rehabilitate the key thing about association.

Why is association valuable? Association is valuable because it assists one. Assistance - it has value.

What is the value of association? Until you can get him over an obsessive evaluation of association, the tremendous value of association, then he will go on obsessively associating, because he knows he's got to associate in order to live, but he'd better not associate because it hurts! So you've got a can't reach-must reach, can't withdraw-must withdraw. Life is painful. See, you just - you've got to have money to eat, but to get money you've got to work. You see? But you can't work because the people you're working with are just horrible people. Get the idea? And when you work you must associate with this MEST and you're handling these light cables and you know they're going to shock you because you've had a shock or two. You know? And it is just a matter of a whole concatenation of unwanted associations.

And out of this bundle of misery, the misery which an individual must have because he has to have assistance - this is the new stable datum - is all being not-known, is out of sight and the main thing he doesn't know is what he has to have to assist him in order to live. And he has to have some of the darnedest things. And he himself never suspects it, or association itself wouldn't be that confused to him.

It isn't the number of associations in which he's involved but the necessity of them that you must solve to clear somebody. And so we work this whole thing down to this particular package.

Now, you've got to give him practice in knowingly creating and taking over the automaticity of obsessive creation, but you can only do that adequately when you have solved something of this necessity to associate, got to associate.

„In order to survive, in order to create, in order to destroy anything I must have the help of a Mongolian saddle. I'm sane. Of course, Mongolian saddles always go underneath the belly of the horse and get you trampled. But you have to have them, but you get trampled and, of course, to go anyplace you have to have a Mongolian saddle and in order to drink coffee in the morning I have to have a Mongolian saddle." He's nuts. That's right.

And there's one of these, or a million, on every uncleared case. That's what you unwrap. So you merely unwrap the curse or necessity or badness of association - you get that straightened out and then you give him practice in creating. And you'll clear somebody.

His not-knowingness becomes not obsessive the moment that he is able to knowingly not-know. But we don't care what he does with his not-knowingness. It's just a solution. We don't care whether he keeps it or gets rid of it.

Just be wary of this one thing: The fellow who has no bank because he has not-known the whole bank is not a Clear. And he will show up on a stiff needle on a meter.

But the fellow who can create and let it go and create and let it go or create and let it survive, and so forth, definitely is a Clear. This individual can be said to stand alone without association, if necessary, but his association with the world is by choice. And you've got to put him into that category and you've got a Clear.

And that is what you are trying to do when you are clearing somebody. And that is the basic and primary goal of Scientology today.

Do you understand a little bit more about it?

Audience: Yes, Sir. Yes.

In Clear checking, the reason I want you to Clear check people and Clear check a lot of people before you start in auditing is because the way to learn how to make a Clear check is a very simple way: that is, you must check out aberrees, check out people who are not Clear and check out a lot of people who are not Clear. And only then will you be able to see how a needle should react when a person's Clear, because it doesn't react.

So, therefore, you must know how a needle does react in order to find an absence of actual aberrated reaction. A needle simply vacillates back and forth and idly and has nothing to do with the questions when a needle is free.

But that isn't what happens when a person is aberrated. You keep running into these not-known, aberrative associations, plowed-under identifications and the needle sticks and halts and get lie reactions and won't move and it's a ball. And I want you to see a needle doing that on a Clear checkout several times so that you'll have some kind of an idea what a person looks like when they're Clear.

Do you know a little bit more about our particular goal for this particular course and unit?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.

[End of tape.]

APPENDIX

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE Washington, DC

HCO BULLETIN OF 14 JULY 1958

Not for general use.

HGC Auditors may find of interest.

20TH ACC TRAINING PROCEDURE

The first day on auditing the student checks out as many other students for Clear as possible with Clear Checkout Sheets and E-Meter.

Text: Ability and HCO Bulletins.

Purpose: To learn to check out Clears. The way to learn Clear checkout is to check out many non-Clears.

How to clear a command. Clear each word once only so that the word means something to pc. Only repeat if the pc says he doesn't understand. Never ask twice *„What does help mean to you?"* Clearing a command is not a repetitive process. There is no other right way to clear a command in any case. Clear the command for all sides of a bracket before running one.

All auditing and checkouts are actual. There is no student coaching except on TRs.

1. CCH 0 with emphasis on goals and PT problem. Done thoroughly at start of every session.

2. ARC Straightwire using following type command only - *„Recall a time when you communicated with something."* Run as a complete 9-way bracket one command each side. Use communicate only. Run until needle of meter is relatively free. Pay attention to cyclic aspect of answers.

   Purpose: To loosen up bank and screens and to teach student use of a bracket and give him practice. This permits student to ease into a rather strict and exacting auditing activity without an instruction to him from an Instructor upsetting preclear as it would if Help were being used instead. Avoid beefy processes where correction, supervision and general instruction are involved. Auditor requires no verbal answer from pc, only a head nod, but checks now and then as to when the communication being recalled took place.

3. Start-C-S oldest version. Emphasis on start and stop. Run change when the start or stop seem flat and only to unflatten them.

   Purpose: Smoothness of auditor control; accomplishment by pc of really controlling body. You start that body, etc., is emphasized.

4. Connectedness, control version. Sole command: *„You get the idea of making that (object) connect with you."* No other side of bracket.

   Purpose: Havingness, unsticking needle, directing pc's attention.

a) Student should scout pc's track looking for the „*rock,*" spot it or something like it in minimal time, stick it good, and free with Connectedness.

Purpose: Giving student and pc confidence that some sticky business can be plowed into and gotten out of readily by use of Connectedness.

5. Help. 5- or 9-way bracket in general to groove pc in. „*How could ____ help you?*" On a sticky item run one side of bracket after another, never repeat any one side twice.

Use whole track type commands, never localized this lifetime.

   a) Run „*auditors*" and „*preclears*" as subjects for Help. 5-way bracket. First run auditors, then pcs, then auditors, then pcs, etc.

   Purpose: Clean up all past auditing.

   b) Isolate whole track „*rock*" and run 5- or 9-way bracket on it. This is an adroit matter. It requires that one know the pc and audit this particular pc. It doesn't mean forcing one's own „*rock*" on the pc. It requires judgment and a knowledge of valences. It may be necessary to unburden the „*rock*" with several items before it appears. Free the needle on the „*rock.*" Command must be phrased to include whole track version of pc's rock.

   Purpose: To locate largest reality of pc and to hit squarely on what he is always mocking up obsessively.

   c) Scout Help with a general bracket to see if it is freer.

6. Step 6 as in Clear Procedure. Use simple forms.

Repeat 5, 5a, 5b, 5c and Step 6 alternately until Clear.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder

[The version above is included with the clearsound transcripts and appears in the new tech volumes. The same HCOB appears in the old tech volumes but with the following signature line:

LRH:bt.rd
Copyright c 1958 by L. Ron Hubbard
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE Washington, DC

HCO BULLETIN OF 28 JULY 1958

All Staff ACC Instructors and students Field Offices

COMMAND SHEET FOR HGC

CLEAR PROCEDURE

ON ALL COMMANDS: BEFORE AUDITOR GIVES THEM, HE MAKES CERTAIN HE HAS PC'S ATTENTION ON HIM AGAIN AND OFF LAST QUESTION.

CCH 0-Starting Session:

„*Is it all right with you if we begin the session now?*"

„*The session is started.*"

GOALS: „*What goal might you have for this session?*"

(Be certain to end session with „*Have we gained anything of your goal at the session's beginning?*")

PT PROBLEM: (Caution: Problem itself, not just its terminals must exist in PT.) „*Do you have anything worrying you so much that you will have a difficult time keeping your attention on auditing?*"

(If pc has)

„*Describe the problem to me.*"

(Pc does)

„*Does that problem exist in present time now?*"

(If pc thinks it does)

„*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*" or „*Invent a problem of comparable magnitude to that problem.*" (Repetitive questions) (No further descriptive name is allowed auditor in this command.)

Auditor frequently asks „*Describe that problem to me now.*" „*Does that problem now exist in present time?*"

ARC BREAK: „*Have I done something you feel is wrong in this session?*" „*Describe it to me.*"

Plenty of acknowledgment to pc, no further apology and certainly no explanation. Object is to get pc's attention on auditor in present time, not earlier in session. Goal of TR 2, of Goals, PT Problem and auditing is to get pc's attention into present time, so don't stack commands on the track or park pc somewhere in session or leave him in an out-of-session problem.

SCS: (Note: All formal auditing, except for final acknowledgment of cycle, which is Tone 40.) Commands:

START: *„I am going to tell you to start. And when I tell you to start, you start the body in that direction. Do you understand that?" „Good." „Start." „Did you start that body?" „Thank you."*

STOP: *„I am going to tell you to get the body moving in that direction. Somewhere along the line I will tell you to stop. Then you stop the body. Do you understand that?" „Good." „Get the body moving." „Stop." „Did you stop the body?" „Thank you."*

CHANGE. *„Do you see that spot?" „Good. We will call that Spot A. Now you stand here. Okay."* (Auditor indicates another spot.) *„Now do you see that other spot?" „Good. We'll call that Spot B. All right, now when I tell you to change the body's position, YOU move it from Spot A to Spot B. All right?" „Good. Change the body's position." „Did you change the body's position?" „Thank you." „Do you see that spot?" „Well, we'll call that Spot C. Now when I tell you to change the body's position, YOU move the body from Spot B to Spot C. Do you understand that?" „Fine." „Change the body's position." „Did you change the body's position?" „Thank you."*

(NOTE: CHANGE IS RUN ONLY TO UNFLATTEN START AND STOP, WHEN BOTH ARE FLAT.)

CONNECTEDNESS: Use: Only to unstick pc on meter when meter can't be read well or when auditor desires to clear an object wrongly chosen as rock in order to look for another.

   b. *„You get the idea of making that (object) connect with you."* (Auditor points.)

   c. (If pc isn't looking at object with mest body's eyes, use following:) *„Look at that (object)." „You get the idea of making that object connect with you."*

   d. (On blind humans:) *„Feel that (object)." „You get the idea of making that object connect with you."*

HELP:

   1. SCOUTING. This is a 2-way comm activity.

      a. „How do you feel about _____?" Vary any object that sticks by asking about specialized form. If a specialized form frees, go back to object that stuck. Gradually sort object that consistently sticks from objects that stick by association with it only.

      b. If pc reads high on tone arm, get inconsistent lie reaction, use following: „What have you had to be responsible for?"

      To be sure pc is reacting, turn sensitivity knob very high.

      Guide him carefully around his life until he gets on a sticky point. Then sort it out, attempting to get parts of it to clear up. Do not let pc linger on matters which do not stick.

      Responsibility sorts the matter out. His realization (cognition) of various zones are what does him good.

This is not necessarily a repetitive command. It can be varied with „What part of that (discovered area or item) have you had to be responsible for?"

Large areas of current lifetime can be freed up and with clues from what he has stuck on repeatedly and using what would not free, return to a standard scout as above.

By using part (b) a pc can be brought down on the tone arm and can be made to react more normally on meter.

2. Running Help in general: Use generalized items, not specific people or objects (don't pin pc in current life).

General Help bracket: 9-way:

„How could you help yourself?"

„How could you help me?"

„How could I help you?"

„How could I help myself?"

„How could you help another person?"

„How could I help another person?"

„How could another person help you?"

„How could another person help me?"

„How could another person help another person?"

Running Help on an item:

„How could you help a _____ ?"

„How could a _____ help you?"

„How could another person help a _____ ?"

„How could a _____ help another person?"

„How could a _____ help itself?"

„How could you help yourself?"

„How could I help you?"

„How could you help me?"

Run in sequence as above. Do not give same command twice.

CLEARING COMMANDS: Clear each word and the full phrase once each with the following: „What is the usual definition of the English (or other language) word _____?"

Do not ask for definitions over and over as a repetitive command. If the pc's definition is poor, clear command every few commands.

Clear only each different word in a bracket. Don't clear each line in a bracket.

STEP SIX:

Select simple nonsignificant objects. Run:

„In front of that body you mock up a _____ and keep it from going away." „Did you?" „Thank you." Then use all directions from the body - *„Behind that body ..." „Below that body..."* Run six objects each on six sides of the body on *„Keep it from going away",* then proceed to *„In front of that body you mock up a _____ and hold it still."* Same procedure, then *„In front of that body you mock up a _____and make it a little more solid."* (There is no acknowledgment by auditor after pc mocks it up and keeps it from going away, etc., or the *„Did you?"*-there is acknowledgment only after full command is executed. Otherwise acks will thin pc's mock-ups.)

Note: The objects should be simple at first, leading on up to complexity. But at first, keep them simple and nonsignificant.

L. RON HUBBARD Founder

> [The version above is included with the clearsound transcripts and appears in the new tech volumes. The same HCOB appears in the old tech volumes but with the following signature line:

LRH:md.rd

END