Freedom is from the Past, in the Heart

A talk by David Truman
available on Youtube at https://youtu.be/s7-e4MPlsls

David: This talk is called "Where Freedom Is From." And our thesis is: freedom is from the past.

So I'll just run through this. A person feels badly usually due to social issues, and maybe finds himself screwed up or screwing up in relationships or about relationship or about other people—something that has something to do with relationships. And in fact, they feel beset, burdened, and plagued by these social aversions or problems or errors.

For example—we're going to use one example through this whole talk—trust issues. So the person thinks, "I have a tendency to be distrusting." And then they go through life with this issue or problem that is causing difficulties in relationship: You're in the fine restaurant over a Chablis, and you're having trust issues with your fiancée—something like that. And you're going, "What the hell is wrong with me?"

This is the beginning of analysis—this question, this introspective curiosity or wonderment: "What is wrong with me?" And then we get to considering our lives and the things that could be causative of me, as I know me to be or believe myself to be or am experiencing or suffering myself to be—in this case, distrusting as I am. And I am going to *look for* the cause of this problem within myself.

Remember the story I love to tell about how a saint got lost and people are looking for him, and they're going to fan out and see if they can find him downtown. And one goes to the lap dance club, and others go to different chapels and other places. But the one who's off, "I'm going to go look in the lap dance club," the other people say, "Look, this is a saint we're talking about here, there's no *way* that's where you're going to find him. He's not going to be in there, so let's not waste time." And the guy responds, "Well, you look where you want to look and I'll look where I want to look." *(group laughs)*

Now similarly, when we look for the cause of our problems, you look where you want to look, I'll look where I want to look. So the investigation may in fact be biased by the fact that I'm going to *look* for the cause of my problem where I want to look. And in this case, if I have some kind of reluctance in the area of

assuming personal irresponsibility, I may look to *external* causes instead of *internal* causes.

So we have an urge to essentially avoid personal responsibility while at the same time discerning the cause of the problem that we have, which is an interesting contradiction in the long run. It would be true to say that if our problem was externally caused, then there are limitations in what we can do about it. Now I want to explain that, which I'm sure is already obvious to you. But the entire culture supports the idea that a man is a product of his environment. And this helps a person look where they want to look: in the environment for external sources of causation of my problem. The environment made me what I am today. My experience made me what I am today. The past made me what I am today. And therefore I say, freedom is from the past.

So the analysis goes on, and you might be involved in what could be called self-analysis, or you might be involved in what you'd call professional analysis—in other words, a shrink. And what you need to understand about that is, both an egoic self and culture at large are somewhat in agreement about looking where they all want to look, because in reality our culture is not a culture of saints, it's not a culture of free persons, and is not a culture of people who are high on responsibility. That's because the culture is made up primarily of egoistic people. And ego shirks the kind of deep responsibility that allows for a real fix. It is so skiddish about accepting personal responsibility *boldly* and *completely* that it can look to its own self in its own self-analysis, or it can look to the shrink for cause, and they're all looking where they want to look for relief in the assignation of responsibility to external cause. So the shrink makes a living by helping people establish external cause.

And therefore, *because* you were beat up by your older brother when you were three, *because* you were dropped on your head by your dad when you were four, you have these trust issues. And this is a mixed blessing. There's the good news and the bad news.

The good news is, I found out what is said to be the cause of my problem at last. I *knew* there was something, but I didn't know specifically what it was and now I do. Either through a rigorous process of self-analysis or an equally rigorous process of shrink payment, I found out the cause. And therefore, maybe I can fix it, because I know what it is. You can't solve a problem you don't have, you can't solve a problem of which you are unaware of the cause. That's the good news.

The bad news is, I can't change the cause if the cause lies in the past. And that's because of the true, inarguable fact that the past is what it was. In other words, without a time machine, I can't go back there and change it. It *is* what it was.

That's what that means. The past is over, which might be a relief in many cases, especially where there was trauma. But *if* that cause *is,* in fact, if that situation *is* the cause of my problem, the *bad* news is, I can't change the cause of my problem. Because it is in the past, and there is absolutely nothing I can change about the past, even what happened three seconds ago, I can't change that ever. It's dead and gone. It's irretrievable in that sense; without a time machine it's irretrievable. So whatever the past has caused, me in effect, that cause is itself unchangeable. *(He holds up a sign:)*

ME
was *caused*
by
THE(Y) PAST

Me was caused by "the or they past."

And then the problem: "I would if I could, *but* me has already been caused or made what it is today by that which I cannot change." So again, you begin to understand why it may be true that freedom is in fact from the past. Because *that* past which caused me, I think, to be what I am is unchangeable. And if it caused it, it's always causing it. And if it made me what I am, then I am what I am because of a past that I *cannot* change. So I am stuck with the me that the past has made. Or the past is my cause and the past is holding me as me, as what I am. The past is holding me where I'm at.

For example, "I'm distrusting. That was caused by my past—my father dropped me on my head when I was four. I can't change the fact that he did that. That caused me to be what I am, and I can't change that cause." So in the fruit of analysis, we see the relief that comes from, "I thought I was a bad person but what I realized is I have been caused by external factors beyond my control. It's a relief to know that I am not responsible for what I am today, that the past and the incidents in the past is in fact what is responsible, what is causative." That certainly, to a certain extent, is a relief. To be able to displace or offput the responsibility from myself, which I was beginning to think I was a bad person, but now I know I am simply a victim. I am a victim of forces that I cannot control and of incidents that I cannot go back and change.

But the displacement creates fear that other people will do the same as the past people, for example. The ones that caused me to be bad, there may be others like them that will cause me to be worse. This is called fear.

3

And then we have, with victimhood, or the fact that I am what I am, we have insecurity. So we have the fruit of fear, and we have the fruit of insecurity. If I indeed am what I am—let's just take that as a hypothetical, you are what you are and you are what the past made you be—then the past made me be a fucked-up thing, and I am a fucked-up thing. Therefore I am insecure. I am insecure because my reality is that I am a fucked-up thing. Yes, it happened to be made from the past, but now *there it is,* here I am, you see, as I am. And because I can't change the past there's not much I can do about who I am, what I've been made to be. And therefore, I am insecure. I am fearful, because I recognize the "fact" that my cause is outlying, and I'm insecure because of the fact that I'm stuck with who I am and who I am is a bad thing. In other words, there's not much I can do about it. You see?

Group: Yeah.

David: I am stuck with the fruit of the fact that not being okay creates all kinds of problems. So I am stuck with fear, stuck with insecurity, and stuck with bad luck and trouble that's going to result from who I am, or how who I am has to be, because of the way it was configured by the action of the past upon my otherwise malleable self, in my formative years, which are essentially themselves gone.

But then there is an awareness that there is some flim-flam in too much blame or outsourcing responsibility. And there is awareness that I am not *absolutely* stuck with who I am, if there is something formative still going on in the exertion of my will. And therefore, I know what my problem is—my dad dropped me on the head when I was four—but I'm going to work with that, and I'm going to overcome the fear, the insecurity, and so forth, that's a present cause of my limitations and my troubles. I'm going to work with it.

Or even more enlightened, and this thought comes to people too: "Look, I *know* I'm responsible. I know it isn't okay to just blame what happened when I was four about my dad. I know I am presently responsible. And furthermore, I *want* to use that responsibility to create different things, better things and to be a *better* person. That's what I want. I know I'm responsible, and I want to be better. *But*, unfortunately, I'm limited in my ability and agility to *do* so by what happened, and what that stuck me with, and as.

So yes, I *have* extremely good intentions. I want to *take* responsibility, I want to *change my life,* but in the process of trying to do so, I am limited by patterns that issue from who I am, which is what the past made me.

So the next step is: *If* I was to have a *better* experience I could be reformed in a better form. If someone was to love me, *then* I could get over my trust issues. If

they were to love me reliably, faithfully, constantly, whatever it was that's the opposite of whatever caused me to be who I am. If they were to do the opposite thing of that, I could be created in the opposite form, or my problem could be undone, because a new and healing external cause would be set up, and it would act upon me and cause me to be different. Then I would get over my trust issues, and then I would be okay, and then I could love fully and wholeheartedly again or for once, or whatever.

But what we don't see behind all this is the fact that actually in reality it *almost* never actually works that way. And we often have histories in which we were loved very well, and we rejected that love out of our issues. We felt unworthy of the context in which that love existed, in the context of that relationship, so we backed out of it. And therefore, the magic expected was not allowed to fulfill itself.

So we have the fact that, "Yes, I will get a tan if I'm under the tanning lights for three hours, but I was only under fifteen minutes before I took off. I had my issues and I had my reasons. I was extremely ashamed and insecure, and fearful—the other shoe was going to fall, blah blah blah. So I beat it out of there before the shit hit the fan. That's the way I saw it."

And so there you go; so I was out. And not too far behind that is the egoic thing of the fact that I really don't want to *love* fully anyway. And therefore, what happens is, *when* I get in a context *in which* my excuses are taken away, I just run away and create another excuse. I go back to the fact that I'm too sick to take the cure. I go *back* to the fact that unfortunately I can't do this. I wish I could fulfill this but of course because of my past and what the past made me, I can't. And therefore, I actually default out of the healing zone. And I'm unwilling/unable to reciprocate in kind with wholehearted love. I return distrust for trust, I return unlove for love, insecurity for confidence, all that. And that's because of what the past made me, and I'm stuck with it because I am a person whose cause is the past. And therefore, the past is dead and gone, and therefore I can't change the past, and therefore I can't change me. And therefore, I can't do it, and now I can't love rightly and fully, and therefore I can't exist in a relationship that would heal me. And therefore, I'm back to the past and its effects, namely *me*.

And I choose the analysis as my perma-excuse. In other words, because the past made me some kind of shit or other, I can always be off the hook for the loving that I know would be required to make a healing relationship viable. And therefore, just as people find out the cause form their shrink, they have developed a perma-excuse. So they're relieved to find out what the cause of the problem was, and they're also relieved that, because they are permanently molded into a

bad form by that, they have a perma-excuse *not* to be a better and more loving person, the kind they claim to want to be, but it's not working and it's because who I am.

So the very desire of the whole society is to grasp onto a perma-excuse for not being a genuinely and fully loving person. And the whole thing feeds into that, as man is made by his, is caused by the past. That's it. And I think that's pretty much it for this talk.

So we're talking about the pros and cons of the *conclusions* of the analysis, when you looked where you wanted to look, and they looked where you thought you would be willing to pay them to look, because they knew that their trade was based on people who were looking for a perma-excuse. And without that they would *never* be able to maintain their Mercedes or their house payments, either one, not in this culture. If you told a person about the reality of the freedom in the present is what you need, and you need to find the freedom of the heart to love in the present and to follow the heart in the present, the person would go find another shrink who *would* collude with them in creating that perma-excuse, and would *not* hold them to a standard of wholehearted loving that is the only actual solution there *is, ever,* forever. That's it.

So, now we know where freedom is from. It's from the past.

Participant: It's from the past, that is so perfect! You can't forget that phrase.

David: And it is in the heart. And it is in the present. The heart which *is* in the present and freely living as itself *in* the present by transcending the past and doing as the heart itself would do. That's it. Which is not this *(cowers),* you see. That's not what the heart would have us *DO, BE, LIVE*. All right?