

THE ARC LIGHT

MIAMI, FLORIDA

A PAPER DEDICATED TO THE DISSEMINATION OF DIANETIC INFORMATION

JANUARY 15, 1952

Dear Swygards:

To carry this interpretation of Robert Burns business a bit further, I would add this to the mutilation of To a Louse:

O wad some power the giftie gie us
To see Dianetics as ithers see it!
It wad frac monie a blunder free it,
And foolish notion;
What pompous phrases and fads wad lea've it,
And Ally devotion!

Doris Mann Fortune
808 $\frac{1}{2}$ Sul Ross
Houston 6, Texas

* * * * *

FROM JOHN R. FARRELL

Dear Friends:

I wrote you a note back about September or so which you printed in your issue of 15 October. I have been interested by the lack of comment.

I think some one ought to have picked the fact that I wrote some eight paragraphs without stating one item of personal experience in a concrete personal way. Not that no one did, but that no one, as far as I know has commented.

I have been experimenting with a process of word-changing in running cases recently. Word-making comprises a high proportion of the muscular activity I observe in people I work with, and thus seems to me important. I have been giving words some careful attention. Goes something like this:

A: "What's bothering you today?"
PC: "Well, there's this pain here (pointing to chest), and it bothers me."
A: "You say: 'There's this pain.' Who has this pain?"
PC: "Well, part of me hurts."
A: "Do you hurt?"
PC: "Yes!"
A: "Can you say so, please?"
PC: "But I just did."
A: "Please say: 'I hurt'."
PC: "OK: I hurt! (You can use repeater on the phrase, if necessary. I don't, however, unless my pre-clear understands firmly that all I am requesting is the muscular activity involved in the word-formation, and perception of any allied events.)
A: "Did you notice that you pointed with your hand as you mentioned pain earlier?"
PC: (May not have noticed, often will not have) Yes.
A: "Please describe the sensations you had or have."
PC: "Well, it bothers me." (I would then, probably tear this phrase apart until the PC had given me an accurate description of the nature of the involvement and had described the feelings involved in the first person singular.)

FROM JOHN R. FARRELL - Continued

When doing the sort of thing I indicate, I do not run incidents, I do not look for discharge (no matter how defined), and I do not have any particular goal in mind. I do use a great deal of repeater, both on words and phrases used by the PC, on words and phrases I suggest as alternatives to statements made, and on the session itself. Pre-clears seem to do a certain amount of scanning for data, of discharging, and of thinking. I have also had reports of heavy out-of-session dozeoffs and of "running" out of session.

Cases I have worked so far mostly on words have been people who either do not, or appear not to be able to, describe situations, ideas, or feelings from their own viewpoint, and cannot apparently remember anything much more than a few minutes, or even seconds. I haven't seen a so-called "full perception" case for months and months. I tried this word changing with one pre-clear who has run pre-natals and the like on Hubbardian Procedure. I had an impression that what I did was valuable. The pre-clear says so, but I shall withhold judgment pending further work and more observation of the individual. The case I have worked most on words is now (after eighteen months of fairly steady processing and lots of engrams and discharge) finally beginning to develop accurate recalls of recent data. We think there is a correlation between what we have done and recalls, as well as a connection between this and a much greater independence of day-to-day action. (Time in processing on words: 35 hrs.)

I did not learn semantics via Korzybski (did I spell him correctly?). I have a long background in languages and linguistics. I say so, because I do not believe the General Semantics approach is a helpful guide to processing. I am indebted to John W. Campbell, Jr., for his Primitive Language editorial in a recent Astounding. In using word-changing I usually attempt (insofar as I direct) to develop the subjective factors in language usage. Far more of my people seem to need to concentrate on the subjective end.

I also think in terms of reversal. If I had a pre-clear who habitually made nothing but direct statements, I would probably start to be interested in developing an ability to generalize, to be objective in language, to abstract. I have mostly worked to point out the literal, simple meanings of words:

A: What are you doing when you have pain?

PC: I am hurting myself.

A: Who do you say hurts whom?

PC: I hurt me.

A: Please notice that you appear to state your personal responsibility for your pain sensations as opposed to "There's this pain."

I would consider directing a person who felt that he alone was the nub of the universe to the more objective perceptions and away from literalism.

I am also indebted indirectly to Gene Benton of Los Angeles and directly to Connie Carlson of Berkeley for some ideas I now use. I'd like to see them writing for you sometime.

Gestalt Therapy by Perls, Hefferline, and Goodman has been very useful to me. Some of the ideas parallel those we have used in dianetics. Some are novel, as far as I know.

I hope you or some of your readers will be interested in this.

Sincerely,

John R. Farrell
2927 Florence Street
Berkeley 5, California

* * * * *

THE SOCIAL DILEMMAS By Peg & John Campbell

The root source of confusions in the mind must be a situation wherein the individual is faced with a choice, and both possible choices are equally unacceptable, or both equally desirable. At any point where the individual comes to such a situation, a severe mental turmoil will result; that it is damaging has been proven time and again in experimental psychology labs wherein dogs have been driven into nervous breakdown by facing them with problems which must be solved, but can't be solved on the data available.

There can be two basic types of dilemmas, or paradoxes; the commonest type is that wherein the individual must make a choice between two or more courses, and there is no factor available to decide the choice. The other type is the situation in which the only possible answer is Action A, but the individual has a powerful bloc that absolutely forbids the acceptance of Action A as an answer.

A simple and typical example of the latter is the homosexual. The individual has strong sex drives; they're natural and inescapably part of his basic nature. But---he has been powerfully, forcefully and frequently violently conditioned that it is absolutely unacceptable for a boy to have anything to do sexually with a girl. Action A---the only sane answer to the problem---is blocked by a powerful and violently installed negative. But there was no similar bloc against boys playing with boys.

Weiner, in his Cybernetics, suggested that neurosis came from more and more of the neurone circuits of the brain being coupled in on handling a particular problem until the major portion of the brain was completely occupied with one problem. Consider what would happen to a computing machine which was ordered to solve the problem: "Find the value of pi; the correct answer must be obtained without fail; it must not involve the digit "3" however."

The way to tie up a mind is to force it to solve a paradox which cannot be solved within the rules of the paradox. Or to face it with a multiple choice with no basis for making a choice.

The latter situation is less severe, because the toss of a coin can always be brought in as the deciding factor if all choices are actually equal. The really aberrative situations are those having the following characteristics:

1. The problem must be solved.
2. The only correct answer involves a factor A.
3. There is an absolute interdiction against the use of factor A in any problem, either as an answer or as a step in obtaining an answer.

Those problems which involve basic human needs are the ones where that situation becomes most aberrative. The basic needs make the "must" in the problem really potent.

Many of the problems are unreal, in the sense that the apparent validity of the interdiction against Factor A is based on a misconception of what Factor A really refers to. So stated, it sounds confused; let's try a specific example.

One, we've already considered; the homosexual has accepted the interdiction against heterosexuality. The trouble is that he has accepted it on the basis "males must have nothing to do with females". That is a literal interpretation of the social code as taught small children; the trouble with that is that the thing is improperly defined. It really means "Adolescent boys should not have sexual relations with adolescent girls, and vice versa."

This may seem, at first glance, like a rather unimportant, applies-only-to-a-few-cases sort of thing. We have reason to believe it is very general, with a great many ramifications on other levels than the sexual one.

The important little gimmick we have been working with is the proposition of writing down the basic rules of Society as we understand them. Literally setting them down in black and white, in the form of the underlying postulates, and seeing the logical

THE SOCIAL DILEMMAS By Peg & John Campbell

consequences. Brother, you'll be surprised! Let's try a few.

1. No decent woman will have anything to do with sex.
2. All Mothers are perfect and without blemish.

Corrollary: Now you know why babies come in the Doctor's Little Black Bag, or via Stork. It's the only possible answer.

3. No decent man will make a sexual proposal to a woman he respects.

Logical Consequence: Either-: You do not respect your wife
Or-: You are indecent.

4. A man who will not defend his rights is a coward (i.e., loathesome.)
5. A child who fights for his possessions is naughty. (i.e., loathesome.)

Solution: Have no rights or possessions to defend.

That latter pair has succeeded in leading to whole monastic orders. The first pair has lead to the social aberration that children were not allowed to know their true origin. It is reasonably probable that the conflicting concepts of society, then, have definitely aberrative effects on individuals, and those factors need working on.

Mr. & Mrs. John W. Campbell, Jr.
1457 Orchard Place
Mountainside, New Jersey

* * * * *

FROM EDWARD ROBLES

Dear Dee and Bill:

I read Dr. Coulter's article in the Arc Light of December 15th with much interest. I agree with him wholeheartedly in his proposition that the "Dianetic Community," should present a united front to the rest of mankind. I believe that he is right in saying that there should be no division between his "Hubbardians," and his, "E", men. The more so because after sufficient Dianetic processing the "E", function will show up without the aid of Kitselman, Altman, et al. Therefore, since this is the case, Kitselman, Altman, et al. have merely discovered a short cut to a function which would normally only show up after a sufficient degree of clear had been attained.

I cannot, therefore, agree with Dr. Art in his theory that the "E" as developed by Kitselman or the "E.R." of Altman et. al. is, in fact, the re-active mind. We are told by Ron and this is affirmed by others that the re-active mind is merely a device for playing back recordings (engrams) and that the re-active mind does not think.

Let me point out that the "E" does think, it also has access to all the thinking and all the wisdom of all the ages, past, present and future. Sometimes a circuit may interpose itself and give an answer which is not correct. You can recognize this as an interloping circuit since "E" is always correct. This gives us an axiom.

"If it isn't right, it isn't "E".

Let us now explore what "E" is. Kitselman, Altman et al. say it is the, "Wisest and best part of the brain." This is only partly true. "E" is more than just a part. It is the whole person--including every last tiny cell. One of my pre-clears put it this way on being asked the nature of "E". "He (the 'E') says that I am He and He is me. That whatever happens to me happens to him."

Ron says that for everything we do, there is a Theta facsimile made. That the engram bank is located in the Theta facsimile. In fact, each one of us has his Theta counterpart.

FROM EDWARD ROBLES - Continued

This is correct. The ability to see things through the eyes of our Theta facsimile is the perceptic we call visio, the other perceptics are also Theta perceptics and these are transmitted to us by the Theta counterpart. If some of us are occluded it is because we do not have good communication with the Theta facsimile.

Now this brings me to an interesting conclusion: Ron's Theta and Kitselman's "E" are one and the same. Your "E" and your theta facsimile are one and the same. We seem to have been dealing with a semantic block here. We are all talking about the same thing, calling it by different names. The Religionists call it, "The Soul," Ron calls it "Theta," Kitselman calls it "E", Altman et al call it "E.R." The Kahunas called it, "The High Self." my good wife calls it "I". What do I call it? I have no name for it, but point out in the words of Gertrude Stein, "A rose, is a rose, is a rose." And the immortal Shakespeare said. "What's in a name? A rose, by any other name would smell as sweet."

To sum up, then, let's all stop calling names. We are not children. We are all adult members of the genus Homo Sapiens on the way to becoming Homo Novis. We are all seekers after truth. We are all on the right track, some because of Ron, some in spite of him. Our goal is the finding of the true soul of man. We have no quarrel with any one, really, let them quarrel with us if they must. In so doing, they too, may achieve clarity by recognizing that we cannot, as seekers after truth, take time out to bicker with them.

Very respectfully yours,

Edward G. Robles, Sr.
P.O. Box 124
Fair Oaks, California

* * * * *

FROM DR. ART COULTER

Dear Dee and Bill:

My letters to ARC Light regarding E therapy appear to have aroused considerable comment. I am grateful to you and to your readers for the attention that has been given to them. I hope to comment upon the remarks made in response to those letters in an integrated fashion later, after the response is "all in". Certain matters, however, require more immediate attention.

1. Mr. Kitselman has pointed out, in a personal letter, that my remarks applied to Altmanian E therapy, not to E therapy as originated and practised by Kitselman and his students. He is quite right. At the time my letters were written I had only a superficial knowledge of his position, and was under the impression that Altman's two papers on the subject was an adequate expression of the views of all E therapists, with perhaps minor modifications in detail. Mr. Kitselman had charitably refrained from public comment on this divergence of viewpoint. Inasmuch as Mr. Kitselman was the originator of E therapy, and not Mr. Altman (as was mistakenly noted in the September "Dianetic Auditor's Bulletin"), he is clearly entitled to prior claim to the term "E therapy". Once again, Mr. Altman's habit of taking terms introduced by others, and re-defining them with his own special meanings, has introduced a great deal of semantic confusion. It should be emphasized, therefore, that there are a large number of people in the dianetic community who are practicing or receiving what they mistakenly think is E therapy, but which is not E therapy at all, but another form of therapy entirely which has been falsely called E therapy by Altman. I would like to suggest that this Altmanian therapy be referred to as Reactive Mind or RM therapy, since the techniques described by Altman consist essentially of putting the Reactive Mind in charge of the case and letting it discharge itself as best it can, with occasional "Rectification" by the auditor. This is a legitimate technique, long known to psychiatrists under a different name, regarded by them as of limited value.

2. In pointing out that the Altmanian Reactive Mind therapy had mistakenly labelled

FROM DR. ART COULTER - Continued

the Reactive Mind with a concept which endowed it with "magical" properties it does not in fact possess, my purpose was not to "invalidate" the Altmanian Reactive Mind therapy. This is a legitimate technique which deserves a fair trial under its own colors. My sole purpose was to correct what I regarded as a dangerous error in Altman's theory -- his denial of the existence of the Reactive Mind. It is a dangerous error because we in dianetics are engaged in a war -- and the Reactive Mind is our enemy. I can conceive of no more dangerous a mistake that could be made in a war than to assume that your enemy does not exist! Have you read Heinlein's "The Puppet Masters"? This is a story of parasitic "slugs" that invade earth. They are able to fasten themselves to the backs of their human victims and take control of their nervous system. Since human beings wore clothes, the slugs could not ordinarily be seen. One of the major problems of the "heroes" of the story was to persuade men that the slugs even existed!

We in dianetics are confronted with an analogous problem today. 98% (or more) of the human race are not even aware that the Reactive Mind exists. We must know our enemy. If we do not recognize him, especially if we deny his existence, he will destroy us.

3. The "spun case" I mentioned in my December 15 letter was a result of Altmanian Reactive Mind therapy, not of Kitzelman's E therapy. Concerning Mr. Kitzelman's therapy my attitude is one of suspended judgment, until I have had more opportunity to study and to test it.

4. It has come to my attention that the phrase, "The examiner is the reactive mind", has itself become reactively installed in certain cases and thus impeded case progress. When this occurs, it should of course be "blown" by one of the many techniques available. I would be the last to want such a statement, for which I am responsible, to be taken "reactively". I ask only that the reader list the properties of the Reactive Mind -- the ability to turn somatics on and off, ditto for perceptics, the production of "discharge", the identity associations (known to Altman as "symbols"), etc. -- and then read over Altman's first paper. He will find, I believe, that the Reactive Mind, and what Altman has mistakenly labelled the "Examiner", possess identical characteristics. In no single instance do they differ. Not one. There is not a single characteristic by means of which they may be told apart. But please, dear reader, do not take this purely on my say-so; I would much prefer that you make your own checks.

Sincerely,
Art

N. A. COULTER, JR., M.D.
512 Marylander Apts.
Baltimore 18, Maryland

* * * * *

FROM DWIGHT BULKLEY

Dear Bill,

For a month now I've been too wound up in publication problems to do much else. Now the book is out, and copies on their way to all concerned (almost 200) - and I can settle down to some routines -

Such as -

Are you still publishing? Haven't seen anything since the Nov. 15th issue, and am kinda wondering....

For The Arc Light (if deemed of sufficient interest)

I notice that The Arc Light is almost exclusively devoted to philosophical and theoretical discussion, and it somehow reminds me of the "how many angels can dance on the head of a pin" controversy of centuries ago which Anita Smith mentioned.

FROM DWIGHT BULKLEY - Continued

Am I assuming correctly that we are jointly engaged in The Search for whatever is "truth" or "reality"? This welter of abstract guesses pains me. We seem to have been led to certain techniques which seem to produce good results in improving human behavior. But when it comes to the Whys and Wherefores -

Over 300 years ago Francis Bacon wrote: "There are and can be only two ways of searching into and discovering truth. The one flies from the senses and particulars to the most general axioms, and from these to principles, the truth of which it takes for settled and immovable, proceeds to judgment and to the discovery of middle axioms. And this way is now in fashion. The other derives axioms from the senses and particulars, rising by a gradual and unbroken ascent, so that it arrives at the most general axioms last of all. This is the true way, and as yet untried.... Those however who aspire not to guess and divine, but to discover and know; who propose not to devise mimic and fabulous worlds of their own, but to examine and dissect the nature of this very world itself - must go to the facts themselves for everything."

And so - even if everyone else would prefer to indulge in creating their own fanciful worlds - I, for one, would like to see in each issue a small space devoted to "facts", data, reports, techniques and results.

Just one more quotation for those who cling to authorities. Krishnamurti echos Bacon in a slightly different way: "We are out on a voyage of discovery. To discover, thought-feeling must not be clogged by any hypothesis or belief; they hinder. To discover there must be freedom, there must be alert passivity.... We are the result of the past; our being is founded in it... This past is to be studied and understood through the living present; thru the data of the present the past is uncovered..."

It is upon these premises that I feel most critical of Campbell's philosophizing. This business of jumping to hypothetical conclusions, of constructing whole systems - and worse - by a process of reasoning by analogy - is one of the major death-traps confronting Searchers. Campbell reasons by analogy to the electronic computer, and is anthropomorphic from beginning to end. He has the "I"-function delegating authorities to sub-computers, and all, just like little gremlins. Dissection reveals no gremlins. To assume them is metaphysical reasoning.

Just a word on O'Neill's philosophizing: On pages 103-104 in my new book "The Mechanisms of Life" (\$2) (!)(paid advertisement)(how much, Bill?) I have dug the grave for, and buried, Hubbard's, O'Neill's, and anyone else's "disproof" of the possibilities and probabilities, mathematical or otherwise, of "cellular recordings", i.e., the physical basis of "memory" and "mind".

So now there's the question: Is there really a contradiction between the "physical" and "metaphysical" approach to understanding life?

I heard Kitselman give a talk in Pasadena about two months ago. He favors the "metaphysical" approach, and I the "physical" or "mechanistic". It now seems to me that the closer we get to the ultimate realities, facts, secrets, of the structure-function which is "life" (and I think I've discovered the fundamental physica-chemical secret of life itself) (see my book) the closer we seem to merge into a common ground which is either, neither, or both. This may be simply because of the fact that "matter" or "mass" IS merely a configuration of energy, i.e., mass-energy, and atoms and molecular groups are electromagnetic patterns. And thus "mind" and "mental" phenomena and behavior are thus the PRODUCTS of these configurations. Like Krishnamurti, the mystic, said. And the Buddha, too.

Therefore, I say, nuts to all your space devoted to abstract theories. My one operating "theory" is: The less theory the better; that when sufficient facts are fitted together, the "truth" will be self-evident, and no theory will be required, as mortar, to hold the facts together.

Now - for facts: If you have space left, you may reproduce page 92 of my book, Appendix - N - The Mystery of Pain. There's something you can really sink your teeth into.

FROM DWIGHT BULKLEY - Continued

(There's something into which you can really sink your teeth.)

Best regards,

DWIGHT H. BULKLEY
350 So. Mills Avenue
Claremont, California

* * * * *

CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORSHIP OF TONO-THERAPY

Dear Swygards:

I note on page 4 of the Dec. 1st Arc Light a very mixed up statement about Tono-Therapy.

I received the original mss from my friend Philip Friedman of Pittsburgh, Pa. This I copied and sent to Morgan J. Morey of Tampa, Fla. The mss author was not named at that time, early in November.

Morey wrote me his comments and I forwarded same to Jack Beever the author and Beever replied direct to Morey.

Jack Beever is the author and his name is not a pen-name for Morey as your article would indicate. Beever is a television engineer in Pittsburgh and Morey in his spare time runs a business college in Tampa, so they cannot be the same person.

Friendly yours,
Addison O'Neill
1814 Hampton Road
Daytona Beach, Florida

* * * * *

WILLIAM SWYGARD
c/o Arc Light

Dear Sir:

My friend, David Feigley, received a letter from you which for some reason has him up in arms. He sent you a copy of the little brochure which I wrote, and which he had made up into the format you have seen. He is naturally a little fanatical about the technique because of the tremendous benefits he has received from it. He was changed from a practically bed fast invalid, with no hope offered of improvement to an active individual through this technique.

The technique, as presented in the brochure, was presented to the members of the Pittsburgh Dianetic Association by me on the occasion of the July, 1951 meeting. I am chairman of this group, a fairly active group. Following this meeting I was prevailed upon to codify my findings. A number of typewritten copies were made and passed from hand to hand. A Mr. Philip Friedmand acquired a copy and sent it to Dr. Addison O'Neill of Tampa, I believe. Dr. O'Neill tried the technique with salutary results, and passed the information to Mr. Morey and Karl Schuman, formerly of Dianetic Consultants, New York. Mr. Morey returned a report on their use of the technique to Dr. O'Neill, dated Nov. 13, 1951. This report is still in my possession. I would like to quote you from the report. Here are some excerpts- "Karl and I had been working in the same general direction for some time but had not hit on the utter simplicity of this technique-" "-I am going to continue with this technique--- thanks again for advising me of this simple but highly effective technique."--"Thanks for the comments of the author of this miraculous technique."

As far as the comment 'amusing' is concerned, I can assure you that I had no idea of amusing anyone when I came to the conclusions which are presented in the booklet. Most assuredly the arthritics, the patient with arterio-sclerosis, or the one with the non-malignant fibroid in the duodenum are far from feeling amused at the results in the use

FROM JACK BEEVER - Continued

of this method of therapy- these things are too serious for amusement. I could mention the foot infection, due for amputation within hours, which recovered completely in eighteen hours, or the patient with arthritis of both hands, joints locked, who showed complete recovery in four days.

By the way, I am not momentarily connected with the publishing of the brochure, not having time from my business for this activity. The effort is on the part of Dave Feigley, who was one of the first to receive benefits from this method. The make-up and method are entirely his. My section on theory is necessarily simplified and is much too complicated now for the taste of most readers. My own ambition is to publish my whole research on the subject, complete with the electro-cardiographic recordings, oscillometric recordings and the tracings of electric activity in the nerves. Some day I hope to further this work with more elaborate investigation along this line. Research is also needed to determine the type of ailments which are amenable to this type of treatment. So far, disorders of the cardio-vascular systems have shown the most spectacular results, but many other ailments can be shown to be dependent on the tone of the cardio-vascular system. Hyper-tension has been shown to respond favorably, but also many disorders of the visceral organs, disorders of function, have responded.

All in all, the field seems to be opening from Hubbard's original ideas and delusions into a vista which should change medical thinking from its absolute dependence upon allopathic techniques to a better balanced system. Certainly I have interested a few medical doctors in this area in the techniques, and I hope that it can spread. You may notice in the booklet the avoidance of Hubbardian terminology, which was done deliberately because of the sour taste left in the mouths of the orthodox thinkers by standard dyanetics, although they are also unjustified in the completeness of their negations. I by no means think that the technique I promulgate is the ne plus ultra, it is merely a step in a different direction - whether for better or worse I leave to others to judge. Certainly it is only a fumbling step in a direction which the mystics and thinkers of past ages have already had their feet upon, but which they had not enough physical data to attempt logic upon. My hypothesis may be entirely incorrect, but it fits facts which can be observed by their effects upon instruments and which are invariable from patient to patient.

Well, having rambled enough upon this structure, I would like to request you to clarify the editorial position of the Arc Light on the origin of this technique, it naturally interests me from the point of vanity, a vice which I am afflicted with., although not unduly so, I believe.

Sincerely yours,
Jack Beever.

* * * * *

Ed Note: I think Messrs. Feigley and Beever misunderstood my comment about Tono-Therapy being "amusing." What I actually said and meant was that several Floridians were amused that two men were named author of a single paper. When usually (at least in dianetics) there is more polarity. We think highly of Tono-Therapy as a technique. My wife (and partner) is selling copies of the technique in her bookstore.

W.S.

* * * * *

FOR YOUR INFORMATION:

J. Keith Armour, HDA
549 North San Joaquin Street
Stockton 3, California

Vallota V. Gordon
417 East Oak Street
Stockton 3, California

* * * * *

"Dear Dee and Bill,

I have no intentions of putting locks into either one of these two fellows! But can't you get anybody else to write for you?. Karl Schuman's things used to be interesting, Bulkeley's stuff was fascinating (though the long formulas and pictures of cells don't do me any good...), how about getting Kitselman to write some little thumbnail sketches on, say, Buddha, Lao-Tse, and how their writings relate to Dianetics, -or to E-Therapy, if he prefers that angle....

Hope I haven't hurt your editorial feelings by this rather frank criticizism --- the brick bats are detail, as a whole I still enjoy the ARC LIGHT very much and am glad it exists!

Enclosed you'll find a little nonsense-poem which is yours to publish if you like...

ON THE SERVICE FACSIMILE OF A WINDOW CLEANER

OR:

"GO RUN YOUR OWN,-LEAVE MINE ALONE"

When Melinda
Found a cinder
On the window,
Why, Melinda
Raised a real hue and cry;
For Melinda
Sees the cinder
On most everybody's window-
But she never sees the beam in her I.

(signed:

Susan R. Isaacson
Stratford on Avon)

SUSAN R. ISMACSON, HDA
986 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1-A, New York, N.Y.

The Arc Light is issued the first and fifteenth day of every month. Rates: 25¢ per copy, Club rates: Ten or more copies of a single issue to one address, 20¢ per copy.

The Arc Light -- 1370 N. W. 86th Street, Miami 47, Florida. A non-profit journal -- Publisher, Dorothy Swygard. William Swygard, editor.

TO THE READER: It is well to note that each article and letter found among the pages of The Arc Light represents the opinion of the writer of that article or letter. The Publisher prints these articles and letters as a matter of record of what has been thought and written in the Field of Dianetics.
