

THE ARC LIGHT

MIAMI, FLORIDA

A Paper Dedicated to the Dissemination of
Dianetic Information

MARCH 15, 1952



ELECTROPSYCHOMETRIC MONITORING OF DIANETIC PROCESSING - By Volney G. Mathison (Inventor of the Electropsychometer)

Part 1: Theoretical and Source Material

L. Ron Hubbard, after a year of testing of electropsychometry, has become its leading exponent. The electropsychometer owes its existence, in a way, to Hubbard himself; for he remarked in one of his earlier lectures, that he wished some one would invent a usable electronic instrument that would appraise psychophysical situations. Being an electronics engineer with a background of specialization in secret and difficult electronic communication installations, I realized suddenly that here again was a problem in communication--- and one that might be solved electronically.

Hubbard's remark, in short, brought into the foreground of the writer's awareness the fact that in dianetic processing it frequently becomes painfully obvious that the verbal level affords a deceptive means of communication from preclear to dianeticist. This situation, of course, is not peculiar to dianetics; it is a difficulty that is encountered in every known form of analytic psychotherapy.

Looking into what had been done previously, I found that little was available below the level of the costly encephalograph. There are some lie-detection devices available--- with which the electropsychometer is sometimes erroneously confused---that function on principles of measurement of respiration and heart-beat. Testing disclosed that this type of instrument is too crude, insensitive, and SLOW to be of much value in dianetic processing.

I turned next to psychogalvanism; and this is one of the principles upon which the electropsychometer functions. Psychogalvanism was discovered over 45 years ago by Russian and French investigators, Tarchanoff and Frere. Although the psychogalvanic reflex has been studied at length, this study has been carried out mostly in university laboratories. College laboratory work is usually productive, but in this particular case it seems to have led to erroneous evaluations---for a certain odd and interesting reason: The professors used it mainly upon one another---and since the useful factor of the psychogalvanic reflex is a delicate and sensitive manifestation of dynamic psychophysical response to disturbing situations, the observations obtained by testing on these relatively emotionless and serene professors resulted in formulations that DO NOT FIT when applied to the widely variable stream of more or less disturbed and unhappy human beings who live outside the quiet walls of the universities. Further, the technical design of the instruments used was far from optimum, as they were lacking in sensitivity, and failed to take advantage of the myological or neuromuscular reflex phenomenon exhibited by the autonomic nervous system.

I assembled an instrument that immediately worked pretty much in accordance with dianetic axioms, but which had a disastrous tendency occasionally to burn out costly analyzer movements during violent emotional discharges of preclears in auditing sessions. This problem was eventually solved, only to be followed by a new one that will be mentioned in a later paper in this series.

The MEST aspects of the psychogalvanic reflex phenomenon are as follows: The human body has about 400 sweat glands to the square inch over most of its surface. However, in the palms of the hands, inside the thumbs and fingers, and on the soles of the feet, the number of these glands rises dramatically to about 2700 to the square inch. The glands in the hands and fingers are tiny "jetters." That is, they squirt saline fluid by the direct activation of nervous impulses coming from the autonomic nervous system. The jetting is sometimes extremely rapid, a matter of microseconds; so swift that when one makes a decision to grab at some object, these glands act BEFORE the decision to perform the act has been completed in the cortical awareness center of the mind.

ELECTROPSYCHOMETRIC MONITORING OF DIANETIC PROCESSING - Continued

An explanation of this reflex that is rather acceptable is that it is a biological inheritance from prehistoric times when the ape man had need of moisture in the palms of his hands and on the soles of his feet to gain adhesion to rocks and branches in running or climbing, as when confronted by an avalanche, an attack from savage animal or other enemy, etc. This reflex is still with us; it is even more or less subconsciously fortified at times by wetting the thumb with saliva to facilitate turning the pages of a book, by spitting on an axe handle, and the like.

The fluid-jetting reflex functions every time we are in any kind of situation equating to a "predicament," however minor. Most important, in dianetics, however, is the fact that this reflex operates when one is engaged in something posing no visible "physical" threat, but which is in the category of a "mental" problem, predicament, or conflict. The A-equals-A formula is fascinatingly demonstrated by this reflex action, whereby the autonomic nervous system---the area occupied by the dianetic reactive bank---responds to any and all predicaments and conflicts, even purely mental ones, as equating to threats to survival, and causes the glands in the hands and feet to jet forthwith---the blind reactive purpose evidently being to facilitate immediate physical flight.. However, there is evidently a great degree of cortical subvention involved; for the amount of jetting varies in relation to the seriousness of the immediate or recalled predicament, as estimated by the cortical analyzer area of the organism. In a person who has developed an extreme degree of self control, the jetting reflex may be almost---but never entirely---inhibited. Enormously high instrumental sensitivity must be available when required, in order to obtain registrations in this type of case.

The psychogalvanic reflex seems to be mainly a fear reaction. It is complicated by its immediate cousin, the anger reaction, which is manifested by the contractions of numerous muscles, particularly in the arms, hands, and fingers, resulting in a clenching action to form a hard and menacing fist. This phenomenon, which is termed the myological or neuromuscular reflex, has, in the electropsychometer, been successfully superimposed upon the psychogalvanic reflex, thereby producing rather accurate registrations in response to a great variety of negative psychophysical situations. This dual-response effect may be compared---purely as a sort of analogy---to the use of cinecolor in motion pictures. Here the combination of only two basic colors produces an incomparably more true-to-reality effect than can be obtained through the use of any single color, or through the use of the invariant single-color effect called black and white. It has been repeatedly observed that preclears with extremely high control circuits are apt to cortically inhibit either one or the other of the two available reflexes; but, so far as I know, none have been found---outside of multiple-sclerosis or drug-addiction cases---who can simultaneously inhibit BOTH reflexes.

The technical application of the electropsychometer to the preclear consists in placing an electrode in each hand. Rather large light metal cans with tinned surfaces have been found to be far superior to any other type of electrode tested so far; and these tests have included a variety of rather expensive gimmicks. The cans afford a large surface of contact, and because of their size, take unexpectedly efficient advantage of the neuromuscular reflex. As processing proceeds, the preclear tends to forget that he is holding the electrodes; whereupon he retains them in a manner corresponding largely to his neuromuscular impulses. The electric current flowing through the electrodic circuit has a value of only a few microamperes. This is electronically amplified, then "detected" as in a radio receiver, and fed into a delicate electromagnetic indicating instrument. It has been found necessary to exercise great care in selecting components that will not introduce falsifying effects into the instrumental registrations.

One thing that seems to have confused the professors who have experimented with the psychogalvanic reflex is the fact that at first most subjects are apt to show sharp registrations in response to any question asked, even neutral and impersonal questions. The reason is that the subject considers the situation of being connected to the instrument as in itself equating to a special "predicament." This reaction is either conscious or subconscious, usually both---a here-and-now fear reaction that is easily and speedily reviewed out by asking suitable tension-relieving questions. The following generally used:

ELECTROPSYCHOMETRIC MONITORING OF DIANETIC PROCESSING - Continued

1. How do you feel about being on this instrument?
2. Do you fear that this will cause the disclosure of painful or secret past experience?
3. How do you feel about the fact that people are observing you here (Used when observers are present)?
4. Please talk a little about your anxiety and tension concerning this instrument.

The average preclear who is seeking therapy will always cooperate, and soon lets go of his concern about the electropsychometer. Hubbard seems to have found that when he audits on the instrument, persons seeking to get his trust and confidence for their own ends, i.e. employment, etc. sometimes go into shut-offs, in an effort to conceal an extremely low tone. Hubbard knifes through this type of situation by inquiring: "Is there an emotional shut-off here?"---whereupon the indicating needle goes wham! against the pin and the situation breaks wide open. This kind of person is usually not seeking therapy. The average auditor will rarely encounter special situations of this sort.

The preclear usually discharges his anxiety about the instrument, if any, in 3 or 4 minutes; and from this point on the registrations become pertinent to the data that is being explored in processing.

To be continued in the following papers: The Tone-Scale and Tone-Scale error factors. Application. EPM-contact therapy (A powerful method for evoking high-level affinity and tremendous grief discharges.)

Volney G. Mathison
1214 West 30th Street
Los Angeles 7, California

(Volney G. Mathison is gaining fame with his Mathison Electropsychometer. The February 12th issue of Fortnight News Magazine ran an informative illustrated article on Mathison and his work. TIME magazine is planning to do the same thing in the near future. Hubbard is using the Mathison Electropsychometer at the College in Wichita. A. L. Kitselman has purchased one and has used it extensively; reports, "Wonderful instrument." Ed.)

FROM N. A. COULTER, JR., M.D.

Dear Dee and Bill:

This is the fourth of the ARC making series, and concludes the first phase of the work. It deals with the Affinity Make. The next letter of this series will inaugurate a new phase -- one which, I believe, will be of revolutionary importance to all members of the dianetic community.

THE AFFINITY MAKE

Just what affinity "is", is not known at least to this writer. It seems to grow in proportion to its use, and decline in proportion to its misuse. Whatever it is, it is certainly one of the most important powers in the universe.

Of course, all auditors and all dianetic groups seek to develop and to maintain affinity. Its use, until now, has been largely empirical and intuitive. By this I do not mean to imply that it has not been effective; nor do I wish to claim any credit for original discovery of the laws which govern its flow. Knowledge of these laws permits affinity to be created and developed far more effectively. Compasses were useful long before the laws of electromagnetism were known; When Faraday discovered these laws, electric motors and generators became possible.

So it is with the Affinity Make. As here proposed, it is far more than the simple practise of ARC with emphasis on the A. It is a specific, precision tool, whose use is governed by definite laws. Provided these laws are obeyed, it produces in both "sender" and "receiver" a surge of feeling and analytical power. For those familiar with electricity and magnetism, it may be likened to a transformer whose "primary" lies in the theta universe.

The Affinity Make "closes a switch", and power surging into that primary produces a surge of power in the "secondary", the ARC uniting two human beings in this universe. This is of course only an analogy and perhaps should not be taken too seriously. The real event -- the surge of feeling and analytical power -- is itself so dynamic and worth while an experience that it needs no theory to explain it.

To many, the idea of an "affinity make" as a tool or technique may sound just a little bit repugnant. When it is used just as a tool or technique it is repugnant. That is one of the laws of its use. It must be genuine. It cannot be "forced". It cannot proceed out of politeness, or out of a mechanical desire to "be a good auditor". It cannot even proceed out of pity. Pity for others is not affinity for them, because it contains within itself an element of pride, of assumed "superiority" to that other. Conversely, blind worship, unquestioning loyalty, toward another is not affinity either, because it also violates the principle of equality. How to insure the genuineness of an Affinity Make will be discussed below.

In my letter on semantic telepathy it was pointed out that "meanings" could be communicated directly, by intangible cues, and the hypothesis was advanced that subcomputers of the Analytical mind were assembled into a task force for "semantic prediction". Semantic telepathy, like "returning", is a latent ability of the human mind, and can be developed with practise -- regardless of the theory that is used to explain it; that theory was presented mainly because it was on the basis of that theory that the technique was developed.

That same theory may be applied to explain the communication of affinity. Affinity is something that we "feel", and we all possess the ability to "detect" its presence or absence. We may hypothesize that subcomputers of the Analytical Mind are delegated to this task; let us refer to these as the Affinity Detectors. Their mission is to report whether or not affinity is present, and its degree and kind, on the basis of data perceived and recalled; like the semantic predictors, they flash results and pertinent data only to the Monitor. How is it that we can sometimes look at a person's face and sense that something is wrong? How are we able to distinguish flattery from honest praise or appreciation? These and other phenomena are adequately explained by the hypothesis of Affinity Detectors, although I certainly recognize that other theories might explain it as well or better.

From this hypothesis flows naturally the basic rule of the Affinity Make:

EXPRESS AFFINITY IN ACTIONS RATHER THAN WORDS

This does not mean that words cannot be used; of course they can. A verbal statement is itself an action, and can convey affinity by explicit statement. Often it is the easiest or the only way to express affinity. Even here, however, it is the action rather than the words that primarily carries the affinity. A man's expressions of endearment to his beloved may often sound inane or incredible to an objective analysis; it is the fact of expression, not the content, that is important.

The ability to express or to detect affinity is, again like "returning", one man has always "known about" but never fully developed. Everyone has this ability and, provided aberration is not too extreme, can develop it to a surprising degree. It is, I believe, very worth while to do so. There is a magnificent power here which is ours for the asking.

There are laws to its flow, and proper observance of these laws will greatly amplify the power it makes available. These laws, like the ARC law itself, can be expressed in the form of a triangle -- the LEF triangle. (Liberty, Equality, Fraternity)

The base of this triangle is Equality. A tacit assumption of equal worth is essential to the optimum flow of affinity. If one party assumes, by his manner or actions, that he is superior to the other, the flow of affinity will eventually cease, and either or both of two events will ensue: (1) An ARC break will occur, or (2) A reactive "alliance" will form.

Conversely, if one party assumes, by his manner or actions, that he is inferior to the other, the flow of affinity will also eventually be interrupted. Instead, there will again occur either an ARC break, or a reactive alliance, or both. The reason for these events -- which have occurred frequently enough in my own experience, at least, to validate their statement as a law -- is this: a relationship of "inequality" violates the principle of

FROM N. A. COULTER, JR., M.D. - Continued

self-determinism -- both for the "greater" as well as for the "lesser" party. That it does so for the lesser seems obvious; in accepting the other as greater he transfers the "power of decision" to some extent to that other. That it does so for the greater may not be so obvious -- until we remember that the principle of self-determinism means "just what it says": self-determinism, not determinism of others (except in a group of which both are self-determined members).

A particularly striking validation of this principle, and one worth pointing out, I think, despite the locks it may install, is the relationship of dianeticists to L. Ron Hubbard. The reader familiar with my letters knows that I have many times expressed my admiration for Ron's many achievements, and my own gratitude to him. I believe that Hubbardian techniques are superior by far to any others I have tried, observed, or read about; and in particular I feel his "Handbook for Preclears" is simply terrific, the best thing he has yet done.

Yet if I make the statement that Ron is an aberrated human being -- a statement that I believe, objectively, to be correct -- I know I shall produce an ARC break with some dianeticists. I might even go further, and say that the name of his aberration is AUTHORITY. I shall say no more than this, for by semantic telepathy, application of dianetic principles, and observation the message can be reconstructed by the analytical reader.

Most analytical dianeticists are aware of this. There are some, however, who entered dianetics by assuming Hubbard to be a superior. The results have been, in case after case, a reactive alliance or an ARC break or both. They provide a remarkable demonstration of both the law of ARC and the law of Equality.

The ideal of equality has been greatly misunderstood or misrepresented. It does not mean mathematical equality. It does not mean that each party has equal talents or equal faults. It does not mean that if I do something good for you, you must do something equally good for me. That is the Reactive Mind talking: identity computation.

Or to use another language: analytical equality is a theta equality, an equality of "things spiritual". It is the very antithesis of a MEST equality. Theta must not be identified with MEST. That such an identification might take place sounds crazy, which is precisely why we should take it seriously. The Reactive Mind can identify anything with anything. That is why it is so dangerous. That is also why it is so dumb.

The left leg of the Affinity triangle (L) stands for Liberty -- or more precisely, self-determinism. Each party to an ARC make of any kind should respect the self-determinism of the other. An important point to recognize here is that self-determinism is analytical, not reactive. Thus, a man who attempts suicide is, in almost all cases, acting reactively, not through analytical self-determinism.

Failure to recognize the self-determinism of another, usually by the attempt to impose one's own self-determinism on the other, is not only "fatal" to an ARC make, it is one of the more serious of ARC breaks. But not only should "self-determinism breaks" be avoided; this is only the negative side of the coin. It is important for each party to act in such a way as to encourage self-determined action by the other. The appropriate expression of honest praise and sincere appreciation is one way of doing this; another is to throw down a challenge in the form of a positive, realizable goal.

The L and E sides of the triangle are rather closely connected, as has already been made apparent. Equality of self-determined action is important. Many of us have a tendency to overemphasize our own contribution.

The right leg of the Affinity Triangle stands for Fraternity. Full understanding in application of the law of Fraternity is the key which guarantees the "genuineness" of an Affinity Make. As I think over my past experience, I find that there is no one, not even among my "worst enemies", for whom I have not or am not able to feel some measure of fraternal affection. I am sure that the reader, on reflection, can make an equivalent statement; it by no means implies an absence of anger, jealousy, envy, or even hatred for the parties concerned. There is almost always some aspect of a personality that is "likeable".

FROM N. A. COULTER, JR. M.D. Continued

This leads, then, to the following simple rule: EXPRESS YOUR "AFFINITY" TOWARD THAT FACET OF HIS PERSONALITY THAT YOU GENUINELY LIKE AND ADMIRE. This rule will ensure that you yourself feel the affinity you are expressing. And if you feel it, it will be detected. Furthermore, if you don't feel it, that will also be detected. The capabilities of the affinity Detectors are remarkable to a degree bordering on the fantastic. It is important to remember that every organically intact person has an Analytical Mind. It is relatively easy to "outsmart" a Reactive Mind. It is almost possible to deceive an Analytical Mind. Anyone who tries, should examine his own motives, because there is almost certainly a reactive factor causing him to do so.

One final simple but important rule is this: any Affinity Make should be followed by a "response" from the receiver. It need be no more than a simple, gracious gesture of appreciation -- but without that response, the "Make" does not "take". The point here is not that the Make is done for the sake of the response, but rather that the response is the signal that Affinity actually has been made, that the ARC is complete.

APPLICATIONS

How and when can Affinity Makes be used? They can, of course, be planned; but a most effective device is simply to maintain a state of readiness for opportunities to make them, and to let themselves be expressed naturally and freely. Most of us "pass up" numerous such opportunities from day to day. Merely altering our state of readiness would greatly increase their frequency of occurrence. Whenever you feel affinity, express it.

A particularly desirable and rewarding occasion for an Affinity Make is toward someone for or from whom one has felt hostility or resentment -- i.e., to a person with whom one has negative ARC. There is a corollary here to the basic law of affinity, which may be stated as follows: wherever a negative ARC exists, the potential for positive ARC is high. An appropriate gesture can release this potential like pulling the trigger on a gun.

Affinity Makes can, of course, be used with anyone. They are far, far more effective among dianeticists, however, than among those in the aberrated world at large, because dianeticists have the "know-how" to use them with precision. Together with semantic telepathy and the VARC, they constitute a universal privilege which is now available to all dianeticists and only to dianeticists. The time may soon come when two dianeticists previously strangers may meet in a crowded place, recognize one another as dianeticists, communicate, and exchange affinity, all without saying a word, simply by use of their semantic predictors and affinity detectors, while their aberrated neighbors are unaware that anything unusual has taken place.

CONCLUSION

The research on these ARC making tools has led to a series of unexpected developments which are, I believe, of greater importance than I had anticipated. I originally conceived of them as an "aid" to processing, a relatively minor set of techniques which might increase to a small but significant degree the effectiveness of processing. (See my letter to Supplement I to "Science of Survival") Instead, research on them has led to a series of major discoveries. Each step in their development has opened up a whole new field of possible research. For example: What is the relation of Prime Circuit to aberration? How can other "wide variables", such as precognition, be developed? What will be the effect on Analytical Minds whose horizons have been expanded to the extent that systematic use of the VARC makes possible? What other ARC making tools might be developed? What other applications of the ARC principle are possible?

We are on the threshold of a great era of discovery and achievement. A discovery as basic as dianetics has many applications other than the elimination of aberration, important though that may be. For such a branch of dianetics I propose the name "Analytical Dianotics". The basic principle of this science, as stated previously, is the analytical principle: the analytical application of our knowledge of the Analytical Mind to its own development. We have, in this principle, a sort of self-priming pump, or a method of lifting ourselves by our own bootstraps. Its importance can hardly be overestimated.

FROM N. A. COULTER, JR., M.D. Continued

One development in particular, however, seems to me to be of major importance. It has evolved logically and naturally out of this research on ARC making. It is far from complete, however, being only in the initial stages of development. It is called the Theta Group Plan. Its development will require the attention and analytical action of as many dianeticists as possible; and its content will be the subject of the next letter of this series.

Sincerely,
"Art"

N. A. Coulter, Jr., M.D.
512 Marylander Apts.
Baltimore 18, Maryland

* * * * *

THE SCIENTIFIC STATEMENT By John W. Campbell, Jr.

We have found it extremely valuable to write down, in positive, definitive statement form, the beliefs and ideas we hold concerning human beings and the nature of mind. Hubbard has, in his Axioms of Dianetics, done something of this; it is valuable for each individual to write down his own beliefs, however. In doing so, however, the most useful technique is to follow the practice of the scientific method; make your statements flat, universal, and definitive.

There is a bad---and I mean highly injurious---conception that a "cautious, scientific statement" must be one that is not over-bold. The psychology, sociology, and medical fields in particular hold this opinion; a psychologist or sociologist will react very annoyedly to a statement beginning "Everybody in the Universe...." and angrily assert that such universal statements are unscientific nonsense.

They are completely wrong in the reaction; that they are can be demonstrated to them, too, by precisely the above statement. I have used it to alter their viewpoint on the matter---because the rest of the above---very slightly mis-written--- statement is "... attracts every other body in the universe with a force proportional..." And today, no one dares challenge the scientific nature of Newton's statement of the Law of Gravity.

The basic rule for making a scientific statement actually must be: A scientific statement must be so phrased that it can be proven only by exhaustion, and can be disproven by a single contrary instance. It is highly unscientific to make a statement that can be disproven only by exhaustion, and can be confirmed by a single instance.

The basis of the scientific method is organized trial and error. But for that powerful method of research to work, it is essential that error be recognized as quickly as possible. Therefore, statements must be so made that a single instance of error will lead to correction of the concept.

For example, take two statements, Newton's Law of Gravity, and the following statement: "Some individuals, under certain conditions of stress, occasionally display a tendency to float in midair while spinning rapidly on the long axis of the body."

In all the history of the Universe yet to come, that latter statement will never be disproven. The statement contains so much rubber that no one can deny that it is a cautious, conservative statement. It certainly is; to disprove it, every individual in the universe would have to be tested under every conceivable condition of stress. Examples of levitation have been reported. It has been stated that certain individuals spin in their graves. I can quote authority that the stated elements might exist.

The statement remains meaningless, however, until I make scientific statement out of it---and I can't, because it is scientific nonsense.

Newton's Law of Gravity, however, was so clearly, sharply, and precisely stated that it was broken completely when it was observed that Mercury's orbit around the Sun did not obey that law to the tenth decimal place. The error detected was in one instance, and it appeared only in about the tenth decimal place---but because Newton's statement was scientifically formulated, it was possible to detect that error. Einstein's relativity theories could then be developed to improve our understanding of the Universe.

THE SCIENTIFIC STATEMENT Continued

The fault in present tendencies in psychology and sociology and medicine is the tendency to make poorly defined statements that allow such latitude of observation that errors in their concepts cannot be detected and developed into useful clues. The same error appears in our normal thinking; by inadequately defining our own terms of thought, we are constantly getting into trouble with overlapping concepts. It is never any trouble to decide a clear-cut issue; the mental problem always comes from borderline cases. Then isn't it evident that what we need is more clearly defined, positively stated borders?

When you write down your statements about people and the mind, state sharply defined terms. Make up your own definitions as you go; it doesn't matter much what your definition is, just so you know what you're talking about. Here are a few I've worked with. If you don't like 'em, by all means write out your own, and see what the terms mean to you.

Dishonesty: It is dishonest to attempt to influence anyone to believe in something that you yourself do not truly believe in. ("Anyone" can also refer to yourself, as when you try to deceive yourself.)

Judgement: Judgement is the ability to resolve apparent paradoxes.

Anger: Anger is the strong emotional reaction to a sense of injustice.

Injustice: I have a definition for it, but I would very much like to see some other definitions and compare them.

In essence, you can clarify and speed your own thinking if you have clearly in mind the terms in which you are dealing, and so phrase your thinking--make it in such positive terms ---as to make it easy to detect and correct your errors. Avoid the rubber statement; expect to make erroneous statements, because only by detecting errors in your own beliefs can you advance. The less cautious, the more sharply delineated and positive your statements are, the more chance you have for finding errors and improving your understanding.

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

* * * * *

FROM MADO AND MARCEL SYLVAIN

Dear Dee and Bill,

You will find enclosed a short paper written by our good friend and closest associate, Morton Jaquays...If after reading it you feel that its publication would be of general interest, you have our fullest permission to do so, and no strings attached. Your comments and criticisms would be very welcome, and if any of your readers wish to communicate directly with us about "Learning by Un-Learning," our address is below. We shall do our best to answer all in the shortest possible time.

As you will see, there is no earth-shaking concept in this paper...BUT,..how many of us have taken the time to re-evaluate and analyze anew? Since dianetics, I imagine that all of us have felt the need to re-assess our data on a personal day-by-day level, but at first glance, it seemed that too much time would be consumed scanning "trivialities"...time better spent hunting big, bad, roaring engrams.

Far be it from me to belittle the importance of removing engrams, but an elephant hunter can be made very uncomfortable by hordes of crawling ants, even to the point of having to turn back without ever doing more than sighting a vague grey mass trumpeting in the distance. How much faster could engrams be removed if this "shadow-land" of false-NOW data had been first cleared away, or at least a good trail cut through the jungle of identifications?

We here at Paramount Farms are trying to find out; we hope some of you out there can also try and let us know your results. So far we have found out that "trivialities" can have a surprising impact on the individual, and that our lives have been molded much more than we thought, by constantly repeated pinpricks. The repetition is what seems to count, much more than the intensity of the pain and/or anaten. Let me repeat that this does not

FROM MADO AND MARCEL SYLVAIN Continued

minimize the importance of properly running engrams, but we do think that this vast area between analytical and reactive thinking should not be neglected, but given its proper place in any serious attempt at processing. The key to many near-failures or excessive slowness in pre-clears may lie in this area...we hope you will join us in exploring it...

Best regards,
The Sylvains
Mado and Marcel Sylvain
Paramount Farms
Sutton, County Brome
Province Quebec, Canada

LEARN by UN-LEARNING
By Morton Jaquays

These notes are offered to those who may feel that the idea of The Engram, The Reactive Mind, The Analyser, etc., does not quite answer all the problems encountered in our search for more efficient thinking. We are told that the Analytical Mind is the perfect computing machine, and that the Memory Banks are the perfect filing system for the Analyser. We are also told that the Reactive Mind is the Idiot Mind, incapable of thought or reasoning - yet this "idiot" is smart enough to control the Analytical Mind for all or part of the time. The Mighty Engram is its weapon, and it is all-powerful-or so we are told. More and more, all efforts are turned towards the Engram and the Reactive Mind.

Can all mis-information, aberrations, compulsions and so on spring from this one source? Might there not be a border area - a sort of shadow-land of error - controlled by neither Engrams nor Analyser? We do not attempt to question the theory of the Reactive Mind and its Engrammic nature - this has been proven too thoroughly to doubt that there does, in fact, exist some such mechanism, regardless of what "tags" are given to it. We know, however, that reduction of engrams is a slow and arduous process - if it were not, the cry of "Show us a Clear" would have been answered long since. (Note: This has been in our Files since January 1st. Read on. ED)

Might it not be possible to turn our attention to the Analyser - that Perfect Machine that nonetheless comes up with the wrong answer all too often? This machine can think - can reason - can compute - can help itself. Might there not be some way for it to throw off some of the chains preventing its efficient functioning? So far, these chains are all bunched under the one heading of Engrams - if we can find some that are not Engrams, and do not spring from moments of pain and unconsciousness, would it not seem likely that the Analyser, if simply shown the way, might correct these errors for itself?

Let us refresh ourselves briefly on the postulated functioning of the Analyser. This is the part of the mind that computes, reasons, calculates and, in short, controls us to the best possible survival pattern - ON THE DATA AVAILABLE.

Whence comes this Data? We are told it comes from the Standard Memory Banks and furthermore that anything filed in these banks is correctly recorded, and, if it is not occluded by Engrams, is available to the Analyser in exact detail and without error, exactly as originally filed.

How does this data get into the Memory Banks - How is it taken out?? Does it seem likely that every piece of Data called for NOW by the Analyser is thoroughly analysed, checked, and double-checked, each time it is used for some calculation? How about habits? When we sit down at the wheel of a car, do we compute whether or not to turn on the ignition? Are not many, many, routine actions done without any analytical consideration whatsoever? In other words, are not many of our daily actions simply habit patterns? It does seem that we must admit that this is truly a fact of life - in fact, another habit pattern!

We have thus shown that at least some of our Actions are done without Analytical Thought. Might it not, therefore, also be possible that some of our Thinking is done without any Analytical Thought? By definition, Analytical Thought means that all the data on the problem concerned is available to the Analyser, is true data, and is checked as regards its application to the problem in question. Is every piece of data checked over each time we form an opinion? It is doubtful.

LEARN BY UN-LEARNING - Continued

Remember, the Memory Banks probably start to charge up immediately after birth. Remember, too, we are talking ONLY about the Standard Memory Banks - not the Reactive Banks. During the growth of the child, surely the Memory Banks are literally soaking up information in an effort to supply the Analyser with Data on the many new problems encountered in the business of simply "growing up". On what basis can this new and inexperienced Analyser decide what is TRUE and what is FALSE DATA? There is simply NO previous experience to check back on, so it has to accept the word of those whom it believes to be Authorities. Likewise, if the same bit of information is repeated over and over often enough, it must almost surely, in due course, come to be taken as TRUE.

Who are the ones most likely to be set up as Authorities by this totally inexperienced Analyser? First and foremost will be parents - they supply food, care, love, etc., and will soon come to have the highest survival value in the eyes of the child. Later on will come brothers and sisters - older relatives - then friends, teachers, doctors, etc.. Is it not a sad fact that the great preponderance of information given to young children by the parents contains phrases including "You mustn't" - "You can't" - "Don't" - "You'll never be able to..." etc., etc. Coming from this Authority, and furthermore being of a highly repetitious nature, some, at least, of this will be accepted and recorded as TRUE DATA. It is, of course, neither more nor less than a training pattern - and it is not our purpose to prove that training patterns are, per se, bad. BUT, it is a training pattern without reason. If the child is taught that it SHOULD not do so and so because it will cause harm in some way, then the child is given a free choice - either do it, and cause the harm (and presumably get punished), or don't do it, and don't cause the harm (and possibly get a reward). Unfortunately, we tend to forget to give the alternative - the child is simply told DON'T do it, and in due course the command is set in, possibly for life. No choice is left, and no alternative is given - simply, DON'T.

During this formative period, the poor child is subjected to many platitudes (He looks just like his father) - many "facts", oft repeated (Don't sit in the draft, you'll catch cold) - many of the parent's own peculiarities and engrammic phrases (I'll finish this if it kills me) - many totally incorrect statements from goodness knows where (Why, everybody knows that) - in short, a mass of incorrect data, or partially incorrect data.

Worst of all, and the point that puts the teeth into this mass of mis-information, is the fact that we all carry the same Analyser and the same Memory Banks with us from beginning to end. These work together, and they are working NOW, right NOW, in this Present Time. They always work in the moment of NOW - but they use only the Data that was accumulated THEN - some time ago. The problem encountered is being encountered NOW - or is being computed on NOW because it appears likely to happen in the future. But the Analyser is using a lot of data to solve the problem NOW, that was fed into the Memory Banks THEN - and which MAY OR MAY NOT be presently applicable to the case in point. But, the habit has been formed - this "THEN" Data is automatically and without any further examination or question, taken as being absolutely TRUE-NOW Data. Of this THEN Data, much is probably quite incorrect from the beginning - some will be based purely on someone else's personal prejudices - some will be based on the fact that some imaginary "Authority" said so - and some may have been perfectly TRUE THEN, but be quite FALSE NOW. Yet, this is the information that we unconsciously use in forming most of our present day opinions, judgements, and so on.

Here, then, is what we might refer to as the shadow-land of error - not truly engrammic, and yet a source of many wrong answers because the data contained therein is never questioned - never given a second thought - and seldom correct. There is nothing mysterious about this - nothing to do with the "sub-conscious", with the "unconscious" - with higher or lower mind-levels. It is simply a straight recording of incorrect Data, accepted by the Analyser as True Data, and used as such, in most cases for the rest of the person's life. And it can be expected to account for at least PART of the aberrations now being laid at the Engram's door. To draw an extreme case, consider a child born about 1935, to extremely talkative and patriotic parents. For part of his most formative years, he is told what fine people the Russians are - how they have practically saved civilization, etc., etc. Suddenly, all this is changed - the Russians are DANGER - and many other things besides. Here is his original TRUE DATA being completely denied, and by the same Authority

LEARN BY UN-LEARNING Continued

that was so positive not so long ago. Unless gifted with remarkable powers of introspection, the child will be hard pressed to form any truly settled opinion as to the merits of the Russians - the data is simply conflicting - coming from equally authoritative sources - and will quite probably end up in the "Maybe true, but insufficient data available" section of the mind.

Take another case - a bright, well brought up, and well educated child. He leads a happy life, and for the most part is given wise and good instructions from parents and teachers - BUT, for all his child-hood, it has been impressed on him "NEVER tell your elders what to do". By virtue of his abilities, in due course he gets a good job, and shortly has other people working under him. But, he knows that he MUST NEVER TELL HIS ELDERS WHAT TO DO, and strangely enough (from his employer's view-point), he soon shows signs of indecision - lack of character when dealing with older employees - in short, he just doesn't live up to expectations. Many will agree that a child should not run around instructing its parents and other people of mature age, but this Data does not hold true for a man given a position of responsibility. But, the Data is there, and it is TRUE DATA, so it will always be taken into consideration when dealing with other people. This might be considered as a typical case of "TRUE-THEN" Data, being definitely changed to "FALSE-NOW" Data. But it is the same Data - the Same Analyser - the same Memory Banks - the same person. The Analyser accepted this THEN as perfectly true - found that it worked well when dealing with elders, as a child, so that to all intents and purposes the data was TRUE in the NOW that was THEN. BUT, it is FALSE in the NOW that is NOW - and how can the Analyser check up on this sort of mis-information??

It is indeed a difficult task. The examples above are simple in the extreme, but the information in most people's memory bank is seldom such a simple matter. Not only is there all the TRUE-THEN-but-FALSE-NOW type of thing, but a great deal of Data which was FALSE-THEN and never will be true, ranging all the way from old wives' tales to virulent prejudices - all placed there by some Authority or other. And, the falsest part of this Data is that the Authority is an Authority - if even this much can be recognised, much of the weight can be taken out of the Data supplied by FALSE Authority.

Nonetheless, it is still a hard task to become aware of our own FALSE-NOW Data, which we use to govern many of our actions and thoughts. Possibly, the hardest part is to really WANT to do this. It is so comfortable to rest cosy and secure in a nice network of preconceived ideas (I know what I'm talking about - do you think I was born yesterday??). No, we don't think you were born yesterday, but it IS possible that some of the data you are now using was stored away by your memory banks when you were only a day or a week old, and certainly a great deal of the material you now use in your computations is drawn from experiences when you were ten years old or less.

But, one may say, even though this data was given me long ago, it still seems to apply NOW. I am successful - I have a good job - my bills are paid (anyway, most of them) - my future is secure - my family is happy - in short, I appear to be on the road to a moderate and comfortable success.

This may be quite true - but are you really quite happy about it all? The dandelion too has a secure future - each year its seed prospers and multiplies - and its off-spring flourish - and it has no bills. Have you ever asked yourself if you have any object in the life we lead, or are YOU here merely to be born, live, multiply, and fertilise the ground when you die? Might it not be possible that there is, in fact, a reason for our presence, other than simply keeping alive from one year to the next? What have you really accomplished in the last twelve months? Have you improved your mind in the slightest degree - have you added one tithe to the total of the world's knowledge - or have you purely and simply "kept alive" over this period. For most of us, the latter answer will probably be the closest to the truth. To realise this is hard - and to do anything about it is harder still. Time is so short - office hours are so long - and social activities are so important - how can I find time to do more than at present? Quite possibly you can't. MOST CERTAINLY you can't unless you WANT to, and you must WANT to, ENOUGH.

LEARN BY UN-LEARNING Continued

If you do want to do something about, WHY do you want to?? Is it to get a better job - make more money - accumulate possessions - gain more time for amusement, or what? If your desire is based on reasons such as these, you will never "want to" enough, because your desire must be greater than these things, that are the accepted measure of success in this civilization of ours. In part, at least, you must truly want to know yourself - to know how and why you function - and to know, even though only partially, what and why you are. Those who truly want to know these and other facts will ask - and will keep on asking - until at least some partial answers are obtained.

Assuming, then, that we want, in the fullest sense, to rid ourselves of some of this NOW-FALSE Data, what avenues are open to us to do something about it? First and foremost, we must fully realise the strength and significance of the entrenched FALSE DATA we have been using from day to day. It is hard to do - just about one of the hardest things we can think of. The habit-patterns are deeply worn, since we have been using them for most of our lives. The Data included in these habit-patterns is literally and positively TRUE-NOW as far as our Analyser is concerned, because up to the moment of reading this, it always HAS been true. All this Data is accepted blindly and without further computation by the Analyser. The Analyser does not make a mistake (given true data) and it knows this, and so tends to violently reject any suggestion that its so-called TRUE-NOW Data might be either FALSE-NOW or merely only TRUE-THEN Data. Here, then, are identifications in their worst form, and by identifications we mean TRUE-THEN, or FALSE-NOW Data which is accepted blindly and automatically by the Analyser in its computations NOW, as being TRUE-NOW data, without making any effort to re-check or re-compute in the NOW frame of reference.

We must realise that these suggestions actually do apply, at least in some degree, to our own individual case. We must become truly AWARE of this fact, and of our desire to correct it. Then, discover the word WHY. Use it, and use it on all possible occasions.. WHY do I do this - WHY do I think thus - WHY do I feel that, and so on. Question at once any overly strong likes - dislikes - desires - urges - etc. that you can discover in yourself. Listen to other people's criticisms, AND ACCEPT THEM THANKFULLY, for they are a shortcut to your own FALSE DATA computations, as others see them.

Slow down a little in your reactions. Before speaking, acting, forming "Snap-judgements", etc., let the Analyser have time to check ALL the Data on which your conclusion is based. Ask yourself WHY do I think this to be so, or WHY do I do such and such. An answer will generally be forthcoming shortly. It may be short and simple such as "Because I like it", or it may be long and involved and apparently the result of full analytical study. Keep asking WHY until some basis appears for the original starting point. Then check this basic Data - IS it true - does it apply to ME, HERE and NOW - How did I find it out - is the source really infallible - and so on, until the Analyser NOW is fully satisfied that the THEN-DATA is still correct and applicable to the NOW-PROBLEM. This may cause you much soul-searching and possibly some unease, because you will almost surely find that so very much of your sacred TRUE-THEN Data is not TRUE-NOW Data, or sadly enough, even TRUE-THEN Data.

And yet, here is the very matter upon which all our life and ideas are grounded - these are the things which have always been taken for granted, without question - are they ALL wrong? No, they are NOT all wrong, and even if they were, that would not be important. The vital and essential fact is that you are able to recognise these basic pieces of information as such - to fully realise that they MIGHT be wrong - and to make your computations always bearing this in mind.

Let us consider a few more of the commoner phrases used by our parents. What about the thought "You must do this" or "you have to do that." Or, "You mustn't do this" and "You can't do that". Let us ask WHY MUST I do this? Or, WHY MUSTN'T I do that?? Stop and remember that THERE IS NOTHING AT ALL THAT YOU MUST (OR MUST NOT) DO, AND THERE IS NOTHING AT ALL THAT YOU CAN NOT DO, simply because someone told you so. There is ALWAYS a choice, although frequently one alternative is so unpleasant that there does not, at first glance, seem to be any choice at all. For example, consider the statement - "I must breathe". WHY??.. "If I don't I will suffocate.." So What??? "It will hurt, and I may die"

LEARN BY UN-LEARNING Continued

Well, So What?? "I don't want to die" - so I take the next breath, not because I HAVE to, but because I have decided it will probably cause me discomfort and possible death (which I wish to avoid) if I don't.

Particularly as a child, there were many, many things that our parents told us we MUST NOT DO. Probably most of them were for our own good, BUT WE WERE NOT TOLD THIS. There were many times we were told "YOU CAN'T DO THIS" - meaning, you can't do this without hurting yourself or others AT THAT TIME. Do the parents protective restrictions really apply to the grown adult twenty years or more later? How many people have been told in their youth "Strong drink makes you drunk" or words to that effect? It is fine to steer the youth away from taverns, but does a cocktail or glass of beer before dinner mean we have an incipient drunkard? But, the Data says THIS MAKES ME DRUNK, so drunk the man gets, while people shake their heads and add just another link of false data - "Poor boy, he never could carry his liquor, you know."

Let the "poor boy" identify the possible truth that strong drink might have made him drunk when his father told him about it at the age of twelve, but just because father said so THEN, does not mean that he HAS to get drunk NOW at the sight or smell of a drink or two.

There are, certainly, many things that you know full well it is wiser to do, or not to do, and you govern yourself accordingly,. You do not have to believe what you have read here, or any part of it. You have, however, read what is written, and having read, are now perfectly free to form your own opinion - and if you can "Un-learn" some of those stubborn TRUE-THEN pieces of information, your opinion will tend to be less prejudiced NOW.

Along with the word WHY, the phrase WHO SAID SO leads to many corrections in our memory banks. It is almost guaranteed that if the answer is "Why, everyone says so", THE DATA IS WRONG. Again, not always, but very, very frequently.

This removal of false identifications in the memory banks goes a long way towards much better functioning of the whole being. As we have made clear at the beginning, we are not offering any substitute for any form of processing, therapy, or what-have-you. We ARE suggesting that the individual can make better use of his Analytical Mind, through his own efforts. Clear up this "Shadow-land", and when further steps are taken to dig out the engramic weeds, they will probably come more quickly and easily.

To those with children can be offered a few specific suggestions, to help the child from piling up masses of TRUE-FOREVER Data, and using it as TRUE-NOW Data for the rest of his or her life. Understanding of some of the thoughts offered above, will make some difference at least in our attitude towards small fry. If we can but realise their tendency to accept our remarks, comments, and ideas, as the absolute and literal truth, we will see our own way out of many pit-falls. If we can only remember to insert the words "I think..." before our statements, and "Because..." after our orders and instructions, they will at least form some opinion as to the WHY behind the matter, and will also realise that they do in fact have some CHOICE, and that it is their OWN decision that controls their actions. If we can also make it clear that a lot of data handed out applies to young people but not necessarily to grown-ups, this TRUE-THEN Data will probably not be forever carried along as always TRUE-NOW Data.

In closing, please note that there are very few arbitrary statements contained in what you have finished reading. Whatever deductions you have drawn are purely your OWN, and, in fact, there is little or nothing contained herein that you did not already know about. BUT, had you THOUGHT about it?

Have you enjoyed it??

WHY???

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 THIS MATERIAL AS A MATTER OF RECORD OF WHAT HAS BEEN THOUGHT AND WRITTEN IN THE FIELD OF DIANETICS.

THE ARC LIGHT ORIGINATES AS AN UNOFFICIAL, NON-PROFIT PAPER AT 1370 N. W. 86TH STREET, MIAMI, 47, FLORIDA, DOROTHY SWYGARD, PUBLISHER, WILLIAM SWYGARD, EDITOR.

THE ARC LIGHT IS ISSUED THE FIRST AND FIFTEENTH OF EVERY MONTH. RATES: 25¢ PER COPY. CLUB RATE: TEN OR MORE COPIES OF A SINGLE ISSUE TO ONE ADDRESS, 20¢ PER COPY. FOR A LIST OF OTHER PUBLICATIONS AND ACTIVITIES, PLEASE WRITE PUBLISHER AT ADDRESS ABOVE, ENCLOSING A SELF-ADDRESSED AND STAMPED ENVELOPE.