

# THE ARC LIGHT

A Journal of DIANETICS

MIAMI, FLORIDA

JULY 1, 1952

No. 29

FROM WILLIAM BRADNER

A little while ago I had a notion that I would write an article suggesting that groups and people within groups stop throwing stones at one another and get down to business. Pointing out that we're all, presumably, trying to attain the same goals might tend to cut down on the kind of distraction that results from wrangling over this or that technique, I thought. Further, consideration of the fact that cases jam, sometimes, when there is enough of this kind of invalidation might act as a moderating influence on those who feel impelled to correct the views of their neighbors.

...It is quite possible that some of the ideas adrift in the Dianetic community are incorrect ideas; some procedures must certainly be more useful than others, some less.

I was going to air an opinion or two, thus: Argument is not a good method of resolving differences in these matters. Argument is a process which, however it may be disguised beneath social veneer, consists in a mutual attempt by two parties to demonstrate that the ideas held by one contender are completely right, and that the ideas held by the other are completely wrong. Stated baldly, the man who argues sets out to prove that his opponent is either a fool or a liar, or both. And this is hardly the process to adopt when one is engaged in an attempt to build a universal ARC and to promote sanity.

Discussion, on the other hand (I was going to suggest), is a process in which two or more parties, seeking a truth or a solution, compare their data, their opinions, their observations and their experiences. Here the goal is the same for each party in the discussion: it is to arrive at a conclusion that is as valid as their combined thinking can make it. Somehow, this has always seemed to me to be a saner procedure than argument.

Even discussion, though, is not the best way of resolving a problem, provided a better method is available.

Let's imagine two workmen who have a piece of two-by-four they're about to put to use. These men might argue as to the length of this piece of wood, only to become angry with one another and precipitate a quarrel. Or, they might coolly discuss its length, comparing it with other two-by-fours they'd previously handled. They'd remain friendly, and might make a fair estimate, but doubt would remain as to the true dimension. That doubt would disappear when one or the other reached into his hip pocket, flipped out a folding rule, and measured the timber.



William Bradner

FROM WILLIAM BRADNER Continued

....Now, in Dianetics we have a measuring device: the Mathison E-meter. Though my experience with this instrument has been brief, it is an understatement for me to say that its performance is impressive. I am sure that others who have used it will agree with this. I believe this instrument to be a true measure and an accurate measure of what processing accomplishes.

And it is my opinion that the quarrels and rambling discussions as to the merits of this technique and that, or for that matter, about Dianetics itself and its validity, will not persist much longer. The E-meter will resolve these questions as readily as the foot-rule measures the board.

I will therefore not write the article I was planning to, (and you may be glad of this, for I might have been rather long-winded about it), for I believe that the problems which arise from trying to evaluate the methods of Dianetics by arguing them and by discussing them are about to vanish; to melt into thin air.

And if this is true, we can all be very thankful.

WILLIAM BRADNER                      1820 Laurel Road                      Winter Park, Florida

\*\*\*\*\*

PSYCHIC LOBOTOMY By Dr. Addison O'Neill

The theory of psychic lobotomy was first advanced by F. W. H. Myers and later by Dr. Maxwell Telling of Leeds.

Briefly, it is a theory which accounts for telepathy, clairvoyance and even poltergeists. It may account for dianoetic file-clerk, reactive mind, and the "E" in E-Therapy. After a period of "incubation" a mental shock may trigger a psychic lobotomy, tearing loose part of the mental system and leaving it floating free, like a disembodied entity, but still capable of personality development, as an autonomous complex, operating on a different plane of activity from that of the usual computing mind.

This would well account for schizophrenia. From a mild start, the case goes to the vast changes of puberty, for instance, and then comes the trigger action of a strong mental shock and then that completes the splitting of the personality, so-called.

It is known that in auditing a near-psychotic case, great care must be used by the auditor lest the pre-clear go into acute psychosis and mania.

It is questionable at this stage of experimentation whether Facsimile #1, or technique 88 should be used indiscriminately. There has been some evidence that these methods have resulted in aberrative actions on the part of the pre-clear. One might say that these techniques might begin the splitting of an insecure personality or complete the splitting of the same under mental stress.

This theory might also account for the statements of some who are reaching out for a theta-clear that they are God. This misconception could easily be the result of a psychic lobotomy, the split-off taking charge of the individual with a build-up of a seeming reality to concepts that are really false, basically. This torn-off part of the mind might easily conquer the counter-efforts of the mind to heal the fracture, and stay more or less permanently dissociated.

It will be worthy of consideration whether the manufacturing of a concept in or of the mind, like the "E" of E-Therapy, the file-clerk or reactive mind bank, and the investing of powers to such factors might not in the long run prove aberrative in themselves and a splitting of personality on a schizophrenic concept. Dianetics is too young and not dry enough behind the ears to decide this in its finality. Let us proceed cautiously with our tinkering with the mind.

Get FATE Magazine for September 1952 and read "Psychoanalyzing the Bell Witch" an eye-opener.

Dr. Addison O'Neill  
1814 Hampton Road  
Daytona Beach, Florida

FROM JOHN &amp; PEG CAMPBELL

Dear Dee &amp; Bill:

Recently, there's been a lot of talk about "facsimiles"; the precise definition of the term seems to be in doubt. I'd like to bring up several points I've observed in a number of people in dianetics---observations that seem to indicate something is going a little sour.

There's an old English term "incantation"; I like that one, because it has precisely the meaning and implication we need here. An incantation is a verbalization of something that is supposed to have the power to do something---it is a mouthed phrase or system of phrases that does things for you, without your having to actually do something. You know---like "Abracadabra, presto changeo! Begone!". And without any physical effort, the incantation causes the undesirable whatever-it-is to vanish away. Or causes whatever you want to appear, or to exist.

There's a lot of incantations in our society. I've been listening to the political conventions; political oratory is made up to an extent of about 90% of incantations---phrases mouthed and repeated, which, by sheer repetition, are supposed to substitute for the action or feeling or process discussed. They use the phrases about Motherhood, and "our brave boys in Korea" and "honest and fearless" with purely incantational meaning.

Words substituting for deeds or understandings.

Try saying "I have excellent judgement" fifty times. By the time you finish, you've got yourself to a point where the words are "excellent judgement", and your actual evaluational ability is diminished.

Next try writing the essential concept "I have excellent judgement" in fifty different ways. The effect is totally different; this requires concentration on the concept, instead of on the name.

Incantations are the standard tool of the Well Stuffed Shirt, or the Noble Character. They are the basic tool of the propogandist, who substitutes a phrase of some sort for the fact he won't face. And we do such a wonderful job of propogandizing ourselves.

General Semantics has point; if you try the basic idea of watching your definitions, you're getting behind the incantations, and getting what you're really talking about.

Now in Hubbardian terminology, I've seen a number of people who are actually in decidedly bad shape running around with a very interesting "service facsimile"---a "clear facsimile". They don't have to get in a slug at the tough, painful job of working out their problems, because they have a nice little incantation for every occasion---they're nearly clear. By incantations of that sort, they can dispense with reality almost entirely, using instead the incantation "my reality". It is startlingly difficult, however, to induce one of the "my reality" people to define his reality--- to study the concept instead of the words.

Incantations are a wonderful defense for the stuffed shirt. Politicians, statesmen, brass-hats---all tend to use incantations rather than genuine thought. So do some of the "facsimile" people i've encountered. There are no problems to solve; there are only "facsimiles"---and there's an incantation that can take care of that.

Of course, they fight the incantation they consider their "service facsimile" by setting up a new incantation, fighting incantation with incantation.

Now that's a trick that's been tried since the days of the Witch Doctors. I doubt, myself, that any new twist on that theme is going to yield adequate results. Hitler was aware that an incantation would effect people; he said one should tell a big lie and keep telling it. It still doesn't produce true sanity.

Instead of merely using incantations, find out the concept behind it, and study that concept. Define it, don't mouth it.

I've heard some of the incanters "accepting responsibility" at a purely incantational level; they say the words, but they don't perform the deed. But because they say the words, no one can accuse them of not accepting responsibility. The politician who loudly proclaims his devotion to the "American Way of Life", to "Motherhood" and "the ideals of womanhood" can still do a fine job of being a crook, a grafter, and a professional pimp. But no one can say he doesn't stand up in public for the ideals of the American Way of Life; he incants the phrases with the best of 'em.

FROM JOHN & PEG CAMPBELL Continued

The "good" churchman who prays every Sunday, goes to confessional regularly, donates largely to the church, may still be a major executive in Murder, Inc. But nobody can say he doesn't express his belief in God, and the spiritual way of life.

Incantations are one of the major forces of aberration---and substituting Incantation A for Incantation B is not one whit less aberrated.

For "service facsimile", I feel that you can read "incantation" quite adequately---and get better results, because we have a pretty sound idea of just how valid an incantation is as a way of life.

The best test I know of for whether or not you're working on an incantation is to catch the phrases you use, and see whether a different expression of the same idea has the same satisfaction feeling to you---whether saying the same thing in other words seems as full and rich and wonderful to you. If it doesn't---you aren't using a concept; you're using an incantation.

Instead of saying "my reality", try saying "my understanding of the nature of things"; if it doesn't satisfy you---you don't have a reality, you have only a hollow incantation. "Yea, though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not faith, I am as tinling brass and sounding cymbals." The old boys weren't stupid, you know; they hit a lot of sound ideas right on the nose.

There's a lot of incantations in our society. One of the prizes is "I'm sorry". This is an incantation that we learn as small children, and learn that it is a magic phrase that washes away guilt. "What can I say dear, after I say I'm sorry?" says the song. You can do some hard, honest thinking, and find out why you actually made the mistake that hurt someone else---and say why. "I didn't know the gun was loaded, and I'm soooo sorry, my friends," is another version.

In childhood, we're taught that that magic phrase cancels mistakes; it's not exactly a valid teaching, however. No matter how sorry the gal of the song was, her victim was just as dead as ever. In childhood, also, we're so treated as to install another not-quite-sane proposition: If you did something wrong, you were apt to get spanked. But after the spanking the mistake was forgiven---you'd paid for your error. This installs the highly insane concept that physical pain will cancel a mental error. I have a strong suspicion that a lot of people in dianetics go happily looking for physical pain; so that they won't have to suffer the mental pain of recognizing that they were mistaken, used bad judgement, misevaluated the circumstances, and were themselves unjust when they thought the other fellow was unjust.

The concept that paying the penalty cancels the crime, in other words, can be applied on the aberrated basis that accepting the somatic pain cancels the mental aberration. This is a form of "physical incantation"; waving the magic wand---Mama's hairbrush---cancels the aberration-caused mistake. Suffering a somatic pain makes it unnecessary to undergo the far more laborious process of understanding what your mistake actually was. You take your licking, and then you don't have to correct the mistake, because now it's all paid for.

Confession is good for the soul---but only when the confession is followed by a genuine self-searching to find out why you made the error. If confession is followed by paying a penalty, the computation then becomes that it is unnecessary to do the thing right, it is only necessary to do what your aberration demands, and then pay a stipulated penalty. Then you can go out and be aberrated all over again.

The mechanism behind the crime-and-punishment cycle is intriguing. Consider this set-up:

Children are frequently mistakenly punished; if the parents are given to not sparing the rod and think that avoids spoiling the child, a kid is apt to get a lot of mistaken punishment. Now children are fanatically logical---that's what makes them so thoroughly irrational in many respects. That's why they ask such embarrassing-to-adults questions. Adults say "Be logical!" which is a fine incantation---but they really mean "Be rational!" A paranoid psychotic is logical; anyone who thinks "logical" equals "rational" should talk to one.

FROM JOHN & PEG CAMPBELL CONTINUED

But children are quite irrationally logical, many times. In the instance of the mistakenly punished child, he draws a perfectly logical conclusion: "Being bad" equals "being punished", and "being punished" is the one certain test of whether or not you have been "bad". At least it is, to him, the one important test.

Now the logical inverse corollary is that "not being punished" equals "being good". Then anything you can get away with equals "being good"! Perfectly logical, isn't it?

Add another factor: Society holds---and the "don't spare the rod" faction in particular holds---that a human being is at heart a savage beast. That the ordinary human being wants to rob, steal, cheat, lie, hurt others, that he thinks first, last, and all the time of himself alone, that self-preservation is the first and only law of Human Nature. That the normal man wants, in his heart, to seize and rape every passable female he sees. These are the stated beliefs of a large segment of society.

Then if a man accepts those beliefs as being true, the consequence is that a normal man can be found in our prisons. Society holds that only by being beaten into line, by being whipped and clubbed and threatened with the power of Society, can that savage brute Man, be made to behave. That civilization rests only on the constant punitive force of Society, and the constant urging of the Church---that, otherwise, all men would steal, rape and murder gleefully.

No wonder the professional criminal has no respect for the non-criminal. The criminal "knows" that everybody wants to do as he does, but that non-criminals are broken, beaten spirits---lick-spittle weaklings who have yielded to the whips and clubs of society, and, like a beaten cur, come back to lick the hand that clubbed them into submission.

Taking Society at its own, stated evaluation, the only unbroken, normal spirits in our culture are the professional criminals. Society that says all men want, in their hearts, to steal, kill and rape, cannot say that men who do that have abnormal desires or urges. And a Society that says it must beat the savage beast in Man into submission, that that is its mission, surely has no cause to be horrified at the performance of the Russian culture that does precisely what our Society says it does!

The degree to which our culture has operated on incantations is fascinating. It says it believes A, actually does B, and underneath believes deeply in C!

The situation stems, it seems to us, from this basic arrangement:

Consider that there are basic laws of the Universe, physical universe laws, that are beyond the influence of alteration of Man. Some of those laws are simple mechanical laws like the law of gravity. Some refer to energy transfers and transformations. Some refer what we call "ethics"---but these universal laws are not cultural, are not moralistic---they're just plain facts of the nature of the Universe. Let's call them the Laws of Ethos

Societies seek to understand those, and do a very bad job---they get, instead of the deep, natural laws of Ethos, rules they call "ethics".

Finally, individuals in a society try to understand the rules they must live under---and get them rather badly misunderstood.

The result is an individual who, at the level of his instincts, has an understanding of the Laws of Ethos, just as he has an instinctive-level understanding of the laws of chemistry that allow his body to function. But this individual has a misunderstanding of the rules of his society's ethics---and those in turn, are a misunderstanding of the Laws of Ethos.

Now we have three levels of "reality". They are:

1. The individual's "reality"---the "my reality" some have been discussing.
2. The Social Reality---what the society holds is real.
3. The Universal Reality---the true, basic nature of the Universe.

In seeking to communicate with other individuals, Bill Blow has to make contact somehow; I'm contacting you, at this moment, through the Social Reality of the English language. If we didn't have a common reality, a shared reality, we couldn't communicate at all.

FROM JOHN & PEG CAMPBELL - Continued

If I were present in person, I could communicate through Universal Reality---by pointing to an object and by pantomime----by physical-universe shared reality.

Now if you choose to set up "your reality", you can---but the more individual it is, the more "yours" it is, the less you can have communication. You can not have affinity and communication and have "your reality". The two concepts are mutually exclusive. You can, for instance, reject that statement as say "It's not so in my reality," but the statement is a meaningless noise---because you're rejecting sharing my reality, and hence rejecting contact with me. You have a perfect right to withdraw---provided you actually do withdraw. You can not ask me to share your reality unless you accept my reality enough to communicate with me---and the further consequence is that if I do share "your reality" it ceases to be yours. Necessarily, if I share your reality, it becomes our reality.

You can not have "your reality" and have affinity. Any effort to do so leads to the interesting spectacle of a man fleeing constantly; if he starts with "his reality" A, and gets someone else to accept it, A now is "their reality", which is contrary to the individual's idea to have "his reality", wherefore he must now set up a new "reality" B, and will in turn have to flee that.

In real life, the difficulty is that the social reality does not correspond with the Laws of Ethos. Example: Consider an educated Greek of 100 B.C. His social-cultural group held the world was flat. Being an educated man, however, he knew that the world was a sphere of about 7000 miles diameter. In the Universal Reality, the world was, indeed, a sphere of about that size.

To communicate with his compatriots, however, he was forced to acknowledge that the social reality differed both from his understandings and from the real facts.

It is perfectly valid to set aside the social reality, or social agreement code, and recognize it for what it is---an arbitrary theory of existence. But---you can not determine whether it is a correct theory of existence or not unless you can demonstrate that you do in fact understand the actual nature of the underlying universal laws. That is, until you know the actual Laws of Ethos, you cannot be certain in any given instance whether the social theory is false or valid.

In breaking an aberration, we must reevaluate our data. Fine---but on what basis?

Incantations won't substitute for incantations; only by laboriously slugging it out, by working, and working hard, can one find those basic laws of Ethos.

It's a damned nuisance, but it just happens that there's no Royal Road to Geometry, and no one-shot clear, either.

You can, of course, set up an incantation, "I am clear. I am clear. Every day in every way, I'm getting clearer and clearer." You can withdraw completely, establish your own unique reality, and be clear within that---if you can just find some way of vanishing completely from this physical universe.

But it does seem as though incantations yield only short-term results. They, like pan-cake make-up, can cover the haggard, wrinkled, dissipated lines of a ruined face, but they don't make the flesh any firmer or healthier. You can even buy a measure of physical health at the expense of mental powers, but it's no overall advance. You can borrow from Peter to pay Paul, but be no further out of debt.

The most dangerous of all "service facsimiles" is the one "I'm nearly clear; I understand everything in my reality."

You might try that little check; try stating the same concept in different terms. If it doesn't sound so good then, maybe it's because you don't have a solid, sound understanding on which a full, sane life can be built----but another incantation.

Sincerely,

JOHN & PEG CAMPBELL  
1457 Orchard Road  
Mountainside, New Jersey

\* \* \* \* \*

## THE THIRD DIMENSION IN HUMAN BEHAVIOR - By Mary Eleanor Forbes

For quite some time now, psychologists have been wrangling over which was more important in shaping human behavior; heredity or environment? Finally they agreed that both played an important part--and thought they had it all settled.

Both sides were wrong. Heredity is important; environment is important. But this is only an incomplete, two-dimensional view of the problem. There is another factor which outranks them both.

Consider: Heredity and environment are factors which act on all living creatures. Every living creature, plant or animal, microscopic or elephant-size, carries in its cells the master plan for its physical structure. All things bring forth offspring after their own kind, according to the almost immutable pattern carried in their cells. And the development of all those offspring is modified and directed by the pressures of the physical environment which surrounds them.

Psychologists have had a wonderful time studying behavior as manifested in animals. Rats run through mazes, monkeys are given problems to solve, dogs learn to salivate when a bell rings. And they have learned some valuable things, and drawn some interesting conclusions. Then they have blithely transferred their conclusions from animals to human beings. And it is precisely at that point that they have fallen flat on their hypotheses.

Consider: How many dogs or monkeys have carefully studied human behavior, drawn up reports on it, and come to learned conclusions about it?

Human beings are not just animals.

Granted--men and dogs bleed when they are cut. Men and monkeys share, to a limited point, a certain ingenuity in solving problems. Men and cats reproduce. Men and mice suffer fear. Men and horses work. But men alone are original and creative; Men alone use abstract symbols; men alone work, suffer, and willingly die for concepts so intangible that no physical parallels for them exist. Men alone make an outsize fuss and bother about his process of reproducing; and men alone, though the weakest and most poorly supplied with natural weapons for their size, have conquered and dominated this physical world to the point where they threaten to wipe it out altogether.

What's the difference? Heredity and environment are common to trees, goldfish and men. What is it that men alone possess? What's the third dimension in human behavior?

#### Seld-determinism!

Let's make it quite clear right here what is meant by self-determinism. Hubbard has clouded the subject somewhat, by defining it as "the theta control of the organism", "theta" as "the symbol for the life static", and "the life static" as "the source of life ...at least a portion of (which) is impinged upon the physical universe." ("Advanced Procedures and Axioms.") This, upon analysis, would seem to imply that all living organisms are self-controlled. Since this is obviously not true (or else why does one pattern of behavior run predictably through a whole species?), let's re-state the matter.

Self-determinism is the individual's conscious, intelligent control of himself.

The important words there are conscious, intelligent, and control of himself. The self-determined person is aware of what he contemplates doing; knows why he plans to do it; can choose to do it or not to do it; and can cause himself to do it or not do it as he chooses.

This is, of course, not really new. Law, religion and philosophy have known it for thousands of years. But the psychologists and psychiatrists (not all, of course, just most of them) seem to have forgotten it. It was all heredity and environment with them--so much so that they even raked up that hoary old chestnut of a notion that a man really can't help what he does, he is only the helpless puppet of an exterior force. They dressed it up in different names, but it is the same old thing that used to be called Fate or Predestination. It's the same old thing, and it has been popular for the same old reason. Can you think of a better excuse for evading personal responsibility?

It will stand to the eternal credit of Dianetics that it restated the principle of self-determinism and restored it to its proper place in the study and treatment of the human mind. In doing so, Dianetics also finds itself in agreement with all the wisest elder schools of thought. For self-determinism is the same thing that other thinkers

## THE THIRD DIMENSION - Continued

have called human intelligence plus freedom of the will.

This is one of the major reasons why psychology and psychiatry were such unsatisfactory food for thought and such inadequate tools for their purpose. They are a flat, incomplete, two-dimensional diagram of a living, breathing, three-dimensional reality. And this is why Dianetics makes so much sense and works so well--because it is also three-dimensional and alive. Psychology admits only heredity and environment; Dianetics admits heredity, environment and Self-determinism.

That which is true continues to exist in spite of all difficulties. Dianetics, in such essential matters, is true; and therefore, no matter what difficulties arise, what schisms and heresies and quarrels tear it internally, Dianetics will go on, and ultimately, in spite of all, will achieve its goals!

MARY ELEANOR FORBES - 10117 Bartee Avenue - Pacoima, California

\* \* \* \* \*

E M O T I O N (An attempt at simplification) - By H. M. Jaquays

We are all born with an "ability-to-feel-something" which, as we grow up, we are taught to call "emotion". Through the ages, this perceptic has been twisted and thwarted until it has turned into a mechanism for controlling others, and a monster that controls the user.

It is my belief that the original emotions with which we start life are only positive. Fear and anger, considered emotions, are, like pain, warning mechanisms once necessary for survival when man started his climb up the ladder from the cave days.

I further believe that joy and sorrow stem from the same emotion source, sorrow being but a manifestation of joy, perverted by imitation of our elders when we were young. Do we not see people crying with joy? And laughing hysterically under an extreme shock?

Emotion should be a positive and wonderful ability, to be used as we wish to use it, for our own enjoyment, and not as a weapon with which to bludgeon others into doing or thinking as we wish.

Consider a child exposed to its parents expressions of grief. To the child, this is counter-emotion, which it can feel strongly. To imitate this, it knows, or quickly finds out, that tears are expected, along with crying. Crying it is familiar with, because it has used this regularly and successfully to get care and attention. Therefore, this emotion (to the child) must have some survival value, since the parent is doing it for some obscure purpose, and since the crying has, in the past, served to get care and caresses for the child itself. To turn it on, the child quickly finds out just what glandular action is necessary, and by observation, it learns under what sort of circumstances it should be used. However, in order to express it fully, it finds it must use its native store of emotion, and so adopts "grief" as a standard part of its emotional expression.

Try the experiment of laughing - and of crying. The muscles used are the same - the control centres involved are the same - many of the glands used are the same. But, laughter pulls one up the tone scale (generally), whereas grief pulls one down - BECAUSE ONE DECIDED LONG AGO THAT THIS WAS THE THING TO DO UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES. If one is not properly grief stricken under a certain set of conditions, one is immediately branded as heartless - inhuman - cold-blooded, etc., etc.

One feels cheerfulness, enthusiasm, and so on, through accomplishing something, owning something, doing something - all positive values. One decides to use anger, fear, or grief, as an excuse for failing to accomplish something, for losing something, as an excuse for an expected failure, or in an attempt to control others. Furthermore, these negative emotions are turned on under conditions that have a real OR COMPUTED non-survival threat.

Therefore, when you feel emotion, analyse it. If it is positive, hold it and cherish it, because it is yours and yours alone, and was given you for your OWN enjoyment, to be used to extract the maximum pleasure from this life you are living.

If it is negative, stop and look at it, and try to find out what it is you are afraid of, AND WHY. Who are you copying - who told you it was dangerous, or could hurt you? Does it really matter? If it is grief over someone or something else, are you sure you



E M O T I O N Continued

are not simply turning on sorrow for yourself because you have always been told it is the thing to do?

If it is none of the above, then, who are you trying to control, and for what reason? Who used this emotion to control people, when you were little? Who are you trying to OWN, and upon whom are you using every trick you have, to enforce YOUR reality?

If, perchance, you have within you emotions that you don't like but that nonetheless pop up all too often, take a few minutes off, and feel within yourself the particular emotion in question. It is not necessary to contact events, people, or anything else - simply get hold of the emotion and savour its texture. Do you like it? If not, WHY ARE YOU USING IT NOW? It is you, and you alone, who has decided to use it here and now - at this very moment - NOW. Who are YOU copying? And why? Why are you using someone else's emotion NOW? Be truly honest with yourself, and see who or what you are trying to GAIN - to OWN - to CONTROL, through the use of this negative emotion, which is actually doing YOU only harm.

Find out who you are copying - scan back over the past, when this person used this emotion (which to you was counter-emotion), and find out when YOU decided it had survival value to YOU. Do you need to make yourself (and others) miserable NOW, because someone was mostly angry around you, when you were little? Must you be afraid of the dark because someone told you that the bogey-man will come for bad little boys and girls? Must you pull yourself down the tone-scale NOW, because you confused "sympathy" with care and affection when you were a baby, so that you are NOW using every trick in the pack to gain sympathy, regardless of the true effect upon YOU, NOW? Must you really?

NO. There is nothing in this world that YOU must do - no emotion that you MUST use, NOW. Every unhappiness - every jealousy - every bit of bad temper - is only something YOU decide to use NOW; to gain, own, control, or excuse, because you watched others do it in the past. This, NOW, is YOUR world - YOUR life, to live in the way YOU want to live it, and not someone else's world and life, in which you must play the part of a puppet dancing on the strings of enforced memories.

Recognise these negative emotions for what they are - SOME ONE ELSE'S - come out in the sun and use the emotions that are YOUR OWN personal and private possessions; JOY, CHEERFULNESS AND COURAGE. You will then get a glimpse of what it is to be truly alive.

H. M. JAQUAYS

Sutton, P.Q.,

C a n a d a.

\* \* \* \* \*

ON REALITY, or OF SHIRTS AND MEN By Dave Dobbs

Are you a "reality chaser"? When did you decide in the existence of "objective reality"? Such agreements will be found to have had a profound effect on your life. No, your MEST won't suddenly disappear. It is as though MEST were subjective on a higher level of abstraction, which makes it objective to us. We as individuals cannot reverse the agreement on that higher level.

It may be seen that aberration is largely the acceptance of "objective realities". In his attempt to validate subjective realities, man embarks on a mission doomed to failure and ending in unsanity through the adoption of the realities of others. Reality lies within yourself, and only there. An attempt to "accept" or agree with any reality outside one's self is the creation or validation of aberration.

What I have said is not just another "reality". It is not to be agreed with nor "accepted". It is only a tool, to be used, if you wish, on and by YOU. Few men have ever used this tool. Many have toyed with it, mouthing it senselessly as an idiot imitates the sounds of words; or have put it on themselves like a shirt and strutted about in it. Those who have used it are achieving their goals.

Two years have passed in Dianetics. For those of us who were looking for purveyors of realities, panacea peddlers, and smokescreeners of truth, they were comparatively wasted years. "Accepting" ANY Reality, even Dianetics, is aberrative! This data has never been given to people so plainly stated. It has been given us by Ron Howes, and

## ON REALITY, or OF SHIRTS AND MEN - Continued

by Forrest Warren. And it checks! For answers, for reality, look not to others, but only within yourself. But LOOK.

The Reality-manufacturers are still working overtime, grinding out more and more Little Jim-Dandy Cure-All Ready-to-Wear Realities. We have, instead of using them, been trying them on like shirts, first this one and then that new style, trying to find one which fit. Some have tried to make their own shirt, using an arm from this one, a collar from that. "They" said, "Everyone has to wear a shirt, you can't live without one. It's for your own good!" And each one said that THEIR kind of shirt was the best; the only true, beneficial, and REAL shirt. There were golden shirts, starched shirts, and dirty shirts to choose from. Some of them were pretty good shirts. But all these people were trying to sell shirts, so they left out a tiny but essential fact: YOU ALREADY HAVE A SHIRT ON!

Look at yourself and see - don't take my shirt for it. Don't put another one on and cover yours up. You see, we already have too many shirts on. We must take shirts off to find our own, not merely add a new one which fits the outside of the padded mess of thousands of useless and hindering shirts we are wearing now.

No one can see your own shirt for you. You can privately begin peeling off shirts before the mirror of Yourself; these damned dirty shirts of other people's realities that we thought we had to wear. No one told us we had a shirt of our very own already, that we were born with one. But we knew that once, and doubting it was the dirtiest shirt we ever put on! We asked people, and envied their shirts, and doubted our own; and they told us our shirts were bad, that we would go crazy if we did not ignore them, and that it was wrong to look at them; and we put on more and more shirts. And some, because of their shirts, lied outright and told us we had no shirt of our own, although they could plainly see them. Then they "kindly" loaned us one of theirs.

Instead of buying more shirts, or hunting for bigger ones, why not spend your time trying to experience your own. Eventually, you can discard all those extra shirts. If you first feel your own, this will be easier. Don't "accept" the fact that you have a shirt; just feel it, by yourself. It is a part of you. If it is not easy to feel at first, take off shirts as you find them until you can feel it. But don't put any more on, please.

I find it very significant that even now we have in Dianetics no word for MEDITATION, the process of passively looking within. "Reverie" was somehow an activity, an effect, the result of a command by another, a straining or negating or controlling. Only an occasional person ever saw the light, because Dianetics was a study of effect. The alignment of effort was wrong -- it was all a conscious struggling to control. Emphasis was on externals, on perceptics, on things which are a natural effect of contact with what we call B.P. or the supercontrol center. Trying to turn on external perceptics was chasing an effect. What needed codification was NOT all the effects of "running", for that is in itself only an effect. What needed codification was means of contacting B.P. - contacting CAUSE.

It appears that people have known how to do this quite well in one way or another for thousands of years. There isn't much of a secret to it - just desire and meditation; conscious passivity, receptivity. Some people dabbled, and became excited with power; they thought their shirt was unique and ought to be made to fit everyone (for their own good). They screamed, "FOLLOW ME, this is THE WAY". And they became so busy selling shirts that they never felt more than the collar of their own. A few became able to feel their shirts very well, and discarded all the extra ones they had put on. They tried to tell people to go feel their own shirts, that no one could do it for them; but people distorted their words. And they all lacked data.

Few indeed ever realized what a wonderful thing their shirt actually was. You see, we have magic shirts. They enable us to do marvelous things, and to know everything. But any extra shirts keep them from telling us automatically. We have to ask for information. And since people didn't ask their magic shirts the right questions, few of them realized their full capabilities while they were here. They used their shirts in minor ways, such as prophesying, or healing, And, being satisfied with these small abilities

ON REALITY, or OF SHIRTS AND MEN - Continued

and the adulation of their neighbors, they never used their shirts to develop themselves fully. They never discarded those last few extra "shirts" of current social realities and external "knowledge".

We have enough data now to begin using the full capabilities of these magic shirts of ours, and not to be tricked into ignoring them once we have sensed them. We know we begin by feeling our own shirt, and, using it, to progress until we are one with it; and not to be satisfied short of that.

Let us no longer mistake TOOLS for SHIRTS. Tools may look like shirts, but tools are to be used, and we don't need any shirt other than our own. Tools are for taking off shirts! Remember, we are all shirt-salesmen on the surface, and shirts are magic only for their particular owners. Let's start using our own, for a change. Or are you too busy manufacturing shirts to be bothered?

Shutting down one's own shirt-factory is the first step in feeling their shirt. One doesn't TRY to feel it, one just does it. At first you are likely to find some of the extra shirts you have bought so unnecessarily in the past, or are still making. Take them off as you find them, and conditions will improve. Thanks to Mr. Howes, our shirts are all easier to feel now. A shirt-feeling intensifier was a great idea. Relaxing shuts down your shirt factory automatically. More shirts won't remove those you have on already. Those old shirts almost remove themselves - your own shirt will remove them for you if you let it.

Conscious use of another person's shirt to try to feel your own is the big danger. This is autohypnosis, and the road to complete effect. Someone says, "To become clear, you must want to." People mistake this tool for a shirt, put it on, and lie in rooms repeating over and over, "I want to be clear". To use the tool properly, one need only make a prime postulate, relax, and start shucking off old shirts. Straining and struggling to wear more shirts or manufacture shirts only prevents the feeling of your own.

This is what the shirt-shovers never told us. This is what those who have cast off their extra shirts are trying to tell us. This is what many have said in the past, though we saw in it just another shirt. It is the sanity of the man. Long known, it appears many times, in many words, in many tongues.

Yet it is the deepest, darkest secret in all the world.

It is simply this:

You ARE your shirt!

DAVE DOBBS - 252 Mershon Street - Fairhope, Alabama

\* \* \* \* \*

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.

\* \* \* \* \*

FAIRHOPE CLICKS AGAIN. . . .

A new paper being prepared for distribution. Will be ready in a few weeks. Contains three new methods for getting people up to the threshold. Called, "Basic Realities of Processing," and selling for \$2.00, it contains methods and realities from Howes, John Lewis, Spikes, Avera and Welgos. The basic definitions that it contains will enable anyone to be more proficient in helping others and themselves. One technique can take an advanced case and stabilize it at optimum in as little as half an hour. To those who have read and used Simplified Processing, we say that this paper will improve your results beyond your expectations. It is solid, basic, factual material that gives facts straight and observable with results immediately forthcoming. Without full understanding of what is happening and WHY one does not get the desired product. We give information that gets the results. Order your copy and be among the first to taste victory. ORDER NOW.

ANNOUNCEMENT:

To those who wish to know -- Dave Dobbs (former certification director at Elizabeth) is now with the Eidetic Foundation.

ANNOUNCEMENT:

The half-price policy for field members, group members, book workers will be continued as long as desired by these same workers. Intensives are being booked 2 to 8 weeks in advance. If you desire to learn how to break cases, an intensive here will show you how it can be done.

EIDETIC FOUNDATION, 252 MERSHON STREET, FAIRHOPE, ALABAMA - Phone Fairhope 8676

\*\*\*\*\*

The DEE & BILL BOOK SHOP will soon add to their list of books some wonderful new titles for sale. This enterprise, as mentioned before, was started on a shoestring. But even shoestrings have a way of getting around--it seems that ours was fitted to a pair of seven-league boots! We have worked ourselves around to serving our customers an expanding list of titles. In the meantime we will repeat our list of "regulars," none of which will be discontinued--they are still selling very well:

My Religion, Helen Keller, cloth bound, 208 pp, 50¢ postpaid.

Archnetics, Morris Kamman, mimeo pamphlet, 25¢ postpaid.

Heaven and Hell, Emanuel Swedenborg, paper cover, 624 pp, 25¢ postpaid.

E-Therapy, A. L. Kitselman, paper cover, 96 pp, \$1.00 postpaid.

Tono-Therapy, Jack Beaver, paper cover, 29 pp, \$1.00 postpaid.

Murderers of Genius, Lyle G. Saxton, cloth bound, 240 pp, \$3.00 postpaid. (We have sold this book to lots of people we don't even know!)

Mechanisms of Life, Dwight Bulkley, paper cover, 112 pp, \$2.00 postpaid.

Incidentally, we are in the act of preparing three new sheets of book titles available in our rental library. This means approximately 135 new titles at the disposal of our book rental service subscribers. It is obvious that this service is well liked and is prospering to grow in those proportions in two short months.

If you folks have a spare moment sometime soon, would you like to do us a favor?

We know how many paid subscribers we have to both The Arc Light and Plus & Minus--but we DON'T know how many people read the two papers.

So, if you have a spare moment would you like to drop us a card and tell us approximately how many people read your copy? Please don't exaggerate--even a little bit.

Paid subscription lists on both papers are GROWING and GROWING.

We often wonder what we did to you nice people to be treated so well.

Will be hearing from you then?

Thanks,

Dee & Bill Swygard  
1370 N. W. 86th Street  
Miami 47, Florida

Hubbard Dianetic Auditor Training in Texas  
 Under Personal Guidance of  
 Doris Colbury Graffam, H.D.A.  
 Standard Curriculum of Hubbard College  
 - - - -  
 Local Certification by L. Ron Hubbard  
 - - - -  
 Consultant:  
 Donald T. Graffam, Ed. D.  
 Psychometrics  
 ADDRESS: #2 West Oaks South Drive  
 Houston 19, Texas  
 Telephones: Mohawk 9911  
 Mohawk 9627

TO OUR FRIENDS IN OTHER LANDS:

We want to thank all of you for the wonderful, thoughtful letters we receive from you. It is thrilling to know that groups of people all over the world are reading and sharing The Arc Light and Plus & Minus. We are indeed sorry, due to many and various factors, that we cannot share our growing rental library with you.

We can share our experiences with each other, however. The pages of both papers are open to everyone. Our subscribers in the United States and Canada tell us that they are very much interested in reading letters we publish from readers from over the horizon. They tell us they would like to know how groups are started and meetings are conducted in other countries. What is being done, how many in your group, what are you reading, what techniques work best for you? When are your meetings held; and are they held in homes, public buildings, or where? We are calling on Europe, Asia, Africa, South America and Australia for reports to publish.

There are many people willing to send material if you tell them your needs. They may want to trade publications with you.

Our policy continues: We will send as many copies of our papers without cost as financially possible to anyone requesting them and having some difficulty in securing dollars to send to us. Our program does not include operating at a profit--but we do want to distribute information from all, to all.

The children in our neighborhood really enjoy collecting the beautiful stamps on your letters.