

the Communicator Supplement #3 I find Sadah a source of delectable quotations. Her first remark on page 15 and Parry's response constitute a gem, but on page 21 she speaks "of a nice, fresh, new organism. An organism with no, so to speak, aberrations."

What is an aberration? Well, in both the tapes in this supplement and in writings by Hubbard, Howas, Gesell and Amatruda, it appears that an aberration is a fixed pattern which the individual finds he "cannot" change.

What is an organism? An organism is a cell and often many associated cells which grow in a pattern largely determined by interaction of heredity and environment-----! Whoa! Did Hubbard say "Your body is an engram."?

He is given to parabolic language containing shrewd observation. My definition of theta is "the basic organizational principles of the universe". The physical universe is composed of motions bound by certain "laws" (theta) and tending to a state of universal uniformity.

Optimum randomness, then is about mid-scale. Say 18 to 22 on the 40-point scale.

All organisms we know have heredities going back to time "immemorial" (pre-Dianetics). They may be considered this old. Or they may be considered to age from the time of cell-division. Lets consider a human from this point.

Each human grows from a single living "cell". But this cell is compounded of two others. These contain the "patterns" of the whole. The ovum waits, usually in the fallopian tube, emanating chemical and ether attractives upon which the sperm may "home in" to her. The sperm are possessed of a deep drive to reach this source and enter. They drive themselves to complete exhaustion several times in the trip, each time proceeding as soon as sufficient food and water have been absorbed and poisons given off. They travel by swishing a tail. The phenomena of deep fatigue and the nervousness of being tested or judged, or of a competitive situation can be traced back to the sperm's via dolorosa, even to the vibrations.

They don't sound unaberrated to me. These are compulsive patterns with great vengeance.

Even Hubbard's hypothetical photon converter has a patterned existence and as such is aberrated.

The physical universe is composed of motion. Free, self-determined motion is natural to it. Any duration of pattern is aberration because it is tendency toward a static (----"randomity similar or repetitious----").

Incidentally the data on sperm and ova are from preclears. If you contact this area and are ever bothered by fear or "nervousness" in a test, interview, competitive situation, etc. try this. Run such a situation and carefully examine the facsimile. Examine a facsimile of complete physical exhaustion (e.f. running uphill, chasing a bus, participating in competitive sport). Examine the two facsimiles point by point including the shaking or trembling. When we wish to flee, but it's too important or we fear to flee, do we haul out a facsimile of exhaustion as an excuse for staying? Now, if you're one who can(I haven't), go back and review pre-conception. Note how the sperm drives himself to complete "exhaustion" of water and sugar content and must pause to absorb them and discharge fatigue poisons. Compare the rate of trembling in the facsimiles mentioned above and the rate of lashing of sperm's tail. Compare it also with the rate of reversal of "inflow" and "outflow"

of food and wastes through the cell wall. Check also the perception of the space: "seeing" the ovum around corners and knowing the emotions, thoughts, attitudes, etc. of people present and of the entire society into which it is entering. Check the "I'm not really worthy of her" attitude of the victorious sperm after entering the ovum and the sudden penicky fear of loss of identity (personal integrity).

When George Sandler began talking about sensing emotions by other than observational methods, I objected. When he returned from the (1951) winter Wichita conference talking about counter-emotion and counter-thought I didn't accept the definition of counter-emotion. It's what one thinks others are emoting, I insisted.

About this time one of my brothers (who wouldn't say a thing ordinarily because he's hiding by pretending to be an ordinary human with only the usual perceptions) said of and to me, "You really broadcast!" Last month Wing Angel said to me, "Man, you really broadcast!" and he was speaking of thoughts as well and I didn't find it strange. I've been using affinity consciously in auditing at least eight months now and my questions increasingly are having the Hubbardian quality of presenting to the pre-clear what he was fumbling about (he won't go into whether he's trying to find it or hide it.)

But 2/26/58 marked a new experience: Pseudopods inside P. C.'s chest, fondling his heart gently to encourage a developing grief discharge. Reality? Mine is high. P. C. wasn't asked. It was as real as sitting in the chair. "I" was interiorized, the pseudopods extended from a shading off "surface" about 1 1/2 feet before my chest, they were lot "beams", they ended in "hands" with "fingers". I've done it since then, too.

Bob seems to be doing all right.

Some folks wonder why they're participating in this exchange. Well, if they don't want to and don't get fun out of it, it's an aberration and I suggest they run out both the possibility of a compulsion to participate in communication and all reporting compulsions such as wonderings about goals or reasons or compulsion not to enjoy communication. As to how much tacit consent the auditor should use, the answer is, none. I'm referring specifically to Anne Sharpe's question about baths. Anyone who takes a bath every Saturday night is in a rut-a fixed behavioral pattern. That's an aberration. Anyone who can't skip a bath oftener than every other week is an badly aberrated. But the auditor has no business telling the P. C. so. His business is to find out from the P. C. whether it is. And his customary manner of auditing should include so many possible postulates and points of view (presented as questions, not suggestions), that the P. C. will not naturally regard any subject or interrogation as either invalidation or interpretation. Hubbard rightly calls these "the two 'ahimsa'".

Jack Poole, the voice of the Great North Woods, asks "what is a clear". My answer is that you're clear when you know you're right. Not when you figure it out or some inner voice tells you, but when you just are right. I'm using right here to mean "good", "appropriate", "best for the most on the most dynamics", "just", etc. But most particularly I mean by "right": "this is just the way I want to do what I most want to do right now."

I have abstracted this from the statements of people who claim to be clear. They tell me everyone does behave by this last definition, but that being clear is being aware of it and understanding it. When one has reached this state then one can set out to develop in other ways. Many of these other achievements can (and have been) accomplished by people who are very unclear in many ways. People may be quite clear on a number of subjects without being "clear".

And if that answer isn't clear, I guess we'll just have to fall back to Hubbard's analogy of held down screws and the definition that an aberration is a stereotyped pattern (of enforcement or inhibition); also Rosen's suggestion to be spontaneous.