

Hi again:

Yes, it's that guy once more. You may have hoped that I would fade with the old year but no such luck. I do owe you an apology for the long delay since number 3. It seems that December is a month of activity, and I have had my share. However, no one bothered to write and say that they missed my masterpieces which failure was a severe blow to my self esteem. For this you owe me an apology, so we're even.

Maxine slung a low blow in my direction with her missile 4. Ed Calkins supplied the KO with the demand that I report the results in verse. You both probably thought you were smart. Well, so am I.

Three questions put in letter four,  
 From Founder Smith to members more,  
 Brought answers back from one plus four.  
 Of course Maxine expressed her view,  
 And to these six I'll add mine too  
 Which number does seem rather few  
 On which to base decisions wrong (#)  
 To help this net grow wise and strong  
 (Or let this pome grow loud and long).  
 Now all but one thought we could use  
 Some one poor fool to take the views  
 And formulate our "Don'ts" and "Do's".  
 This one and I perforce agree  
 That Ernie Pope should not be he  
 Who correlates the policy.  
 A group of twenty-five, say two,  
 Is large enough for what we do.  
 While one more says he thinks so too,  
 If all of those same twenty-five  
 Are wide awake and quite alive  
 Thus adding to our network jive.  
 So what we do, I cannot tell,  
 For seven votes ring not the bell.  
 It seems as though we'll drift along.  
 Since we still grow, that can't be wrong.

(#) This word should probably be "right", but I couldn't seem to make it rhyme.

Since the vote on Maxine's proposals was inconclusive, I believe we should continue each going his or her merry way. From my contacts with the group, I am of the opinion that we would do this anyway. In line with this statement I hereby announce a policy of my very own. (It is not copywrite and you can follow it or a modification thereof if you so desire.) Here 'tis.

I, Ernie Pope, will hereafter not send copies of my marvelous communications to any individual who has not communicated with me during the preceding 90 days. In other words if my letter is dated Feb. 1, I will not send a copy to anyone

who has not contributed to the net or written me personally since Nov. 1. Exceptions will be made for those who desire to pay for these masterpieces - rates on request (confidentially, I'll charge plenty.) Of course, new members get 90 days free service.

Please add to the list of members - Harry's letter 12/26/52 - the following:

John Carey, 3122 East Federal Street, Baltimore 13, Maryland  
Don G. Purcell, 211 West Douglas Avenue, Wichita 2, Kansas

Also please note that my middle initial is "P" for Purser - the guy who was charge of things on a ship. Except I've only been on a ship once in my life.

I have failed to keep an accurate list of those to whom I have sent my previous letters. If I have missed you, let me know and I'll send the missing numbers promptly. No 1 was largely devoted to the problem of selling dianetics. No 2 dealt with Analytical Procedure and No 3 was mostly comments on what you had said. Nos 1 & 2 contained poems and should be treasured.

A synopsis of Analytical Procedure appears in the Dianctic Auditors Bulletin for October (actually mailed the day after Christmas - confusing no end). The soft cover edition including some of the results of the preliminary testing will be available shortly from the Foundation at Wichita for \$2.50. Some of you may have seen John Maloney's remarks in the Nov. Dianotes. He states: "Analytical Procedure has developed beautifully. - - - In most cases we begin to accomplish things on Monday or Tuesday that heretofore began on Thursday." Incidentally recent issues of the Bulletin have had several case histories. It looks like the Foundation is getting results that they can document. Those of you who haven't seen the Bulletin in the last few months should look over a copy - the change is amazing.

Do you find your buttons pushed frequently? Remember when you react excessively to something that irritates, you are probably reacting to some ancient stimulant. In other words buttons are the keys to discovering where you need processing. The next time you find a button pushed, wait until you have calmed down, then try Analytical Procedure. Find the BA that covers the situation and check its validity. Then set up the Beliefs, Attitudes and Motives that best fit the current situation. It works a fair part of the time.

Harry's comments on communication (Fortune p 17 et seq.) are pertinent. Just what is the goal or goals of this net? So far it looks like we are mostly engaged in selling our ideas, but we are doing very little buying. Can anyone say that they have really changed a viewpoint as the result of a network communication? Just how thoroughly frozen are your thought patterns? Harry mentions in his 3rd circulating letter (p 16, 12/25/52) that he had been without a purpose for a long time. (Ref. Lewis Carroll - "The Whiting and the Snail") Isn't it time we did a little exploring to set forth the possible goals of this group. Just to talk is not enough.

While I can't say much for Dick's art work (Kerlin 12/26/52) I must say I sympathize with the sentiments expressed. Unlike Fred (Hand 3) I find it difficult in the extreme to cull out the trash from Hubbard's current output. Maybe self-consistency is an undesirable state, but there are limits to my ability to untangle apparently conflicting statements. Some of Hubbard's writings remind me of the test

for color blindness. The one where a picture made up of numerous different color dots will appear as one number if you have normal color sensitivity and as different numbers for different types of color blindness. One individual reads one meaning into Ron's writings and one reads another. Mostly I am confused.

Those of you with recorders may be interested in the free tapes being circulated by the Lidetic Foundation. We have heard the first three: Semantics, Frozen Action States and Yoga. These are definitely aimed at newcomers with little or no background but with considerable interest in the subject. To me they seemed somewhat draggy and only the second was worth the time. By and large it covers the same material that is in their 25¢ booklet "Secret Road to Success", which incidently is well worth the price.

Jim's "Basic Course in Nexology" started out with a bang and part two seems to follow right along. This material is so far beyond anything else that I've seen for getting newcomers started that there is no comparison. There is no attempt to shock you out of your current beliefs, nor is there a lot of new words to confuse you. It is a shame that Jim has seen fit to discard the word dianetics. Personally I feel that it is a more logical title word than "Nexology". Some day I'll have to cut down on my reading and really go to work on some of this stuff.

Which leads me to a few questions, but then questions are supposed to be a good technique these days. Do you self-process, co-audit or both? How did you get started? Which method fits what conditions? And last, what is it about current dianetics that makes somany want to write fables?

With a little space to spare I'll let you enjoy some more of my pomes.

It isn't who said it that makes it true  
 (As Authority seldom discovers the new)  
 But does it work, or will it do?  
 For things that are different under the sun  
 Are oftentimes found by an ignorant one  
 Who didn't know that it couldn't be done.

- - - - -

"It can't be done" and "It isn't so"  
 Will block your path as thru life you go.  
 Keep an open mind as you meet things new:  
 "It can be done" and "It may be true".

With twenty-five members we have now reached our first goal. Who'll be the first to add to our number or don't we? At least we can try out our self-determinism.

Until another happy day.

As ever,

