

Hello again,

At the urgent request of my intelligent readers (your own evaluation accepted) I have anticipated my normal schedule of one month, three weeks and a few odd hours minutes and seconds to bring you another masterpiece. I am resisting the thought to do it in (blinkety-blank) verse but may not hold out to the end. At this point please refer to lines 12 & 13 on page 3 of my letter of September 29.

Last time I mentioned that I'd have a word about Analytical Procedure. It looks like it will run to several words, but having disregarded my warning, you are in for it. Just remember that this procedure is experimental. Confine it to those fairly well up on the tone scale until more is known about the tone drops that sometimes develop. If you run into any bugs that you can't solve, let me know and I'll pass them back to the author.

Analytical Procedure is another approach to the problem of why we think illogically. For the purposes of this paper let us consider any thought leading to an opinion or action, positive or negative, as a decision of the "I". These decisions are based on certain factors available to and used by the analytical mind at the moment of decision. These factors are drawn from the memory banks for use at a particular moment and may be considered to be of two types:

1. Data, either observed or accepted from others, and
2. Decisions made previously and filed as Beliefs, Attitudes and Motives.

These factors have a kind of "validity rating" attached to them that represents the "I's" judgment as to their applicability and reliability. As new data arrives the analytical mind is continually and automatically reevaluating the ratings of factors already in the memory banks and making changes in light of the new data. Sometimes however, a validity rating becomes set or frozen and when the factor to which it applies enters into a decision, it is given incorrect weight. Most often this happens with factors of the second type.

The rationality of any given decision varies not with the mechanical accuracy of the brain (high, if not perfect, except in cases of physical impairment) but on the data available as interpreted through the filters of our Beliefs, Attitudes and Motives. (Hereafter we shall refer to the complex of Beliefs, Attitudes and Motives entering into a single decision by the term BAM.) Thus if a given BAM has a high validity rating, it may filter the true data so that an illogical decision results.

As far as I know all BAM's were once valid for a given set of conditions. We do not want to invalidate the BAM as such. We do want to determine the limits of its validity and see that the validity factor is not frozen. In some, perhaps many, cases we find that a given BAM has no validity in any situation now conceivable. Even more frequently we find that a BAM does not have validity in the situation to which we applied it. These findings should not be used as a reason for self-recrimination. How much or how little sense went into a given decision at some time in the past is of no moment. The only need is to evaluate your BAM's and, when desirable, replace them by ones suited to the present situation.

Fine enough you say, but let's get down to action. All right. Pick an aberration - make it a little one the first time - one that even you wouldn't miss if you lost it. (What, you don't have any little aberrations? Then skip to the section on SET points.) Now let's track that aberration to its source - not its source in time-space, but its source in a BAM with an erroneous validity rating. The nice thing about BAM's is that they are always present, ready for a little searching analysis. We don't have to go chasing down a time track to the dawn of creation; our troubles are with us in the here and now.

So start around the BAM triangle relating to this little aberration. Let's take an example, say a common malfunction of the mind like the "inability to remember names". Consider a Belief that might enter into this problem. e.g. "I have a poor memory." Evaluate this Belief by finding instances where it was valid or invalid. e.g. "I remember numbers whenever necessary". Decide to do something about it. e.g. "I will make a conscious effort to be as interested in names as I am in numbers." Act on the decision. i.e. Follow thru at every opportunity. Of course there may be more than one Belief bearing on a given aberration. There are ordinarily many facets of that Belief to be explored and evaluated before reaching a decision or group of related decisions. There are usually many opportunities to act in line with that decision before a correct validity factor is assigned to the original Belief.

In the same way examine the Attitudes affecting the aberration. Consider "I'm afraid of strangers". Evaluate, "But a stranger helped me to find my way when I was lost." Decide, "I will be more interested in strangers". Act as the opportunity affords itself. Again there may be several Attitudes influencing and strengthening a given aberration. And the CEDA paths will be many and varied as you agree with yourself on a course of action.

Likewise give your motives a going over. C "I make myself important by considering others too insignificant to be remembered." E "Pushing others down hasn't raised me up". D "I shall try to make others feel important". Act, Act, Act. Motives need not be the hardest one of the trio to evaluate, but you will have to have complete and objective self-honesty to really get the validity ratings correct.

The CEDA sequence is the key to logical tracking to find the real validity of your BAM's. Use it not only on a given BAM, but on the BAM that gives a high validity to the high validity rating of the original BAM. Sometimes it pays to see if there isn't a chain of BAM's each in turn governing the validity rating of the BAM ahead. Then set up and explore by CEDA the positive BAM for eliminating the aberration. It is frequently easier to establish a low validity for a BAM you have been applying to a given situation by setting up a new BAM with a valid high validity.


Following down the track to the source BAM's and assigning each a validity rating in keeping with the present situation is easier if an auditor is there to help by judicious questioning. Full vocalization is helpful, particularly until you are used to the procedure. Hold those items that you cannot freely discuss with your auditor until you are self-processing. Start each session by setting up a positive BAM toward this procedure. This BAM will increase in validity. After you have consciously assigned validity ratings to a few BAM's, you will find the analytical mind will do this automatically following an effective CEDA sequence.

There are many tricks to finding the track and keeping on it that we do not have time to cover here. There are many interesting experiences awaiting you as you explore the Beliefs, Attitudes and Motives that are coloring, obscuring or filtering the basic data that your mind uses in thinking. You can learn just when a given BAM is valid and useful. And don't let anyone tell you that all BAM's are useless burdens. BAM's that are valid for a given situation impart a richness to living that coldblooded data can never give. On the other hand the BAM's that have an erroneous validity cause us to miss the pleasure that comes from correct thinking. Along this line you might explore the BAM's relating to the idea of saving face. There's pay dirt here.

It looks like the part on SET points will have to wait. Both space and time have run short and besides I don't want to hog the act.

The foregoing represents my present interpretation of the major features of Analytical Procedure. Those of you who have read the original paper will notice surface differences besides the omission of theory relating to the establishment of erroneous validity ratings. Despite these differences and omissions, I hope that I have extracted enough of the meat to give you something to act on without the extras that might give you mental indigestion. Perhaps some of you can even identify the BAM's that I used to filter this concoction.

Let me know how you make out as you CEDE your BAM's. There is some evidence that this approach is a real springboard for an attack on aberration in intelligent individuals. This simplified version seems to appeal to some that are scared by techniques with more complete theoretical backing. If you would like an extra copy or two to circulate among your friends, let me know and I'll try to provide. Or just try it on your friends yourself and let me know what happens. I am awaiting some comments. Let's make this a communications net.


Ernest P. Pope
1005 Pierce Road
Madison, Tenn.

P.S.

It wouldn't be genuine without a poem.

A BAM that's given high validity,
And that made stet with great rigidity,
Leaves little chance for a preclear's brain
To give forth thoughts that are really sane.

Now wouldn't it have been better if this whole paper had been in verse?