

We Networkers talk about a lot of things.

I am indebted to EWS Calkins for Theta Clearing procedures. By the way, EWSO, I meant to answer your extra note, but holidays interfered, so will take this means. When I said I popped out for one second while pushing against the back of the forehead, and back in, that's just what happened, but that's all. I've tried many times since with no success. I got down into one kidney once. I don't see ridges. I see pink blobs that float toward me first slowly, then splatter all over in closeness. I get a vague idea of flowing agreement and disagreement to and from concepts, but in contrast to Fred Hand and the Marshalls, I find Scientology 8:80 confusing, and not at all the 1-2-3 procedure Dr. Hubbard seems to imply it is.

To Fred Hand: thanks for the data on your work with 8:80. This is the most I have heard on the subject. Evidently this stuff is real, but for me it isn't very--yet. I realize what this means in terms of the Theta tone scale. Unfortunately for us duckers, each of Dr. Hubbard's new theories contains built-in reasons why they won't seem to work for some. Maddening!

I am attaching to this communication the latest St. Louis Facsimile, and a lousy cartoon which I would inflict only on you fellow Networkers. I think I ran out some things just making up the cartoon, so please don't think I take it very seriously now.

Having run off the Facsimile today, added remarks to Fortune's 2nd circulator, and now battling this out, I suspect this is one of my high-communication days. Perhaps Ron Howes' field is especially strong today.

After hearing of Howes' "field tests" of the "psycho-mechanical field," I couldn't think of any unusual effects I had noted. Later I discovered in my files carbons of scads of letters I had written on those very days--but it had seemed so natural to do that I hadn't counted it as data.

How do you Networkers feel about Dr. Ronald B. Howes? Or should I ask? There has been considerable silence in the Network about him.

I have just read "Dr. Howes Discusses" published by the Humanics Group. This raises my already high opinion of Dr. Howes. It also redeems Jim Elliott to a great degree. I allowed Elliott to get 'way down under my skin when the early releases were bombarding us from Phoenix early this year! Water under the bridge.

"Dr. Howes Discusses" for me, at least, synthesizes several schools of thought without actually trying to do so--it just comes out that way, again, for me. And it opens my eyes to a beautiful philosophy--one I had along, by the way, but forgot. Rather than explain further, I'd urge each of you to read same.

I enjoyed a tape letter from Bob Van Nice a few days ago, and shot an answer back the same night. This is a good way to communicate--I said lots I'd never say on paper.

*Dick Kerlin*

January 3, 1953

## HAPPY NEW YEAR FROM ALL OF ME TO ALL OF YOU.

1. It is within five minutes of the New Year. I am spending New Year's Eve more quietly than I have in a number of years, sober- both in the alcoholic and the mood sense- and alone. Though meditative, I am not tranquil, but rather anturblated. Near and distant I hear the staccato druffire of explosions from the hellow pops of distant firings to the heavy detonations of those close by. The neighbors are celebrating the year's end the way they seem to celebrate everything else, with firecrackers. They have been banging and roaring intermittently every day for the past ten days. I have been living in Texas for more than a dozen years and I still do not emotionally understand the significance of this custom. Since my sole important phobia is on explosions, it is a case of being philosophical. There is no alternative.

2. This year has been interesting and progressive for me. I have learned some thing of the human personality, the human body, the human mind and, yes, even a little about the human soul. I have learned significant details about a number of individuals, one of whom is myself. I have studied the philosophy and psychological system of L. Ron Hubbard and, to a lesser extent, the doctrines of his followers and rivals. Many of his statements and descriptions I have verified to my satisfaction and in an extensional and not merely intensional way. Other parts of his current doctrine I have classified as doubtful; and a few statements have a probability vanishingly small. I am not "clear" in any of the several definitions, nor did I expect to be. Neither, for that matter, are several people I know who did expect to be. Perhaps I am correspondingly less anturbulated as a result. I have progressed both from my own standpoint and that of impartial nondiagnostic observers. I have no settled conclusions regarding the personality of Hubbard himself, whether he will come to be regarded as a Freud, a James, a Paracelsus, or a Menger. Regarding the principal aspiration of all Hubbardiens, I recognize only one MEST Clear, namely Ronald Howe. I take this mainly on the evidence of Dwight Bulkley despite the fact that Howe's status is denied by an HDA whose opinion I respect. And too, Howe has conspicuously succeeded in making much less of a complete jackass of himself in his published statements than any other claimant to the title of Clear. (That's as far as I got New Year's, P.M.)

3. A Quote. For the benefit especially of the engineers and technicians in our Net work, I put this little piece which I got from Clyde Marshall.

## THE EPITOME OF OBFUSCATION

An Engineer is a crude individual who passes as an eminent expert on the basis of being able to produce with prolific fertility infinite concatenations of incomprehensible formulas calculated with microscopic precision from vague assumptions which are founded upon debatable integers evolved from inconclusive experiments executed with instruments of problematical accuracy by persons of doubtful reliability and questionable mentality for the avowed purpose of annoying and confounding a helpless chimerical aggregation of fantastic refferents altogether too frequently as Engineers.

4. Do you suppose that ILLUSION PROCESSING first reported to us by MacMillan, is the technique in the new 8-6008 which Hubbard feels (Journal Of Scientology) too dangerous to be given to unethical and uncleared personnel such as the likes of our book auditors?

5. This paragraph is just to preserve the numbering system on pp 24 S. I had to make a new microcopy. Written any good books lately?

6. Second Note On Processing With A Tape Recorder. In HAND TWO I mentioned using a tape recorder on the PG's session as a means of getting off much additional charge from session material. Recently the Marshalls and myself, using the Pontron, tried it with a group discussion (Clyde's idea) on topics of diastolic bearing. We found the tape technique works perhaps even better as a group process than it does on the individual level. A discussion leader familiar with tape recording is advisable in order to keep the group on relevant subjects, and to keep one or two members from monopolizing the dialog. Just take any appropriate subject and start a bull session about it and let it go on from there. If anyone has mike fright, you have session material.

6 cent.) Because of the ease with which magnetic tape can be erased the same reel can be used over and over indefinitely. The idea is not to preserve the gems of wisdom emitted by the respondents during the discussion. If any such occur, some one can transcribe them at leisure. The idea is to have the group listen to their own dialog, as a group, just as they spoke it, immediately afterwards. The play back can be stopped anywhere to allow a comment by a speaker on his own words. An additional refinement we worked out is to add a short discussion of the discussion at the end of the tape. Other twists will surely suggest themselves to anybody with a tape or wire recorder. I make a guess the tape recorder can become a diastetic instrument ranking at least equal to the psychogalvanometer in usefulness for processing. Clyde's Pentron runs 7 1/2 and 3 3/4 inches/minute and takes the 7 inch 1200 ft. reel, playing 30 min. or one hr. on each track.

7. More On Terminology. In HAND TWO I considered the semantics of "Reality", "Compute" and "Tone Scale". Following are thoughts on two more, also multi-ordinal Self-Determination. (a) A person determines his own efforts, determines the counter efforts he receives, determines his own reaction to these counter-efforts. (Determines equals causation in the Classical sense.) (b) "You will agree with me and do what I want you to without my having to force you. Be self determined!" (c) "You are part of my environment which I must influence. If I disturbulate you you are responsible. You are Self-Determined." I choose (a), rejecting (b), (c), as aberrated.

Full Responsibility. Restricted sense (a) "I am responsible for everything I do and everything that happens to me, including the remotest discoverable consequence of my efforts, and of my adaptations to counter efforts." Unrestricted sense (b). "I am fully responsible for all efforts and all counter efforts of everybody and everything everywhere, always." This is the metaphysical "for whom the bell tolls" sense. While computing on this concept I worked out the following proposition which, while not rigorously derived, is, perhaps, provocative.

8. Full responsibility exists implies any given person is responsible for any given event (b). Then it is the case that; either the Universe is real and individuality is illusory (one person exists) or, individuality is real and the Universe is illusory, or, both individuality and the Universe are real and full responsibility (in sense b,) is illusory. Or; XY not Z, XZ not Y, YZ not X.

9. My E-Meter Articles have drawn mixed comments from the Networkers. Two psychic mechanisms were operating while I wrote HAND ONE & TWO. The first was an emotional reaction against the militant non-technicality of the Meter writings of both Hubbard and Matheson. (Street's article in the CADA Journal is a brilliant contrast to these.) Also the large proportion of mere speculative metaphysics, polemic, and mereless paraphrase of the words of the Originator, in the diastetic literature (including the literary output of our own group, and also no.) None of this seemed very useful, either as heuristic theory or applicable to the real problems of real auditors trying to unambulate actual preclairs with true aberrations, during existing sessions. Secondly, now is the first opportunity I have had to do extensive research in biophysics, verifying hypotheses etc. operationally, and I have taken advantage of it. The material in my E-Meter papers I intended as a sort of appendix to Hubbard's auditing handbook, from which such details are mostly absent. As I find out other things I will pass them on similarly, but will not restrict my communications to such topics.

10. Greetings to the newer Network members. From my own experiments and experiences, I recommend the gelatine process for short run duplicating of numerous pages. It's cheap, simple, versatile, and not too messy. I like the new relay letters as well as these duplicated kind, and will probably put out a relay of my own soon. Thanks to Ed Calkins I have been reading a book which I recommend to anybody. It is Wilhelm Reich, THE FUNCTION OF THE ORGASM. Volume one of DISCOVERY OF THE ORGONE. It anticipates some of our recent discoveries by five years. e.g. relation of skin potential to emotional tension, basic personality, servise facsimile, etc. Reich appears to harmonize with Hubbard as did Korzybski.

11. On The Network As of the last week in December we have 22 members in the Communications Network. The more the better say I. If it ever really gets too big we can simply cleave it apart into two or three sub-networks along lines of community of interest among members; say Hubbardism vs. Non-Hubbardian, or self process vs. co-process, or organism-as-a-whole vs. mind-over-matter. Alternatively, if the network grows big enough, we might be able to support a periodical of our own, perhaps quarterly or bi-monthly, containing all the contributions sent in by the members during the two or three month period, preferably one paper per member per period. I doubt if this last idea would be practicable for less than fifty or sixty members though. We would need that much slack to absorb the irregularities in number of papers per year per member. We already have both duplicated communications like this one and add-your-comments circulating relays like Fortune and Smith have started around. Both seem to work well.

12. We're doing well in keeping up with the new techniques almost as fast as they appear (sometimes before they appear) but I think we still need something else. We need more developmental and research reports by us ourselves, the members of the Network, instead of letting the big centralized groups like Phoenix, Fair Hope, Colorado Springs and Wichita do it all for us. Stage fright is inappropriate here. You and I and the rest of us who have been with diastics from the first article and book are just as much experts and authorities as anybody in the field except Hubbard himself. OI knew a couple of Hubbard's students and I still say so. The second sort of paper we need is related; I mean case histories. We got quite a few case histories earlier but again only from the big central places, Wichita, Phoenix, and Dr. Winters, - but few from the field. I know the case histories exist. I've seen some of them in correspondence when I was associate editor of the PRECLEAR. But I haven't seen any on the network yet, although we have had some good technical papers. The trouble may be that few of us are professional psychotherapists or even semi-pros like most NDAs. Consequently a lot of us have had only a small number of cases and probably can't compute how to publish a case history without violating the Auditor's Code. Or we may be confused about how to transform a bundle of session notes into a case history. Details my friends, details! We can figure out a way. It seems to me that if we don't want this science to wither on the vine, we're going to have to do some developing ourselves and not let Hubbard, Howe, Welton, and a half dozen odd more full time professionals do all the work for us.

13. Have any of you been getting any fascinating facsimiles lately? We have run some of the "What To Audit" class that would make your blood run cold and your hair frizzle. They did mine. And others have real aesthetic value. I mean real drama and beauty. Thank Hubbard for 8-80! When I think of those hundred prenatal we used to get.... There are reports of Poltergeist phenomena among Theta Clears. Has anyone heard anything about that? A local professional NDA claims to be WEST Clear.

14. Diagnostic End Products. Tens and Fifteens are defined in Advanced Procedure as people free of Service Facsimiles, and Optimum respectively. Optimum conversely a Fifteen. Home Novis, a complimentary term for those Optimum or better. Theta Clear is defined merely as one with consciously sterilized stabilized Theta. It seems that certain people declare themselves WEST Clears, get their auditor or some auditor to agree with them, and then usually issue a tape lecture. Then everybody follows their careers and if they don't go psyshe in a month or two, as they frequently do, some Authority like those mentioned in #12, looks them over and gives the Word. This semi-certifies them. Cleared Theta Clear seems to be the name of a theory. The only one I've heard claiming this was that kid in Los Angeles who spun.

15. That's all of HAND FOUR. Next issue I want to consider what I call the Termination problem, why PCs stop processing, what shuts down cases, etc.

ARCistically Yours FRED HANDED