

Edward G. Ladd, Jr.
3145 Ardenridge Dr.
Sacramento 21, Calif.

Feb. 13, 1953

Dear Dick;

The communication network is a good idea; many thanks for letting me in on it. If you send the roster right away, I might even receive it before I take off to Wichita, for I am going back there very soon, now. If you would like to, you may introduce me to the net with a blast; as you may have noticed from my attitudes while I was in St. Louis, I am a very positive person; further, I am not at all averse to stating my beliefs; therefore, I will lead off with somewhat of a polemic; frankly, I believe an injustice has been done, and if you have read Campbell on the subject of injustices, you know that they are nearly impossible to deal with, dianetically. Perhaps a bit of argument will help. You may reproduce this over my name if you want, or let the St. Louis group kick it around if they so desire; it might lead to some interesting discussion, anyhow.

(If you could throw it into a round-robin: I'd like to see what some of the net have to say about it. I assume it includes some of the Scientology work)

WHERE DID SCIENTOLOGY ORIGINATE ? ? ? ?

About a year ago, L. Ron Hubbard made the crowning discovery of his career. He discovered that man had an immortal soul. For an engineer, this was quite a discovery. Of course, the same discovery had been made about two years earlier by a fellow named Kitselman; he called it 'E', and was laughed to scorn by the engineering-minded Hubbardians. Nevertheless, to us in the hinterlands, who chose to believe nothing anybody said merely because he said it, it was interesting to note that anyone could claim to have discovered the soul. So we listened to Mr. Kitselman, and we added E-therapy to the toolbox to be used if the situation required. (And believe me, it has been required; once in my presence it saved a man from a psychotic break when every dianetic technique known to five of us, including an H.D.A. was nudging him ever closer to it) It is well that we did so, since we are abreast of the Scientology techniques without as much self- invalidation as certain others, who believed that if Ron said something was bad, it was wicked.

Of course, having discovered that man had a soul, Ron then had to make it complicated. He called it a Thetan (first time somebody sprung that one on me, I thought he was lisping), and attributed to it all sorts of powers, which everybody has, anyway, if they'd only stop hiding them. He wrapped the whole thing up in a completely new terminology, and took off to Arizona. We will say little about that rather 1.1 period of time, except that it definitely proved that Ron needed a large slug of his own medicine. Now it is very interesting to note that all the faddists, all the mystics, all the humbug artists, and most of the schizos, together with a few very earnest people that were already followers of the great man, took right off after him. The more or less solid citizens, such as Bulkely, vanVogt, Campbell, Dunbar, and other relatively sane individuals either stayed with the Foundation or remained neutral. Some of the - as I say - earnest people who were followers of the great man, used the techniques, with about as good results as they ever got from any group of techniques, but the unstable ones became even more so. Jack Naylor, for instance, who got out of an institution under Dianetic processing, was put back into one after a few runs in Scientology. I submit that a technique that will do this is definitely not of the safest. And make no mistake about it; you can spin anybody - and spin him fast - if you use E-techniques wrongly.

For that, friends, is what Scientology basically is. E-therapy, with all the safeguards of E-therapy carefully left out. It is, in fact, not even E-therapy complete, but only that section of E-therapy known as E-strategy, and a subhead of that, wherein the auditor suggests the strategy to be run. Frankly, it's dynamite. E-therapy was safe only so long as it stayed non-directive, as is the case with any form of psychological processing. When you fall into the trap of telling your pre-clear what's wrong with him, you might as well send for the men in the white coats to take you both away, because you're crazy for doing it, and he's crazy for letting you.

If you want to use E-techniques, go ahead. They are relatively harmless, when used non-directively, but for the sake of the sanity of all parties involved, use Kitzelman E, not Hubbard E. Beau is the proper data source on this, albeit as aberrated as Ron, because he is the originator of it. For data on Dianetics, I'll go to Hubbard rather than Kitzelman, because he knows more about it, but Scientology is not dianetics, make no mistake about that. There is precious little science, and absolutely no logic in it, where dianetics had plenty of both. Hubbard did the world a great service when he wrote the first four books. He should have stopped right there.

All right - how in hell do I get the idea that I know so much? Well, I'll tell you. I have been audited by every technique extant, to a total of some five hundred hours. I have done over a thousand hours of auditing, using every technique extant. I have had miracles using book 1&2 techniques, and a few using E-techniques. Our own baby, Theta processing, or Hyper-E, as it is known to some, has opened two unopenable cases, and eradicated one benign tumor, as well as causing several rapid and lasting tone-rises. I have seen many people show slow but steady progress with HBFCP, and I have experimented about fifty hours with Scientology techniques. I have this to say; if you really want to grind a sub-optimum habit pattern in, use Scn., it'll do it for you. You see, I had the rather unpleasant task of running out all the Scientology sessions on the very people I used it on; every one of them suffered a rapid and staggering tone-drop; further, I had to run out two tone 22 manics on people who had had them installed by a couple of fairly capable Scientologists. Sure - you want to see a rapid tone rise, just install a manic; it's real easy; but how about the headaches, sinusitis, and rhinitis you also install? They make people damn uncomfortable. I am admittedly at tone 2.0 - overt hostility, that is, concerning Scientology; I am at the same tone regarding anything that can do as much harm - and as little good - to my fellow man. I advise strongly against using any of the techniques as described in What to audit, but if you must use them, for Christ's sake at least let the pre-clear pick his own imaginary incident to run; don't try to run something out of the fertile brain of L.Ron Hubbard. The techniques in 8-80 are quite good, but they are all book one techniques, or didn't you notice? They're all there - but mostly under the heading of lie-factories. For a beautiful example of self-invalidation, consult L. Ron Hubbard's works.

Now - for the goal of processes 80 and 88, the 'Theta clear'. Definition, if you please, 'The ability to leave the body at will'. Hell, if that's the case, I've been a Theta clear for two years. I developed the faculty during my third E-session, and have been using it more or less continually ever since. It's real handy. If the body gets too uncomfortable, just get out of it. Fine, in processing sessions.



Not so good, though, when trying to face real life situations.

If somebody needs the word of an authority, here, let him ask John Campbell what he thinks about it; if John has any more asbestos to write on, he'll probably tell you. Or you might consult van Vogt; he also has some ideas about the desirability of being a Theta clear (so-called). As for me, I lay no claim to being an authority; I can merely say this; on the data I have, my opinion is that you will do your fellow man much good, and no harm whatsoever, if you use the data in the first four books, and use it right. Let Hubbard reap the fruits of his own sowing, and may he and his followers have much success. Meanwhile, there's still that same world to win. I suggest that it will be won much sooner if we use relatively safe techniques. In my frame of reference, Scientology is not safe. In fact, at the moment, the only absolutely safe technique I know is Analytical Procedure, as elucidated by the Foundation, and the reason that it is safe is that it is completely client-centered; the auditor has very little chance to make hash of a case using it. The one drawback to it is that using it, a person will become only as self-determined as he wishes to become. It will be completely impossible, using Analytical Procedure, to help a person in spite of himself, as was the case with book one techniques.

For fun and games, then, use Scn. For lasting results, use any other technique you choose, but if you must use Scn., for the sake of your pre-clear, get a thorough grounding in E-therapy first, so you'll know what in hell you're doing. You might even do some good that way, although I haven't seen any yet. Period.

Well. That was a philippic, wasn't it? Maybe I'm being too rough on the boys, but dammit, Dick, I've seen too much of the wreckage put out by directive types of therapy. I'm agin' 'em, strictly.

And so - to sleep, I guess. I'll have to cease this typing anyhow, as I'm keeping the kids awake, so for now, adios. Hope to receive the roster of the network soon. Perchance I can slip over to St. Louis while I'm in Wichita; if so, I'll see you.


(ARC)

Ted