

Dear Network,

1. I'm heartily ashamed to admit that this is my first network communication, after all these months of enjoying your collective literary outpourings. My circumstances at the time I joined the network were suddenly changed and I offer this as some excuse, albeit a limp one. I have had to travel quite a bit in the past few months, and the nature of my job is such that my mail could not be forwarded. In odd moments while away I would compose network letters which seemed entirely inappropriate when I got home and read the latest batches of information that had collected during my absence. The worst thing about this travelling was that I couldn't seem to light in a spot where I could at least spend a few hours with one of you interesting characters.

2. Here's something we've been cooking on for some time now -- I'd like to present it to you as a tentative consideration, as it is only a HAN reality for about seven people.

The current explanation of the unpredictability of sex at conception involves the postulation of some slight difference, some plus or minus gene, some punched or unpunched electron in a generative protein molecule; to my knowledge it hasn't been pinned down very definitely.

In running sperm sequences, however, I have found several cases in which the male preclear is aware of a relatively short interval between the beginning-of-awareness and penetration of the ovum. Conversely, the female preclear who is able to contact this region finds this particular interval relatively long, and is definitely conscious of a "waiting" period.

Also, the male is invariably conscious of a frantic drive and rapid movement in seeking the ovum, while the female uses such terms as "drifting along" and "seem to be waiting for something" or "travelling by spurts", only becoming frantic when the proximity of the ovum is detected. (Bear in mind that in using such terms as "invariably" I am referring only to those dozen or so preclears I know who are able to contact this small segment of the time track with reasonable reality.)

Logicking merrily along, it is apparent that during some portion of the oestrous cycle, an ovum would be prepared to receive the first frantic "male" sperm cell that came careening along the mucosa ahead of his rivals; during another portion of the cycle this would not be the case, and the ardent "males" might expend their vital energies in a fruitless chase, while the "female" spermatozoa lounged around on warm membranes waiting for the immature ovum to develop. Of course, during the balance of the oestrous cycle, because of the production schedule of ova and the mortality of spermatozoa, the act of intercourse would be entirely unproductive except for the facsimiles engendered.

But there is an alternate postulate which will also fit this data; perhaps the chemistry of the female reproductive system during the first oestral interval mentioned is such that all sperm cells are inclined to flagellate like sixty (intellectuals please excuse occasional colloquialism; in Lower American, the term "like sixty" means "rapidly"), while during the second interval mentioned above that chemistry tends to slow down the motile activity of each sperm. This explanation fits the tentative data, as I mentioned, but somehow it fails to achieve the reality of the first theory for most of the preclears involved.

These considerations are currently of no known value in processing, but just for the scientific interest of the thing lets develop a few hypotheses:

- a. Sex determination is made indirectly by means of the bivalent characteristics of the sperm cell which cause it to move rapidly or slowly. Thus the sex of the zygote depends on the portion of the oestrous cycle during which intercourse occurs.
- b. Sex determination is made by a particular bivalent chemical balance related directly to the development of the ovum, which either inhibits or stimulates the activity and maleness of the sperm -- depending on which part of the cycle insemination occurs.
- c. Sex determination is made by an aging process of the ovum; during the first portion of its fecundity conception will result in a male, while a female will result if conception occurs during the latter portion of its generative life-cycle.

If the basic tenet is correct, one can predetermine the sex of ones progeny by careful synchronization of intercourse with the appropriate portion of the oestrous cycle. I am currently aware of four validations and one invalidation of the effectiveness of this technique.

With each letter I am enclosing a postcard for another purpose. Just as a matter of interest, lets have a poll of relative reality on these propositions; to vote, merely jot down a single letter in place of the salutation on the postcard (Dear Charlie is an ambiguous sentiment, anyway) as follows:

SEX DETERMINATION, I AM INCLINED TO BELIEVE, IS MADE BY

- a. the sperm, indirectly as above, and related to the oestrous cycle.
- b. changes in female body-chemistry during the development of the ovum.
- c. the relative age of the ovum at the moment of conception.
- d. a specific sperm quality, such as a male or female gene.
- e. a specific ovum quality, ditto.
- f. none of the above; the foregoing data does not possess reality for me.

3. Having mentioned the postcard, let me tie that in. I'm trying to arrange my nest so that I can get away for an intensive run this spring or summer, and am having some difficulty in deciding where this project has the best chance of success.

I realize that you cannot be aware of my conceptual alignment with the various schools of thought; nevertheless I would greatly appreciate any comments you care to make, regarding your own BAM's on the relative merits of Integration Processing, Wichita Foundation, Eidetic Foundation, Examination, etc. for my immediate purpose (intensive run -- case reopening).

4. Don't remember ever having been introduced to the Network with the conventional frame-of-reference details. I am 34, an Electronics Engineer by profession (Radar Systems), currently retained as a technical advisor or consultant or something to the Air Force.

A disgustingly intellectual child (my recollection -- notice I did not say "intelligent"), sometime during my adolescence I discovered that fascinating pastime which has since become known as "gliding smoothly down the dwindling spiral". Just previous to the publication of the first book (Hubbard's), life held little more for me than mystery novels and animal appetites.

An immediate interest in Dianetics started me whizzing back up the spiral in the expanding direction. Unfortunately, however, I picked up some drag along the way that has gradually diminished my rate of upwhizzing, and I am now bordering on the Dianetic Doldrums. Thus the desire for an intensive run, to get rid of the BAM's which inhibit my ability to get rid of BAM's.

My formal education, which was originally in a medical direction with psychiatry as a goal, was diverted by the U. S. Navy into the ardent pursuit of electrons with winning-the-war as a goal. Shortly before this educational fork, I met and succeeded in marrying one of the most charming female-type humans imaginable, yclept "Marty".

My success was truly fortunate, as it turned out that she had been practicing dianetics (on herself) all her life, without realizing that other humans might not. She has been an invaluable guide in developing postulates on the subject and has a beautiful Examiner, Integrator or Id except when pregnant; at all other times she is pianola even for a novice. We function very well as a team, dianetically and otherwise. We have three children who are illogically named Prunie (14), girl; Squee (7) boy; and Tia (8 months) girl. How do you do?

5. Bulkley, the author of "The Mechanism of Life" and in my personal opinion one of the finest mechanistic thinkers in the business, pulled a good trick which I thought you might like to hear about. I was complaining to him that I had been extremely careful in selecting the people with whom I discussed Dianetics, simply because it took so long and was such hard work explaining the subject to the uninitiated; I also mentioned the particular difficulty of presenting a technically adequate explanation ~~to~~ to a professional man.

With a twinkle in his eye, he commented that he had sold a professional psychologist on the basic theory of Dianetics in ten minutes. I yawned rapidly several times, flexed my credulity and asked for details.

It seems that there is a well established experiment wherein a fertile egg is given a mild electrical shock, and a buzzer sounded simulataneously. This is repeated a number of times during the gestation of the chick. After hatching, the chick exhibits a profound nervous reflex (if you weren't talking to a doctor you could get by saying "jumps") when the same buzzer is sounded even though no shock is applied.

The chick has been conditioned to expect pain when it senses the buzzer, and this conditioning was prenatal! After being startled a score or so times, with diminishing intensity, by the sound of the buzzer, the chick becomes deconditioned and ignores the stimulus.

With a few words, Bulkely obtained agreement (from the psychologist) with the validity of this classic experiment. He then asked the worthy man if it were feasible to consider the same form of prenatal conditioning in a human embryo, with various forms of pain accompanied by words or sounds which become post-natal stimuli. The man looked amazed, dazed and very ~~thought~~ thoughtful. 10 minutes had elapsed!

Besides being a very fine and perhaps useful anecdote, it is a facile description of an experiment which anyone can perform if a fertile egg, incubating arrangement, buzzer, batteries and wire are available. To carry the experiment one step further, I rather think that the basic engram could be keyed in by giving the chick a shock along with a buzz after it had hatched, so that this conditioned response would become permanent unless it interfered with survival at some time. I haven't the heart to do this, as I happen to have a tremendous affinity for chicks -- they grow up to be so delicious!

Anent the original problem here, for quite some time now I haven't found it necessary to explain dianetic theory in detail to an individual before processing him. As a matter of fact, I was amazed to discover how easily you can process an unsuspecting preclear without his realization that you are doing much more than having a conversation with him. Apparently the propriety of a question which might otherwise ~~have~~ be considered too personal or ~~inappropriate~~ impertinent, is not even considered by the preclear if the question itself is good CEDA material and carefully worded.

6. Heard a tape of Perry Chapdelaine auditing, in which he used "Concept Analysis". This I found very impressive; was able to run right along with the pre-clear, to some extent, as Perry asked the questions. I have a transcription of the hundred odd questions he used if anyone is interested, although it should be an excellent exercise to make up ones own list.

Using any referrent that seems worth investigation, for example a particular itch, you ask the pre-clear, "Can you get the concept ofbeing itchy?"

In the blank space, simply fill in words descriptive of a feeling or emotion; these words can be derived from groups of terms familiar to all of you, such as ARC, the tone scale emotions (apathy, anger, grief etc.), Inhibit-Enforce-Desire, BAM and so forth. To illustrate, lets start going up the tone scale to derive a few of these questions:

- "Can you get the concept of dying because of being itchy?"
- "Can you get the concept of not dying because of being itchy?"
- "Can you get the concept of being in apathy because of an itch?"
 - not being in apathy
 - being covertly hostile
 -not being covertly hostile

Note that each of these is phrased in the negative and affirmative. Some other useful concepts are:

- "Can you feel the beautiful sadness of being itchy?"
- Substituting, "the ecstatic apathy; the beautiful helplessness; the beautiful cruelty; the cleverness of; etc."

BEFORE asking these questions (should have mentioned it sooner) it is desirable to ask the pre-clear to get a concept of the whole track (in any form that satisfies him) and keep it to one side in getting these concepts. This, in my opinion, is a special circuit you are asking the pre-clear to construct to avoid being popped directly into an incident by a "trigger" question. Then ask him to match each concept he gets at your request with the "whole track" concept.

These questions are asked in fairly rapid succession, as there is no useful purpose served in dwelling on any one thought facet overlong (unless PC insists; again my opinion). After asking such a question as "Do you get a concept of punishing yourself by being itchy?" PC will ponder a moment and reply in the affirmative or negative as a rule (a negative reply is never questioned by the auditor). Then you simply go on with the next question, without giving the impression of rushing.

This procedure will yeild a microscopic picture of any particular BAM, and is certainly proving handy in loosening up a case. Some of the questions may seem utterly ridiculous to you as an auditor, as you follow a given sequence, but remember that you have a different frame of reference and the PC might consider them very sensible indeed.

On rereading, I find that the above is definitely NOT CONCEPT ANALYSIS, but my own particular application of this approach to auditing. If you don't like this, please do not form an opinion of Concept Analysis until it has been more fairly presented to you.

7. Marty, my favorite preclear, hit "Construction" the other night. Construction is our name for the awareness of having been the architect of your own body. This fascinating session started when she began thinking about her parietal fontanel -- the front soft spot on the skull of an infant. She had started to pull "this one over here," as she expressed it; but that didn't feel right and besides it hurt, so she took "that other one and pulled it over a little, tiny bit at a time."

From this, she became aware of earlier moments of awareness, during which she had to consciously decide whether various parts of her should grow "this way or that way." She said, at one point, it felt sort of like picking up the individual genes for inspection and accepting or rejecting them in accordance with a sense of fitness or rightness.

This may sound a bit dreamy to those who have not yet had the thrill of encountering that particular area of thought; as a matter of fact, this auto-architectural concept is one that Marty had never previously considered logical -- until she hit it herself.

When the session was over, she asked me accordingly, "Why didn't you ever tell me about that?" "Oh, well," I replied trying to wriggle out of a tough spot, "you built yourself so beautifully that I assumed you already knew more about it than I."

It is particularly tough on me when I hit mistakes I made during the formative stages. Some of them, the far reaching ones, seem so terribly tragic; I am overwhelmed with remorse and self-pity at times, when I discover that I could have arranged things so much better in the light of present knowledge. This manifestation I attribute to later locks on the incident -- the rest of the chain -- so that I am accumulating a binful of useful material to run out at my leisure.

8. Does anyone know Dot & Bill Swygard and Tully retracted their communicators? This whole business puzzles me very much. I get the impression that they don't want us to know the reason, probably for our own good. It may be rude to inquire further, but nevertheless I, for one, would very much like to know the whole story.

9. Just had my attention called to the fact that I am the guilty party in delaying Fortune's December circular letter, and have immediately revised my bookkeeping system to avoid a recurrence. Will forward to McMillan immediately. Returning from my last trip the other day, I inadvertently filed it with the regular communications and passed the works on to the growing circle of people who, besides myself, are enjoying the output of the network. So while it was delayed, it was not idle, and drew a lot of comment.

10. And speaking of the Network, I certainly have enjoyed the fables and cartoon, particularly the last one, along with the solid matter. One suggestion: cryptic and/or incomplete comments pertaining to other network contributions would probably be far more useful in the form of a circular letter -- or even appended to the first circular letter that happens along.

When I stretch out to read the latest, and see something like this as an isolated paragraph:

7a. Ronshwilder #3, paragraph 2 -- Yes, but don't you think it would be better if you considered the life-death dichotomy as well?

I feel frustrated; I either haven't got the time or inspiration to look up the original reference, or I lent it to someone who is out of town for a week. Perhaps if you jotted down on a separate sheet:

Comments on Ronshwilder's theory of ultimate-infinity processing:

If the life-death dichotomy were included, the zero-point would be in the middle. This ~~xxxx~~ would permit the preclear to travel either way without getting stuck in a limbo.

And added this sheet to the next cilet that came by, the results would be far ~~xxxx~~ more creative as far as I'm concerned.

Hey, that "cilet" just slipped out; that is a US Gov't abbreviation for circular letter, which might be handy if you refer to them such.

11. I have been very much interested in Kitzelman's output. Send some money or an ~~xxx~~ inquiry to the Institute of Integration, 201 Clayton Street, San Francisco, California, if you want to find out more about it.

He is an exceptionally lucid writer (Marty & I call him "Hyaline Kitzelman") ((we thought this sounded more respectful than "Crystal Kitzel")). We find an excellent degree of agreement with him.

Some of you Easterners who have heard horrible tales about this fellow, stemming from the original foundation, would be well advised to evaluate your BAM. At one time I was quite convinced that the man was dangerous; at that time I ~~xxxx~~ hadn't read a single thing he wrote nor talked to a single proponent.

After reading one or two of his articles in Arclight, however, I corresponded with him and have entirely revised my opinion, which had been based on malicious untruths. I hope that hasn't happened to you; I happened to land right in the middle of a particularly nasty Dianetics family squabble, which resulted in the formation of several new groups.

It is my firm belief that a small number of narrow-minded people in Dianetics have set back the advancement of that science by years. I most sincerely hope it doesn't happen again.

But I started to tell you about Kitzelman, and got side-tracked. For the benefit of those who have not seen the papers he has been sending out from San Francisco, I would like to quote an early one; this is an imaginary conversation (I am presuming -- it may be a real one) illustrative of C-integration or C-therapy:

Q. First of all, consider this body (of yours), the physical organism, the person we see. Is it secure?

A. No.

Is insecurity pleasant or unpleasant?

Insecurity is unpleasant

Now a thing which is insecure and therefore bound up with unpleasantness -- is it worth clinging to, claiming, owning, identifying with?

No!

In regard to a thing which is insecure, uncertain, subject to change without notice, irrevocably bound up with disappointments, loss and unhappiness -- is it proper to say of such a thing "this is what I am", "this is mine" or "this is my Self?"

No.

Is there any physical phenomenon which is secure, fixed, safe, certain, permanent?

I can't think of any.

Is there any combination of physical phenomena which is secure, safe and certain?

I don't ~~know~~ know of any.

Now consider that which is insecure, unsafe, uncertain, unreliable, subject to change without notice -- is it a fit basis for happiness?

I don't see how it can be!

Is it fit basis for expectations, hopes, clingings, beliefs, identifications and serenity of mind?

I'm afraid not.

To expect security in the insecure, to look for happiness in the inevitably disappointing, to identify with the unreliable -- is this practical or futile?

It appears to be futile.

Will it lead to unhappiness?

Yes.

Now let us consider mental phenomena -- feelings, ideas, abilities and awareness. Consider the mass of feelings -- pleasant, painful, happy, unhappy, and neutral. Are any of them secure, safe, always to be counted on, reliable?

No.

Are not feelings experienced in regard to anything changeable, unpredictable, subject to change without notice?

I'm afraid so.

Is there anything that you enjoy today and can be sure that you will be able to enjoy it tomorrow, or next year, or ten years from now?

No.

Can security be found in any feeling, or in any combination of feelings?

No.

Are feelings, then, a fit basis for happiness, expectations, hopes, clingings, beliefs, identifications, and serenity of mind?

They can't be!

Does preoccupation with feelings lead to unhappiness?

It must.

How about ideas? Are they secure?

Now we are getting somewhere! Plato and other philosophers taught that pure ideas are eternal. Certainly the rules of logical thinking and statements like $2 + 2 = 4$ are eternal truths. The principles of religion are absolute truths.

Can you actually experience what is pure, eternal, or absolute? Is it part of your experience that pure ideas are eternal? Are the rules of logical thinking eternally at your command? Is "2 plus 2 equals 4" eternal for you? Although the principles of religion may be absolute, is your ability to know and understand them indestructible or absolute?

Ask me about ideas again, please.

How about ideas? Are they secure?

For me they aren't. Maybe somewhere outside of my experience there are pure and indestructible ideas or feelings or physical phenomena, but as they appear in my experience all physical phenomena, all feelings and all ideas are insecure, unsafe and subject to change without notice. That $2 + 2 = 4$ is clear to me now, but if I am injured or sick or mentally unbalanced, I may no longer know what two plus two equals. I see that all ideas are insecure.

Is there any combination of ideas that is secure?

No.

Then what will be the consequence of preoccupation with ideas, theories, beliefs, memories, and speculations?

Unhappiness.

Are such things worth claiming or owning or building hopes on?

No.

What about abilities? Are they secure?

No. I do not have any ability today that I can be sure of having tomorrow, or next year.

Should we rely upon abilities, then?

No.

Then what about being preoccupied with abilities?

It will lead to unhappiness.

Now consider consciousness, awareness. Is it secure?

No. There is no kind of consciousness that I have today that I can be sure of having tomorrow, or next week. My awareness of any thing is subject to change without notice. Nor is there any secure combination of varieties of consciousness. I see that I cannot rely upon consciousness of any kind as a basis for building happiness, and I see that even to cling to consciousness will result in unhappiness.

Well, then! We have considered five kinds of phenomena -- the mass of (physical) appearances, the mass of feelings, the mass of ideas, the mass of abilities, and the mass of awareness. Does this include all phenomena?

It includes all phenomena which are part of my experience, I think.

Then let us be more general. Is any phenomenon secure?

No.

Is any combination of phenomena secure?

No.

Is anything insecure a fit basis for happiness?

No.

Now, a thing which is insecure and not a fit basis for happiness -- isn't worth clinging to, is it?

No, but -- if I may say so -- isn't this all very negative?

How ~~xxx~~ so? Is it negative to know where happiness lies, and how to reach it?

Happiness! It seems to me that I have learned only what causes unhappiness.

Well, what is the cause of unhappiness?

Let me think. Unhappiness is a consequence of expecting security where there is no security, of seeking happiness where disappointment is certain, of regarding something as "mine" or as "my Self" or as "me", and, in general, of being preoccupied with phenomena of any kind.

If this is so, what procedure leads to happiness? If you know the one, do you not know the other?

Why, I guess that's so, isn't it? How shall I say it? Let me see. How's this? Happiness is a consequence of not expecting security where there is no security, of not seeking happiness where disappointment is inevitable, of not regarding anything as "mine" or as "myself" or as "me", and, in general, of not being preoccupied with phenomena of any kind.

How will you go about doing this?

I don't know -- it still seems so negative to me. If I can't regard anything as "mine", how can I own property?

Is it the fact of owning property, or the attitude of clinging, which causes unhappiness?

Oh! Then it is all right to legally own property, as long as I am not possessive about it. But won't that make me careless?

Which is more likely to make you careless -- thinking of property as safe and secure, or seeing it as insecure and perishable?

Why, seeing insecurity makes one more effective!

As any banker can tell you. Does all this seem as negative as it did?

Not any more! Happiness doesn't depend on external actions at all; it depends on not clinging.

Does happiness consist in looking at life with rose-colored glasses?

No; happiness involves knowing and seeing things as they really are -- especially in regard to the action of time.

All this should give you some idea of the nature of C-integration, which might be described as "integration by means of studying and observing the action of time".

Where can I obtain further instruction in C-integration?

The subject is discussed ~~ix~~ in the E-Therapy book under the heading of E-minus, where many references are given.....A great deal of C-Therapy is available in my tape-recorded lectures, seventeen of which have been prepared at the time of this writing. Each tape contains two hours of lecture (seven-inch reels, speed 3 3/4" per second), and will be sent to you for \$6. (You may have a tape or two on a loan or trial basis, without charge.....Good introductory tapes are #12, #16, #13, #9 and #11 (in that order).

Wallach here again. This man also expounds on more familiar subjects, also very creditably.

Simply got to tie this thing off someplace, or I'll have to send it by express.

PAU

Wally