

THE
Communicator

SUPPLEMENT N° 3

APRIL, 1953

THE COMMUNICATORS
PUBLISHERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Interview with H. R. (Wing) Angell.1
November 17, 1952

Excerpts from a Tape Letter From Wing.15
March, 1953

Negative Effort Processing.16
Wing Angell, March, 1953

Experimental Technique.17
John Morse

Transcribed and published with the permission
and cooperation of Wing and John and of Gordon
Beckstead, of the Psychological Research
Foundation, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona

* * * * *

THE COMMUNICATOR SUPPLEMENT NO. 3

Edited and Published

by

THE COMMUNICATORS
1598 West Alameda Avenue
Denver 19, Colorado

Price 75¢

INTERVIEW WITH H. R. (WING) ANGELL
November 17, 1952

(Tape #23 in the Tape Lending Library of the
Psychological Research Foundation, Phoenix, Arizona)

Wing: The name is Harris Richardson Angell; born, 1914, September 4, in _____, Illinois. The way I got here was a very devious way, but a lot of fun.

Q Can you give us some detail in terms of processing hours and techniques and so on?

W Processing started right after the publishing of the first book and continued practically constantly for about 500 hours worth. A good deal of it, latterly, was self-processing. This may come as a terrible shock to some people, but, believe me, it works.

The purpose of this tape has not been made known to me, and I don't particularly care, but I think we can have a lot of fun with all these people in the room if any of you would like to go ahead and ask questions. Probably work a lot better than for me to try to give a lecture. I will tell you to start with that practically anything I say is a doggone lie until you go and prove it yourself. Don't believe anything I tell you until you know it's true for you.

Q What particular techniques have you been using of late?

W Those with the most effect have been Perry Chapdelaine's repeater-integrator technique and his counter-emotion technique, plus Ross Lamoreaux's little invention which he calls, "Inflow." I don't know how widely he's disseminated information about inflow. I have disseminated it quite widely around the Phoenix Scientological Universal organization out here, and we've had a lot of fun with it. It simply consists of feeling or imagining yourself as the center of the entire universe and feeling that from all directions and all MEST are coming items of attention -- a constant, steady inflow from all sources. The theory being that only the things that you try to thrust back, stop, deflect, or evade can hurt you. Now this sounds like a very simple little thing. If you feel or imagine that everything is flowing in to you, and I can assure you that unless you're a lot different from what I have been, you're going to feel as if the whole universe is about to collapse around your ears, there will be all kinds of things that you will want to thrust back and stop and deflect and evade. These things will be mainly counter-emotion. Let 'em come on through. Let 'em flow. For me, it gave me about the roughest 28 hours I have ever had in my life. I came out of it kinda feeling shaken and haggard. But I also knew that I had won.

Q Did you have an auditor in this period?

W No.

Q Was it a constant 28 hours?

W Yes. Day and night. I then continued it for a total of 4

days. And now it's more or less automatic -- goes on all the time. Only enough thrusting out to get people to pass you the salt is necessary. Just inflow. All the time -- 100% of the time, regardless of what happens. You find after using these techniques -- at least I found after using these techniques -- that everything is enjoyable.

Perry Chapdelaine made the comment to me the other night that he thought that Hubbard's idea that survival was the main goal of man could be changed a little bit -- that pleasure was the main goal of man and that survival was the way of achieving it. I think I can agree with this. More questions?

Q Is this interview a pleasure?

W I'm having the time of my life -- this is the biggest game of all.

Q What is the state of your recalls at present?

W Hubbard made the remark some time ago that there are about 59 perceptics, and since then some others have been discovered. Some of these I have and some of them I don't. As far as complete recalls are concerned: as a recording instrument, I don't know. I haven't gone through it that way. But I do know that any information I want out of the past, I have. And that if I want to dig into it and do it, I can recall word-for-word conversations, that I can see any sight that I've ever seen, and so forth. Feel any emotion that I've ever felt.

Yes, and let's straighten out something on a semantic level. Let's not talk about a "state"; let's talk about an "attitude." Because, believe me, that's all it is. Just an attitude. Hubbard put a chart out -- in big block letters across the front of it -- across the top of it -- it says, "HUBBARD CHART OF ATTITUDES." That man knew what he was talking about. It's attitude all the way.

Q Do you have complete awareness?

W Yes, this is true. The body awareness and the extension of awareness outside the body are both very great. I'm not enough of a medical man to label all the parts of my body, but I know they exist, and I know how they function. They work very nicely.

Q Prior to this particular state, how long had you been working with these techniques?

W Approximately 5 weeks -- to date. Prior to that I have had degrees of this condition since last March. This thing has been growing. I recognized I was "there" last March, and so did Smokey. Almost exactly the same time. And it's been a weeding-out process ever since -- finding those last little trickles with emotional charge, re-evaluating.....

There's something else that's interesting: you can re-evaluate a whole lifetime every day. Every time you pick up a little new information it throws new light on the entire past. If you want to concern yourself that way with the past.

Q Do you?

W No, I don't. I'm having too much fun with the present and the future. It's enjoyment. It's enjoyment that transcends anything I thought was possible. When I read Hubbard's first book and got his description of "clear", I thought if I could ever get half that -- matter of fact, I said this: "If I could ever get half of that, I'd be perfectly satisfied." I have that, and I have a lot more. I didn't know what Hubbard was talking about. But I don't have what Hubbard described. I've got something of my own, and it's constantly changing.

People say to me, "Well, how do you feel about this?" And I feel about this at this moment in such-and-such a way. Five minutes from now, I feel entirely different about it. Change ----- human beings are so resistant to change! And this is a condition of change. A condition of wanting to change -- wanting to change myself and wanting to change for the better my environment.

Q To what extent is the attitude you have now similar to the attitude you might have had as a very young child?

W Let's put it this way: that to a degree I've always had it. I ran out all the agreements to be less than I knew I could be in order to survive.

Q Did you have what we call "E.S.P." as a child?

W Let's put it this way: I had a whale of a lot more in the way of perceptic ability than I have had in between times. I'm still working on that, Gordon. Communication seems to be the biggest problem right now. You want to communicate something. You're thinking on an instantaneous basis and your verbal communication is slow, so you think of about 800 things that you might say between the time that you first start to say something and the time you get your words out. That 800, by the way, is not a flat statement -- it's just symbolic.

Q Do you have anything in the way of perceptics now that you did not have as a child?

W Mmmmm, no. Not precisely. A very good researcher down in Tampa, Florida, with the Tampa Bay Dianetic Research Institute, Morgan Morey, wrote a paper in which he mentioned a perceptic about which I knew nothing and which I think most people have on a very limited basis, which he said could be developed to a point where you could use it all the time or shut it off any time you wanted to. This was known in the psychological field as "memory of the present." All it is is that feeling when something happens that all this has happened before. You know about it. Sometimes you can even get a cycle ahead of it so it becomes memory of the future. This I have always been able to do in a very, very limited way. Probably because of random factors. I don't think there is much possibility of ever predicting the future except on a basis of maximum probability.

Q What has been your field before you came into dianetics?

W Mostly advertising and radio and television. I'm going to remain with dianetics and scientology at least for a while. I still have enough regard for people so I want 'em to feel this way, too -- it's really wonderful!

Q Do you feel that you, as an auditor, do a much better job now?

W I know I can. I'm getting results in a matter of days now that I couldn't get in months a year ago. This is partially what people are calling nowadays, "reading other people's facsimiles." Sometimes you can do this very, very clearly. And, of course, it helps. If you can provide the next line in the play for the preclear, you really get results. That may be the very thing he was trying to hide from himself.

The main thing that any preclear has to do is do it himself. No auditor can do anything but provide information and a little persistence, particularly when running apathy, where persistence is notably lacking. The important thing for any preclear, though, is that he does these things himself. To start with, he makes all these agreements to be less than he can be, and he has to unravel that thing himself. It can be done very rapidly. All he has to do is to have the willingness to be utterly and absolutely honest with himself. I tell my preclears, "You can lie to me, refuse to answer, evade me -- do anything you want to -- as long as you are honest with yourself."

Another thing I tell them: "You have never, ever, done anything wrong. It's impossible for a human being to do anything wrong as far as I know." It's only when you start riding your donkey backwards, looking back with this new information that says, "Hey, you shoulda done this yesterday", that you come up with a mistake. And you blame yourself for it, which is a beautiful squirrel-cage. I've worked with people who've been in the same squirrel-cage for 23 years; I'm working with one now. She's not in that squirrel-cage any more, and by the end of this week she'll go away a very happy individual -- and after all, what are we trying to do? Make people happy. And it's easy to make people happy.

Q How do you see facsimiles in other people?

W Sometimes I do, and sometimes I don't. Ordinarily not. I just have an awareness of what they're doing and what comes next. This may be partly due to processing an awful lot of people, because most people's difficulties are fundamentally the same, although different in details.

There is no human aberration that is not based upon interpersonal relationships. Every human being that has ever become aberrated, that I have been able to observe or read about or hear about, has done so because he was seeking approval. Lacking approval, he tried to get help; lacking help, he tried to get sympathy; lacking sympathy, any darn kind of attention will do.

Q Would you say that your attitude is one of unrestrained enjoyment?

W I'd hate to run into semantic difficulties on that, and I don't think we have to. Yes, it's unrestrained enjoyment. Look at Hubbard's Attitude Chart, or his earlier chart. Not as a scale from low to high, but as a list of operational patterns. People get stuck in an operational pattern -- anger, fear, apathy, embarrassment, all kinds of things, but they get stuck on 'em. Pain or heavy counter-emotion thrown at them, or their own heavy emotion, leads them through to survival by acting in such and such a fashion. So from there on they are, as we say, "stuck" at this particular operational pattern.

If you think that there is a low and a high, just look at the number of people that are in institutions today because they are stuck at the level of exuberance, which on the chart, is supposed to be very high. Can you think of anything more non-optimum than being exuberant 100% of the time, under all circumstances? It's not a matter of low and high; it's a matter of where are you stuck operationally? What do you always use to overcome an emergency?

Q Would it be possible for some of us here, if we knew that we could, to assume this attitude without going through certain forms of processing?

W I think it would be a darn good idea for each person here, and for each person that hears this tape to try these three techniques: Complete inflow, Perry's Repeater-Integrator technique (Described in "Translation Hypothesis", COMMUNICATOR SUPPLEMENT NO. 1, p. 11), and the third one, which is merely finding any incident containing heavy counter-emotion, either thrown at you or thrown at somebody else valuable to you in your presence. Then just sit there and feel it and wear it out. Find out how you do this and what you use it for.

Believe me, you never make a motion that doesn't have a use. I have a big scar on the left cheek. I've never done anything about this much. It's about half the size it was 6 months ago. It was a glaring, fire-house red, and a good deal of that's gone. But to me it doesn't make any difference. I've been asked, "Well, if you're in that condition, why don't you repair that thing?" I will. But I've had some things that I've had more fun with. I've got three brand-new teeth in my mouth. This is a parlor trick. It has no value whatever because I was getting along quite well without those teeth -- but I've got three new teeth just for the fun of it.

Q How much have they grown out now?

W Practically completely.

Q How long did it take?

W Oh, four or five months.

Q Had they been pulled out?

W Yeah, they had been pulled out. They're back

Q Do you think anything could be done about repairing a tooth which has fillings or holes in it?

W Yes. You have a choice. You can either repair it or jerk it out and grow a new one.

Q Not to change the subject, but are you aware of the various habits or expressions that you have picked up and are using now? Are you aware of them when you use them, or their identities, how you're using them?

W The phraseology that I am using now is a combination of an awful lot of facsimiles from an awful lot of people. I have great imitative ability. For instance, I think that each and every one of us knows Ross Lamoreaux. Mmmhmm. Yeah. I find with people who come out to the school for processing and for class work that this works real good (This is an excellent imitation of Ross Lamoreaux's tone, delivery, and style. Ed.) I can be Ross Lamoreaux. I can look like him. And I can talk like him. Mmmhmmmm.

Part of the fun is finding out all the things you can do that you couldn't do before, and then remembering when you could do them and shut them off.

Q Why shut them off?

W In order to survive.

Q Could you give us an example of how you did that? A specific incident?

W A specific incident where I shut something off? Mmmhmmmm. I think so.

Yeah, we used to have a dog when I was a child -- a big Airedale -- his name was Sandy. Sandy and I got along very well until one day he got overly affectionate at my behest and knocked me down. From then on I didn't communicate with Sandy. I was afraid of him, because I was barely able to walk and he was taller than I was. I picked up an awful lot of stuff and hung it on that, about big things being frightening. But that's where it started. As a matter of fact, I was afraid of all dogs for a number of years after that, and finally got over it -- or suppressed it.

Q I'd like to ask about control centers, rehabilitation of control centers, for you.

W Again, communication interferes, Gordon. The rehabilitation of control centers merely means to me getting the mind/body into a unit. Everything has been separated and scattered and been out of communication with portions of your body -- you shut down awareness. It's just a matter of opening up all communication channels. I don't think that one can say "control centers," except on a very limited nervous system basis, because it's all one unit. And don't ask me where it's controlled from, because it's controlled from any point

that it's necessary to control it at that particular moment. Of course your brain is your switchboard.

Q What would be the answer to the question, "Where are YOU?" -- as a location?

W Everywhere.

Q Not just in this skin envelope, but throughout the universe?

W Right.

Q But concentrated in one spot? Would you say that?

W I am willing to say that, but I can see that it isn't so. I feel that it is so at this particular moment.

Q What about your service facsimile? Did you have something that you would call a service facsimile?

W Yeah. I sure did. It was a combination of very bad eyesight -- I wore very thick glasses -- and a wonderful lie-factory. I got out of more trouble by telling untruths than anybody you've ever seen before in your life.

Q Was it helpful in selling business tips?

W Oh, very. Yes, indeed!

Q How long ago did you take off your glasses?

W It's been a year. Those things -- those physical things came fast. I haven't sustained a physical injury since a year ago last January second. It's almost two years. And I haven't had an illness, no matter how slight, since a year ago last August eighth. I had a slight cold. I found out that early that there are ways of solving one's problems besides getting hurt and getting sick.

By the way, that getting hurt was a portion of the service facsimile. A very strong portion. My body has been a mass of scars from one injury after another.

Q When did you agree to this particular pattern?

W It got me lots of sympathy, Gordon. When I did shut down awareness and get really hurt, then the flood-gates of sympathy really opened for me, and from then on I used it. You asked me how that happened -- I'd been given a bicycle, and I had, I thought, learned to ride it. I was very confident. I was told I shouldn't ride it in the street -- everyone knows that that is a restriction one should not put on a child. Anyway -- I was riding down a hill and a man was coming up the hill in a model T Ford. I started for him, and I couldn't steer that bicycle for anything in the world. He saw what was happening and pulled over to the curb and stopped, and I ran into him. And it hurt me -- and it scared him. He gave me oceans of sympathy, put

me in his model T and rushed me home; insisted on carrying me up the front walk, although I was perfectly able to do it under my own power. And here I was in this guy's arms, and he was white as a sheet. My mother came to the door and said, "What happened?"

And he said, "I ran over your son!"

He hadn't done that. That was where Mother started to get white as a sheet and turn on sympathy. This was very effective; and, strangely enough, most of the things that have happened to me have been on bicycles. Have I stayed off bicycles? No. This scar on my face is the result of another bicycle accident.

Q On some level were you aware of what you were doing?

W This is a real rough question, but the answer is "Yes." I was aware of what I was doing. The mechanism I sued for getting injured was a very simple one: just ignore all the information I had. In the processing I have done on other people who have sustained physical injuries, I find out that this is the universal thing. Most people who get hurt are ignoring information which if they would take into consideration would save them injury.

Q When you give a time, if you hadn't looked at your watch or hadn't been around a clock all day, would you still be able to give a pretty accurate time?

W Sometimes I'm five minutes off. Time's a tool, not a manifestation -- a tool.

Q Can you tell when people are lying to you?

W Usually. Mmmhmmm. Some of them are real good at this. But they forget they've got an expert at it talking to them.

Q I've heard that you are very sensitive to emotions and counter-emotions. Is that correct?

W Most of the time I don't realize that they exist, as I still operate on inflow. In other words, it's like swinging at someone that isn't there. Out at the institute, every once in a while somebody will come to me and say, "Gee, you handled that situation beautifully yesterday," and I say, "What situation?"

"Oh, when so-and-so was taking those wild swings at you."

This is the first news I've had of it. I didn't know anyone was attacking me!

Q How much do you sleep every night?

W Depends on how much I have to do. I've gone for months on two to three hours a night. Recently, I've been sleeping a little more. Been a lot more pleasant to sleep and I haven't had as much work

and research to do. I slept five hours and a half last night, and I slept off and on almost all day a week ago last Sunday.

Q Do you have any dreams when you sleep now?

W No. It's been a long, long time since I've had a dream.

Q What is theta for you?

W Everything.

Q And MEST?

W Everything.

Q So theta and MEST are the same?

W No. MEST is just another manifestation of theta as far as I know.

Q Then the unity is theta and you divide it up into MEST and what?

W MEST. Let's put it this way: the material universe, as the scientists say, is reducible into energy.

Q Do you feel that you have complete and total recall -- no omissions in your life? This includes how far back of birth -- before birth?

W About 6 hours previous to conception.

Q What about past lives, genetic track, and so on?

W Let's leave that one out, shall we? There's an awful lot of controversy. I would rather not jump astraddle that controversy. I have some very definite opinions about it.

Q Would you answer a question: did you have to run any of this material, whether we accept it as real or not?

W Put it this way: I have run some of this material.

Q Do you feel that you have got birth.....(unintelligible on the tape. ed.) ?

W No. I ran birth as birth -- the hard way. As a matter of fact, I ran it three times. I ran it very early in processing, pulled a lot off it then; thought I had it. Then I had to go back and review it again about a year later. And about two months ago I ran the rest of the efforts off, found a couple of new postulates, blew a little more emotion, and then reviewed and reviewed and reviewed until I was absolutely positive that all the feelings connected with birth were completely gone.

GORDON A question was asked about the function of the vagus nerve.

W Apparently the vagus nerve is the trigger for the involuntary nervous system. At some time previous to birth, usually very shortly before, it activates the breathing apparatus and the digestive system, increases the activity of the endocrine system, turns on the things like the sweat glands, and closes forever the valve through which the combined blood of mother and child were moving, puts the heart on a different beating basis from what it had been, although it had been beating previous to the birth, of course, and after birth remains as an emergency control system. This is why when the elevator drops out from under you too fast you feel it in the pit of the stomach. An emergency has arisen -- one of the fundamental emergencies that we know about is falling. Also it seems to open areas that would ordinarily be occluded in cases of severe emergency. This is the mechanism, I think, by which people are able to say, "My whole life flashed before me in an instant." Apparently it's a search on the part of the mind for some sort of data to get out of this situation -- to best handle the emergency.

GORDON A question of whether the vagus nerve during an emergency generates extra energy.

W Oh, definitely. You can feel it. Yeah, you can feel it do this. That hard knot in the pit of the stomach is it.

Q Is that the generating mechanism there?

W Apparently it is. I'm still investigating this.

Q Would it be possible for the purposes of this tape that the vagus nerve could be more or less pin-pointed in its place?

W No, because it extends from the brain to the solar plexus and then has branch-offs into the various abdominal organs.

Q And in feeling, you could trace it all the way? You could feel just where it goes, could you?

W Yeah. You could feel where it goes. Ordinarily, in case of fear, I have not felt what some people feel -- a constriction of the throat, and a sort of prickly feeling I have had described to me at the back of the neck -- a sort of hackles-rising feeling. I have had, however, very sweaty palms, intense tightening-up of the entire body, followed by trembling immediately afterward. But apparently fear does not manifest itself in each organism the same way. There are differences between people. Some people's mouths get very dry, for instance. I've had that described to me.

Q As to techniques, what do you think of Black and White?

W We have some hundreds of techniques, Charlie, and all of them are based on the same thing: teaching people to focus and unfocus attention.

Q As to total reduction of an incident in this fashion, what do you see?

W I don't know because my recalls when I found out about Black and White were good enough so that it was difficult for me to run Black and White. I bought Mr. Hubbard's statement that people don't use Black and White very well when they have good recalls. I've done some of this, but with a dearth of material because I was pretty well along when I found out about Black and White. I find this: that in severe traumatic incidents, such as birth, for purposes of the processing I do, nothing takes the place of good, old-fashioned effort-postulate processing -- effort, emotion, thought. And best of all, I like these three techniques for quick reduction that I've already described. They work! I've had a chance to use them on several preclears since using them myself, and the results are astounding.

Actually, you find some people who will not do it. They'll do it for a while, but it gets too rough -- you see, the physical manifestations of fear and rejection, intense anger, and so forth, are the things that most people have been fighting all their lives. An individual begins to, for some reason or other, feel the physical manifestations of fear and he gets up and goes to a movie, or he turns the radio on and asks his wife to dance, or he calls up a crowd of people and goes and plays poker. If he'd just sit in the middle of that thing and find out how he does it and what he uses it for and then continue to keep it turned on until he can no longer feel it, can't turn it on at all -- I don't mean get to a point where he can stop it, turn it off and on at will, but to the point where it's absolutely erased, it does something that nothing else will do. It teaches the preclear that he has absolutely nothing in the world to fear -- and the only thing that he has ever feared is the physical sensation of fear. And this is true of anger, apathy, and all the rest of 'em.

Q Do you ever use the emotion of anger, fear, or antagonism to get something done in your environment?

W I haven't yet, but I can see where it would be possible. I do quite a bit of that out around the Institute. I see somebody that has something I know is all ready to run, and this person has, for purposes of his own, ignored the fact that it needs running, and I am not above pushing buttons -- but I will hang around to pick up the pieces.

Q When you project a particular emotion, do you feel the emotion inside yourself, or is it purely an act?

W Either way. I can feel it or not. Some people you don't have to do anything more than imitate a glare and they get all upset.

Q If you do it without any facial expression at all, would it communicate?

W I haven't tried that, but I've had it communicated to me. I've had people that were throwing counter-emotion at me and I became

aware of it, even though they were carefully hiding it from me.

Q Some of these people whom we might call "clear" were nevertheless afflicted with some bodily difficulty. I thought some time back that these people had never really run out these things so they had not achieved the perfection which we can achieve now with more data.

W Most of those people were very, very good at one particular thing and pretty well messed up in other ways. You take Beethoven and his deafness.

Q Do you think there's a possibility that we can communicate throughout the country and even, perhaps, beyond our borders, what is being accomplished so that many can do so? Or are the differences so great in people that they're just not acceptable?

W No. I think that this ought to be done and I think it can be done. I'm interested in this from the standpoint of recognition -- very full recognition -- of the methods that people use to control each other on an international, business and interpersonal basis. You start trying to control your environment when you are a little tiny baby, and before. And the measure of your success is the measure of how many times you succeed. The measure of your failure is how many times you postulated that you failed. It's just a matter of control. I don't say that there's anything wrong with controlling your environment. This would be ridiculous. But I do say that some of the methods used are very ridiculous. I am speaking of such things as service facsimiles. There are alternatives.

Q I was wondering if there is any hope of any large segment of our population achieving this state of being, of taking the time required, believing that it can be done, working at it.

W How many people do you know who want to change? Really want to? I don't mean the ones that say they want to. I mean the ones that really want to. For instance: the preclear comes to you. You ask him, "What do you want your processing to do for you?" and he tells you something utterly ridiculous like growing new hair or shedding his glasses, or something of that sort. These things are so blamed unimportant. But as you process him he sees new horizons ahead of him. I see new horizons ahead of me. If you had complete success, you might as well die -- you have no goals. Most of the things that are wrong with your environment are your reaction to them.

I like to use this example: two people talking about anchovies. One of them says, "They taste horrible! They're awful!" And the other one says, "Man, what're you talking about? Anchovies are delicious!"

And neither one of them is speaking of anchovies. They're talking about their own reactions to anchovies.

Find the pattern upon which you automatically react with a response to a stimulus, and you've got it made. Then you can react or not, just as you please.

Q It is a little difficult for me to conceive of very many individuals, taking those of my own experience, who will actually take time out for processing.

W I have been guilty of this same thing. There have been occasions when I was much too busy making money, or making love, or making something or other difficult for myself, to make things easy for myself. Actually, you can do so much more so much faster and so much better after you've run out all this gunk. Anything that you want to do now, you can do 100% or more better.

Q Could there be any excuse for delaying this?

W I don't know of any excuse for delaying it. When I find somebody that's delaying, I have a standard question that usually works: "What are you afraid of? What are you going to lose?"

Q Do you find the basicness of your goals any different now than a year ago?

W No, Charlie. This is a surprising thing. All of my life I have wanted to do things that would make me operate better and I wanted to do as much for other people as I could to make them operate better. When I say, "Make them operate better," I don't mean make them operate the way I want them to operate. I mean to make them operate better along the paths that they want to operate on. Now I have the first goal under my belt. I'm operating better.

Q What might be the prime goal yet that you wish to work toward?

W It's a great big one, but it isn't out of sight. I'd like to see the entire human population as happy as I am. There's no necessity for being any other way. It is not necessary for people to be miserable.

Q How would one proceed to achieve this large goal?

W I am hoping that some sort of geometric progression will take place -- that we can do enough processing with enough people so that they can adopt the same attitude, or even a better one, and do it for five or ten other people, who will then do it for five or ten other people. I don't know whether this could be done or not. I have high hopes of it. I think it probably can.

Q After these three techniques that you mentioned, would it make much difference in the technique, aside from persistence, even with other techniques?

W No! Charlie, these are not the only techniques. These are just different manifestations of the one technique -- fixing and unfix-

ing attention. Lock scanning, effort processing, engram running, grief discharge, and all the rest of it, is just a series of manifestations of learning how to fix and unfix attention, and so are inflow, integrator -- repeater-integrator -- techniques and what Perry calls his counter-emotion processing.

Q Do you think it will ever be necessary for you to lie?

W Can you think of a higher concept than being able to lie in a good cause without a feeling of guilt?

Q I made an experiment for about a year to find out if there was a time when I had to tell even a white lie. And I found it was largely a matter of not taking the trouble to analyze the situation or not being intelligent enough to respond to something in some other way. That I really didn't at any time have to tell an out-and-out lie. What constitutes a lie?

W Something that to you is not so.

Q An attempt to deceive without consent.

W Mmmhmmm. That's a good definition, too.

But the whole thing is -- let's make a lot of people happy in any way that we can make them happy, by any techniques that we can use to make them happy. We've all said that we're not trying to get people well; we're not trying to do this, that, and the other thing. If it is necessary in order for a person to be happy to get over his physical disorders, they'll disappear just as soon as he finds out that he has other methods of getting the things that he wants and of getting out of things that he doesn't want. It'll eliminate a good deal of this service facsimile, physical manifestation stuff. And make it easier to run it.

Q A statement you made about people thinking about thought is undoubtedly a popular fallacy is validly explained in the repeater-integration in that when we repeat a word.....

W Yeah.

Q Eventually you feel it in yourself, throughout yourself.....

W Right.

Q And even itself.

W That's right, and when we're not on tape for purposes of general public use, I'll get you off to one side and I'll give you a prime example of how you can prove this to yourself -- how powerful words can be. I don't think any of us have ever realized how much meaning we, ourselves, how much action we, ourselves, put into language.

Q Do you have any last words before the tape runs out?

W Only this: scattered around the country are a lot of dianetic and scientology groups who are doing an awful lot of talking and not much doing. I can only say this -- and I'll try to get a pleading note into my voice if you wish -- DO SOMETHING! Anything! But do something!

(We have edited from the transcript commentary by Gordon Beckstead and Dwight Bulkley pertinent to the question of whether Wing is a bona-fide "clear." We, as Communicators, are not particularly interested in this aspect of the situation -- "clear" or not, Wing communicates data, attitudes and ideas which we want to help bring to you. Ed.)

EXCERPTS FROM A TAPE LETTER FROM WING
March, 1953

Hello, Communicators, this is Wing. Imagine yourself like this: you arise in the morning fresh and alert after sleeping three or four hours. Your plans for the day are fully integrated in your mind but sufficiently flexible to allow for random factors. Your breakfast is a delightful experience. Your body feels charged with limitless energy. You approach your day's work with relish and handle it easily and efficiently.

People come to you for help, and you know their need and fulfill it. You sense their emotional levels and thoughts before they put them into words. Your decisions are so automatically right that you don't even have to consider the possibility of their being wrong. You love everyone and everyone loves you.

The whole universe is a pageant of color and beauty, and there is nothing in it that you do not have the capacity to enjoy. You handle problems with ingenuity, efficiency, dexterity and minimal effort. A new decision, a new situation, everything, uninfluenced by mis-emotion, past decisions or wishful thinking.

Your body functions perfectly so that no discomfort or injury troubles you. Your mind eagerly seeks new interests, new paths of exploration, new goals. You spend a few minutes during the day testing and improving old abilities and developing new ones. You have any information in your experience instantly available to you. You integrate people, situations and things into your function by extracting data from them instead of mis-emotion, understanding instead of reaction, so that you can operate with or around them instead of in disharmony with them. You await with eagerness the things that tomorrow will bring and the things to be seen over the next hill.

That, to me, is optimum function now, with more ahead.

NEGATIVE EFFORT PROCESSING
From a tape letter from Wing, March, 1953

Here's a technique that you might try:

After you have your preclear so that most of the surface emotion is off the case, do this: I call it "negative effort processing."

Have the preclear on the couch feel his efforts not to move; not to be moved; not to let anything happen; not to do anything; his efforts to shut down pain; his efforts to shut off perceptics; his efforts not to display emotion, and a big, overall effort to hold these efforts in place.

Be prepared for anything when you do this, because in most preclears -- or let's say perhaps 70% -- this will result in unbalancing the carefully balanced tensions that he calls "relaxation", and it may result in something like this: your preclear may flip like a fresh-caught fish. He may go into a convulsion. This, of course, may be very frightening, and it will be up to the auditor to maintain his own balance and talk the preclear, coax the preclear gently through it.

This technique produces real relaxation in a preclear and at the same time does a lot toward developing body awareness. In the latter stages of it, while these efforts are being worked off, it's rather interesting to see a preclear who is all but putting his footprints on the ceiling discussing last night's date or his future plans with you while his body twitches violently.

Try it and let me know what you think of it. It may take several sessions to work this out. It may take as much as a week in ordinary two-hour sessions. Keep digging away, though, until all of these things disappear. You'll have a preclear who is brighter, better able to handle himself; with good body communication, and a new interest in life and a new interest in processing.

I've found this particularly valuable with some of these fifteen hundred hour cases who have had no results.

EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUE
by John Morse,
2618 Spaulding, Long Beach 4, Calif.

(Tape #25 in the Tape Lending Library of the
Psychological Research Foundation, Phoenix, Arizona)

This is John Morse, HDA, in Long Beach talking. This tape is in answer to a request by Gordon Beckstead that we inform you people of the results of some of the experimental work we have been doing here in this town. I hope you won't be too disappointed. The technique I am about to explain here is not new; it is a composite of some old techniques. The only difference is that they are of the "WOW!" type when it comes to results.

Our experiments started in 1950, rather late in the year, when a group of us were listening to Gene Benton, who was at that time chief auditor at the old Foundation. Gene was giving a lecture in Los Angeles and made this statement: "Dianetics is the art of asking intelligent questions." Our group took that up and since then we've been trying to ask intelligent questions. We have been questioning everything including, and specifically including, dianetics and scientology. We've been trying to investigate with open minds. The peculiar thing about it is the more we investigated these questions, the more questions came up. We questioned each new technique as it was given to us by the various groups throughout the country, including Hubbard and the Foundations, and in turn we found that we were getting some rather unusual answers.

We found, for instance, that in spite of what we said about them, each technique was not universally applicable. Some would work on some types of preclears, some would work on others. We tried this: we tried combining techniques. Sometimes they'd work O.K., sometimes not. Sometimes we got ourselves in some pretty good messes.

When the Axioms came out -- Hubbard's group of Axioms and Logics and Postulates, you know -- we started to question them. We found that most of them, in answer to our questions, were rather valid.

One particular axiom which we questioned was ARC. We fooled around a little bit, questioned it, and found some universally applicable things such as everyone was saying at the time. We tried using straight ARC as a technique on some preclears. Ooh! Wonderful! Improved rapidly.

Then they reached a plateau and from then on they did no improving whatsoever. It seemed rather peculiar. They became rather sensitive to things. If ARC wasn't exactly to their liking, they'd drop off that plateau and hit the bottom. We asked ourselves "Why?" If ARC was such a wonderful thing, why should people drop so low on the tone scale with a break in ARC? We questioned our preclears to try to find out about it. The almost universal answer to our questions about ARC was this: "We want ARC." Emphasis on that word "want." Questioning their answers, we decided that perhaps it was a compulsion. People had to have ARC. Well, if that's a compulsion, then it's aberrative. At least

that's the way we looked at it. It seemed peculiar that people had to have ARC in order to exist. We tried to work out a system at that time of getting rid of the compulsion towards wanting ARC. We had very poor results.

Later on, when Hubbard's "Fifteen Acts" came out in the Handbook for Preclears we started questioning the various things there.

We seemed to get some pretty good results working with those acts until one of us came across the particular act where we start working with sympathy. We got some remarkable results working with sympathy. Hmmm! Maybe we could work with sympathy and ARC! We tried it. We got partial results. What results we got seemed to be indicative of a possibly improved technique.

It seemed, when we questioned our preclears, that they wanted sympathy. Perhaps there was a connection there. People want ARC; they want sympathy. We experimented around. We tried chain scanning, chain scanning the sympathy out of the case. Some cases we got fair results; some cases negative. In one case we got what you might call medium-good results; but taking it all together, it seemed that our results were getting better all the time.

Earlier this year we began working with concepts. Then Hubbard's book came out -- you know, 8-80 -- and gave us the idea of "bracketing." We investigated and found that bracketing worked pretty good, but still results were not one hundred percent. We tried attention unit and black white; pretty good. Still some preclears didn't respond.

Then one day a group of us were discussing the situation and one of the members mentioned that he had combined bracketing and sympathy-running on a concept level and results seemed to be quite different from anything he'd gotten before. It gave us all a shot in the arm. We all got busy and tried it. After considerable work, qualifying, dropping this, adding that and the other thing, we finally found what appears to be a universally applicable technique. I say "appears to be;" we're not sure yet. We're still questioning.

This technique which I am saying, for the time being, is universally applicable, is a combination. It's a combination of concept-running with chain-scanning, bracked by sympathy, and ended --that is, the session will be ended -- by running a self-determinism deal, trying to break the decision along with the feeling of trying to hang onto the aberration that we're trying to run out.

I'll try to give you, in a few words here, how it works. The way I'll do it is to quote what I would be saying to a preclear during a session. In between these quotes I'll make comments.

First of all, in running a session, I would, of course, locate the particular aberration I'm trying to run out of the preclear.

Let's say, for instance try to get rid of arthritis out of the preclear. Now I ask the preclear to get the negative concept in regard to

arthritis. In other words, I would say to him, "Try to get the concept that you want arthritis." Of course the preclear is going to object and say, "But I don't want arthritis. That's what I've come here to get rid of." So I generally try to get an agreement with the preclear at this point to go along with me anyhow.

"Let's try it out and see what'll happen." And the preclear will generally be willing to go along with it, if nothing else, at least as an experiment.

I then say, after I've got this agreement, "Got the concept now?" And if he says, "Yes," I say, "Well, intensify it. Get it stronger. Really get that concept that you want arthritis." After getting an okay on that I'd say to the preclear, "Now think of how beautiful that concept is. Isn't that a beautiful thing to want arthritis?" Generally I'll get a chuckle or so at this point.

After the preclear gets that concept, I'll ask him to intensify that concept -- really get it strong -- really feel that wanting arthritis, having arthritis, is a beautiful concept.

Next thing I try to present to the preclear is something like this: Now consider how sad it is to have arthritis. It's a kind of a beautiful sadness." The sadness generally comes in when the preclear recognizes the fact that arthritis is aberrative to him. After the preclear has got this concept, the beautiful sadness of having arthritis, I would say something like this to him: "All right, now while you have this concept in your mind, consider the sympathy which you can give yourself in connection with this concept. And while you're considering this sympathy, kind of look over your life -- that is, scan your life -- for anything that comes in connection with it."

I would wait a minute or so, and sometimes the preclear will have some questions; sometimes he won't. If he has questions, I attempt to answer them. If he hasn't, I just let him lie there and scan his life. Usually, after waiting a few seconds, I'll say, "By the way, let me know when you're through looking over your life, then we can go on with the next part of this."

The first time through a scan like that takes anything from five minutes to -- well, the longest has been half an hour so far. You'd be surprised at the stuff that comes up there. When he has thoroughly scanned over that, if it has taken a long time, which means to me that there is quite a bit on that, I'll ask him to go through it again. If it has taken a short time, I'll sometimes hint or suggest that he might find other sympathies in connection with that same deal -- that is, sympathy for himself -- and ask him to scan again. This isn't absolutely necessary, but it does help the case.

After I've had the preclear run out -- or scan -- all the sympathy in connection with himself along with this concept, I'll then ask him to consider the concept again -- how beautiful it is and the beautiful sadness connected with it, and then I'll ask him to consider the sympa-

thy which others gave him in connection with this arthritis, this beautiful arthritis. And then ask him to scan his life for that. In other words, go through the same deal again.

After I've run that, got it pretty well scanned out, I then ask the preclear to pick up the sympathy which he had for others in connection with this same concept, the arthritis.

After he has scanned that out, I'll then ask him to pick up the sympathy that others had for others in connection with arthritis, or whatever the concept is you're working with, and have him scan that out.

Now, at this particular point, a lot of auditors feel like jumping and asking for the last step in this process. Let me give you a warning here: don't jump to the end of the process. It just doesn't work. At least it hasn't worked in our experience.

The next part of this process is to ask the preclear to pick up the concept again and think how beautiful it is, and then have him consider the ugliness -- and emphasize your voice just like that (with a sort of tone of loathing. Ed.) -- the ugliness of this concept. You might say something about the beautiful ugliness of having arthritis.

Then have your preclear scan his life again as you did before, only this time consider the ugliness of all the sympathy that the preclear gave himself for having arthritis. Then go through the sympathy that others gave him, the ugliness of that sympathy. And the ugliness of the sympathy that he gave others. And, of course, the beautiful ugliness of others giving sympathy to others connected with the same concept.

At this point your preclear will generally be getting the idea of the whole thing and will be picking up his former experiences connected with sympathy in large amounts. He'll be getting them pretty fast, too. He generally picks up so much of it that he gets into a philosophical mood and will waste quite a lot of your time, if you'll let him, by giving you a lot of philosophy about sympathy. You can listen to it if you've got plenty of time. If you haven't, you can ask him to hold it until the end of the session. I generally let a preclear run a little bit out of his system; it seems to help a little, but it doesn't seem to have an awful lot of therapeutic value.

After having run out the beauty and the ugliness of all this sympathy, the next idea is to ask the preclear to pick up the concept of the decision that he made to have arthritis. He picks up the concept -- the idea of it. Then you ask him to see if he can pick up the concept of the time when he made that decision. Very often the preclear can do that. In fact, very often the preclear will pick up the decision itself.

If he can pick up the decision, fine. Have him run the decision out. If all he can pick up is the concept of the decision, have him run a bracket on that with sympathy, of beauty and ugliness, only this time you don't ask him to scan his life in connection with it. Just ask him

to pick up the beautiful sadness of making the decision and the beautiful ugliness of making the decision and the sympathy connected it. That is, without scanning his life.

Another thing you can do there -- you can run it out Black and White. It seems to work pretty good in some preclears. For some it doesn't work any too well -- some don't seem to be able to pick up the idea of Black and White quite readily. But you can do it that way; you can do it any way you want to, but run out the decision. That's rather important.

Now, after you run out the decision as thoroughly as you can, ask the preclear to see if he can get the feeling, or the concept if he can't get the feeling, of wanting to hold this aberration. The first time you say that to him, emphasize the word, "wanting." And see if you can get it. You might repeat that same sentence to him again, "Feel yourself wanting to hold the aberration" -- emphasis on the word, "hold" this time. And then I very often give them the same sentence over again and emphasize both the words, "wanting" and "hold." "Feel yourself wanting to hold this aberration." Let the preclear hold that for a little while, get the idea of wanting to hold the aberration, whatever it is.

As soon as he says he can feel himself wanting to hold it, or has got the concept thoroughly, say to him, "Now I'm going to count from one to three and snap my fingers. When I do, I want you to let go of this aberration." And then you say, "One, two, three," SNAP. And the preclear lets go of the aberration.

Now the first time he does that, he might find difficulty in letting go of it. Might take him a little time -- maybe a minute. The second time he does it -- by the way, you do this three or four times -- the second time he does it, he will be able to drop it a little faster. The third and maybe the fourth time he does it, he'll be able to drop it almost instantaneously, even before you snap your fingers.

As soon as the preclear gets to the point where he can drop the aberration -- and this works wonderful on somatics -- as soon as he gets to the point where he can drop it, ask him, "Can you hold or let go of this aberration as you wish?" If the preclear says, "Yes," you can say to him, "Well, which would you rather do? Hang onto it or let it go?"

Of course the obvious answer is that he'd rather let it go. You say to him something like this: "Okay, you can make the decision now if you wish. I'll wait. Let me know when you decide what you want to do." So you wait a minute. As soon as the preclear has made up his mind that he doesn't want this aberration, that he has dropped it completely, fine. The session is over. That's all there is to it.

As L. Ron says, "Simple, very simple."

Now here's a variation if you want it: you can run concept or attention units, or both as a combination, on the preclear and then use

this last part I've just given you to finish it up. That is, have him feel that he wants to hold it and then count to three and snap and have him let it go, and so forth, and you'll find that a preclear can let go of a somatic specifically very fast that way that is active on concepts or attention units on the somatic.

Then we've been using also here in Long Beach to help our persons to a clear. The way we do that is to look for basics -- basic aberrations, overall aberrations -- such as the decision to hold onto decisions. That is one of the first basic aberrations which we run out, and we run it out with the technique which I have given you above. Incidentally, if you're going to run out that decision to hold onto decisions, run it thoroughly. That is, go over and over it and make sure that it's completely shot. Because if you do that, then the preclear can contact and self-run out all former decisions.

You can suggest to the preclear that he does that and then just sit down and tell him to do it for a while, and in about half an hour's time he'll run out -- oh, I don't know how many decisions. First time it was done on me I must have run out thirty or forty in half an hour.

Then another important basic which can be run out by using the same technique is the decision not to be alone. If you can run that out -- and believe me, there's quite a bit in it -- this seems to blow the aberrated ARC in the case -- that is, the compulsion towards ARC.

Another decision that seems to be basic -- I don't know how it is with other people, but at least it's rather strong in some of our preclears -- is the decision to hide from yourself and from the world. If you can run that out thoroughly, it seems that the preclear becomes actually honest with himself for the first time in his life.

Another basic to run out is -- this can be mentioned in several different ways -- would be the decision to obey others or to learn from others or to depend upon others. Or another way of putting it is that you can't be yourself. If you run that, your preclear goes so high on the tone scale it'll be another one of those WOW! deals.

Another one of those basics that it seems very good to us to run out is that which would be included in the sentence, "All the world's against me; nobody loves me." Believe it or not, everybody seems to have some of that in his system.

Another very good basic to run out is the feeling that the preclear must control himself or that he must control others. They both seem to be connected together.

Then, there seems to be a confusion between sympathy and survival. And that confusion seems to be the basis for this whole process that I've been giving you. It is a good deal to bring to the preclear's attention, if you can, the difference between sympathy and survival before you begin one of these runs. I might suggest that someone try running that out one of these days -- sympathy and survival on the basis of this technique I've just given you.

There are many other variations of this technique we've been trying out around here. Some have been good, some bad, some indifferent. But they all depend on this beauty-ugliness of aberration and bracketing it with sympathy.

Well, I hope this answers most of your questions. The peculiar thing about running these sympathy deals is that every preclear that has been run on it so far has made this statement, with variations: "Believe it or not, I seem to be making a career of trying to get sympathy." When they say that, you put it down in your mind as just one more case of a person becoming honest with himself.

Incidentally, another thing has come out of these techniques, and that is that ARC seems to have two aspects to it: there is the aspect of having and giving ARC and the aspect of being ARC. Being ARC seems to be on a much higher tone level than giving or having.

Incidentally, this is all present-life stuff. This doesn't go into past lives. The results so far that we have recorded have been tremendous. The time on most of these runs varies anywhere from thirty minutes to two hours.

Among the things that we generally do at the end of the session is to have the preclear draw back to himself all the energy that he has given out during the session. We get some rather surprising results at times -- the preclear feels like he's ready to go out and lick the world. Another thing that we do is to ask the preclear to continue computations on what has been brought out of the session between sessions and to tell me what his computations are at the next session. It seems to help quite a bit.

Now, once more I'm going to give you a warning: Do not try to go from running the concept of sympathy on beauty directly to the holder deal. Be sure to run the ugliness. We tried several times to jump directly to running the holder deal without running out the ugliness and the preclear was pretty badly restimulated for a week or so.

That's about that.

- THE END -

* * * * *

OTHER COMMUNICATOR PUBLICATIONS

THE COMMUNICATOR and Your Goals -- Health and Happiness. Semi-monthly. \$1.00 for 6 months.

COMMUNICATOR SUPPLEMENT NO. 1 -- three articles, "Three Steps to Theta Clear", by John Robinson, "Translation Hypothesis", by Perry Chapdelaine, and "Point of View Processing", by Clifton Amsbury. 50¢

SUPPLEMENT NO. 2 -- Transcript of "Structure, Function, and Speculation" Chapdelaine, Higgins, and Field., and "The New York Tape", George Fisher. 75¢

TWO LITTLE THETANS -- Boyd, Bowen and Bill. \$1.00