

THE
Communicator

SUPPLEMENT N°4

JULY 1953

THE COMMUNICATORS
PUBLISHERS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
A New Orientation on Processing.	1
Perry A. Chapdelaine, B.A., M.A.	
Denver, Colorado, June, 1953	
Information for Would-Be Optimums	8
H. R. (Wing) Angell, HCA	
Denver, Colorado, June, 1953	

* * * * *

THE COMMUNICATOR SUPPLEMENT NO. 4

Edited and Published

by

THE COMMUNICATORS
1598 West Alameda Avenue
Denver 19, Colorado

Price \$1.00

* * * * *

A NEW ORIENTATION ON PROCESSING

1

Perry A. Chapdelaine
Denver, Colorado, June, 1953

Basically, there are two kinds of cases that we talk about in dianetics. One has been called the wide-open case, which was misnamed originally in dianetics, and this has been given another label -- pianola. This is the person who can lie down on the couch and display all kinds of phenomena in terms of prenatals and other things but he never changes. The other kind of case has been described as the occluded case. These two types of cases can be described with more words which will give a little clearer picture of the relationship between them.

In the so-called wide open case, you can call this person the extrovert, and in contrast the occluded would be the introvert. You can call the wide open case a blocked-hostility case, and in contrast, psychiatric term, oral-dependency for the occluded. There are other labels -- you can call the wide open the under-controlled case and the occluded case you can call the over-controlled case. Or, again, under-corticalization, over-corticalization.

There is a third term in psychiatry which is the mis-controlled case. The mis-controlled case is the person who attempts to handle his environment by utilizing a psychosomatic to control it with. More often than not the mis-controlled case is the occluded case.

Most of the people who are attracted to dianetics fall into this category -- miscontrolled cases -- and as such, most of them are also in the category of the occluded case, which means they are over-corticalized, which means that they are over-controlled. They over-compensate.

The basic difference between these two types of persons fits a rationale which predicts the specific type of technique which must be used for the person. The over-controlled case will take such noises from the environment as "self-determinism" and will invariably interpret this noise to mean, "I must block all of my dramatizations. I must 'decide' to become clear by controlling myself further." The very thing that is the matter with the person already is that he is controlling himself too much. So when he interprets the noise, "self-determinism" to mean, "I must throw in more controls", he does nothing more than set up the initial difficulty.

The wide open or pianola case, so-called under-controlled case, is a person who appears to think or analyze in the environment but in reality only responds to environmental stimuli by reproducing a pattern-effect. Many women fall into this classification; some do not. You say, "Good morning!" and they must respond in a total configuration, including certain types of words. Something else comes along and they must respond in a certain fashion. This is merely the placement of one pattern after another. It is all identity thinking; there is no analysis involved. From the observer's point of view, they seem to be extroverts. They are not real extroverts; they are merely responding to stimuli according to patterns.

This kind of person will take the noise, "self-determinism" and will interpret it to mean, "Now I can do all the things in the environment that I have been afraid to do." So they will set about deliberately to dramatize and break their patterns. In this particular case this is good for them. There is a reason why it's good for them, and I'll come back to that reason in a moment.

There should be an equilibrium in terms of energy flow or in terms of circuitry, or in terms of whatever label you wish to give it, between the thalamus and the cerebral cortex. True engrammic material lies in the thalamus -- at least, it's either triggered or controlled from the thalamus. The cortex is, of course, the analytical machinery. There should be an equilibrium between these two.

The thalamus integrates sensory data; the cortex symbolizes the data coming from the thalamus and utilizes logic, memory, imagination and many other functions in the process of symbolizing the true data being integrated through the thalamus. There should be a balance between these two mechanisms internally. The occluded case is a person who is operating essentially upon the cortex and has blocked, physiologically, the sensory data being integrated through the thalamus. The wide open case is a person who has merely shut off the cortex and is operating primarily upon thalamic material and therefore he has almost total recall, except that it is very badly distorted, along with aberration and pain.

The relationship as set up in the environment, because of the environment and for all the other reasons -- perhaps even because of heredity or evolution -- the relationship between the thalamus and the cortex is such that as an individual utilizes energy from the cortex to block thalamic reactions, more energy in the thalamus is derived to be blocked. And the more there is to be blocked, the more energy from the cortex is needed to stop the energy from the thalamus. But the more that's used to stop it, the more energy there is in the thalamus. And what have we got? A feed-back mechanism, much like when you take the receiver and speaker of a telephone, place one to the other and it takes the noise from the environment and adds it to the noise from the environment and adds those to the noise from the environment until you get a real high squeal. This is the same type of mechanism which occurs between the cortex and the thalamus.

You will observe that some little tiny thing in the environment will trigger off a dramatization in a person. I'm going to talk about the occluded case first. The occluded case, which most of us here represent, will suddenly get just too much from the environment and dramatize. The dramatization may be anger, but not necessarily. It could be any other form of activity. It could be anything peculiar to that person and his experiences -- apathy, grief, fear, it might even be reading a book or playing the piano or doing this or doing that.

What has happened here is that this feed-back mechanism has built up more and more and more so that the individual is using more and more energy to stop his energy, more energy to stop that energy, on and on until soon there is very little energy left to handle the environ-

ment and it is all in conflict internally -- a basic internal conflict. This little thing comes along in the environment and it isn't enough normally, rationally, to upset anyone, but in this case it was just enough of an overload in stimulus to set into operation one of the primary defense mechanisms the person has.

Obviously, if this circuit were allowed to continue, the person would soon have all of his attention tied up with all of his attention and he wouldn't be able to live or exist in the environment. So we have the inhibitors -- that's this cortex process which seems, subjectively, to be behind the eyebrows -- which are suddenly taken out. And during the period they're taken out, essentially, cortex control is dropped. This means you have actually busted the feed-back circuit. During this period of having it busted, the thalamic material comes through and what you observe in the person is the result of true engrammic material coming through. During that period of dramatization there will be an actual trickle discharge of engrammic material. The discharge will be just enough so that a rebalancing of this feedback mechanism can be set up. But after the dramatization the person has more energy to extrovert and handle the environment better.

Now you have just observed _____ here. Observe yourself and what you just did. This is common to all of us, not to just you, but since it just happened here, we can focus our attention on it. You felt better when it was done -- there was a sense of relief. This was because there was a true trickle discharge taking place that allowed you to focus more attention again on the environment, less in this feed-back mechanism.

Now, what would happen if a small child, as he was growing up, were stopped every time he learned a way of handling the environment and discharging thalamic material? So he would figure out a new and novel way for it to come off, and someone would stop that. Every time he did it, somebody would stop it. No matter how many different ways he invented, somebody would stop him. What's going to happen to this circuit? Well, nature utilizes the last defense mechanism of mankind: shuts off the cortex. Significantly, under a real survival threat, the cortex always shuts off. Here is the last defense mechanism man has -- to shut off the cortex and exist on particularly thalamic patterns. The individual still survives, but he cannot analyze very well. There is your pianola or wide open case.

You see, when the pianola case interprets self-determinism to mean, "I'll do all the things I've been afraid to do", he begins to spontaneously express engrammic material. He does those things which were blocked off from him originally. Before, he was not allowed to express the material; now, he deliberately does it and in so doing he continues to take the charge off. Which means he will get into a position where he can "run" in the dianetic sense -- in the reverie sense.

The occluded case, in interpreting self-determinism the way he does, necessitates that by throwing in more cortical control he reinforces the feed-back mechanism which was wrong with him. And this is demonstrable. If an occluded case will deliberately stop all his dramatizations -- merely observe and continue to stop them with cortical activity

he will end up as a wide open case. It will then be necessary for him to do other things to come out of that and back into, at least, the occluded case, if not into a little better condition.

Now here is the hard part of all this to get across to many people: dianetics has attracted more of the over-corticalized type of case than any other type. This is shown by the IQ tests and other forms of tests which have been given -- extremely high percentile. What do these IQ tests measure? The ability to manipulate symbols. All of them consider themselves very brilliant. They are, according to these tests, but they have blocked off true life data -- they have blocked off all the integrative sensory data which was coming in and are operating only on the symbols of reality rather than on reality itself. Most of these people will find it physiologically impossible to contact a true dianetic reverie. When they lie down on the couch for processing, as far back as they can contact or shut off their cortex is the so-called ideo-motor center. They cannot contact the thalamic material because this would necessitate shutting off almost their total cortex, and to do this, according to their identification of their personalities with their analytical machinery, would seem to them subjectively as if they would have to kill themselves.

The ideo-motor center, when activated in this fashion, as occurs with most processing that I have experienced and seen for the past two years, will only be a translation of thalamic energy into a symbolical form of material which then displays itself on the couch. The material which is being run is the symbols of the true thalamic material rather than the true thalamic material itself. This could manifest itself in any of the emotions.

But here is the rough part of it: the very process of communicating to an auditor is the process of setting up the feed-back mechanism which is wrong with the person. The very process of using words to describe the difficulty is the process of that feed-back mechanism.

In addition to this, for the over-corticalized person, any technique dealing with memory, concepts, decisions, postulates, conclusions, experiences or imagination will only maintain or reinforce the feed-back mechanism.

So you can generalize from this and you can say that any technique dealing with abstraction, dealing with logic, dealing with symbols in just the communication form, will do nothing more than maintain or reinforce the occluded case. Any type of technique dealing with integrative systems, such as lock scanning, will do nothing more than maintain or reinforce the wide open case.

From that one simple little rationale, whether this rationale is true or false, you can demonstrably predict the form of technique which will hinder or help the person that you're dealing with.

Now, significantly -- and I'm going to talk about you again -- you are interested in communication. You have a high degree of agreement -- of reality -- with symbols. Now we know your history for this and you know it. I don't have to say anything about it. But, by virtue

of the fact that you sit down and you type things, you use symbols, you think all day long and you communicate with people you are dramatizing -- a dramatization which is the reinforcement or the maintenance -- particularly the maintenance, since you survive fairly well -- of the feed-back circuit which is causing your difficulty.

You can take the wide-open case and possibly one of the best things you can do for him is to sit down and help him differentiate. What is the difference between this and this? The difference between this and this? You can help him compute because you will be helping him do something that he has shut off. As soon as you attempt to get him to integrate and find similarities, you maintain what is causing the difficulty.

On the other hand, you can use integrative material very nicely with the over-corticalized case. But both types of cases can be solved very nicely on the same level. It isn't necessary to use these other things except at certain stages of the game for some people here and there.

Q Ron Howes has said in his book to use whatever is your strongest point to --- for example, if you verbalize, to use it as an entering wedge to get at other things. How does this integrate with that?

PERRY It integrates with it, sure. It's a dramatization. Being a dramatization, it can be utilized just as any other dramatization -- just as the facial configurations and all the rest of the things. These are entering wedges. This does not mean that a person would stop communicating, necessarily. There are many people who find it necessary to verbalize constantly. What this is is a substitution device for avoiding particular kinds of emotion internally.

And, of course, what are words? Words are not only abstractions or corticalizations; they are also muscular movements. A muscular movement is, itself, a form of dramatization when it is done in this fashion, particularly coupled with the abstraction mechanism. All this does is avoid tension, pain and emotion which would normally be there. It acts as a trickle form of discharge.

A person could utilize any form of dramatization -- any trickle form of discharge -- for all of his life without doing much more than keeping the tension down and never solving the basis for it. The talking is not at fault. The words are not at fault. The actions you go through are not at fault. These are merely the things a person does to avoid feeling the pain and emotion. Now, it might be something else -- it might be, as I said, going and reading a book, or it might be going to a dance, or it might be drinking alcohol, or it might be any other form of anything which can get a trickle discharge off -- which means taking down the inhibitors along some line of action.

Q Don't you think a lot of people do a lot of talking in order not to communicate?

PERRY Oh, yes. You can cut communication lines just as effect-

ively by over-communicating as by under-communicating. This happens with a lot of people in many different ways.

Q I think this is one of my greatest faults.

PERRY If this is a fault of yours, it does not mean you should try to stop yourself from doing it. As soon as you try to stop yourself from doing it, you will utilize the pattern of throwing in more controls to stop a form of dramatization. The way to get it, of course, is merely to resolve these other patterns underneath it.

Q What this boils down to, then, is that for most people, the best way to run their cases is not to use "a technique" but to experience it on the structural level?

PERRY There is another answer, too. The obvious conclusion for the over-corticalized case is to shut off the cortex. There are many ways to do it. Virginia Allen described some very nicely (Processing Under Medical Supervision, PRF, 1953).

The trouble is that most people will interpret the goal of what they're trying to do as exercising the cortex. And no amount of it in the world will ever solve any difficulties for the over-corticalized case.

There is another basic point involved. The goal of dianetic processing is to reproduce the effects of a past experience. There's a lot said in that. I should add one other thing: in present time. To reproduce in present time the effects of a past experience. How many ways are there to do this? The symbolical approach would take this: provide a symbol of a stimulus in the form of memory, recall, imagination, or rolling a word. So far as processing is concerned, it isn't important whether it's a past life, a thetan, a real experience or rolling a word. They are all on the same level of abstraction. They can be utilized in order to find out the effects of some past experience and to find out how to reproduce it for you, right now, in present time. Once you have observed how to do it in present time, the symbols themselves are no longer important -- they were simply crutches to enable you to do this. You can throw the crutches away then and just keep reproducing it. Once you have observed it and know how to reproduce it, you just continue reproducing it. Continue it and continue it and continue it, and, provided you are a person who can discharge it, you will exhaust the thing.

At the tail end of having exhausted it there will occur spontaneously, without any effort on the part of the preclear, the experiences it was derived from, the concepts around it, the attitudes, the beliefs, the decisions, the postulates, the conclusions, how the person utilized that reaction in life, and all the relations to it. These are all bonuses for having done the other job. They are a gift to you. But any attempt to go down on those things will only maintain or reinforce the original feed-back circuit.

Q It has occurred to me that all processing is referent-exhaustion in one form or another.

PERRY There is another set of verbalizations describing a different phenomenon -- the rebalancing of homeostasis -- which would not be referent-exhaustion, necessarily. It could be associated with it, however.

So far as the description of the goal of processing is concerned, I find more and more each day that the first book (Dianetics The Modern Science of Mental Health, L. Ron Hubbard, Hermitage House, 1950) was uncannily accurate. It was not so accurate in terms of the techniques to get at it, and has become less and less accurate from the time it was printed.

One outright lie that came out in the field of dianetics is that repeater technique will bog down a case. It will, in a sense, cause difficulty if the individual cannot discharge the material he is contacting. There is never, ever, any difficulty in a person's contacting material -- it is always there in present time. There may be difficulty in some individuals here and there in discharging what they are contacting -- in fact, you might say that the only problem in processing is finding a channel of discharge for the preclear.

* * * * *

INFORMATION FOR WOULD-BE OPTIMUMS

H. R. (Wing) Angell
 Denver, Colorado, June, 1953

Aberration is the avoidance of pain, regardless of how painful that avoidance may be. So in your approach to a preclear, if you keep this firmly in mind, you can resolve as many problems as the preclear has as rapidly as you can find the things against which he is defending himself and the things within himself that he is protecting.

An individual can run five hundred, a thousand, fifteen hundred, two thousand hours of processing and have no change simply because the five hundred, a thousand, fifteen hundred, two thousand hours of processing validates and excuses the preclear for the way he is today. If he is really interested in changing, he will begin to change by looking at today and finding out what are the things that he is doing that he doesn't want to do, what are the things that he is not doing that he does want to do, what are his psychosomatic disorders and other forms of aberration, and what is he using them for and how is he doing this to himself. Approaching the preclear's problem on this basis, we very soon lay the service facsimile bare. It can't help but lay it bare. It puts it right in the preclear's lap. With this in mind, an average, competent auditor should be able to find the service facsimile in a two to four hour session.

It seems a little ridiculous to me that an individual should have to run a 36 or a 72 hour intensive, or anything of that nature, in order to find out what the thing is that he is using and how he is using it. It sticks out all over him, and he will tell the auditor in his first session just exactly what he needs to look at in order to change.

Preclears, though, speaking of change, do make an error sometimes. They come in, flop down on the auditor's couch with the attitude, "Change me." That isn't going to happen. If any change is coming in the preclear, the preclear is going to change himself from within. There is an alternative that you see sometimes -- the preclear runs a session and he runs a grief charge, or he does something on that order, and then he goes home and he calls the auditor back in 24 hours and says, "I haven't changed." Again I say that any change that comes from a preclear is going to have to come from within him -- by his volition, by his decision, by his action.

If you really and truly want to change, start changing. Start changing in small ways and then start changing in larger ways and still larger ways until you have made all the changes that you want to make. And this you can do without any auditing at all if you will just look at the things that you are considering standing in the way of your changing and recognize that they do not constitute threats to your survival or self-esteem.

When we go into the case with the preclear, why should we be interested in something that happened 20 years ago? If we find it, it simply gives him a valid explanation that he can use on his friends and

relatives -- a "reason" -- why he is as he is today. By this I am not saying that the preclear does. He needs to re-evaluate an entire life-time. He needs to follow through a lot of the stopped and changed actions with the attitude in mind that he has stopped them and changed them, even if he has done this under duress.

But the first step in the program is to find out what he is doing today. How he is doing it to himself and what he is doing it for. And that can be readily done. What are the things that the preclear finds emotionally disturbing? Whatever they are, they are the things against which he is defending himself by using aberration. If you remove the need that the preclear has to protect himself by becoming enturbulated, and thereby restimulated, you have released a necessity for defense. Having released a necessity for defense, the defense can be dropped and the power that was going into the support of that defense can be used to search out another need for defense and eradicate that so that that defense can be dropped.

In a very short time the preclear is dropping defense after defense, very rapidly, correlating the data out of his past with what he knows now, which, by the way, is a form of proper "running", and, naturally, the more power he has that he has withdrawn from this "protective" attitude, and these "protective" and defensive devices, the more he has for any creative and constructive purpose -- clearing himself, or anything else. So you will see your preclear after the first two to four hours of processing by this particular method, rapidly taking charge of his own case and carrying himself on to "optimum."

There are many definitions of optimum. Probably the best one, as far as my reality is concerned, is: "the ability to operate fully and functionally without any need for defense." I can just hear people rising up and saying, "What do you mean, 'no defense'? What about threats to survival? How about threats to self-esteem?" Well, let's make it perfectly clear NOW that if you are a preclear and you continue with your processing, you are going to discover that there is no such thing as a threat to your survival or a threat to your self-esteem, that the things which you have been considering threats to your survival and self-esteem are purely imaginary, that you have built yourself a long, steep, dark, cold, miserable staircase down which you have been walking, step by step. And the ridiculous part of it is that the staircase was never there. There is no such thing as a threat to survival. There is no such thing as a threat to self-esteem. And when you can stand soul-naked in the universe with the full knowledge that nothing can hurt you, then, as I've said before, you can channel all your tremendous power and ability into creative and constructive action. Then, of course, you can go ahead and clear, because you will have sufficient mental power available to you to do this and to do it very rapidly.

People say to me, "Well, what about the occluded case?" All right. What about the occluded case? The occluded case is occluded as a protective device. A nother defense. A defense against what? Well, for each preclear it's probably a defense against the same thing: rejection. Because you can narrow down any threat to survival or

self-esteem into a threat of being rejected. By yourself, by somebody else, by a situation or by a thing.

Nobody ever rejects you but you. When you come to run the chain of rejections in your time-track, you will find this to be so. You will find that every time that you were rejected, you set it up for yourself in a manner in which you could be very efficiently and very thoroughly rejected. Your own doing. By the way, don't take my word for this -- find out for yourself. It's true, but find it out for yourself.

As long as we know that all aberration is the avoidance of pain, we know that all aberration is used in present time to protect. I'm being very redundant about this -- I'm doing a lot of talking and I'm saying it over and over again, and I'm doing it deliberately, because that is something that I want to have seep in very thoroughly. Actually, I have said just about all there is to be said on the subject. Except that people will say, "How to find out what it is that enturbulates me in present time?" Well, that's real easy -- anything that gets you emotionally upset in any way, shape or form, anything that you can point at and say, "I don't like this", whether it be carrots, dogs, women, children, bicycles, moonlight or masturbation.

The universe is a very enjoyable place. As a matter of fact, there is nothing in it that is not enjoyable. You sit squarely in the middle of the universe, wherever you happen to be. And all you do is pick up vibrations from the universe, vibrations that come to you laden with information. Those vibrations have no meaning whatever until you translate them into meaning within yourself. So that anything that has meaning for you has your meaning. Anything that disturbs you, you turn it on and you supply all the power to it. There is never a situation in which "he did it", "she did it", "they did it", "it did it," or "God did it." YOU did it. You did it every time. Everything good, bad or indifferent that has happened to you, YOU DID IT. Entertain that as a concept, if nothing else. You'll find out as you go through with your processing that this is true. Don't take my word for it -- continue to process.

Now, you are picking up these vibrations and you are translating them into meaning. And a good many of them you are translating into postulations of threat to your survival or to your self-esteem. Why should this be so? Because at one time or another you felt that in order to survive you were going to have to maintain a fixed belief about this type of thing that you now find is enturbulating you.

There is no reason in the world why a human being should have a fixed belief or a fixed attitude or a fixed motive. An individual should be a completely fluid, completely spontaneous, organism, correlating data out of the past, comparing it with present-time observation -- and by "observation" I mean receiving information through all of the senses -- the comparison being done on a basis of differentiation, identification and similarizing, the result of which enables the individual to predict with more-or-less accuracy future happenings and to decide on future actions with which to meet them.

I can go in practically any direction from here -- perhaps it would be a good idea to toss in a definition of a decision. A decision is the selection of an action with which to contribute to your survival. Simple, isn't it?

Returning, then, to these "squiggles" that come in from the environment -- the minute you begin to consider a thing as a threat instead of a source of information, you shut down. When you shut down, you stop getting information. When you stop getting information, you stop functioning. When you stop functioning, things happen to you. As long as you consider all the data that is coming to you, the data that is coming to you enables you to survive.

If you suddenly look up and notice that the south-bound express is about to catch you in the small of the back and you huddle yourself up into a little ball, the south-bound express catches you in the small of the back. If you consider the south-bound express to be a problem in mass, speed and direction, you can probably get out of its way.

If you consider your boss to be a threat to your survival, you will get all fumble-fingered every time he comes near you. The fact that you operate at optimum when he's up on the next floor doesn't make any difference to him. He is taking in the data that is available to him and all he sees when he goes by your desk is fumble-fingers. When the time comes to lay off a few men, he remembers "Fumble-fingers Joe", and you get the pink ticket.

If you consider a wife a threat to your survival, this is probably because you made a decision of what you intended to use her for when you hooked up with her and she is not performing that function. Maybe you better take another look at what you intend to use her for. A wife -- or a husband -- can be a very, very valid data source, but the minute you shut down by refusing to accept communication or to communicate, you have a threat to your survival. Or to your self-esteem. And to a good many people it's about the same thing, because many an individual is not nearly as concerned about nearly being run down by a truck as he is by the fact that the driver leans out the window, bangs on the side of the door and yells, "Wherethell ya think y'r goin'? Ya blind 'r sumthin'?" That constitutes a much greater threat to many people than the radiator grille of that truck.

What don't you like? What disturbs you? Who makes you mad? What are you afraid of? What do you feel exists in your universe that you can't do anything about? These are the things that you need to look at. A brief glance at most of them will show that actually they constitute no threat. How could they? You're all alone in your universe and all you're doing is picking up vibrations.

Look, for instance, at the problem of interpersonal relationships. In the last analysis, the only weapon that a human being can use on another one is emotion. He may implement this emotion with a pick-axe, yes, but in the last analysis, the only weapon that a human being can use on another one is emotion. And then ONLY by that individual's consent.

And how does he give his consent? By agreeing that it's a threat. By recognizing that it's a threat.

A human being's emotion can't possibly bother you; a human being can't possibly blast you with emotion unless you try to thrust it back, stop it, deflect it or avoid it. If you just open up and let it go through, what's happened? Nothing. People cuss at you? Makes you want to fight, does it? Why? All they're doing is sitting over there vibrating at you.

A man came to me one time and he said, "Listen, you bastard....." And I told him, "Someday you're going to call someone a bastard that isn't one and get the devil knocked out of you. Now let's go get a cup of coffee and find out what this is all about.

That man wasn't particularly interested in the marital status of my parents. There was something that he wanted from me and wasn't getting. So I needed the data; I got the data; I gave him what he wanted; he gave me what I wanted -- oh, by the way, he apologized for calling me a bastard, but that's neither here nor there.

But there you have it: great big threat to self-esteem with some people. Must defend with life. Must defend by taking life. People shoot other people because of those vague noises that they get and translate into meaning. That meaning being a threat to them. People kill themselves and other people; people go crazy; people get sick; people get neurotic; people get beat up; people get put in jail -- all kinds of things, all non-optimum, happen to people who consider that vague noises are threats to their self-esteem. They're not. The word, "bastard" is simply a noise that you can make with your mouth -- no more and no less. Look behind it for the true meaning: "I wanted something and you didn't give it to me."

Every human being is 110% selfish -- at least. He is operating along 8 dynamics as selfishly as he can. An individual comes to you and says, "You're selfish!" What he's telling you is, "You're not giving me enough."

When an individual comes to you and tells you that he is criticizing you for your own good, he is telling you that he can make decisions better than you can so that if you will allow him to control you, you will get along better. What he means is that he will get along better.

When a man gives money to charity and doesn't let his name be known, he gets a smug satisfaction out of it -- or something -- or he wouldn't do it.

A human being is 110% selfish -- and you might as well recognize that you're a human being and you're selfish. And as soon as you recognize that you're selfish, you can ask, "Well, what do I want that I'm not getting? What don't I want that I have to accept?" and, "What am I doing about it? What do I do to myself on account of these things? What do I use my aberrations for? and, "How do I produce them?"

You can line up a hundred men, walk behind them and slap them on the back with your open hand -- you may find there is one sane one in the bunch. A certain proportion of them will burst into tears; a certain proportion of them will say, "Well, that's life. That's what happens to you." Some of them will want to fight with you; some of them will cringe, expecting the next blow to fall; some of them will think murderous thoughts but keep them to themselves, and, perhaps, one of them will turn around and say, "Would you mind telling me what you did that for?" The only sane one in the bunch! He's looking for information so that it won't happen again.

Why do people cut themselves off from data? To me this is a mystery. Why do people cut themselves off from the data that's available to them? Why do people cut down their awareness, deliberately, so that they cannot receive the information that they need? Well, perhaps there is an explanation: say that a man goes into a drug store to buy a cigarette lighter. And the clerk in the store shows him a lighter and says, "Sir, I believe this to be the finest lighter on the market." The man says, "Oh, no! I couldn't own a lighter like that! Uncle Herman had one in his hand when he died." He thereby gives up an opportunity to have what may very well be the best cigarette lighter in the world. And all he had to know about it was: does it light cigarettes?

Another man walks in. Same drug store, same clerk, same spiel about same lighter. The man says, "No, I want one with a red flamingo on it." Obviously, one does not light cigarettes with red paint! All he needed to know was: does it or does it not light cigarettes?

Another man walks in in. Same story, and he says, "No, I knew a fellow one time and he had one like that and it was always running out of fluid." You know, they do that -- cigarette lighters. So he passes up the opportunity to buy what may very well be the best cigarette lighter on the market. And all he needed to know was: does it or does it not light cigarettes?

This is one way that people crud up their data. In the first instance, with emotion; in the second instance, wishful thinking; in the third instance, past postulates. Each of those three individuals blocked himself off from optimum survival. The man who walks into the drug-store and says to the clerk, "I want a cigarette lighter. Give me the best one that you can give me at the price I can afford to pay", who checks to be sure it lights when he spins the wheel or flips the flipper, or does whatever he has to do, finds out that it produces a bright, clear flame without too much smoke and does this at least once or twice on the first flip, can safely go away knowing that he has optimumly acquired a cigarette lighter. The same goes for acquiring pay checks, acquiring spouses, automobiles, or anything else.

Speaking of spouses, we had a little talk around here last night in which I mentioned that very few people get married until they have convinced each other that they are doormats. Consider the language of love: take me, I'm yours. I'll do anything you want me to. You can have me. I'll work for you, I'll slave for you, I'll bring you

buckets of diamonds. Sure, I'm really controllable. You can safely marry me. You can make all my decisions for me so that when anything goes wrong I can say, "Well, you told me to." ----- Yeah, who's got charge of that situation? All right, six weeks after they're married, the individual who has been such a doormat starts to assert himself. Goodbye marriage!

Two people, standing clean and free, supporting the same structure of goals and each willing to work toward the optimum attainment of those goals, make a successful marriage.

One person beating another person into success, one person controlling another person into success -- no marriage.

Look at your own marriage. When you got married, what did you intend to use your spouse for? Be honest. Chances are you're going to find out you had no business marrying that person under the circumstances. By this I do not mean that you have to rush right down to the divorce lawyer in the morning! Because if you take another look at your spouse, you will probably find out that here is a real swell individual in his own right -- an individual with whom you can make a go of it. I don't mean by bearing up and being noble and long-suffering.

Did it ever occur to you to give your spouse what he wants -- in order to get what you want? With some people that won't work because, regardless of how much you give them they demand more. Remember, they're 110% selfish! But with a good many people, it will. Would your self-esteem suffer tremendously if you gave your spouse what your spouse wants? Probably. But try it, anyhow.

We've seen tremendous strides in the dianetic field in the past three years and some great improvements in techniques and so forth. And along comes a man tonight sitting in front of a couple of microphones and says, "You don't need any techniques." Probably the worst form of getting stuck is getting stuck in techniques. Techniques can be written at the rate of about four an hour by any healthy individual with even a smattering knowledge of dianetics. The application of those techniques may resolve cases. I have never seen a technique yet that wouldn't help somebody.

But you don't need any techniques. All you need is to BE. To decide, to do, to act. That's all you need. But you won't do it -- it would be painful. What would the neighbors say?

And that brings us to the basic thing of all: what aberrates people? People. Nothing else, just people. If it were not for people, people would not be aberrated. If any human being in the world would suddenly recognize that an individual has a right to be anything that he wants to be and to do anything that he wants to do and to have anything that he wants to have, we would probably have a much more optimum world. Unfortunately, the way that people try to get the things that they want and do the things that they do and have the things that they have and be the things that they are are pretty crummy.

For instance, there is no objection in the world to controlling other human beings. But it is decidedly objectionable to you and to everyone around you if you control other human beings by being psychotic or by being sick or by being neurotic or being bad-tempered or being apathetic or crying all the time or any one of the things that people do in order to control other people.

There's a better way: function as beautifully and as ably as you can and other people will come to you because you've got something they want. And you'll get 100% cooperation. - Ace

I laugh when I hear people say, "Well, every time I get up the tone scale a little bit, somebody knocks me down." That's perfectly true. Every time a human being gets a little bit up the tone scale, somebody knocks him down -- because that's what he gets up for: to invite being knocked down. Because then he doesn't have to get up too far. He doesn't have to get up to a point where he can be optimum, where he can make right decisions and act on them, where he can be above the criticism of others. No. He gets up just so far and allows himself to be knocked down so that he won't have to take responsibility for his actions. We hear every once in a while about somebody who gets to be optimum and then gets shoved off of it. That individual wasn't optimum or anywhere near it or nobody could have shoved. Because that individual wouldn't have agreed to be shoved.

Perhaps it would help if I tell you, although again I want you to find it out for yourselves, that you have never been wrong in your life. Ever. You cannot be wrong. Ever. Because the mind selects the best possible decision and action at any given moment from the data that is available. You can be misinformed, but you can't be wrong. Using what data is available to you, you make a decision and you act upon it. You step back and observe the result of the action and it is not as you predicted, so you say, "Oh, my God! I have failed! I was wrong!" No, you weren't wrong -- your information was. This is not a shift of responsibility to the information. Remember Hubbard's adding machine with the held-down seven? You fasten down that seven button and you can add columns of figures all day and every one of them will be right. Every solution to every problem that you crank up on that machine will be right -- but totally unusable. Because the data fed in was wrong.

Are you beginning to see what I mean now when I say, "considering everything as a data source"? If you postulate that you have failed or are a failure, you are postulating that you are not willing to receive data which is resulting from your past actions. You can't be a failure until you say, "I am a failure." You cannot fail until you say, "I have failed." As long as you consider and evaluate and decide and act and observe the result of the action as a source of data from which to extract more information upon which to decide and act, how in the world have you failed? It's only when you fail to study the information that went into the decision so that you can make a more correct decision to carry on from there that you've failed. When you perform an action, you perform it because it is the most right action available to you at the time that you make it. The fact that thirty minutes

later or thirty weeks later or thirty years later you have new information which, had you had it at the time of this decision and action, would have changed the decision and action, doesn't mean that you were wrong. It means that now you can make a new decision and action and carry on from there, not sit down in a puddle of your own tears and look back and say, "My God! I was wrong!"

As long as you can continue to consider everything as a source of enjoyment and information, you can operate at optimum. Hubbard said it in his first book -- you can be crudded up to here with engrammic material and still function as a clear. That's true. And again, I say that you would naturally want to go back and re-evaluate all that past data some day, but why don't you start being optimum RIGHT NOW?

Well, how can I? You can. Because you always have. Yes you have, too! You have always operated on the basis of optimum, because the basis of optimum is making right decisions. And any time you ever made a decision it was the most right decision you could possibly make with the available data. So you've always operated at optimum. Silly, isn't it? BUT with the new information that information is what you need in order to be more right, you can probably be more optimum, because there is a lot of data available to you that you are ignoring by shutting yourself down -- by pulling into a shell like a turtle. A turtle doesn't get much information when he's in that shell, and he doesn't get anywhere until he sticks his neck out. Are you afraid to stick your neck out? What's the worst possible thing that could happen to you if you did?

Oh, THEY won't let you, huh? Well, go have fun with that one. Your service facsimile's tied to it.

I have a little mechanism that I use on present time problems, particularly. Part of it came from Dale Carnegie, part of it came from Ron Hubbard, and part of it came from Wing Angell. An individual comes to you and he has what seems to be an insoluble problem. The first part, which comes from Dale Carnegie, is, "What is the problem? What is the actual problem?" Not, "What will be the result of my failure to act?" or, "What will be the result of my act?" or anything of the kind, but, "What is the problem?" Get it stated as simply as possible.

The second is straight out of Hubbard's Handbook for Preclears. "What do I need to know that I don't know now in order to solve the problem?" Well, that should blow the problem into a cocked hat.

Funny thing about problems -- the minute the mind has enough data to solve one, then it's automatically solved. Bing! No more action's necessary than that. An unsolved problem is a problem for which there is insufficient information for a solution.

All right, if that doesn't blow the problem, then, "What is the worst thing that could possibly happen to you if you don't solve the problem?" Again, that's out of Dale Carnegie. Well, you'll probably find that the world won't fall down on your head.

But if you have postulated that some great big horrible thing will happen to you if you don't solve the problem -- here comes the Wing Angell part -- run it as if it had already happened. Because for you, it has! Take the charge off it and go through that sequence again and the problem will probably be solved.

Remember that some of the data you may need for the solving of some of your problems may be in the future and not available to you. It simply means that you can afford to pigeonhole the problem until the data comes to you in time. If you plan to make a birthday cake for Aunt Minnie and you don't know what kind of cake Aunt Minnie likes and you can't get hold of Aunt Minnie to ask her what kind of cake she likes, you either make a cake and take the risk of making the kind of cake that Aunt Minnie doesn't like or cannot eat or you wait until Aunt Minnie arrives and ask her what kind of cake she does like or can eat. But in the meantime you do not go skuppity, skuppity, skuppity around in a squirrel cage about making that cake. You pigeonhole it for future reference.

A lot of people come to me who have problems and the answers will not be available for six months or more because the data will not be available. But they are using tremendous quantities of energy in squirrelcaging on the problem when all they need to do is to find out where the information is in space and time.

There actually is no excuse for a present time problem if you have this simple data. A worry is an unsolved problem; an unsolved problem is a problem for which insufficient data is available for solution. That should help.

My wife and I travel around the country. We have no home; we have no car; we have no security. Isn't that awful? Because to us the type of security that most people have is a quick-sand, a static, a stagnant puddle of pseudo-safety. Most people don't realize that you can lose your job, lose your money, that your home can burn down, that your wife can run off with the milkman, that your husband can start drinking -- and then what happens to your security? Actually, the only security that you have is your knowledge that you have an alert capability to solve problems as they arise.

I've told you how you can solve problems as they arise. Solving problems as they arise is optimum conduct. See how easy it is to be optimum? It isn't complicated; it isn't like trying to knit with spaghetti. It's real easy -- all you have to do is decide to be optimum. Not to be optimum in 10 years, but to be optimum tonight. Right now. And as soon as you are operating at optimum -- it may take a little practice -- then you can start working for whatever your particular idea of clear may be. And you can achieve that goal very rapidly.

And what is a clear? A clear is an individual who is being or not being, doing or not doing, having or not having, anything he wants at any given moment. That's all. An individual who is under no compulsions to do, be, or have or not do, not be, or not have, anything. So you can solve that problem for yourself by first becoming optimum,

by taking down this terrific, tremendous, need to protect yourself and defend yourself, and using that power -- that awesome ingenuity of the human mind -- to do anything that you want to to make the world a much better place when you leave it than it was when you came into it.

Q Would any of you say that Wing's face has changed?

Sadah No, not Wing's face! Everybody else's face has changed. I came in and Billi was looking red-eyed and grim and (indicates various people in the group) she was looking pale and strained, and he was looking sort of strained, and he had his fear facsimile cranked up, and the kids were kind of wondering what the hell they should do about this. Everybody else was sort of..... well, now they look different.

WING Well, I don't possibly see how they could feel differend with you telling each and every one of them how two-faced they are!

Sadah Two faced! Is that all?

WING Well, I have noticed as we've lectured in various parts of the country that this happens in groups large and small, and it is not a phenomenon. It is not due to the fact that blue lightening comes out of my ears or that I teleport myself to the drugstore instead of using the car. Because I am just another human being who has found a few methods of getting along in the world that he didn't used to have.

I am not interested in phenomena or the ability to produce phenomena. I am interested in happiness and the ability to produce happiness. Producing happiness is a matter of giving data. I give data, people get happier. So there's a tone-rise here simply because people have some information that makes some of the things that were bad problems to them no longer problems. I think that explains it.

Q One thing that I felt, Wing, was that a great deal of mystery has been built up around this word "clear" -- the word "optimum." I found a certain relaxation when you gave data in regard to these two states.

WING Yeah. "Clear" is not something that is out of this world or out of this head. Hubbard in everything that he ever wrote on the subject of dianetics has said, "It's simple", so people have proceeded to make it as complicated as they possibly could. Perhaps my reading is just a little bit weird! But when a guy says something is simple, I do not immediately contradict him mentally. I try to find out why he thinks it's simple. Because maybe it'll be simple for me, too. And it is.

For instance, people talk about "the state of optimum"; they talk about "the condition of optimum." No. Change in attitude -- a change in attitude. That's all. Motivation is the same.

One of the basic motivations of any human being is to help somebody. It helps him survive along one of his dynamics. If you can take a psychotic individual and give him the notion that he can help somebody and let him validate himself by helping somebody, he will be very, very much better off. Want to get somebody to like you? Let him do you a favor. It's simple. Dale
C. Mann

The whole subject of dianetics is simple. If it isn't simple for you, find out how you do this to yourself and what you're using it for. Of course, to make things complicated is a great deal more dramatic -- you can be a great big martyr if you complicate it! You can run reams of regret because you're not clear now. But why should you? Why dramatize that? Haven't you dramatized enough? Why not seek a new viewpoint -- the viewpoint of looking at that as a source of information?

Have you ever sat down somewhere and said, "Why am I not optimum?" I keep claiming that someday a preclear's going to walk into an auditor's office and sit down and the auditor's going to say, "What do you need to know in order to be optimum?" The preclear's going to get up and walk out optimum. May not even bother to answer the auditor. All he's got to do is find the answer to that question -- and he can take a thousand hours at it if he wants to or he can answer it in five minutes. So far, I haven't seen any one-shot clears -- the best I've seen is 10 hours. But that poor, unfortunate guy! Nobody'd ever told him you couldn't do it in 10 hours. As a matter of fact, he actually did it in 6. Let's blame it on the luck of the Irish -- his name was Cassidy!

Q Would you give us the data, Wing, on what changes have come about in yourself?

WING Well, when Old Man Hubbard wrote a book, I got it the first week in June of 1950. As I sat down to read that book with my thick glasses, my trembling hands, my paroxysmal tachycardia kicking against my ribs, my indigestion, and my general attitude that the world owed me a living and was damn sure not doing anything about it -- I hadn't got to the point yet where I thought I was being persecuted, but it was coming -- and I bought Mr. Hubbard's book for laughs. There weren't many laughs in it for me because the guy was talking right at me. And you know what? When he described the l.l, I wondered if he had been reading my mind. I was a mess -- and there are still some things about me that I'm changing, but I'm not a mess, not by a long shot. I don't mind telling you that I function; I solve my problems as they arise. I know my body from one end to the other and it's a friend of mine -- it's a part of me. I know the universe around me better than I ever have before, and I enjoy everything in it. What more could you want?

Q And the tachycardia and the various things like that?

WING They went away -- I didn't need 'em any more! Because of the tone-band that I was in -- and this is very funny -- when I read Hubbard's italics about, "Do not try to run yourself without an auditor, if you could do this you would have already done so", why, of

course I just automatically said, "Aaaahaaaah! Anything he says I can't do, I can do!" So I immediately started madly running all the things that people had done to me. And boy! Were there a mess of 'em! And I ran 'em, and I ran 'em, and I ran 'em, and I ran 'em, all by myself, without an auditor. Once in a while I ran into a tough one and I went and looked up a friend of mine and got him to sit by and help me through it -- nice guy, he put up with an awful lot!

Then a phenomenon occurred: I completely ran out of material about what people had done to me! And I was beginning to get a nagging doubt about whether they had done it to me or not. This was distinctly uncomfortable, but I was still a good l.l, so I dodged. But I apparently dodged in the right direction -- purely out of lack of data! Because I started running all the things I'd ever done to people. And there were a good many of them. There were hundreds of 'em.

So here's what happened: as I ran all the things that I had done to people, I found that the reason they had done things to me was that I had done things to people. So, one bright morning I was carefully trying not to evaluate that, and I could no longer avoid it. I suddenly recognized in full -- 100% -- that anything that had ever happened to me, good, bad, or indifferent, I'd done it. Boy! That one shook me down to my foundations! So I went and ran it all off again, trying to find a flaw in it so I could admire it. No flaws! I did it. No excuses. I did it. No way in the world to worm out of it. Now, how in the dickens can you be a successful l.l with that attitude?

So, somewhere along the line, I realized that the power that I gave people to have power over me was what let people hurt me. So I carefully spent four of the most gosh-awful days and nights of my life removing and erasing, 100%, every value, good, bad, or indifferent, that I had ever placed on a human being. And when I got through, I stood all alone. I trepidated. It was fear, but it was a different kind of fear. I stood face to face with the fear of being alone.

But I looked around and nothing hit me. And I found I had a choice: I could be alone or I could be with people. I never again could be lonely. I was out from under the compulsion to be with people and to have their approval. If I wanted to be with people and have their approval, I could; if I didn't want to, I didn't have to. That's all.

Q When you say you "ran" -- what, to you, is running?

WING To me, running is contacting in every way possible, from every viewpoint possible, everything that has ever happened to you in this lifetime and correlating it with everything else in this lifetime until you have a very clear picture of everything that you have ever done.

I was badly occluded, but I found that as I needed material the occluded areas opened up. They did not have to be dynamited with CO₂ or kicks in the pants or any of the other things that I hear are being done nowadays. Maybe Old Man Hubbard was right again -- who knows? He said, referring specifically to birth, that a good many auditors start diving immediately for birth. Don't do it -- when it's ready to

run, it will come up and will run off just like any other incident. That was the basis upon which I worked and that is the basis upon which I now audit -- when the material is needed, you get it. Until you're ready for it, it doesn't come. But sooner or later you run your entire lifetime as one incident, which of course it is, and you can take any viewpoint you want to and run it with that viewpoint in mind and get an entirely different picture of a lifetime.

Now, I'm not interested in looking back any more. I do once in a while -- I'll get a new piece of data and I'll scan my lifetime to see how that correlates with the other data I have. But I am interested in looking ahead. I'm looking ahead to a world in which people can be honest and people can be free and people can be their delightful, charming, natural selves -- no show, no pain, no strain, no tensions, no bigotries -- nothing but enjoyment and optimum functioning. I'm contributing to that everything that I know how to contribute because I want people to be as happy as I am.

Q What about growing new teeth?

WING Yeah, I'd like to talk about teeth on a broad, general basis -- I discovered a person can grow new teeth if he wants 'em, and I've done so. But that's parlor tricks. They aren't even teeth that would have been valuable to me one way or the other. It was just an experiment and it worked.

But I would like to say that people come to me or go to any auditor with the idea in mind of having a psychosomatic disorder or a physical dysfunction corrected. These are very minor goals and the auditor that addresses himself to a psychosomatic disorder or a service facsimile is slowing down the case because the service facsimile or psychosomatic disorder is a reflection of what is really wrong with the preclear. What is really wrong with the preclear is threats in his present time environment, and we've been through all that. But don't go into your auditing sessions with the idea in mind that you would like to grow new teeth or new hair or that you would like to be able to take off your glasses or that you would like to fix up that crippled leg. Don't make those specific goals, because if those things need to be resolved in order for you to be happy, as you come up the tone scale, as you increase your ability to solve your problems and decrease the number of postulated threats in your environment, those things will fall away because they'll no longer be needed. Then, when you've completed this process, you can go back and find the original facsimile, blow the charge off of it, re-evaluate it, "erase" it.

Q Do you have comments to make about the work that Ron Howes is doing?

WING No, I do not. Ron Howes functions in an entirely different manner from the way we function, as far as I am able to observe. Which does not necessarily mean that the way we function is not correct or that the way he functions is not correct. I think he does a very nice job. I have never met the man. I talked to him one night on the telephone very briefly. He gave me a rapid fire set of data that I needed at the moment. That's the only contact I've ever had with him

on the verbal level.

I like the guy and I like what he's doing. I understand him and he's one of my greatest sources of amusement. But it isn't amusement in the sense of ridicule -- it's amusement in the sense of understanding what he's doing and appreciating very much how he does it. Maybe he chuckles at me, too -- who knows? I'm looking forward to meeting him. I don't think he has anything I want, but it had occurred to me that had I approached a meeting with an individual of Ron Howes' caliber a year ago, I would have gone out through a wall and left my imprint the way they do in cartoons. People used to frighten me, so I figured out ingenious ways to protect myself -- and to hit myself in the back of the neck with them. Because I wouldn't even approach myself from the front.

Q Do you have to take your awareness completely down to the cellular level, or just try to do the best you can and.....

WING Don't try to do anything. Just let things happen. As you evaluate you will find that the areas that you need to study, as I have already said, will open up and that all of the information that you need out of them will come. As that information comes, the body areas that have been injured will come back into communication until you can communicate with your body. And if it's a necessary goal for you to contact your body on an individual cellular level, you can do so.

Q Then it isn't necessary?

WING No, it isn't, because control of the body by awareness on a cellular level becomes increasingly less necessary as your body re-balances through processing. It's just another of those things -- I used to think that if I had eidetic recall, it would be a marvelous thing. Now that I have it, I don't use it. It's a slow and cumbersome method of thinking. And the same with body awareness. My body functions. Period.

Q I think, perhaps, Wing, that a lot of confusion has been caused on that particular thing: because of the fact of Ron Howes' being a scientist, quite naturally he would chase the thing down just as far and just as scientifically as he could. And he would communicate what he had discovered for the interest and benefit of those who were interested in following equally scientific investigations.

WING Yes, that's true.

Q I don't recall that Ron said anywhere that it's actually necessary -- he may have, but I don't recall it.

WING I don't see where it's absolutely necessary. It's nice to know another part of you -- be familiar and friendly, happy, and enjoy the fact that you have a functioning body, but I don't see any necessity for being preoccupied with it.

Q You mentioned in a letter, Wing, some investigations that your doctor was doing. Would you care to comment on that at this time?

WING That doctor was interested in phenomena. I gave the doctor phenomena. Metabolism...expanding and contracting the iris of the eye...changing endocrine balance...various other body functions...all this was a great mystery to Doc. It just couldn't be! Doc used to say twenty times a day, "Get outta here! Go across the street and have a cup of coffee! You're the most exasperating human being I've ever met in my life! How the hell can I find out what your norm is when you ask me what I think it ought to be and then go ahead and make it that?" But we had a lot of fun and I learned a few things.

Q Do you think this approach to this type of thing will allow more people to get where they want to go?

WING You mean the approach I have outlined about present time threats? Or body function? Or what?

Q Body function:

WING Only this: because of the fact that you think with your entire body, it's a good idea to be familiar with the thinking apparatus. You literally cut off your leg when you cut off communication with it. You literally cut off a part of your evaluative power when you cut off communication with it. So that knowing the body is a part of knowing yourself. It's a part of the great enjoyment of the universe to be able to enjoy the function of your body. But again I say there's no necessity to be preoccupied with it.

As you process or are processed you will feel the recordings in your body of the emotional storages that you have accumulated through the years and the physical stresses and strains that you have accumulated through the years. Evaluate 'em, wear 'em out, and go on. I told you folks the other night about that great big feeling in the pit of the stomach -- okay, just open it up, experience it, become familiar with it. Probably the only thing in the world that you're afraid of is the turning on of that physiological sensation of fear. So, instead of considering it a threat, consider it as a source of information and find out all you can about it and just sit right in the middle of it and keep it turned on day and night until it's gone. Not until you can turn it off any time you feel like it -- until it's gone. And you can do that with all of these cellular level recordings.

But unless you get the physical reflection of a traumatic experience worn out, there seems to be some residue of power left in it. So it's well to wear those things out, remembering that it is not that particular condition of the body that is important to you in your evaluation, but what you're doing about it.

Pain is resistance to a threat, or a source of data. It's the body's burglar alarm. An individual in pain, constantly, chronic pain, is that way because of a constant threat in his present time environment. Alleviate the threat, you alleviate the cause for the pain and the pain

goes away. That, of course, is not true if you're sitting on a tack. But again it's an alarm system. It indicates that something is trying to puncture your rind.

Q What about what Hubbard called the "thetan"?

WING The part that Hubbard has called the thetan is that portion of your thinking mechanism that has the awareness of awareness. That's nothing new -- there's an old quotation, "I think, therefore I am." That applies. The only value that I can see in placing the center of awareness outside the body is to take away some of your preoccupation with your body so that you can run off some of your fixed thinking patterns. And as such it's a very valid technique -- if you're looking for techniques.

You see, what I've tried to give you tonight is not a technique but is a valid, living, day-to-day thing that you can, yourself, do every time something disturbs you. Is this a threat? Of course it isn't! It's ridiculous to assume that it's a threat. And the minute you see that it isn't a threat -- no more defense. You take down another aberration. Simple! I don't see how in the world we'll ever get it more simple. But I hope we do.

I was very interested in reading Dr. Howes Discusses... to find that he had discovered something that I already had discovered myself: that someday you can think a thought and have it be just a thought with no chasing around in the body -- non-verbal and non-physical. It's real interesting. Oh! Another thing Hubbard was right about: thought is instantaneous. At least I can't measure the speed of it and therefore it's very interesting when an individual tells me, "I'll sleep on it and give you my decision tomorrow."

Q You were talking about opening up to sources of data and so forth -- as I understood it, the state of "clear", to use that phrase -- I supposed that when I became a clear I would have enormous sources of data open to me which I have shut off, not only in this lifetime but somewhere else, sometime else.

WING That may be so. I haven't contacted any someplace else, sometime else, data, except that there is a much deeper sense of what Hubbard calls "knowingness" now than there used to be. But it's not from any particular outside source. I cannot find anything in it which does not have a referent within my experience. I may extrapolate from data, or imagine from data, but I have never been able to think a thought that did not have any referent in my experience. Try it and see what happens. Maybe you can.

You know, there's probably a way of doing that. It just occurs to me -- if you are willing to accept the postulate that the mind can solve any problem that it can perceive, then setting up the problem of perceiving something outside of your experience should be a solvable problem, shouldn't it? Okay, then all we need is data. See how it works? Very easy. Haven't come to the solution yet, but let's work on it. All we need is data.

Another thing that may be helpful: I find that a good many people's difficulties come from "trying." I can't think of anything that is more tension producing than trying to relax. I can't think of anything that will make an individual stutter worse than making efforts not to stutter. I can't think of anything that will make a guy madder than trying to hold his temper. Trying!

Met a man a couple of weeks back who said he was the most even-tempered human being in the world -- always mad! What was he mad at? Well, this is very funny. He wasn't mad at his environment or anybody in it. He was mad at the fact that he was mad!

A good many people are doing those things -- the man that stutters because he's trying so hard not to; the man who is near-sighted because he's trying to put his eyes 'way out there where the object is that he is trying to see instead of letting the vibrations from the object come to his optics. The harder he strains to see, the more his seeing shuts down. He isn't going to see that thing, anyhow, until the vibrations get to him, so there's no use in his reaching out for them.

But a good deal of the difficulty that people have had has been caused by the simple little mechanism of trying real hard. Remember: as long as you try, you don't succeed. It's only when you quit trying that you can possibly meet with success. I don't mean go catatonic or apathetic, but just know that whatever you do in the seeking of your goal is going to be right and go ahead and function. No pain, no strain.

But -- when people meet with obstacles on the way to their goals, "tension, apprehension and dissention begin." I claim that the more tension and the more pent-up emotion you put into the solving of a problem, the farther you get from solving it -- because those are the things that human beings do, among others, to shut themselves off from sources of information.

Q This includes, of course, the "trying to be clear."

WING Trying to be clear! Suppose you wanted to operate at optimum. Suppose you say instead of, "When I get to be clear I am going to do so and so", or, "I am not going to do so and so...." Suppose you started in practicing the way you figure you will be when you are clear -- a completely free, functional human being!

Which shoe do you put on first in the morning? Put on the other one first for a few mornings. Feel your resistance to doing so. Start being different in little ways -- change the way you comb your hair -- change the way you answer the telephone -- change your eating habits -- change your bedtime -- change your reading habits -- change your taste in music -- change the way you drive a car -- change the way you use your friends -- those are ways of becoming optimum.

Try recognizing that you can do, be or have anything that you want to do, be or have, because you can have any viewpoint and change at a moment's notice.

* * * * *