

A monthly magazine published by Scientology-Detroit.  
Sullivan, Communicator

Franklin S.

### DETROIT AREA IS IN MOTION

The Detroit area will be well prepared for the anticipated increase of activity expected when L. Ron Hubbard's new book is offered to the public this spring. There are three churches here now, and it is hoped that there will be several more by mid-summer. There will be a sufficient number of Ministers, as indicated by the following:

Arie Klopp HCA, Chairman of the Board of The Church of Scientology of Michigan, and Treasurer of Scientology, Detroit, is now in Washington, taking advanced training.

Pauline Ward is in Washington, taking her HCA training.

Mary Gluski has completed her HCA training with Refa Postel and is assisting Refa at the Church of American Science in Berkley.

Vincent Turner HCA, is leaving shortly to take his advanced training in Washington.

Earl Ash HPA, will be taking his advanced training in Washington in the spring.

Chloe Mitchell has returned from her HCA training and is located in Pontiac.

Elizabeth Hopp of Pontiac completed her HCA training, and we understand is planning on locating in Lansing.

Warren Lepczyk HCA, who has been doing a good job running personal intensives in Detroit, has just completed his retraining.

James Lurkins HCA, who has been working with Dick Steves in New York, is completing an intensive and retraining, and we hope that he will return to Detroit.

Rev. Refa Postel, Minister of the Church of American Science, will be returning to Washington for retraining in the early spring.

Rev. Leo R. Hoemel, and Rev. Franklin S. Sullivan of the First Church of Scientology of Detroit, are returning for retraining in the late spring.

Rev. Ernest Wirick of the Church of Scientology of Michigan is planning on returning for retraining this spring or early summer.

### NEW CHURCH OPENS IN DETROIT

The First Church of Scientology of Detroit opened its Guidance Center on Feb. 4, 1956. It is located at 19112 St. Marys, Detroit, Mich. St. Marys is a north and south street about half way between Greenfield and Southfield, and the Center is adjacent to the northeast corner of Seven Mile Rd. Rev. Franklin S. Sullivan is the Pastor, and Rev. Leo R. Hoemel, Rev. Donald McCanney, and Rev. G. F. Leydorf are Ministers. Group Meetings are held on Tuesday and Thursday evenings at 8 P.M. and Sunday Services are held at this same hour.

The Church of American Science, 2557 Coolidge, Berkley, Mich., conducts group processing each Monday and Friday nights at 8 P.M. Sunday Services are held at 10 A.M. The next week-end intensive will be on

Saturday, March 17, and Sunday, March 18. Refa Postel, Minister; Mary Gluski, Asst. Minister.

The First Church of Scientology of Michigan, 19875 Mack Ave., Harper Woods, Michigan, welcomes you to open group processing each Thursday evening at 8 P.M. Ernest Wirick, Pastor.

It is our desire to get THE MIDWEST COMMUNICATOR into the hands of those really interested in Scientology; especially relatively new people. So, if you will send us the names and addresses of those whom you believe might be interested in receiving it, we will arrange to send it along.

On the other hand, when we do not receive communication, we can only presume that it is not of interest. We will, of course, have to pare our mailing list before long, so if you wish yours to keep coming, let us know. We still seek news and articles also. By all means send us your church notices.

The expense of printing is underwritten by Scientology-Detroit, but if you should feel that you wish to take your share of the cost, your check for a dollar or so will be used to expand the issues.

#### CORRESPONDENCE

From Dr. Walter L. Hamilton, Director, Scientology Guidance Center, North Wilbraham, Mass.

Hi, fellows! Real proud of your maiden effort in the communication field. Real sharp article in magazine. Could I reproduce here? As you know, I have been playing solo up here in Massachusetts, but am now moving heaven and earth to get full time staff auditors up here with me. Massachusetts is beginning to crack wide open. Enclosed, find the best gimmick I have used. Send this letter to every group in your area. Then list your requests for lectures, give them a five minutes talk, and then ask them if they would care to have a sample demonstration of how a group auditing session is conducted. If you hold your five minute talk to some simple aspect of life, and its clarification by Scientology, they will agree to the auditing session. After the auditing session, give them a simple card telling them where to come for further sessions - free except for donations. Now you will really have congregations. After several meetings, ask members of the congregation during the session you are running, if they can think of one person not present who could benefit by these sessions, and then another one, then a third. The following week, you will find a lot of new faces.

The letter Dr. Hamilton referred to is as follows:

Sir:

We would like the opportunity of having one of the doctors of our staff speak before your group at one of your regular meetings. We have a talk that lasts about an hour and a half. This talk has three parts. First, a definition of Scientology. Second, how Scientology can be applied to solve the problems of juvenile delinquency. Third, how Scientology can be applied to individuals of your group, or applied as a remedy for group problems. As Scientologists we state positively that we can prevent wholesale juvenile delinquency, and in this talk, we adequately demonstrate this statement. Also during this lecture, we demonstrate to the

group that as individuals they can feel much better, be more efficient, and be happier. There is no charge for this talk, as it is a part of our public service presentation.

Sincerely Yours

From Jack Sheline, Park Shore Box 94, Cassopolis, Mich. Excerpt: THE MIDWEST COMMUNICATOR seems a very efficient method of "shucking" out help, experience and data.

Frank, I can't say enough for your fine, simple explanation of Scientology. You've done a real good job.

My wife Katy and I are auditing one another - perhaps with more understanding than before. We are sticking very close to the manual.

From Garnette Shawkins, South Charleston, W. Va. Excerpt: I used your material from THE MIDWEST COMMUNICATOR as the basis for a talk before the Unitarian Group here. I did not have time to get your permission, so I hope that you do not mind. They seemed to understand it, as they did not ask the silly or hostile questions that I expected them to.

---

#### UNDERSTANDING

By Franklin S. Sullivan D. D.

When we are confronted with something that is new to us, our first reaction is usually that of rejection, antipathy and hostility, until we can identify this intrusion with that which is acceptable and familiar. We could say, "until we identify it with ourselves," as we identify ourselves with those things which are acceptable and familiar. This is gradiently true, as it depends upon the depth of identification which we have with the subject matter; that is, the force with which it was imposed upon us, the number of times which we have accepted it to be true, the degree to which our group believes it, etc. If the identification is deep, we feel as if our very beingness is threatened, when contrary or even merely new data is presented.

We set these identifications up as a frame of reference. All that lies within it, we take to our bosom; and all that lies in the blackness and mystery outside of it we avow to be degrading, dangerous, untrue - - will not even look at it. We become like the farmer who saw the giraffe for the first time. It did not belong in the frame of reference of cows, pigs, chickens, etc., so he blandly remarked: "There ain't no such animal."

On this earth today we have approximately two billion individuals, and approximately two billion sets of frames of reference, no two of which precisely agree. We have thousands of group frames of reference, each with adherents who are certain that their compartmentalized viewpoint is the only one which is right; that each and every other one not in coincident agreement is to that degree wrong.

Frames of reference are the product of the necessity of obtaining certainties; something solid, something dependable, constant and stable;

and constitute a beacon to guide our life by, which gives us another determined, synthesized, artificial reality on our position in the time and space of the physical universe. We feel that there is such a scarcity of rightness, that when an enforced rightness is imposed upon us, we seize it with such a fanaticism that we can no longer perceive any of the gradients of relative truth.

It is hereby emphatically stated that any certainty is better than no certainty. The many levels of certainty will be discussed in the next chapter. Our present point is that rigid frames of reference are not necessary to attain certainty, and the limiting frames of reference act as a barrier to understanding; because, as the being has no affinity for, reality upon, or communication with all that lies outside of it, his understanding, freedom and certainty is thereby restricted.

At the core of each frame of reference is a piece of information with which all other must conform. Ron calls this a stable datum. It is primarily this stable datum with which we assume identification. In any field wherein it bears its shadow, we react as an automaton, as a push button robot. All other data which aligns itself with the stable datum constitutes the remainder of the frame of reference. We have frames of reference relative to such items as baseball teams, baby sitters, blondes, religion, medicine, Chevrolets, etc., etc., and etc.

How do we become owned by this stable data and accompanying frames of reference? Usually in one of three ways, or combinations thereof.

1. As the result of a period of pain and unconsciousness, including any form of hypnosis--that is, an engram, or trauma.
2. In agreement with the winning valence. The other guy wins and wins and wins. To avoid the feeling of perpetual loss, we identify ourselves with the winner. This is the "if you can't lick 'em join 'em" mechanism. Mama or papa with a hairbrush was always the winning valence.
3. In agreement with the group, or society, as a whole. Don't you know that you **MUST CONFORM**? If you do not, everyone will tsk, tsk at you, and you cannot tolerate being tsk-tsked at.

In his magnificent tape on "The Stable Datum" L. Ron Hubbard gives the example of man who had the stable datum that "horses sleep in beds". Technically speaking, this is homologous to that which constitutes most stable data: that which is produced so prolifically and is found in such great abundance in stables.

When we understand something, we have completed a creative act. We are being cause, not effect. We are gaining a reality. We are creating a sphere of communication with something that is novel, with an attitude containing some degree of affinity or "sympatico". Our understanding is in direct proportion to the size and flexibility of the frame of reference in which we ensconce it.

Let us take two men; who have the same education and profession, same general intelligence level, and same available information. One of them believes that the Republicans can do no wrong, and that the Democrats can do no right. The other one holds the opposite view. Neither one is, obviously, right--both are composed of fallible humans--(unless YOU happen to be a Democrat or Republican). The man who thinks that horses sleep in beds, we consider a bit batty. Actually, the stable data on Democrats and Republicans is only somewhat less askew. But, this is socially acceptable, and we think nothing of it. Nevertheless, this rigid and limiting frame of reference has depredated these men's understanding of political matters.

One might ask--and you probably are, "Golly, can't a man even have opinions?" Certainly, but where did your opinions come from? Are they really yours? How many of the opinions you now hold, on any subject that you might want to mention are really your own? A lot of them? Look again.

Let us regard a person who has gained a certainty and freedom of understanding. As he reduces the barring frames of reference, he no longer feels that data or truths are scarce. He no longer identifies himself with them. He will willingly abandon his most cherished beliefs in the light of a new, higher order of relative truth. He owns this data, it does not own him.

Such a man is L. Ron Hubbard. Over twenty five years ago, he gave his last limiting frame of reference the heave-ho, and started to just plain look. The result of this just plain looking is Dianetics and Scientology. Scientology could be described as: The bases of understanding all that is man, without the imposition of limiting--other determined--frames of reference. Now we come to the horrifying and mysterious part of it all. Scientology does not fit any existing frame of reference. The Old Doc tells us that it is non-existent because it does not fit the frame of reference of medicine. The fundamentalistic theologian, the "pure" scientist, the mystic, even the average guy on the street, have, each of them, the same story. You know, it just could be that before we can really understand Scientology, we have to first understand the anatomy of understanding, as real understanding has been a pretty scarce item in our society--so far.

Scientology would not be Scientology, if we were to use any limiting frames of reference at all. If we fence in understanding, any attainment of the truth would be impossible. We may get half truths, segments of whole truths, local data having no relations with anything else beyond its immediate time and/or place; but it is difficult to imagine one of the magnitude which makes up the data of Scientology being understood if we were told at its presentation, "this much you MUST know--or else. The remainder is a secret, a mystery; and as far as you are concerned, brother, it's unknowable." This is the mechanism of "authority". Scientology is most vulnerable to this vile epithet. "It ain't no good. It ain't authorized."

What we are really doing when we use a limiting frame of reference is to stop time. Right or wrong, we regard the moment of surrendery to the stable datum as an observation. When we close our minds to further observations, we are declaring that this "truth" we have "discovered" is ultimate; that there is nothing more which can be known which can in any way change it. It is immutable, eternal. We are bound by it. There can never be any uncertainties within the frame of reference we have set up around it. We can, with the invalidation of our powers to perceive, rest in a state of eternal, somnambulistic, bliss; at least as far as the limits of this setup are concerned. We are like the sea captain with his ship snugly anchored in a snug harbor, afraid to venture into the open sea--because it is too dangerous. But so what! We have something solid, constant, dependable and stable, a beacon to guide our life by.

When we perceive something ourselves, we accept the datum merely as that which exists at the moment of perception. We do not blind ourselves, and say "It must be ever thus, or I will perish". We look again. Perhaps we see it even more plainly; or if it had been raining and now the sun is shining, we do not feel invalidated because it is still not so. We know that the sun is shining. That is a stable datum. We know that it WAS cloudy. That is also a stable datum. Are these stable data and their accompanying frames of reference, rigid, limited? When we look in present time, they are never rigid and limiting.

For hundreds of years, sailors sailed the seas and believed that the world was flat, They had but to look at distant land or another ship to perceive for themselves in present time that the earth is round. But "authority" said that the earth was flat, and, by golly the earth was flat. They had set up "authority" as the frame of reference, could not see beyond it. It is entirely possible that there are people who trust "authority" more than their own perception, even to this present day.

Man's progress in our civilization can be written in terms of fracturing of Limiting frames of reference imposed upon us by "authority". There is not a great discovery, a great invention, and few great works of art or music which have not been hostilely received upon first presentation. This is to be expected, for in order to be great, it had to be original, and if was original, it was outside of existing frames of reference.

Many of the "disturbing" truths revealed by Scientology are only a bit less apparent than the perceived curvature of the earth. In those past days it was wicked to think for yourself in any manner. Heresy, it was called in those days. Gradually there came the rise of science and man was given the right to be an observer. Science and the scientific method are now highly accepted, tho the battle was not won easily. The field of battle has been restricted to the application of the scientific method, only to the subject matter of science itself.

This scientific subject matter constituted a frame of reference which had no common ground with the past one, of religion. In the frame of reference of religion the rules have remained only slightly altered, that is, relaxed somewhat, during the past several hundred years. The right to be an observer in this frame of reference has not been accepted.

Then along came L. Ron Hubbard. What did he have the gall to do? He applied the methods of science to subject matter religious. Most obviously it just could not be. It just could not be done, because no one has ever done it before.

To the scientist, it could not be, because the subject matter was not the subject matter of any extant science. Obviously, a fraud. It could not be a religion, because in a religion, you are told what to believe; it is never never said, "Take a look, fellow, see for yourself." Obviously a work of the devil.

Scientologists are a faithless crew. They have no faith in Scientology. They understand it.

Please notice that we <sup>UN</sup>said that Scientology does not employ limiting stable data. But we do employ limited stable data. A stable datum is necessary for the alignment of other data. In Scientology, a datum remains stable only as long as it aligns itself with other data, if it does not, it is summarily rejected. It is thru the use of stable data that the body of knowledge which is Scientology was aligned. The result: every datum which makes up the body of knowledge which is Scientology is explainable in the terms of every other stable datum which makes up the body of knowledge which is Scientology. Each stable datum has its own frame of reference, and this constitutes its alignment with every other stable datum in Scientology. In toto, they form a boundless, interlocking pattern. Truth and understanding cannot be truth and understanding as long as its bases are limited.

Scientology includes all that pertains to man. It is the first attempt to solve the problems of, and to understand man by including ALL of the data. You cannot solve any problem without all of the pertinent data, whether it is baking a cake, building a bridge, or assisting man to become more sane and more able. Yes, Scientology is different. It is as different from all that has gone before it as the great outdoors differs from a musty cell.

Now, just what is it we should know about understanding, itself, before we can understand the theories of Scientology, optimally? First, it would be most desirable to know that it is not dangerous to understand--to understand anything, regardless of what we "think" we understand now. It would be well to realize that sanity does consist of being able to perceive for yourself, in present time, that we, just like everyone else are subject to the compulsions imposed by the stable data we have agreed to, in the past. Very simple, but to put this into practice is a different story.

This story is the story of Scientological research. The present processes have been evolved from the trial of thousands of techniques. The resultant of this experimentation has been the discovery that those processes which increase the units of understanding, which we call cognitions are most effective. They are now achieving the goal of eliminating or reducing the effects upon the being of these limiting stable data, and the "foreverness" therein contained. As these imprisoned units of awareness are released from past time-timelessness agreements, they are made available for use in perception in present time. They gain for us the ability to control time by the increasing of ability to be in present time, to contact past time as we please, but with memory only--from present time.

\* \* \*

This is a second series of articles to be presented each month. The first of these appeared in the February issue. There has been such a demand for reprints, that we are offering them for the cost of running the stencils--5¢ each in lots of thirty or more.

The articles to follow, titled "Certainty", "Freedom", "The Religious Aspects of Scientology", "The Tone Scale", "The Physical Universe--the Great Imitator" and "Fighting" have been outlined and will follow in about that order. It is planned to reprint them in present mimeo form, or, if the demand warrants it in printed form.