

February 27, 1967

SCIENOLOGICS

Number Twelve

Franklin S. Sullivan  
Editor

Notes on Book on Sciognostics-- now in preparation-- introductory chapter.

That which is herein contained will certainly seem different to you, mainly because it is different. The writings one is used to are put down as viewed from a frame of reference local to time place and circumstance-- including both social and personal aberration. The more authoritative the writing is, the truer this will be.

Can you imagine someone writing a book, who admits that he is not an authority on anything in particular, and takes for granted absolutely nothing because everybody, including authority, says or assumes it to be true? You really do not have to imagine this; the reading of this book will save you that rouble. To grossly understate it: this is a very radical approach.

I represent that these contents are resultant of observations having a single variable-- me. As it does have this defect, perfection and absolute-ness is not claimed. But, I do hope that it will contribute toward the induction of others into similarly looking-- extending and refining what I have seen.

However, there is nothing herein offered which is not validated by the awareness of others-- usually many others, excepting as specifically noted. But, please, accept it as tentative-- which is the status with which it is presented to you.

The subject matter of this book is not particularly new. It just puts it into clearer focus-- as it is not prised, screens, blindered by the encumbrances of the fixations and inhibitions peculiar to a limited viewpoint.

For example a psychiatrist, or psychologist, or pscho-analyst who operate under the premise that we are nothing but a body and stimulus-response mechanism encounters something that did not happen in this lifetime which is brought up by a patient. No matter how often this might occur-- and it is bound to occur often-- he will dismiss it as "hallucination." It is very "mysterious."

Actually, there is nothing which is unknowable. To hell with Kant et al! Definition: A MYSTERY IS SOMETHING WHICH IS NOT LOOKED AT. In this case, it is something exterior to the limited frame of reference in which the dear doctor is operating. Outside of the space of his small corral, he is thoroly incompetent.

Another example is that of a religionist. Here, beautiful truths are expounded, as ephemeral generalities-- then left dangling. So often no attempt is made to relate them with reality... and they, again, remain mysterious. Like, "the kingdom of heaven lies within you," and other truths which impart it that we are immortal, a spark of the divine. No matter how I look, where I look, I find this to be true. But, if we are immortal what the

heck have we been doing all of this time? Any answer that the minister, rabbi, priest, witch doctor might give in this society would be akin to the stork or the santa claus story. A bunch of us have peeked, and that which we have found is herein contained.

What is sacred to me? You know, I have a dickens of a time trying to see innate differences between what is referred to as "sacred" and what is compulsion and inhibition. If the fixation is of your own origination, then it is aberrative. If the religionists impose it upon you, then it is sacred. Of course, anything that those other groups believe in which is counter to mine is hallucination.

Of course, if I limited my address to physical status quo, I would feel congeniality with the beatniks or hippies. I still am sort of a squarenik. In fact, I have written a "Squarenik Ballet," several years ago. It is quite profound, contains 22 pieces, including, "Minute Steak Waltz," "Dance of the happy television witches," "Dirty schirt scherzo," "Ecstatic Neurosis Waltz," "The ride of the valkries-- in a Volkswagen"----- and similar opii.

Whether it is art, politics, economics, music or any other endeavor, it is almost trite to say that the radicalism of one generation is the conservatism of the next one. And things are moving more and more rapidly. But, almost monotonously, each time the new arises, society resists, and calls the innovators bad names.

But, invariably, up to now, EACH AND EVERY FACET OF HUMAN PROGRESS IS IN TERMS OF AN AUGMENTED FRAME OF REFERENCE. It is a breaking down of something which was considered a stable datum, fixed, sacred.

The English scientist, Mr. D. C. Darlington, in a Conway Memorial Lecture on "The conflict of Society and Science," published by Watts & Co., 1948, very aptly states: "Scientific discovery is often carelessly looked upon as a creation of some new knowledge. This is true of some of the strictly trivial discoveries. It is not true of the fundamental discoveries, such as the laws of mechanics, of chemical combinations, of evolution, on which scientific advance ultimately depends. These always entail the destruction of or disintegration of old knowledge before the new era can be created." He later says, "It is no accident that bacteria were first understood by a canal engineer, that oxygen was first isolated by a Unitarian minister, that a theory of infection was established by a chemist, the theory of heredity by a monastic school teacher, and the theory of evolution by a man who was unfitted to be a university instructor in either botany or zoology." He closed by saying, "We need a Minister of Disturbances, a regulated source of annoyance; a destroyer of routine; an underminer of complacency."

If the contents of this is not but an extension of lookingness, as represented by the above-- I have failed to accomplish that which I intended to do. It seems strange, far out to you? How could it be otherwise? Things are regarded from a viewpoint of REJECTING NOTHING WHICH SEEMS TO BE THERE, MERELY BECAUSE WHAT SEEMS TO BE THERE DOES NOT CONFORM TO PRESENT FRAMES OF REFERENCE.

How could one seek the truth otherwise?

Each and every age, society, religion, and down to each individual has the compulsion that he can feel secure only if he is CERTAIN that that in which he believes is true. He surrounds himself with frames of reference upon frames of reference, within frames of reference galore.

And each frame of reference contains that which the person considers

himself to BE. Really, it is their concept of ultimate truth-- as bounded by their ability to understand.

So, if you or I should rip our blinders off and say, "Hey lookit," the guys and gals with their blinders on will consider us very destructive, far out and kooky.

Now, of course, there have been a lot of people looking. Usually that which each has found is focussed upon, most often, as if it were the whole answer to the whole truth. I call these sectarianisms. They each contribute. That which I have found is a sectarian truth. The word, "Sciognostics is used to include all of these

There are those western movies every night on television. What is their appeal? Putting forth into new country has its thrills. Never know if a bad man or a flock of indians are around the next bend... space...new rules... freedom of action.

Those frontiers are closed in, but the frontiers of the mind and Spirit are wide open.

Modern man has accumulated data, devised ingenious mechanisms, set up synchronous organizations; has well conquered time, space, energy and mass, on and around this planet. The sole end of these efforts has been the comfort and security of his physical body.

As man conquered his environment, it has also conquered him. At last, in the name of science, all of this is gradually convincing him that he is nothing more than a complicated animal. He is totally lacking in exact data to the contrary.

As he reverently kneels, as he does sometimes as often as twice a fortnight, he is told that this is not true. He is told that he does have a soul. To this, he tacitly agrees, but it is daily refuted by the physical universe, which tells him, IF HE CANNOT SEE IT, TASTE IT, TOUCH IT, SMELL IT, IT IS NOT SO!! With the infliction of invalidation and pain, it tells him that he IS the physical body and nothing more. Yet, far deep within him he does feel that he does have a soul-- and even fleetingly that he IS Spirit; that he is more than animated clay.

So, consider this book an invitation to participate in the exploration of and the taming of the wild frontiers of the mind and Spirit. To oversimplify it a bit-- all we have to do is LOOK-- without the imposition of limited frame of reference, without denying anything because we have previously had the fixation, " 'Tasn't so!" Up to now, when we encounter something which is alarmingly new to us-- before we LOOK, we:

1. Obey the mandate that we must be very careful, award it a furtive glance laden with fear, suspicion and hostility.
2. Think about it. Try to figure out a way to set it up as a problem.
3. Automatically search thru the past for something with which to identify it, symbolize it.
4. Hostilely regard any element which might threaten our sacred realm of status quo. Often, we tell ourselves, "there ain't no such animal and deny its existence.
5. With out backs squarely facing the matter, we studiously figure and figure until we doubt whether we CAN look.
6. When out "problem" has become sufficiently muddled, we decide that we cannot look, as we cannot trust our perception, and anyways, what we would see would be hallucination.

WE RELATIVELY FIND TRUTH AS WE ARE ABLE TO CONFRONT THE THING ITSELF, AND WE DEVIATE TO THE EXTENT THAT WE TRY TO UNDERSTAND IT IN TERMS OF ITS CONFORMANCE TO OUR PRESENT AND PAST BELIEFS. IT IS JUST A MATTER OF ACCEPTING THINGS JUST AS THEY ARE.

It is impossible to understand anything of novel content, which differs with present agreements/compulsions, etc. without first agreeing with it one hundred percent. If you cannot do this, you are victimized, impaled on the solidity and rigidity of that which you are fixated to believe HAS TO BE TRUE. Herein is an area wherein you are total effect.

It is equally true that if you agree, say, with what I say, do not, secondly, relate it to all present data, raise every imaginable criticism-- you are also being disloyal to yourself-- and just being my effect.

On the other hand, suppose that I speak about something on which you are lacking both data and experience. Do you HAVE to say that I am either right or wrong? All of this is written because I expanded my frames of reference-- and it seems that if we are to communicate, you will have to do a bit of frame of reference expanding also.

Like with the UFOs. For years now, the materialists have been taking the position that there MUST be a physical explanation..... it simply could not be otherwise. (They were something outside of their frame of reference.) After an accumulation of some thousands of incidents-- with hundreds of incidents unexplainable-- even the skeptics are now admitting that there is something there.

A standard scientific practice is to throw out any piece of data which does not fit into the pattern of the other data-- under the presumption that somehow, this mysterious reading, etc. mysteriously is wrong. They are right only if they consider their local and temporary frame of reference to be ultimate truth. In Sciognostics, there is no such thing as a mystery. If something is inexplicable-- crunch; there goes another frame of reference which we had not noticed as limiting us. Then we LOOK to see if the "errant" datum is related to present understanding-- and how. If it is not, we seek extensions of it which might relate with knowns.

There is no such thing as untruth per se. Something might not relate to a specific frame of reference. But if it exists, it contains some element of truth. We are so inured in agreement with the santa claus type of tale that the physical universe is ultimate truth-- that if it is not solid, that if you cannot stub your toe on it, it comes under the general category of "imagination" and this is too often synonymous with "hallucination." When this frame of reference goes "crunch" we see that there are many, many other universes which occupy this same and adjacent space.

Yeah, that sounds like far out talk. It is. But-- it is a double whammy. It is also far in talk. Just as the patterns of the atom and the solar system and the galaxy seem to be similarly cast, so does all pertinencies extend from the microscopic thru the macroscopic beyond the astronomical. Similarly, everything that is looked at follows the same laws-- and they are relatively simple.

These are laws like CAUSE AND EFFECT. A whole sectarianism could be founded to operate on the verity of this single truth. Every phenomena in any manifested universe could be discovered, related, and everything that is can be understood, providing this was not distorted frames of reference

IS understood, theoretically, solely in terms of cause and effect. This--- provided that no significances are added.

Actually, this true, simple law, for example, deteriorates into all of the massive and minifold interpretations of karma. Of course, the more complex the interpretations are, the wronger they are. It drops thru the garden of eden into the agreement of good/bad. With this we get Billie Graham etal-- "We must beee goood! We must fight eeeevil."

Good-and-evil is simply a matter of agreement, opinion. To a pirate, it is "good" to sink a merchant ship. To a cong it is "good" to kill a foreigner. To an american, it is "good" to kill a cong.

I do not believe that my saying this is particularly new to you. But, dispite this-- dispite the fact that everyone knows better everything that motivates one's life and actions is on the basis of opinions of good/evil.

Introversely, this manifests as the pleasure/pain dichotomy. That which is pleasurable is "good." That which is painful is "bad." This is not so aberrative when limited to body machinery. But when we become conditioned by the body to the extent that we believe, "that which is pleasurable is true; that which is painful is untrue"-- we have a major core of aberration. The is probably THE major core!!

This is coordinant with the fixity: "I have to be right!" So, we have. "That which agrees with that with which I identify myself is right, and is that which gives me pleasure." Thus one becomes sealed off in tiny, dark, cellular frames of reference limited by time, place, circumstance and EXPERIENCE. This is arrogance. A person impaled upon this compulsion will not change. They are totally lacking in humility. HUMILITY IS THE WILLINGNESS TO CHANGE.

Because the above category includes most everybody, this book is written with the knowledge that it addresses a limited audience. To them, that which has been most thoroly agreed upon-- which is that which is imposed upon him with the greatest force-- is the truth.

The exception to this is wherein we are unhappy with status quo, and "solve" the problem by doing the exact opposite. Like with too much conformity, the "problem" is solved by too much non-conformity--- freedom way in excess. Then the resultant chaos is "solved" by really putting the tight controls on. Back and forth, as has happened, is happening.

It seems that in ordinary existense we have two extant patterns available. We can fixate on something of relative truth-untruth, consider everything within its frame of reference "good" everything outside of it "bad." We can make a complete flip-flop and take the diametrically opposite view interiorize in a new frame of reference, "free" ourselves from the shackles which have now gotten rusty, and ensconce ourselves into nice, new shiny ones. I hope that this slight exaggeration is pardonable.

This book, and Sciognostics in general is but a route map leading to getting above the necessity of accepting these two alternative only. This is accomplished by being willing to assume EITHER viewpoint. ONLY IN THIS MANNER CAN UNDERSTANDING COME ABOUT.

Understanding cannot possibly come about unless a person is willing to sympathetically confront both sides of an issue. This seems almost too trite to be worth saying. Sure, we can agree with this-- but we never practice it! Exceptions to this are practically neglible.

We must have certainty! In order for anything to be a good certainty, it MUST be a solid certainty. It is always a single horn of a dilemma and somehow, the solider it gets, the sharper it gets, and the more we identify with it, the deeper we become impaled upon it.

Of course, you understand that everything that I am telling you is absolutely right-- and I am certain about it! Like with the oldey-- "Only fools are certain."--- "Are you sure?" --- "Absolutely certain!"

----- So, to the other side of the coin. Of course, if you knew everything; if every problem ~~essad~~ upon your confrontation of it-- you really would not have much fun. You would not be able to create interest, aspiration, adventure. No fun climbing mountains if you could without effort teleport to the peak. So, you gotta have obstructions, problems, OPPONENTS. And they do have to be agreed upon, solid. Rules penalties, etc. are essential.

And it is fun just as long as it is fun pretense. Sure, we take one side of a dichotomy, agree that it is right and good, that the other side is wrong and bad. Like, locally, the Tige.s are right and good; the Indians are wrong and bad. It is when pretense, fun games get serious that we become stuck with them

It is then that we set up these rigid, limited frames of reference. Our space is reduced, and tend to feel that our localisms are the whole of existence; that all truth lies within this frame of reference, and anything not in accord with its agreements is hallucination. We become so identified that we feel that if we do not have status quo, that if should be proved wrong, the whole universe would dissolve.

Yes, it is to the degree that we become limited in our viewpoints and agreements, that we feel that we cannot/should not know more. Why-- we do not want the universe to disappear! Think I am being humorous again? Nope. I betcha that to some degree, you feel that way....I do-- but less and less as I am, ~~most~~ most slowly and most painfully able to practice what I preach. I assure you that it is not easy. But, really-- I am trying. Do you really believe that I am setting this down TOTALLY for your benefit?!?

The expansion of viewpoints leads to the only true freedom that exists-- the freedom of thought. Whether the restriction to this freedom is imposed by oneself or by others is immaterial. If you are impaled upon a fixity, compulsion, or inhibition on any subject-- to that degree, freedom is absent, and you are the effect of it, are owned by it..... unless it is all a part of a good, fun game that one is playing knowingly.

We become thusly a victim to the degree that we believe that points of view are scarce. We can become so trapped only as we are unwilling to establish our own certainties-- be willing to look at both sides and all gradients in between. This is really the basic to real competence-- and ethics.

It is doing unto others as you would have them do unto you. How do you like being evaluated by others by their fixed reactions-- without really confronting you as you are? How do you like your communication twisted to fit a fixity of viewpoint?

I am not herein referring to mere toleration. How do you like to be "tolerated" by others. I am referring to UNDERSTANDING. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO UNDERSTAND A COMMUNICATION WITHOUT FIRST TOTALLY AGREEING WITH IT. If objections are raised prior to full agreement-- the objections will pertain only to ideas "about" what was said, and will not pertain to what was said.

It is ALSO impossible to understand a communication or almost anything else, if it not thoroly disagreed with. Suggestion, hypnosis is gradient. Any prepossession "fer" something, someone, etc. is as potentially aberrative as a prejudice "agin" it. It represent an area in which one has lost control, ownership.

It is as we are able to confront everything in our lives just as it is, that we break thru the small, cell-like frames of reference, gain the space necessary for the inception of larger ones-- that we can play more, bigger and more interesting games.

-----  
 Trichotomy: SPIRITUALITY- MATERIALISM- RELIGION

Totality, Allness, Spirit, Static, The Supreme Creator is the great unmanifested--POTENTIAL. SPIRITUALITY IS THE KINETIC MANIFESTATION OF POTENTIAL. It is the focus of Potential in the differentiation of a pretense of a singularity of viewpoint. This differentiation IS individualization; and each individualization IS different in potential availability, nature, and pattern TO SOME DEGREE, from every other individualized viewpoint of POTENTIAL. Mundanely: Each of us as IS a branch office of Potential.

As such, WE ARE UNMANIFESTED-- just as per se, the Supreme Potential, and it is only the creations, the pretenses of Potential, or the qualification of Potential that is locatable-- as Spirituality. That is seen. Allness is the unlimited universe of Potential. Subjunctive to this, is all that is manifest. But, each viewpoint of Potential manifests as its own limited universe. Mundanely, again, as the district of a branch office.

So that which is referred to herein as Spirituality is viewpoint of Totality. As such viewpoint, we have our own limited universe. This, too, is herein referred to a Spirituality, as is all that is of our own determinism. Herein, we are cause, responsibility, ethics-- not morals, courage, loyalty-- all of the true attributes. It is that we ARE courage, for example or any of the others. It is not that we are courageous--we ARE unqualifiedly.

Materialism is that which is and persists thru common agreement. It is the manifestation of Spirituality. It is the area of interaction, or communication, fun-- as the manifestations of Spirituality. The liability herein lies only in that there is the fixation as so presently extant-- that materialism is all that is-- is the ONLY frame of reference.

Religion herein is used as per the root meaning of the word-- meaning "binding." It is wherein a cellular frame of reference is established as if it constituted total truth, and all else is orientated to it.

Materialism, as above, could be a religion. Any subject could be in this category. To an alcoholic, alcohol is the religion which owns him. It is any condition from which one cannot readily withdraw. The subject matter could be anything to which one is the effect. As Spirituality, one is limited cause. Within the agreements of materialism reality, one is both cause and effect. In religion one abnegates his own Beingness and places cause "out there" with some other-determinism.

So it is with all of the trichotomies I have looked at. They correspond largely to the limited concept of Hubbard's of DEI scales (desire, enforce, inhibit). It is a declining scale of freedom.

Again, any datum of relative truth is explainable, relatable in terms of any other true datum. This in contrast to the Scientology added axiom that there must be a stable datum with which to align other data. It is thus that limited frames of reference are precipitated. The high hubbamuck makes an arbitrary statement-- enforces it as true, as a stable datum. From then on, all data consistent with it is accepted. All other is rejected.

EXPERTS

"An expert is a guy who has prejudiced himself completely on one side of a question that he feels that he has to make a lot of noise about it-- so that he can keep everybody from looking at the truth of the matter." In practice, this is largely true.

Like, if you wanted to find the truth about advertising, would you ask an advertising man? He might give you some good steers regarding procedures in the mechanics of advertising. But, he is almost certainly prepossessed in regard to the subject as a whole. A person who is identified with something is bound to give a slanted viewpoint of that subject.

The most noxious and hideous example of this is Laffy talking about Scn.

A person is truly an expert on a subject on which he has knowledge, AND IS CAPABLE OF AGREEING WITH/DISAGREEING WITH every phase of it-- and thereby making his determinations. Like, Woody McPheeters, Jack Horner or Elanore (Turner) Eddy are real experts on scientology.

-----

Should you care for assistance to move toward the attaining of the purposes I have outlined let me know. If I am not available, I will put you in touch with someone in your area.

SCIOGNOSTICS  
31805 Bond  
Farmington Mich 48024

Return Postage  
Guaranteed

Feb. 27, 1967

Subscription: \$2/epoch; 13 issues; \$5/eon, 51 issues