

May 14, 1966

SCIOGNOSTICS

Third Issue

Franklin S. Sullivan
Editor

The number of and the content of the communications received since the first issue of SCIOGNOSTICS has been gratifying, indeed. The quicker that we get together, the better. However, everything about it is evolution, gradiancy-- excepting the name. SCIOGNOSTICS is vulnerable to be agreed to, to the extent that one has earned his Spiritual Freedom, and has knowingly created space within his Spiritual (Games, Creative) Universe. Assent to SCIOGNOSTICS is just a manifestation of this. SCIOGNOSTICS, or nominal successors will be around for a long, long time.

If this leaves with you nothing more than the understanding that there are those who are aspiring, O.K. If you point your nose this direction, so much the better. If you write and say, "I AM," great!

--ON LETTING GO

The major criterion on Spiritual Progress is found in the differentiation of the ideas of "changing", and of "letting go."

A desired "change" is in terms of re-arranging the bank so that the irritating solids are moved out, or otherwise dulled, so that the person feels more comfortable. Herein, the person does not differentiate between his own determinism and the bank. He is operating on his agreed upon this life valence, subject to sectarian aberrations such as overt/motivator and havingness anxieties. Therapies and Sectarianism try to produce change.

It is as Ron put it in the first of the 1952 Phoenix lectures: the bank is like a bunch of balloons. All that you have to do really, is to let go of them, and they leave. That is precisely what transpires when the via of Vacuum Cleaning Procedure is used. It is just that simple. There is but one difficulty: YOU HAVE TO DO IT. YOU are original individuation, sans valence. The purposes of SCIOGNOSTICS can be translated into means of aiding you to BE determinism--original individuation, that you might let go.

It is difficult to change that which we feel ourselves identified with. For that reason Ron Hubbard has cautioned against causing change too fast in processing. The reactive bank is per se the defender of status quo. To the degree that you function in identification with the bank, you consider yourself identified with it, as a status quo.

Under such circumstance, actually keying out of something is "loss" of havingness" or some other consideration. Everything with which one identifies himself is something which "must be defended." So, any change that does take place must be minor. And anything of a Spiritual nature to a person viewing from the sanctity of bank is a lethal threat, makes him "queezy."

BUT, IF ONE ADDRESSES THE BANK FOR WHAT IT IS--A SOLID ENERGY MASS--NOT WHAT IT COMES US INTO BELIEVING ITS-- SIGNIFICANCE-- WE CAN LET GO OF IT ALMOST UNLIMITEDLY WITHOUT INTURBULATION. We do not change. We ARE SPIRIT. Bank is just addendum to be sluffed off, in order to start a new cycle of action. When a person feels that he is changing, he is viewing from identification of the bank, can but key out, or rearrange.

In orientation with our obscured, big, long cycle of action game, we all entered Scn. or other sectarianism at the level of "broken piece," ("Piece" is herein referred to, per LRH, as in a chess game.) a condition wherein there is no stability relative to freedom, barriers, purposes. So the person often tries to make everything else stand still, in order to frantically stabilize a datum. In a specific way, reactivity is the attempt to make something unchanging, that it might serve as a stable datum. He then descends to the condition of knowing that he cannot control anything, that he, himself is the only stable fact, like being lost and alone in a mixmaster. THIS COMPLETE INTROVERSION IS THE TOTAL INVERSION OF THE TRUTH THAT WE, AS BEINGNESS, IS THE BASIC STABLE DATUM. WE-SINGULAR.

The function of a sectarianism is to extravert a person, by providing a stable datum outside of himself...certainty. Until this occurs, he is below the level of identification, and of significances. When he gets a stone idol, he gets something outside of himself which is comfortable, safe. As he more and more alterations of truth, therein gaining more and more solid certainties. He changes and changes for the better.

He becomes a more and more efficient stimulus-response mechanism--a good change. He believes everything he is told by sectarianism, obeys with little question.

The subject matter of the sectarianism is but incidental, relative to pattern, herein described. It is of the physical universe, subject to Principles' 1. Any "good" that is done is balanced by some "bad." If some freedom is given, it must be counterbalanced by some enslavement. I dislike repeating this theme so often. But, it is so simple, but difficult to really understand.

LET IT BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THAT MY EXPOSITION OF THE VALENCES OF RON--. THE GOD WITHIN HIS OWN UNIVERSE, DOWN THRU TO LAFFY, THE GOON, WHO ABETS THE COMMISSION OF CRIMINAL ACTS AGAINST THOSE WHO EXHIBIT ANY DETERMINISM OF THEIR OWN, IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ASSISTING YOU TO REACH THE STATE WHEREIN YOU CAN HELP SCN., ETC. SHOULD YOU ELECT TO DO SO. Each of us contain the potencies of each of those valences. Like it is with our own banks, the bad things have the most impact. Unless we who have risen above the compulsive identification level on Scn., or other sectarianisms, understand them as a whole, we are apt to be repulsed. cannot help them. There is really nothing there to be resisted. Everything that has occurred therein, that will occur therein is in accord with natural law.

Nevertheless, all that they are doing and can do is to re-arrange the bank, make it more solid. Is this bad? Nope. The bank has to be made solid before its pattern can be destroyed. You cannot let go of something unless it is solidly there.

For this reason alone, sectarian Scientology is indispensable, and altho they might call me bad names, I will continue to accept them just as they are, help them. Again, I would give preference to Berner or anyone else who is operating on their own determinism. Now, I particularly recommend JACK HORNER 5550 North Kenmore St. Apt. 508, Chicago, Ill. He is a St. Hiller, Amprinistics Fellow, knows Dramanatomy.

To summarize: Addressing the bank from undifferentiated viewpoint of Thetan/bank as is done in Scn. converts obstructive not-issnesses, or denials, unknown-- thru confrontation-- into solids, then into keyed-out solids. This is change. The keyed out, solid bank is then elligible to

being dissolved, by use of Vacuum Cleaning Procedure.

The bank is mainly at the level of symbols, and Ron's a good definition of symbols is-- mass, meaning and mobility. In any Hubrig process the meaning-- or better, signifigence-- is addressed. Unless the cognitions, certainties forthcoming in the process are ABSOLUTE truth, they as lies apply a force which impells the mobility of the mass away from the zone of attention, back into the major bank mass. This usually occurs in some form of "I will do the opposite of what I have been doing." This is the bank SOLUTION terminal/opposite terminal, is constituted... is but bank addendum. Its product; better order, is but in terms of change.

Signifigences can be addressed only in terms of further signifigences. They are the adhesives which hold the bank together, like magnetically. The bank can be let go of only by addressing it for what it is-- a mass. The mass, itself is not sticky. Running hard to move GPMs, etc. to the length necessary to effect mobility, manifold terminals/opposite terminals, etc., is but a complication of the above-- and what I say still applies. GPMs are more complicated, harder to move.

It is possible to alter the location of a bank mass, dealing only with signifigences. But, in order to let go of a bank mass, it is necessary to see the mass, that it can be copied; so the copy can be moved into the same space-- violating, as postulated, the law of universes, that no two things can occupy the same space. IT IS THE SIGNIFIGENCES ONLY

WHICH CAN BE LET GO OF.

But to try to address them, then let go of them is as difficult as it is in the gag about getting a prize if you do not think of the word "hippopotomus." To address it would be trying to solve it. It would result in saying something "about" it-- therein altering it, keying it out, adding to its mass. If the pattern of the mass itself is so thoroly altered that it no longer can ensconce the signifigences-- as in burning-- the signifigences dissolve, along with the solids themselves. The truth of this has been verified in every case I have audited during the past five years.

So-- LET GO OF THE SIGNIFIGENCES, AND SHOVEL OUT THE SLUDGE. When this is done, ability is unobscured.

Hubbard has presented the very accurate statement that the bank is composed of:

1. Signifigences
2. Pattern
3. Masses

It is a mass having a form or pattern (s) containing signifigence(s). The three should not be confused. The plural inferences are that multiple signifigences can occupy the same pattern, and practically always do.

In vacuum cleaning procedure, the mass, pattern is perceived. About 98% of the time, the signifigences can be ignored, let go of. If the mass is keyed in tightly, the command, or other phrases are recovered-- that is, ANY pertinent phrase, and the mass moves out a bit, so that it can then be handled. The pattern is destroyed, irreversibly. MASS CANNOT BE DESTROYED. It is moved away from the bank-- joins the physical universe.

THE BASIC FREEDOM

THE BASIC FREEDOM IS THE FREEDOM TO OWN YOUR OWN THOUGHTS. It could be restated that basic freedom is the ability to control one's own Creative and Games Universes. This is resultant in the ability to reach toward and withdraw from ANYTHING.

It is the ability to perceive, dissolve that which is seen, by the attaining of understanding of it, by confronting it in terms of two terminal reality and gradients.

ANY SINGULARITY OF STATEMENT ABOUT ANYTHING IS A PERPETUATION/ALTERATION OF A LIE. This is a two-terminalled universe, and this Principle 1. holds thruout it-- including the solids and energies of the reactive mind. It is truly pitiful to hear St. Hillers so piously state, "When we get the truth about a terminal (or what have you), it as-issues, and the needle becomes free." Don't they know that this is a two terminalled universe? The trap is the horns of the two-terminalled dilemma. Address one terminal, only, and you are hung on the other horn.

Laffy, or some other despot might tell you, "You are either for me or agin me." Accede to this, and you are impaled on one horn of the dilamma. He is saying "You cannot understand me, my actions: succumb or resist!!"

In each case on the track wherein you have either succumbed or resisted, you will find as a part of bank content.

-----Three days later, May 9, 1966, and after writing of Issue 4. I have been unable to write, altho I had decided to finish this over the week-end. Instead, each time I went near the typewriter, I felt a positive force pushing me away. THIS WAS TOTALLY OTHER-DETERMINED-- it obliterated my power of choice. The other truth is that there is still some beastie within my bank which I have not yet confronted. It is my purpose to confront this, destroy its pattern, return its mass to nature. This is routine, has happened before. ANY CERTAINTY WHICH ONE HAS, IN WHICH HE FEELS HE MUST/MUST NOT DO SOMETHING, THINK SOMETHING, OBVIOUSLY IS NOT OF HIS FREE ELECTION-- IS A FUNCTION OF SOME IMPLANTATION.

The last several mornings, I woke up with the certainty that Hubbard was so very, very right, and feeling so sorry and guilty because I had "abused" him. Right about what? It seemed that this was telling me that he was right merely because it was he who said it. Brother, this was applied with force!! They remarked at the Sunday meeting that I seemed so friendly toward LRH. I was just rolling with the punch.

Later. My co-auditor showed up, and I told him about the above. He then related that after the last Friday session, he felt uncomfortable, like unfinished business. He checked himself, found that the primary "Aggressiveness" was "out a bit." (Amprinistics: See 2ndT #61. If a primary is not regarded in terms of conceptual meaning, but is limited distorted in any way, it is "out a bit" and when it is aligned, the aberration disappears)

I suddenly recognized the likelihood that this same primary seemed to be "out" on me-- may be pertinent to my problem. So, we related--defined--the primary "aggressiveness."

The dictionary meaning of the word is "a first or unprovoked attack of hostility." Real nice guys, the ones who comes out last, simply d3 not do things like that! But, when this primary was defined in terms of other primaries, it did not come out that way at all.

Aggressiveness: Knowing action, born of purposeful intention, manifesting Theta-Determinism.

Aggressiveness: Open purposes, evidencing postulation--creating doingness.
 Aggressiveness:---(Your turn, create your own relations, definition.)

In truth, we are the god of our own universe. Herein dictionary/social agreement definition of aggressiveness does not hold-- excepting to the degree that we have abnegated the space of our universe. With the reality on the above definitions, I realized I must have to some degree rescinded dominion over some of my space-- allowing some other-determinism to move in. This space is recoverable.

IT IS MY PRIME PURPOSE TO RECOVER DOMINION OVER THE TOTAL SPACE OF MY CREATIVE AND GAMES UNIVERSE. I choose to do this by dissipating, dissolving the patterns of my bank/valence directly. If you feel that you can let go directly-- let me know. If you feel that you can change-- then let go-- I would sure still love to hear from you. If your goals are fully in terms of change-- look up the reallest horizontal sectarianism, and surrender.

So, what do you surrender? You-- as a viewpoint of Theta ARE determinism, creativity, power of choice. Everything which obstructs this is a lie, bank, valence--- soul. So you identify with a sectarianism, like Sen. You agree and agree and agree. Like that man is basically good, but you are responsible for all of those bad things-- and dare not blame anyone else, (but yourself-- silently) and you become more and more aware that you are bank, but become very comfortable about it, as it is run. And you own less and less of your space, and Holy Hub owns more and more of your space.... And you as determinism lose more and more interest in all of this, but do tend to resist this other determinism's imposition into your universe. At last, you let go entirely-- surrender the space and the bank to Holy Hub, and someone yells "Trueclear." From that moment on, you will be a full fledged piece in Hubbard's game.

But, it is never too late to say, "I am," and assume dominion over one's own universe. I did it gradiently about ten years ago. As others have divested themselves of the Huborg via, their case uniformly improved tremendously. I expect this to continue. Things are changing fast. Who the heck would have expected Hubbard to don the white robes and start talking about LOVE?!?! A new valence which I dub-- Holy Hub. You never can tell what will happen next. you might even get a postcard from me about the middle of July postmarked, "East Grinstead." Significance!

Sydney J. Harris

Almost every daily article of Harris' as syndicated in Detroit Free Press, provokes from me to some degree an "I wish I had said that." These daily articles have been collected in three books still in print: On The Contrary (1964), Last Things First, and Majority Of One, Published by Houghton Mifflin Co. Harris and I have the same basic theme songs. It will take you a couple or several readings to really talking about; whereas, the gist of Harris' terse capsules are available on the first reading. The following is excerpted from "On The Contrary." I strongly recommend that you ask your book dealer to order this one for you.

"A few weeks ago on that splendid television program, 'At Random' I listened to a man who seemed to be more or less of a spokesman for one of the new African governments.

He was plausible--quick, ready with facts, eloquent, smoothly reason-

able, and unfailingly courteous. Yet I was suspicious of him the moment he opened his mouth, and the more he talked, the more I distrusted what he said."

"Curiously enough, in the delicate art of persuasion, there is such a thing as being too persuasive. And this is precisely where 'official spokesmen' usually fail: they have what mother used to call 'a plaster for every sore.'"

"An honest person, with a mind that is not entirely closed, will never seem so fully rounded in defense of his position. There are gaps in his thoughts; there are facts he does not have available; there are flaws he is willing to admit; there are points he will admit the other side to score."

PLEASE LET ME EMPHASIZE: I GIVETH NOT A HOOT WHAT IT IS THAT YOU BELIEVE IN, OR PRACTICE-- YOU ARE OF SCIOGNOSTICS AS LONG AS YOU ARE DOING IT ON YOUR OWN DETERMINISM. I was somewhat taken aback when Elbridge McVey, Universal Life Church, 6935 Flamingo Way, West Jordan Utah, "I do not wish to be a part of your group because I wish to remain free." SCIOGNOSTICS is non-binding, is on the association, differentiation level, not the identification level.

Finally got around to using Wally Stanley's suggestion that I print on punched paper so that the issues can be saved. Hope that you do bind them as you never can tell maybe some months or so from now, you might pick some up, re-read them, and get a whole brand new understanding. I do this with Ron's early writings quite often.

Subscription: \$2/epoch--13 issues: \$5/eon-- 51 issues.

SCIOGNOSTICS
31805 Bond St.
Farmington Mich 48024

RETURN POSTAGE
GUARANTEED

Mailed May 14 1966