

This is the all-purpose fanzine of Samuel Edward Konkin III, published irregularly (semi-monthly, approximately) for exchange with other Science Fiction fanzines, locs, artwork, filks and other fannish and sercon material, and for the following Amateur Press Associations: LASFAPA, Frefanzine, APA-clearerther! nu, Alarums & Excursions, and any others the editor is invited to join. clearerther! is available only for trade, letter-of-comment, art, fanwriting, or in APA. All correspondence should be sent thusly: New Libertarian Enterprises, P.O. Box 1748, Long Beach, CA 90801, Personal: SEK3.

**This issue is Number 26 (of Volume II) and is intended primarily for Frefanzine & (July 2, 1977). Note new format (4-column comments, 2-column text). Next issue: back to straight fanac for LASFAPA 10.**

### **SCIENCE OF SURVIVAL—L. Ron Hubbard**

I completed reading this book over a month ago, and would have had the critique in the last disty if not for my week-long illness just before deadline. I'm sure any inaccuracies due to memory fade will be quickly picked up by Bob or Lee.

For those wondering what this is all about, I made a deal with Lee Gold to read L. Ron Hubbard's *Science of Survival* if she agreed to read Ludwig Von Mises' *Human Action*. While I'm sure most libertarians would be amused at the ranking of Hubbard with Mises, I'll consider it a fair exchange if only on the grounds that both present a "complete system." They don't overlap much, true; one could have a Praxeological Scientologist. But enough of that; what is *Science of Survival* (SoS) about?

Hubbard is not a libertarian. This may come as a surprise to some who have approvingly observed the Church of Scientology's battles with the IRS and compulsory psychiatric imprisonment. But anyone who thinks people below a certain "tone level" should be shot (to prevent them "enturbulating" higher levels) if they can't be caught and cleared, is no libertarian.

Well, you may well be asking yourself, what are "tone levels," "cleared," and "enturbulated?" The book is filled with jargon enough to shame an objectivist. Rather than attempt a dictionary, I'll try to explain the terms as they come up.

Another surprise for some is that Hubbard is an out-and-out theist. He believes in One God, and says so. Besides the world pertaining to God, he divides existence into two other worlds: *Theta* and MEST. The latter is the familiar Matter-Energy-Space-Time.

*Theta* is the stuff of the mind or soul. His evidence for it, at least in SoS, is circumstantial at best, and to me, entirely unconvincing. But its postulate is necessary for the development of Dianetics (the study of the anatomy of the mind).

OK, so swallow it and move onwards; suspend our belief as we would with a Science Fiction story (Hubbard was an SF writer).

It seems *Theta* and MEST have a mind-body dichotomy. But instead of fretting with theologians about how the immaterial can interact with the material, he takes the interaction as the keystone of his theory. You see, they collide—and it's painful.

Each collision produces an engram. *Theta* is enturbulated with MEST; MEST with *Theta*: entheta and enMEST. Well, why not? Engrams can form a chain with other similar engrams.

Very important to further development of Dianetics is the assumption that pain produces unconsciousness. (Again the assumption is unproven in SoS.) Most importantly, words spoken during periods of unconsciousness are put in an unconscious part of the mind defined as "the reactive mind." It sounds suspiciously like that hoary old Freudian

myth called the "subconscious," which I don't accept either. But these words and phrases (with colourful names like "bouncers" and "groupers") produce compulsive reactions until the individual recounts them. Once one fully remembers the engram and all the words, he is cleared...but I'm getting ahead of the story.

All our troubles stem from engrams, but they themselves can produce psychological hangups known as "secondaries." A secondary engram is one which results from emotional, rather than physical pain, but, Hubbard insists, there must be an underlying physical pain engram for a secondary (or chain of them) to exist.

Finally, there is the "lock," which is a hang-up in the reasoning level—compulsive action, aberrative ideas and such.

They're all undesirable, so what do we do with them? Well, you find an auditor, someone who knows all about them and is in better shape than you are, and you "scan" them. SoS is, at least the second half of the book, a manual for auditing. Scanning is a recall method, where the patient—"pre-clear"—is led to remember back along his "time-track" the incidents of his life. There are numerous techniques worked out to do this properly. Just ordinary memory is not enough in abstract terms. All the senses (and a few more) are to be engaged. What did one hear, smell, see, and so forth at the time?

Just running through the memory is called "straight wire;" it's used on those too far gone to do anything more serious on. For those higher on the "tone scale," one can scan locks. ("Tone scale is coming; have patience.) When enough *Theta* has been "freed" by scanning locks, one can tackle secondaries, and finally "clear" the engram. One moves up this tone scale accordingly, and finally hits "Clear" at 4.0 on the scale. Hubbard speculates on the supermen who could be produced at higher levels, but admits he knows of none.

There are a parapsychology and such things as earlier lives, reincarnation, and immortality posited; but let's mercifully leave these out as I'm told (by Barry Gold) many Scientologists do.

Supposedly people undergoing auditing are improved; I received at least two testimonials of some credibility. I'm afraid I can't help feeling that it's more due to the development of the techniques in "laboratory conditions" than to the theory.

Hubbard has developed Scientology as Campbell wanted SF written—like an engineer. And to that dubious virtue, where techniques are tested and theory is actually adjusted to facts, is where Scientology probably owes what validity it has. Again personally, I have a great deal of trouble accepting that simply recalling—or even complicatedly recalling—one's past experience is supposed to alter strong behavior patterns. Whatever happened to free will?

All right, let's look at the Tone Scale (which Lee was particularly anxious for me to grasp, if for no other reason than that she could refer to it in the future). It starts down at -3 (if I remember correctly) where *Theta* and MEST are entirely separate. The organism is dead and decomposed.

At zero, the organism is dead but still twitching. *Theta* and MEST are separating. A brief digression here: the *Theta* is supposed to go on to the next MEST encounter (the next "life") having learned by all its enturbulation. Clearing is

supposed to be the only alternative to this drastic educational process.

At 0.1, the organism is in "pretended death," playing possum or catatonia for humans. It's ready to go all the way with only a feathered touch of enturbulation.

Why? Cannot a "high-tone" individual "play dead" convincingly, maybe with a little yoga, say, on a battlefield?

0.5 is apathy, where the organism doesn't care about much. Here too, it's ready to succumb to death. I can certainly buy that as "being almost as good as dead."

Moving upward through fear states, we hit "Covert Hostility" at 1.1. Those at 1.1 are mostly psychotics who will profess their love for you as they busily stab you in the back every chance they get. Their lives are full of conspiracy.

Subversives are placed here by Hubbard. Those of us who are frankly out to subvert the State are amused—until we remember that we're to be shot for enturbulating others.

From fear we move to anger, 1.5 is Overt Hostility. One can imagine why anger is better than Apathy (isn't anything?), but it's not at all obvious that it's an improvement over keeping the hostility "covert" and thus controlled.

At 2.0 we reach the magic line where we are fit to live in society without enturbulating everyone by contamination, and where we're headed for "survive" rather than "succumb." We can now have our locks scanned, and maybe even a secondary!

Why Boredom is under Enthusiastic but superior to Anger and Covert Hostility is not at all obvious to me. True, the definitive points describing it makes it clearer, but a better term might have been simply "Unenthusiastic."

The scale goes through 3.5 (Mildly Enthusiastic) to 4.0 (Clear) and supposedly onward. Hubbard asserts that one cannot pass from one level to another without passing through the intervening levels.

Well, I'm out of the purview of Dianetics, then; I've been able to jump from one to the other. Anyone else out there want to testify?

There is an enormous amount of information (or misinformation) in the book, and I'll not cover any more. Read it yourself if this is turning you on. It's a system, large and encompassing, reminiscent of objectivism especially in the "survive/succumb" axiom, even down to Hubbard's style and attitude.

Given a choice, I'll take Rand. On the subject of emotions, she makes a lot more sense. Emotions *à la* Rand arise from one's premises, implicit or explicit. Since one can alter one's premises—and at some point however early in life one chooses them—our emotional states are the result of our choice.

So here, then, is to me the nail on Scientology's coffin. It is determinist; it removes the responsibility of your behaviour from you and puts it outside—on engrams and pain and surgeons talking in operating rooms.

You're not to blame! You can unburden your guilt and be forgiven! You can be saved! Hallelujah and praise L. Ron!

Beware, though, from listening too close to my irony. For Hubbard in SoS finds those of us most unwilling to submit to his auditors low on the tone scale. The Church of Scientology's Guardians may already have your name...

In conclusion, *Science of Survival* did have two positive qualities for me: it made me think about mental states in a new framework and methodology which was useful for insights, and it seems to have helped some people in some circumstances through its auditing.

The philosophy expressed in the book is fundamentally negative: determinist, coercive, and at its roots, irrational. Not for libertarians, or rather, not for libertarianism.

Libertarians will read whatever they want and evaluate, accept and reject as they see fit for their own lives.

May it never be any other way.

## FREFANAC

Much of what I had planned to write in this column has been dropped or already happened. The Sixth Annual Heinlein-Konkin Birthday Party (July 7-8) will probably be over by the time you read this. And the plans for a suite at SunCon have definitely been dropped. With luck, Susan and I will still be there in Miami, but with a double. (We're still waiting for confirmation.) Everyone else in the Anarcho-village is even more conditional about making WorldCon than us. Even the ALL-SF NLN for this year is in doubt.

But there is one bright spot: The First Order of the Jedi Knights (Intergalactic). Look for more on that in Vic's zine.

Let's not forget Richard E. Geis who not only fills the pages of *Science Fiction Review* with hard-core libertarian musings, but has brought the frefen to the attention of an even larger world through his column in *Galaxy*. (In that same column, Alter Ego argued in favour of government! Bring back the Prime Self!)

Next issue I hope to have a line on Frefanac in Pettigrew, Arkansas, New York City, and other exotic places. (Meanwhile, Long Beach falls to the inexorable hordes of libertarian fen...)

## EN GARDE AT THE RIPOSTE OFFICE

### FREFANZINE 5

**Cover** That's the way it should have been.

**ToC** Well done and getting better. So we're going hexaweekly?

**Lee Gold** Vic did an adequate job, but he's no Barry. Do you let just any man run your stencils, or are you true to a few?

Whatever happened to that rent law? As you must now be aware, **LASFAPA's** going a different route on limitations. I may follow you out soon, but (as usual) I'll go down fighting.

The WorldCon of last year seems to have succeeded in cutting attendance. I hope it's not even further cut at SunCon. And I haven't heard from **SotM** for about a year. I may conceivably find some area of agreement with you on "cultural conditioning" if we work out the semantics, but no way if you equate it to coercion. I don't believe my inhibitions were imposed from without; I accepted them freely at the time. Whether I would have done so now is irrelevant. Find me a hundred moral people in the District of Columbia, Lee, and I'll stay my finger from the button.

Northrup Frye is undoubtedly useful for clarification of genres, but I don't see the relevance for "sense of life." I consider the Romantic-Naturalist or Old Wave-New Wave battle a moral struggle. Thanks for the ego-

boo, as always. I've read all the Goldin pseudo-Smith books and will probably continue. They're not real Smith or even Space Opera to be sure. I think we've reached an impasse on Duquesne. Do you have any idea of what Smith's *intent* was? It seems to me he intended him to be a villain. I think I already mentioned that Fort was not only implausible but boring. "Historical Choice" by Robertson Jeffers is Right On! Rest is good too. How did you come across him?

**Duncan Frissell** Welcome! Good Con report, even if it was a TrekCon. Are you going to make any L.A.-cons? I know a lot of anarchists in DC and I'd question the "genuine" bit of all of them. Those passing through could be warned. You have a point concerning children—but that could be solved by a prior propaganda campaign (which should have been undertaken anyway for other reasons) to urge defections, including children from statist parents. Yes, there are innocents. A risk of killing innocents is acceptable in self-defense (but you got to pay for it); a *certainty* is not. I find no conflict between the non-aggression axiom and "practical problems of human conflict"—only lack of imagination in the defenders.

**Harry J.N. Andruschak** Seems like nothing but out-of-date

complaints here. I'll move on. **Victor Koman** Is that the *Scaramouche* referred to in that exquisite song by Queen, "Bohemian Rhapsody"? Can he do the fandango? || Agree with you on *Rollerball*. || You're one of the few film fen I know who cares about what the movie is trying to say. Maybe that's why I listen to you. || You got your time off without quitting. Happy? || "Chinook" is equivalent to a California "santana" and "eh" is an end-of-sentence "huh" down here. || You have many of my favorites among your female horde—but then you've probably got most of everybody's.

**Sandy McIntosh** Nope, the last to be free will be children. || So some inhibitions are bad. That hardly condemns the institution. In older terms, they were called Virtues and Vices. || OK, so let's rescue that kid from Omelas.

**Steve McIntosh** Good article; well presented. How about wrist terminals? || The Counter-Economics application seems sound; obviously there are a lot more. For example, how about keeping books in a computer which are irretrievable by the State's snoopers? How about some comments next ish?

**Ken Gregg** Good story, but I should address my comments to Benjamin Tucker, I should think.

**John Thiel** Libertarians are generally Rationalists, and creatively Imaginative. I'm afraid your surrealistic attempts are shading into incoherence. No offence intended. It's obviously difficult to give comment on absurdities, though.

**Flyer** Great Conference! (Comment in NLW 75.)

## FREFANZINE 6

**Cover** Best art I've seen from you, Vic.

**ToC** Idi Amin's now dictating *Frefanzine* editorial policy?

**Lee Gold** Right about getting Robert A. Vampire to a Con. || With the exception of Brad Schenk, I doubt that those contributing artwork to A&E would find NLW their cup of anarchotea. Note that the colophon of **ca!** does indeed solicit art, and I've had few takers even there. || Van Rijn is a character of Anderson; Anderson believes libertarianism is genetic. || The chimichanga at Dr. Munchies in Beverly Hills is almost up to snuff. || How do you "perpe-

trate" subliminal advertising other than by fraud? Fraud is immoral. If you tell people that the program contains subliminal advertising and they watch it anyways, then it is voluntary.

**Victor Koman** You were right about *Star Wars* and never wanting to see anything else again. But...what about seeing the sequel? || *Annie Hall* had some good lines, but it was too Naturalist for my taste. But then I lived a lot of it (and it was painful). || You typoed my name? Consider yourself purged! || Lack of interest killed *CarbAPA*. || Why don't you save up the money from your sale of *Saucer Sluts* for World-Con? You can crash with us, of course. || You know where I was that ish. Flat on my anarcho-back trying to swallow.

**Harry J.N. Andruschak** "Gee whiz, it's a hexaweekly!" Hey, that's my line! (How about a sexaweekly? Fits Vic's personality. \*disclaimer\*) || No, *Frefanzine* is not the only Libertarian APA; just the best...er, the others are not SF oriented. || I hear it for ditto. \*silence\* || It's quite possible to "put forward anarchy" without preaching. Did *The Moon Is A Harsh Mistress* preach? How about *The Syndic* or *The Great Explosion*? || Why should a male get all the sex he wants for the asking? TANSTAAFL! And what's that got to do with discrimination? Look, any female cannot get all the sex she wants without paying a price; does that mean we men must be discriminated against?

**John Thiel** Much more readable than last ish. || Comments on comments would probably cause comments on comments on comments. || Wrong. I distinctly remember starting to buy *Worlds of If* because it was serializing *Farnham's Freehold*. || Talk about *obscure* filks! || "Certificate of Guarantee" was amusing.

**Duncan Frissell** I remain repelled by "The Ones Who Walk Away From Omelas." Throw in *The Lathe of Heaven* and *The Word for World is Forest* for dislike. I did like *The Dispossessed* and *The Left Hand of Darkness*. LeGuin is not a liberal; she's an avowed anarchist of the Left. || I have a copy of Van Vogt's new *Anarchistic Colossus*. Maybe I'll have a review next ish. || Good point on anarchist Asimov robots. I once told him in an elevator at a Con that the middle

section of *The Gods Themselves* described an anarchist society (of aliens). He was surprised at the observation, but agreed. || Fits what I know of Anderson too. What were you doing at a Partyarch party?

[No fillo; enjoy the white space.]