

FREEDOM

A lecture given on
18 February 1952

Definitions of Terms

Tonight I have something possibly a little less fascinating for the first part of our talk, and a little bit more about why in the second part of the talk.

The first thing I'd like to get off my mind are some definitions, here, that I'd just like to be on a piece of tape.

You know, pieces of paper kick around: You wake up in the middle of the night and you say, "Well, that's it"; you sit down and you write it down, and backs of old envelopes and that sort of thing accumulate. Then one day you say to yourself, "I wonder what the definition of that is?" and you say, "Well, it's on an old envelope somewhere."

Definition of invalidation: Invalidation is the inhibition of an individual's use of force, emotion or thought, or the deprivation of his ability to use these by enforcing his use, by inhibiting his use of them. In other words, enforcement or inhibiting of a person's force, emotion or thought adds up to invalidation of the person. That is a workable definition of invalidation.

In other words, some fellow is going to haul off and hit a taxi driver and you catch his arm and don't let him hit the taxi driver: That actually operates on him as an invalidation, because it interrupts his rightness. Now, he has made a decision and he starts to put a force into action, and then something interrupts that force. This tells him he is wrong, so it throws him down tone scale.

Here is somebody who is going to get angry, and he starts to get angry and somebody checks him from getting angry. Well, the moment he is checked from getting angry, this is like telling him he is wrong. He has made a decision to be angry, he is angry and then somebody does not permit him to be angry. He has a thought: he says that the Republicans are doing just right by electing some stupid general for president. And he has this thought, and somebody comes along and points out to him that every time you have a general in the White House you have graft and fraud such as Truman never dreamed of. At least, that has been the record based on a series of one. Well, that is good psychiatric research — a series of one. The whole prefrontal lobotomy is based upon a series of one. Do you know that?

That is very amusing, by the way, just as an anecdote on the side. We ought to know about that. This is something that all psychiatrists have to know, so we should know. The way they got into doing prefrontal lobotomies on people — in other words, cutting out their brains to make them more tractable (they never say more sane; they know better) — was that there was a fellow out in Bavaria.

By the way, you know in the American Weekly they are always telling you about these bats and werewolves and some girl has awakened from the dead after twelve years in a graveyard or something. And the American Weekly — the Hearst special — you find these always happened in the Balkans. These always happened in Romania or some other place that nobody could ever get to by dogsled, helicopter or anything to check them.

Well, that is the way psychiatry handles its case histories. They always put these things in Bavaria or Lower Slobovia.

Anyway, this fellow was a blacksmith's helper, according to the case history (and I am doing almost a direct quote, now, from psychiatric text). This fellow was a blacksmith's helper and he worked in a blacksmith shop, as most blacksmith helpers do. One day he was standing near

a forge and by some accident or other some coal exploded in the forge with considerable force. And there was a crowbar lying across the forge, and the coal blew the crowbar into the air like a javelin, and it sent it in one side of this fellow's head and came out the other side. And he lived.

Well now, the psychiatric text tells you that before this happened, the individual stammered badly and was an idiot. And then they say the crowbar was blown through his head: he lived.

And I see you are all hanging on the end of this story, but you see, that is where they end it. It doesn't say he was saner or greener or less a Bavarian or that it cured his stuttering or anything; it just ends right there. So that is why everyone does prefrontal lobotomies.

You think I'm joking, but the odd part of it is that if you ask for why they do prefrontal lobotomies, they will probably tell you this story. And they will end it right where I ended it. And you say, "Yes, yes, but he became strong, he became powerful, he stopped stammering, he became more intelligent?"

"Oh, no. No, he lived."

So you see, it is "perfectly all right," then, to cut out all the prefrontal lobes. It is very non sequitur. But don't ask for reason in that field; it is not the field of reason. Now, to get on with invalidation: An individual, then, can be inhibited from thinking something, from having an emotion or from exerting a force or effort. If he is inhibited from using this force, emotion or thought, he can be said to be invalidated; that is, he is not valid — his computation wasn't valid. This is what the society around him is telling him.

On the other hand, supposing he is a nice, mild, peace-loving fellow that never wants any trouble and so on, and wants to get on with everybody and is very mild (like me!) and supposing everyone is coming up to him all the time and telling him he has to be angry with somebody. Well, eventually he sort of surrenders and gets angry with somebody, but that is beside the point. The fact that people want him to act differently than his self-determinism tells him to act is invalidating him by enforcement.

Somebody comes up to an individual and he says, "Now, your car is double-parked outside and you've got to move it." "You've got to exert force," in other words. "You were wrong for parking your car out in front," it is saying at the same time. A cop comes in and says that. The individual gets sort of crushed; he goes out and exerts force to start the car and move it. That is enforcement invalidation.

Supposing an individual is happy. Supposing he comes into a house and he is very happy and very cheerful, but Mama has that day received a letter from Aunt Agnes and it says that it is snowing in Michigan or something. Somebody says to this person as they come in the house, very happy and cheerful, "What's the idea? You can go around singing like a lark, and do you know that all the larks are dead in Michigan?" or something, you know? It is wrong to do this.

They are doing, then, two things at once: shutting off one emotion and enforcing another emotion. "You can't be happy around the house." You get the same thing: "You can't sing around the house" — people who tell you you can't sing and so on.

People who force you to think something besides what you want to think are doing, again, an enforcement invalidation. And people who agree with you are probably trying to trick you into being sympathetic for them or something. So there is no course left open to anybody except being fully self-determined. And when you start to sock the taxi driver and somebody halts your arm, you are just dissuaded long enough to kick them in the shins and go on and sock the taxi driver! That is how you never get invalidated.

Now, here is identification definition: Identification is the self-determined action of trying to make the motivator personnel the same as the overt personnel. Why, that is very learned, isn't

it? In other words, an individual self-determines the fact that he is going to identify one person with another.

This fellow is going along through life and an auditor gets hold of him. This fellow before this thought he was sane, and this auditor gets ahold of him and he is quickly disabused of that and he finds out that he is merely “normal.” All right. Every time he gets around his wife he gets a twitch or something, you know? And this auditor traces it down to his wife.

“Well now, did you know anybody your wife reminds you of?” Now, the point is that this individual, theoretically, hates somebody somewhere in his past, and his wife reminds him of that person he hates. His wife isn’t that person. His wife has some physical characteristic — her eyes, her voice tones or something are similar to a person this individual hates because this person has done something to the individual. You see? So it looks like a mechanical proposition: An individual identifies his wife with somebody else in his past and therefore doesn’t get along with his wife — very simple sort of a calculation. And we look it over and we find out it is done on purpose.

Why? Well, he actually is blaming his wife for something, but he has done something overt to his wife. And the way he explains it (and this is the suborder computation) is by telling himself that his wife is the same as this other person and therefore he is justified in sitting on his wife’s head, you see, because his wife is actually Aunt Agnes who used to spank him. The thinking, if you want to call it thinking, is then in reverse to what we supposed it was. We supposed it was that quite by accident his wife restimulated Aunt Agnes, as a mechanical proposition — that there was no self-determinism in it, the environment was just playing a dirty trick on this individual. That is not true. What happens is that he is trying to find some reason to be mean to his wife and he finds Aunt Agnes. And he hooks it up by saying “Let’s see, Aunt Agnes is the likely candidate because my wife’s eyes are similar to Aunt Agnes’s eyes. Aunt Agnes used to beat me, so therefore I have a perfect right to beat my wife.” Simple!

So, that is what identification is: it is a self-determined action done to justify the individual’s overt actions.

Now, some individual becomes very mean to a society, a whole society — let’s say a whole nation. Let’s take Hitler. Now, he will find some reason; it will show up as an identification; A therapist going into his case would have found out that he had the German people confused with his family or something of the sort. No, the way he was justifying being mean and administering punishment to the German people was because his family had treated him wrong, and he had said, “This group and that group are the same. Therefore I am justified in doing so.” He knows darn well they are not the same, just as everyone who is doing this identification knows very well they are not the same. Rather a hideous state of affairs, isn’t it?

It is a self-determined action. The individual chooses to be confused; he chooses to get two things into confusion, one with the other. And what you have got to find is the time he chose to do so. And when you find the moment he chose to do so, the identification springs apart. If you find just the similarity, in most cases you are not going to resolve it — if you find just the similarity. You find that his wife and Aunt Agnes are similar. Once in a blue moon you point out this similarity to him, he sees it and immediately he likes his wife afterwards. Well, that is because you got the rest of it too, by accident. But what you want to look for when you are straightwiring somebody is the reason why these people have to be similar, and it has to do with overt acts.

When you get a person identifying something in his environment, some person in his environment with somebody who has been mean to him or something that has hurt him in the past, you look for why. But you look particularly for his overt act in his environment against that person or thing that he is trying to identify with something in the past. And that is the way the two fall apart. Now, that is of interest to auditors primarily.

I wanted to get that on record. Another little item here, written with the midnight oil, that I would like to get on record.

You know, there is a thirteenth button on the Chart of Attitudes. It is the “freedom” button. There are all these buttons: “I am,” “cause,” and so forth, that you process out of individuals. Well, you will find out there is a thirteenth one, and that is “freedom.” At the top of the scale, with the individual in excellent condition, he is completely free and he has the feeling of complete freedom. As he goes down the scale his freedom is less and less and less until he gets to death — and how free is a dead man? Well, he is not free in time and space at all because he can’t move. Death has wrapped its clammy arms about him and has immobilized him, so he is wrong.

Now, you find out that “right” is at the top of that scale, and as “right” descends, you get to the bottom and you get “wrong” — very wrong. You have got a scale here and it starts out “right” and it goes down to the bottom, “wrong.” Right alongside of this is “free” and “completely imprisoned” — not free at all.

We look at these two together: How wrong can you get? Dead! That is how wrong you can get. In other words, a person considers himself less and less right the less free he is. He considers himself more and more right the freer he is. And that is why individuals strain toward democracy or higher levels of freedom. That is why a little child will not remain still on your lap if you try to restrain him.

You want to conduct this experiment: Put a little kid on your lap and don’t touch him; let him sit there and chatter at you all he wants to and he will sit there. And then you put your arms around him. Don’t touch him; just lock your arms around in front of him, quietly talking to him cheerily. He is going to leave you because you have restricted his freedom. Restricting a person’s freedom is the same as making him wrong, is the same as cutting down his survival, because you are cutting down his motion, or his potential motion, in time and space. And the harder you try to hold that little kid, the more he will try to get away from you, up to a point where he goes into apathy. But a kid will go into a screaming fit if you hold him tightly. There is no reason why he has to leave you; it has nothing to do with reason. You have merely restricted his freedom and you have made him wrong. And if you can make him wrong enough, he knows that the end of that track is death.

If you take all the freedom away from a people: death. You take a nation like Russia right now, with freedom very restricted within its borders, according to the best accepted newspaper stories. (And newspapers, of course, never lie, never have, print nothing but the truth!) Now, you take Russia and look at her on the freedom scale. And we find out that she is probably restricted to a level of about 1.0, because the Russian government rules its people to a large degree by fear. We look at the tone scale — the chart — and we find the potentialities for progress, construction, constructiveness, advancement, for being of actual worth to the world of men; and 1.0 across the boards is pretty bad. It is the ratio of freedom, you see?

In America, here, we have had a fairly high ratio of freedom for a long time; therefore, the country has stayed in pretty good condition. It is in pretty good condition right now, actually. This stuff about economics. Any couple of good economists with a few sleight-of-hand tricks could straighten out the economies of this country, if it got bad enough that somebody would let them. But the economics of this country are still in such good condition that you can do all sorts of weird things with them, such as pass government regulations concerning them and so forth. I mean, you can do almost anything to them and they still stay fairly sound and solid. This is in direct proportion to the amount of freedom this people have.

You notice that when a nation starts going down the tone scale, it more closely approaches a police state, finally passes into a police state and is finally owned, controlled and so forth. You get a one-man strong-arm rule and it will go out the bottom. Its next step down from that is a messianic society; that is, a society which is held together by the apathy of “Let’s all die, and

the only leader we want is somebody who can tell us the fastest, quickest way to kick the bucket.” That is a messianic society. Man has been going on this rollercoaster for a long time.

So your freedom button becomes very important in the estimation of politics. It also becomes important in the estimation of a business organization: How free are the employees in this business organization? Because the business organization will be at the point on the tone scale of that freedom column, and if that is too low, your business is going to be very ineffective and very inefficient.. This has to do with freedom.

And so out of this we get a therapy. There is a complete therapy contained in this: it is restraint on all dynamics. You just start running a person on restraint in all dynamics. Restraint: “When have you restrained yourself?” “Sex?” on the second dynamic. “When have you restrained other people — a group?” “When have you felt like restraining man?” “. . . life forms?” “. . . restraining the physical universe?” and “. . . restraining the seventh dynamic, theta?” or even “. . . higher religious spheres?”

“When have you felt like restraining these activities?” “When have you tried to restrain them?” And “When have they tried to restrain you?” And if you just start matching that and just start straightwiring on this basis — “Have you ever tried to restrain anything?” — the person will say, “Oh, no. I wouldn’t think of doing that.”

“How about a dog?”

“Oh, well, a dog. Yes, I’ve restrained a dog. Yeah, I used to put this dog up on the table and he’d have to stand there. (sniff)” Person feels kind of bad about it.

Because the horrible part of it is, what you do to another dynamic, you are going to get too. That is not so good.

And we’re sneaking up on something that is very important to an auditor, when you get a super-control case. What is a control case? It is a person who is restraining himself terribly. He is restraining his emotions; he is restraining his effort; he is restraining his thoughts; he is restraining his whereabouts.

And this person who has terrific restraint — and by the way, this is the ideal of the British Empire. As a person is entirely and completely restrained, why, he is a “good fellow,” you know, providing he doesn’t show any emotion or quiver.

There is restraint. Who restrains who in England to make this an ideal? That is an interesting one, because it is very apparent, in the English upper class particularly.

Here is a level of restraint, then, whereby the individual is restraining, restraining, restraining, restraining — he is restraining himself, because it will come back to him; or if he is restraining himself, he will try to restrain everything else around him. The inhibition of motion, of people moving and so forth, is actually restraint.

So you take this restraint button, as a button, and you start into its anatomy, and you will find out that you can free up a preclear and you can knock out a control circuit. And you can shut a control case completely down to the bottom, if you want to, by just making him restrain himself from dramatization and so forth. Or you can free a control case by picking up all the times he has tried to restrain others and other things. And there is your circuit. It is just this mechanical thing. So you get your people around who won’t emote, who won’t cry, who won’t do this and so forth: start working the restraint button, you get some very interesting material.

Now, restraint, then, is quite important. But freedom is much more important. How does an individual win his way up toward the freedom of being able to use his own thoughts, of being able to do his job in the world, being able to be effective, being healthy and so forth? What are

you trying to do? In some fashion or other, you are trying to free this individual. And, of course, the restraint button is the most obvious button to work on. So there is a button. It is awfully close to center — very close to center.