

DERIVATION OF LAWS - PART I

A lecture given on
17 July 1950

Invariability of Basics

The Dianeticist has to know his laws. If he cannot think and derive above these, then he is not going to get good results. This has been reduced to a point where a great deal of it is rote, where it was speculation before, but because it is rote, that merely allows the auditor more time to think.

We want to see, even before we complete our chemistry research, cases going through on 75 to 100 hours to clear. In the past month alone, we have knocked off three quarters of the usual time required on a dub-in.

Some very marked advances have been made which require less skill as an auditor and result in less time for the preclear in therapy. Nevertheless, a person who is trying to work Dianetics without working his mind hard at the same time is not going to achieve these results.

So, this lecture concerns the derivation of laws. Dianetics begins with the law "Survive." Therefore as one follows along the track, he should be able to discover ways and means to derive new data. What is pain? What is pleasure? What is death? What is survival? What is immortality? And so on.

Of course, infinite survival would be immortality, an impossible goal perhaps but nevertheless the postulated abstract, the unobtainable absolute. Death is not an absolute since a man goes on dying, I have heard some morticians say, for about a year after he has been pronounced dead. In other words a cellular death sets in.

Furthermore, we must not overlook the fact that there may be an immortality in the form of personal identity as a spirit or a soul. We are dealing here with a science. Just because something seems odd or incredible is no reason to believe that it is not possible. Many people, for many, many centuries, have believed in a personal spirit and immortality.

Dianetics takes no stand on such a thing. It doesn't have opinions or beliefs. There are definite physical laws. These laws are invariable within the science. As far as we are concerned, survive is an invariable. The definition of pleasure and the definition of pain might be improved slightly, but they are invariables. The effort of an individual is toward survival, the best possible survival.

Now, this must contain, of course, a considerable overage. It isn't enough to grow one basket of wheat for every month in the year and then say that one has adequately provided for one's survival. A person could not grow enough baskets of wheat to get the optimum, because his survival may not lie strictly along the line of baskets of wheat.

It is perfectly true in the field of living that just the plain ordinary obtaining of pleasure has to be a sufficient lure. It is there to make a person desire to survive. It is a valid commodity. And furthermore, pleasure as a commodity is obtainable in various ways, which as long as they are not physically harmful and actually detractive of survival, are of course the very stuff of which survival is made.

As we look along this line, we find various cults and creeds in the past that have denounced pleasure as being extremely evil. We notice also that with the emergence of this philosophy upon the face of earth, man's survival deteriorated. The last time that happened we had the Dark Ages. Pleasure was very bad—a piece of reactive thinking.

So, we can derive these various invariables. We have the engram. Its existence and anatomy is invariable on a functional level. We don't know all we need to know about structure at the present time. We are trying to learn. We know too little about biochemistry. That too we are trying to learn. But we know function, and functionally we know the anatomy of the engram. We know the anatomy of the grief emotion.

The anatomy of the engram is invariable. Most of those sessions which fail for an auditor fail for one reason only: He is not sufficiently conversant with his tools to recognize that he is dealing with invariables. I have watched this. One is not sure, for instance, that the somatic strip is there, or that it goes where he wants it to go instantly.

One isn't sure that there is a file clerk with which to work. And yet there is. That is invariable. There is always a file clerk. Perhaps he can't get through. If he can't get through, then it is up to the auditor to try to find out why, and then let him through.

Perhaps the somatic strip won't work. Perhaps it's stuck somewhere on the track in a chronic engram. But that doesn't mean that the somatic strip won't move. These are invariables: The somatic strip will obey the auditor, the file clerk will cooperate with the auditor. Also, the theory of valences, although it may even now suffer considerable alteration, is workable and is invariable. But now we take what is variable in the case and we find that the incidents and the principle of allies are not invariable. The allies in one particular case are definitely variable. The names and numbers and times of life that this case had allies are variable.

So, the auditor must learn what he can depend upon in a case and to have reliance on his tools; and, by having that reliance, he will be able to work with the quick certainty that can be found in a good many professional auditors working today.

Some of these cases which are supposed to be so difficult are difficult simply because basic rules are being overlooked. Every case an auditor faces will try to make him believe that there is something very strange, unless it is a pianola case.

There are various types of cases in Dianetics.

There is the coffin case, one who is in the valence of somebody who is dead and who lies there with his hands crossed on his chest, his feet straight out, motionless, running through all sorts of engrams.

The pianola case is so called because it plays itself. The auditor simply puts such a preclear in reverie and then says, "The file clerk will give us the next engram which we need to resolve the case. The somatic strip will go to the beginning of the engram. When I count from one to five and snap my fingers, the first phrase will occur. One-two-three-four-five (snap!)," and the preclear runs through the engram and gets to the end.

The auditor then says, "Go back to the beginning and run it again," and the person does. That's a pianola case.

What I want to teach auditors to do is to make every case into a pianola case before he starts. After that the case will run.

The major cause of error is that one doesn't believe one's tools will work. But they will. I don't believe that an auditor ought to try to audit until he himself is convinced that these tools do work, and has felt inside of himself the horrifying impact of a real, live, off-the-couch engram. After that he has no uncertainty about it whatsoever.

I'm not trying to convince anyone about the validity of Dianetics, but I do ask each auditor to please use the tools as they are. Use them invariably, as they are invariable tools.

When one starts to think about Dianetics, the first thing one must learn to do is to set up a little piece of circuitry in one's own mind that will think like an engram, that will think with horrible literalness, that will think in puns.

For instance, "He rode a horse" and "He rowed a horse." Or one can say, "He must be crazy," and you know that we are not talking about "He must be crazy" but that he is compelled to be crazy, because that's what the phrase says. The reactive bank does not differentiate in anything, much less tone, or whether a person was sarcastic or not. It operates solely on the literal meaning of words. So, one has to set up this little piece of circuitry that will think like an engram. One must be able to recognize a bouncer for what it is.

For instance, an airline pilot turned up recently wanting to know all about Dianetics. He ran a few engrams, but the incident that brought him to the point where he thought life was wonderful and actually was the reason he was a pilot was the engram that said he was no earthly good!

That is the way an engram "thinks." It has no reasoning power. The principal error which people make when they are trying to follow along with engrams is that they expect them to reason. They think, "Well now, let me see, because this was said then it must mean that the computation was so-and-so."

There was a horrible example of this by a psychologist in Washington and I imagine his patient was a very unhappy patient the next day. The psychologist ran the patient back down the track. He had had this patient in psychoanalysis for about three years, and had been looking for a hostile stranger in this person's case.

Naturally, for years he had been asking this person, "Now let's see, is that the hostile stranger, is this the hostile stranger, is that the hostile stranger?" and the person was quite well educated into looking for a hostile stranger.

So he ran him back down the track and found some late life incident that wouldn't amount to much in Dianetics of where his sister took the little baby in the crib by the throat, shook him, banged his head against the bars, and then took his bottle away from him. And the psychoanalyst said to him at that moment, "What did you think of your sister?"

And the patient said, "I thought of her as a hostile stranger."

"Come up to present time. Now there, you're cured."

He didn't desensitize the engram or anything.

There are two things that can be said about new auditors: (1) they talk too much; (2) they use too much repeater technique, because they are liable to start in on any phrase they get and use it as repeater technique and wind up in places where they don't belong, such as birth.

You have got to be very careful about what you are using repeater technique on. It is perfectly valid. It isn't that it is dangerous. But you don't work a whole case with repeater technique. Psychoanalysis at this time is having a wonderful Roman holiday with repeater technique. They say, "There are parts of Dianetics which we can use. Repeater technique is one of them."

Then they have somebody repeat something like, "I'm a bad boy, I'm a bad boy," or, "You're a bad boy, you're a bad boy, you're a bad boy," and sooner or later they are going to get him into a spanking. And the moment he gets into the spanking, they say, "There you are. That's why you think of yourself as a bad boy. You're cured." Only this is nonsense. They might just as well stick this person in the eighth month of the prenatal bank in an engram which will not reduce and which contains all manner of injury, and then bring the person up to present time with all the somatics, because "You're a bad boy" does not necessarily appear in the engram

bank postpartum, it could also appear earlier if there are older children in the family and it is there at all.

That is what I mean about using bits and pieces, of having confidence in your tools. A good auditor knows when to use these tools and when not to. He can think in terms of how an engram thinks.

A person being choked does not think of anybody as a hostile stranger. He doesn't think. But the engram has content, and we want the content out of the engram. It doesn't matter how much the person says concerning this engram, although occasionally on a grief charge we let the person explain to us for a little while, if he doesn't take up too much time, how it was that Uncle Oscar was so valuable to survival. Then we send him back in there to get that engram and its word content.

And that is what we want out of the engram. What computations he made on this content are of no real concern. Whether or not it resolves one of his aberrations is also of no concern to an auditor. So the person feels better. That's all right.

People who have been in psychoanalysis for some time will busily analyze every piece of wordage they get out of an engram. They are wasting the auditor's time. All the auditor wants is content.

Getting back to derivational thinking, when one has the basic principles of a science, one can derive the information one needs. There are pieces of information lying around inside Dianetics which have never been figured out. In fact I would go so far as to say not one one-thousandth of the data available from the basic principles of Dianetics has yet been dreamed of.

As an example, we have had trouble with coffin cases. We have another law that a person will seek to occupy the winning valence of an engram. If one wins he survives, so he will go over into the winning valence. The next valence down is less survival, and of course his own valence is the last ditch, because that one probably contains the pain.

So, we have the very valid theory of the winning valence. And what is the winning valence in the coffin case? It's the dead man, of course.

Have you ever seen a little child going around saying, "Oh, if you look upon my cold, dead face you would think better of this," and that sort of thing? Then there is the way they idealize a funeral, "How everybody will miss me when I am gone," and so on.

I took a brief survey on some of the cases I had and here was Uncle or Grandma or somebody lying out there in that box, stiff and cold, with everybody saying, "I am sorry we were so mean to him. Poor old fellow, he was an awfully good guy. I'm so sorry."

They are practically singing the song "Poor Jud Is Dead" over the corpse. And what does the child do but go into the corpse's valence, not only from grief of loss, but because Grandpa really won. We will test this theory along in this order: We will take the coffin case who is lying there with his hands crossed, and say, "Now let's pretend that you're dead and it's your funeral. Let's see what people are saying to you." Just coax him into the text of what he is saying. We will go over it a few times and see whether or not he winds up in that valence in the death, because the coffin case has been pretty hard to spring out of a dead valence.

We won't use direct memory, but will simply put the person into reverie to run out the valence and do a valence shift on him.

But remember this person is in another valence, so we are going to have to coax him into this situation until he is actually lying in the coffin and so on, and then whip him out of that valence as soon as he becomes a little bored with it and the intention is off it. Then we can shoot him into the secondary valence, whatever it is, and in this fashion finally work him down into his

own valence and run the grief charge off that and I think we will get quicker results on a coffin case.

So, that is an example of the terrific amount of material which one can derive in Dianetics. One has got to think and be on one's feet on the subject.

We know what our tools are. If you come up against what you consider to be a sticker, derive it. It is always better to be able to compute from certain basics which you know give a right answer to a given situation than it is to be able to go back and get visio recall on ten billion pages of research material which may or may not contain your answer at all.

There are two ways of approaching any piece of learning. One is to file in the standard bank on the pack rat principle everything and anything which one encounters in life, so that the person winds up as an encyclopedia. And although present education may so reward him, and graduate him with A's, he is merely a good catalog.

In many lines you will find this is unfortunately true, particularly in lines of literature. You get somebody with a good, solid visio recall. He can go over and over literature, but he can't write it. So we get in this society B.A.s who are not bachelors of art but who are good catalogs for it.

The second way of approaching learning is by derivational thought. Derivational thought is not stressed in the fields of the arts. One of the best reasons why an engineer can do the things he can do, and think the thoughts he can think, is not because he is any brighter than others, but because he is trained into derivational thinking. He can derive new answers continually, and by doing so, he keeps his brain live and active. He doesn't just go on remembering, remembering, remembering.

After a while a person's data is so old that it is out of date. For instance, it so happened that I took the first course that was given in the United States on the subject of atomic and molecular phenomena—and if I had to depend upon anything I know about atomic power from that course I would be in trouble, because most of the data was wrong. The conclusions which were drawn at that time were in error. But if one had the fundamentals, he would have the various equations and the mathematics which eventually developed into what they are now calling quantum mechanics, and he could still be active in that field. But not if he could merely read the pages of the books that he read then.

It was fortunate at that time that we didn't have any textbook. Yet some of the people who are studying in the field of atomic and molecular phenomena now, graduated from school at that time and they must have kept up to date on their data.

Those people who are able to retain everything they look at, who have eidetic memory, are in much worse shape than those people who are forced by occlusion to derive everything. It is not true that a person who has no sonic and visio recall is, by reason of numbers of engrams, made in some way smarter. He is merely blocked from access to his textbooks. He can't go back and look over Construction Materials, page 426, on the mixing of concrete.

Engineers who can do this are considered pretty good engineers, but one doesn't go and find one of those engineers if he really wants somebody to do some conceptual thinking.

Someone who has had to struggle through school without visio recall, whose memory for facts and isolated data has been very occluded, has had to set up a derivational circuit. If the person who has sonic and visio recall has also been made to set up a derivational circuit, he would actually be doing much better than the one who, by occlusions, has been forced to derive everything.

The difference is that it is too easy for the person with visio. He doesn't quite know exactly why he knows all these facts. But he has attention units right close to hand that can read his

textbooks for him and he gets those facts easily and fast. So he doesn't have to derive anything.

Now in Dianetics, we don't have any vast literature. We have a Handbook, we will have some bulletins, and the university text in Dianetics is in preparation. It is going to be a masterpiece. If anybody can understand it in four years of intensive work I will give him a medal.

But you don't need that data. What you need is a knowledge of fundamentals and the ability to use those fundamentals and to derive new answers from them, so that at any time you look at a case, by knowing the fundamentals, you can derive the solution to the case very quickly.

We have tried to make it very smooth and easy in Standard Procedure. But an auditor has to be able to think. He has to be very fast on his feet. I have seen people sitting down with a notebook on their knees "auditing" and it is a ghastly thing.

There is the patient, the poor guy, running auto, jumping all over the time track, doing this, doing that, writhing around, getting thoroughly restimulated, with control mechanisms completely out of hand, and the auditor is sitting there writing, writing, writing, and never thinking, just doing a stenography job on the engram bank. And that is not Dianetics. In the first place the auditor should never have to do very much writing unless he recovers a particularly interesting engram which he would like to hand in to research, an engram which is the center of something, or a new aspect of a case that he has not noted before.

The practice of stenographic auditing, to give it a name, is not important. What is important is to get all of it out of the preclear's mind.

One has to be able to derive these principles. There is only one way to learn that and that is to read the fundamentals, know them well, and then do lots and lots of auditing. A person who works only one case is liable to find himself possessed of the idea that all cases react in a certain way, and the moment one puts him on another case which offers an entirely different aspect, the same fundamentals just changed slightly give it a completely different view.

Let us take the case which has a demon circuit that says, "You never can control yourself, you're utterly impossible." It is a declaration which produces a very definite type of case.

Now, supposing whoever was in that same engram had said, "You've got to control yourself, you've got to control yourself all the time," that is another type of case. But they are exactly alike in the degree that each had a demon circuit. And they are exactly alike in the steps one has to take to get that demon circuit out of the case in order to make the case run.

In the first case which can't control himself at all, one is liable to find a circuit interposing which just cripples the file clerk. And in the other one, there is an extra circuit which is substituting for the file clerk.

But these are the same mechanisms at work, although the cases may look entirely different.

Standard Procedure, used, takes care of both cases.

Having covered derivational thinking, let's start in now on the Auditor's Code.

Somebody once called the Auditor's Code a code of how to be civilized. And sure enough, if everybody acted like this toward other people, it would be a pretty smooth world.

A violation of the Auditor's Code can cause an auditor 20, 40, 60 hours of extra work, or can close a case down on him as an auditor completely so that some other auditor has to take over. Furthermore, it may throw a psychotic person into a complete spin. It may even precipitate his psychosis.

So, the Auditor's Code is of very definite interest. The most important part of the Auditor's Code was not sufficiently stressed in the Handbook. The first part of the Code should say:

"Do not evaluate and do not invalidate any of the patient's data no matter how invalid that data may appear to you. Never correct the patient's data, never tell him it is wrong, false or imaginary. Never infer to him for a moment that there is such a thing in the world as delusion, even if he is running something that is nothing but delusion." This goes to the point that if a person says, "I know this is just dub-in," do not agree with him. Don't disagree but don't agree. If you lean to any side, lean on the side of leading the preclear toward the fact that he can recall accurately.

Never say, "I don't think that fits in that engram at that place." "I don't think you are recalling that properly because I was there and I heard your Uncle Bosco." "You know very well that prenats are delusions after all." "I don't know whether this material is correct or not. I think it's mostly imaginary."

Any one of these remarks, as innocent as they seem, has an enormously forceful effect upon the preclear. You destroy with this his sense of reality. There are actually three chief social aberrations in the world. One of those is the class of statements which say, "You are wrong."

It is the principle of the analytical mind to be right. When somebody says, "That's just your imagination, it's all in your imagination. You are not sick, it's just in your mind. You know you're wrong, that isn't the right material," and so on, these things riding along as social aberrations destroy one's sense of reality.

Of course in engrams you'll often find the phrase "It's all so unreal to me." That is the chief aberration which, running through the society, produces more insanity per square inch than any other.

With the issuance of Freud's theory of "all is delusion" in 1911, the curve of promulgation of this theory throughout the civilized world began to gather a parallel curve of the number of people institutionalized.

That is a horrible condemnation of a theory.

It is not that I am criticizing, I am merely pointing out the extreme seriousness of invalidating information, or permitting anybody in the field of mental healing who is also handling one of your preclears to brand as delusion anything that preclear is saying.

One knows dub-in. One knows imagination when one sees it. It is the auditor's business to recognize it and to know what to do about it. But it is not his business or anybody's business to say that it is delusion.

Sometimes when working with somebody who has engrams to the effect of all is illusion, that "This is so unreal, I'll have to pretend I'm somebody else," or something of the sort, "because I can't believe this anyway," the auditor can actually shift this preclear over into another valence where this engram exists, and in that way achieve an apparent alleviation. The mechanics of it are very simple. He is having a hard time facing reality so the auditor tells him that the reality he is trying to face is in fact delusion.

The auditor simply says, "You don't have to pay any attention to this sort of thing because it's all delusory anyway and you don't have to worry about it." It acts like a positive suggestion from somebody with altitude. The person can actually be shifted into another valence, he can be handled in this fashion, and his mind can be eased. But those cases are very few and when they come into Dianetics they have to be treated with greater skill because they have to be brought back into facing reality. That is what we are trying to do. Don't drive a person away from reality.

But the bulk of these cases when told that something is delusory while they are undergoing Dianetic therapy will come close to a break. They will become more neurotic and they will become very upset. That is how important the Auditor's Code is.

I saw a case that was proceeding very well. And then "friend" husband who was doing the auditing said to the case, "Well, you know that doesn't fit in there. " That was all he said, but with those words he precipitated the case into a very bad state of mind.

Nearly every case is going to have engrams to the effect that it's all in his imagination anyway. That is such a common social aberration that any statement or invalidation of information spoils for that person his sense of reality, after which he won't be able to run engrams very well because he will be running them on the subject of, "I don't believe this, it's not real. It doesn't seem real to me." A sense of reality is extremely important.

This is rehabilitated on a straight memory circuit as much as possible, because straight memory when it selects out a real memory, validates it and says, "This was real." In such a way we can validate engrams and the emotional reaction toward reality.

"All is delusion" is something which we definitely leave out, not because it is nice to leave it out, not because of any morals or any feeling that we ought to do something different, but because it will, if often enough repeated, destroy an intellect. That is number one in this society as an aberration.

Patients occasionally become so anxious about the validity of their data that they will write home to Mama or do something else equally strange, because they are writing home to the person that drove them crazy. They have got engrams in there that say possibly, "You have to believe everything I say, dear, because after all I have your best interests at heart and even though I am throwing you out into the cold, this is for the best, " and so forth, "and you have to mind your elders and besides I have always loved you and I didn't try to get rid of you" (outside of 35 AAs), "and everything is going along just fine."

So the patient with these engrams writes home to Mama to find out when the hypnotist hypnotized him. He has just written to the person who knows least about it. He himself knows most about it. And his auditor at that time knows much more about it because demon circuits just don't appear out of nowhere.

Mama writes back and says, "No, it was 4 when you suddenly got over your stuttering. You started stuttering when you were about 2. And you were never hypnotized by anyone," and that puts him into a flat spin. There wasn't any reason to have written home in the first place. Now he gets back a new lock which says, "Dear, you're just imagining things."

So Mamas who have guilty consciences are very careful about what the little child can remember. They will tell the child many times that it is impossible for it to remember that early. Some little boy will come in at 3 years of age and say, "I remember when we had this dog Towser."

Mama thinks, "Towser, he was only 6 months old when Towser ran away, and we never had him after that. Do you think he can remember to 3 months old, 2 months old, prenatal?" Aloud she says to him, "Oh, you can't remember that, Willy. You were much too young."

The little kid pleads with her. He says, "But I do remember it," because the analytical mind's function is to be right.

And Mama will say, "No, it's just your imagination. You are imagining things. All is delusion, all is delusion, all is delusion."

When this case enters Dianetic therapy he will lie back and when the auditor says, "All right, let's go to the earliest moment of pain or unconsciousness," he gets a streetcar running over

him or something of the sort, and he says, "It just must be imaginary," even though he has got somatics and so forth, "I can't really believe that it's real." And the auditor goes through this case over and over.

That's the prime aberration running through the society today, that reality is not reality. So don't add to it as an auditor, because one would be clipping right into something that is pretty thoroughly messy throughout the land. Don't stir it up, it would be like prodding a stick into a hornets' nest. It will cause a whole case to cave in.

Of all the clauses of the Auditor's Code, that one is the most important.

Another bad aberration which runs through the society is the one which says, "Control yourself, control yourself, control yourself." Everybody is very interested in everybody else controlling himself. This is a general sort of cowardice to which this whole world today has become prone, that everybody must be controlled.

The only thing that makes a dangerous lunatic dangerous is the fact that he has control mechanisms.

All manner of things have been promulgated in this society by some "I" in an effort, aberrated or otherwise, to make the world safe for that "I."

The extent of man's invention, placed on this subject of making people control themselves, if invested in space travel, would now have us out over the whole universe, because for the past 50,000 years he has been trying to work hard along this line of "Control yourself."

If someone gets emotional, somebody is bound to say to him, "Control yourself." "Control your emotions, dear, don't go all to pieces."

The thing for the person to do at that moment is to cry, and to cry loud and hard. A grief charge comes off partially at the moment of the receipt of grief. If tears can be shed, that charge is going to deintensify slightly, and the rest of the charge will come off during therapy, sooner or later.

Someone saying, "Control your emotions, don't cry," is harmful enough, but the next thing they do with "Control yourself" is try to toilet train the child. There was a perfectly good observation made many years ago that toilet training had a great deal to do with aberration and that is a valid statement. Just think for a moment of the number of holders which enter into a sequence of toilet training, such as, "Sit here. Sit down. Now you stay there until you've done. You stay there. Now sit there."

If there is a big "believe it" engram, such as "You've got to believe me, you've got to believe what you're told," underlying this toilet training, everything Mama says goes in and it has just as much value as an engram itself, because it is depending on the lower engram and locks her voice tones into the lower one. So, everything she says is believed. Add "Now, you've got to control yourself" into those holders up and down the line, and that particular sequence in life will be aberrative in the form of locks.

In moments of anger, people often say, "Control yourself." "Control yourself" has many types of phrases. "You've got to get a grip on yourself," "You mustn't let yourself go to pieces," and "You've got to get hold of yourself" are all phrases from the same species.

It is an effort to make somebody else be very self-controlled. These things go in as demon circuits. The demon circuit is "You control yourself," whereas "I" as a single aberration just tries to align itself with "I."

Psychosis seems to occur because one of these demon circuits says to what is left of poor "I" after a big engram charge has gotten in there and lopped off part of the analyzer, "Damn it,

control yourself, you've got to be logical," with the person installing the demon circuit himself becoming increasingly more hysterical, while giving out all this "good advice."

I have studied the human animal in some remarkably strange places, and in a bar one day I saw a drunk who had his buddy up against the wall and he was banging his head against it saying, "Damn you, I'll teach you to be reasonable. Be reasonable, damn you, be logical like I am!"

There was a demon circuit going in right at that moment.

This is the aberration which permits a person to take himself out of the auditor's hands. There is an "I" demon circuit inside the mind busily running "I."

Undoubtedly some of these demon circuits are going to start picking up Dianetic terminology some day and it is possible that an incipient schizophrenic who is almost ready for a break could, with some very stupid and careless auditing, get a demon circuit set up in the mind.

It would have to be a huge break of the Auditor's Code, with the "auditor" kneeling with his knee in the preclear's chest, holding him by the throat and banging his head against the floor, saying, "Control yourself. Now, damn it, you've got to go over these engrams. You know you can do it. You can make yourself do it. And I'm not going to put up with any more of your nonsense. Now, go back to basic-basic and I'm not kidding you, go back to it!"

This is nothing against Dianetics because such behavior would definitely be off the line on Standard Procedure. But some psychiatrist may try this.

The magnitude of installation has got to be very high before this sort of thing could happen, or it could be very slight but lock up on some earlier demon circuit which would then become vocal.

Start to work psychotics and nothing will show up quite as clearly as "Control yourself." It is quite aberrative. Any organization in the society which seeks to exert control upon members in that society by force is to some degree an aberrative factor on the society.

If you don't believe this, go back and check up totalitarianism in the history of those governments which worked most sharply with force and you will find that their social order deteriorated afterwards and became more psychotic than most social orders are.

The last factor is the aberration which has set itself up within the last couple of millennia that pleasure is evil and that one shouldn't think about it, and that hard experiences are the things which are best to remember.

On many preclears you will find that pleasure is occluded, and that they are very unhappy people. Such an idea is a definite promoter of neurosis and psychosis. So much so that many of the psychotics with whom I have worked had their reactive minds, which contained the pain, out in front, and the analytical mind in the rear. There was a complete turnover of mind so that the only thing that was visible was pain, hard knocks and tough experience. Actually engrams are not an experience. Engrams are things that happen at times when the analyzer isn't there to gain experience and they enter unknown.

But such an aberration will so interpret the engram bank that one might see some poor man who looks about 16 years of age in appearance when he is actually about 40. And he has had an IQ of about 20 all his life.

I found as the central circuit on one of these inverters one time the phrase "All you want to do is play. You've got to work. You've got to think about the serious things in life. You will never learn anything from play. What you want to know are things that are hard and tough."

Also, “Experience is the great teacher” can be uncovered in lots of patients when one tries to take them back to moments of pleasure and they insist they don’t have any. However, what cuts the pleasure out can be detected as one goes further into alignment with it.