

## PREVENTIVE DIANETICS

A lecture given on  
30 August 1950

### Deaberrating the Society

There is a possibility that one of the many mechanisms of schizophrenia may be contained in the whole series of phrases which mean "I'm all alone," such as "I have to be by myself," "I have to get away by myself to think it out," and so on. "I am all alone" is possibly a phrase which is very responsible for this. We are looking for the central phrase in various cases, and this search is an interesting one.

For instance, the paranoiac inevitably surrenders to the phrase "against me." It is fascinating that these two little words are sufficient to cause such a serious thing as paranoia.

To think that this set of phrases could lay a continent in ruins seems impossible. Certainly no motto ever succeeded to that extent! But think of Hitler, for instance. I don't know what the German equivalent of "They are all against me" is, but I'm sure there is one.

Schizophrenia is evidently caused by a superabundance of control circuitry. It is often very hard to reach the person, and further research may uncover that this is one of the central phrases for this type of case.

A repeater phrase that should be used routinely is "I love you," because it may lead you into a heavy sympathy engram. Perhaps you will get a grief discharge on it.

Now, this lecture covers a subject which probably is even more important in the long run than the general subject of processing. That is fixing people up so they don't have to be processed. The way to fix them up is to catch them at conception and keep them engramless from there on out. It's a very simple formula. Around a woman who is injured, who has been jolted, shocked, or who has just received news causing her great grief, say nothing. Around any person who has been injured, or who is anaten, say nothing, not even "Shhh." In short, around anyone who has a case of analytical attenuation, be quiet.

The second stage of it is to prevent the key-in of engrams by keeping things very calm around an unconscious person, and not quarreling, for instance, in the vicinity of a child. If there are no disasters or striking in the vicinity of a child, he may have a large bank full of engrams and never for a moment suffer the consequences of any one of them. This is an almost impossible goal, but it is one which should be sought.

In addition to that, in Preventive Dianetics one should give attention to the pulling of attention units up to present time on a necessity level. One could create, perhaps, an artificial necessity level by placing one athletically in danger of his life, or something of the sort.

One doesn't pull attention units up to present time by suddenly giving a person a piece of bad news. One pulls him up to present time by doing something like dropping him off a yardarm 75 feet down into the sea. That's one method. People whose whole lives flash by when they are drowning are actually coming up to present time. Anyone is better off for having been drowned, providing he lives through it, and providing it, itself, is not an engram! Of course, in laying down these specifications, it immediately becomes impossible.

These are the central pivots of Preventive Dianetics. The distance these things carry is very wide. The application of Preventive Dianetics reaches into every branch of society. I know of no part of man's activities that escapes this because we are working with the basic mechanism. We are keeping him from getting inside him the cause of insanity.

We could take a person who had no engrams and give him a youth wherein practically every day contained a parental quarrel and nothing is going to happen to this person. We could fix it up so that every teacher he had disliked him heartily. Nothing would happen to him. He would get some odd educational data about the world, but he would calculate how to get around it, and man being what man is, of course it would be impossible for everybody to dislike this person since he would probably be a rather likable person, but not for that reason. One could give him Freudian toilet training and nothing would happen in his youth. He could lose both parents under very bad circumstance at the age of 6 and there would be no reaction.

We know how it works the other way, but when we take a look at the same mechanism in action, we realize how things are in the absence of the engram—it makes an entirely different picture. We are so used to an aberrated society where everyone in it has engrams that we look at the reactivation/restimulation of engrams as the normal average procedure, and we look at the manifestations of engrams and consider those to be man's natural course. It has become part of our educational strata that naturally if you do so-and-so to a person you get such-and-such results. Actually, such a generality is impossible. You will find out, in dealing with aberrations, if you do such-and-so to A and do the same such-and-so to B, you are going to get two widely different reactions.

But having read the novelists on the subject, we have agreed that humanity reacts in a certain way. That is an educational pattern. It doesn't happen to be true. One is educated into the belief that the moment someone comes in and says "Your mother is dead," the person says "Boo-hoo-hoo. I loved my mother very much," and thereafter goes into a sharp decline. This is not necessarily so. One could feel very sad about Mother being dead and after the funeral be in excellent shape, because the painful emotion engram depends upon the physical pain engram for its action. A painful emotion engram can't be formed if there is no basic engram on which this should append.

The general breakages of affinity, for instance, would be almost impossible. If a child had no engrams and he was told consistently "Well, you're wrong, you know. You're not right. You just don't know about these things," instead of breaking affinity, communication, and reducing his reality, the child would merely conclude that his parents were not quite bright! In other words, it would be an analytical adjudication. Furthermore, the number of illnesses would decrease markedly.

The prevention of the engram would give us a brand-new society, all by itself without therapy or education, just the mechanical process of everybody agreeing to keep his mouth shut around a person who has been injured, who is ill, or who has any analytical attenuation. Just on that agreement in the society, within a matter of about 35 to 40 years you would have an entirely different society. It would have come up a steep curve.

In Dianetics we are dealing with an inevitability. If the society, not even knowing anything about Dianetics or techniques of application, would just agree that it was very bad mores (worse than killing a man) to say something around a person who was unconscious or to quarrel with or otherwise disturb a woman who might be pregnant, within the course of a generation you would see a marked change in the whole society.

So, it is interesting that the people who had great confidence in an automatic working-out of man and his mores never hit upon this as being immoral. They never suspected it, and it is an odd thing that by accident somebody didn't uncover this one.

Man's history demonstrates that he has stumbled onto all manner of mechanisms by accident. He knew nothing about the cause but he knew a little bit about the effect. In each one of these cases it was a matter of visible evidence, of visible injury, but the engram is an invisible thing which fortunately has all of a sudden been uncovered. It will probably enter into the moral structure of the society in the next few years that whatever else you do, keep your mouth shut around an unconscious person. Already there is antagonism toward this idea in some quarters. People who are badly aberrated are suddenly becoming aware of this fact and can't seem to

resist finding an unconscious person so that they can open their big mouths! The indoctrination of people into this principle is very difficult until, suddenly, they know about it. A letter from a medical doctor says he is having a very hard time educating other doctors with whom he is working into being quiet around patients.

In Preventive Dianetics we get several conditions. A person just recovering from an operation is in a very perilous and serious state. He is apparently conscious, apparently able to speak, but is at best, usually, in amnesia trance, after which he will come up out of amnesia trance into what is actually a light trance. Pain is also present.

For example, there was a lady who had delivered a child and was hemorrhaging rather badly, and she continued to hemorrhage for several days, lightly, and then heavily again. She was anemic to the point of being waxy. People were getting very interested in her life because one can't keep this up forever.

I gave her a few quick questions on this order: "Whom did you see immediately after delivery?"

"Nobody."

"When did this bleeding start?"

"About two hours after delivery."

"Whom did you see immediately after the bleeding started?"

"Nobody. Oh, yes, the nurse came in and said something, I'm not sure what." And then all of a sudden she remembered that the nurse had said, "I'll roll you down now. Now just lie there quietly." (She was in one of these propped-up beds with her feet higher than her head.) I clipped back on that line, ran the incident out, took her out of the tail end of the incident, brought her up to present time, and the hemorrhaging stopped.

Of course this looks like straight magic to an M.D. who doesn't know Dianetics. But you know how easy it is to do something like that. You have got the mechanism.

Here is an instance of a nurse placing a human being in danger of her life. It is very serious. Here is a little kid just born, getting along fine. Here is a husband who needs his wife, and here is a woman who is certainly entitled to her own life, then some fool rushes in and says "I'll roll you down now? now lie there quietly" right after an operation, all of which could have been prevented completely.

So, Preventive Dianetics is very interesting. It goes out in some other lines. Let's take the line of industry where a person has worked for several years in the same area. Naturally, every time he has been injured in that area, or every time he has been slightly anaten or restimulated in that area, he has received all the environmental perception For example, take a steel plant with the roar of the furnaces, the odor, the feel of the floor and so on. He hits his head one day and somebody immediately says "Come over here." Maybe that was the first time it happened. The possibility of keying something in at that moment is great, but it would be keyed in with the additional bundle of the whole environment where this person works. Men get killed in steel plants. You don't have to make very many mistakes along this line to kill somebody. Here we have a person who hits his head or burns his hand and somebody says something to him. They could be holders, bouncers, denyers, anything like that in the reactive mind, until we finally get to a point where one day he comes in and he isn't feeling too well—he has got an engram in restimulation. The restimulation of the environment, of course, is what is very responsible here. He throws the wrong lever causing two men to die who have no connection with him whatsoever, they just happen to work in the same place. These are called industrial accidents, but Preventive Dianetics goes forward into the prevention of this type of accident.

Another example would be Joe Jones driving down the road. He has an engram which makes him get exorbitantly drunk. The unseen engram says, "I can't see straight." It also says, "You don't know what you're doing." He is drunk, this engram goes into restimulation by some perceptic, and all of a sudden he screeches across the road into another car. Three or four people die in the other car. What did they have to do with this engram? So, Preventive Dianetics is also the heart and soul of accident prevention on the highway.

It is an old saw with traffic departments that 10 percent of the drivers cause 90 percent of the accidents. I will go further and say that 100 percent of accidents are caused by engramic restimulation. If it is a mechanical failure, it means somebody failed in design for some reason or other. But his ability must have been inhibited for him to have failed so signally in design, a design into which he was thoroughly educated. A mechanic might have had a headache that morning when he was fixing the steering apparatus and didn't quite seize down the bolts. Or the Highway Department might have been just a little bit careless about all this, with a couple of engrams on the subject—"Well, it doesn't matter anyway," maybe, on the part of some workman—so that the sign that should have been there isn't there. And here are you and I driving down the highway; and the next thing we know, we are in a hospital—not through any fault of our own, but because somebody got an engram into restimulation.

When one looks this over, he finds that this is not a personal project. It isn't a whim on your part or my part that all of a sudden we deaberrate this society. It isn't just an idea that we have suddenly where we decide to go on a big crusade. We are dealing with the very stuff of which hospitals, morgues and cemeteries are made. It is a very great problem.

As one goes back down the line and looks over accident reports, he finds occasionally this gentleman, the "accident prone." Some of the data assigned to accident prones, not thoroughly checked, seems to demonstrate that there is a sort of telepathy about accidents, just as there is a sort of telepathy about mass hysteria. On further very cursory investigation it would seem that an engram is the best broadcaster in the field of telepathy of which I know. All the evidence I have of telepathy, which is really very good evidence in some places, announces that this is an engram which is broadcasting.

In other words, the reactive mind and the animal body long since developed an alarm system for the herd, and having developed it, it now functions best in that bracket.

You will find, for instance, two people in an argument who have never seen each other before, and one person will say yakety-yakety-yak, and the other person will come through with the other half of the engram, the other valence.

When affinity is a reverse charge it becomes grief; and as one approaches grief, fear, terror and so forth, this reverse charge sets in. In other words, we have a tone scale operating and we could draw affinity all the way up this tone scale and get a spectrum which starts with this cohesive force, which on being reversed doesn't become a destructive force so much as maintaining its own characteristic all the way through. It starts at the top as love, cohesiveness, and then down toward the bottom of the scale we would have a herd, for instance, being alerted toward some danger, giving a fear, shock reaction which would broadcast and cohere the herd into flight.

Don't think this isn't important in Preventive Dianetics. The amount of mass hysteria has been vastly underestimated. Did you ever walk into a room where people had been quarreling? There is an actual impact involved in it. I don't know what it is unless it is this form of alarm telepathy.

When one is living in a society which is full of these engrams, it can be expected that these principles would follow, and that this telepathic line would have a very definite reaction in the society itself.

The accident prone could be explained along these lines, but it also includes the person who, purely by mechanical means, kills or injures other people.

An engram in restimulation in one person caused him to practically cut his hand off. It went into restimulation, had been picked up but not reduced, and for about three days he went into this situation of having accidents with that hand. The engram said something to the effect that he had to cut his hand. It even said which hand. So, he managed to do things with that hand which injured it. That is what an engram will dictate, and a person will follow it. Furthermore, it is an actual fact that in the vicinity of an accident other accidents happen.

Some foolish traffic department someplace started the practice of putting up crosses wherever a highway death had occurred. And all of a sudden crosses started piling up right in that one spot, one after the other. They soon had to do away with the crosses.

The observance of a sudden accident will cause several mistakes to be made immediately afterwards by other people in the vicinity. This could be on an alarm reaction level as well as a mechanical level. I am not trying to include alarm reaction telepathy here. It is not a necessary postulate to any part of Preventive Dianetics. I'm just telling you about it in passing.

In mathematics they talk about a two-dimensional worm. We could look at the two-dimensional worm this way. He is busily crawling along on a two-dimensional plane. One day he bumps into a post. He walks on and says, "Nope! There's no post there, that's all. There couldn't be!" Then he comes by another day and he shoves up at it again. He is aware of the existence of something, but of course he would be unable to think in the third dimension.

We are in that position as far as alarm reaction telepathy is concerned, or even telepathy in general. We know there is something there. We keep nudging this post. We try to run up laws of averages to nail this thing down. So, although it is not essential to this postulate, it is something for you to keep your eyes open on.

In the whole field of Preventive Dianetics, nothing is more shocking than watching the curve of accident rates go up by two or three. Then there is the old railroad superstition "There's been a wreck! There'll be two more." And there will be. That is the superstition which runs through the field, and a couple of people will take upon themselves the responsibility of getting the two other wrecks.

This is the reactivation of engrams. Whether it is on an alarm reaction level or a mechanical restimulation level, it is still the same thing: it is the reactivation of engrams. So, if we want to cut out these group accidents, we have to get in there and pitch.

For instance, a small change in the licensing of automobile drivers would do away with about 99 percent of the highway deaths and accidents. It would merely be a selecting out of those people who had had accidents. It could be taken on an arbitrary level. This person has had an accident in which he was driving and somebody was injured to a point of having to be hospitalized. If you simply pulled out of the whole run of drivers maybe 8 to 10 percent of them, the highway death toll would plummet, because you would have selected out people who had accident-prone engrams. I have used traffic department statistics arbitrarily because they have added this up and found out that 10 percent of the drivers cause over 90 percent of the accidents. So if they would just pull the licenses, and make it a hundred years in jail on bread and water if anybody drives a car who has had his ticket pulled, highway accident tolls would go down.

We are becoming as thoroughly calloused on this subject of automotive accidents as were the Romans looking at the arena. We get in every year as many or more deaths than there were in our own army in World War I! People go around saying "Well, we have to make the highways better." If you had people driving on those highways who weren't emotionally

disturbed in the direction of becoming accident prone, you could probably hang the highways up on 45 degree banks and nobody would fall off them. That is not the factor.

Of course, the ambitious young engineer who wants to make a good name for himself by building big cloverleaves because they look so pretty hangs on to the taxpayer these billions and billions and billions of dollars of highway improvement, and one of his chief arguments is "We are going to prevent accidents." But do they? No! Let's check over and find out how many accidents occur on this superhighway, and we find out there are more.

When we have this picture clear in our minds, we can see what is making the accident prone and the accidents; and when, at one fell swoop, we could save the life of a person every 15 minutes of every 24 hours, that is certainly worth saving.

This is how far Preventive Dianetics goes and how deeply it reaches into vital problems in the society. And it is based mostly upon just that one thing, although there are intermediate steps which can be taken. We have an aberrated world at this time, but we have a means of determining what steps we should take in order to cause the minimal number of accidents in the society, the minimal number of deaths because of engrams, the minimal number of sicknesses because of engrams, and so on down the line.

I want to talk to you now about a very interesting phase of Preventive Dianetics, namely, the pregnant woman. The pregnant woman has always been an interesting problem in the society, but she becomes a fascinating problem to the professional auditor since he has to make a judgment of whether or not he practices Preventive Dianetics or processing on her.

There is a rule of thumb by which he goes. Because of her nervousness her morning sickness, her debility, he may find it necessary to audit her, particularly in view of the fact that she may give the child a very bad birth or the child might even die during birth. She gets morning sickness, she doesn't want the child, she is liable to practice an AA on herself—he has got to think of these things. On the other hand, if her morning sickness is relatively minimal she isn't likely to practice an AA or cause a great deal of injury to the child, and he must realize that any engram he runs out of her, particularly a grief engram, may transplant.

If you have ever seen a preclear roll up in a ball suddenly or leap convulsively on the couch, you will understand that the intra-abdominal pressure is increased, and when that pressure is increased even mildly, we get a transmission, especially in a grief engram. When Mama cries, particularly convulsively, that grief charge will transplant and it will have the very interesting data in it, "Let's go over it again. Let's go over it again. Let's go back to the beginning. When I count from one to five, the phrase will flash into your mind.... Come up to present time." In other words, within a generation we are going to have to have a new patter to take care of it. But, at the same time, these are very uncomfortable commands to have in an engram. It means that when a person gets to some part of the engram, he will have a tendency to go over it again as a sort of a bouncer. All sorts of oddities will show up because of Dianetic patter when it is enclosed in the engram.

For example, imagine some professional auditor 20 years from now running this preclean and he says, "All right, let's return now to the moment when "

"Ow! "

"What's wrong?"

The "Return now to the moment when . . ." will be part of the engram.

Or the auditor says, "Who died?"

The preclear says, "Nobody died." The auditor checks through carefully and finds no relatives missing. They are all present. And yet there has been a death there. Somebody's

dead. It was somebody in one of Mama's engrams! Maybe it was her great-grandfather which puts it back two or three generations and out of reach. The preclear couldn't possibly have known this great-grandfather and yet he has an engram about his death.

Therefore, if you run out many of these grief engrams in a woman who is pregnant, she will give birth to a child who will give every evidence of having had a great deal of sorrow in his life when he won't have had any. So it is a matter of adjudication.

If a woman's aberrations are causing her to do and be things which are injurious to the child to the point of costing it its life, yes, audit. But if she can get by until after the child is born, leave it alone. Giving her a little bit of Straightwire is about the best you can do. Sometimes you can whip these cases up a little bit on Straightwire without hitting grief discharges, without any disturbance. So, if you audit a woman who is pregnant, make very sure that she is not going to turn over and fall hard on her stomach or beat herself in the stomach or otherwise injure the child.

She probably ought to have a piece of armor plate strapped around her. One of these days in the society, why, women may be wearing a piece of expanding armor plate when they are pregnant so the child can't be hurt. But leave girdles alone. It may be a good piece of armor plate, but every time she puts it on she cramps the baby.

Did you ever see pictures of people back in the Victorian period? I once saw a skeleton of a Victorian lady that had been exhumed and it was fascinating that the rib cage on this skeleton was right down to where you could put your hands around the bottom part of it.

If we look back over history, we find that fashions of that type have preceded very aberrated actions on the part of the society in the next generation.

A horrible thing sometimes takes place, and if you ever run across a young girl who is pregnant and unmarried, such as a high school girl, be sure to check whether she is lacing herself in in such a way that it won't become obvious. If she is, that poor child has got a continuous engram for every moment that it is laced in too tightly. A lot of women do this but particularly young girls.

In Preventive Dianetics, cases of moral turpitude should never be handled in the fashion in which they are handled by this society. The system is completely and utterly wrong! No matter how wrong the act may seem, there is no reason to ruin the health of a girl and the sanity of a future child just to be moral.

As many doctors have gotten in trouble saying, a good contraceptive is more efficacious in these matters; and a knowledge of contraception is very efficacious, more than an ignorance of sex. You will find as some of your most serious cases people who have been born from a woman who conceived them out of wedlock.

Preventive Dianetics definitely goes into the field of morals. Morals came about to reform harmful practices. Everything that is now moral was at some time or other harmful to the race. That is the practical side of morals. But morals go forward in the society by contagion. That is to say, a moral code is set up.

For instance, a lot of our present-day morals came into existence because venereal disease moved in on the society. Nobody could do anything about it, so they shifted the moral code in order to take care of some portion of the venereal problem. Now we have penicillin and sulfathiazole, and all of a sudden the moral problem comes up against our wiping out venereal disease.

Morals, in the initial stages of their creation, were a practical consideration on the part of some race or group. They have practically nothing to do with spirit. I know a great deal about spirit, but I have never been able to find morals aiding and abetting it.

It is not that we want an immoral society: we want a rationally moral society. And rational morality at this time demands, for instance in the matter of venereal disease, that it be brought into the open quickly as a disease and that it be treated and cared for, because it can be stamped out of all the societies of the world. We have got the weapons to do it. That is where a moral, going forward by contagion, becomes in itself a social aberration. And, actually, the main part of the social aberrations that are carrying forward now are old fragments of morals which we have even forgotten as a race. It would be difficult to trace their inception. Those are social aberrations.

Firstly, they are practical considerations. They are used for very definite purposes. Then they come forward, break up, their use is outmoded, but they go forward as a set code and become, then, an aberration because now they are not rational any more. And what is an aberration but an irrationality! Don't misinterpret me, and quote me as being against morals. I am not. Morals are fine. However, morals are not understood by this society today, and we hope that we will make them a little better understood, because it is a vital problem.

Look up in the dictionary today and you find the word ethics defined as "moral sense." Look up under morals, and you find they are defined as "ethics." Morals are ethics and ethics are morals, but they aren't that at all!

Ethics has to do with a code of agreement amongst people that they will conduct themselves in a fashion which will attain to the optimum solution of their problems.

Morals are things which were introduced into the society to resolve harmful practices which could not be explained or treated in a rational manner, so an artificial law had to be created which went forward merely blocking this and that in an effort to keep something else from happening.

In other words, the morals were jackleg solutions all the way along the line. We didn't have the answer so we invented a preventive. We didn't know what caused it and couldn't stop it in any other way, so the solution was "Let's prevent it, let's invent a moral."

That is actually the history of moral codes. Anybody who wants to examine that field closely will find that although this is a very simplified statement, it is actually the fundamental with which we are dealing.

In this society today, if a moral code injures the life of an individual and does not enhance the life of any other individual, that morality is destructive and should be struck from the culture of the society. It is an unfortunate thing that several of those around today have this result. Without aiding the society, they hinder it.

It can get into a very involved problem; sometimes it gets into a financial problem. Some agency has been hired to enforce morals on the society by means of blue laws, or the vice squad of some town. We found out that one particular vice squad had a very definite vested interest in the morality of the community, and to a large extent had waged blackmail and were waxing rich with it!

So, morals are remunerative to some people. They have a vested interest in it, and that vested interest hurts the society. Fortunately, that vested interest will cave in if it is existing for the injury of men. Men take care of this themselves. All they have to do is look around and take a rational measure of a problem and say "This thing is harmful," and it changes rather rapidly. So in Preventive Dianetics we get, whether we want it or not, the problem of morality.

Morality is a very interesting thing, but when it takes a high school girl, sends her down to an abortionist, impedes her sexually, blocks the second dynamic, wrecks her glandular structure, gives her a sense of great guilt, and gives her an engram of a sort which—kicking around and



festering in any reactive mind—will undoubtedly trigger the majority of the engrams in the bank, and if we as a people say that this is necessary, we are crazy.

You may run into the case of a high school girl who has been handled in this fashion. She has gotten “into trouble.” She then becomes a “juvenile delinquent.” We put a label on her. She becomes a moral liability in the society, and her parents are liable to ship her off to have an abortion performed on her, or sometimes a judge on a bench will declare that an abortion be performed on her.

But if somebody says “No, this child shall be born,” think of the scenes, the grief and the emotional upset that surround this young girl, and we have a very nasty engram bank. If you go back toward one of those engram banks in some preclear sometime where this situation has happened, you will have to wade through this material, the secrecy, guilt, shame, grief, all of these things in the prenatal area of a person who was himself completely guiltless except that he had a biological reaction occur at the beginning of his life span.

We also get into something else in Preventive Dianetics. We have the adoption problem (you run into this in auditing) of finding somebody who doesn’t know he was adopted. And if this happens, we don’t find the same dramatizations in his parents that we found in his prenatal bank.

If a child is without his parents, one of two things has happened. The parents have been killed sometime after birth, too early for the person to remember, or there is what they call moral turpitude or poverty. There is something wrong in that person’s life that he has to be adopted after birth.

There is a lucrative adoption market that goes on, but what they are buying is a rough prenatal bank. If you look over the history of adopted children you will find out that it is not as good as it should be. But, the child has been done an enormously good favor. The dramatizations which are in the prenatal bank aren’t duplicated in the postnatal bank. Furthermore, the words are not restimulated. The prenatal bank is not restimulated. The dramatizations don’t occur, but occasionally the person is old enough or has had enough keyed in at the time of his adoption to make his case pretty rough. This is where we call for Child Dianetics in a hurry. In other words, the sins of the little high school girl which were so horribly condemned fall upon the head of an innocent child and then become inflicted upon wellmeaning foster parents who had nothing to do with it at all. This is the way contagion runs through the society. It follows a very crooked path.

I am showing you that Preventive Dianetics goes into the moral structure of the society. It also goes into the ethical structure in all of man’s activities. One could not draw the line and say “Don’t adopt children.” That would be silly, because people want children and they will go on adopting them. But, when looking them over, be sure to look over the record of Mama. Under what circumstances was this child conceived? Were her parents very stern parents? Was she ever driven into the snow with a precious bundle in her arms or under her belt? These are very definite considerations. We go from there into the field of marriage. We want to prevent all these divorces that are happening in the society. Actually we can prevent them. People too often choose their reactive mind partners. That is to say, Gertrude actually marries Uncle Bill. Only Uncle Bill’s name happens to be George, and the only similarity with Uncle Bill is maybe the way he wears his hat or maybe his tone of voice. But Uncle Bill was the staunch champion of Gertrude all through her early youth. So she, of course, marries Uncle Bill, only his name is George now, which is very confusing. And then she finds out that this restimulation of Uncle Bill makes her take on the valence of whatever valence she was occupying as a little girl—and she does the things which pleased Uncle Bill. These don’t please George. Up to this moment she was a strong, reliant woman, and now she is a weak little thing that has to be defended.

This becomes very confusing. She expects certain things from Uncle Bill. Or Uncle Bill took care of her a lot, and took her swimming, was very nice to her and one time when she was

sick, why, he brought her all her meals in bed. So, she will start to use this “in bed” trick on George, but George doesn’t understand anything about Uncle Bill. And the next thing you know, he gets very resentful about a wife who insists on having breakfast served in bed by him every morning.

He had a different idea. His ally went by the name of Agnes, and he thinks that Gertrude is Agnes. So between Gertrude thinking George is Uncle Bill and George thinking Gertrude is Agnes, we get a confusion, so that we find these people aren’t married to each other at all, but a couple of allies who are both probably dead! And this confusion will result in an occasional divorce, and divorces will continue to happen in any aberrated society.

The practice of suttee was somebody practicing prevention. They had decreed that there was to be no divorce in that land anymore. Wives could not divorce their husbands, so the wives murdered their husbands. As a consequence, somebody passed a law in order to make all this moral, and said that any wife who was really a wife at all would walk upon her husband’s burning pyre and sizzle. That is suttee, and that is prevention acting against prevention!

Arbitrariness has been introduced into the society. Next there has to be the introduction of some more arbitrariness in order to make the forced first arbitrariness work, and it keeps getting more and more irrational, less and less sensible, until we have a complete cave-in of an institution such as marriage.

So, reactive mind partners as a problem is a very sad one. Go to Reno and pick up any ten divorces and you will find ten reactive mind partners married to ten people who had married reactive mind partners. Lives get wrecked in this way.

It is no joke that a broken home causes a child to have an upset life. However, it isn’t the breaking of a home; it is the yak-yak followed by the loss of an ally. If a home is going to break up and people are going to be divorced, there have probably been quarrels and bitterness between them before that time. So you have got a bad prenatal bank, a bad postnatal bank and then we have a broken home. Of course, the broken home is obvious. We can look at the broken home and say, “Well, some children become aberrated when they have broken homes,” but that isn’t the reason. It is because of reactive mind partners.

If you want to know how to pick out your spouse—let’s say it’s a man picking a woman—find out if she adored Papa. In the case of a woman picking a man, find out whether or not he loved his mother early, and if so, leave him alone! If there is a terrifically strong attachment with Mama, if he does what Mama says and so forth, his valences are so slopped up and turned around that he is a liability. Or, if he hates his mother viciously, leave him alone. If he hates his father, that isn’t so bad. But if he is passionately fond of Papa, that’s not so good.

Look over the parents and try to find out how aberrated they are. Are they very stern, “good” people? Did they change this person’s mind all the time about everything? Was there a great deal of trouble over allies? Did they fight with Grandma over this child? Look at these people as people, and realize that in the human being is potentially the valence of each one of these people and probably the majority of the engrams of these people. You can therefore look over a girl’s parents or a man’s parents—don’t just take the social look, try to take a Dianetic look if you can—and you will know what the setup is, and you as an auditor should have no trouble whatsoever in checking this person over.

If you are passing out advice to the lovelorn anytime, that is the rule you go by. A woman might be in either parent’s valence, but the chances of being in the valence of either one or the other, even if she detests them, is very good, and it is the same way with a man.

Out in the divorce marts, if you want to slow it down quickly, just put in a little propaganda to that effect and you will see the marriage rate falling off very definitely. But until something is done about it, the divorce rate will probably go up.

Actually it is a terrible thing for two reactive mind partners who restimulate each other enormously to have to stay together because the society commands that they do. If they keep restimulating each other and their health and efficiency go down in a dwindling spiral, they are being ruined as people. At the same time they may have a terrific compulsion to stay together. The engrams say "I love you. I just don't dare leave you. I can't leave," but there is this man that she would just love to poison with arsenic, yet she has to sit opposite him at breakfast every morning because it says "I love him; I've got to love him. I've just got to love him."

A science of thought would not particularly guarantee to resolve the old mores of the society, but maybe the mores are not right. Marriage may not necessarily be a natural institution, and if one applies a natural law to it, about 50 percent of the marriages are likely to blow up in your face and about 50 percent of them will cement very strongly and go along beautifully; because in the process of treating one or the other, you are liable to have two people who are naturally antipathetic cleared up to a point where one of them will suddenly decide "Oh well, I don't have to stay with this person," and leave.

Dianetics does not break up marriages. I have seen it pull together marriages which were on the rocks, but the whole trick is to get it past the hump up to a point where both partners can be perfectly rational with each other. But sometimes you get it halfway up the hump and one of them is liable to get enough strength to separate right there.

A good divorce attorney who is also a good auditor could probably with Straightwire salvage about 50 percent of the marriages which come to him to be put on the rocks. He is sitting in the driver's seat on the subject. These people come to him for advice, wanting to hear all about the legal problems, the alimony laws, the community property laws and so on, and he could simply say "How old are you? (snap!)" and it would solve quite a bit!

This is merely window dressing on Preventive Dianetics in order to give an idea of the scope of preventing aberration.

Preventive Dianetics as a basic subject doesn't much deal with superficial things like salvaging marriages and so on. Preventive Dianetics has right there as its basis preventing the engram from occurring in the first place, and if that can't be done, preventing the restimulation of the engram and thereby flattening the aberration of the society quite markedly.

After birth, a child who maybe has a bad prenatal bank goes on with life, and if the parents mend their ways rapidly and are nice to the child, you get a pretty sane kid.

Actually the human organism is extremely hard to aberrate. It takes a lot of magnitude. It is on the order of being stamped on by an elephant, thrown down and run through a washing machine mangle with eight whirling dervishes screaming incantations in the ear. That would be the order of engram it would take to aberrate, something very high in its intensity and content.

Now I am going to give you a short demonstration.

LRH: How far has your case progressed?

PC: My own?

LRH: Yes, we are talking about you.

PC: In other words, you want me to evaluate my own case?

LRH: People often do. Have you got sonic?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Vissio?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Somatics?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Gee, you've got everything.

PC: I think so.

LRH: All right. Now, what we want here is for you to shut your eyes, and any time in the future that I say the word canceled, it will cancel out what I have said while you are lying here on the couch. Okay? Now, where did they leave your case the last time?

PC: I was 12 years old.

LRH: How old are you?

PC: 42.

LRH: Did you get a flash? You really move on the time track, don't you. Let's go back to the thirty-first of January, 1923. The somatic strip will go to the thirty-first of January, 1923. Let's take a look. Where are you?

PC: You will have to wait a minute because I seem to feel so much.

LRH: Well, you are right there automatically at the thirty-first of January, 1923, at this moment. Let's take a look.

PC: Yes.

LRH: What are you doing?

PC: I am dressing for school.

LRH: What are you doing when dressing for school?

PC: Well, I am brushing my hair and it's quite a job because it's so long I can sit on it.

LRH: Can you feel yourself brushing that hair?

PC: Of course.

LRH: All right, continue.

PC: It's the brush I have had ever since I was 2 years old. Brown, worn on the edges. My hair's light golden brown.

LRH: How do you look there in the mirror, to yourself?

PC: All right.

LRH: Look good?

PC: Pretty good.

LRH: All right. Fine. Let's go back to the time they presented you with the hair brush. You are getting the hair brush now.

PC: It doesn't mean very much to me.

LRH: Okay. All right. The file clerk will now give us the earliest moment of pain or unconsciousness existing in this case. The somatic strip will go to the first part of the engram, and when I count from one to five the first words will flash into your mind. One-two-three-four-five. What words flashed?

PC: She ought to have her tonsils out i

LRH: How old are you?

PC: 12.

LRH: Now, when I count from one to five, you will give me a bouncer. One-two-three-four-five.

PC: No.

LRH: No bouncer?

PC: No.

LRH: The earliest moment of pain or unconsciousness. Have you had conception run out?

PC: Yes.

LRH: Have you got an erasure of conception?

PC: I have erased everything to now, when I am 12.

LRH: Well, God bless you. "She ought to have her tonsils out." Go over it again. "She ought to have her tonsils out."

PC: She ought to have her tonsils out. She ought to have her tonsils out."

LRH: Who's talking?

PC: Oh, a doctor at school. He's examining me.

LRH: Is your throat sore there?

PC: A little.

LRH: All right. Let's contact the somatic on it. What is he saying?

PC: She ought to have her tonsils out. She ought to have her tonsils out. She ought to have her tonsils out."

LRH: What is he doing with your throat?

PC: Oh, he has one of those wooden sticks.

LRH: How does it taste?

PC: Hmmm.

LRH: Medicinal?

PC: Slightly, just antiseptic is all. And then he tells me to say "Aaaaaah."

LRH: Yes.

PC: Do you want me to say "Aaaaah"? I don't like to. I feel uncomfortable.

LRH: How does your throat feel there?

PC: It's gone now.

LRH: All right. Let's go over that again. What is the doctor doing to you?

PC: You see, I don't like to go over these things. I like pleasant things.

LRH: All right. Now what is the doctor saying to you there?

PC: Oh, "She ought to have her tonsils out. She ought to have her tonsils out. She ought to have her tonsils out." And my mother says, "Well, we will think about it. We will think about it. We will think about it." My mother teaches in the high school. Gee, she left her history class. I wonder who took her place?

LRH: How does your throat feel?

PC: All right.

LRH: All right. Let's go back and pick up the somatic again.

PC: I don't like to do this.

LRH: Pick up the somatic.

PC: Do I have to? The words are getting very dim there.

LRH: Yes. All right. Let's go over it again.

PC: She ought to have her tonsils out. She ought to have her tonsils out." "We will think about it. We will think about it. We will think about it."

LRH: Give me a yes or no on this. Is there an earlier engram existing in the case?

PC: No.

LRH: Who used to say "Control yourself"?

PC: Nobody.

LRH: Who used to be very self-controlled in your family?

PC: All of them.

LRH: Let's go over the words "Control yourself." Let's see if we can find one of these. There might be one scattered around someplace.

PC: Control yourself. Control yourself. Control yourself. Control yourself. Control yourself. “ I am sorry, Ron. There just isn’t any. Do you want me to keep on going?”

LRH: No, that’s okay. You are doing fine, now. You are doing fine. All right, did you have many childhood illnesses?

PC: No.

LRH: Did you ever have a sore throat when you were a little girl?

PC: No. But my mother did. She had tonsillitis.

LRH: When and where?

PC: Oh, several different times.

LRH: Have you picked up a prenatal of her having a sore throat?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Give me a flash answer. Does one exist?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Let’s go to the next moment of pain or unconsciousness now existing in the case. You are doing fine.

PC: Give me a little more time, will you?

LRH: Sure. I said you were doing fine.

PC: Thank you.

LRH: All right. The file clerk will give us the next moment of pain or unconsciousness now existing, and the somatic strip will go to the beginning of the engram. When I count from one to five, the first words will flash into your mind, one-two-three-four-five.

PC: There aren’t any words. It’s just an age. I am 13. You see, my file clerk is peculiar, shall we say. He seems to have these things divided into what you call chronological years.

LRH: All right, what have you got there? Where is the pain there when you are 13?

PC: It seems to be something to do with my teeth.

LRH: Okay.

PC: I can’t quite get it.

LRH: All right. Is there a denyer?

PC: No.

LRH: Is there a bouncer?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. You know what this is about teeth. Let's go to the beginning of the engram, give me the engram.

PC: Oh, there isn't any dentist in our town. I had to go to another town. He is putting in something to pry my teeth apart. There's a cavity. Jeepers, no wonder!

LRH: Let's contact it.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. What have you got there?

PC: Mmmmmm. He wants to give me something, and I say no. And, I want to know what's happening. (laughs)

LRH: Okay.

PC: Oh, this is ghastly.

LRH: Let's roll it, honey.

PC: Mmmmmmmmm.

LRH: How does it taste?

PC: Terrible. Grinding on my tongue.

LRH: Is he saying anything as he does this?

PC: No.

LRH: Okay, continue. How does he look?

PC: He looks sort of concerned.

LRH: How is his breath?

PC: He thinks he is hurting me. Oh, he's gargled something.

LRH: Take a sniff.

PC: (inhales)

LRH: Continue this; sweep into it.

PC: It hurts. He doesn't have any nurse. He does everything himself. Oh, this is complicated.

LRH: Continue. Just carry it on through up to the point where he's finished.

PC: All right.

LRH: All right, honey. Let's go back to the beginning of it. Shall we go back to the beginning of it and roll it?

PC: Oh, of course. But I don't want to.



LRH: What is his first action as he starts in on this? Is there a sound there or something? Maybe water in the bowl?

PC: Yes. It's on my right side, and he puts this towel up here and clips this little metal clip in the back. And I am frightened.

LRH: Go ahead.

PC: Oh, he puts something around my mouth.

LRH: Continue.

PC: And then he wants me to take some codeine or something . . .

LRH: Continue.

PC: and he says, "It will hurt too much for her."

LRH: Continue.

PC: It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that."

LRH: What did he say?

PC: That's what he says, "It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that. " And I say no.

LRH: Let's go over that phrase again. "It will hurt too much with that."

PC: It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that."

LRH: Listen to his voice.

PC: I don't like his voice. I don't like to listen to it.

LRH: Listen to his voice then.

PC: It will hurt too much with that. It will hurt too much with that." And I say, "No, it won't; no, it won't. " And then he starts prying these things, and I guess he doesn't do anything. It starts to hurt and hurts worse. It's not too bad though.

LRH: Okay, continue with it.

PC: I stopped to spit it out.

LRH: What does he say about it?

PC: He just looks at me. Sort of half-mad and half-concerned.

LRH: How did it feel that time?

PC: Oh, it didn't hurt so much.

LRH: All right. Let's roll it from the beginning again.

PC: Oh, I don't want to. This is boring. Very dull.

LRH: All right. Let's roll it.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Okay, continue. Pick up there at the beginning. Now you are doing fine. Continue.

PC: That's funny. I can see him doing this but I can't feel it anymore.

LRH: Okay, let's roll it.

PC: Mmmmmmm.m. (laughs)

LRH: How does it feel?

PC: Just fine.

LRH: Do you ever have any yawns off these anymore?

PC: Oh...

LRH: Have you had yawns in the basic area?

PC: Oh, yes.

LRH: Have you had any yawns up this far on the track?

PC: No.

LRH: Okay. That's fine. How do you feel about this dentist now?

PC: Oh, he's all right. I guess I always gave people sort of a bad time. Put them in pigeonholes.

LRH: All right. Let's go back over it again.

PC: Okay. Well, there really isn't anything left anymore, excepting I can just see the room.

LRH: Yes. Let's take a look at it as you roll through there. Might be a little sound or something.

PC: Mmmmmmm. Well, this is a little difficult because, you see, it always gets like one of those old-fashioned things you used to look through.

LRH: Stereopticon?

PC: Yes. It gets sort of like a picture and then it's on a stage, and that's what I take with me. And then I have to get rid of that.

LRH: What?

PC: Get rid of that last thing.

LRH: Does that worry you?

PC: No, but I thought I was supposed to—everything was supposed to go.

LRH: Well, let's not worry about it. Now, how about coming up to a moment of great pleasure?

PC: Which one do you want?

LRH: Well, just pick a moment.

PC: Okay.

LRH: All right. What are you doing?

PC: Eating.

LRH: Let's taste this. Good?

PC: Of course it's good.

LRH: All right. How do you feel?

PC: Wonderful.

LRH: Come up to present time.

PC: Okay.

LRH: Canceled. Five-four-three-two-one.