

DIANETIC LANGUAGE SERIES

9. Validation and Invalidation

Valid is a word that has been shaped after the same model as our word for value, and there is a good deal of similarity in the ideas which they convey.

Values, however, may be of many kinds, depending on how we compare the worth of things or ideas.

Money, for instance, is a convenient abstraction which we compare against many other things as to difficulty of obtaining; thus we say that an article is worth so much in money. These relationships fluctuate a great deal, depending upon times and events, such as the weather and the size of the potato crop. A country's money may fluctuate in value too; we may even say, then, that money has such-and-such a value. Value is always based on comparison.

Validity is also a comparison, but of ideas. An idea is evaluated in relation to the world which is around us and within us, and in relation to other ideas. An evaluation on this basis is said to have determined the validity of the idea which was tested. If favorable to the idea being weighed, a comparison is said to result in a validation; if unfavorable, in an invalidation. (Remember this about validity being a comparative measure.) For instance, a saying may be valid in one situation but worthless in another.

Supposing your clock has stopped at 12:00; it is still right at midnight and noon. When this clock shows the same time as clocks which are working well, its time is valid. It is the same with other statements which purport to be true. For a notion to be demonstrably valid, there must be a standard of validity — other observations and statements which can be used as measures against which to compare the new idea.

Our first measure of validity is the report of our senses. This is the basis of one's personal sense of reality. We compare what we see against what else we see and also against what we have observed before. This enables us to make estimates of distance, time, etc., which are valid with ourselves. Make sure of this point before you go on: The first measure of any kind of validity is that which you find yourself, in yourself.

The next measure, which comes closely after the above, is the report of others. It is often reasonable to let such reports invalidate one's own observations, but not without taking a second look and making a first-hand re-evaluation of the situation. Grandma has said that where there is smoke there is fire. Little Willie now observes that the brook is afire, since he sees it smoking under the morning sun. Grandma, knowing that water doesn't smolder, might feel that her statement has been invalidated. The two realities are close to becoming one agreement when Grandpa speaks up announcing that there is no fire, but the morning mist is rising. If Willie is a smart boy, he will accept the invalidation tentatively, go out, take another look, and decide what is going to be valid for him in this particular case.

When we get a report contrary to our present reality, we do not always have time to go and see. When we get two contradictory reports from others, each invalidates the other. Sometimes one gets conflicting reports from one's own mind. My memory is not clear, and sometimes I have to let my own writing, on old papers, invalidate what I thought I wrote. And do you ever check a telephone number by looking in the directory?

Because everyone has compared one truth against another, we can all use these words, validity and validation, to refer to the degree of agreement between

observed
and wibe n
in

s

observations. And reality, as we know, is built up of agreements with oneself and with others.

These matters, being comparative, are highly variable, and hence there can be no absolute validity; nevertheless we need strong validity, good agreements, in order to go forward with confidence along all dynamics.

Just as validation is establishing a substantial degree of agreement, even so invalidation is establishing a substantial degree of disagreement. Validation is pleasant to us because it is an assurance that all is well with our faculties and data. Invalidation is often disagreeable, but acceptable if it can be turned into better, more valid, agreements by means of further comparisons, observations and interpretations.

This matter is useful in dianetics in more ways than one.

First, because the mind knows how the mind works, the presence of an area of unconsciousness becomes a known area of low validity. The mind wants it validated. Any form of invalidation takes on great importance and stress because it is associated with an intolerable sense of having invisible holes in one's head.

Then there is the matter of auditors who invalidate by not agreeing with the data of their preclears. This is one of the least necessary evils in the world; not even a brain surgeon can see into another person's mind. What is valid for one person is not necessarily valid for another. If your clock stopped at age seven, postnatal, that time is valid for you until you find what stopped the clock so that you can commence running in present time.

In the ordinary course of affairs, people compare realities and disagree very freely, because this brings about improvements, eventually, in the validity of data. Auditors, however, must not do so; they are supposed to be listening and computing, but not sounding off. As a matter of fact we would all live more harmoniously with one another if, before getting excited about differences of opinion, we were to pause and consider whether they are not actually valid differences. A twelve-high stack of griddle cakes is a valid breakfast for my boy, whereas a poached egg is valid for me, and neither has any particular bearing on the other. If I had to eat all the griddle cakes, or felt bound to restrict the boy to one paltry poultry egg (and how many families try things of the sort!), there would be some bad business going on in the way of mutual invalidation.

By being kind, courteous, quiet and uncommunicative, the dianeticist can keep out of such trouble very nicely.

There is one further note about validation to be mentioned here: People want to know whether dianetics is a valid science.

If the available reports are not satisfactory for some reason, there is but one recourse: They must try the procedures and find more data for themselves, for validity is best established upon a comparative study of one's own observations.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A., 1952.

— ALMA HILL.

AFTERWORD regarding INVALIDATION OF PERSONALITIES - By George R. Tullis

We now know what it means to validate or invalidate a datum of our own or of someone else's.

Let us ask what would have happened to the hypothetical Little Willie if Grandma or Grandpa had not been such good sports. If Grandma had insisted too strongly that "Where there is smoke there is fire," she would have been enforcing

her platitudinous reality upon Willie. If she had then called Willie a nincompoop, she would have been denying him affinity (and might have broken down his ARC with himself as well). And if she had thrown up her hands and refused to discuss the matter any further, she would have been breaking communication. Any of these would have been far more serious than what Grandpa did, namely, point out that little Willie's conclusion was based on a false premise. (Of course, Grandpa — a near-clear himself — did not sneer, wink, tap his head nor guffaw as he supplied his explanation.)

Had either Grandma or Grandpa assumed an authoritarian air, or had they scorned Willie for his innocence or ignorance, he would justly have felt invalidated as a personality. Part of the dignity of being a human being is the right to make our own mistakes as a result of erroneous data and to correct them on our own, upon receipt of better data.

Alma obviously feels that her (real-life) boy is entitled to his reality as to what constitutes an appropriate breakfast. Only if he exceeded his own quota would she consider him other than an admirable trencherman, there being no famine abroad in the land. Never would Alma try to enforce an alien viewpoint on him.

This question I have raised on personal invalidation and the point I have made of it seem to follow naturally from No. 1, A-R-C, and No. 3, Nomenclature of the Auditor's Code, of the Dianetic Language Series. It has been known for centuries that there are right ways and wrong ways, right times and wrong times, to tell a person that his facts, his beliefs, or his attitudes, are in error.

Here is one reader who is finding the Dianetic Language Series more of a Dianetic Language Network because of the interconnexity the various papers have,

BALTIMORE, AUG., 1952. — "Tully" Baltimore Dianetics Group.
5217½ York Road, Balto., Md.

WOULD YOU LIKE TO JOIN WITH US IN THE DIANETIC LANGUAGE SERIES? Our objects, ways and means are as you see.

We set out to explore and research, discover and explain, and sometimes knit a few brain waves. Clarity and simplicity are what we try for.

YOU MIGHT (a) ask for all the papers in this series, as they become available;

(b) act as a relay point; help us to reach more people;

(c) suggest improvements. Argue any or all points. Language as we see it is made up of agreements bounded by disagreements.

(d) suggest additional subjects for papers, to be written for free and published without benefit of copyright, by whoever assumes the responsibility of writing and publishing — that could be you too! Alma Hill, Apt. 1A, 53 Spring St., Boston 14, Mass., is the control center and nexus of this plexus.

YOU MIGHT. But what do you want to do?