

RANDOMITY, CONTROL AND PREDICTION (part 1)

A lecture given on 14 October 1953

1st ACC – 14

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-13, renumbered 7A and again renumbered 14 for the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series. Tape number 666 in the Flag Master List.

[Clearsound. Checked against the old reels. Omissions marked ">".]

> Good morning. I suppose our cases are advancing to some slight degree here and > there. And I suppose you might be able to tell if you carefully compare your > last week or so, that you might find some slight idea which has altered about > existence. I don't say this is so, I say there's some slight possibility that > this might be so. We must run this on a scientific manner, which is to be not > sure. You see, if you became certain you would cease to be a scientist and you > would move up into something useful. Well anyway, it is October the > fourteenth, last time I looked at my watch here. October the fourteenth and > the morning lecture. >

This is October the 14th and the morning lecture.

[Clearsound version splices in the "This is" in the above sentence.]

This morning I want to go into something very interesting, which – I hope you will find it's very interesting and – has to do with the lag of the MEST universe – the lag index.

Now, when we speak of communications in Scientology we are speaking of the transfer of a particle or a motion from one part of a space to another part of a space or from one space to another space. That's all we mean by communication. That's the reductio ad absurdum definition of communication.

We have a pencil at one corner of the desk and we move the pencil to the other corner of the desk – that's communication. Because why? Because one corner of the desk has now communicated with the other corner of the desk. That's the reductio ad absurdum of communication, definition.

If you understand how absurdly simple this definition is, you'll understand all about communications. Communication doesn't have anything to do with one corner of the desk demonstrating the volition which moves the pencil to the other corner of the desk. Do you understand? You're not interested, then, in the volition if we're interested in communication.

If there's going to be any motion at some time or another, somebody at least set up some form of automaticity which resulted in an arrangement whereby you got a communication point from one point to another point.

An anchor point which, severely defined, is not in motion – that's theoretical, but theoretically and for our purposes so far as practical considerations are concerned, the corner of this room up here is not in motion. You see, that's a practical consideration. But your glance between one corner of this room and over to the other corner of this room is your communication with two corners of the room or the communication of one corner of the room with the other corner of the room. Follow this?

One corner of the room is the source and the other corner of the room is the receipt-point of a what? Of an attention. So there's been communications between the two corners of the room. It didn't require any volition on the part of either corner of the room. But there is always volition involved wherever you look in this universe.

Whether the volition was a long time ago or right now or whether or not it runs on an automaticity or not – this is beside the point. Any automaticity has a causation of one sort or another. And the causation is no different than thee. And it's not just even the same order of beingness – it's thee. And your level of communication, then, between these two corners of the room does have a double.

If you said "There is a communication between one corner of the room and the other corner of the room," and you have not made a communication or dispatched a particle or given an intent between these two corners of the room, you'll still have the "prime mover unmoved" causation even though it is now running on an automaticity. You get the idea? Any interchange, then, is a communication.

But we don't have to have the second corner of the room replying to the first corner of the room to complete a communication. We don't have to have any meaning or reason in the communication.

So, let's just sort out this whole thing of communication because it's obvious that the wordiest and most wonderful letter which you ever received in your life just had reasons all through it, actually had no reason at all in it.

The circuit case asks you consistently and continually, "Why did God make this universe? What was the cause of this universe? Why was it made?"

Well, we're coming close enough to it when we say cause and effect and attention.

Why? Because these things are observable, terrifically observable. Does there have to be a reason for attention? No, there doesn't have to be any reason of any kind at all for attention of any kind.

Now, if you don't think this is true, did you ever hear of a false arrest? Of course, the reason in there for the arrest is the fact that somebody has made a mistake. But actually, when we talk about an arrest, what is the reason behind an arrest? It is the impulse of life to duplicate and copy and it is the police impulse – *reductio ad absurdum* – of life imitating the MEST universe "having to stop something." That's all. There's reason behind it – yes, stop.

So, we're very up close to the surface on reasons when we go into things like start, stop and change. And when we say, "What is the purpose behind all this?" well, you just can say "communication" and you're all set.

And this might sound very wise and a circuit case can go off and figure-figure-figure and he'll come up with the right answer which is the fact that it's communication, even within his definition.

A religionist can come in on this and he can say suddenly, "Why, yes! Well, how wise! How wise! That's true. Because you see – you see, it was set up so that God could communicate with each and every one of us. Isn't that wonderful?" And he can play beautiful sadness and sweetness and light on this and he's quite happy with it. The truth of the matter is, there's not this much reason in it.

I don't think God wants to communicate with anybody myself I'm – some people I know, and so forth – I know some of the things I have to say – I don't think he would want to communicate with me. I know an awful lot of people that, boy, he'd run if he thought he had to communicate with them.

So, you see, it's in essence simply an interchange. And it's quite a trick to have any space at all. And it works out very nicely for anyone if you simply explain it to them on terms of communication.

But remember what communication is – communication, *reductio ad absurdum*.

There is some attention in any piece of MEST. It might have been – the MEST might be representing an automaticity. You see, it might have been attention set up to run it.

By the way, a wonderful button is setting up something to keep on going without attention. You double-terminal that damn thing and you'll find yourself being cursed more often and so forth. The fellow who set up this universe to run this way actually wasn't a fellow. He wanted the universe to run this way more or less because it's a good test of randomness. It makes lots of randomness.

Man versus the universe – that's a good fight. A beautiful button in this universe is "I have to have enemies. I must have enemies."

You see a lot of these people running around – hate, hate, hate, hate, hate, hate, hate, hate, hate. They're just saying, "I must have enemies." They've got to have them. They'll make them any way, shape or form.

Well now, that, very high on the scale, is simply, "I must have randomness. I have to have something to interchange against what I am putting out to interchange with."

See, so you have this problem if you get no motion without randomness. Simply moving a particle from one corner of a space to the other corner of a space is not in itself randomness. It just is moving from one corner to the other corner and it'd be very happy if all we did was move a little particle from one corner to the other corner and then move it back again and move it around into another space and then move it back again and move it around and move it back and shove it around here and there.

Sometime, if you want to have a good time and understand what I'm talking about, find a pool table or just take your desk and take a match. And as you sit there over the pool table or over your desk with a match, just move the match from one corner of the desk to the other corner of the desk. And then move it to another corner and then move it to the center and just go on with that for a while.

I'm serious. You really ought to make the test so that you get the emotion. There is actually a reaction to doing that. It's always best not to predict a result but I say you ought to satisfy yourself about this.

But you think you know what boredom is, well, do this for two hours. Just force yourself to do it two hours. Of course, it's not quite fair because you have a reason for doing it.

But let me assure you that if you had two matches or two pool balls which is much better – why I introduced the pool table in the first place – you can actually spend a lot of time with two pool balls making one go around and hit the edges of the thing and bank and hit the other pool ball and billiard on it and so forth.

You put three pool balls in or three billiard balls and you've got the fascinating game of billiards. And even if you just use your hand and you just kick the ball around and it hit the other two balls and so forth, there is a nice satisfying click-click and they roll in various directions and when you hit one, it rolls off at an angle. It never goes away exactly straight. Hm! You've got your first definition of randomness.

People have trouble understanding randomness and this is the series of experiments which you make to demonstrate randomness.

Your first randomness is with two particles. Now, you can take one pool ball and throw it around the banks but then immediately, every time it touches one of the banks, you have to realize that at that point it was touching another particle. To get any other action isn't an automatic characteristic of space. You wouldn't just throw a pool ball around inside a space. It would just fly out of the space which you had demarked if you weren't – because it would just go on making more space because the second it, as a particle, moved outside the plane of any of the four particles of the side, you would have a fifth particle and you'd have more space. It would become an anchor point for that space. And it would just make more space.

This, by the way, is a basic game – making more space with one particle. You can make various shapes of space and so on. It becomes very interesting.

[Note that in the following, the clearsound version has phrases carefully chopped out from the middle of some sentences where Ron is stumbling around a little bit.]

All right. Basic space, by the way, I call to your attention, is

> three particles, not eight. I beg your pardon, > four particles, not eight. I'm giving you three sides -

> what I was trying to say was that space is three sided, whereas three > triangled – > one, two, three, four triangles is the basic space, rather than four squares.

> I'm having a rough time here. I was trying to go back over dimension geometry > instead of just figuring it out, and then just giving it to you by looking at > it, and I finally looked at it. It would be six. That's interesting as a > trick. All right. > You just take these – this match and you move it from one corner to the other to the desk, and you'll eventually get bored. Why do you get bored? Because you can predict exactly where it's going!

Now, you take two matches and by moving one against the other, you don't have enough to make much of a pattern. You can make a T or an L. But you don't have much to make a pattern with and they're not mobile. But with two pool balls you've gotten your first step of unpredictability – no predict. In other words, to have interest you must have a condition whereby there is a no-(hyphen)prediction condition.

Instead of getting mad at this universe, let's look at that: No-(hyphen) prediction is a very definite necessity in the field of interest.

Now, putting it this way, we've got it in terms of motion rather than in terms of thought – putting it this way, in terms of motion rather than in terms of thought.

And if you just think about this, this is obvious and you can philosophize on this, which is to say just think about it and so forth. But if you set these things up in terms of motion they become immediately visible.

Now, why did two pool balls form a no-predict? That's because when you slam one pool ball against the other pool ball, it'll carom off slightly. But you can get pretty bored just throwing one pool ball against another pool ball. What you need is two pool balls. Three – two pool balls, to throw one pool ball against. And these three pool balls, then, will get into a situation where the new pool ball will itself interact all by itself against the second pool ball when either or the other is hit with the first pool ball. There's a possibility of an interaction. And that's your first automaticity.

Your first automaticity takes place, then, on a higher no-predict. In order to have interest we must have a no-predict.

> I'm talking against this traffic noise, a different position of the room. > All right. What, then, are the conditions of interest? The conditions of interest are no-predict and enough particles communicating one with the other (which is to say, hitting and clipping and going the other way) to form an automaticity. This is – I'm sorry but these two things which we condemn so hard are the first and second levels of interest. You see how that would be? You've got no-predict and then you've got automaticity.

You wonder why your preclear is bored sometimes, why he doesn't want any processing up above a certain point. He gets scared. He's afraid you're going to take away from him his no-predict and you're going to take away from him his conditions of automaticity.

The only thing wrong with him is that he himself has become a particle and he has no volition. He doesn't have hold of one of those pool balls. He isn't objecting to the numerous other pool balls on the table. All he's objecting to is the fact that he doesn't have a chance to bat one of the pool balls.

When he doesn't have a chance to bat one of the pool balls, then he is the effect of all of the no-predict and all the automaticity with which he's surrounded.

And when he is the effect of the no-predict and the automaticity around, he becomes very, very unhappy. He could tell you various reasons why he's unhappy. But I am telling you the highest echelon that you'll get. It's just there's – it's utterly impossible for him to predict anything. And all the automaticity can use him for an effect.

Well, if this is the case, then he is in a perilous situation, he considers. But the main peril is, is that he's not interested. And that's really the only peril.

So, there is a, what we might call, a critical point on a case or any case. And this critical point is that point at which the preclear considers – you've got level of tolerance of randomness, it's in the Axioms, look it up in the Axioms there. Everybody has got a level of tolerance of randomness.

Randomity is the introduction of no-predict and automaticity into the motions of particles in a space or in many spaces. See? It's a simplicity itself.

Now, his tolerance is merely his consideration.

Now, you'll find men are postulating the weirdest kind of an impossible situation with regard to randomness and no-predict. They say, "I want to get some farm with some orange groves and sit down and just let the oranges grow and that will be all I have to do."

Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no. Uh-uh. Nunca, nunca! Those oranges are being put out automatically by the trees. And there's probably not going to be enough wind around to even bother them. His goal is to do that. But he would be very, very upset indeed if there weren't a few worms; if there wasn't a little wind; if there wasn't a drought and a fight with the irrigation company. You see? These things have to be. If they aren't, he'll go.

But if he gets to a point where the irrigation company is always right and the worms are always victorious, he is immediately in a situation where we have him the effect of the no-predict and the automaticity. Now, you see that?

So, what's the – what's the criteria here?

He doesn't want too much self-determinism, which is to say, self-determinism is the right to push one of the balls that will interact amongst the other billiard balls – that's all. That's self-determinism. That's the right to throw this billiard ball into the midst of other billiard balls or at least, when a billiard ball is rolling along, to alter its direction slightly; but to predict you are going to alter its direction and which way.

Now, if you depend exclusively upon the MEST universe to gain that effect for you, you have again entered an automaticity which is too great.

You say that a rifle bullet coming in through the window and hitting a cotton bale, here, will stop. And it will stop exactly so many umph-umphs deep into the cotton bale. And it will stop at a certain heat. And you know all this. And already there's the cotton bale sitting there. And you don't pull the trigger on the rifle bullet. And just – you know any rifle bullet

that comes in through that window is going to hit. You've entered an automaticity in, real heavy There's nothing ever going to go wrong with that cotton bale. It's just sitting there. See?

And you, by the way, I'm sure would not sit there for many hours, many days, many years, looking at that cotton bale. It won't hold your interest because the MEST universe itself by a basic law inherent in the universe is doing your stopping for you. And it's always going to stop the bullets and it's always going to stop in exactly that fashion and you know this will keep on happening forever. And this is real dull, isn't it? Real dull. It's not interesting.

You're up against again a no-difficulty in predicting. You're up against the other thing: a complete predict.

So a complete predict and a complete automaticity or a no-automaticity and a no-predict are amongst them, all undesirable.

So, let's get these things arranged better. No-predict goes with automaticity, which is working against one, and complete predict working with no automaticity make setups. And you work these things around and you push these factors around into various shapes and you can get a tremendous number of answers. In fact, you can get all the answers there are.

You must have the right to put out and stop the particle or change its course, change the course of particles. You must have the right to do that. And you must also have the right not to have it do that all the time.

And when the MEST universe really gets pinned down and one of these super-machine-age societies is really rolling, boy! It has taken away from you your inheritance from God himself. You're surrounded by full automaticity. You know, after you get a house fully automatic-oh, but fully automatic-it's automatic at every hand. It does all the heating and it does the water softening and it does the air conditioning and it does the cooking and the washing of the dishes. And it does all of these things automatically. It draws your bath and pulls down the sheets. It doesn't even pull down the sheets – it just turns on the thermostat exactly right in the blankets. Oh, boy! You got this house all set and then you put somebody to live in there, see?

Will you please ask me why? Why don't you just make a doll, then, that is automatically running continually and forever and just have the doll in the house? And then go off someplace with the satisfaction that you've put together a fully automatic arrangement which fully automatically takes care of a fully automatic being. And you've done it. And you are no longer interested in it.

I think God left sometime back. He just shoved off. He couldn't take it. This universe is really in a beautifully automatic condition.

So, when you get too much automaticity and too much prediction, your interest alike fails.

When you get a complete no-predict and no-automaticity, you fail. See? See what aberration is? Aberration would be a complete no-predict on some subject in some place of the case – a complete no-predict and a no-automaticity. See why that would be?

There'd be two things wrong with a case then: Either the case had everything all nailed down so beautifully, so gorgeously, that there was nothing else to be done for it or about it, or, on the other side, had everything agin him. Because if nothing is automatic for him, he has no opponent or he has to do it all himself which is the same thing. And if it's a complete no-predict – if he can never tell which way anything is going or even begins to approach the theoretical absolute of never tell which way something is going – oh boy, oh boy, oh boy, this is a real, real dumb deal.

So, what's our problem, Mr. Anthony? Our problem is a very simple one. Any case that is in trouble is somewhere out of the area of what he considers optimum randomness for him. You can't tell exactly what optimum randomness is for a case because it will vary from case to case. That fortunately is a variable. It's really the one variable in the problem. I mean, this is real grim to have just this.

So, what – what would you do? What would be your basic theoretical therapy? Basic theoretical therapy is just merely to change the level of randomness of a case. Give him more or less automaticity, more or less prediction than he now has.

I think probably the sickest person you would ever meet is one who had a total prediction. That would be the sickest person you'd ever run into. And yet you don't think of that ordinarily. As we process here, you don't think of that as being an undesirable state, because we're all below the level. We're too close to no-predict. We're closer to no-predict than we are to complete predict.

Male voice: It would have to be a level of total predict with the additional postulate: There's only one universe to predict in.

That's right, of course. But what you've got to do in any case is take a look at it – if you're looking for basic aberration – just take a look at it and size it up to this degree.

For God's sakes that is why people in Dianetics and Scientology are actually lousy preclears. You should understand that instantly. They're just terrible preclears. For all the damning and howling which I do occasionally about auditors and auditing and so forth, we're not up against a tough problem here. That damning and howling is just adding some randomness into the picture.

It becomes very obvious why, then, a case which is deeply interested in the problems of epistemology – one person in Dianetics and Scientology will be tremendously interested in epistemology. He's just thinking too hard about knowledge and so forth. But actually, boy, he really gets revved up just on the subject of thinking. It in itself is a randomness. See? He's thinking about it without looking at it and all he would have to do is look at it and, gee-whiz, if he just looked at it, why, it would blow up on him as a – as an epistemological problem! He has to kind of keep from looking at it.

He's using his preclears and himself for basic randomness. There's absolutely no reason why he shouldn't. See? He should, but he makes a lousy preclear because he immediately starts playing a game with his auditor. He knows the answers and so he's – although he's below optimum randomness – you can't be in Dianetics and Scientology very long or even get audited very long in a coffee shop. Coffee shop auditors, even those today, can do such things

as take away these cruel and punishing chronic somatics. They can. They blow up. So nobody who is really working with the field is in any real trouble – not today. That was true two or three years ago but not now. They're not in any real trouble.

Their real trouble is the fact that they have fixed upon and made a postulate about their future randomness. Their future randomness has to do with their own case and the cases of those around them. They don't want these things solved. If you solve these things you'd get a predict.

You'll find every once in a while an auditor getting quite frightened at the idea of solving a case. He knows that he can get a complete predict. He could get a complete predict with a case. He wouldn't even consider it desirable or super-desirable. Therefore, he has a tendency to go toward the cases that are in the most trouble. These, for him, furnish the most randomness.

Now, fortunately we have a great big universe here which in itself was set up to provide an enormous amount of randomness. And fortunately you get somebody up into motion – the tolerance motion of this universe – and he can actually find it; high level of randomness. So, let's realize that this condition of mind, that attacking the problem of attacking the case as a randomness in the field of Scientology is intensely spurious. That's very bad. That's quite, quite bad simply because there is so doggone much randomness available which is not yet perceived.

Did you ever really get excited about organizing a party? Did you ever get real excited about, oh, I don't know, really, really violently excited about some terrific project or other in its original and new stages? Did you ever get that feeling you can recall of "Oh boy, oh boy, oh boy, oh boy!" See? Zing, zing, zing, zing!

Well, optimum randomness for this universe is well above that point. Man is running way, way, way, way below the normal. Man is running so close to a no-predict complete automaticity agin him that he's having a hell of a time for himself.

And every time these condemned societies build a little more automatic car, they seek to add to the happiness of all of us, you see. And gee, it just bogs somebody down a little further. He's got to have this car and it's got to do all these things. It's very nice to free up all these hours for him, but as the Chinese said, "He saved two minutes on the trip, but what did he do with them?" The only thing he can do with these two minutes is simply get two minutes more of some other kind of randomness.

When you've wiped the whole society out and you've got safety campaigns on every hand and side; when you have cops on every street corner; when you can't bump anybody off – actually you don't even dare hit anybody in this society – boy, they're – just got it reduced down and I guess they are trying to make a lot of new particles, is about as near as you can figure. They just must be trying to make a lot of new particles which themselves could be pushed around. And that becomes very grim.

It, by the way, is no-it's no accident that there are less people in Scientology than there were in Dianetics. The less isn't very much, but it's there. It's because we're really pulling

away from the level of motion of the rest of the society. We're pulling away from their level of tolerance.

They've got an educated tolerance level. They know that cars should be driven, really, at 35 miles an hour. They feel comfortable at 35 miles an hour. They do not feel comfortable at 180. They're not at all comfortable. And yet randomness for an automobile would be about 110. That's good randomness. You're liable to hit anything. And you wouldn't quite predict which side of the road you would be on because of the structure of the automobiles to hand. And you wouldn't be able to predict a lot of things about it. So you've entered a bunch of no-predict.

When you've got a car going down the road at 35 miles an hour, complete, new, good tires, excellent condition-nothing wrong with it, I'm afraid that you get into this strata of boredom. In fact, drivers have been known to go to sleep at a wheel in such cars.

What's it got to do with communication? You want to change the communication level of your preclear is what you are trying to do. Communication level is simply his ability to move particles or move as a particle from one part of space to another part of space. So it's basically motion, isn't it? You're trying to increase his motion.

Well, if you can just move him from one part of space to the other part of space and demonstrate that he can do this and demonstrate it often and conclusively and convincingly to him, believe me, his level of motion and his level of communication are going to come up!

The reason he doesn't move out of his head is because he's got too much no-predict and too much automaticity. It's all being done for him. He has terrific dependencies on all sorts of things. He's got dependency on the body. He's got dependency on the MEST universe to hold out anchor points. He's got dependency on all kinds of things. Basically, he's got dependency on the MEST universe to hold out his anchor points for him; he doesn't have to hold out any anchor points.

Fellows by the way-cases will crack just on this: "Do you know that you don't have to hold out all the anchor points there are around you?"

And the fellow says, "What are you talking about?"

You say, "Well, compare one arm of the chair with the other arm of the chair." You watch him, he'll be like a bird dog, like a pointer. He'll look at that chair comparing one arm with the other arm. And you move over to a bookcase and you say, "Compare one corner of the bookcase with the other corner of the bookcase." He'll look at that and he'll compare those two things. "Now, get the slight differences between them," you say. And he'll take his attention off of that carefully. And they look over to the window and you compare one corner of the window to the other. He'll take his attention off of that a little less carefully. And he'll look back at these things every once in a while.

Well, you'll get cases at this level and you want to know what you are looking at. That guy thinks that he is holding apart these two corners himself He doesn't realize that it will be done for him. He's got his own universe and the MEST universe completely, completely coincided, you see, too much so that he still thinks he is in his own universe or has to be and he hasn't differentiated between his own universe and the MEST universe.

Well, how do you get this differentiation across? Very indirectly. He finds out all of a sudden, usually, and then the process, by the way, becomes useless when he is completely convinced of this: That corner of that desk and that corner of that desk-table are going to remain apart whether he puts his attention on them or not. Those two particles are going to stay in position.

In other-in other words, he-you are showing him that the MEST universe is nailed down and that space is made that way and that the space will stay space.

He isn't sure that the MEST universe won't collapse. He has gotten to that point.

Now, let's look at communication lag and let's look at this very carefully. Your case which is in a level of "be a body" has bought large quantities of automaticity. Everything is being done for him through the body. Emotion is being made for him. And everything is being done for the body by automatic gimmicks out through the society. See, we've got this automaticity set up.

But we have factors around him whereby he is educated to believe everything should be ethical and good and sweet and noble. The school does a good job on this. I mean, the . . . And the fiction of the country-a writer can't sell reality. He can't sell this universe. He's got to sell a terrifically fictionized version.

The stories in Collier's magazine compare with when knighthood was in flower-real sweet. It's all real sweet. Heroes are heroes and they're honest and they are noble. And the women are usually-they have become less so in fiction lately-but they're usually virgins, and so on. I mean, it's got no bearing on reality at all.

And we take this kid who is supereducated by the movies, by fiction and particularly by his school which taught him he must be honest, he must be kind, he must be merciful, he must be all these things, he must be, you see, terrific restrictions, and not to be strong and not to use force. That's what everybody's got everything convinced with.

You can't have any randomness before you use-unless you're willing to use a little force. What's force? Force is just a change of a particle from one corner of the room to the other corner of the room or one corner of the universe to another corner of the universe. And that's what force is.

And you say to somebody, "You mustn't use any force," and by this you may mean one thing but he interprets it to the fact that he mustn't use strength.

Just try and build a bridge sometime without using any force. Hah! It would be an interesting thing. A fellow would walk a tightrope of thought from one corner of the chasm to the other corner of the chasm. Well, the last time I saw anybody try to do this he fell in.

So, the main difficulty we have then with your preclear is the fact he's got a no-predict on this level: He can't tell what people are going to say to him or otherwise because he's been sold, first, on certain conditions in the society which aren't true and then having come out of that educational period, is abruptly confronted with the fact that the universe runs some other way. And he's been taught in this fashion. And then he experiences in another fashion. And his education being intensely artificial does not then permit him to predict his fate.

Therefore, you find fellows who leave school in the third grade and can't read, very often being fabulously successful in the society and very happy and extremely sane. It isn't how much they've studied. It isn't how much time they've sat in a chair or in a schoolroom. It's just the fact that what they've been taught is false! This is another method of entering a no-predict.

You tell the fellow, "Well, the best way to be admired is to crawl around the floor and say, 'Gah-gah, goo-goo-goo' and be naked and don't control toilet activities." This is the way to be admired. Obviously.

And then, then you teach him that this is all frowned on. Well, that's what happens to every kid. He goes through these stages. All of a sudden they start toilet training him and he finds out that's not good, that's not good at all. That's not admired.

Education could be said to be a superevaluation of what will be admired. In other words, what will vanquish force. Well, how do you get the force that's opposing you vanquished? See, it gets very simple if you look at it.

Education enters a no-predict by teaching a fellow one method of prediction and then letting him experience in quite another series of randomities.

Now, here is a better example of that. You take your billiard ball and you teach a fellow very carefully that all these billiard balls are resilient. They bounce, you know? And he throws his billiard ball down the billiard table and it hits the other billiard ball and it bounces and they go crack. And they spring apart beautifully and ably and they bank against good beautiful rubber cushions, you see. And they come back together again-crack-crack-and there's lots of motion. It's all so smooth, so-so nice.

And then you say, "Now that we've trained you to do this, now you know all there is to know about that. Now, there's your billiard table over there."

And he goes over to this billiard table and of course he finds one billiard ball is made out of cast lead and the other two are made out of putty. And one bank of the table – one bank is made out of steel and the other bank is made out of cotton. And the first time he throws that ball down there something goes squash! He didn't learn that. And he sinks into an apathy. You see how you'd do this?

Now, the funny part of it is (and this is quite heartening to realize) if you had given him his own pool table in the first place and said, "All right. This is your pool table. You're going to form randomness with this thing," why, he would have made these basic errors and he, right away, without any experience, he would've said, "That's the way a pool table acts. Putty and steel and you have to kind of watch out for it." And even if you fixed it up so that every other game or every few games, why, you switched the character of the banks and gave him two lead balls to hit and a putty ball to throw with – if you did this to him a few times, he would merely form the opinion that he was up against a situation which was altering and that there was a certain amount of no-predict in it.

But if you've taught him that there is a complete predict, and then you lowered the level of predict on him, even slightly, he has a tendency to drop down Tone Scale.

Actually, you could train somebody so that the pool balls would shift without warning in character so that you could never tell which pool ball was going to be made out of putty, which one out of lead and which one was going to be steel and which one was going to be cotton, and what do you know? He'd say, "Well, this is the way pool tables are!" and he would establish it at his own level as the randomness which he would have to embrace. And he would go ahead and embrace the randomness because he hasn't been convinced!

What he's convinced of now is, "My God! Is there an awful lot of randomness here! There's no automaticity. I have to do practically everything there is done on this table! After I've hit the putty ball, I have to reach down and put it back in shape again," and so forth. He has to do everything on the table. There isn't an automatic resilience which brings it out into a sphere as the case with another ball.

You see how simple it gets when you take a good solid look at what randomness is, what prediction is and what education is.

Now, you take a fictionalized society and we know in this that "all communists are bad." We know they are all bad. And then we send this guy to Russia. And we get a book of dull, surprised amazement, such as that written by the late Wendell Willkie called *One World*.

It startled him to find there was a similarity between Russians and Americans. And he completely missed all the finer points, merely because he'd been supereducated into the idea that Russians were beasts. You see? And Russians aren't quite beasts. So he just omits the "aren't quite" in their own civilization and he goes all out on the other side of the fence and they're saints. And so, you – well, practically – "They were just American businessmen handling their economics in some other fashion," if I remember it correctly. A commissar was just like anybody else that you find in a factory management position. There was – of course, he was under a little more pressure: If he didn't make the town run – if I remember the quote from many years ago – if he didn't make this town run well, turn in his quota, he'd be liquidated. Which meant according to Willkie, well, he'd be fired or maybe even shot as an extremity. But he knew this was what would happen to him and it was all routine and just like in Keokuk, Iowa!

You see, he was trying to do a predict on the Russian scene against his other level but he had been told that you couldn't predict this and he'd found out a level of comparison where he could and so he was real proud and so that made the Russians good. Perfectly good line of logic, you see, except it doesn't happen to form a prediction level for anybody else.

All right. What's this – what's this lead to then? It leads to the fact that unless you've torn up some of the convictions of your pc with regard to his ability to move and make move – you know this "live and let live"? To hell with that; that's apathy. What we want is move and make move!

"Stop and make stop" is the game the cops play. But it becomes a very dull game when nobody's moving. You know, playing cop is a – playing cops and robbers is a very interesting game. Little kids play this game. But playing cop depends upon there being criminals. And if the cops get too thorough on the thing it all becomes automatic. The fingerprints find the man,

the – everything else. And the educational system prevents him from stepping out of line and so forth.

And I'll bet you – you know, when I say, "I'll bet you," I know cops quite well. I've sat around with cops and actually detected these long, drawn-out sighs on the subject of "There ain't no crime – no crime." I've seen cops training, training, training to fight criminals, you see, and there's no criminals. This is a hell of a note.

It's like telling this guy that, boy, this is, you've been trained, you know, and by fiction, they believe that there's nothing in that pool table, you see there. They've got a pool ball which is intensely subjectable to pain. And they're going to throw this ball around against balls that are made out of prickly pear spines and this is the life they're taught. And then they get to the pool table, see, and all they can find to hit is just empty space. And people have got them fighting nothing. There is no randomness there. Cops go kind of psycho because their efficiency has reduced their own level of randomness. They are still playing the game hard. That's what happens in any game. Somebody starts playing the game real hard to win! I don't care what you define win as. Win is just hitting a couple of the balls, see. And predicting them sometimes a little bit. And that's winning.

And so, pang, down goes the cop against the table of crime and he simply swamps up all the other balls and there's no balls on the table which leaves him nothing to fight – he wins. He predicts them so well that he vanquishes them and he gets better and better on his prediction.

I think people who play expert pool must be terribly bored with the game. Willie Hoppe, when he shot that cue ball down into the – in pool – and shot it down into the triangle of balls and pocketed this one and that one and the other one and the other one and always pocketed them and so forth – well, he would get some admiration for this, but if he were – that's introducing another – another factor for his interest.

But as far as they were to go, if you were to put him all by himself in a house someplace with a pool table and he had nothing to do but that – uh-uh. His randomness comes about with showing somebody else how to do it and then their tremendous amazement and his interest that they can't. That's his randomness; it's exterior to the game.

So, what are we trying to do with a preclear? Well, look at the shape he's in. He's either in too damned much randomness for him; he's fighting on too many fronts in life or he isn't fighting on enough fronts.

You can process a juvenile delinquent and you will know immediately that there's another kind of case. He isn't fighting on enough fronts. The guy's front or opponent saturation point has not been reached. And a person will get to a point where he will actually run around and be the opponent. He will go around – he can't get anybody to fight him, so he'll go around and fight himself He gets tremendously involved in this.

In arguments you will see people doing this. This is not an uncommon manifestation:

"You're a dog! You're just no good!"

And the other fellow stands there and he says, monitoringly, you know, kind of quietly, he says, "Well, really, we shouldn't get – we shouldn't get upset about this, and so forth. We can talk this over quietly."

"Oh! You say I am raising my voice, do you?"

You get the trick? He didn't get enough bang back! He didn't get enough reaction, so he's real upset.

Now, you've heard – you've heard women do this around the house. Well, their level of randomness is quite poor. They stay home and the husband goes to work, the house is kind of empty. They have to straighten up this house. It's the same house, you know. It's always been the same house for the last ten to fifteen years. The same pieces get out of line. The same meals have to be gotten. The same butcher is bought from. And they get to a point after a while where they just do this. They've got to put randomness into life. They can't stand it!

And you will actually see preclears who are just practically going through their roof! They just can't take this little level of randomness.

Now, I've had preclears show up who wanted an engram run. Was anything wrong with them? No. They just wanted something else to fight. So, you showed them this engram and they come up with another engram. Well, the hell with this. You run that engram and they come up with another engram. Boy, this is all right! They've got randomness.

Now, you take somebody's imagination. It's when these factors get extreme that they become very important in the society because a guy gets convinced. You take a lot of people down here in the insane asylum. They just started onto this line of insufficient randomness and then they just ran it into a hole. Now they've got – Western Union has wires plugged into their brains so as to inform the government of what they're thinking. And there are people going to shoot them through the window any minute and so on. They've just overdone the danger, you see, and they can no longer control this level.

But what is the pitch there? The pitch is a complete mock-up, a complete mock-up, of no-predict. I would say offhand their life became enormously predictable. Their life became too predictable. All right.

When somebody is trained then – somebody gets trained in one direction and then life gives him another pool table.

You'll find if you want to uproot the past lives all the way up and down the track, you want to uproot the whole track on a preclear, you just work with this principle. And what is the principle? It's just shifting pool tables. Every time he turns around, somebody gives him a new pool table.

And I'll tell you, that's why space opera hangs up so fabulously in this completely dull society. I'll bet you no space opera was keyed in at all here a hundred years ago. You could always go out West and get shot or shoot somebody or be run down by a bull elk or... You could always get into trouble, always. And the police, boy, were they inefficient! No telegraphs to amount to anything and they have no fingerprint files and Bertillon, I think was – about then – was just starting to struggle up with something, if not a little bit later.

Then you just shaved – shaved your head a little bit different and you wore a different colored tie and you go into the same police station that arrested you yesterday and say, "I want a job as a cop," and they'd hire you.

I mean, life – life – you could change your identity. Well now, this society has got it rigged so you can't. If a guy finds a no-randomity situation in this society today, he is hung with it because he is hung with his identity.

You can make a preclear just happy as can be by saying, "Now, let's see, what restaurant do you go to regularly? Oh? What do your friends call you? Oh? Where – where do you live? Oh. Well, now I want you, one, to patronize an entirely different restaurant. Oh, you say one of the same kind? No, no – no. Patronize for two weeks a joint, just a joint. And make your friends call you by another name. And move."

The guy says, "There's nothing wrong with the house I've got now. It's a beautiful house and I have – I have a lease on it, so..." Well you say, "Move."

That's what we're talking about in the first book when we said shift environment. That's the factors of shifting environment. You change his level of randomness, you see, some way or another.

There are two things that will be happening in that environment: He'll either be hit – be hit too hard and too often or he won't be being hit enough.

What's happening to your preclear? Well, you'd better adjudicate which one it is. It's an either/or. This is quite important what I am telling you. You'd better adjudicate which one it is. This guy during his life had too much. This guy during his life had too little.

But past is not as important as present, ever. So, all the question you need ask is the pertinent ones. What are the real factors with which this person is surrounded?

Psychology gets hung up on changing environment and things like that merely because it doesn't resolve within itself this problem: Is it either/or? Is it plus or minus randomness? Plus randomness is simply too much.

[End of tape.]