

# RANDOMITY, CONTROL AND PREDICTION (part 2)

A lecture given on 14 October 1953

1st ACC – 15

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-14, renumbered 7B and again renumbered 15 for the "Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space" cassette series. Tape number 667 on the Flag Master List.

Number 0667-A on the Flag Master List. 5310C14B 1ACC-14 RANDOMITY, CONTROL AND PREDICTION, PART II

[Note that this was packaged together on the old reels with the first section of the next lecture.]

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

Okay. Continuing this morning's talk on randomness.

We can get into this – we can get into randomness much more thoroughly than this but I'm trying to add it up against cases and against living.

There is a very interesting process which is a – merely an investigatory process. You have somebody be in one spot, you see, and ask a question and then have him be in another spot and answer the question.

Now, when I say that, I don't mean do it with his mind. Should differentiate this very carefully.

You give the preclear two chairs – don't get off into psychodrama. That's a – that's a bunch of bunk. That's just an opportunity to dramatize an engram without being criticized.

You put him in one chair and you say how – and you have him say, aloud, "How are you this morning?" Then have him move to the other chair and say, "I am fine, thank you." And while he is sitting in that second chair, you say – have him say, "What is wrong with you?" to the other chair. And then get into the other ch – just that phrase, by the way – and have him get into the other chair and have him not answer.

And then have him get into the first chair again and say, "But what is ailing you?" And then get into the other chair and not answer. And you will work out the valence problems of the most violent schizophrenic you ever had.

The only thing wrong with a mind is that it is there. I hope we can really learn that as we go through this. The only thing that's wrong with a mind is its thinkingness. The mind is the substitute of predict.

Now, a person goes too low on no-predict and then he can't look and see what is going to happen, he gets into a situation where he figures what is going to happen. And he's pretty good at this. He can use his past experience and so forth.

But, let's get exactly why he does that. A preclear can run this as a concept quite interestingly: "I don't know what's going to happen. I'm looking around to see what's going to happen." Those two levels, see? The first level, "I don't know what's going to happen." And you will have him run through all sorts of thought things.

You are not trying to solve very much about how the mind is thinking. The mind will think all right if its problems of randomness are solved. Exteriorization and motion through space solve problems of randomness much better than thinking about them. The fellow will suddenly throw out tremendous quantities of circuitry without even looking at it if you just teach him that he can move and that he can make things move.

Well, of course you've got to bring him way up scale before he can move anything else. But you teach him he can do this. And you teach him that with a drill, just like you would teach a soldier or something. Not to make him obedient but to show him he can move. And you move him from one corner of space to the other corner of space and you move him here and move him there. And have him move mock-ups while he's there and blow up mock-ups and change mock-ups.

You see, explosion is beautiful because, boy, is that making a lot of particles move in a lot of space and – in a very short time. Boy, that's real good, see! Gee, that's real good. All right.

Here you have a condition in this universe as I told you yesterday – the perception lag time of the universe. If you see by use of this universe's perceptions (waves) something will happen and then afterwards you will find out about it, because sound traveling at eleven hundred feet per second arrives with you sometime later. See? So simple. It arrives with you sometime later. Well, damn it, that's a condition of no-predict!

But it is slightly desirable. Don't ever overlook the fact that it's slightly desirable. It is desirable, really. I say slightly and you could take a lot of this. Of course, you've got practically nothing but a spotlight.

Now, this gets keyed in on speech this way. You go in; the person that you're talking to is apparently in good spirits. And you go ahead and you say, "Blah-blah-blah-blah-blah. And a beautiful morning. And the birds singing. And everything is going along."

And the other person simply says, "To hell with you!"

"Jesus," you say – baaahhhhh!

You go in. You just made 82,672 dollars in a terrifically clever way and it didn't spend any of your future at all. And you've got all of this money, you see? And you say, "You see?"

And tremendous enthusiasm. They don't admire it at all. But you look at them. They look like they're going to admire it. And they say, "Money is the root of all evil."

People who do this are in two conditions. They, one – neither upscale nor downscale actually; they are both aberrated conditions. They don't have enough randomness so they – they just don't have the capability of making any randomness. See? That's kind of what they've lost. They don't have enough randomness, so they try to make it with speech. Or they're deathly afraid to admire anything you've got because it might set up some randomness. And they can't be predictable! And there's a center pin.

They don't dare be predictable. That takes care of both cases. The back of both cases is that. And both cases have this: The environment is dangerous.

They have been hit, not spoken to. They have been hit often enough in the MEST universe where they didn't know they were going to be hit. That's all it takes.

All it takes, actually, to shatter the morale and spirit of a small boy or something like that is, without any causation in his environment, no – no ability to predict it and so forth, without any change of relationship, with no guilt or any of these reasonabilities that are used for prediction and so forth, and without his seeing the forewarning motion of preparation for the blow, have him standing in front of you and then just suddenly hit him very hard while you're smiling. You'll shatter him. And you'll find incidents like that on a case. It's an actual impact, see? He's been hit without warning.

Now, don't think that the automobile accident, then, is the tremendous trauma. Birth isn't the tremendous trauma. This is just a slow grind. It's hit without prediction. The automobile accident was only a severe automobile accident if the fellow was driving along the road and then he wakes up in the hospital. He's hit on an oblique angle. He never saw the incoming car. And you'll find this is what they complain about in the emergency wards: "But I never saw it coming. I never s-." If you find anybody who is in a terrible condition, terrific psychic shock, that's what he's saying over and over. And the other thing he's saying, "Where am I?" or "Where was I?" Locational, you see? Both of them are the same thing: is "What the hell was I doing there?" And he's trying to look for some future method of predicting such an occurrence. See, he's got to have a better answer. He knows it now, because he can't predict. And he's just shattered.

And then all of a sudden he'll begin to find out he can predict things a little better. How do you teach him that he can predict things?

You say, "What is the realest thing in the room to you?"

"Oh, the ashtray."

"All right. Reach over and touch the ashtray."

And you will find that these people very low on the Tone Scale will wait a long time before they touch the ashtray. Why? They're not sure it will be there when they arrive. They're not sure that it won't move. They're not sure that it isn't a billiard ball that is going to be struck in some mysterious and invisible fashion.

There is why people are very upset in this universe about religion and God. They're upset about hidden things, invisible things. And that's why they use, continually, the hidden standard. In all their arguments and everything else, you'll – they work on this thing called the hidden standard which I'll go into. Remind me sometime, I'll tell you all about that hidden standard. That's a really tricky one. It doesn't belong in this morning's frame.

You've got to teach them that they can be there when something reaches them and that when it reaches them it won't kill them and that they can reach something which will remain there long enough to be reached because these people don't think their environment is going to be here two seconds from now. And that's the condition of mind they're in.

If you want to understand the mind of a psychotic, that phrase will do it for you. They're not sure that any of this or you will be there two seconds from now; that you're either going to be here, which accounts for the collapse of the line, or you're going to be gone, so forth. And they live on this kind of a perpetual level. So we get again this technique called comparison – corner for corner. This corner stayed there while he looked at that corner. That's the first thing a psychotic will notice. And that's the first little jump up the line he will do.

"Look! The corners stayed there ha-ha-ha!"

I've actually had one laugh just like that, I mean, terrifically relieved, see? He didn't dare look at any of that stuff because it wouldn't be there by the time his gaze reached it. Oh, this is real low, real low. You find it – you find yourself stretching your imagination a little bit to embrace how low you can get on something like this.

And the other one is, is something has started a long time ago which is going to hit me any second and it's traveling at a speed which I can't see. And a fellow gets that in space opera and that's why space opera is so deadly.

Going faster than the speed of light, an object reaches you before you see it, if you're using MEST universe perception.

You're going along just as nice as you please and everything is just swell and there is a dull feeling. The body isn't there anymore. And very often they didn't even find out what hit it. Do you see why this universe forms – if a person is in it too long – forms too much no-predict?

But the only thing really wrong with a case is your no-predict and your automaticity, if something must be wrong with a case. It's his level of randomness has been violated – plus or minus – been violated. He expected this damn thing to get to him last week and now it's this week and it isn't here. Now that's a no-predict on the slow – the minus side.

You take some fellow who has customarily been waiting for somebody else's decision and the guy is kind of batty. The ultimate in "too slow" is an absolute nothing. It never gets to him. That's the ultimate in "too slow."

Don't, because of the drama in it, assume that an impact is all there is. There's that nothing, too. But what is the best thing to aberrate a nothing? It never arrives and there was nothing to arrive. That's the worst nothing you can get.

"And I didn't see it at all and I didn't know when it hit or what it was!" is the other one. But you don't have to add "what it was," because that's just form and an aesthetic.

Now, for God's sakes, solve this in a case that's having trouble. Any one of these factors solves, but solve this little one I'm going to give you now in a case that's having trouble: "Who done it?"

I know that sounds idiotic but we're dealing with Homo Sapiens. And we'll soar right now down from anything that will embrace the whole track to something that applies immediately and intimately to Homo Sapiens is "Who done it?"

They read detective stories, not because they like detective stories or their acceptance level of "baby murdered" and so forth – a lot of explanations if you want them – but it's, who, who, who? Who was the fellow? And you just ask – you just put – preclear on a case – and I want you to do this today while you're processing – just put it on the dial and just ask him, "Now, who did it?"

And those that are very wary and very differentiative and so forth will ask you coolly, "What are you talking about?" You see.

And fend around, "Well, who was responsible?"

And your other phraseology will kick it because they're carrying one like that right in present time. There's hardly anybody who isn't. "Who was responsible for it?"

But what you want to find out is not "How did you place the guilt?" The actual identity is the one you're looking for. And they have fought identity so long that identity has gotten awfully important to them and it's why the guy is hanging on to a body. The fight with identity. "Which identity was it?" You see? "Which – which – which was it?"

And so they'll cling on to this identity because identity has gotten very, very scarce. How'd it get scarce? Because he couldn't acquire identity? No. Because he didn't dare acquire identity? No. It's just because those that operated other particles in his vicinity were not identified. And that's terrifically specious and spurious and it's very low toned.

What the hell difference does it make who pushed the rock? The fact is the rock was pushed. And your preclear who's having a hard time has to come into some kind of a recognition of this: that the "who"...

You'll find that the trouble with the "God complex" is simply the trouble of "Who is God? What is his name?" You might... You see, it's – this is the *reductio ad absurdum*. There's no sense in this. And you'll never find any sense in it.

All you have to tell somebody is, "God is a fellow by the name of Caterwump and he lives on Mount Sputtergut." Gee, if you say it loud enough and with enough conviction and so forth, you'll have an enormous religion going immediately. That's all you have to say, you see, because of this terrific anxiety of "Who done it?"

So we get this thing, "Who made the universe?" And what have you got there? You've just got the ultimate of uncertainty. Obviously the thing is made, so they want "who" made it.

Well, when you're asking for who, you're finding nothing because that's an identity. You see? You haven't solved anything merely by saying, "This is a lighter," if you're talking to a Swede. You've solved nothing.

He says, "Who is this?" And when he's saying, "What is this?" he means purpose. But if he were asking "Who is this?" and you said "Joe," he would be satisfied. Why the hell should he be satisfied? Well, that's so he could say "Joe" next time.

Well, I don't know that anybody is really excited about God today the way they used to be. But they all have the feeling like they're going to meet him or something and they'd like to know what name to call him and this is very – this is very upsetting to them. And they want to have enough – this who is simply – and they want to have enough responsibility hung on this person so they can go and look this person up and have some randomness.

You'll find out some person who is really fixed on "Who done it?" is – they just haven't got enough reason to punish and it runs right off into reason to punish." So that's the next thing you run on a case. You get a drop on the meter, "Who done it?" Then you run "reason to punish." See? Just do it and you will understand a lot more about it than I'm telling you right now – "Who done it?"

Your preclear finds that it is enormously and horribly important to have a name. Here he is a poor little defenseless baby and someone comes along and hangs the name "Aloysius" on him. He's utterly defenseless. But this is it. This is a thing. This is a particle. It's a valuable particle of some sort or another which can move around and he can do things with and so on. Terrifically valuable particle.

Why is it so valuable? Well, it identifies him. It gives him an importance. When you don't have an identification you don't have an importance.

I want you to subjectively examine that because your preclear is very often not hanging on to his body. He's hanging on to his name. Hm – boy! That is the third stage removal, you see, in terms of thought. You can't hang on to a name. You can't get attached to a name. You detach him from his name and he can detach from the body.

One of the ways of doing this with a child – this is the simplest process in the world. Kid comes in, his name is Johnny Jones.

You say, "Say 'Johnny Jones.'"

He says, "Johnny Jones. Whatcha talking about?"

You say, "Say 'Johnny Jones' again."

And he says, "Johnny Jones. Well, what are you talk – getting at?"

"Well, just sit there and say the name Johnny Jones now twenty-five times. I'll count them."

He says, "Johnny Jones, Johnny Jones, Johnny Jones, Johnny Jones..." All of a sudden he'll say, "Who am I?"

You've shaken him into his first questioning attitude on the conviction which has got him beautifully nailed down.

You actually can take a preclear and practically exteriorize him on that. He's nailed down by his name. "Who am I?" he will say. And then he will start to find other names. He's got to find a lot more names now. To hell with that! He's him! And that's the first thing he's got to learn.

He only asks "Who am I?" when he loses his own sense of identity. He only loses his own sense of identity when he identifies himself with space. He's got to go back through and be perfectly willing to identify himself with space. And then he won't have to be space anymore. And then he won't have to have a name, because he wants exterior designation that says, "You're not nothing."

Now, what do you do after that? "Desire to punish." There's one more step instantly, immediately following.

You've got, "Who did it?" Then the "desire to punish," that's the first reason that shows up in the thing. And then you've got desensitization of name and this flies apart on "the right to be nothing." You'd better run that. See, you're moving him closer and closer to reaching it – the right to be nothing. And this is run with concepts, brackets, matched terminals and so forth. That's one of these a – haaa sort of a technique.

Okay. Will you please investigate this and look over its subjective reality. I don't expect you to integrate all the theory I've been giving you this morning in a lump sum. But there are ways that you can use it and you should figure out there are ways that you can use it.

"I don't know where it's coming from" as a concept will put a guy immediately in a – into thousands and thousands and thousands of engrams. I mean it's the little handy jim-dandy one.

But just recognizing that you are on a mission of demonstrating to somebody that the universe is predictable to some degree will do an awful lot for you as an auditor when you're auditing Homo Sapiens. And if a person is terribly bored, showing him that it's not predictable in every way and shape and form. And those are the two sides. It's not entirely predictable. You're really not going to be here for the next seventy-five years keeping this house, missis. There are other things going to happen.

Well, all these things resolve by exteriorization because it's motion of particles through space and moving particles in space. See why exteriorization works out as your ultimate therapy.

Okay?

> We've got let's see, now if we did the assigning yesterday and so on. You > grabbed a brass ring last night I understand, Bill. De Young. I understand you > grabbed a brass ring last night. I trust you have been in your body very > thoroughly all during this lecture. (...) Well I hope you have, it's a very > serious lecture. >

[End of lecture.]