

AICL-48(24B) 46 2 Nov Cause and Effect, Automaticity, Ridges Proc. I

Transcript of lecture by L. Ron Hubbard AICL-48 renumbered 24B and again renumbered 46 for the "*Exteriorization and the Phenomena of Space*" cassette series.

CAUSE AND EFFECT, AUTOMATICITY, RIDGES PROCESSING

A lecture given on 2 November 1953

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

According to my watch it is November the second and we have this morning the arduous and horrible task facing us of the half period having been passed and the real dope having been handed out and the last three weeks of solid application to confront us.

Now, we have two subjects with which you are indifferently acquainted and one of them is called randomness and the other is called automaticity. And this week, more or less, we're going to take up processes in general, we're going to take up automaticity and randomness.

One of you people just got himself in trouble a few minutes ago - asked me a question he hadn't answered himself. Well, that's the best kind of instruction on anything like this. He says the PC is motivator hungry - why, by mocking up acts happening to him we've got what you do about it.

And so I had him - had him give me eight ways of remedying motivator hunger. If we'd had a little time he would have given me eight ways to remedy overt hunger. And then, I would have given - had him - if this was - if you were really up to the end of the three weeks, I would have had him give me ways in which a person could make himself motivator and overt hungry in order to get some randomness. So that's what we're going to take up here.

Now, first we're going to take ... Who's got an AP&A, anybody? First we're going to take up randomness. Now, there are some people who think I call this "*Randomity*" just

to confuse and confound people and that it's an overt act on my part against society. Well, that's mainly because they have so much trouble with it, they can't understand it - very simple, isn't it?

They have so much trouble with it, it's so much on the exact *modus operandi* of living that they have great difficulty with it. And let me give you a principle right now which you cannot do without. You cannot do without this principle.

Actually, in trying to process somebody you can do without it a bit but in trying to instruct somebody, by golly, you can't do without it. And that is that the fellow won't look at what he won't look at. Now, that's a principle and it's a wonderful principle. And if you have this principle, you will save yourself God knows how many hours of gum-beating on the subject of thisa and thata and something else. This class is being instructed along the lines of that principle.

Been trying to give you experience with subjective, objective processes. Tried to make you look at some of the operating principles of the mind by experiencing them, by leading you to look at them through processing rather than trying to make you a bunch of dictionaries.

Well, we could make you a bunch of dictionaries. Suzie had a happy thought this morning. Apparently had a very good night's sleep, something of the sort, and she got very bright this morning - says, "*You know, I had a dream last night and all of a sudden my university education has come entirely clear to me, exactly what happened to it and exactly what I did with regard to it.*" And this was very revealing to her.

I've kidded her many times. I said I was going to write a letter of complaint to the University of Texas complaining about them having committed an overt act against me by giving her her diploma because she got it in science. And she's a very smart little cookie but, as I said before, you ask her, "*Now, what is Ohm's Law?*" and she says she didn't take up law.

And so she finally found out what she was doing and she had mocked up a circuit which then absorbed the education and spat it back. And this circuit had been most beautifully educated. But she unfortunately blew it. And this explains four years of German and not being able to order a cup of coffee in Aachen. This explains this Ohm's Law, explains a lot of things. Anything she was actually interested in, and so on, she learned about it from the MEST universe; she didn't learn it in school.

Now, if you've - if you've had the arduous of being backward or something of this sort in school - if you were bright enough to be completely stupid in the school - you had this sort of a thing happen. There was - there was this Mamie Glutz and she got all these A's. And she got A in Spanish when you were in high school, particularly, and one day you passed her on the campus and you said "*Buenos dias,*" and she looked at you and thought you were making a pass at her in pig Latin. And you come to find out that all these A's that she got in Spanish were based on exactly no reality as far as Spanish was concerned. And this must have been very disabusing to you or confusing.

Well, what you had there was a classroom circuit in operation. Now, why does a classroom circuit go into operation so easily? It's because it has a limited space and so it's a

natural to set up a circuit. There's that piece of space. All this society does is provide the material, which is to say the anchor points necessary to set up a circuit, and then sets one up.

This type of education which is not associated with experience and which doesn't lead immediately to experience - one doesn't see what he's going to do with it in the real universe at all - is not worthless. Don't ever make that mistake. It is savagely ravaging; it's not a worthless.

The incidence of suicide on the part of college students immediately prior or following examination time or in the summer which immediately follows is no accident. It is immediately coordinated with examination time. The incidence is high. You never hear about it. What you hear about colleges in this country is football stadiums. The definition of a college is *"a small number of professors entirely surrounded by a football stadium."* And when it comes to anxiety in your preclear, you want to look at education and do something about it; there are a dozen, dozen ways of doing something about education. The simplest is just lock-scan it. Lock-scanning in brackets, by the way, is a fascinating technique. (Good old Science of Survival - way back; pull it out of the tomb.) It's not a very high order of technique but, I mean, you could at least do that.

Here's somebody that's had his space nailed down; he's in a condition of fixed space And the society has set up a Circuit for him. Well, why could this circuit be set up and why was it set up as far as the society was concerned?

Did the society actually and honestly believe, at any moment, that it would be better off if it had more educated people in it? No, not since the beginning of time has a society ever supposed that it would be better off because people were more able to utilize skills. This is the last thing a society thinks of - the first thing it should think of and the last thing it does think of.

A society is as good as it has able, skilled workmen. It's just that good. It - all it is, is a large organism which produces and if its production units are smashed flat all the time and inhibited, it'll go to pieces. We never had any iron work in this country to amount to anything in - before Benedict Arnold captured Knyphausen's regiment and it was interned in Boston. They kept going out of Boston into the farms and so forth. That regiment was practically composed of nothing but artisans.

The king of - I don't know, what country was it? Spooferunia? He had run fresh out of peasants to sell to other people so he could buy actresses or whatever he was doing with the money, and he'd run fresh out of those and he actually sent press gangs out and he picked up artisans. And they made up Knyphausen's regiment of Hessians.

So, these dirty Hessians that we read about in American history, these dogs, these beasts that were turned loose upon our poor, brave colonials, built the damned country. Society doesn't give a doggone about an artisan! It doesn't just figure this - it says, *"Well, we are going to get along as well as we have what?"*

Well, they just don't ever answer the question. They think *"as long as we have good laws or as long as we have a democratic system."* Well, boy, the day a democratic system could put any gas in a gas tank or insert a new spark plug, I never heard of it.

You can take this democratic system and stand it up alongside of a diesel truck and the truck will just sit there. You can put it - you can put it up at the front end of a bread line and feed it out with a big ladle and by golly, the people in that bread line will starve to death; there has got to be bread in that bread line. And we don't get bread by passing a new set of laws.

The society has noticed invariably this strange one: When it didn't have heavy-handed educational facilities, it had too much randomness on the subject of its populace. Noticed that invariably. It noticed that its hoodlumism, rowdyism, street fights, bar brawls and so forth were at a much higher incidence.

And they can't send the kid to jail when he hasn't done anything, so they send him to school so he won't do anything. And you'll see this many times, you'll see - you'll see essays back when they had realism instead of Karl Marx as the prime method of running a democracy. Karl Marx is the textbook of today of the modern democracy. If you don't think so, just take poor old *Das Kapital*, which laughingly enough is still used as - it's been rewritten many times since - but it's used by the Communist Party today. But if you'll read an original Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, you'll swear to Pete, you're thinking - you'll be - you'll just swear that you must be reading a textbook - if you didn't know it was *Das Kapital* you'd think you were reading something by Harry Truman or the *"Running Handbook of the Democratic Party as Operating in the Latter Part of the 40s."*

Practically everything that Karl Marx said is taken over lock, stock and barrel. For instance, his methods - his formulas of taxation and so forth are today the formulas of taxation of the US Government. And just by rote - communist - no, I don't know what the communist is going to do. He's over too far to the right.

That's always the comment I make to a communist when he tries to sell me on communism; I listen to him for a little while and then explain to him very carefully that communism is far, far too far to the right for me. And he looks at me very alertly and scared, probably because he knows what he has run into; he has run into an anarchist. So he has to spend the last part - he has to spend the last part of his dissertation trying to convince me that there should be law and order in a government. Oh, dear. I am not, by the way, an anarchist; that's far, far, far too far to the right. Anyway.

When we look - when we look at a big social organism we'll see this tremendous effort to maintain a certain randomness within its own tolerance level. And it has decided, one way or another, that its tolerance level for randomness was so-and-so, and then everything it moves in is just to adjust that.

But the hideous part of this universe is, it is very seldom that anybody ever decides he has minus randomness. It's all plus randomness, plus randomness, plus randomness. Germany - the one European nation that periodically considers that it has minus randomness and it starts raising hell - it says, *"There's just not enough randomness in the rest of Europe; we'll make some."* And they do. They go out and blow everything up and get motion in all directions and so forth and get blown up themselves.

And then we think that will teach them a lesson. Well, what did you think they were trying to do? Teach them a lesson? No, it merely confirmed what they were trying to do in the first place. They have their randomness; they get it every twenty years; couldn't do without it. It's like you have to feed a baby every two and a half, three and a half hours.

All right. We have, then, a culture - a cultural speed, you might say. And when somebody comes in and exceeds this speed that's real rough.

Well, the early boys who came into the United States were trying to get away from reasonable and rational people. And they had a rough time of it because they had been kicked out of everything; they were minus randomness people. And they finally came over here, and boy, they - did they find plus randomness like mad. The wolverines and coyotes and bison and Indians were quite a bit. And these boys were real hard and they were real tough.

And they - early groups were subscribing up in the New England states to a chap by the name of Calvin. Calvin always called himself the "*maitre*." I don't know what he was the maitre of the maitre d'hotel or something of the sort. He was the guy that had, every time anybody thought anything, why, Calvin's only answer to this was "*Hang him*." But not spectacularly - please! Hang him quietly.

And Calvin's reformation took that renaissance that was just starting and threw it into a nearby cesspool. And all was evil, as far as Calvin was concerned. I guess he figured it out on the basis of all was sex or something because he had been in connection with too many Catholic priests. And so he decided that the best way we had better handle this whole situation is just give everybody zero randomness.

Well, the Puritan and so on came over here and they had already imbibed this poison. And what's made this country remarkable is the fact that it's running on a zero-randomness goal with the country itself just raising hell with them all the time and giving them plus randomness. And between the two of these you've got a perpetuation and a persistence the like of which nobody ever heard of do you see? You got plus randomness enforced upon the people with a tremendous, tremendous desire for no randomness by their own creeds. And it has just made a very exciting playground for an awful lot of thetans.

Anyway, you get the history of any new country. And no new country on Earth in recent millennia has done this incredible thing of being utterly sold on minus randomness, and then going in suddenly into a country that had the plusest randomness there was on the face of Earth, See?

So you'll get the tremendous strength of early ordinances; they - for instance, the - one of the first ordinances was enforced - they hung a man for stealing a chicken, see? And the code of laws which were imported into early America are very fine, they - but they don't show anything even vaguely resembling mercy or a feeling that anybody was human or should move. It was just this strong.

Well, the little red schoolhouse was an immediate effort to keep the boys from running taverns and things, and having patrons.

And you'll get all up and down the line, you get religion, use of. In 1805 there was a fellow writing over here in Philadelphia; he published a very lovely history of the world - very brilliant book. Nobody has ever heard of him - I happen to have his book, however. It was published in 1805, you can imagine what kind of shape the book is in,

But he gives there all the way through what the thinking world - what the world of letters and arts really felt about government and religion. And the people who were running the societies at that time, what their honest opinions were. Because he - at that time the lettered men - people - hadn't gotten them in school. They had read law or they had been bred as a gentleman or something of the sort. And they were just sort of hatted in the tradition that they were supposed to be polite and before you ran somebody through you said, "*By your leave, sir,*" and ran him through. In other words, they had politeness.

And he gives there the use of religion in handling the masses. And it is a method of control by which it is represented that there is a supreme being who can punish after the courts have ceased jurisdiction.

And you need this extensional method of control when the action of courts of law have no penalty sufficient here to restrain the amount of evil which is being done, you see? It's very simple.

I mean, if you - if hanging and torture... You figure this out, see? They figured out, well, all right, we're putting people in jail; well, that doesn't restrain them. All right, we'll start killing them for doing that crime; doesn't restrain them; we get more of that kind of crime. Therefore, we will torture them and kill them. And that doesn't restrain them, so the next thing you've got to have is religion which says, "*Look, fellow, we'll catch up with you after you're dead. And you'll burn forever.*"

If you tell him this hard enough, why, he comes into the belief that there is some kind of a coalition between God and the state and he'll obey some of these laws.

Problem of reduction of plus randomness. That's all it is.

Well, this modern society here doesn't have the vitality or the philosophy anymore that it started out with. And furthermore, it isn't being faced by the rigorous problems. This society has gotten down more and more and more into a - toward minus randomness. In other words, the boys that started it out are ending the cycle of action and are actually succeeding. See, they're ending the cycle of action. Their goal was no motion and they're getting there, this late.

And you get the institutions and so forth of education - they actually set up a circuit which could be educated. There isn't any other plot there, they just want a circuit to be educated and this circuit will thereafter run the person.

You know, if they can reduce his randomness sufficiently, the law won't have any trouble with him. They've gone on the misconception, rather constantly, that the reduction of randomness reduced crime and overt acts against the state.

It doesn't! It makes it impossible for an individual to join the society. That's what this punishment does. The fellow - he gets the idea that he can't join the society and as soon as he can't join the society he can't have any of its anchor points, can he? And if he can't have any of its anchor points they're not his so he has got to steal some. And he doesn't care what happens to them. Blow them all up - they're not his, are they?

Well, that's the - in the final analysis is the result of superpunishment on the part of the state and the family. People just wind up with the concept of they are not his.

Well anyway, we have in any preclear that you'll process here in the United States: we're into a problem of minus randomness. This is not necessarily the only problem there is. There is also the problem of plus randomness, but you're not likely to run into it very often but you must remember that it can exist.

It's generally too much unwanted action and not enough wanted action - desirable randomness. Well, the second we add a big consideration into it, we have - the second we have added consideration into it we have a problem here of what's good and what's evil?

Well, you find out if you run "*wasting*" in brackets that you don't have a problem of good and evil - that is a specious problem. There is no such thing as a bad or unwanted sensation and no such thing as a good or a wanted sensation. What there is, is sensation.

But now, people evaluate and evaluate and they figure out just to reduce randomness that some sensations are good and some sensations are bad; that's the first trick. That's the first trick. Some sensations are good, some are bad.

That, of course, reduces randomness by at least half. You've got an immediate reduction of randomness by 50 percent the moment you introduce morality. So morality is the first state trick to bring down the amount of this horrible, intolerable thing called motion.

Now we can just plain knock it in half. We'd say all these actions over here are bad. Now they say, "*Gee. That word crime - look how well that worked. Let's just label all the rest of these actions as bad, too. And if we can do that then we'll get our goal of no motion.*" And so they come down to a basis of people believing that 99 percent of the motion, sensation, looking-ness, feelingness, effort, thinkingness, is bad, see? Very simple, they get 99 percent is bad and only 1 percent is good. And then they won't even tell them what the 1 percent good is. Well, this is the way you reduce randomness on a state basis.

Well, one of the methods of reducing it is education if it's done in this fashion. You understand that anybody who has been educated on a circuit basis, which is to say, the little red schoolhouse at nine and you get out at three, and on and on and on and on and on - I don't know, how long do they educate them now in this country? Thirty-five years or something of the sort? It keeps going up. No, that's 1980 when they will graduate when they're thirty-five yeah. They now graduate normally when they're about twenty-four. It used to be when they were sixteen, earlier than that when they were twelve earlier than that when they were ten. They had more education, too, by

the time they graduated when they were ten. Don't think that there's more subject matter being forwarded; that's not true, just more time is put in.

I, one time, asked a bunch of mothers why they didn't shorten the school hours and so forth and make it a little bit easier on the kids and so forth. And they were shocked. And I very carefully cross-questioned them and discovered that uniformly these ladies had no idea whatsoever of their child being educated - that there was any advantage whatsoever in learning how to read or write or do things in school, but boy, you sure had a lot of free time there with no kids underfoot!

Now, that's a brutal statement, but that's why they put the kids in school; school is a wonderful method. These people, by the way, had children in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth grades. And they were - they were flabbergasted that I would be interested in whether or - what the child was being taught and what good it was doing the child.

Well, finally I beat it down: they had - just by the cross-questioning: "*We're going to talk to the principal about it,*" because it had occurred to them that the child was not being taught anything useful. This had finally come through to them. There was nothing useful in the curriculum.

Now, did the - after the child comes home is he - does he shine his shoes better? Does he know how to wash an automobile? What's the child being taught? See, I just started using all of the household operations that these women - these women had to do themselves and would like to have done. And they suddenly realized that the state was doing them out of labor. Which of course it is; it's trying to cut down the labor market. The only reason you have child labor laws is just so you cut down the labor market. Anybody that goes around, "*Poor little children. They have to work and slave and they work their eyes out,*" and so forth. Balderdash! Dirtiest trick you can do on a little kid is to keep him from working.

You make it uniform that no little child can have a job, you've immediately consigned him to the prison of an orphan asylum. See? You've immediately consigned him to the onerous contribution of Papa and Mama where he can contribute nothing back. You've made him, artificially, into a parasite.

And the goal of a government, but not the goal of the people, where the government and people fall down and fly at each other's throats eventually is right at this point - and they really fly at each other's throats eventually - is the government tries to create, actively, indigence on the part of its populace, so that the populace will depend upon the government utterly and fall then into a slave status. And the people try to create work as long as they're healthy. They try to be independent, self-determined and support themselves individually and support their organizations individually.

And the difference, for instance, between the government of France today, which is shot through with... You know, a very funny, loose word - one day I'm going to have to find out what modern communism is. I - last time I looked up it was a military aristocracy. And that's not a bad form of government - military aristocracy. It's rather workable, if it's ever done right. That is, if you have any people to govern with it - that's the main thing. The Russians are kind of hard up there.

Anyhow, the military aristocracy is used today in Spain; it's quite successful. But communism - God knows what this is - is being used in France. And free enterprise is being used in Holland. So we have all of these model societies running different ways. Well, how are they running?

Well, in Spain - in Spain, the people are still good enough so that the government can go take a flying leap into the Mediterranean or the Atlantic, whichever direction it wants to go - period. I mean, they're still good enough. Little kids work in Spain. Everybody works in Spain - old ladies; see some old lady that's supposed to be - in the US, she would have been for the last fifteen years in an old ladies' home. Anyway, she's working hard; she's a laundress. And you see this little six-year-old kid, who in the US would be in an orphan asylum and so forth, he's the grocery store runner. He's very cocky, ornery little fellow, He really buckles down and works, though. In other words, everybody is working, they've never lost their ability to work. So it doesn't matter what kind of a government they've got. If the government gets in their road, they buy them off and send them the other way.

The revolution, we think that's terribly important because it would have been very destructive in the United States. Actually, all it did was take away from Spain about thirty years of continual political turmoil which wouldn't let anybody finish a job. And this one finally settled it and it's got enough guns to keep off other political pretenders.

And whether it's good or bad is beside the point. It's just tough enough and rough enough right now so that no other political pretenders come up and upset the public calm. And Spain goes on working. It's picking itself up remarkably.

But France? Well, France is still striking and it's still doing this and it's still doing that; and everything is on a bureaucracy paper chain and there's too little work. Why? Because it's all being done by the government, everything is being done by the government, everything is broken down. There's another rule, you know, is if everybody owns something then nobody owns it. It'll just fall to pieces, nobody will take care of it. That's a socialism at work. Nobody owns the state so it goes to pieces. And nobody owns the tractors standing in the fields, so they don't run. That's Russia today.

All right. Here you have France running on a total communism, practically today, as far as the government is concerned. Nothing happens. You can't send any baggage across France. You stop and try - there's a couple of American gasoline companies in there, so you can buy gasoline; the service pumps are generally serviced and full. But there's extraneous duress being put on the country to get efficient in some department or other.

Everything else is just poeey! Nothing is functioning - bing. It feels like you're in the middle of a small hurricane that just is - everything is just being tossed up in the air and let fall where it will.

Holland is total free enterprise; the government is getting in nobody's road. The government has been bought off in so many directions by so many American capitalists and Dutch capitalists and so forth, and has been so nullified in various directions that

it doesn't know quite whether it's in Holland or "*Lithuania*." And free enterprise - that's the motto they're going on; total and unlimited. It's not free enterprise as defined by the Republican Party of the US which is "*the right to have sole monopoly of*." Get - that's a real limited free enterprise. No, it's just free enterprise where everybody has a perfect right to get in and form a business with minimal taxation and minimal legislation and obstruction. And my gosh, Holland - you just have to sort of be very careful when you walk in the streets because everything is running and it's not just running well, it's also running fast. There's all kinds of equipment and goods and well-fed people and food and so forth, all the way around. Minimal government. The government, well, once in a while somebody happens to think there is a government. But that's about all it is. There's so much traffic in the country that the government has all it can do to eat up its customs taxes; it lives on its customs and so forth, as things come over the border. Lots of American Cars - country is full of Cadillacs and so on. No other country in Europe has this, but there's free enterprise for you. In other words, the state takes its hands off - all I'm trying to show you is that the state takes its hands off somewhat, as in Spain, and the country will run. The people can get going.

The state is in there a hundred percent on everything and everything breaks down and everybody is miserable, as in France today. And there's no government at all (I mean, gradient scale), there's no government at all, practically, and everything is running full out at high velocity. But it's plus randomness by the time you get up to that; that's full out, high velocity, terrific traffic, lots of goods, lots of food, lots of employment and terrific amounts of money in circulation, of all currencies. It's to a point where nobody cares what you're spending. They - you give them a mark, a mark is good; you give them a Belgian franc, a Belgian franc is good.

When we find the state willing to let happen what will happen natively within a people, we get lots of action. But we get more action, actually, than can be easily cared for by a bunch of cops standing on the corner with guns; we just get lots of action.

Because it's a very silly thing, the thought that one-sixth - oh, I don't know, there's one-half when we take in the armed services of the United States and the police force of the United States - what do you have? And the government employees - what do we have, one-half the populace? But you could go to that extremity. You wouldn't even be able to get - if you had - if you went to that extremity you could keep all the randomness out of the society, by force of arms; great ease. One police officer per taxpayer; you could keep it up. But boy, if you let *Homo sapiens* run at the speed he will run and if you don't inhibit him in any direction whatsoever, the government hasn't got a chance.

This is not saying whether or not *Homo sapiens* has a chance. This says the government doesn't have a chance. You take one one-hundredth of its populace involved in police activities, they would just stand by and look at the blur That's right - they wouldn't have a chance.

In other words, what do we get here? I've just been talking idly, trying to put it up on the third dynamic so that you could look at it rather than in a preclear. We get controllability as the coincident factor with randomness. And the reason one wants a minus randomness, if he does want it, is so that he will be able to control. Now, the

randomity, if he does want it, is so that he will be able to control. Now, the randomness which he can tolerate is then - and you can put this down as a law - the randomness which he can tolerate is the randomness in a thing which he is able to control without straining his attention.

Now, that is the amount of randomness and that's what we know as tolerance. Tolerance - speed tolerance or randomness tolerance. You can tell immediately what the randomness tolerance - it's a good, good factor, I don't know of any other way you would state it. Undoubtedly we could think of thousands of ways to state it but actually this is a new thing in thinkingness. It's been there all the time but it's just a way of thinking about this.

We'll take a preclear who isn't in good motion at all. He won't go into motion. He won't go out walking; he won't go more than - more than a few miles from the house; he won't go out to movies and he won't move himself around one way or the other. Well, he has reduced the randomness in the body itself and in his - in his business of living, he's reduced the randomness down to a tolerance level.

What is the tolerance of the thetan? The randomness tolerance of the thetan is directly observable in what the thetan tolerates in the motion and action of the body. Now, just strike out of this whole thing "*bad*" and "*good*"; let's just look at motion. Regardless of the valuation of motion - no consideration to it at all - just look at motion.

We find that this fellow spends most of his time sitting around and thinking about it. Well, that's not a symptom of thinkingness. That thinkingness won't give you the index. That's why Dianetic processing every once in a while falls on its face with some preclear. We start to treat his thinkingness. And that's a wonderful opportunity of him to have just his randomness tolerance. And if he then can, with this idea of being processed in thinkingness, adjust his randomness to just thinkingness, he's happy.

Is he going to get any better? No, sir! You've handed him on a silver platter the randomness which he as a thetan can tolerate easily in a body. And he's real cheerful about it now. And you'll find people that will - would actually just go on for just years and years and years, lying to the auditor, trying to figure it out one way or the other so that they can go on out and tripping over and falling under something so they'll have to have another engram run out and the case is just being extended forever. Because he is running at his own speed factor which he finds very agreeable. And that speed factor happens to find processing by a slow auditor very desirable because it's another opportunity too.

So this is why, now - he doesn't have to argue back with the society. Society tells him all the time, "*You ought to run a little bit faster. You ought to get out and do something. You ought to make something of yourself.*" Society has been telling him that.

Now he has a good reason why. And his reason why is, is he's not able to because he is being processed. How long will he be processed? Well, there was one case like this. I won't mention any names; it was J. W. Winter. And this was a case, strictly, of having found his tolerance level. And he wrote in a book on the subject (he should have

known the subject before he wrote the book) but he wrote in a book on this subject that he had had somewhat was it? Sixteen hundred hours of processing.

Well, by the way, between the time he heard of Dianetics, and the time he was - that meant that he had to have been processed at the rate of four hours a day up to the time the book was put in the publisher's hands from the moment that he first heard of Dianetics. We have to embrace all of that time, and we find out it still means that he was on a couch four hours a day, seven days a week and holidays to get that many hours of processing in. I won't say this is a lie, I'll say the fellow is a medical doctor.

Anyway, he's used to making statements which sound very profound. When you have to - if you can't cure a patient you sure get to be an expert at profound statements which are kind of impartial about the whole thing. If you can't do anything you sure have to alibi for it all the time and you get into a habit of doing that.

Well, here is a case of having met his randomness - sixteen hundred hours of processing? Yeah, we'll allow him sixteen hundred hours of processing. How about adding in about five thousand more hours of processing on top of it? Sure, this is a way of life all of a sudden.

Well now, the problem we're taking up, see, we've moved out of the third dynamic and now we're looking at the first dynamic (and we're really looking at the first dynamic) we've got a problem there of what is the randomness of this preclear? He has hit his tolerance; he can tolerate no more physical randomness than he has. Actually, he can tolerate no motion or randomness on the part of those around him. None. It really upsets him when people move in his vicinity - just move. He can give you lots of reasons for it, but if somebody were to reach over and pick up something, a preclear like this will get upset. He can - he can cover it, you understand. But overt act-motivator - an overt act has been done to him; therefore he now has a motivator. So he's going to flick back at you in a short or a long time, more or less on the same basis. What was your crime? You moved. See that?

Now, his own randomness adds up into just this static state of lying as a corpse, you see, and being run on engrams. This doesn't - requires no physical effort; you kind of get a chance to chew up energy. Well now, there is where Dianetics was falling on its face as a science because it would keep running into these cases - they aren't few; there's lots of them. But these cases in the normal run of a practice don't walk up to your front door. They'd have to really be pepped up to drift in. And I, unfortunately, pepped up people. And after that my entire practice picture changed. And I started running into these people.

Well, they are in insufficient motion. And they're in such insufficient motion that I'd never ordinarily see them; neither would you, do you see? Because they're not in sufficient motion, which means they're not very observable.

So, there was Dianetics. It suddenly pulled these people in and gave them a good reason. It's no accident that psychoanalysis takes two years. They take a year; an analyst takes two year - a year, at four hours a week, to find out if he can do anything for the

case. And then the second year to just let the patient discover that he can't. Two years! Imagine that.

But you get the level of randomness. What kind of patients does he get? Well, he at least gets patients that will come to his office. Anyway - which is probably higher than ordinarily exists. I imagine around in the houses and so forth you have the really minus randomness cases. Well, they're tolerating on the first dynamic.

Now, let's take France. What is the randomness tolerance of France? Zero! It's letting the government do everything; nobody wants to do a thing. The railroad workers all strike; every time you put anybody on a job they've got to have a union so that they can strike for shorter hours and longer pay. See? I mean, just going to - going down there quick. This is their main concern, is no motion, no motion.

All right. What's the tolerance, then, or you might say, the (quote) "*group thetan*" or the spirit of the French people? See, what's the tolerance of it? And the tolerance is "*We've had too damn much motion around here. There have been a lot of people around here throwing bullets around, and we are awful tired of it and we don't want any motion.*"

[End of lecture.]