

## EXTERIORIZATION

A lecture given on  
19 January 1956

Well, it makes me very happy to look at so many bright, interested faces, and to know that the bulk of those present are going to comprehend every word of this lecture, even if I don't.

There are three or four subjects more technical than the subject we are about to address tonight, they are much more technical than this. One of them is the exact descent and genealogy of the Indian gods. That's very technical, very poorly understood. They've written four books, one after the other, all of which came from word of mouth. And it's all a very involved subject; it goes way back.

Another subject that's more technical than this is the difference between Homoousianism and Homoiousianism. That's a very technical subject. Interestingly enough, these two Christian sects accounted - with their technicalities - for one hundred thousand casualties in the city of Alexandria in one year alone; a hundred thousand Christians were killed by Christians because of the differences between Homoiousianism and Homoousianism. And all the difference one can detect between the two is that one has an I and one doesn't. But it's a much more technical subject, much more technical.

Well, there are probably three or four others that are equally baffling. There's probably, "How many angels can or cannot dance on the head of a pin." There's probably, "Whether or not one actually did descend from a large sunburst." All of these speculations, past lives and their exact ramifications and so forth, however, are subordinate to the subject I am going to talk to you about tonight.

Now, you understand just about where we sit. We sit somewhere between the Hindu gods and their genealogy, the abstract theoreticians of the other side of the Dark Ages and the known territory of what we can discover in a preclear's bank and E-Meters, and what we can observe in the way of phenomena, directly. But it's an awfully technical subject, which has not only baffled many of us, but it's made several of us, I'm afraid, rather ill. So, if you feel strange or quivery, or anything like that, please leave quietly. We are, after all, making a tape recording. And it isn't really for us, it's the taperecording engineers. They grind their teeth and spit out bits of enamel whenever a chair falls over or something like that. So, we just hope that this will not occur.

Now, the facts of the case are that the subject I am talking to you about is not popular. It is the least popular subject in our modern scientific world and is, at the same time, the most important subject in our modern scientific world, because here we are at the crossroads between man as he really is, and man as his enslavers wish he was. We're right there at that crossroads, and the subject, of course, is exteriorization. It's not a popular subject, not today.

A person who is very immersed in MEST - who finds himself at every hand utterly dependent upon the machines, test tubes, looms and wheels of this society, upon its biochemistry, its delicatessens - does not like to look at a thetan. In fact, it makes him sick. Now that's literally, actually true. There is a process, second only to R2-45

in its finality, in The Creation of Human Ability, and that technique is Conceive a Static. You simply ask a person to "Conceive a static." It says right at the top of it, "Not recommended." That is the understatement of the age! Every now and then somebody takes people out and starts spotting energy sources, which we were doing. There's a liability to it: sooner or later the individual discovers that the chief energy source in this universe is a thetan. And they start spotting this thing, and they're liable to get sick. They've got to be pretty high-toned in order to confront the actuality of a thetan.

R2-45: As given in The Creation of Human Ability “An enormously effective process for exteriorization but its use is frowned upon by this society at this time,” used humorously.)

Many other people who are having hard times with their cases have nightmares all night long about being attacked by thetans. It's not necessarily a friendly subject then. There are insane asylums that are full of people who just claim that they've got thetans crawling all over them. Now, where - where we come in suddenly, flagrantly, blatantly introducing this tremendously unpopular subject into a society that couldn't care less, I don't know, unless we like to make it tough for ourselves.

The truth of the matter is, that the subject itself contains all of the answers to anything man ever hopes to be. That's the only excuse we have for introducing it; it's not its popularity. If you want to be popular, if you want to introduce something very popular to the public, you say, “It is not your fault. It was all done to you. You have never had any responsibility for anything from the moment that you said, ‘ga-ga,’ in a cradle. The highest crime which you have ever committed, perhaps, was not being able to snap on to your bottle's nipple. And that is about it.”

And the public at large says, “Oh, isn't that wonderful. Isn't that wonderful.” That's popular. “You do not cause any slightest motion or ripple in the entirety of this universe.” Ah, the public loves that. They want to float all together like drops of water or something out of a biologist's laboratory, all alike, being pushed here and there into patterns they need not understand. That's a very acceptable subject. I hate to be harsh about the matter, but that's a fact. And that is the end goal of a thing called “science” in its more materialistic sense.

Now of course, we say, “science,” and we, at once, do not mean what science means. Science merely means truth. It means knowingness. We have actually taken the root word of science in Scientology. The - knowingness in the fullest sense of the word, that is really science. But science has become something else in our modern age. It's become a bunch of wheels that clank and formulas that slip and pop and do various things for us so none of us have to put out any effort. Science is a sort of a huge housemaid that sweeps up all of our dirt and makes it unnecessary for us to notice where we're spitting. The nobility of science, of course, is something we mustn't gainsay at any time.

If you go around any scientific area of the world, you probably can't breathe. Camden, New Jersey is a very scientific part of the world. All the research laboratories of Standard Oil and all sorts of things around there - the air is absolutely supersaturate with science, hydrochloric acid and so forth. But science is a life-giving thing - except when it kills you.

Now, you will find there are still countries on Earth which are worshipping science actively. There are. Russia today has entered upon the worship of science. The US is just recovering from it. And I think Great Britain left off a worship of science some years ago - feels somewhat, over here, that science really hasn't done everything that it should have done. Life didn't become smooth in all directions. It was a sort of a movement at one time, a sort of a crusade. “Let's all be scientific.” And outside of new, rather pantywaisty countries like Russia - I'm sorry to classify them that way, but you know, we discarded communism a century ago, and they're - just found out about it. The point is, that in the whole field of science, we do have this rather depraving factor: dependency upon MEST, And we have ideas going downhill at the same ratio that we have machines going uphill.

The more important the machine becomes, the more important the object becomes, the less important is the idea. And the funny part of it is, is once you have a world full of machines with no ideas left at all, there will be no reason left to run any of the machines. Science does not really foresee that point.

Now, here in Great Britain the people that persuade other people to work in factories and so forth, are having a harder and harder time getting a good solid output out of people. Man sort of went through this age. He actually entered into it about 1837. And he came on from that time

into the great industrial epoch here in Great Britain of the '80s and '90s and has been losing confidence in these things that went whir-clank ever since. And during the last war, when all of these things that went whir-clank kept coming over and dropping things that went pop-pop, people had an idea that maybe it wasn't the best advance in the world to have machines doing everything and man doing nothing. Just maybe this had something to do with it.

America is getting close to that, however - their science they've put into a certain category now. They have made a successful social system out of science. But people are beginning to notice there's something missing, and that missingness is life. America entertains a very high idea of what something alive must do. It must be going at least at two thousand miles an hour, you know. And they've noticed that things around are only traveling these days at sixty and seventy, and they say things are slowing down. They're beginning to wonder what happened - what happened to the verve and vim? Well, Great Britain could give them a great example of what's happened. A great dependency upon MEST brings about a great triumph of MEST, which is no life.

Russia, in its infantile state it's just entering - I have heard a couple of very well-known authorities say, recently, it's just entering its Victorian age of high fidelity on the part of the military and glory and what fun it is to go out and get stuck full of holes by the bushmen, you know. This period is just moving in on Russia and they have a philosophy, however, that goes along with it they call "dialectic materialism." Dialectic materialism goes so far as to say that all ideas are generated from a couple of chunks of MEST. It's a very simple idea - I mean, it's kind of a simple-minded idea, too. But if you take two pieces of coal here, each of them capable of considerable force, and you bang them together a couple of times, an idea occurs. I'm sorry, but that's the basic definition of dialectic materialism - only I'm not stating it exactly as they state it in their textbook.

Now, the way they state it in their textbook is this: that two forces produce, in their conflict, an idea; that ideas are the product of two or more forces in conflict. And that is dialectic materialism, which is a couple of chunks of coal being knocked together, an idea occurs. You see how it is? I don't know where the idea is registered or who generates it or something, but that's what it claims. It just isn't true. I know - I know I've had people banging my head into things for a long time, and I didn't think of a thing except, "Quit!" It's wonderful.

Now, I don't mean to put dialectic materialism on the fire. Evidently it's an all-right philosophy for a simple-minded people who haven't got anything more to think of than sleeping on the stove all winter. But, where it comes to trying to understand the actual forces of existence, the philosophy, as such, of science, somewhat lets us down.

Now, in demonstration of this, the physical sciences have advanced at a tremendously rapid rate; oh, this tremendous whirlwind rate of advance which has given us, since Newton (which is, I think, under three hundred years, isn't it or somewhere around three hundred years?) we've come all the way from watching an apple drop to watching an atom bomb drop. And that's quite a distance, quite a distance. You'd think so if you were there watching it. Well, where - where science has made this tremendous advance, in the same period of time we have had, if anything, a regression and a subjectiveness enter into the field of philosophy, which is the most confounded thing you ever saw.

Our philosophy today is not as high or at as good a level as the Greek. We could still read the Greek philosopher with enormous profit. We don't read Anaxagoras or somebody, and read him over and then put him down and say, "Well, John Smith said that a lot better the other day in Parliament, you know?" We don't do that. We say, "My, that's well done. Wonder why nobody is thinking like that today?"

Well, the reason they're not thinking like that today is they're not. Just isn't any real other rationale. It isn't that science crept up on them; it isn't that thought and science are to any great degree interposed. We're actually dealing here with two problems which have a tendency to be generate

But here we have this thing of the social part of life being less well understood and regulated today than it was a couple of thousand years ago. For instance, anything we know about liberty was probably better talked about and better expressed in the forum at Athens than it ever has been in the US Senate or down here in the Parliament. That's a cinch. I mean, I don't think anybody would argue - I don't even think the senators would argue with that. They'd wonder that I'd got it in the same breath.

Now, they sit around and talk about the appropriation - how they're going to get more taxes out of the yokels. They don't talk about liberty and how the law safeguards the rights of this and that, and the human interplay. These are not a subject of their discussion anymore.

Well, what the dickens happens here? We have an enormous upsurge of MEST and no comparable upsurge in any other branch of truth or wisdom. It's just something that got left at the post - left at the post to such a degree we wonder it was at the post at all.

Sociology today - if you want to go take sociology or listen to some lectures in sociology, you'll find that there's something there; there's something to listen to. It's not bad, you know? But a better grip of the subject can be found in almost any age. The idea of man trying to live alongside of man is, today, academically understood and publicly understood not at all. I mean, it's not a subject that has come up and become popular.

We go into the field of mental healing - we discover one great discovery in the field of the mind of the nineteenth century, and that was Sigmund Freud's discovery. And - discovery actually boiled down to this: Something can be done about it. He just made this discovery. He found out that occasionally he did something for people. You don't have to add up the libido theory or laugh at the guy because he did this or that or echo the opinion of the medical doctor of that age, who was dead against Freud. But, he did discover something and, boy, that's an awfully lonely thing that sort of sits there all by itself in the middle of a great ocean of nothing.

And we look at this generation, and we find in America, for instance, just one philosopher who has written anything. Was a fellow by the name of Dewey, he wrote about education. After you've read Dewey on the subject of education, you feel, "Well I don't know anything about it either." He wrote about it beautifully, though. I'm sure there were other philosophers in our modern times, but if they've been dead five years, why, we've forgotten them. And that is really not what happens with good philosophers. All right.

Up to the time when we took the rationale and way of looking at things that was in use in the field of physics, mathematics, and started to look at man and his social activities and behaviors, right up to the moment when we did this - and really sprang out sideways from science and said, "Hey, there's something else here. There's something else here beside a machine. There's also a man standing here beside this machine. There's something else here besides this huge dangerous flamethrower. There's a guy wielding it and there's a guy on the other end of that receiving that flame. Now, what about this?" Well, man had learned to think in the interim and hadn't noticed it. He had learned to classify and codify and discipline his thinkingness. And it was simply the assembly of that discipline and its application to man himself which gives us, today, what we know in Dianetics and Scientology.

Now, it was then with great astonishment that we walked forward from a highly mechanistic approach, such as the early engram in Dianetics, and found ourselves looking straight at the human spirit. This is a shocking thing. It's like somebody had started out, you see, to prove the total nonexistence of an allhippodile. And he keeps showing the class: "You see? Just look at this space. You don't find any allhippodile here." And all of a sudden something taps him on the shoulder and says, "What do you think I am, Professor?"

Here was the subject of life. Here was a - rather an unexpected end and goal to find the actual entity of existence, the actual creator and motivator of life and this universe standing there, ready to be examined, simply by walking up a channel of reason and logic as developed in sciences

Now, just because we used a scientific approach didn't mean that we used a mechanistic approach. You see, here were methods of thinking which had been evolved to think about MEST, and all of a sudden we took the same methods of thinking and found ourselves thinking about life and, of course, the answer turned up. It was obvious that the answer would.

Well, we know what the answer is. We know very thoroughly that a static is a static. It has no wavelength and it has no real location, it has no mass. But it can consider that it has or can make any of these things. A static is something that can consider. All right. This almost total negative description is, nevertheless, the description of the situation, because these things can occur. And knowing that, we can then handle various activities of life and understand them.

We would know at once, for instance, that this thing called life, a static, that we designate with the mathematical, not spiritual, symbol - thetan - that this is in contest with space, it's in contest with matter, it's in contest with energy flows and in contest with other thetans. We know these contests exist; we can understand these. We say, "All right. Now look at this thing. It's nothing, and here it is looking at this mass over here."

Can it duplicate that mass? No, it can't duplicate that mass. It, itself, is not mass unless it says, "I am mass." It says, "Now I am mass" and so therefore it says, "I am duplicating that mass." Well, it can't do that convincingly unless it can simply consider that mass is there, and then, consider that it is duplicating the mass that's there, because the mass isn't there either. Eventually, it begins to understand this and so conceives that it can duplicate mass, and becomes rather happy about it. But in essence, it doesn't think about this. It finds itself anywhere in space it cares to be, looking at anything it wants to look at.

Now, that is the most unrestricted thing that could happen to anything. So its specialty is dreaming up restrictions. And it does this in order to have a game. And if it can't do this, well, it can't have a game. A game consists of barriers. You have to have a playing field, and you have to have various restrictions - rules, in other words. We have to say that, "When the whistle blows nobody must run with the ball," you know? And we must have these rules. And life, therefore, thinking them up and forgetting them one way or the other, and as-ising them and not-knowing them and scrambling them somehow or another, then gets in contest with other life forms and has a game.

And I'm not now saying that this particular universe life finds itself in was or was not produced by some divine being and so forth. That subject is too complicated. That's the only reason we're not touching it at all. That's why I say we relegate that to the Hindu way back when, it's more complicated something when we're addressing - we're only talking about those things which we can see, feel and experience.

The second that we could measure the output of a thetan on an electrometer of some kind or another, we were there, see? We could right away experience this thing. We could know by the experience people had in our vicinity, we could know by the improvements we could make in people's health, by addressing this subject, that we really had something here.

It wasn't whether or not we, ourselves, with our physical eyes, could see a nothingness out in front of us. It was whether or not that nothingness out in front of us could see us. Do you get the idea? And it was very strange, but it could. And then when we, ourselves, get nice and cleared, we find ourselves outside looking ... We say, "What's this? What's this? I didn't desire a proof like this. I was perfectly happy."

But, as we look over this situation, we discover that there are great numbers of objective proofs concerning the actual identity of the life-creating unit, you might say, or the energy-consideration production unit - space, energy, matter comes from this unit.

Now we don't care whether it made all of the space there is, or all of the energy it is - there is, or all the matter there is. This is not a subject really germane to our activity at this time. It is

enough that there are chairs here and we can see them, and we get three feet back of our head and we can still see them. Some people get three feet back of their head and they see a chair their mother used to sit in, and this involves them sometimes; it upsets them. They say, "I'm supposed to be here in present time."

Well, this is also the time production unit; you can be any place in any span of time that you want to be. And this is very upsetting to an animalcule, a thetan, which wanted a nice heavy barrier called time. It wants the next moment to be the next moment. It wants the last moment to be the last moment, and no argument, please! Don't let's get confused, see? But here we have this thetan, who can be in 1790, whether the MEST of 1790 is there or in his facsimile bank, we don't care. It is in his facsimile bank, by the way, but he gets into 1790 with equal ease to 2008.

Now, you say to this thetan while he's around in space - you say, "Come up to present time." He practically has to manufacture it in order to get you bracketed, and to actually see a chair as you see a chair with your physical eyes. There's no necromancy going on here, it's just the fact that we have suddenly unrestricted the life unit. And having unrestricted it, we, of course, don't find any restrictions, such as time. And he very often doesn't find any restrictions, such as walls.

You say, "Take a look at the wall."

So, he kind of fumbles around and next thing you know he sees a brick wall and he says, "This is the wrong wall, the wrong wall. I'm looking at the wrong wall."

You say, "Well, what's the matter?"

And he says, "It's a brick wall." He went through it and he's looking at the other side.

All kinds of interesting little things like this happen. There's an auditor right here in this room at this moment that was exercising somebody, and he knew that I had said that sometimes if you got the individual to look at a picture - I mean, whatever he's looking at fixedly was simply a picture - if you'd get him to looking at something else, why, things would evolve and he'd be outside. And about a half an hour later this auditor said to this fellow, "Where are you anyhow?" And the fellow was down, as a thetan, on the railroad tracks. He was actually watching the trains come by. And this auditor hadn't known he was down there at all. And it scared him half out of his wits, you know? The preclear had no indoctrination on this at all.

Well, the funny part of it is, that as long as we can maintain an individual in any kind of a fairly well restricted - fairly well unrestricted state, he's happy. That sound complicated to you? Well, it is complicated - it contains the whole structure of the laws and civilizations of man. A happy society is one which is in a relatively unrestricted state which is in a satisfactorily restricted state. You get the idea? And that is a nice, happy society.

And societies get unhappy when they become too restricted or when they become too free - they're alike unhappy. So, somewhere in there there's a mean of "how many boundaries do we have to have in order to play this game? How many of these white markers down the lawn do we have to need in order to play tennis?" Somebody says, "We don't need any."

Try to play tennis.

"That ball was outside."

"No, it wasn't outside. There is no outside; therefore, it's my score. No, it's your score."

And you immediately perceive the difficulties in such a simple thing if we had no barriers. Now, let's play tennis without a net. And the fellow says, "That hit the net."

"No, it didn't hit the net," and so forth.

“Now let’s play tennis without any rackets. Let’s just cut it down here.”

And the fellows, of course, make a gesture in the air and that makes the ball rebound one way or the other, by consideration, which is the only reason it’s bounding anyhow. And now let’s play it without a ball.

“The ball did go outside.”

“No, I distinctly saw it hit the net.” You get the idea? “Now I saw it hit the net.”

“Well, how could it hit the net since it’s over here in this side of the court?” In other words, we have nothing but turmoil and argument and chaos, which is why man’s idea of “the total universe was chaos” is one of the first ideas we find man having. He really had this idea very early: universe is chaos.

Yes, an unrestricted universe without any agreements on what we’re doing or how we’re doing it is chaos. A bunch of thetans with no space is chaos. Or a bunch of thetans with space but no barriers in the space is chaos, see? Thetan doesn’t like that any better than he likes being in a jail cell. See, that’s too restricted. So, somewhere in there, by the considerations of the individual, there are boundaries enough for a game and freedom enough to play it.

If you want to consult at once whether or not a people are going to be a happy and progressive people, just ask them, “Have you got boundaries enough to suit you and freedom enough to live?” And they just - they’d look it over, and they could adjust a civilization just on that equation alone, which would make a livable civilization. You’d have to have a lot of conferences if you were doing it from scratch.

If you want to adjust any enterprise or group, you just say, “Well, are there enough boundaries to suit you?” Once in a while in handling - a group, you fail to lay down a law. You fail to say, “Everybody who comes in this room must hang their coats outside in the cloakroom.” You find cloaks all over the chairs, you know? Everybody comes in, all these cloaks all over the chairs and so forth. And the room is disorderly and so forth, and they don’t like that. They don’t like that. So, they practically force you, you see, to put up a sign saying, “Put your coat and hat on the hook,” you know? In other words, it is only when the group is no longer consulted in the imposition of the barriers that they become onerous and restrictive.

A government which starts passing laws without due consultation with the customs of the people is a government that isn’t going to be with us very long. I mean that. It’s just not going to be around long, because it isn’t the government. And people sense that it isn’t the government.

Now, you can look in the past and find a great many very - very silly governments. You can find governments are passing laws in all directions and find nobody revolting against this government. The thing which you assume at that time is these people needed a lot more barriers than they were getting. That’s what you assume - long-winded, involved codes of conduct and all that sort of thing. You assume, “Well, nobody did anything about it so they didn’t have enough barriers.”

But, let’s take France in that fatal part of the eighteenth century, when they decided even the sight of the Bastille - which hadn’t been used for a jail for years - was too much for their idea of freedom. And pang, they knocked it down, which was a lot of labor, I will say. It hadn’t been used for a prison for years but down came the Bastille, a symbol of restraint. We find that the restraints were much too great and down came the aristocracy. They’d failed to consult the people with regard to the imposition of barriers, so the people didn’t have any game.

Now, where we look then in the social sciences, we find that here is a simple, if somewhat clumsy and itself unrestricted rule, and we find that we can guide ourselves along this way

Well, if we can do it on the social sciences, can we do it with a thing called exteriorization in processing? And that's what we want to get to at once.

The old idea was to get the preclear three feet back of his head and have him patch up the mock-up. Fifty percent of the cases, this works. Just works. I mean, you say, "Be three feet back of your head."

The fellow has never heard of this before. He's liable to give you some kind of an argument sometimes, like, "I am."

And you find out he's mocked up a head in front of him, at which time you can confront him with this, "No, no, no. I mean you! You know, you! You get three feet back of your head." And he is.

He takes a look, and he says, "Well, what do you know?"

You say, "Well, all right. Now, what you looking at?"

And he says, "The wall."

And you say, "Copy. Copy. Copy. Copy." And you make him used to making mock-ups and remedy his havingness a little bit and so forth. And eventually you'd get around to chasing him around in space. And you'd eventually get around, as far as the body was concerned, of "Let's fix up that mock-up. Now, let's fix up that body; let's fix up its pancreas and take those black bits of energy out of this and that, and straighten it up one way or the other." And he would. And this is a relatively fast route as far as curing is concerned, because you have that thing which is injecting the livingness into things doing the actual readjustment.

Now, when an individual doesn't respond to this, there's something wrong. And it's been our contest for the last three and a half years to find out what the hell is wrong. Got the idea?

Now, it's hard for a chap who doesn't have too much trouble being three feet back of his head to understand that somebody else is having, trouble being three feet back of his head, because he can say to him over and over, "Look, you idiot ..." (He wants to say that, he doesn't say that. He says, "Sir" or "Ma'am.") "Look, you idiot, all you've got to do is change your mind and just get the idea that you're three feet back of your head, you see? And then you'll see your actual head in front of you."

Now, the guy gets back there and you have him mock up and duplicate for a while, and he actually starts seeing the real room, you see? Unless he's slid out of time too far, he will spot actually the walls and so forth. Many people who have an unreality on exteriorization get out all right, they have no unreality on that. But then they don't quite locate themselves. That's because they are providing themselves with a bunch of facsimiles to look at. You get the idea? They get back there and then they tailor-make the atmosphere they're going to look at. Well, maybe they're out of present time, maybe they're not, we don't care. But they just don't see the walls, that's all. They see some pictures of some walls and this isn't real.

And a lot of people who have been (quote) exteriorized (unquote), and who yet have not been able to really fix up the body and so forth, just aren't in that century. That's about all there is to that, since they're not any longer barriered by time. And they promptly go out and get lost. They haven't decided what time it is. They decide what time it is and they'll see the room.

But, the 50 percent that just don't exteriorize at all, obviously, have something wrong with them. Three and a half years - fathomless! I've finally fathomed it. I'm not just giving you a recount on how tough it all is. I could do that, you know, and get away with it. But I won't. I got the problem licked so I might as well tell you what this is.



Now, what could be wrong? Why don't they get back of their head? All right. Now you'll find if the body gets sick enough, they will. That's one factor; one little laboratory test you can make - feed them ipecac or an underdose of strychnine or something, and they leave. They leave. They feel very sad about the whole thing. And we look it over further and we find out that there's an inevitable exteriorization at death. At death they go bang! Out they go.

Well, that's a curious thing to happen, too. I mean, look that over for a moment - there's an exteriorization at death. Reasoning along that line brought us to the fact that evidently an individual is motivator hungry. If he gets enough motivators, he can leave something. That's true too. Because the end product is that he exteriorizes.

Well, we look this thing over a little further and we find that some people exteriorize when you say, "Get the idea you can control the body from outside. Get the idea you can't control the body from outside. Get the idea you can control the body from outside. Get the idea you can ..." You know, the old Concept Processes. And we just run those two, one against the other, back and forth, back and forth. The next thing you know, the guy's three feet back of his head.

He wasn't there because he couldn't control the body from outside. Well, that's a very funny thing because control, we discover, is just below communication. When an individual goes out of communication, he goes into control. Have we got that? That's one for you to notice. These control-happy boys are just below communication. If you bring up their ability to communicate, they drop this control proposition.

But, that again is not a satisfactory answer. Well, we know all kinds of bric-a-brac like this. You can sneak a lot of guys out of their heads, in fact I can slam guys out of their heads on the first technique of exteriorization we had. I knew all about exteriorization, because I was, you see? And I kept asking people, on these tough cases, for a nice neat technique that would, do something about it. And the first actual technique - but unfortunately it doesn't work very generally, but it was the first actual technique for exteriorization. And that was simply this, "Try not to be three feet back of your head." And that will bring you in 20, 30 percent of the 50 that can't. But unfortunately, they get out there, and they don't know really what they're doing most of the time, and if you don't handle them very, very gently indeed, they'll snap back in - in any event, in the next couple of weeks will be back in.

So, I had to finally conclude, on this subject of exteriorization, that there was an unsolved thing here which took place to first prevent exteriorization and then to make the person relinquish an exteriorized state, since all those persons who were exteriorized by the great cleverness of the auditor, pop back in again. Interesting. I know about five hundred techniques that slip guys out of their heads, some real covert ones. A few sentences and the guy is out of his head - sicker than a pup, usually, if it took that much to get him out. Get the idea?

So, there's some factor here. All right. Now part of the answer lies right here: Other-determined exteriorization has brought about a protest against exteriorization.

A fellow is killed without any consent of his, unexpectedly, when he wants to go on living, and he finds himself three feet or three hundred yards back of that mangled body, you see? That's exteriorization under duress. Now, when that has happened too often - oh, and a thetan can stand lots of these, several thousand, probably, until it really gets on his nerves - but when it's gotten on his nerves, he gets a feeling about exteriorization. And such a person, by the way, we say, "Be three feet back of your head," and instead of being three feet back of your head, if you interrogated him closely he would say, "I could just go out someplace and just cry for about ten thousand years."

And you say, "What's the matter?"

"Oh, I don't know. I just feel griefy."

Some aren't quite that protesty; they get back of their heads and snap back in again. And you say, "What's the matter?"

"I don't know - I just feel so sad." And they - if you kept this up, you'd throw them into a grief charge.

Now what are you doing? You're actually restimulating an engram of exteriorization - not only in the physical body, but in the thetan. Two engrams: one, the body has had a thetan blown out of its head, by force, which is matched by the thetan's engram of being blown out of a body's head by force. These two get into comparison and become an agreement that "Exteriorization is no good!" So you just try to exteriorize one of these boys, no matter how cleverly, and he will either go out and come back, or go out and stay a couple of weeks and come back, or he won't go out at all in the first place. Now, that's the size of it.

Well, just knowing that much, however, doesn't solve the problem. These are just phenomena that I've been giving you. There is, however, an earlier approach to this which said, "If you're trying to exteriorize a preclear," said in one of the PABs, I think, "try to find out what you're trying to exteriorize him from." That's cute. He might not be in his body. You might have to first exteriorize him from Earth and then from other bodies and then from his own body. But an adequate way to do this didn't exist. Although some success was had with this, it evidently wasn't quite on the right road, see? It wasn't quite on the groove.

The only thing that was really wrong with the processes of exteriorization is we had not allowed the thetan, or understood that he had, enough power of choice. And that was the key. We, in processing him, processed him as though he were much more stupid and unknowing than he really is. Yes, he is so accustomed to looking at that mass out there, and being himself here, without much sensation, that he forgets that he exists, and he becomes an unknownness to himself. That is his unknownness - there is no purpose in him knowing himself. Furthermore, he is totally capable of mocking himself up as a mass. A thetan can just as easily say, "I am a mountain," as to say, "I am Mohammed," as to say, "I am a thetan."

Now, we didn't allow for this fact: He does know - he does know really what he's trying to do. And when you're not exteriorizing him easily, you're not exteriorizing him out of the right body. Until, so much so, that we can make this statement very bluntly, and this is one that'll stay with you, that you can audit with. You can say, "He doesn't get three feet back of his head, therefore, it's a case of wrong body."

A nonexteriorizing thetan is a case of wrong body. You got it? He doesn't want the body he's got, and the inverse vectors of desire and not-want and all the rest of it, has kept him pinned in it. He doesn't want the body he's in. You got it? It's a case of wrong body. No exteriorize? Wrong body!

It isn't that he has made a mistake about what body he's in. Got it? See, we figured he was dumber than this. Well, he's not that dumb. He's not that stupid. He actually kind of knows that he doesn't want this body, you see? It isn't really that he is making a mistake about what body he's in. We got it? He isn't making a real error about the body he's in. It's a fact that he just doesn't want the body he's in and conceives himself to be in another body more desirable to him, and this is the game he's playing. And therefore, we get the universe closures which are so difficult to resolve in processing. They are difficult to resolve in processing because they consist of a more desirable body from the viewpoint of that thetan. And he may desire some old stinking drunk, more desirable, than the very fine looking young man that he is.

The universe closure is a symptom of his game of trying to be in the other person's body and yet stay with the body he has. And when you try to separate these two universes, you are unmasking, to him, his lack of desire to be in the body he's in. And so he becomes unhappy about the whole situation. He accumulates another universe because he doesn't like the one which he is, basically. And there we have the whole idea of universe closure. It, again, is a case

of wrong body. Only he wants this other body. He's got it kind of hidden from himself, but he is pretending he is this other body.

We have a lot of men walking around who have so desired some beautiful woman, for instance, or some very vivacious woman, that they themselves are pretending to themselves that they really are in the universe of this woman. Get the idea?

Now, this is almost Freudian when it comes to that, but unfortunately does not continue along a Freudian line. You could understand it obviously if this puny, runty, horrible-looking young fellow desired to be this big, dashing, robust, strong character. Now, that's a storybook sort of thing. We're led to believe this by the writers that get a penny-a-word or five-cents-a-word, like myself. I'm not a penny-a-liner, by the way, I get five cents a word when I write that stuff. We could understand this, but it's a storybook attitude. The truth of the matter is that the big, robust guy has usually had enough bad luck with people trying to make nothing out of him because they think he's strong and formidable, that he wishes he was some puny runt. Get the idea?

So we have a completely reversed idea as being far more average and that is this big, hulking brute of a beautiful man, you know, wishes he was this little pipsqueak, see? And he's going around in the universe of this little pipsqueak. And we say, "For heaven's sakes, what's that fellow acting like that for? He ought to have his chest out there and get his muscles rippling," and they don't though. They don't want those muscles to ripple.

They come and see you to get more into the universe of the pipsqueak. That's their idea. "If I could just swap bodies smoothly without anybody noticing, I'd be a happy man. The only trouble is the FBI or Scotland Yard might notice, you know? Well, they have fingerprints of all these bodies, and there are rules about the game and so on." So, they come to you, and they think by some necromancy you will cut them down to size.

They lost - well, all kinds of wild things happen. Some girl, whose acceptance level was nyuh, knew this guy and instead of marrying him, married this fellow who had buck teeth or something, you know? And that was the way it went and that is the situation. You see?

People's ideas of acceptance are not necessarily the Greek artists' way of thinking. Acceptance level is acceptance level. And acceptability is an acceptability, not a storybook. So don't make mistakes about this. And the second you know that, then of course, wrong body, as a game, becomes a very understandable mess. It's a mess, but it's very understandable. Because when they adopt the other universe, they adopt its habits, customs, gestures and some of its physiological features. So that you'll find this great, strong, hulking brute is liable to have very flabby muscles, you know? And it's not possible that he has very flabby arm muscles. His leg muscles are good enough. Yeah, what is this?

See, that's something offbeat. Well, that's wrong body; and he's just trying to wear the other body, and that's about all there is to it.

You find many a girl - various stresses - in the war you notice this: Some girl who was very much in love with some young man, and he got knocked off, something like that, and right away she becomes a lawyer - begins to talk in a rather husky voice. If you watch her a while longer, the next thing you know, she's liable to start smoking cigars. You know? And in order to exteriorize her, you'd have to exteriorize her out of the body of a young man before you could exteriorize her out of the body she's in. Now she doesn't want to be in the body she's in, so she's not really in the body she's in, and you just don't have a dog's chance of exteriorizing her out of that body. You say, "Be three feet back of your head." She's not in it. So the whole command misses. You see that? See, you just couldn't possibly - she couldn't execute this command. You've given the individual, then, a nonexecutable auditing command. Wrong body.

Now, what does this have to do with control? Well, it's that the old mechanisms of - something resisted you and resisted you, you finally tried to control it one way or the other. You finally tried to stand it in one place, you wanted it to stop moving in some fashion so you could at least

size it up. You couldn't communicate or you couldn't talk with this other person, and the next thing you know, you feel kind of engulfed and overwhelmed. But the funny part of it is, is under that engulfment and under that over-feeling there that we didn't really want this person, there is a great deal of desire sitting there. And that desire was native and basic; so we get this axiom: We say, "We cannot hate or despise those things which we have not once loved." That's absolutely necessary that we must have loved those things which we now hate or despise. Otherwise, there'd be no closures.

Now, therefore, ARC is the preceding thing to this. So, we look this over and we find that we have - there's a universe closure here. Well, the universe closure started to happen way back. And then the individual said, "Well, I can't have that person anymore. Well, I've got that person." He actually, very often, is carrying a mock-up of that person's body on frontwards or in reverse.

It's quite amazing. He's actually got a mock-up. It's in so close that not even he sees it. He doesn't view this at all. He very often wears a black shroud over the body. So you get him outside at all and he'll say, "The body is black." That's satisfactory. Yeah, he doesn't want to know what body that is. Get the idea? He wants to keep up his illusion.

So, here again we have a case of wrong body. As soon as we know this, and as soon as we know the vitalness of repair and remedy of havingness, in exteriorization, we're off, right away, to the races and we can exteriorize anything we walk into - providing we can get it to sit still long enough. Because no telling what we're exteriorizing. We're certainly always exteriorizing a thetan, but out of what we never find out till he tells us and sometimes he doesn't bother to.

Now, the actuality is, that many of the cases which have a totally black field and which are nonexteriorizable at all, are stuck in an exteriorization. Let me give you this very rapidly. I told you this last Tuesday. We had this kind of a situation: An individual who is stuck in a body, evidently - and that's very advised, we didn't say what body he was stuck in - he's apparently stuck in the body standing right in front of you, but he's not. All right. Now, this individual feels some grief or gets upset one way or the other, and we find out that his major engram is exteriorization. Now, get that very carefully: His major engram is exteriorization.

Now, we know that running separateness on things produces enormous gains in a preclear. We know that running connections to things reduces the gain or wipes it out or sends him downhill. We could have somebody sitting saying, "Now I'm connected with that chair. And I can get now the idea of being connected with the window. And I can get the idea of being connected with the wall." And you can go on with this for about twenty minutes, and you'll spin him right on in, if he's a rough case. If you just then, at that point say, "Now get an idea you're separate from the window, separate from the wall, separate from the chair," and so forth, he'd come right on up the Tone Scale again. The clue is separateness.

Separateness is good for a thetan. It is the way out toward greater freedom; but remember he can exceed his desire for freedom. And then he has havingness which brings him back to enough barriers. Got the idea? He wants separateness until he has his desire for freedom surfeited and then he wants to come right back on in to enough restriction, which is havingness. And it's the auditor's job, if he wants to do a good, neat job of exteriorization, to balance these two factors: separateness and havingness, separateness and havingness. And the funny part of it is, he may only go an eighteenth of an inch toward freedom before, boy, does he feel like he's got to close. You get the idea? His desire for barrier seems to be so overwhelmingly greater than his desire for freedom that the individual apparently will sit there and plow himself right on in.

Well, he won't if you give him the right barrier. It's another case of wrong barrier, wrong body, wrong piece, you see? He'll go on desiring havingness, on and on and on and on and on until you spot the right restrictive barriers. And that's very easy to do with these auditing commands.

One can go over this very easily with a preclear, following all other rules of auditing, being able to remedy his havingness, remove it and do other things using a routine auditing approach. You

understand after you've done all that (and this doesn't end all techniques, it certainly doesn't wipe out old Route One or Separateness Processing or anything of the sort, but just to get him out of his head), you would start in, in this fashion: You would say, "What body would you like to have?" Got it? "What body would you like to have?" Any variation on this as long as it's "have" and "body," you get the idea? "Well, what body would you like to have?"

He will cognite almost at once, unless he's completely in the spinbin, and say, "Well, not this one." He's not liable to express that to you, but that will be an underlying feeling as he goes through this, which will become clearer and clearer to him.

And he'd say, "What body would I like to have? Oh, I don't know..." And then he will say, "Well, a robot body. That is a good body, a robot body; it's indestructible and so forth. That's a good body."

Having given him just that much greater freedom, because you started to exteriorize him out of the robot body, he called for you, at that point, the first body of the chain out of which you've got to exteriorize him. Got it? You gave him that much freedom, and if you just left it at that and didn't repair or remedy his havingness at once, he would simply start going down and going anaten and getting agitated on you, because you will have as-ised what facsimile he had of a robot body. You will have cut him down one. You got it? So you got to put it back and do so always with abundance. So your next auditing command immediately after that is, "Well now, can you mock up a robot?"

"Oh, I think so. Yeah. Yeah."

"Well, do so. Go ahead. Mock up another robot. Now mock up another robot. You got two or three there now? Well, why don't you shove one in on yourself?"

And if he's real good at mock-ups, which he probably won't be, you have him shove them in until he can mock them up and throw one away, or get one to leave. Get the idea? Just one, and he's sure it's gone, then just neglect the rest of the whole subject of robot bodies and start in again and say, "Now, what body would you like to have?" You got it? Hm?

Audience: Yes.

They're apparently both Havingness Processes, but they're a sneaker. One is an exteriorization process, "What body would you like to have?" The way out is the way through. We've known that for a long time in Scientology, and it's never more true than it is now. The way out is the way through. You've got to be in a body before you can get out of it. And to be in a body, you've got to accept that you have it. And if an individual doesn't accept he has it, he's there with lord knows how many weak universes or better universes, or any other kind of universe sitting around, resisting like mad being in his own head, see? And sitting in all these other beautiful universes like a robot's universe that's a wonderful universe, you know? It clanks and it doesn't hurt and never needs operating on and you never have to give it any juice, you just threw another battery into its back, and wonderful, wonderful. Of course, it's kind of embarrassing; he will tell you this probably. They have stylized descriptions about each one of these kinds of bodies. Thetans evidently have pattern opinions about them.

Robot bodies are liable to be crossing a field and suddenly stop in midpace. You know, they run out of juice. Then you have to wait till somebody comes along and slips them a new power pack. Well, human bodies don't do that and so that's an advantage. And so do their considerations on the whole subject of bodies improve to a point where they are no longer so furiously and savagely resisting and resenting the body they're in, but that they can be in it and leave it. And you never say to them, "Be three feet back of your head." You just keep running this technique, "What body would you like?" Remedy havingness with it. "Fine. That's good. What body would you like?" Remedy havingness with it and you'll get your preclear exteriorized. I guarantee it.

Once you've got him exteriorized, you can run him on Route One. It's fine. Run him on Separateness. It's fine. You can run him on SLP Issue 5, that's fine. SOP 8, that's fine. You've done the trick. Because the one thing he could never be allowed to look at in the past was a body. We never let him look at his body.

If he got back of his head, and you said, "What are you looking at?" and he said, "My body," you didn't let him copy that body, because he'd be right back in his head again. Why? He didn't like that body, and he didn't notice it really until you called his attention to it, at which point he interiorized - but not into that body - into some other body that he did like, and so he got lost.

So, when a thetan doesn't know where he is, he's probably telling you the truth. But it's a truth that becomes very obviously a lie, the second that you run him on this type of process.

Now, remember, at the same time you're running bodies down on terms of problems, and it might be necessary somewhere along this line, to run such a process as, "What problem could bodies be to you?" which would be about the only process that you would interject. "Invent a problem a body could be to you." And so keep his inventiveness up. That might be necessary.

If he starts to have a difficulty or gets stuck on some point, just say, "I have run this boy too short of problems, he'll have to invent some." You know, that's always the case. If he's stuck on a problem, have him invent some and he'll let go of it.

But we play the little bit of freedom against a little bit of barrier and a little bit of freedom against a little bit of barrier, until we've worked him out of the case of the wrong body.

I know these processes work for you, and undoubtedly there can be refinements upon this. Undoubtedly many things can occur which will better it when it's in very general use, nevertheless, I have not discovered, so far, any violations to this particular thing. Because I look back at many, many hundreds of cases that I've audited, and find in them that they all had the common denominator of wrong body, only it becomes obvious now, not while I was processing them, when it should have. I hope you can use this material. I hope you find it beneficial to your preclears.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.