EXTERIORIZATION BY SEPARATENESS FROM WEAKEST UNIVERSE

A lecture given on
15 December 1955

Okay. And I want to talk to you tonight about a very spectacular thing that is not particularly germane to basic auditing. Basic auditing is how you get a preclear to sit still and be happy that he got out of the session unscathed. That's basic auditing. If you can ask a person questions for two hours and he's happy about it, why, you've done a good auditing job, according to basic auditing. You get the idea? I mean just that, if you could - if you can hammer and pound a guy with various thought concepts for two hours and at the end of this time he's happy about it, you must be a pretty good auditor.

But let's specialize, let's specialize now, in preclears, and let's go way upstairs. Let's go up into the super high school of auditing. And let's immediately ask this question of auditing in general: Is it an infinite job? That is to say, is there an infinite rise in the preclear? In other words, is there no end to this auditing? Let's ask that question.

And then let's ask another question that's just as pertinent as that: What do we mean by universes, anyway, and how do you split them? And what's meant by splitting them? All right.

And then there's another question that goes along with that, which is just completely ungermane to these other two, but I refuse to go on and on and on being sequitur all the time. I just refuse this orderliness. And so the next subject on this line that I will probably - I will announce to you and then probably forget to talk about, or maybe forget to talk about first, is do bacteria exist?

So, you see, that has no relationship. So I'm feeling rather proud of being able to jump that gap.

Let's go in at once into the second subject, since I've forgotten what the first subject was. But anyway...

The second subject is what's a universe? What's a universe? And that is germane to the first subject for the excellent reason that infinite auditing is only possible when you are auditing a complexity of universes which you are mistaking for one individual. And infinite auditing then pretty well ensues unless you split those universes. In other words, is there any end to auditing? Yes, when you get all universes split.

Well, there's an awful lot of things a thetan can do and exteriorize and be himself and everything, without going into a lot of universe splitting; that's certainly true. And in such a case, you do get to ceiling - or an apparent ceiling of a precision exteriorization with full view of the environment.

But what about the exteriorization that doesn't return to the thetan full view of the environment? Something very, very amusing happens here. What happens to this fellow? Exteriorize him, he doesn't get a full view of the environment or he won't exteriorize. Either way, he's in the wrong universe. He exteriorizes into the wrong universe. You can just say that's what happens.

Well, what is a universe? We have to get that before we even know what we're talking about. And you may have lots of ideas about what a universe is, but it is simply any time continuum, any time continuum under the control of one specific individual. And that, you could say, carelessly, is a universe. But a universe is a time continuum, we say that definitely; but in control of one person, we say that indefinitely. Do you get the idea?

It's a consecutive series of incidents. Now, when an individual has had a consecutive series of incidents in cooperation with another person, we get an agreement condition which brings about a duality of universe. And by this agreement - I give you The Factors - we get a co-time continuum. We get two people working on the same time continuum. You get the idea? They've

agreed, then, that this time continuum exists, and now there are two of them that have agreed it exists.

Well, we look at the physical universe and find we're all agreed upon this time continuum. We're very precisely agreed upon it - even though we have, privately, very strange ideas about it sometimes, such as the 1.5 who tells you he never has any time, and the fellow who's always late, and the other guy who's always early and so forth. Nevertheless, there is an agreement.

And this physical universe that has these walls and this space and so forth is evidently the product of an agreed-upon time continuum; only there's just plain ordinary billions, to what enormous power, I wouldn't know, things and persons agreed upon it. So it's very solid.

We got that now? And that's really all this physical universe apparently is, because as we start to break this down, we start to break down the physical universe too. We can process a guy today to a point where the walls disappear. We can process him ahead of his own time in various ways. We can process him behind it.

You want to know - just an example, how would you process somebody so the wall would disappear? Well, just get him to sit in a chair and start reaching for anything and everything. That would be the simplest, most elementary thing. He'll start to reach for things in the next room, the next thing you know, he's looking through the wall.

Run "What wouldn't you mind obeying?" and "What would obey you?" those are the two auditing commands - and you're liable to have a wall melt on your preclear after a while. Because these things essentially are stuck orders. They are commands. And they're solid because somebody said they were solid.

Now, many of your preclears have the most gorgeous engrams of things they never experienced. These engrams are manufactured out of the postulates that other people have made to them. Their mother said there was a terrible accident and the house all burned down, and the preclear is sitting there with a beautiful picture of a burning house that burns down. And now we audit out this picture, and there's Mother. You get the idea?

See, we had merely audited the picture that was made by Mother's command that the house burned down, see? She said, "Horror, horror, terror, terror," and the child put together the picture of it, only the picture stands between the child and Mother in some odd fashion.

That is exactly the way a wall is built. There's no other way a wall is built. Somebody doesn't come along and lay a lot of blocks up.

Fellow comes along and says, "That's a wall."

And you say, "Yeah, yeah. I guess so. That's a wall."

And he says, "That's a wall."

And you say, "That's a wall."

And if you want to try this sometime, you'll probably get for the two of you a wall across the middle of any room. You just sit there and gruesomely agree upon the fact that it had a wall there, and eventually the thing is liable to start taking on dimension for the two of you. But somebody else comes along and walks through it, therefore he invalidates the both of you, you see?

Therefore before he walks through the wall, you would say to him, "Ahah - ah. Wait, wait, wait. Look out. Look out. Look out."

And he says, "What? What's the matter?"

And you say, "There's a wall there."

And he says, "No wall there."

And you say, "Well, we'll beat you to death if you don't think there's a wall there."

And the fellow says, "All right. There's a wall there."

And if he keeps that up with you for a while - well, if you got everybody in a whole building to agree completely that there was a wall in a certain room and nobody after that ever came into the building, theoretically, you would have a wall. Get the idea? People come along years later and rent the building, and they have a wall there. I mean, something silly like this could be expected, you understand? There's something going on here.

In other words, a series of orders and counter-orders are the composition of a universe. Commands, counter-commands -postulates, in other words, or considerations. Postulates are made and considerations ensue. All right.

We have, then, walls and so forth which we can touch and feel. But remember, we had - agreed we had a hand, and we agreed there was a wall, and so a hand can touch the wall.

Now, similarly, a thetan can exteriorize not only out of his head but straight out of a universe, and he says, "What walls?" Only he seldom does this because he's below the death level of a body, ordinarily, in tone. I hate to have to mention this, but it's a fact. Fact.

So as far as walls are concerned, he's liable not to see any walls. Then you process him for a while, exteriorized, and he finally gets up to the point where he can see the walls. And we process him some more, and he gets up to a point where he can't see the walls anymore without saying they're there. You see what his course of action would be.

Now, that's all open and shut. We would simply exteriorize somebody. He couldn't see the surroundings; we processed him, and he could see the surroundings - not because we told him to; because he recovered his ability to receive commands. Get that as the key of reality, please. You can receive commands without being upset by them, you can see. But if you can't receive commands, you can't see. Get the idea? And everybody hangs kind of between these two points. There are limited numbers of commands they want to receive, and they don't see things where they won't receive the order to see them. You get the idea?

These walls are perpetual commands, you might say. And when an individual is receiving commands and he's happy to receive other people's postulates and so forth, he has a good grip on the physical universe or any other universe that he wants to look at. But when he's unhappy about seeing them, he braces against the physical universe, and he puts himself below the point of seeing a wall. So we process him up to a point of where he's willing to receive a command, and he sees the wall. And we could process him from there on up by running the other side of it too, "What would obey you?" And we get him up above the level where he has to put the wall there in order to see it, but he can do that too. You get these three grades - hm?

I said we were going into high school tonight. I probably should have said doctorate in college, but that's about the score.

Now, if you want to - if you want to really get yourself a good firm reality on reality itself, you want to run this on somebody quite permissively and very gently, with lots of two-way comm: "What wouldn't you mind obeying?" and "What would obey you?" You see, those two sides there, unbalanced. You don't run "What wouldn't mind obeying you?" There isn't anything as far as the guy can see, you see. It becomes an impossible question.

So "What wouldn't you mind obeying?" and "What would obey you?" This permits him to get the idea of using force and all sorts of things in order to make things obey him. And he will, and he'll work up out of this. And his reality will turn up; his reality will change. This is definite. Furthermore, it's not a terribly abusive thing to havingness.

It's a very, very important process. There are a lot of other processes down along the same level, but most of them would fail to reach any altitude - that is to say, you couldn't run a case all the way out with the process. Well, you could run a case all the way out with this "What wouldn't you mind obeying?" and "What would obey you?" You could run a case all the way out. That goes right straight through the roof. See, you run that all levels. All right.

That's quite an interesting thing. But to get a reality on reality, you want to run that on somebody or have it run on you, and you'll wake up to the fact that that thing that's sitting there is just an order. It says, "See a wall"; that's what it's saying. You say, "Ha-ha." Of course, you can accept this intellectually, but it's not quite as startling as it is to look over there and not see a wall but hear an order.

Now, one's own resistances and so forth compound until he actually thinks he's putting masses into things. Actually, resistance is not putting energy up against an order, you see. I mean, if there is no mass, if it's all a series of orders, then a resistance would simply mean putting an order up against an order. And so we get another possible process (which I have never run on anybody, but which seems quite amusing) is "Who could you outorder?" And that would be resistance. "What could you resist?" and "Who could you outorder?" would be more or less the same thing.

Now, that's an interesting thing about reality. Now, if we have all these commands and postulates compounding into the physical universe - and you don't have to believe that if you don't want to - get the process run; if it turns out all right, it turns out; and if it doesn't, it doesn't. So what! But it does give us a little bit better grip on what all this time, space is.

Now, if we're all in agreement upon what orders we're receiving from where that makes space and that makes walls, that makes everything else - if we're all in agreement on this, then we'll all perceive the same things. But that doesn't make us all the same person.

The Hindu philosopher, in my youth, was very entertaining, but he abstracted a little bit too abstractly for my youthful digestion, and he gave me some awful mental headaches when he started telling me about the way things were. Because he kept insisting that we were all part of the great pool of yup-yup or something, and that there was no separateness amongst us or individualities. And he just never did pound that home; he just never did.

And years and years later, imagine my astonishment to discover what we call the "thought pools." Every thetan has had an engram somewhere along the track - he's had a pool mocked up, you know, in which he could look in it and see thoughts and so on. Real cute. But it's on almost anybody's track. So it's a natural thing to assume that life would be a pool of something, or something like that.

And for one who really has no good grip on a postulate and can't receive orders, like a Hindu philosopher sitting on top of a mountain or something - this chap has a bad time with it, and so he gets around the whole thing by looking at the bottom of the scale. And the bottom of the scale is the thetan just goes right on down through the bottom. And he is so unseparate from everything and anything that he conceives himself to have merged with everything.

And maybe you can get out through the bottom. I don't know. I've seen preclears pushed in that direction, but not pushed all the way out. They usually protested before they got there - thus ruining a noble experiment. But anyhow ...

Here we have - here we have, however, the truth of the matter and, again, another rather simple experiment which anybody can make. And if everybody can duplicate a similar experience, then

we certainly must be duplicating something like the modus operation of existence, see? We must be approximating it if any of it can reproduce an experiment with the same result. The whole science of physics depends for its similarity of result upon the fact that it's working only with things on which we're all agreed.

A physicist is always afraid to go out of any field where he doesn't have total agreement. You never saw a man quite as frantic on the subject of disagreement as a physicist. You disagree with a physicist, and he gets upset. He works entirely in the field of agreement; entirely. He works nowhere else. Only he's got an obsessed and compulsive agreement that's gotten very, very solid as his total point of fixation, and that can make some interesting mental quirks if you haven't ever met many physicists. Anyway ...

Life magazine, I think July of 1954, ran - in the middle of the month - ran a whole series on the prominent physicists of the day and so forth. I had an ACC class in absolute stitches over the pictures of these guys, because it looked like something off of a - what's that German intelligence test that shows you the pictures of insane people and tells you which one could be a friend?

Male voice: Rorschach.

Huh?

Male voice: Rorschach.

No, not the Rorschach. It's the Sckone or the Skzoz or something.

Anyway, they show you pictures of insane people, and as soon as the guy says, "Well, I think I would..." - you have to answer the question this way, by the way. You have to say, "Well, I least dislike that one."

And they say right away, "He has an affinity for paranoid schizophrenics," you know. Marvelous. Marvelous test.

Anyway, where we have this agreement on solidity itself, you see, we're working with a rather low order of things. And we can go down from there or up from there. And if we go down from there, we get a mergence - mergence of life. We get almost a total mergence of life. It might be individualized, it might be composed of individuals, but it certainly isn't individuated.

And therefore we can run this experiment, any one of us, and achieve a similar result. I would be very interested if you ran it and didn't achieve the same result. It would be quite peculiar. And that is, you ask a fellow to - not a preclear, but anybody - don't put him in session or anything like that, because you might help him with this - just run an experiment and ask a fellow to get things around in the room from which he's separate, and just have him spot them. And have him spot this for about three, four minutes, just so you know he's doing it all right and so forth.

And then you say, "Things that you are not separate from" or "Get the idea that you're not separate from" or even this one, "Things that are not separate from things" - in any way you want to run that; but preferably, "Things you're not separate from" or "Things you're connected with," over and over as an auditing command. Sends him down, down, down, and he goes right on out of communication with you.

He tries to drop through this bottom into this complete vacuum of something. And you never saw a guy go down so fast in your life. I mean, it's good. I mean, you run it for twenty minutes, and you can establish this. Not because you think so, but simply because as we look at it, that's the way it happens. I've run it on preclear after preclear, just to get the way of things. All right.

Having run this, then, for about twenty minutes - things he's together with, (togetherness) - we then turn around and ask him once more for things he's separate from. And we notice he's

getting - "Haahhh. Boy, that's better," you know. He's coming up out of it. He gets out of it further and further and further. And the next thing you know, he'll go out of his head if you run this long enough, and he's not in horrible condition. See, "things you're separate from," and he should finally wind up and go out of his own head and exteriorize.

See this? And he is not in any kind of an artificial or false condition, because his IQ, his ability, his appreciation and all other desirable factors go up. He can handle things better, he can postulate things better, and he can start to handle this thing called matter and he can do various things if he does this.

So we just look at these two directions, and we find the wrong direction. And the wrong direction is "things that you're connected with," see, or - so on, and the right direction is "things you're separate from."

Now, to play a game, somebody gets connected with something, you see? But he always must feel that he can separate himself from it, otherwise, he doesn't easily play a game with it. After a while he gets to be a pawn, not a player. See how this is? All right.

So we run these two processes, and we rather easily discover - to be very, very technical, very technical indeed - we discover at once that being all squashed into one nirvana, and so forth, is for the birds. That's my scientific opinion on the subject: It's for the birds.

Now, it's quite interesting, it's quite interesting that an effort such as yoga and the rest of these things would still play around with this togetherness as a goal, and it's only therein that yoga is trapped. Got it? See, that's the only trap in yoga. There is so much learning in it, it is so impressive, and it takes so long to do it, that it rather persuades one that there must be something there.

Yes, there must be something there, but there's just enough of this reverse vector in it to booby-trap it. That's the only booby trap in any of these philosophies is that they make one go toward togetherness - do all sorts of odd things.

They approach it obliquely sometimes. There's the chakras. In order to get out of your body, you're supposed to exteriorize six, I think, other thetans first. It's quite amusing. If you want to get ahold of an old book published in France sometime in the seventeenth century, if I remember rightly, why, it gives you seven things to get out of somebody's body, seven exteriorizations. And they claim that this last one - the last one is the individual. This is 1661 or something like that. Somebody had just got the hot dope from the Far East, and he spilled it out in all of its splendor.

And you only had to exteriorize six entities to get up to a point of where you could bump off, see? And I want to call to your attention that the exteriorization of an entity is a little bit difficult. In fact, the effort to do so, by the time you got up to number six, would have proved so great that you'd be dead in your head. Get the idea? You get the reverse vectorness?

Now, the person is not these other entities. See, that's the other trick. So that's - I say, is an oblique booby trap, you know. It makes him think that he's the other six, too.

And the Huna and the spuna and the muna and the kuna and the rest of the Boola-boola witch doctor philosophies that I've sat around and yap-yapped about under the banyan trees and had a good drink of smullagulut and so forth, with the boys, are all fine. There's a tremendous amount of wisdom in them, but sooner or later - sooner or later you sort of feel like you've just tripped over a crocodile and he said, "Gulp. "

But here we have, then - here we have the entirety of - we've got this, see? I mean, this is a very valuable thing to have in Scientology and I've mentioned it a couple of places. But I want to mention it and give it the value which I think, if you inspect it, you will find it does have. And that is, that we have a common denominator of booby traps, see?

If you want to look at a philosophy - a philosophy of the Goldi medicine man of the Amur River, and you look over everything he's doing and so forth, you'll think, "Boy, can that guy really pull a few tricks." And he can too. And if you want to know if he's doing anything wrong that will lead to any harm along the line, you see - if you want to look that over very carefully and, thereby, get out of it anything right that is being done along the line, you see - the common denominator of error in the philosophy is apparently grouping, see? Togetherness. And wherever he tries to make the fellow identify himself falsely with other things, he is pulling a fast curve. Got the idea?

The only reason I suppose we can stay together at all organizationally is because we run so much in the direction of sanity and ability and so forth, so that we make a workability as an organization. But if we were to start making this - a big thing out of togetherness and at the same time knock out our insistence upon and philosophy about exteriorization or separateness in general, ooh, would we have a mess on our hands. No matter what else we knew, see, in Scientology, it would become a mess, you see? See this?

So although it is unpopular with the public - and several squirrel publications consistently try to tell you there's something wrong with exteriorization - it's the only organizational saving grace we have. You see that? It's just because we have the philosophy of it.

So they say, "Don't put out anything about exteriorization." It's true you'd better not talk to the press or the casual public about it because it's a technical subject. But if you start suppressing the idea of exteriorization in auditing, you see, and stop stressing separateness and so forth in processes, you know, why, the whole thing would cave in. Boy, we'd get solid. We would have an edifice down here that was granite a hundred and twenty-five miles through.

See, we know enough to almost get away with it, see? But even with what we know, we still couldn't get away with it if we dropped out separateness and exteriorization. See that? So just mark my words, anybody starts to drop these things out of Scientology in the future - you know, I'm not around or something - you could take a look at them and say, "Tsk, tsk, tsk, tsk. You shouldn't do that. What are you trying to do, plow everybody in?"

You know, somebody tries to drop Separateness out as a process or say, "Well, there isn't anything to that," and "Exteriorization is actually a hallucinory delucitation" or something and so forth, why, have your opinions. Because following along the line after these have been dropped out of Scientology would be rather arduous, you see? Rather arduous.

At the present moment we can get ourselves out of practically anything we get ourselves into, but only because we have exteriorization and Separateness, you see. Now, if we dropped those out, somebody could get us into something we couldn't get out of. You got it?

Male voice: Got it.

All right. Now, let's look this over. Let's look this over, having given you a great moral lesson - which I hope you'll account it, by the way, because a movement is as good as it can undo itself. When you make it a shooting offense to get out of the army, war is no longer a game, and people get killed.

The way you want to stop war is to make it possible for anybody in a uniform to walk over the hill anytime he wants. That's a good way to stop war. They won't fight their fellow man the same way. All right.

Now, let's look over the situation from a standpoint of processing. If we have this marvelous thing called Separateness and exteriorization, and if we've got all that, then why don't people just go zzzztt and right out of their heads? Why isn't this an inevitable consequence? Well, today, with modern processes, it darn near is. But in many cases it is not. What they doing?

Well, you're trying to exteriorize them out of the head which you see in the preclear's chair or in Paddington Station or someplace, see? You're trying to exteriorize them out of that head, and they're not in it! And any time you take a marble out of a box when there is no marble in the box, you let me know, and I'll give you a certificate as chief postulator. Now, here's the entirety of complexity.

Now, the very funny part of the universe problem is that it is the havingness problem at the same time. These problems are two problems of similar magnitude, scope and interdependence. The reason a fellow inherits another universe in the first place or tries to occupy one, it's a wonderful way to misown things so that he can have. You got it? His havingness problem here is easily solved.

He's saying, "It's mine" when he knows darn well it's Grandpa's, see? So there is some practicality to misowning or having another universe hanging around, a little practicality to it, since it does permit somebody to have.

But unfortunately, these universes promote within the individual a craving for havingness and a vacuum for havingness, which then brings everything in on him and gives him a mechanical togetherness. And when you have a mechanical obsessed togetherness, you have an unhappy preclear. And if he goes far enough along the track, he becomes a small black BB shot. You got it?

Now, what makes him this small black BB shot? Why does he become powerless and so forth? It's because of this togetherness, togetherness, togetherness, as finally represents itself in engrams caving in on him, thought masses caving in on him. He can no longer maintain the space between himself and the order.

Why? He is at the source of the order. And maybe the source of the orders he accounts to be Mama, the source of the orders that create space and so forth - Mama, an aunt, an uncle, grandparent, a doctor, somebody, you see. But he's at that source. And you really should work a bit on pulling him out of that other universe before you try to pull him out of his physical universe difficulty, you see that? Because the body is really itself another universe.

Now, let's look at how he gets into this body. He picks it up at the moment of birth, evidently, according to our E-Meters, and experience in general - only he doesn't have to pick it up at that time, and I've found pcs who picked their bodies up at two and three years and one who picked his body up at eight and so forth. So it's not a hard-and-shut thing. It just happens to be one school of body picking up; one school of body snatching, you might say.

And so anyway, they pick the body up at birth - and we have a technical name for that, we call it the Assumption - and they come swinging along the track one way or the other from that point on.

Well, one of the reasons they pick the body up at birth is because it is so damned weak. Got it? It's awfully weak at that point. And a thetan who no longer has very much beef finds it very, very easy to pick up a body at the Assumption because it's just been born, and it's had hell knocked out of it. Got it?

Now, a body can mechanicalize itself along the track without being guided by a thetan. It can zombiacate. You see them around every once in a while. Well, you could either say this thetan has such small amount of power that he couldn't resist the incursion and the overtaking of command of another thetan, you see, or there just isn't any thetan there. You could say all sorts of things connected with it.

But the point is that you'll find occasionally somebody has picked up a body right after it's fallen on its head when it was three, you see? It's ridden a tricycle down the hill or something and fallen on its head, and bango. And maybe the other thetan that was there, you see, did

exteriorize and do a bunk, say, "This is too rough." But you'll find sometimes that another thetan comes along.

Oh boy, can you get spooked over this, you know? I mean, this is interesting. It isn't that a diffuse or an unconscious intelligence has come in to take the thing over. It's actually another person, another being. It's like Joe or Bill or Pete, you know, has come along and picked up this body. Quite interesting.

Little Roger at the age of eight gets almost killed in the stone quarry, and after he comes out of the accident, he's another boy. Doesn't have much memory of what happened before he was eight, too, only it's a fact. You as an auditor, trying to recover his memory before he's eight - he wasn't there! How could he have any memory before he was eight? All right.

So we go along - every once in a while they'll say, "Well, you know how it is. One just forgets his youth." You look those people up on the E-Meter, you find an interesting history there. You don't have to coach them into it; you just ask enough questions so as not to tip them off, and read the answers, and you'll find out exactly where they sat.

But here you have a thetan in close confluence and agreement with the body, and sooner or later he's going to interiorize into the body because the sets of agreements are identical. So he and the body have their own time continuum.

The body has a certain engram bank. The thetan has a certain number of machines and engrams too. And you will find the thetan pinned to the body by identical or similar engrams or experiences.

The thetan's past track experience goes smack together with the body's past track experience. You start to run a Fac One or another life out of the preclear. Nyyaahh, don't you do that - without running it out of the thetan, too, because there's another one just like it.

One won't give up without the other one. You get the idea? You don't erase one very often and have him blow free. There'll be another one lying there right along with it. To do a complete job, erase both. Got the idea?

So that we find that a similarity of experience, energywise, has a tendency, then, to make a time continuum between a thetan and a body or a body and another body or a thetan and another thetan. And it's actually a mechanical thing; it's quite mechanical. It begins with postulates and orders, of course. And all there are there are postulates and orders, this we agree. But the point is, it's involved itself mechanically down to a point of where you have these time continua dependent upon similarity of incident.

Two fellows, they want to become friends. One of them says, "You know, I had a girl once; I had a girl once. She threw me over when I was seventeen - never been the same since."

And the other fellow says, "Well, you know, that's a funny thing. When I was nineteen, similar thing happened." They've got something in common; that's the way we ordinarily express it. They have started to build a universe.

Now, there's nothing wrong with building a universe, you see, unless the guy wants to unbuild the universe. And if he starts to unbuild the universe and he decides he better pull this one apart and do something of the sort or get into the right universe, why, he may have to do some of this universe exteriorization, you see?

Now, there's no sense in his being in the universe of the first company of Royal Fusiliers when he's working for Selfridges, just not the least - it's just for the birds. He's very unhappy where he is. He doesn't like what he's doing and so forth. Well, he is in another universe called the first company of Royal Fusiliers. You get the idea? So he's in the wrong universe.

Now, we used to have an expression - I think it's Welsh or something of the sort, it's very old on the track - but people were in the wrong pew, spoken of in churches and that sort of thing. But this is about the only thing that ever gets wrong, as such, with the pc. He's trying to get into a new universe, and he can't get out of an old one. You get the idea? So he's not out of one universe, and he knows he should be in another universe. So he's sort of hung up between this way and that, and he's confused; he's confused about life.

But you start to take these universes apart just indiscriminately and you discover that you cut his havingness to pieces, and you discover he becomes a very, very unhappy thetan. Very unhappy. Why? Well, he wants some of these things. Well, there isn't any reason why he shouldn't want some of these things. But the havingness itself, if you please, is the only thing he's going to get out of the wrong universe. So you have to give him havingness in the right universe; that's one way to do it.

Now, one of the ways to give him havingness in the right universe is get him to take orders from the right universe and give orders to the right universe. Savvy? So we could actually take somebody out here who is having a bad time and put him on a farm and have him run some farm machinery for a couple of weeks, and he'd come back and he'd be feeling fine.

You get the idea? I mean, the sun comes up, you know, over the horizon, bing, and he's up, believe me. And when it dives, why, he can quit. But of course, if he's working at this season of the year, why, he's been working for two or three hours before he saw any sunlight. Unless, of course, he's part of the National Agricultural Act, and then he gets to work at noon and quits at 12:01.

Anyhow, he's taking orders from the physical universe, and by handling machinery and that sort of thing, he's giving orders to the physical universe. Now, you see how that would be? And he does that for a couple of weeks, and he just sort of comes into present time on the subject. Get the idea? Because he finds some new havingness to replace the old havingness.

But the very funny part of it is, is he sometimes cannot reach far enough south to undo a universe. There sometimes is a far enough south that he doesn't come out of the universe, and the person who is - exteriorizes with grave difficulty is simply not coming out of an old universe.

And let me tell you something. Way back, way back in 1950 I had the gravest suspicion - knocking everybody out of this universe, "Come on, start, come on into present time." I had the gravest suspicion back sometime in 1950 or maybe '49. It seemed to me that if a fellow knew about the aberration, it wouldn't be aberrative. It just seemed to me that was the case. Now, today we could say, "If he knew about it or could himself not know about it at his own will, it would not be aberrative." We could expand that thing.

But I've just had an interesting experience, a very interesting experience indeed, fascinating experience having to do with this very thing. It became obvious to me that exercising preclears through various universes was not being very successful in some preclears. Sometimes you just didn't seem to be able to fish them out of the universe.

So I got real clever again, and I said, well, I bet it's a universe he doesn't know anything about. I'll just bet you. I'll bet you it's one that's right there that he doesn't know anything about, and he doesn't know anything about it because he's totally interiorized into it, and therefore it must be resident exactly where his body is standing! And it is not the universe that is out there four feet away, where Papa is always present; he's at least four feet out of that universe. No, it must be one into which he's totally interiorized, on these very difficult cases.

So I ran this sort of an experiment. I said the not-have universe, the one that has the vacuums and so forth, must be the one; therefore we'll try to run some Separateness with this. And I found that that was a very, very fine process but, unfortunately, required - as experience has later demonstrated with auditors - requires a diagnostic process to precede it. The universe they're

trying to fish people out of is not the universe they're exteriori - should exteriorize them out of. You got the idea?

They're running the not-have universe, usually, as the wrong universe. It's the wrong one. The preclear would never suspect it. The first way we discover this, then - let's just lay down some little principles, shall we, just - which are just a one, two, three, four, five kind of formula as to how we go about this. Because what I've done since is put together and test with success a diagnostic approach to this which does get, evidently, the right universe. And having gotten the right universe, then does bring about a separateness from that universe.

And this is quite a trick, because it is next to impossible to do. It's quite a trick. And the formula which I followed along here does do it. All right.

So it's no wonder we were having universe trouble. Remember, a universe is just some sort of a time continuum, an agreement between two people, where the postulates of one person can become the solid walls to another. But let's set some kind of an unbalanced universe. Let's get a universe where one person has domain over another person or dominion. Got the idea?

We've got a dominion at work here, see, without any choice being exerted by the preclear; actual overset of some kind or another. And we find at once the kind of universe that is the unsuspected universe. It's got lots of cross agreements in it. This, by the way , is the whole subject of valences, as covered in the first book. Today we call them universes because they're made space and packages of characteristics.

Here's your pc, and right where he is there's another universe. In other words, we have the extremity of togetherness, the absolute extremity of togetherness: coincident space in a no-space. And boy, that takes a lot of doing. All right.

Now, I ran this on the "not-have" basis, and I found out the preclears weren't scaring them up. So I turned around and ran it on the "poor" basis. You see? Who is the poorest people you ever knew? And I got a little bit. You know, I got a little bit further than not-have. Poor - just talking about poor people, you know, and things like that.

And then, with complete inspiration, hit on this other one. This thing has to do with force and resistance to force. There's something here. There's a force greater than the individual has been able to resist in some fashion or another, and this is all wound up in here. So I started testing this one: "the weakest people they knew," and got the answer to this. All right.

Now, we find the preclear, then, interiorized into the weakest universe. This is incredible, isn't it? We find it by the weaknesses. The preclear's own weaknesses are so closely associated to the other person's weaknesses that they've done a closure, which makes a no-protest, which you get a collapse on, then. Get the idea?

Person A, person B have their weaknesses more or less coactive, and we get a collapsing universe. Neither one of them has enough resistance to keep off the other universe. Here we get it coincided.

Well, the way we run this is very simple. We discuss with the preclear, in two-way comm, simply weak things, weak people. We discuss weaknesses. We discuss protests and resistances, in other words, but we discuss, in the main, weaknesses. Resistance means that we don't have a total weakness, and we want to discuss and find the total weakness.

So we just discuss this, and we start turning up people. And the next thing you know, the preclear will be sitting there with a body on backwards - not his body, but another one. A person he never would have dreamed, usually, was aberrative to him. A person he's totally unconscious of but he knows all about. After all, he's being this person kind of in reverse, and it's probably his chronic somatic and the rest of the whole package up and down the track. This is quite interesting.

He has inherited a series of things here, all at once, in one fell swoop, and he has a universe that he cannot pry himself out of because it is, and he is, too weak on the subject to do so. Oddly enough, it fits exactly the old Book One ally description, but which one was the ally? And we have this method now. Preclear will tell you after you've discussed enough weak people.

See that? Your weakest person wouldn't even register on an E-Meter. I mean, there's not that much charge on it. It is a completely chargeless situation, which is about the darnedest thing to run you ever tried to run. It's chargeless. There aren't resistances. There is no tremendous effect. There will probably be a feeling of degradation run off in the early stages of the processing, but from there on, it will not be startling. And an auditor must know this, since he's liable to think it's flat when it's just started to flatten. Remember that the total closure is because there's no resistance.

So we get step one of this little process, which is "Discuss weaknesses." And you discuss weaknesses until the preclear gets somebody on backwards. And he'll tell you about this. It's usually quite startling to him.

And then we run Separateness, both ways, on that person's possessions. You're not going to see that person showing up; that person won't be visible. Person's room and all kinds of other things may be visible, but not the person. Got the idea? That person is just missing, most missing person you ever saw in your life - or you ever didn't see. All right. So we separate, with Separateness, out this person's possessions until the person appears, and then we run Separateness on the person, with this assistive mechanism: weaknesses of comparable magnitude whenever he gets too stuck.

You got it? You'll have to have a weakness for that person, a weakness of comparable magnitude for that person, and immediately afterwards, a weakness of comparable magnitude for the preclear. You got it? Two-sided. You'll have to get one for each, every time you start this weaknesses of comparable magnitude.

Well, how would you run that? You would just run it. Say, "Now ..." The person says, "I don't know. I just feel weak."

"Well, can you get a weakness of comparable magnitude? Can you conceive a weakness of comparable magnitude to that person's weakness?"

And he finally does.

Then you say, "Can you conceive one of comparable magnitude to your own?"

And he does, and you've sprung that one.

Really going to have to fish for bottom on this weakness. So weak they couldn't pick up a mop. I mean, this is Tone 40, Tone 40. The weakness of a rotten cell at the base of a decayed weed that has rotted clean away in the middle, is fairly strong, see, compared to some of these weaknesses. I mean, it's real low scale. But it's not dramatic. And you, you look for fireworks, and you're not going to find any fireworks on this. This is going to drift away.

Most fascinating thing you ever saw in your life. The individual could put up no resistance. His resistance was totally overcome by one mechanism or another. He will swear at the beginning, just like it's described in Book One - just as it's described rather fully in Book One - the person is all love and affection. And he starts coming upscale, he's liable to find some stuff there that wasn't quite what he dictated. We get this kind of a contradiction.

We say, "Well, there was a - there was a - oh, this-this-my father was - he was really very, very, very fond of children; very fond of children."

God help you if you've got Father as a weak universe. If he can get a visio of the person, to hell with it; it's not the person, by the way.

And, "very, very, very fond of children." We go on talking about this for a little while, you know, and, "Oh, he's very fond of children. He was always bringing me things and so on. Very, very, very fond of children and so forth; very, very, very fond of children, and... "

You say, "Well, how many children did he have?"

And, "Oh, just me."

Something wrong with this, somehow, only you don't point this out to the preclear. Never took any part in any youth activities, never took any part - never went to camping or anything else or walking with the preclear. There's some kind of a delusion mixed up in here somewhere as it didn't have anything to do with a good second dynamic, and you usually turn up an awful lousy second dynamic. That's one of the first things you turn up in running this process.

Now, we got these steps now?

The diagnostic approach is what's lacking, and all we have to do is talk about weak persons and things with the preclear that he has known, or some such thing, until we get one of these closures showing up.

Now, we could go on talking about weak persons and things until the closure went by the boards. You see? That's an alternate process. Or we could just start in at that point and run Separateness on the possessions of that person and one's own possessions connected with that person, both ways separatenesses; and boost it whenever it stuck with this other thingweaknesses of comparable magnitude. Whenever he just goes bong, why, he's in one of these weaknesses of comparable magnitude. It's an inconceivable level of weakness. Got the idea?

We're liable to find all sorts of interesting data. But you would resort to this kind of a mechanism if your preclear had been processed for quite a little while, (might say several hours) and wasn't showing any real gain. The preclear is sitting there processing the other universe. They're so interchanged that the preclear is processing another thing than himself.

Now, you may trigger on the preclear four or five weak universes before you trigger the basic weak universe. He'll give you others, but they're out here somewhere. And boy, when he's living right square in the middle of one of these universes, its postulates and his postulates are all the same breed of cat. He has a chronic case of togetherness with that universe, and you can spring him.

Now, I'd point out other mechanisms to you except that they aren't terribly workable - I've tested them. Such as mocking the person up, mocking the person up being weak, mocking oneself up being weak and so forth, and this doesn't seem to be very good.

But there's an experimental process which has proceeded out from this, which I am not settled on yet at all, which done something on this order, is "orders you wouldn't mind receiving from that person or giving the person." You get a total automaticity, and you just run it out. I'm just experimenting with that. But it'll probably lead someplace and may lead someplace with you, which is why I give it to you. All right.

Now, you get the steps of how you would do this?

Now, here we have this very strange mechanism; it's a very strange mechanism of interiorization into the weak. We've scouted this out where we've had some preclears who were quite recalcitrant, and we would have found that the enclosing universe was normally a weak one.

Because the preclear could apparently give orders to it in the beginning. And he'd permit it to give orders to him. And then the next thing you know, there'd be some kind of a closure.

All togetherness then would vanish, and most of his hallucinations and chronic somatics and so forth - I say, "his hallucinations" advisedly, if you merely call any misvisio the individual has a hallucination - these are liable to spring from this. It happens very, very quietly. All right.

Now, on this other thing: Is there such a thing as bacteria? Ha! You thought I was going to forget that, didn't you? You thought I was going to forget that.

Is there such a thing as bacteria? This is an interesting and broad subject. I've seen bacteria wiggle in a microscope. I've seen virus - invented a microscope one time that actually would detect virus, way back when - ultraultraviolet ray microscope. It was a very interesting laboratory bench experiment. Years later they came out with them - they weren't workable then either.

But this business about bacteria is very interesting. Now, the question is, do bodies generate bacteria which then bite bodies? Or is bacteria simply a series of orders which makes bodies themselves mock up things to give them orders? Or is bacteria actually handleable by serums and viruses? Or is it true that since the Salk vaccine has come out that the incidence of poliomyelitis has risen 700 percent? (It has, you know, by the published official figures.) Or is it true that Salk vaccine breeds poliomyelitis? Or is it true that propaganda about poliomyelitis breeds poliomyelitis?

Now, is there such a thing as bacteria? Should you process an acutely ill person who is sick from some virus or bacteriological infection? Should you? Should you? You'd better damn well had. That's all it is.

Evidently, due to some recent looks I've taken at this thing right up close, right up close, and some earlier experiments which I did on the same subject, fortunately - I would just like to see the bacteria that perishes in the snap of a finger, that goes all the way out, that disappears, that all of the various extra gimmigahoojits and so forth that are supposed to take place because of bacteria - how could all these things blow simultaneously?

If bacteria exists, then why is it that it can cease to behave exactly like bacteria and just cease to behave instantly, without running any further course at all and without any introduction of any other fluid?

Now, this is a very interesting problem, and it opens up a brand - new chapter to us in this: Should we process people who are acutely ill? Process which I've just given you - oh, you didn't think these things were related, did you? Ha! I'll show you. I'll get even with you. I'll show you that they're together.

The weak universe processed upon the acutely ill person may very well finish off all bacteriological or virus manifestations. It might happen. And if we have a process which uniformly banishes bacteria or virus by separating out the weak universe, it would mean either we had gotten to the orders which create bacteria and virus, or that they didn't exist in the first place.

And we've believed they existed since 1870 and Louis Pasteur, but that isn't very long to believe anything. It's only about eighty-five years. And a guy who can't hold a postulate for eighty-five years without becoming convinced just is no good, that's all. That's kind of a backwards statement, but it isn't long enough to really have a conviction.

You know, we've got to take it easy, these new things. We Scientologists recognize that our own long history cannot at all times be duplicated by other professions and that the many centuries that we have been at work do not necessarily mean that other professions, new professions, as they come in, pop in-like bacteriology, only eighty-five years old - we've got to be tolerant about this sort of thing. We've got to give them a chance.

But right here at this stage of the game we have an opportunity of solving the fact of is there bacteria or isn't there bacteria? And I've given you the process tonight which answers the question. This process does clip out bacteria. How many bacteria does it clip out? How many virus does it wipe out?

We find acutely weak person, a very ill person suffering from an infection of this kind or that, we discuss with them weak things and people, we find the interiorizing universe, and they might possibly get enough cognition at that moment to make them get well. They might.

Interesting, isn't it? So we stand on the threshold of maybe making some interesting discoveries in the field of bacteriology and medicine. And it would be the only time we ever felt that we had any right to talk about medicine in any way, shape or form.

Now, if we could do this and if we did have a better answer which would assist the medical doctor, I'm sure we would have furthered our cause and goals considerably. But if you know anybody who is ill, particularly from a chronic infection of some sort or another, do that for me, will you, and ask me how you come along. If this cures them left and right, it doesn't mean that bacteria do not exist, necessarily, but it certainly means that they're awful pantywaists. It means that they must be awfully delicately constituted to disappear in a tenth of a second. Something wrong with the picture, though, if they do, isn't there? Something very wrong.

Well, let's find out what luck we have with this, and it very well may be that we're all - that I'm dead wrong about this and that this guess isn't - but remember, it's just a guess, and it's just a hopeful look, a possibility that something like this could take place. Even though we are already the oldest healing and philosophic profession on Earth - we might as well claim that (I hear these other wild claims coming out from Abbott and Lilly and so forth), in view of the fact that we are, we should be hopeful of the fact that we, even because of our seniority, can still make discoveries.

Well, we sure put a lie on that track.

All right. How - you think you have any use for the material I've given you tonight?

Audience: Yes.

Is it comprehensible to you?

Audience: Yes. Very.

Okay.

Female voice: Could I ask a question, Ron?

Yes.

Female voice: It's about a case - well, which I'm not really finished there. It's about a case I was running this afternoon. You seem to know when I've got a sticky case - you give me a lecture right after it ... I was running - I'm pretty certain that he's interiorized into his mother's universe. He's an indoctrinated person and ...

I wouldn't worry about it.

Female voice: Yeah?

It isn't his mother's universe. He's probably suspected it. If he's suspected it, it isn't it.

Female voice: He wasn't suspecting it. I mean, he says he's not interiorized into any universe

You talk to him about weak people and see how this one will turn out. Will you do that for me?

Female voice: Well, wait a minute. I ran him on another universe which I thought, you know, he'd have to be run on first, and he was getting "togetherness" all the time. And he just went right out of communication.

Wrong universe. I can tell you this, that at any time you have the wrong universe and are running it, you don't get much advance on the preclear. You have to get the right one, the weakest one, and then you do get advance on the preclear. Otherwise, you merely get things falling into him. This fallinginness stops when you have the right universe and run it. And it also hits a big cognition, and everything turns off as far as he's concerned. Okay?