

P.A.B. No. 24,

16 April 1954

CERTAINTY OF EXTERIORIZATION

Are they exteriorized?

Perhaps one never appreciates the benefits which result from exteriorization until he runs, with a case which has been exteriorized, a drill of exteriorization-interiorization with solid objects. This step, the principles and operation of which will be covered in an early PAB in greater detail, demonstrates the great difference which can be achieved in a preclear who is made able at last to exteriorize from and interiorize into any and all objects and spaces at will.

An individual has to *have*, as long as he believes objects can be forced upon him and pushed around him—whatever his own determinism on the matter may be.

After a theta has been unable to separate himself from a group or object for a considerable length of time he begins to believe that whatever it is is something he must have. He will then figure-figure a reason why he has this object.

After a theta has been a body for a long period of time, he believes he cannot separate himself from a body, and believes, therefore, that he has to have a body. He will then add many reasons why he has to have a body. Reasons always follow the fact. The fact occurs, and then purposes are originated in order to account for the fact. Explanations ensue from incidents. Necessities in havingness ensue from possession.

If an individual has to have something, it is certain that he has once possessed the object or one similar to it, or he is in the valence of something which has to have the object.

Contrary to all the rationale connected therewith, all possession derives on the basis of "Now that I've got it, what can I do with it?" "Now that I am doing something with it, I have to have it."

The basics of this are contained in the Theta-MEST theory. This was the original theory of somethingness-nothingness. A theta, being nothing, attempts to achieve nothingnesses. A body, being something, attempts to achieve somethingnesses. The effort of a body to achieve somethingnesses continues long and arduously even into the field of reason. The effort to achieve somethingnesses includes "having to have a reason for."

A person who is firmly convinced he is a body and is therefore being a body always has to have a reason for or a significance. Hence we get figure-figure-figure. Given a fact, there must always be a reason for the fact. Thus there must be other facts. And in this wise we get somethingness adding up to greater somethingnesses. In the case of the theta we get a continuous effort to knock out the somethingnesses and achieve greater simplicities or nothingnesses. Basically this is a problem in communication. A perfect communication demands that that which is sent from the source point must be duplicated perfectly at the receipt point. The graph of communication is therefore C- - - E. Here we have cause, a distance, and effect. A perfect communication would be one which found at the E point a perfect duplication of that impulse or particle which emanated from the C point. It should be very plain, then, that communication is, in a purity, a complete duplication. Any communication resulting from a cause point which has no form, if perfectly duplicated, would contain as an integral part of its message "no form." Thus at the effect point of the communication line one would discover the message to be without form. Thus the impulse of the theta in communicating is to make no form. In other words, being a nothingness so far as form is concerned, if balked in communicating one way and another, the theta would eventually become obsessed with the idea of having no form at any effect point he was trying to reach. Similarly, when there is a mass at the cause point of a communication line, the effect point would be expected by the cause point then to have mass. In other words, a body talking to a nothingness would tend, if it became obsessed upon the subject, to become upset because there was no mass at the effect point of its communication line. A theta would tend to become upset if there continued to be a mass at the effect point of his communication line.

Completely rational behavior naturally permits a nothingness to communicate to a somethingness and a somethingness to communicate to a nothingness, a nothingness to communicate to a nothingness and a somethingness to communicate to a somethingness. These, being all possible combinations so far as mass and communication are concerned, are of course the requisites if anybody is to have a free feeling about communication itself.

Let us take, though, the case of a body obsessively communicating with a spirit. Here we have John Doe addressing a nothingness. John Doe believes he is a mass, therefore he seeks to give all of his communication mass. He continually seeks to communicate with a no-mass at the effect point. Inevitably he will begin to believe that there is something wrong with his communication since no mass appears at the effect point. Talking to God, John Doe would be most pleased if God were to step forward in a massive form, for this would be a more or less perfect communication. But John Doe, going on talking to God without God appearing, will eventually become obsessed and will believe, then, that he cannot communicate. Believing he cannot communicate, he believes that the line is now reversed and that the cause point is at the nothingness and the effect point is at himself. Therefore he will seek to become a nothingness. A nothingness will be communicating with John Doe. And this will make it necessary for John Doe to achieve a no-mass state if the communication is to be perfect. Thus John Doe could liberally interpret this communication system in various ways, and the least of his interpretations would be that he was unworthy or degraded, or that he should repent or abase himself—which is to say in all cases become nothing by the common interpretation of nothing.

But let us say that John Doe is totally aware of himself as a thetan. He begins to communicate to a mass such as an idol or a body or some other solid object. If he continued such a communication line without realizing the fundamentals of communication, he would soon begin to expect a nothingness to appear where the idol or the body or other mass was. The persistence of the mass at the E point would make Doe feel that he had never communicated. He would therefore believe that his power to communicate was less, and he would believe that he therefore must become something. Thus he steps out of the role of being cause and becomes an effect on this communication line. This, at the very least, would tend to interiorize John Doe, the thetan, into the mass he was trying to communicate with, for he would not consider himself capable of reaching the distance necessary to communicate and would believe that this mass, now considered to be senior to himself, would have the power to reach him; therefore he would interiorize.

These, basically, are the mechanisms of communication. But they are also the mechanisms of interiorization-exteriorization. Duplication, you see here, is the effort. And duplication becomes the effort solely because communication is the effort. When a being loses grip on these principles he is then in for considerable trouble, for he will find himself unable in this universe to achieve a perfect duplication and so will be unable to achieve a perfect communication.

Now let us take this matter and apply it to auditors, and let us discover that an auditor who is not himself exteriorized and who still believes that he is a somethingness would actually feel thwarted and unsuccessful if he achieved an exteriorization on a preclear. His effort would be to continue to make something of the preclear, in other words a mass of the preclear. That the preclear was still interiorized would be gratifying to an auditor who is not exteriorized. You should see this very easily, then, that an auditor who is not exteriorized and who has no actual subjective proof of exteriorization would, whether he knew it or not, work towards more thoroughly interiorizing the preclear. In other words, he would continue to try to have something at the E point of the communication line between auditor and preclear. The auditor being something auditing from source point would attempt to gratify his desire for a perfect communication to have something always at the effect point. Similarly, an auditor who was exteriorized would find it more or less intolerable, if he had forgotten these principles and had become obsessed about communication, that the preclear's body continued to sit there in the auditing chair. In either of these cases, a conflict may possibly arise and the theta clear and the auditor still interiorized might alike (forgetting these principles) dispute whether or not the preclear was exteriorized, since either one of them would find fault with the preclear's condition. The basic fault that they would be finding, in the case of the theta clear auditing, would be that the preclear's body continued to be there, and in the case of the person not yet exteriorized, that the preclear maintained that he was not any longer there and was not in his body. An auditor, then, whether a theta clear or one still thoroughly interiorized, is likely to raise a very large point over exteriorization itself. This point would rise to the same violence that the individual himself would feel toward communication itself. If an individual, whether exteriorized or interiorized, has any arduous or frantic feeling about

communication, he is likely to manifest that arduousness or franticness on the exact point of "Are they exteriorized?" If any damage is to result in auditing it will be on the lines of invalidation of the certainty of exteriorization. By invalidating this, particularly to a preclear who has just achieved it, one is complementing thoroughly a continuous communication problem of the preclear; which is to say, he is a nothingness continuously in communication with somethingness. In order to remain cause on this communication line, and in order to be an effect and relaxed about it, the preclear has to attain a considerable serenity on the subject of being a nothingness trying to communicate with somethingnesses. People who are still interiorized have lost that serenity and find the communication with a nothingness intolerable.

Only an auditor who is ignorant of these principles and is still obsessed on the subject of communication would make the effort of invalidating exteriorization on the preclear's part a major activity.

How can you tell if they are exteriorized? The most recent and delicate E-Meters will register the fact. But much more than this, DOES THE PRECLEAR KNOW HE IS EXTERIORIZED? This last is the only true test. By questioning his certainty and by beating him into an uncertainty, one has undone a considerable amount of his knowingness.