

## SOP: ISSUE 5

A lecture given on  
15 December 1952

This is December 15th, first afternoon lecture, first hour. Today we are going to continue with Standard Operating Procedure and uh.. although the last couple of lectures were on Issue 3, uh.. today I realized that I had started to give you, really, Standard Operating Procedure Issue 4; since it was at variance with the next you have there. And uh.. you see more and more details and data comes in, tougher cases start to crack and the question of “What did they crack on?” and so on becomes very pertinent.

Uh.. you don't have to worry at all about a Step One case or really a Step Two or a Step Three case but brother, when you get down to Step 4, Step 5, Step 6, uh.. anything that can be done to chop down the amount of auditing time on this case is a boon to the auditor.

So we now have Standard Operating Procedure Issue 5. Now don't ask me what happened to Issue 4. Issue 4 sort of went by while I was standing up here talking to you. And uh.. as far as the lecture material is concerned, which I gave you earlier I kept saying Standard Operating Procedure Issue 3 and uh.. wherever I said that, you can put in there “Issue 5” because Step One is completely unchanged; it's just exactly as I gave it to you.

The Standard Operating Procedure Issue 3 which is in the book is - and don't underestimate this - an intensely workable procedure. But Standard Operating Procedure Issue 3 simply changed Step One and put Spacation in and Step 5 took the Case 2 right on down the line - from Case 2 down - and rather radically changed the procedure so as to simplify and codify that procedure to make it very easy for the auditor to go on and spring these 5's. I've done enough tests on this later material now, that uh.. I'm very confident in handing it over to you.

The facts of the case are that a Step 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are badly out of orientation and are in one of two conditions. They either have so thoroughly fought loss of any kind, fought loss; they've so thoroughly fought it, that they are now in a situation where they hold on to anything. And we go just down scale on the DEI cycle just a little bit and we find out that the case below the level who resists all loss is the case who has lost so much that it abandons anything. And we can categorize then any and all cases above and beyond Case One in these two categories and it doesn't matter whether we have a.. an “abandon all” case or a “hold all” case; the step is the same for that case.

Now I have to go into this a little more deeply with you. Now fortuitously we have talked a great deal in these lectures about cycles of action. I've just beaten cycles of action practically to pieces here. Some of you have thought perhaps these lectures are not.. not very thoroughly plotted. Truth of the matter is when you have a plot like this book here you don't need much plot in the lectures because you're going over the same material over and over and over from different viewpoints and different angles until an individual can compare it with his own experience thoroughly enough so that by that alone he grasps and owns the subject. And one day you'll suddenly find yourself in complete ownership of this subject. Nobody's trying to.. to either give it to you, you're not trying to take it; the point is that it is knowledge and the knowledge must, to become your knowledge, become yours. You are not on a standpoint of being convinced of the truth of this knowledge. That is the wrong tack. To look for proof, to demand proof and that sort of thing is no part of knowledge. That is a very wishy-washy uh.. way to get away from knowing anything. A person who is demanding proof and trying to obtain conviction is playing a game of pretense that is above all pretense. Because from the first moment you decided to be, the next instant you asked for conviction that you were. And -1- of course a conviction that you existed, coming exteriorly from yourself, was antipathetic to your best interest. And so we get the first instant of conviction that you were you - that was yours, but then you asked to be convinced that you were and back and forth straight down the interwoven track of aberration and down tone scale, it is simply this play of “Let's pretend I am

convinced” instead of “Let’s pretend I know.” That’s of very.. you.. if you’ve.. if you grasped that principle by itself you will understand, perhaps for the first time, what is meant by knowingness.

We’re going right on here with Standard Procedure Issue 5. But you have to know these things because this is the condition your 5, 3, 2 case levels are in. They are not in a state of knowingness; they are in a state of convincedness. An entirely different thing, and part of that conviction has come about through the cycle of action known as DEI.

If that has any similarity to God, I’m sorry.

True knowingness is a capability to know and to ascertain within oneself, truth. There are many kinds of truths as I’ve talked about before. There is also a theoretical level of pure truth. Some of you know of the earlier lectures of Bin 1, Bin 2, Bin 3; remember those earlier lectures? What was in Bin 3? Man only knew relatively what was in Bin 2 was a route to knowledge and knowingness and what was in Bin 1 was all true - theoretical, absolute - Bin 1.

Well, now an individual comes out of Bin 1, and goes through Bin 2 and winds up in Bin 3. When he is in Bin 3 he has traveled the course of aberration in that he has to be convinced. And this being convinced is the handiest little mechanism for aberration of which you’re ever heard. A thoroughly gorgeous piece of nonsense. There’s only one thing you can do, really, and that is, know on the highest level of your own beingness and capability, and the day that you have to ask somebody to convince you that you are you’re practically done from there on.

That’s why I say when people come around and tell you that you should prove something to them about this subject, go ahead and prove it. ZAP them, drown them, throw ‘em into birth but don’t bother proving it. If we were operating simply with a conviction or a convincedness, we could talk about anything, I can prove to you completely that black is white and pink is blue. I’m the best handy little jim-dandy convincifier you ever heard of. Any fellow who has been through engineering to prove this and to prove that, is the essence of engineering. And any fellow who has been through writing is doing nothing but setting up ‘convincedness’. The reader is convinced the story is true. The odd part of it is, and all it is, is just a chain of probabilities which are so put together and usually interwoven with aesthetics, that one achieves at the end a belief that something has occurred.

Of course that’s a pretense. That is a complete pretense. You step off the level of your own knowingness into conviction and you’ll get into the same situation an individual is in who is demanding to be hypnotized, who is demanding to be drugged, who is demanding to be operated on. He’s just trying to say, “Convince me it’s real.” That’s all he’s interested in. He wants to be told that it’s real. He wants to be convinced because basically, of course, it is not real, and he is dwindling out down the bottom on being convinced instead of knowing; and knowingness could be said to be, itself and within oneself, and at best, a capability for truth - just a capability for truth. It is not data. All the data you run into anyplace, unless it tends to place you back up into a capability where you yourself have knowingness, is false data. Any route that you follow that returns to you your capability of knowingness or returns to the preclear that certainty of knowingness is a road to knowledge. If it contains data, it contains it solely to communicate. So that an individual can perceive, in these steps, the eradication of those barriers which intervene between himself and himself. Between himself and his actual capabilities. And if we have data, it is the data in those barriers and we know it to remove it.

Processing in this universe is a process of negative gain. You will very often run into this with a preclear: you will process him very arduously and very arduously and very thoroughly and.. and the first thing you know, why, your preclear will be saying, rather dully uh.. to you, he.. he obviously feels fine now, and he will say to you uh.. that, “Really uh.. we ought to get down to cases now and.. and do something,” and you look at this fellow and before he would have said, “Do ya.. do ya.. do ya think it ever.. ever any.. anything uh.. uh.. uh.. wha will happa.; happa.. happen to improve.. improve me?” And he says, “Well I think we’d better get down to cases now, and get my case some improvement.” You feel like killin’ him! You’d just

cheerfully shove him into the nearest Iron Maiden and turn on the spikes and juice. But don't be upset because you are following a course with him of negative gain. He is gaining by eradication. And of course those things which are gone no longer bother him. And in view of the fact that they no longer bother him, he is now in good condition.

But this universe vector is "In order to progress you must have," and that of course is 180 degree falsehood. You can progress with or without having. But this universe tells you only by having and acquiring and by new possession can you progress. And so you turn the vector around and you start unhaving and of course the fellow gets freer time, more action, more capabilities in space, and a much more desirable ability or capability in all directions, including that of knowingness; and then he says to you, "Having acquired nothing, I feel I should acquire something."

Up at the top of all this you see is this terrible mania "Acquire," "Have," "We must be in the time span," "We must be timed according to this universe."

Well, a conviction must exist before a possession can exist. You must be convinced, one, either out of yourself or from another that you desire something. And then next, you must be convinced by it, by yourself, -- or by another that its havingness is actual. And of course it isn't actual; it's real. Get the distinction between those two words we're making?

So all of a sudden here.. here nothing existed. Nobody had to desire anything, but could; and now desiring it, two conditions can ensue: One has it, and then has to have it, and then of course mustn't have it.

And that cycle, which I will draw to you with even finer detail, is the cycle of your Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5, Step 6, Step 7. Until Step 7, you can no more alter the possession of a man just by snapping your fingers, than you could cut a rock with a feather. Of course you could cut a rock with a mocked-up feather. But he isn't going to part with anything. Or, he's got to part with everything.

So convincedness proceeds from desire and actually mostly exists before desire, but it is not so rough just before desire, in the early stages of the track, but it becomes rough immediately afterwards. Then a fellow has to convince himself that he has to have - and that's all pretense. He doesn't have to have anything.

The story I told you and that is quite popular in Asia about the shirt of a perfectly happy man as the only cure for the princess is, of course, itself a misleading statement, because even though that perfectly happy man did not have a shirt, he had possession, and therefore he was not a perfectly happy man. A person has to be willing to have, and willing to lose before he can completely be. He must be willing to hate and be hated, leave and be left, before he can love. Because all of these things, so long as they contain enforcement and loss as terrible things which mustn't overtake any man, are therefore debarred to an individual.

You have to be able to want this whole universe, to be hated by this whole universe, to be smashed by this universe and to smash it - you have to be willing to - before you could control it. Really even before you could really desire it. And that desire must be a thing that you can monitor too. You must be able to desire and not desire at will. You think that's a pretty cool way to look at existence... No, I'm afraid that is a lot hotter than any of these heat engines I see are running just now. It's very, very warm. Somebody said I should say more about love and sort of understand something about this thing called love. I told you that the lower part of the track was a mockery of the upper - uh.. pardon me, tone scale - was a mockery (lower part of the track too) of the upper part of the tone scale. The upper part of the tone scale was far wider and far stronger than the lower part of the tone scale, but that the lower part of the tone scale was very serious and everything was very real, and the brotherhood of man was something that we must have, and uh.. all that. And yet before anybody at the very bottom of that tone scale would form a brotherhood of man he'd slit his mother's throat. He's too little theta and too

much matter. Too little order and too much confusion. Too little beingness and too much havingness. He's your "Joe Gotbucks," the famous tenement owner.

He's uh.. in a very sad state who is in that mockery level. If you don't think that it's mockery, you should watch some of these people operate. If ever there was anything like complete contempt and disdain for you to feel anywhere in this universe, you'd find it there. "I am your friend; now turn your back - that's good. Now just hold still while I adjust your collar button and you feel that steel sliding in between your vertebrae." And they always start with that line, "I am your friend."

You get some little character completely in apathy, just 'flop,' practically catatonic, and so forth. They apparently are so sweet, so needing, so this, so that. Go ahead, commit suicide. 'cause you're looking at something that would make a black widow spider appear to be a pet.

Not at that end of the tone scale do you find affection or love. You find these things used for death, not for life. And up the tone scale, however, there is sufficient theta, as compared to the amount of.. and sufficient space, compared to the amount of particle present, that the actual capability of theta can pervade and express itself. You've got a latitude of action, you also have a latitude of expression. And up there at the top of the scale, you find love as something which is strong enough to practically monitor, or control anything - a warmth of feeling of which Homo Sapiens sometimes, in sad and nostalgic moments, dreams.

But it's that toward which he is yearning, not toward "I'm your friend. Turn your back. There's the steel." And he sees that operation at the bottom of the tone scale and he's revolted. And he said, "Ah well, there's no such thing as love; then there's no such thing as valuable possession, there's no such thing as any honest or worthwhile emotion. There is no ARC, there never will be any ARC, and it's all a delusion and I'm better off without me, without the race, without anything." And that's just exactly what that level is trying to do to him, and it accomplishes his purpose the moment it makes him strike his flag and say, "There is no love. here is no beauty. There is nothing." After that he's MEST. He's very easy to control. You could make a slave out of him, you can do anything to him.

But up high on the scale, one can possess and be fond of possessing; one can be strong and be fond of strength; one can live and feel love returned; one can have and take joy of having, and lose and not care if he loses. And the difference between the top of the scale and Step 2, Step 3, Step 4, Step 5, Step 6 and Step 7, is the degree to which the individual has sunk in abandoning any effort to have ARC, affection, possession.

He's to a level where he's afraid to be, afraid to love, afraid to have space, afraid to have time. He's apathetic about any of.. possession that he possibly could have. Because he well knows, even though he continues to want, since he's still in the time stream, that if he has, he will lose, and if he loses he will die. He's well educated into this.

So that possession of any sort to him becomes terribly dangerous and he becomes very, very upset at the idea, for instance, of owning a pet. Why? Because the pet might die, and the loss of that pet, if he gave it affection, would be more than he could bear. So he doesn't own; he doesn't love; and the reason he doesn't love, is because if he loved it would become unbearable if he lost the object of his affection. He cannot further lose. Your big D is at the top of the scale, your big E is at the center of the scale, your big I is at the bottom of the scale. And he's down to a point where he inhibits all of these things either by trying to hold on to everything or trying to abandon everything. And he's someplace on that lower scale.

And a Step 2 isn't at any particular level on the scale, or a Step 3, or a Step 4, they are not at particular levels on the scale; they're all way below, as Homo Sapiens, 4.0. And as thetans they're all way way below 0.0. And you'll find some 'One's' kicking around who are both above zero as a thetan and above 4.0 as Homo Sapiens, but not necessarily. You may find a 'One' who is above zero as a thetan, but as Homo Sapiens, because he could never quite fit, he was maybe 1.1.

So you see, let's not get these values tangled up because they're easily entangled. Don't suppose then that you have to unentangle them. Because of course they're all messed up when you get to the bottom of the scale because they're mixed up with MEST and MEST is chaos. MEST has no affection; it only has the pretense of affection. You can well remember the morning when your automobile said to you, "I'm sorry I am so cold and I am starting so hard." No, it doesn't have any feeling down at that bottom of the track. But somebody puts some havingness on it. Somebody fixed the fenders good and painted it up brightly and therefore it appears to be something that is terribly attractive and something which an individual personifies. And he said, "My car.. My car's name is Bingo. And Bingo has a personality." Who gave it to him? He did. Then one day he loses Bingo. The world's full of cars. There's a lot of cars. They can be manufactured - just endless chains of cars. And yet he will sit down and completely sag.

What's he.. what's he feeling in terms of loss? The utility of transport? No, he knows basically he really doesn't need transport. No, he's losing that which he created to be alive. And as such he feels sorrow at its loss. And the study of all these cases is the study of the chaos resulting from having gone too far, too long, of becoming too afraid, or too apathetic to have evenly and well.

You'll find the people at this end of the tone scale, these cases are badly.. are badly out of orientation in terms of what we call, laughingly, time. 'Course this is.. they're out of orientation of havingness. A day to one of them might appear five minutes to you. A year to -- one of them might appear to be only a few hours to somebody else.

Do you recall the interminable afternoon of childhood? The interminable afternoon... Johnny went out to play with somebody else, and you sat there and you had nothing to do all afternoon - it would be the same thing to you as.. now as saying you had nothing to do for a whole month.

Havingness. This is an expanse of havingness, a capability of havingness, which gives us all kinds of apparent time. It's almost a reverse vector, you see? One.. the.. the particles of havingness are really so easily controlled. A child lives mainly in a world of mock-ups and those particles are so easily controlled, and they're shifted so fast, that one's havingness can increase with such a rapidity, and decrease with such a rapidity, that a child's time track looks like a roller-coaster.

But wait till we get this child up to the age of 35, 40, 45, 50 and he goes to the office in the morning - he doesn't have any universe of his own, he just has the havingness which is given to him, by sufferance, and which may be taken away from him at any moment. And he sits at a desk, he has pieces of paper, or if he's a laborer, he has a drill press. He has a locker, he maybe has a car, he has a Sunday suit, he has a cubicle of some sort, his space where he has a few items parked away, and that is the extent of his havingness, and he knows very well by this time that he cannot enlarge it. And so his time doesn't go by interminably. He can't change his havingness. Time just is fixed for him. He's living forever, but the days go by with a rush. A complete chaos of orientation.

Now you step up to this fellow and you say, "Be a step back of your head."

"What head?" He'll be in a.. various stages of disrepair. And we'll cover these fellows with the steps and it'll be just that gradient scale, but back of all this work that we're doing from Step One on down is the formula of DEI and Forget and Remember as a result thereof.

And it goes on this use. The man cannot be certain. You are looking for certainty in a preclear. Is he certain that he has put a mock-up in yesterday? And he can't be certain of that. Is he certain that he has changed it from the front to the back? And he can't be certain of that. It keeps moving on him, and he can't be certain that it can be stopped. This is faith of capability, but it.. it's also to the degree that he desires to be convinced. As he is unable to know, he becomes desirous of being convinced. As he is unable to know, he has to be convinced; until at long last

he is s.. solely and only capable of being convinced and he is not capable of knowing. And the lower part of this scale is a hideous thing to see - really low on it. If you were to tell him that it were so, it would then be so. But would this man be free or would you have a slave?

Do not operate as they have operated in the field of psychotherapy. Do not tell a man to be certain. Give him a skill, give him an exercise, suggest something for him to do, but do not tell him where he is or what he is doing. Let him tell you and you find out where he is and what he is doing.

I How do you control Homo Sapiens? By placing him in space and time and in creating space and time in which to place him. That's the way you control Homo Sapiens. Q-1.

Now if you at the bottom.. had a preclear who was going out the bottom, believe me, the only method he thinks he has of knowing is if you tell him. Why? He's in a hypnotic trance. He's in an hypnotic trance from 2.0 down and a bad one. And at.. then.. he gets to a point where if you tell him that's why, it isn't true; but if you do the opposite, then of course it becomes convincing. He becomes sure that you're going to kill him because you're so nice to him. He becomes sure that you are his enemy in that wise. You are so mean to him that he's sure, then, that you are his friend.

Reverse vectors walk in, and those vectors reverse back and forth, and we get this dwindling spiral of belief. And here you see the sandwich on the tone scale. Those little sandwiches come down the line - distrust-trust, distrust-trust, distrust-trust, and up high on the scale, all those trusts are trust of self and all low on the scale, those trusts are trusts of that which convinces him - only.

So let's.. let's be a.. aware, then, of this first fact in handling any case below 2 and that is that he will take your word for it ordinarily, or take the reverse of your word for it, before he will take his own knowingness. And that's what's wrong with him. And if you evaluate for him you can kill him. Just remember that. If you've ever had anything to do with people who have been consistently and continuously hypnotized you will know the truth of what I am saying. These people have been slain. Because somebody else took over their knowingness for them.

How do you reverse this vector then? You work on the highest level of certainty obtainable and each time discover a highest level of certainty obtainable. And what are you trying to discover a certainty on? On that thing of which he is convinced falsely, the existence of the NEST universe? No, Sir. His level of knowingness proceeds up the scale along the line of his ability to create, change and destroy his own universe. So your levels of certainty in his own universe lead directly to knowingness - not conviction. And you go straight up scale with this fellow.

But if you ask him to be convinced by reality, he will go down scale. You can get resurgences by making him suddenly aware of reality. But you're not interested in reality; you're interested in actuality. And the only actuality there is for this man is the actuality of what he can do with his own mind and all of its skills. And that's his actuality. And you build on certainties, and certainties lie in the field of actuality. They can appear to lie in the field of reality. But all reality is a farce. A very broad statement, but it's a farce. If you can't play a game, don't fool with reality. If you were capable of the spirit of play and playing a game and pretending, if you're capable of action which you merely postulate should be undertaken and still know the fact that it's only being undertaken because you've postulated that it should be, you're in a position where you can play the game called reality. But the game called reality cannot be played by somebody, safely, who is in a state where it is real, where it is important, where it is serious and where he must agree with it or where he's even abandoned agreeing with it because it is so strong and powerful.

Now let's look over this situation with the preclear and really know what you're looking at when you look at somebody who doesn't, the first instant, step out of the back of his head. Don't immediately suppose this person is mad. He's not. He may be in much better shape than most Homo Sapiens you've run across. But, he's not in a collected and orderly condition with

regard to his environment, and he's out of orientation on these two points only: Space and Energy. And Energy, lumping up, becomes Havingness. He's out of orientation on these two things. And being out of orientation on them, that orientation must be remedied before you find him capable of becoming a Step One and working accordingly.

Your job from Two down is to create a Step One and then follow the rules back of running a Step One. Very simple, isn't it.

You can make a Step One and then you have Step One to do. When you've got that done, you've got a Theta Clear - that's all there is to that.

So you treat a Two, Three and Four and Five and Six, Seven - these ashtrays uh.. you create these people solely to get a Step One case, that's all.

Now what.. what do you.. how do you remedy this situation? You could have an awful lot of formulas; you could have an awful lot of peculiarities in these cases. Let's get the common denominator of all these cases, solve that and go on from there. That would be a good idea? That gives you only one thing you have to know and that's DEI.

Now let's look over this Standard Operating Procedure Issue Three, and we will use these headings: "Step Two by Orientation. Ask the preclear, still inside, to locate the inside of his forehead. Ask him to put a pressor beam against it and push himself out the back of his head. Supplement this by asking him to reach out through the back of his head and grab a wall with a pulling beam and pull himself out. Ask him to steady himself outside and then by means of beams, to raise and lower himself while outside," and so forth.

You can go right ahead and use that as Step Two - just as it is right there. With this single point: The moment you start to have trouble with this, this man is convinced already that he has to have energy to move around. And that in itself is an upset. It's not true, you see. You don't have to have energy to move around. You have to learn how to use this stuff called energy, but you don't need it. You have to use it so that you need never thereafter be afraid of it. You must not only learn how to use it, but you must be completely willing to use it. And use it better than you ever used it before. But, that does not mean this person is working well, just because he can run energy. He will fix himself up so he looks like a grasshopper to himself. Quite often people get quite upset. They say, "I must be an insect, or.. or something of the sort." They go walking around on these beams. They find out they can get around by doing that.

This simply means that he is convinced that all space is NEST universe space and that you need NEST universe type things to move in it. So he's short on space, isn't he? Well, therefore you had better devote some time with this case to orienting him with regard to space in the MEST universe. And drilling him into moving by thought. You walk him out of his head with beams, and add now to Step Two "Now drill him until he can move by thought." And you do this by saying, "All right, now move over, or walk over" - which is what's he's doing - "to the mantle. All right, now you're there? All right, now let's just 'think' yourself on the other side of the mantle and be there."

Well, we won't have a good time with this at all. You'll probably have to hit it at a gradient scale. "Think yourself as two inches over to the right. Think yourself two inches over to the left" - little tiny gradient scales until he's used to shifting himself around in space. And all of a sudden he finds out he can do this; an awful lot of things will clip out of the case immediately.

So add that drill to Step Two and then just go right on with Step One as outlined in these lectures, not as outlined in this book. You get that little addition there to Step Two - "by orientation" it says. Well "by orientation" means you've got to train him to 'think' himself around in space before you go back to using energy. He's got to find out that he can move in space by thinking himself from one point to another. You've got to teach him that by gradient scales and then you run Step One on him - very simple.

Now he isn't in very bad shape, if you can do this, by the way. He's in pretty good shape. If he fouls up to some degree on this or if he gets upset or the use of energy suddenly makes him feel terribly degraded or he's in bad condition about some of this, why what do you do? If he falls from a Step Two - he walked out of the back of his head and all of a sudden he can't now - he of course has done what? He's just fallen into a later step case. That's all.

He used energy for a short time and then all of a sudden the energy folded up on him; he couldn't use it. Well, he's just a later step case.

So when you pick him up and find out he's no longer able to move himself out of his head this way, or something has happened to him or some waitress has banged a tray over his head or.. or somebody shot him with a shotgun, or something of the sort, between sessions, work him then as a later step case. Don't get confused about that. We had a Step Two; he could move himself out of his head by orientation. And we moved him around in space by getting him to "think" himself in space; and then we went on to Step One and went on from there.

But the next time we saw him, he wasn't in as good a shape as we thought we were, and uh.. you tell him, "Move out by energy" and he can't do it - this doesn't mean that some new and heroic something that Ron didn't tell you about is necessary. No, he's just a later kind of case, that's all. Do you get the idea?

Any.. don't.. don't get fixed on these cases. Don't get arbitrary on these cases. As.. a Case Five, a Step Five case can and should become a Step One case. He might even become a Step Two case. These categories change, and you will be alarmed by this fact: There will be some preclears, Two's and Three's and Four's particularly, who do the damnedest things. They keep moving all over. One day they're a Step Two, and the next day they're a Step Five. The next day they're a Step Three and the next day they're a Step Two. They keep moving around on this.

Well, the only way that this is upsetting, and the only reason this is upsetting, is because they are, actually, incapable in some line or another and your presence gives them sudden hope. And this hope is sufficient to boost them up from what they are: A Five. It boosts them up and they're very optimistic and as long as you're there, they'll all right. And then they go off down the street and they take a step a foot in back of their head and Pang! Zing! And they're all upset. They're being bolstered by the auditor, and the auditor has artificially bumped them up a couple of steps in auditing them. And of course, they're not there and they can't do this. Don't worry about it. Don't get any worry about this stuff. This is s.. really too easy.

Now Step Three is by Spacation. It says here that "The MEST universe has forced upon the thetan its space.. spatial dimensions and directions. The thetan is likely to become a point which is being subjected to all the counter-efforts and emotions of his environment, for his entire concept of space as being determined by the MEST universe. Have the thetan who's still inside find his feet in the opposite direction."

All right. Step Three, Space Processing. Let's call that now Spacation, and I will give you Spacation. If you had your books, you could strike out - and when you get your books and hear this tape again - strike out the rest of that beyond what I read. He's out of orientation. The MEST universe has forced space and dimension upon him to a degree where he can't handle it.

You say, "So far, we've had this case this way: We've said to this case, "Be two feet back of your head." He wasn't." You say, "All right, put a beam against your forehead and push yourself out." He didn't. Okay. It.. that.. that took how long? That.. that took 45 seconds. We've done an assessment on this case and we've spent about 45 seconds now following through Standard Operating Procedure, and we're at Three. And we find out that he can't do this.

Here's our test.. immediate test for a Three: Have him put a point out in front of him. This is the next thing you do to this case. Put a point out in front of him - a mock-up. See, after he

couldn't step out of his head with a beam, the next thing you do is, "All right, now have a point in front of you. All right. Got it there? Now hold it steady. What's happening?" That's just as simple as that, see?

If that point is stable and if no strange new and peculiar facsimiles start shooting through, and if he's obviously in very good control of this point and can conserve it and keep it stopped - with no further processing and so on - this fellow is a Three. And he.. he will give up right away on Spacation. But...

All right, now what happens here? He.. he holds the point. You say, "Put a point out there."

And he says, "What kind of a point?"

And you say, "Well, make it just little gold point of some sort or -- another. Now just put that out in front of you. All right, now. Look at it. Now hold it steady."

If he has even the vaguest difficulty with this, if he has even the tiniest uncertainty as to what this point's doing, go right on to Step Four. If he holds that point, you can spring him by unmocking him.

And I'll tell you exactly how that's done: You unmock the body and leave the thetan sitting there. And then he moves off. Very simple trick. Because if he can hold that stable, he's just within an ace of being able to handle space. If he can't, he doesn't know yet. That's why he wasn't a foot back of.. two feet back of his head. That's why he couldn't push himself out with a beam because space is kinda dangerous. But he still might be able to handle a little bit of energy and so forth. But if he can hold this point, if he has no trouble with this point, you go with Spacation.

And from here on, this is the way you do Spacation.

Okay. Gonna give you a whole hour on how you do Spacation, and I'll just go on with the rest of this right now, this.. immediately follow this.

It's just this: The manifestations which take place around that point must be carefully examined before you determine that this fellow is a Three. If he can hold that point, he can be stable in his own space. You can make his own space for him and then stabilize him in it.

And if any one of the following conditions occur, however, you go right straight on to Step Four. One, the point jiggles out of control. Two, it sweeps in on him. Three, it sweeps away from him.

Four, the point uh.. holds, all right, but a lot of facsimiles start showing up and flying around.

And six, if it keeps blinking on and off, if it's intermittent.

Any one of those conditions, he's not a Case Three - not a Step level Three.

Now there's a very distinct possibility you won't find too many of these. But whether you find them or not, Spacation is doable by a Step One, a Step Two, a Three, and has to be done by a Four, and has to be done by a Five before you'll get anyplace with these cases.

So therefore, Spacation is quite important. But right here at that point, can you, at Step Three, can your preclear hold this point? If he can hold this point, you go right straight on with Spacation and unmock him. And just.. he moves out. That's that! He's out.

Now the additional data which you need as you go down from Two and Three and Four and Five and Six and Seven is simply this: The fellow has lost too much, so that he abandons everything. Or loss is so frightful to him, he's just a little bit above that on the scale, that he

holds on to everything. The one who is abandoning will be very thin, and the one who is holding on will be plump. You can tell them on sight. And they'll both use the same process for this.

This does not become marked until a Four, Step Four, but you're still dealing with those factors on the earlier ones - still dealing with them.

Now in the next hour I'm going to talk to you about Spacation. It's a very special technique, and you've got all the theory that you need on this. But it has not been assembled for you into a very neat, one-two-three, little package. Well now, you can use it with great ease.

Let's take a break.