

POSTULATES 1, 2, 3, 4 IN PROCESSING – NEW UNDERSTANDING OF AXIOM 36

A lecture given on 14 September 1955

Okay.

Want to talk to you now on how to do a process named Union Station.

If you believe that Union Station – if you believe that Union Station and R2-46 in general supplant all other auditing you are falling into a pattern of error which has been consistent with Scientology and Dianetics for a long time.

Every time a new process comes out everybody says – expected to say, "Well, now this is it," and all other stuff goes by the boards. I would go so far as to say that a person who did not know his Six Basic Processes and Route 1, really had no real business doing too much Union Station on somebody who was in rather poor condition.

Union Station is a process which belongs at the level of Locational Processing, which is just below Two-way Communication. And when it has been run and is pretty darn flat, you will find that the preclear is in pretty good communication with the auditor and now he can really do Two-way Communication, can't he? And so that after we've done a little Two-way Communication he's willing to originate some things, and so forth, then we've got him just now in a position where, maybe, he could do a little bit of subjective work.

The Invent, Assign, Recall Processes are subjective processes.

And when he could handle a subjective process pretty well, he could certainly do some 8-C, couldn't he? And he could certainly do some Opening Procedure by Duplication and by this time certainly he can remedy havingness, and if he can do that, then he can spot spots. And if he can spot spots he can do Route 1. So, it's going according to schedule but we have put a tremendously powerful process down below Two-way Communication where I think, you will agree, we desperately needed one. But because an individual has been leveled out fairly well on Union Station does not mean he is now in the best condition that Scientology can put him in.

Now, completely aside from the Six Basic Processes and the new – the position of Union Station at the level of Locational Processing, we have another factor which has been

introduced – two factors, really: the – Axiom 53 – the stable datum necessary to the alignment of data; and with that we get the factor of chaos. It's the chaos that supports and gives power to the stable datum on a reactive level. On an analytical, a rational level, it is the first postulate which gives power to the second postulate. The second postulate is a dead thing without the first postulate to back it up and give it power. So on an analytical level we have: not-know – know.

Here's the thetan and he not-knows so he can know. It's real cute. He can do a lot of involved things concerning his not-knowingness and one of the most involved things he does is not-know, then know and then forget that he now knows so that he can remember it.

So we have postulate one: not-know – this is on an analytical level; postulate two: know; postulate three: forget; and postulate four: remember. But forgettingness is a harmonic of not-knowingness and rememberingness is a harmonic of knowingness, and the second and fourth postulates depend for their power upon the first and second – third postulates.

We have postulates one and three which are not-know and forget, and postulates two and four derive, in totality, their power from one and three and two and four are the two things people have the most trouble with: know and remember. And they're dead things; they have no dynamic potential in them whatsoever – no dynamic potential in postulates two and four. They are dead. Their life is only apparent life, There's something kicking around the corpses of two and four and the something which kicks around the corpse of two, knowingness, is not-knowingness, and the something which kicks around the corpse of four is forget.

Hypnotism is exclusively dependent for its action and operation on the sequence of postulates one, two, three and four.

By hypnotism, we have a somebody there who not-knows. We get him fixated on a piece of knowingness. We make him forget it and then he remembers it in terms of action. And we have there the entire explanation, mechanics and modus operandi of hypnotism and hypnotism at last is completely explained.

Another way to hypnotize somebody would be to put him in the middle of chaos, everything going in all directions, everybody shooting at him and suddenly throw him a stable datum, and make it a successful stable datum so that it's all called off once – the moment he grabs this. And this gives you the entire formula of brainwashing: interrogate, question, lights, pain, upset, accusation, duress, fear, privation and we throw him the stable datum.

We say, "If you'll just adopt 'Ughism' which is the most wonderful thing in the world, all this will cease," and finally the fellow says, "All right, I'm an 'Ugh.' " Immediately you stop torturing him and pat him on the head and he's all set.

Ever after he would believe that the moment he deserted "Ughism," he would be drowned in chaos and that "Ughism" alone was the thing which kept the world stable; and he would sell his life or his grandmother to keep "Ughism" going. And there we have to do with the whole subject of loyalty, except – except that we haven't dealt with loyalty at all on an analytical level but the whole subject of loyalty is a reactive subject we have dealt with.

So postulates one, two, three and four actually descend from the analytical into the reactive and are the bridge between the analytical and the reactive; and the action of remembering that which you have forgotten is to some tiny shadow a reactive action, and we carry it several more, one, two, three, four harmonics down the line – it becomes obsessive.

How does the individual remember if he goes way down scale into the reactive bank? He remembers by dramatization and dramatization belongs with the lower harmonic of postulate four, remember. Instead of analytically recalling it, he goes into motion. He waves a pink flag or something.

In psychosis he knew that some action, something he remembered once won, but he's no longer too able to analytically inspect. Forgettingness is now chaos and to salvage himself from that chaos he does an action without analytical inspection which is a lower harmonic of something that once won as the fourth postulate. In other words, he gets a stable datum. This stable datum was all right.

Let us say that he has become a waiter in a hotel having been at one time a general in the Russian army and things get very confusing and the head waiter starts bawling him out and everybody starts going to hell around him. On an analytical level he's liable to draw himself up and say, "You forget, comrade, that I was once a general." That's how he handles the chaos.

Sure enough, the head waiter says, "Well, that's right. You really aren't a general now but I know how things are," and he kind of knocks off, see, gives him a little win.

After a while, this individual when he's surrounded by too much motion such as a baby crying or some other violent action, will solve the situation by instantly putting a paper hat on his head.

Now, do you understand that ununderstandable, noncomprehensible thing called psychosis?

Let's take behavior as a tremendous scale from clear up at the top all the way to the bottom and let us say that that whole big scale of human behavior and reaction, or the reaction of life – that whole big scale all the way down the line begins – when we get onto a scale; before that time there is simply life. It is alive. It is aware of being aware and everything else but it's there.

Now, when we get onto that scale we go into not-know. We come down the scale a quarter of the way and we come into know, and we come down the scale one-half and we come into forget and we come down the scale three quarters and we get into remember and our next level at the bottom of the scale would be not-know. We've started all over again when we hit the bottom of the scale.

All right. Now, do you realize that any tiny portion of this scale that you'd care to snip out with your scissors contains in it postulates one, two, three and four. And it's quite interesting that if you just took this scale and looked at it with a magnifying glass, you would see that it not only broke down into these huge parts but that a little section of it runs like this.

It's saying, you take a magnifying glass and you look at this and the print on it's very small, and as you go down scale it goes down from: remember, not-know, know, forget, remember – see – not-know. And we put our magnifying glass on that and we say, "Hey, we can tell what the whole scale is by inspecting these tiny parts." See, this little section, and this little section has in it all of the parts of the big scale. And so, we would happily – putting our magnifying glass on the little scale and being only able to see the little letters, not the big ones now, we would say, "Well now, look, the highest function of life is remember." And if you don't remember then you don't know. See, that's very obvious, isn't it? And you solve not being able to know, by knowing, says right there below that and right below that it says – look at that – forget.

So, the worst possible thing that could happen to an individual we could say, fallaciously from this, would be – the best thing that could happen to you is to remember, and the worst thing that could happen to you is forget.

Why? Why would we make this adjudication? Is because we wouldn't know which one was one and which one was two and which one was three and which one was four. So, actually we would be reading the scale looking at this small gradient as four, one, two, three. See? Four, one, two, three the scale would go; and we'd say, "Well, therefore we know all about psychotherapy. We just get everybody to remember everything and they're all well." Um-mm.

We have to work it, study it, test it and get an axiom like Axiom 36 about a lie; and when we've got that as a little yardstick then we can look at this scale all over again. And we can say, "Look! Look, the way – the proper way this scale counts is one, two, three, four; not-know, know, forget, remember; not-know, know, forget, remember; one, two, three, four; one, two, three, four and the scale does not read then. remember, not-know – see – know, forget.

See, that's the wrong way to read that scale. The thing reads very simply and very adequately: not-know, know, forget, remember.

All we'd have to do then is skid on this tiny gradient of the huge scale just to get the sequence wrong.

If we had a circular dog, we were liable to pick up his front legs as being the front of the dog and we'd say, "It's very obvious now that this circular dog begins with those front legs, goes to the hind legs, goes to the tail and the very last end of him is his nose." Well, this is what psychotherapy has done. It has misread the beginning of a circular dog. A dog begins with his nose and we have made just as obvious a discovery as that but it is tremendously sweeping; so much so, that it moves us right on out of Homo sap. Just bing! Because the way we can look at things and think about things now are entirely different than Homo sap; and you understand that Homo sapiens is called Homo sapiens because he has a method of looking at things. He thinks about them. He is an animal with reason; but his reason, I am afraid, is entangled, upset and chaotic, simply because he considers the first postulate is remember or he might consider the first postulate to be know – probably he does. First postulate is know, second postulate is forget. Then he has no relationship for forget – for

remember and not-know. He didn't even see them on the scale. So we've made some very sweeping advances here, to say the least.

No, the one, two, three, four, whether you look at it as a huge scale which goes entirely from complete serenity down into the depths of irrationality and reaction; or whether you look at it from the tiny level contained in the area of enthusiasm or the area of apathy; see, whether you look at it in vignette or in entirety, it is the same scale. And its parts go in the same sequence as the whole and that sequence, regardless where you pick it up is not-know, know, forget, remember. And the reason it's that way, is because that is the way it works. Not because I've said so or you've said so or we've agreed that this is the case. We have some gruelingly arduous tests to back this up.

Not-knowingness on a subjective level to a person who has not had Locational Processing adequately run in the beginning, is a terrifyingly overpowering process. It simply keeps flicking out his stable data before he has a chance to as-is the chaos. It leaves him in the soup.

So, this tells you now where Union Station belongs on this huge scale – Locational Processing. We're going to let him look at something he is fairly accustomed to: people. Or we're going to let him look at some objects and we're going to build him back up this scale; and we can expect that he will go through all the harmonics of any scale we have: the old Tone Scale, the Know to Sex Scale (the early one) or the Not-know to Mystery, it's all we can call it now. He'll go through those harmonics and climb up scale, but he's climbing up scale toward what with Union Station? He's climbing up scale toward being able to see another human being, a necessary thing for his conversation with human beings.

We've gotten him to establish some terminals. But we've done more than that, we have run out a great many reactive computations with regard to other human beings on several processes, all at the same time. The first and foremost of these processes that we're doing is, oddly enough, Matched Terminaling.

That ever occur to you?

Therefore, you wouldn't want an area where all the people were of the same order of wealth at all. Would you?

You'd want kid – an area where you had kids and little babies and old people and middle-aged people and wealthy people and poor people and – you know. Otherwise, you'd simply match terminal out of existence, mechanically, all the guy's reactive computations towards being middle class, fairly well-off.

But quite aside from that, we don't care what we're doing to his body, we're asking him to get used to this idea that there are people in the world and that you don't have to know all there is to know about them. You can relax where people are concerned, and having relaxed where people throughout the world are concerned, you can certainly relax where I am concerned as an auditor and we can get on with this business. And you can get relaxed enough so that you can recognize that this reactive bank belongs to your body and doesn't belong to you, and therefore, inspect it on a subjective process level.

Do you see what would happen to an individual if he did a subjective process while he himself thought he was a body? Ownership would get in your road. He would start owning every computation that turned up out of the body's bank and this would be identification deluxe, wouldn't it? You would actually assist his identification with the body.

Now, the clue to all this, as to which was right – know or not-know for Union Station – the clue to this order of postulates – which one was number one – was done on a matter of testing.

Did people exteriorize on the second postulate? No, people would never exteriorize on the second postulate. So, if know was the third postulate or the first postulate, people would exteriorize, wouldn't they, given Axiom 36?

See, you'd have to have that early – the first postulate – you'd have to have the condition whereby they were separate from. Well therefore, would they exteriorize on know or exteriorize on not-know? Well, we know very well now that they don't exteriorize on know.

You use Union Station on the basis of the positive side and they do not exteriorize as a result of running it. They get better, they get more cheerful, other accidental effects are present, it's a good process, but they don't exteriorize. Which tells you at once that it isn't going then in the right direction. It must be going in some other direction, so that, know must be the second postulate. And if know then is a second postulate, what the devil is the first postulate? Of course, the first postulate is just not-know.

Now, at once you must realize the actuality of Axiom 36. We aren't running a dichotomy in which we have to run so much not-know and then so much know. We are not doing a process where know is equal to, but opposite from not-know, a primary mistake man at large has made and one which we're in no position to make at this time. We mustn't make this mistake now.

It's not a dichotomy. It's not the positive and negative side of the electric motor. It is not-know – the first postulate, the first condition – followed then by a postulated thing or condition, which is the thing which you now know.

So, not-know is natural and know must be an awful swindle. And so it is, but you run it in the direction of not-know and your preclear will start to get less and less concerned with the mass called the body and he will exteriorize. He gets exteriorization manifestations as a result of running not-know.

Now, what is the goal of this process?

The goal of this process is simply to get the individual into two-way communication.

How far could the process be carried forward, supposing you made this the only process that you were going to do'?

Well, you could probably carry it right on through to the end, all the way through; but sooner or later you'd have to change off onto entities, thetans, gods. You'd have to come off of people, see. Because it had become pointless after a while on people. You'd probably come

off onto the universe, like what -"Give me some things you don't know about that space, about that chair," you see. "Some things that chair or that space doesn't know about you." Right away you would run out the early barbaric Christian concepts of religion; God is the supersaturated ether which inhabits all space. And this would run out and a lot of other things would run out. God knows all about you – that's an interesting thing to run across aberratively, isn't it?

All right, therefore the goal of the process is just to get the individual into good, solid two-way communication.

Now, there are many other things the process does, such as move the fellow out of the human race, but we won't bother with these. We're going to work it in the framework of the Six Basic Processes.

Now, understand that Union Station is one process and postulate one, two, three and four are a theory which has some experimental proof. And the two then are necessarily not – are not necessarily married to each other and are inextricable. Don't identify one with the other because this postulate one, postulate two, postulate three, postulate four of not-know, know, forget and remember can be applied to any of the Six Basic Processes. And if it's going fast on not-know and slow on know, which it does for Union Station, be assured that the principle will remain constant through other processes. So we get a variation in processes something on this order. We get something where we're stripping off engrams or something of this sort or things that concern this individual, one way or the other.

We say, "Well, now, tell me some things you don't know about your reactive bank, about that engram, about splitting universes, about your father, some things your father doesn't know about you." Don't think these'll work though unless you've done Union Station and work easily because it'd be too tough a process. It'd practically spin your preclear right on in. It's an interesting thing to do. It occasionally, undoubtedly – given enough two-way communication and enough auditor presence you could probably get away with doing just that. You know, you could probably take this fellow who is half-spinning and you say, "All right, give me something you don't know about insanity." If you were good enough as an auditor you could beef the individual's Tone Scale up during the session of processing to a point of where he could run a higher process. Remember, an auditor can always do this. We take a fellow who's creeping around at black eighteen, you know, and somehow or other we beef him up during the session and we say, "Well – I – uh – black eighteens aren't hard to run." How do you know? You never ran one! You brought him up to a black five by your skill as an auditor and you audited for the entirety of the session a black five. At the end of the session, he might have relapsed a little bit and become a black eight, not a black eighteen but you weren't running a black eighteen.

Similarly, you take an individual who could only possibly do Locational Processing – you start running a subjective process on him. Well, how do you know you didn't beef him up into the subjective processing band by your ability to audit, to acknowledge, to get his communication, his awareness of the auditor, his awareness of the session? You made all

these things good. You were auditing somebody who could run a subjective process. Never overlook that fact.

In other words, you can beef a person up. You can bring him up scale for the duration of the session just by the fact that you are there, by your personality, your beingness and your skill. But letting all things just ease along the way we are, do it the easy way. Take a person – run Union Station flat.

Now, you could take Opening Procedure by Duplication – by the way, I'm not giving you advice on how to run this process or giving you any particular change in the process – but Opening Procedure by Duplication, we used to ask, "Do you see that bottle? Go over and pick it up." And then we asked him what he knew about it.

Well, let's ask him three questions in order that he doesn't know about it: "What don't you know about its weight, its temperature?" Get the idea?

You could keep him going back and forth between these two objects, not knowing about them and Op Pro by Dup would exteriorize him much faster.

Now, it's pretty darn hard to run Opening Procedure of 8-C, pretty darn hard to run Opening Procedure of 8-C on a not-know command basis. So, until we get real inventive, why bother to alter it because the goal of 8-C is to show the individual that he can become an effect without dying in his tracks.

It teaches him something then, doesn't it? I don't think it has anything to do with know or not-know, beyond the fact that you hope his cognition will come up to the point of where he'll not-know.

But you could run it on the basis of chaos, the only suggestion that comes up, and not suggested as a process. You understand this? This is not suggested as a process.

You could put it on a dramatization – this is just – I'm just kidding with you – dramatization level, whereby you said, "Do you see that wall? Well, go over and touch the chair." You could turn the whole process, as many auditors have, into bringing about a tolerance of chaos. You could do this.

But in view of the fact that its goal is simply to demonstrate to the individual that he can be an effect; in view of the fact, oddly enough, that communication does as-is matter, energy and space and increase life, it would be a more formalized method of two-way communication on the subject of command. Particularly, if you made him give you orders for 8-C for a while – it's something that a lot of preclears won't do, by the way, you know. They let you run their machinery but then you say, "All right, now you sit in the chair and you give me some similar orders to those I've just been giving you." The preclear'd just practically collapse. The idea of giving somebody else an order is so antipathetic to them, they've taken up modern child psychology.

Now, nevertheless, Remedy of Havingness immediately on inspection demonstrates that there isn't anything much about know or not-know about it. It fits into these principles.

These principles influence it, but all you're doing is having the individual bang masses at himself. You didn't ask him to know about any of those masses, did you?

I told you a long time ago that the significance in the mass had very, very little bearing on the Remedy of Havingness – very little bearing on the Remedy of Havingness. And a great deal of experimentation taught me at length that to give the mass he was mocking up to push into his body significance was detrimental to the process. "Mock up some mass," is a better auditing command, anything in that direction.

I'm not giving you that as a specific auditing command but if you say "planet," if you say something of this sort, all right. But remember all you wanted was some mass. And when I run Remedy of Havingness on people I explain this; I don't care what kind of mass this is or anything of the sort.

"What do you think you could mock up? Do you think you could mock up something that has a lot of mass, like a sun or something?" "Oh, yeah." "Well, all right. Mock up a sun." See, I've taken the significance off of it.

Now, the least significant process you ever wanted to run into in your life is Spotting Spots, just as such. "Do you see that spot?" or "Pick out that spot," any one of the early auditing commands that went along with this were always totally without significance. And what do you know, it did weird things to masses and spaces and all kinds of things.

The reason it was, is because how – you know how stupid anybody can get? Space. Look at the tremendous amount of space around the individual.

There's nothing in it to know. Only one datum there. So after a while an individual begins to prefer black space. It at least might have some mystery in it. It might have some not-knowingness in it somewhere, from the datum that it's black space.

The fact that there is space there, is a knowingness. I'll leave it up to you to discover in your auditing what's ahead of space. Space is obviously a second postulate, isn't it? But a spot in space is again a place where something could appear but about which you wouldn't have to know anything. So, it's a very permissive process.

Now, let's take Route 1. How would you use not-knowingness on a Route 1?

Well, one of the steps in Route 1 runs the person all over the universe.

You know that you can have him find or not find and then not-know about each one of those implants and they go zing, ping, crash, boom! After a short time he couldn't care less. This gets real dull. Of course, you should audit him a little bit further and push him up through that band of boredom.

Boredom simply comes about from knowing everything there is to know in your immediate environment. Boredom comes about from a tremendous supply of knowingness and practically no not-knowingness. And an individual departs from boredom by going out and discovering himself some not-knowingness and then starts down Tone Scale and we get more and more not-knowingness and less and less knowingness until we get into apathy which is total not-knowingness, see.

Now, Union Station then is done best by an auditor who understands exactly what he is doing because sufficiently fascinating phenomena occur to derail and sidetrack anybody who doesn't know his business.

"Oh, how fascinating," you know. This fellow has a... An analyst starting in to do something like Union Station, would be the *reductio ad absurdum*.

He would say, "Now, what don't you know about that man over there?" -something like this and the fellow would say, "Well, I – I don't know what's under his clothes." And the analyst would say, "Aaaaaah, now let's get down to business, enough of this shilly-shallying around." He would get so engrossed, his interest would be so fixated that he would immediately come off of the process because the things he was looking at were too interesting. He has found some deep significance here. He's going to explore this significance.

In other words, what happens? We get the skid principle. That's a nice technical term, the skid principle. Look, the first postulate will slide into the second postulate. First postulate slides into second postulate. So you say notknow and then slide into know. You say, "I don't know anything – well, come to think about it..." Get the idea? The first postulate is so mobile, so unfixed in time and space, that it will instantly start to disintegrate the second postulate and therefore, the second postulate will come quickly to view.

So, we say to this person, "Now, give me something you don't know about this person." Fellow says, "All right. I don't know whether he's wearing a mustache. He has his back toward me go – you know my father had a mustache when I was very young." And you say, "That's fine. Now, give me something you don't know about that lady." "Well, well I don't know – I don't know where she bought her shoes.

Uhhhhmm – I got a pair of shoes here that I bought the other day." What's he doing, huh? This is a skid, isn't it?

Well, if you're a real stupid, poorly trained auditor, you would believe because of the tradition of man with regard to remember, you would believe that we were trying to run this not-knowingness to find out some hidden knowingnesses. No, we're not. We're running not-knowingness to get rid of it. And we don't give a darn what he knows. It has no significance beyond the fact that he has a lot of not-knowingness dammed up with a lot of stable data and he's doing this skid.

He's something-now, look how he'd be in life. Look how he'd be in life.

Look at that hopeless state this individual would be in if he was reactively doing this, consistently and continually, right on down the line, all the time.

Supposing he were doing this. He goes out here, there's a car parked and he says, "Well, I don't care what kind of a car that is," kind of occurs to him and – goes right around and looks at the radiator. He walks up the street and says – sees a little sign on the mailbox and the mailbox says "Collected at such and such and such and such and such and such," and he says, "I never write anybody any mail. Why should I? When is it collected?" You get this skid principle. They slide from one to two or from three to four.

Now, let's see it operating in a more reactive line: forget to remember.

Now, forget and remember are not totally reactive, you understand, but they contain not-ness and so forth. So, the individual says, "Well, I'll just have to forget her. I see her face before me." Now, that is simply the skid principle, nothing else more significant than that, just as easy as that. He see – tries to forget something or he decides to forget something or he thinks that something is forgotten and he remembers it. Now, there is a little test on this. If you were to say to an individual who was trying to remember something desperately, "Well, tell me something you could forget," he would come up with the datum he is trying to remember.

See, hell skid from that forget into remember.

Forgetting is not-ising knowingness which makes it the third postulate.

And remembering is recreating the forgotten thing. We're just running on postulates one, two, three, four. So an individual who is obsessively trying to forget, will at length do nothing but remember.

Saw a cartoon one day that knew more than everything in Freud's textbook. Individual came in and said to the analyst, he said, "All day long I just go along with this horrible, grim reality." So, there he – he's unable to forget anything, you know. He can't go into a nice fantasy or delusion, can't have himself a nice spin now and then; he's wrecked. An individual would be in this kind of a condition, he'd be an army captain, let us say. And an army captain is supposed to report to the mess hall at such and certain times and inspect the chow and is supposed to do this and supposed to do that and he's supposed to do this and he's supposed to do that and he would start going through these motions. It'd become more and more routine, more and more automatic and one fine day after he had been at this for a few years, why, somebody would be sitting alongside of the road fixing a tire and he would come along. You know, he wouldn't be able to fix the tire? That's not part of his routine as an army captain. "Fix a tire," you tell a sergeant.

So, this guy is a civilian and the army captain is now out of the framework of the army and there's no sergeant. But the person who has the flat tire is a frail, little girl who couldn't possibly use a jack. What do they do?

Well, the least that will happen is the army captain will probably 1.5 about the whole thing. You know, get mad at the jack, mad at the tire, and so forth.

He's liable to get real upset. Why? It's off his beat. It's off his reactive beat.

And that's not too good an example. He is remembering, don't you see, by action, consistently and continually. He will then depend more and more upon what he remembers and more and more upon his action and less and less upon his ability to simply not-know and know. What's the trouble with him?

He has lost the ability to say, "I am not an army captain." To not-know himself as an army captain and to know himself suddenly as a garage mechanic or a service station man. If he were in very good shape – you see, in spite of how much routine he'd been through or

anything else – in very good shape he'd suddenly say, "Well-" as he lays aside his coat and stars and bars and so forth, he would simply say, "well, good garage mechanic like myself..." You've often heard people say things like this being in pretty good shape, rather kiddingly, you know, "Well a good electrician like me can fix that up." You know, guy isn't an electrician at all, he's a bookkeeper. See, but he's in pretty good shape and he goes ahead and fixes it up. Why?

He can not-know himself and know himself as something else and then not-know himself as that new thing and know himself as the old thing with no fixedness.

Sooner or later, he'll get trapped into the idea of having to forget he is an army captain or forget he is a bookkeeper and remember from some other area or past how you fix a tire or fix an electric light switch. And he's dead.

And that's why Beingness Processing is such a fantastic process. But Beingness Processing now has a new command, "Give me some things you could be or not be," type of command.

You could say, "Give me some things now that you could not be. Some things you don't know how to be." The guy will turn up on that one the earliest and most horrible thing that has ever been done to anybody, which is, "know thyself." If your total capability depends upon you being unconsciously you, simply doing things, you know, we have the individual who is told to know thyself wiping out all of his not-knownness and becoming a fixed identity and a fixed beingness.

Another type of Beingness Processing which doesn't work is: "Be something now which would not be known. What could you be that wouldn't be known?" Involvedness of this character. But let me show you that it's as important to be able to not be something, as to be something. And when you yourself as an auditor can not be an auditor and be an auditor at will, and then if you suddenly become something else, to be it or not be it and be an auditor again at will, you're in there cooking.

But if you're an auditor doing something else or if you are a business executive who is now auditing, you've had it. You're right into that reactive swing. You're forgetting and remembering in the level of action. You should be able to not be an auditor and be a garage mechanic or a bishop or anything else, see, and then not be a bishop.

Actually your ability to communicate to people is to approximate a terminal with which they will communicate rapidly, not condescendingly but simply not be what you're being and be something else.

So, rapidity of be and not be is very vital and this depends upon an individual's ability to know and not-know, and these two things are of comparable magnitude and almost comparable value in processing, except of course, be and not be implies that the individual has mass.

How do you do Union Station? You do it first by knowing all these theoretical backgrounds. You know such things as the skid principle. You know about exteriorization

and you carry it on up to a level keeping up tremendous amounts of acknowledgment and communication. You carry it on up at a level where the individual at last goes into two-way communication with you and his fellow man.

Now, the actual commands – which are used with your knowledge of all this other material – the actual commands is something you don't know about that person. You indicate the person. "Give me something you don't know about that person," you say to the fellow, and he says, "Well, um-a-di-dum-badum, let's see, uh – see – uh – see – uh – see – see. I know he's not wearing a hat." Well, now if you suddenly jack him up and make him clarify his terms and all that sort of thing with you, you're liable to bust two-way communication. So you gently infer to him in the next five or six questions that he is not quite hitting on all four cylinders. You want to know something he doesn't know about that person.

Now, your criticalness of the preclear is very light, very slight. You don't care whether he gives you something horribly abstract or something very common or anything else. You just want to be satisfied, not by nagging him but – because remember you're usually running a person who's below two-way communication, he won't stand any nagging, he'll just shut up. You just run him very gently and you say, "Give me something you don't know about that person, now that person over there, the girl in the red hat, give me something you don't know about her." "Huhhhh. Well, I don't know where – I don't know where she bought her stockings" "Okay. That's fine. That's very good. That's swell." Totally adequate answer. Lord knows how many fixations on stockings you just blew – that isn't your business. You don't care anything about it one way or another. You pick out another person and say, "Give me something you don't know about that person." Simple.

All right, one person after the other. One shot per each. You level this thing down until two things happen on that side of the question: until the person is through the entire session with just that one side or until he boils off. And he all of a sudden starts to dope and boil off, flip the question or in any event change it by the time the next session comes around.

Now, what's the second – you change it for the next session. You'll run the other side and this other side is: "Something that person does not know about you," that's the auditing command. "Tell me something that person does not know about you." Now, you can, of course word these things in such a way that they communicate, but "don't have to know," and so forth, has been found to be a little bit enforcing and it's a little more complicated. Let's always use the simpler formula. So, "Something that person doesn't know about you," and the preclear goes on and you would run that question for the whole next session or until the preclear boiled off, at which moment you would reverse the question.

Of course you give them lots of acknowledgment and you say yes – a lot more conversation and acknowledgment has to be used on this obviously than would ordinarily be used on a process.

All right. Now what do we mean by flipping the question?

It's very simple, we say, "Something you don't know about that person?" and he's answered this question about forty times, you pro – about forty different people or the same

person twice or three times, that's perfectly all right, you see – you know, the woman in the red hat, the man with the pink pants, the girl with the wooden shoes, the little boy with the baby brother and you can go right back to the woman with the red hat. See, one question per each. We don't care how many times we hit these people but we don't hit them one, one, one, "Woman with the red hat – something you don't know about the woman with the red hat – something you don't know about the woman with the red hat – something you don't know about the woman with the red hat." You're liable to unmock her.

All right. So we just hit this.

Now, what do we mean by flipping the question?

All of a sudden you've asked – the little boy with the baby. You've said to the preclear for about the dozenth time now, "Give me something you don't know about the little boy over there with the baby brother" and the preclear says, "Nyaaaaauh, well. Huh?" "I said give me something you wouldn't mind the little boy with the baby brother knowing about you." "Oh, is that what you said? Oh, I see. I got you, yeah. Well, I don't mind if he knows I'm standing here." Now, how long do you run this?

You just run it until he's out of the boil-off and then you flip the question again. See, until he's good and alert, then flip the question again and you'll all of a sudden find out the boil-off point has disappeared. You don't run it the other way until he boils off in the other direction. You got it? You don't run this from boil-off to boil-off.

Now, get how you do this? He gets groggy, so you flip the question. Now, if you're a real sharp auditor you will notice he's getting groggy before he ever finds it out and you'll flip the question. You'll notice the declining curve of alertness and you will know that about five minutes from now he's going to be wanting to lie down somewhere. And you just flip the question at that moment and you run it until he's good and bright and alert, and then flip it again and get back to that question that made him boil off. The question that made him boil off, of course, was – let us – usually would be, "Something that person does not know about you," and he runs this and a boil will occur. It'll occur much more often on that end, because this is something he doesn't much contemplate.

All right. Now he started to boil and you said, "Now give me something you don't know about that person. Give me something you don't know about that person, something you don't know about that person, something you don't know about that person, something you don't know about that person."

Good. Something you don't know about that person. Good, Fine. That's swell.

Good. Fine. That's right." "Now, did you know I acknowledged you?" "How's – oh – did ya? Yeah, so you did. Yeah, that's interesting. Hey, what do you know, you've been saying that all the time, haven't you?" You know, some kind of persiflage like this. Anyway, he gets – he gets to remembering, after a while, that he's in an auditing session and he's alert and he's feeling better about it, and then you say, "Now give me something that person doesn't know about you" and you'll find he'll go a little bit longer this time. And all of a sudden he doesn't boil off in that direction at all.

Boil-off is not therapeutic. The number of hours a person boils off is not a measure of how fast they're getting Clear. Made an adequate test of this a long time ago.

Now, there's an alternate process which an auditor can throw in at any time. Let's say that the individual cannot grasp these syllables. They're going whirr-clunk. Something he doesn't know. "Uh – something I don't know, ummm – something-uh – what did you say? Uh – let me see, that's a real interesting question you asked there. Uh – I don't mind knowing anything about the person." You're having semantic difficulty, an inability to resolve the auditing question. Now, if you don't think that's important, you're not a good auditor.

Sooner or later a question – an auditing question won't communicate. You can actually run a person for half an hour doggedly, bullheadedly, stupidly on your part and the individual doesn't know what you're saying. He's never rationalized it.

For instance, you tell somebody, "Invent a game." Somebody right in this room I had to tell that to one time – and this person went on for fifteen minutes describing various known games to me and I kept saying, pointedly, "Invent a game" and the person would say, "Well, tennis – tennis – checkers." "Good. That's fine. Invent." I was darn near getting that word up in neon lights. But to this moment that person has never flattened that process.

You know why? The person never started on the process. Isn't that a real good reason for never flattening one?

Well, when an auditing system does not communicate, that is to say, when you have this type of question, you got noncommunication.

In Union Station, you go off to an entirely different process which is simply R2, I think, 47 and it is a very interesting process. It is the same process. It simply says to the individual, "Find a person around here you're separate from." "Find a person I am separate from." Now, this is observable in terminals. There is no abstract matter here at all. It's quite observable and the person will look through the crowd – and this person, by the way, will carefully search and finally find some old bum or something or – oh no, probably usually some good-looking, well-dressed young fellow or something and say, "I'm separate from that person." See?

First choice. Then you just go on with this question as though you're running Union Station and it's got a reverse: "Now find a person out there who is separate from you." And the person very often will not see that this is a reversal. They'll cognite on it sooner or later. Run the same thing – they'll still boil off on this sort of thing. You run that separateness process.

Now, the – this alternate process also does something else which you should be cognizant of and which is terribly important. It brings about an exteriorization if run long enough and is a process you could jump into if the person started to yo-yo.

Now, you know what a yo-yo is? The person says, "You know, I think I'm – no I'm not out of my head but I had the funniest feeling I – I'm out of my head right now. I mean, I

kind of look – no I – I – uh..." Now, sometimes when this yo-yo occurs, when they start bouncing in and out of their skull, they very often go out of control as a preclear.

Now, you get that phenomena?

They go out of control as a preclear. They go into autocontrol. You found that you exteriorized them but they were auditing a circuit all the time, and so therefore, they go on auditing the circuit but you're not auditing them.

They think you're interfering with them now auditing the circuit. You're auditing the circuit. They're auditing the circuit. Get out of my road, they kind of feel and they will go banging and caroming all over the room or the universe, sometimes, real upset. And the way you get around that is that separateness thing. Just keep them at it. It's a good, simple command, see. They can bang all around the room and still answer it. So, that is actually a lower level or an emergency interjection into Union Station – that separateness.

Now, you run Union Station with tremendous amounts of acknowledgment and two-way communication, knowing the Auditor's Code, following it very closely. You run it best walking around, not sitting down. You run it in parks, bus stations, but not in federal airports. You run it in places where you are relatively inconspicuous but are part of the public. You can walk through crowds running it. You don't have to sit down as a fixed spot. You can get out on the traffic of F Street and simply walk down S Street running Union Station and these are excellent places to run it. And the essence of it is simply to keep the preclear in-session, aware that a session is in progress, aware of an auditor, acknowledge, vary your process only to match his understanding of it and that variation is simply to make sure that he's doing what you say but you don't nag him too much because you'll break his two-way communication. Keep up an even flow of communication with him. He'll talk more easily and more easily and more easily to you.

Now, the negative side, is today the official Union Station as far as you're concerned and will be that way in the next HCA manual and the other is a peculiar test Union Station, see, negative side. Now, experience I am sure will bear this out.

Well, that's the way – the way you run Union Station, and I hope it helps you out.

Thank you very much and good night.

Thank you.