

UNION STATION – R2-46

A lecture given on 30 August 1955

Want to talk to you about the goals of Scientology, now, and the process that leads immediately and directly to them.

You're in essence studying about people. Therefore, a process which led directly to the subject of people would be quite a process, wouldn't it? And we have such a process called Union Station. This process is not new but in its use it is new. It is R2-46 in your Creation of Human Ability. Union Station is simply a variation of the process. It is a method of running it so that it doesn't spin your preclear in.

There are many ways that you could run R2-46 that would practically spin your preclear. One of the ways: "Find something wrong with that person." Well, of course, maybe if you ran it long enough you would get to a point where the individual was – you could look at anybody and find something wrong with him, too; that's part of your ability – should be. But you wouldn't really be able to do that with impunity and stay unspun unless you started out finding something good about that person. You'd at least have to do that.

But more important would be the process, "Find something you know about that person." Know is your highest level of relationships, so we'd start with the highest level of relationship. Now, if you found something you knew about a great many people and things, you would then run out a great many things you didn't know about them. But if you simply went on finding things you didn't know about them, believe me, you would wind up with more things you didn't know about them.

Now, we have subjected this rather pitilessly to test over a period of a year – the entheta-theta differentiations in processing. We have discovered that there are many ways to run entheta out of the preclear, with considerable impunity, but we have come upon a new definition of a limited process.

In the first hour I was just talking to you kind of highly generalized. I'm talking to you very, very specifically now.

We have here the definition of a limited process. It is that process which is entirely devoted to as-ising errors or wrongnesses – and that's limited. Why?

It depends on the willingness of the preclear to live! And when that willingness is high he can, of course, regard many wrongnesses with considerable impunity, but when it is low, he can't. You see that?

So as auditors, just as a government, we are dependent upon the willingness of the person to live. And being dependent upon that, we can, in a person who is very willing to live, then take the considerable risk of as-ising a bunch of entheta in the case. We can knock out,

address, walk up to, handle unwillingness to live, because we've already assumed his willingness to live, that's there, and so then we can handle unwillingness to live.

Now, this is the riddle and the mystery of why cases sometimes can run engrams and heavy incidents and sometimes can't – a puzzle which was very, very apparent as early as the fall of 1950. Some could and some couldn't.

Same way. We say some were willing to live and some weren't. Some had a tremendous fund of life and this fund of life, you might say, (unfortunate to speak of it quantitatively) but this fund of life was sufficient to address and vanquish a great deal of unwillingness to live.

We took preclear after preclear, right in a line. Some of them could run birth and some of them couldn't that about it. See the difference amongst preclears?

Well, let's just put this difference just on this level: his willingness to survive and his willingness to succumb. Now, a person who is in terrific condition can be willing to survive or willing to succumb at will, see, just at will.

But oh, what condition this individual would have to be in! He'd have to be a lot higher than any human being you ever ran into. You said it! So, that just as a government is entirely dependent for its survival upon the willingness of its populace to survive, so are we as auditors dependent on the willingness of the preclear to survive. And when we take that for granted and don't examine it at all, then we find a puzzle and the puzzle is: some preclears can run heavy incidents and some preclears can't; some preclears can run "invent a wrongness" and some preclears can't; some preclears can stop themselves thinking and some preclears when they stop themselves thinking, spin in. Why?

Now, right here you get a great oddity. We get an individual who is apparently only willing to succumb. Ah, no, no. See, he's not only willing to – that's the wrong level. Just like I said, it's the high command that is the less stupid high command that can win the war. Now, this preclear is simply less unwilling to survive. See, he's in good shape, he's less unwilling to survive.

All right. And we get a preclear who is less unwilling to survive and we find out we can get away with the doggonedest processes and the puzzle is answered right there. And if we keep regarding as an automaticity, as just something that we, you know, it's just there – this willingness to survive -then we will have an interesting history as an auditor and that history will be this: some preclears got well and some preclears didn't.

Now, when a preclear is telling you obsessively everything that is wrong with everybody around him and everything that is wrong with the world and isn't envisioning really anything that could be right with it – you see, this is quite two different things. It's just the fellow who finds things wrong and then there's the fellow who looks around and finds out how much righter could things get. See, that's just two different levels here. We discover that this individual's critical level (you understand that – critical level) is such as to indicate that his willingness to survive is minimal. Got it?

Now, let's take this thing of a single datum – it's a double-datum universe, double-data universe – and just one datum here is saying about all other data, "they're wrong." What's this datum think about itself? Tricky, huh?

This individual could not possibly support the subject of goodness inside of himself if he found everything else wrong, because goodness would not stand there as knowledge, so therefore he couldn't be cogniting on the subject of his own goodness. It would be some kind of an automaticity or something which would rapidly fade out, because there isn't anything else good in the world.

And so individuals get to a period where they are unwilling to survive and thereafter spin in on a curve which is awfully steep and they start telling you, "Well, Joe, he's a bum. And Bill, he's a bum. And everything is no good and the cars won't run and all dogs bite and all Negroes are no good and all – all Russians are dogs." This individual can go down to a level where he excuses all this by saying he has to continue an impartial view of all things.

My God! What's happened when he did that? Oh, boy! He's not even vaguely part of a game. He's an observer of the game. He's maintaining an impartial view. He can't even be partisan anymore. See? His impartiality – he must just observe, observe. He isn't part of the game. His individuality has become so automatic that he is not there. His criteria and criticalness is no longer required in the game.

Any science which sets itself out to be simply an observational science is a doomed science and the individuals who practice it are equally doomed.

Nuclear physics is a good science except for one unfortunate remark that was made by a very famous man, the late Albert Einstein: scientist is an observer and an observer has no right to do anything but stand there and look at the needle. No! No! No! So we give as a stable datum every nuclear physicist, in study, the destructive datum that will finish his career: the only thing he has any right to do is observe. Mmm. That, by the way, is below inhibited knowledge, see? He's gone on a complete buttered all over the universe attitude. He's no longer a participant. Many times you will mistake this for pan-determinism. It isn't pan-determinism, it's "pan-don't-care-ism." All right. Wherever we discover the willingness to survive or the willingness to live let us say – slightly different than the willingness to survive – the willingness to live is low in a preclear, then it is up to us as an auditor to bolster it.

Now, a thetan might have a willingness to live independent of the body's willingness to live and we may have a thetan who is perfectly willing for this body to die right now in its tracks and he himself is willing to live.

But how willing to live is this thetan? He's not so willing to live that he'll let something else live too, see? So he's got an interesting view there -very interesting view. Just because something is an object or if some life is in an object form, is sometimes enough for a thetan to kill it. Why? Because it doesn't – isn't duplicating him; but a thetan himself is not very willing to survive, create or do anything else. All right.

Now, here we have, then, something which looks to you like a quantity -life. In the preclear we would have something like a quart of life or a ton of life or a pound of it or something of the sort, see, or 20,000 pounds per square inch of life. It's very easy to describe

this as a quantity but it is a misnomer to do so. It's really – there is no quantity there at all. What there is, is a willingness, a concatenation of considerations which end up with abundance of life or practically none at all. It's just a series of considerations and the series of considerations could be this: life is horrible, life is horrible, life is terrible, life is unliveable. I can't possibly live and I can't die. It's too painful to die. I couldn't possibly let myself die, nobody will let me die – and you have a person in an insane asylum. He's just between those two things. That's the only thing that's happening to a person in an insane asylum. You can test this out and you should someday. He's merely convinced that he cannot die and he's convinced that he cannot live. Between these two points is insanity.

It means no-reach-no-withdraw. He can't go on living; he can't withdraw from living. He's stuck so he's insane.

The insane itself has also an emotion that goes along with it and when this becomes very acute, with a lot of force mixed up with it, he experiences something called the feeling of insanity. You'll run into it sometime. We call it the glee of insanity.

But it's just this can't-live-can't-die situation. All you'd have to do is imbalance this either by letting him die or fixing it up so he can live. Now, it's a little more difficult to fix up a person so he can live than to kill him. It's a little more work. That is why they have wars. See? It's much more easy for the society to go into wars than into "lives." Did you ever have a society-hear of a society going into a big "live"?

Well, near you as an auditor have only to bolster this person's willingness to survive to have him kick out an enormous number of considerations about succumb and he seeks a new balance. But remember again there is no quantity here so there is no such thing as balance. He doesn't have to have eighty-two data that tell him to survive and eighty-two data that tell him to succumb, balanced, you see, to live a normal life. He just has the consideration he's going to survive or the consideration he's going to succumb and these two things are just the basic stable data.

All right. Now, as he goes along then-he's made up his mind to die, to die, to die, to die – and you come along and you tell him live, live, live, live, live. Well, now, you start telling him "live" and its opposite stable datum is "die." So what will he do? He'll go on living. I want you to see this very clearly that the condition of livingness is no less artificial than the condition of dyingness. I want you to see this dearly and get off any big mawkish sentimentality on the subject, see? Let's just be factual about the whole thing.

Let's look at it now. If this business of livingness is a consideration and the business of dyingness is a consideration, the only thing you're upsetting are considerations. So you get an individual to concentrate on one or the other and you get the other. Now, you see, we concentrate on living and well start running out dying. We start concentrating on dying and he'll run out living! Now, there's another mechanical thing which enters in with time called a second postulate. The first postulate, if he's in the time stream, is automatically present – but please, Scientologists, look at this – it is automatically present. It just happens to be there. It might be designed – it could be designed in a thousand different ways, but not in this universe. We just are so obsessed with the idea of survival that we think that survival and living is the only thing there is to do.

Yet we had some Hessian regiments over here during the Revolutionary War who had an entirely different philosophy, not because life was horrible at all. Whole squads would go out and sit in a hollow depression of ground and sit around and mourn to each other about how awful it was – no, pardon me, they wouldn't mourn to each other, they'd mourn to themselves – about how awful it was and then they'd kick the bucket. Over in Peking I have seen coolies who just didn't want to live anymore, so they'd go and sit down in front of their grave and will themselves to death in about three days and they'd give the gatekeeper a few coppers to shove them in and throw some stuff. It's over there at Coal Hill. They probably do it today. It's probably driving the communists nuts.

But here we have – here we have the fact that an individual is in the time stream and therefore he's running on this postulate: survive-succumb.

That is the order of postulate. See, the second-postulate principle is only present when you have a time continuum. We have a time continuum and we are alive and therefore we're concentrating on this as the first postulate, survive, and as the second postulate, succumb. So we've got our second postulate. Well, that's – just happens to be the way it's constructed – it doesn't have to be constructed that way at all. So we get rather automatically a run-out of the second postulate; we start hitting the first postulate.

So if we have know – secret – by the way, that's the dichotomy. It's know-secret. It's not know-don't know. It's quite important to you in the science of knowledge to know that that is the order; that is the dichotomy. It's know-secret, see? Those are the two opposites.

Know-suppressed knowingness. It isn't know-negative knowingness.

All right. So we get this survive-succumb. It'll be know-secret. It'll be live-die, good-bad, see? It will be motion-stopped; it'll be space – no space.

See? Those are your first and second postulates in this universe. So if we go on the basis of what we consider good, then we will automatically have the survival postulates, which are the first postulates which run out the second postulates. The second postulate is the effective postulate because it depends on the first postulate to keep going. The second postulate can be stopped but it – the stopped postulate can keep traveling because it's got a start postulate behind it.

Did you ever stop a car that was sitting still? You could go through the motions of doing so, couldn't you? You could change your consideration and say, "I stopped this car." See how simple it would be? Nothing to it. You stopped the car. There's going to be no heat in the brake drums, not a bit. There's going to be no semblance of a car having just been stopped either, unless you really rigged it up as on a movie set. Now, here you've had the consideration that a car is in motion and then it's stopped. And you go around and say, "Gee, that was a terrible accident.

Ohhhh! Horrible accident." Keep talk-talk-talk about this horrible stop, see?

This horrible stop, horrible stop, horrible stop. What the devil keeps this horrible stop floating in the time stream? It's way back on the track – I mean it happened yesterday or

something like that. We still say horrible stop. It's the fact that something was in motion before something stopped.

Now, we could as easily say, "Well, the car was running, the car was running, the car was running, the car was running, and there'd go the accident. You got it? See? Now, how would you really run out an accident on a person who couldn't as-is and was having a hard time and stumbling all over the place? How would you run out one? You'd just have him get the idea of a car traveling, a car traveling, a car traveling, a car traveling. You'd take him out in traffic and have him watch cars traveling. You know, after a pilot has had a crash, they almost always take him by the scruff of the neck, if he's still even vaguely in one piece, and put him in the plane again and have him fly. They're just trying to run out that – that crash by motion, see? The wrong way to do it is to sit down, if you want to run out the accident. Of course, if you want the accident in restimulation and you think you should succumb, why, by all means stick with the accident. See? It's a matter of choice.

All right. The survive-succumb order of the first and second postulate then therefore dictates to us – it's already been dictated because it's the universe we're living in – that we'd have know-secret as the highest order of things and also as the Know to Mystery Scale. What is this Know to Mystery Scale but the know-secret scale. So, if we start plugging know, know, know, know, well get – that one will go, that one will go, that secret will go, that secret will go, don't you see? Know, know, know, know, see, that secret will go. See how simple? Nothing much to it – in practice. A lot to it in theory.

Practically nothing to it in practice as long as you know enough to run the survival aide of the postulate, because I insist that this society does frown on succumbing. People come to you and the society adjudicates the processing and judges you and judges the preclear all on the survival basis.

Truth of the matter is, people invert on this after a while, when they've been plugging on it, and they think only things that are sur – are dead are good. "The only good Indian is a dead Indian." You ever hear that in some past life? Anyhow – newspaper reporter: "The only story is a bad story"? The only good story is a bad story – William Randolph Hearst. He had that datum thoroughly. Well, he's just inverted. He hasn't escaped the laws of this universe because part of them is, is if you press one side too long you're going to get the other one.

But how would you do this? You would say this: "Only good Indian is a dead Indian? All right. Point out a good Indian. Point out a good Indian.

Point out a good Indian." After a while, why, you'd have a survival condition.

If you want a survival condition, you merely process in the direction of a survival condition, see? If you want a succumb condition, process in that direction. Only that's not done in this society, you see?

All right. This is simplicity itself then – why and how you start running such a process as Union Station. Simplicity. Union Station is first and foremost a process which takes the individual out of obsessed oneness and puts him into the swim again.

One of the first things that's illustrative of this is that it shows him there are other bodies in the world and therefore he doesn't have to be so darned careful as this one – of this one so as to never enjoy it. That's the first thing it'll do for him. It'll say, "Now, look, you haven't got the only body there is." He gets so bad off, by the way, that he looks at his own body and then doesn't see it anymore at all. He's practically disappeared as an individual. You usually get these people – they are a no-body case, they haven't got one, they aren't an individual, neither is anybody else; yet this process still works on them. You ask them just find people, one after the other, and tell you something they really know about each one of those people.

Now, the oddity is – "really know something about the people" is a very senior process to "something good about that person," but "something good about that person" would still work. It would start to unglue more energy however. More energy would start to move around.

"Tell me something that's good about that person. Tell me something that's good about that person. Something that's good about that person." You -more electronics would arise because good seems to be closer to energy. It just seems to be. We associate the word good with food and motion and so forth, and aesthetics. So "something you really know about that person" gets there more swiftly. "What do you really know about him?" Now, it doesn't matter what your preclear says, as long as he really knows it. You don't even badger your preclear about this.

He would say, "Well, I really know – I really know..." This is the first question you've asked him. "I really know that that girl is obsessed on the subject of legerdemain." Now, I'll tell you how to run a good succumb session. Want to know how to run a good succumb session?

"Now, what do you really know about that person?" "Well, I know that that woman is really an expert on legerdemain." "No! Do you really know that? What did you just say you knew about them? Who, which – which girl? Oh, that one over there? And what did you just say about them? You really know that? Are you sure that's the case?"

Well, do you know – what is legerdemain anyhow?" And then say, "Oh hell," and sit back. Now, that's a good way to run it on a succumb fashion. Now, it wouldn't matter whether this person started out -and very usually – you see what's wonderful is, this process even takes in and includes the mystic, the person with tremendous mystic background. They start in saying, "I know that that person's aura will be a gold-pink color at 8:32 tonight." And you say, "I don't know that – about that person, (to yourself, you know, see). What the hell's going on around here?" Funny part of it – maybe the person's gold-pink aura will be gold-pink at 8:82. So what! You asked the preclear something the preclear really knew about that person; and you can actually go in some of these eases twenty, thirty hours getting answers of this kind but they will become less and less of this nature as the person more and more moves out from an observer into merely being an "only one." (You recognize that being an observer is lower than being an "only one.") They move from being an observer, into being an "only one," into being a participant, and you've got it, see? You just move them out of that rugged individualism characteristic, too – that goes too, but that's just one stop on this observer, "only

one," rugged individual – "the best" comes in there someplace – and so forth over here. And all of a sudden the person says – you're processing this girl and she says, "Oh! That's another girl over there," and meant, "besides myself." And you say, "Hey, what do you know!" Now, you'd say automatically and immediately that this person's knowingness would have decreased. Their conviction of their own knowingness would have decreased. Got that – their conviction of their own knowingness. But they'd get smart. They get smarter and smarter and smarter. About what? About people! Here's some interesting things occur. How can you understand something if you're the only datum?

Now, remember what I told you about knowledge? The tin can? You've got at least to have a crock over here alongside of it to evaluate the tin can.

You could say, "Now, aside from this crock, this tin can is the only object present." See, that's not quite correct, is it? It's the only tin can present; but most people are in this kind of a state: they've got a room full of tin cans and they've got one tin can picked out as being the only tin can in the room and the whole room's full! Well, does this mean that an individual isn't valuable, that he shouldn't himself hang on to his individualities and characteristics and his own brilliance and that these are bad? No, it doesn't mean that these are bad at all.

It means these things can move him out into not having any concourse with anything else. It can move him out to where bodies are so scarce that he can't even have a body. And, by golly, you know, if you're living in a world of bodies and you can't have a body, you don't have any fun. You spend all your time being careful of the body. There are no other bodies. You can't have another body. Well, maybe you can't have another body while you're being one body, but if you can't have any other bodies at all, don't go to any parties! The fun you have at a party is dependent on how many bodies you can have there. Not on the second dynamic either – just this fact. You won't get any enjoyment of anything there.

You know it's a terrible strain. I know what I'm talking about. I used to go to literary teas – young author – literary teas-around New York. They're held exclusively by matronly ladies who have no social position but who want one. And if they hold enough literary teas, you see, then everybody concedes that they have the only social position in some field. They get there one way or the other. They aren't really, though, trying to find a group or do anything; I never could really find out why this was going on but I used to go to them anyway. That was a ghastly strain because everybody was under such a strain. Everybody was under a strain, but the person who was mainly under a strain would be my fellow authors who would get very upset if another author was there.

Well, I never played much of an "only one" characteristic in authoring. I used to write under a half a dozen different pen names at any given year. I had another half a dozen and would – was perfectly prone at these tea parties to represent myself as Alexander Woollcott, who I didn't even look like, you know; perfectly willing to do things like this, and it was very upsetting to writers in general, many of whom, particularly when they're not successful, get into "only one" characteristics, you know, and this is the – the way it'd go, see?

But these guys weren't having any fun et all. They couldn't – it wasn't this condition that they couldn't participate in the party – they weren't there! They weren't at the party! They weren't at home writing either! They weren't doing anything. They were dislocated and would

come away from it miserable. One of the best ways to handle it in the opinion of most of these boys was simply to get drunk. That's a good way to solve the problem of you can't get from here to there.

So, wherever – wherever you see this "only oneism" or the outside observerism or something of the sort creeping in on the situation more and more and more and more – in other words further and further out – you get less and less participation, you therefore get less and less enjoyment, and oddly enough you go down Tone Scale from "know" till you wind up as a total secret. Oh, you can become very enigmatic.

Someday when you're over in Egypt, either during a session or when you're over in Egypt as a body, knock on the Sphinx. Awfully solid – awfully solid. And she isn't having a bit of fun – I asked her once.

Now, wherever – wherever we get this departure from identities, you see – I mean, we get a departure from the fact, well, let's all consent to have identities, you see? Let's all have identities. And now we depart from that to where a person has the only identity, that game isn't being played anymore. Some other game is probably being played but certainly this game of identity isn't being played anymore because we have the only identity in the midst of all these identities – and that is silly, of course.

Now, these individuals sit around and start worrying about themselves and start picking up things like psychoanalysis and all sorts of things to find out about themselves. Why? Because they've become a secret to themselves! Bzzt! In other words, they've moved out as an identity out here until they were a secret to themselves. Well, what is this but aberration? Finally, they get a stable datum – I'm a secret. I'm unknowable.

We get Archbishop "Shenanigan" Sheen whistling through his false teeth on the subject of... You know, I was perfectly willing to sit and listen to that man until one day he started talking about: "You wouldn't let strangers come into your house, would you? Well, of course you wouldn't." You wouldn't do this and you wouldn't do that, all on a privacy basis; and he was really getting worked up in some direction, and I sat there saying, "What tricks is he working up?" "Therefore, you wouldn't let anybody investigate your mind, would you?" I said to myself, "Dong." The Catholic church has always been renowned, according to itself, as having the only psychotherapy that was effective amongst men. And all of a sudden here we have. this clown, standing up in the name of the Catholic church, saying that we mustn't have any investigation of any kind and we mustn't let anybody invade our knowingness in any way. And he was getting more and more colorful on this subject till, you know, I got the spooky notion that that fellow was working an operation on people. You know, I didn't quite hear the ring of sincerity in what he was saying anymore.

If Catholicism is something that's so shaky that an investigation of a Catholic will shake his faith, why sit and listen to somebody on something that has that little strength, you know? Why not study the strength of the left-hand hind leg of a grasshopper.

It's a study in weaknesses then, isn't it? So I says, "The devil with it." But they're throwing a constant and continual pitch in this direction.

Now, invasion of privacy can be very upsetting, but do you know something? You process a preclear for a little while on the subject of invasion of privacy and you'll get him in trouble.

Here's an example. I – processing somebody one day – I had him roaming around and squaring things up and doing this and that and so forth and I asked him to be three feet in back of an old lady's head and patch up something in her head. Well, if you think it over for a moment you'll realize that if you can handle one body you can certainly handle another body because you didn't own the second body any more than you owned the first body – you didn't make either of the bodies; you had some share and responsibility in doing so but you didn't and there isn't any reason why he couldn't have pushed the same number of ridges around in the old lady's head that he was pushing around in his own head, now was there? And yet he withdrew and winced and said, "No, no, no, no. No, that's – mustn't fool around with anybody else's body, you know. All against the rules." And after he got this into restimulation he stopped working. Perception went dim, he started to use facsimiles. I had to process him quite a little while to get him straightened out. He just hit this invasion of privacy.

Of course, we realize that it is necessary if you're going to have a game to have somebody located someplace, but you don't have to have everybody obsessively located and fingerprinted, do you? You don't have to have it fixed up so there's nobody can ever be anybody but himself. You look around the world at some of the people and you realize that they're – the necessity of being themselves only would be a pretty bad punishment, wouldn't it? Think of General Franco. Think of having to be nobody but General Franco all the time. Even he has done something desperate about that. He's imported a new monarch.

All right. Therefore, we're not moving in toward a great nirvana to make a tremendous collectivism of all individuals anywhere as one lump sum. This is not our goal. We are merely trying to recover a totality of knowledge on the subject of people, at which time your individuality and your associations will be a matter of choice, not a matter of obsession or compulsion. And that's the goal of Union Station. We're moving individuality, identity, other things, out of an obsessed or inhibited – first we move it out of an inhibited basis into merely an obsessed basis – into a basis of desire and into a line of free choice.

Now, how long does it take to do this? It takes a long time. I would say offhand that a hundred and fifty hours of Union Station would be necessary before one really had a good idea of how high a man could get. But I'd say seventy-five hours of it would be adequate to merely command the community if that's all you wanted to do. Fifty hours of it would certainly put you in a position where you would never feel ill at ease with people again. So you see there, different goals would be different amounts. Now, what you're basically running out is a bunch of time: how long have you spent as an individual; and if you're basically running this out then you have to put a little time in on auditing it.

All right. How do you run Union Station – very, very precisely – how do you run it? It has two questions: "What do you really know about that person?"

What would you permit that person to know about you?"-two questions. It is run in places like bus terminals, railway terminals, airports, any place where there are lots of people walking around. Not necessarily people sitting still, but there are lots of people in view – and

we mean live people. We do not mean that Union Station is run by letting the preclear lie in bed and thinking about people, see? It's not run that way. It's just run where live people are in direct view of the preclear.

And the first session or day or period of the process is simply run in this fashion: "What do you really know about that person?" indicating a person -over and over and over. Don't run the other side.

On and on and on, "What do you really know about that person?" Now, you could have two or three data for the person, for each person present, or just one datum for each person in view. Or you could hit the same person again several times or just do it on more or less of an accidental order.

We don't care. It doesn't matter. What we want to know is what does the preclear really know about that person. Got it?

Now, do we care what his classification is of answer? He says, "Well, I know that person will have a pink-gold aura at 8:32 tonight – I really know that." You'll say, "Okay. That's fine. Good. Now, what do you really know about that person," probably indicating another one. "Well, I know that person hates grapefruit." "Good. That's fine. Now, what do you know about that person?" "Well, that person had a terrible childhood." "Good. Fine." What do you know? I mean, this guy really may know these things. Who cares? The oddity is he'll eventually come down to being perfectly comfortable to know this about that person: "What do you really know about that person?" "That person has a head." "Fine. Good." Get the idea? How long does it take for him to get to that point? You merely want a great certainty on his part. You just want a certainty with regard to that. You just ask him, well, what's he really know about that person? We don't badger him but – he knows that person has a head. Well, up to that time he didn't know people had a head. He knew they had auras or he knew they had tattoo marks on the inside of the thigh and he knew all kinds of other things. All right! So what? Maybe he did know these things, maybe he didn't, but he supposed that he knew them. So that's enough and that's all you want.

All right. Now, let's run the other side of the question-for the next session. Now, that next session may be one hour, it may be five hours, but it's just the next session. We've run one side, one session – now, the other side, the next. "Now, what would you permit that person to know about you?" Now, "Good. Good." "Now, what would you permit that person over there to know about you?" "Good." "Now, you see that person over there with the red hat? What would you permit that person to know about you? Now, you see that man over there -that old man? What would you permit him to know about you?" Not, "Well, would you really permit him to know that?" See? Nah.

All right. You ask the preclear, "Now, what would you permit that girl in the red hat to know about you?" "Well, hhhhhmmmm, that-uh – that I'm good to cats." "Tine. Fine. Now, what would you permit that old man to know about you?" "That – that – gee, you know, he's an awful mean old fellow, isn't he?" "Well, what would you permit him to know about you?" "That – that I'll be old once, too." "That's fine. That's good. That's good," see? You just go on that way for the whole session, the whole period. We don't care if the session is an hour or a day. We're going to carry that on for that whole period.

Now, the third period would be, "What do you – what do you really know about that person?" again. See? That's the third one.

Fourth session. "Now, what would you permit that person to know about you?" And this is the way it goes. Now, it has been suggested that another one, "What would you permit that person to know about that person?" – it's been suggested, hasn't been tested. I don't imagine it would be harmful but it would certainly put your preclear in an observer class, wouldn't it? So I don't think it is vital that we run that side, but we could. If it worked out fine, okay. But we're running know, know, all the way along the line; k-n-o-w and nothing else. And we will find some of the darnedest things.

Now, we keep in two-way communication with the preclear – a necessity.

Now, the preclear says, "What do I really know about that person? Let me see – ooh! ooh!" You don't sit there like a dumb piece of mud. You say, "What's the matter?" See, invite that communication. "What's the matter? What's the matter with you?" "Well, I just thought, you know, all women in red hats – sure seems likely that if a woman would wear a red hat, she's pretty bad." And you say, "Is that so? Well, now, what do you really know about her?" "That she's wearing a red hat." "Good. Fine." Here we go, see? But don't let those communications drop.

You say, "All right, now what would you permit that boy over there to know about you?" And the preclear says, "Mnnnyeahhh!" You don't just keep asking the question. You say, "What you screaming about?" "I don't know. I don't know," something very vague.

Well, here's something else you don't do. You don't say, "Well now, how does it seem to you there? I mean – I mean, you got an idea about rape or anything like that? Did that occur to you at that moment? Was your mother ever scared about that sort of thing? Well, let's run some Straightwire on boys." You don't do that.

If the thing was ready to release, it would have released on this process.

You can count on this process to release things, so don't go chasing off on other processes. It's enough if he says, "Zzziz! Rowrr! That just upsets the hell out of me. That's what's the matter." And you say, "Well, good. What do you really permit that boy to know about you?" "I don't know! I just-just – just don't like that idea at all! I guess – he permit-I – permit him to know – I'm scared!" And you say, "Good!" That's a win. All right, another one. Get the idea?

Keep that two-way communication running. Find out what the preclear is talking about, what he's thinking about.

Well, now this is murder on a case for the good reason that you, as an auditor, are serving as a terminal with the other person, see? You're serving as a terminal. He's really looking and paying attention to two people, so that's why it's questionable if running "What would you permit that person over there to know about that person over there" is of any value. You're running that all the time.

All right. Your preclear will come up the line. How high can they come up the line? Don't ask me. The process is only a few weeks old in this form and frankly I can't find how

high it goes. It just keeps going up! The preclear just gets in better shape and better shape and better shape and better shape.

Well, I set up a test here recently. Let the preclear be run on Union Station for all of one intensive and then let the auditor (who didn't like Union Station) run the preclear on any good process he saw fit for the ensuing week. Now, we tested the preclear in the interim. We know where the preclear went on just Union Station. Now, there's two things that could happen: either the person can't be upset very badly by other processes or – don't you see? – or will improve or will just stay there. Now, I'll bet you the gain is not as great on just random processes. But we weren't even talking about basic processes. We were just talking about random processes.

All right. Therefore, we don't know really how high Homo sapiens can get – haven't any idea. You guys right here are going to be the first ones to have some inkling of this. See, you'll have some inkling of this, but I don't think well have the final answer for quite a while.

Now, here's another oddity about Union Station. It can be self-audited.

R2-46s can all – always be self-audited; so let us be very chary of self-auditing the thing if there's an auditor handy because it leaves part of the bracket hanging, you see? Nevertheless, you can get away with it as a self-audit. You can get away with it. Why? Because there are at least two terminals present. So if you found yourself in a theta trap you could always find out what was good about theta traps. It does give you an indicated process. Therefore and thereby there is no excuse today for an auditor being anything less than at least three times as willing to survive as Homo sapiens in general, because he could do it himself.

Now, I've run enough tests on auditors in way outflung points right now to know that there's more gain for an auditor in running Union Station on himself than there has been for the same auditors on other processes – self audited; but we know it would be better if it were audited on them by an auditor, but there's no auditors available in these spots. So you'd run it the same way – same way exactly. So we have an enormous gain here. We have a big win on this. But you understand that running it on yourself is nowhere near as good as getting it audited on you.

Now, this doesn't wipe away everything else that we know about auditing simply because we know a process. We're old hands at this – five years now – and every time we turn around, why, I've been coming up with a process that theoretically should have wiped out all other processes. Funny part of it is they did! But the point is that just because we know Union Station, we don't suddenly wipe out all other classes of process, because Union Station is part of the Six Basic Processes. It's Locational Processing using people -that's all it is. Got it? Using the principle of the first and second postulates.

Pretty tricky little package. It runs on almost any level of case. If an individual can be audited at all, he could certainly be audited on this Union Station variation of R2-46. If he could be audited at all he could be audited on this.

Now, the business of survive and succumb imbalances when the individual believes that all of the forces of life, nature and the universe are opposed to his survival and when they're all opposed to his succumbing, too. Sounds strange that you could get into a crosslock

of that character, but it'll tell you that there are very few psychotic people amongst primitives who are living in a dangerous environment. They don't go mad easily. You see that? The primitive environment where you're escaping from death three times a day, certainly that environment, a part of it at least, is very, very willing that you succumb.

There is no indecision there at all, is there? No hang-up, no maybe.

And yet there would be parts of that environment that are very willing for you to survive, because a tribe, pushed together in any way, shape or form, that is surviving at all is certainly a pretty dose-knit, co-survival unit, see? So there are a lot of people there real – who'd get real upset if anything happened to you because you're part of their unit, one way or the other. Even if you're a cripple, even if they have to just take care of you all the time.

Usually it fits in that you're still part of it, therefore there's always somebody around who wants you to live. If somebody wants you to live – somebody wants you to die, you're all set. Nobody wants you to live – nobody wants you to die, you're dead – you're alive – you're insane. Got the idea? See, here we have a basis of no solution – can't die-can't live.

Well, anybody who moves out into that bracket is no longer getting any cooperation in either living or dying, see? He's being an "only one." He's the only one living, the only one dying, see?

Soldiers don't go mad in battle in spite of the fact psychiatrists would love to have you believe that so you could think worse of yourself and your fellow man. Nobody goes nuts in a battle. They go nuts between battles when they sit around and hurry up and wait and hurry up and wait and nobody wants them to live and everybody kicks them around and nobody will let them kill anybody or die or anything else, held in a suspended animation of this character on some shore base. More people went mad in any day in the naval base in San Francisco than went mad in any six months in the South Pacific during World War II. That's actual statistics, by the way.

So they move out into this "only one" category – so their participation brings them in – so you don't have to worry about alive and dead. This starts working right on out. The mere fact that there are more bodies, more people, that they are part of something, itself removes them from this "only one" classification and as they are removed from it, thereafter they can decide to live or decide to die. And when they can do that, they're sane.

Therefore, Union Station is a very, very, very valuable process because it won't leave you high and dry without an auditor.

Now, in ordaining people in the field, we're going to require fifty hours of Union Station – audited, not self-audited – fifty hours audited by an auditor or two hundred hours self-audited – just to ordain somebody.

The goal of the clinic is working up toward: You process somebody and then they go home and take command of their environment, whether that environment is a small town or a big state. You see how this would be? They take command of the environment. Well, by taking command of the environment they just are trying to coax other people to "let's all play this game, too." But somebody's got to start it in some direction. After you've got all -after

you've got a clock blown all over the living room, somebody has got to come along and pick up the cogwheels, let me assure you.

So it's about time we picked up some cogwheels and got a clock running again because there are good games can be played here.

The principal game being played on Earth today is the game of "you can't play a game." Union Station remedies that, and remedying that it will remedy everything else that comes along the line, too. So therefore, I recommend this version of Locational Processing very, very strongly to you.

Thank you very much.