

02 The Philosophy of TROM

and Levels 2, 3 and 4

Research Notes

By Dennis Stephens

Edited for Publication by:

By Pete McLaughlin

Second Edition May 2014

Cover Design by Leona McLaughlin

**Be sure to visit the Website WWW.TROMhelp.com
for more information and resources to study and
apply the TROM therapy. Also join fellow
TROMers at the email group:
<http://lists.newciv.org/mailman/listinfo/trom>**

Table of Contents

Introduction	8
The Philosophy of TROM	10
Axiom 31	10
Code of Ethics in TROM	12
To Reason	14
Base your Life on the Positive legs of the Erasable Goals Packages	15
Compulsive Games Players never look into themselves to solve their problems	17
The Compulsive Need for Stimulus	17
Tests for Erasable Goals Packages	19
Society is Noisily Going Mad	20
Get Your Purposes Right	24
Philosophy that Differentiates TROM	25
There is Goodness and Badness	25
The Conditions of Life	26
Four Conditions of Life:	26
No Game Condition	26
Native State	27
Nirvana	27
Nirvana and Dreamless Sleep	28
Voluntary No-Games Condition	28
Non-Compulsive Games Condition	28
Most Desirable State	29
Compulsive Games Condition	30

Most Common State for Beings	31
Insanity Condition	32
Proof Against Insanity	32
CCH's	33
Level 2 of TROM	35
Differences	35
Similarities	39
Any Two Things are Both Different and Similar	40
THE SUPERMARKET PARADOX	43
There Are No Paradoxes	43
A Tape of TROM's Level 5	49
Timebreak a Body Sensation	50
Establishing a space in which to work	51
Level 1A	52
Then put the postulates back up again	53
Level 1B	53
Level 2A	54
Level 2B	54
Opponent's postulate won't move	56
Importance of RI	57
Dropping Back a Level	58
Self determined and Pan determined Postulates	59
Level 1A	60
Level 1B	60
Level 2A	60
Level 2B	61
Goals Package Construction at Level 5B	63
Rule 1, Goals Cannot Oppose the "to know" Goal	64
To Change	64

Rule 2, Ionization	65
Rule 3, Single Word Goals	65
To Start	65
To Make	65
To Grow	66
Rule 4, Suffixes	66
To Be	67
To Cause	68
Cause and Effect words	69
To Interest	69
Rule 5, No Within Games Goals	71
Games Goals and Civilization	72
Level 5C - To Sex Goals Package	74
“Sex” as a Noun and a Verb	75
Gender	75
All Sexuality is within the “to Sex” goals package	76
Compulsive Games Play in the “to sex” Goals Package	77
False Identifications in the “to sex” Goals Package	78
Asexual Reproduction	79
Sexual Reproduction	80
Sex Cells	80
Bisexuality	81
Unisexual	82
Bisexual Classes	83
Unisexual Classes	83
The Must Sex” “Mustn't Be Sexed” Game	86
Orgasm	89
Sexual Ionization of Body Parts	90

Lesbianism	91
Thereby Hangs a Tale	92
Gender Symbols	97
02 TROM Level 5C – Loose End	100
Merchant of Fear, Energy Thief, Vacuum, The Black Hole in Space and Bubbles	100
Null “to know” Goals Package	102
Postulate Failure Chart Null	106
Additional Data on Sex	107
Gender Obsessive Postulate Situation	107
Identity and Purposes, Entities	113
Junior Universe Only Consists of Postulates	113
Level 5 Procedure	115
03 Level 5C (Overts)	118
The Innocuous Question	120
Running Overts Out at Level 5C	121
First Address the Goal "to handle"	122
Second, Formulate the Therapy for Overts	123
First Pair of Commands	123
Second Pair of Commands	125
04 Erasability of Junior Universes	127
Glossary	133

Introduction

The original book "The Resolution of Mind, A Games Manual" was written from the research notes of Dennis Stephens by Greg Pickering in 1978 and published in 1979.

Dennis Stephens research into the mind and how to resolve it continued after the publication of TROM and by 1992 he felt he had much new material that needed noting down.

Dennis dictated to cassette tape his research notes over the two year period from 1992 to 1994. Those research notes remained unpublished until I found them in Australia in 2010. I typed up the transcripts which I found very difficult to read so I edited them to improve their readability and this series of books is the results.

- 01 Insanity Point
- 02 The Philosophy of TROM
- 03 Expanding on Level 5
- 04 Bond Breaking
- 05 The Game Strategy

On completing these books I found that Dennis had introduced modifications and improvements to the Practical application of TROM so I took the Practical section from the TROM manual and added in the modifications of Level 5D of TROM and the Differences and Similarities Lecture to create the:

- 06 TROM Therapy Manual.

After finishing the above books I reread the TROM manual and saw that it was difficult to read because it had long blocks of text that needed paragraph breaks where each new idea was introduced. I put in the paragraph breaks, added a few notes as "editor" and added graphics where it would make things easier to understand.

The result of all this work was the Kindle versions of the TROM manual, Research Notes and the TROM Therapy Manual.

Be sure to visit www.tromhelp.com for more information about TROM and the TROM therapy methods. Also join the TROM email group at

<http://lists.newciv.org/mailman/listinfo/trom>.

I hope that you find this study as interesting and useful as I have for understanding and resolving your mind.

Sincerely

Pete McLaughlin

May 2014

The Philosophy of TROM

By Denis H. Stephens

Okay, I'd now like to take up the subject of the philosophy of TROM.

I'm very grateful to Terry Scott who reminded me of the importance of this subject in a taped communication to me; he felt there's a definite need for a look into the philosophy of TROM. Well, I agree with Terry. And so here we go, we're going to talk now about the philosophy of TROM.

Let me say at once that the theory of TROM is quite consistent with the theory of Scientology, and there are no areas, really, were they are at variance at all with a definite exception that there's one of the axioms which does not apply in TROM.

But I suspect that Ron in his later years would have suspected that there was something odd about that axiom. I used to talk to Ron in the early fifties and we used to skirt around the subject of that axiom. There's things he said then that made me suspect that he felt there was something odd about it.

Axiom 31

Anyway, the axiom is Axiom 31 in Scientology, and this is the axiom which states that "Goodness and badness, beauty and ugliness are alike considerations and have no other basis than opinion" that is Axiom 31 of the Scientology axioms.

And this axiom tells us that goodness and badness is really relative to the situation. In other words, it's entirely a matter of opinion. That there's no basis for goodness or badness, or beauty and ugliness in the universe.

Well now, discounting the subject of beauty and ugliness, for which I would be inclined to say that the second part of the axiom is true, but I haven't studied it all

that much. I would say that if the axiom simply read, "*Beauty and ugliness are alike considerations and have no other basis than opinion,*" I would agree with that. But it's the first part, goodness and badness that sticks in the craw.

Now this is a very old philosophical point that Ron hit when he hit Axiom 31. I don't know whether he knew that he'd hit a very old philosophical argument. I missed it at the time.

It wasn't until a number of years later that I realized there was a flaw in this axiom. It wasn't really until I started to get down to my own research that I began to seriously doubt the validity of the first part of that axiom. And I hadn't got too far into my own research before I realized that the first part of Axiom 31 is in error; it's simply wrong.

This is the way it works: if you say that all goodness and all badness are simply a matter of opinion, then you stop all possibility of social comment.

You know, you can't then point your finger at something and say, "*Well, I consider that bad.*" The person would say, "*Yes, that's fine, but it's simply your opinion that it's bad, and I consider it to be good.*"

You see that? And, bang, you've destroyed the whole subject of morality and ethics in one swoop, just like that. You've just wiped them off the face of the planet. You see that?

Once you say that goodness and badness are simply a matter of opinion you've just destroyed all social comment, you can't comment about an action, because the person could immediately say, "*Axiom 31!*" He could invoke Axiom 31. So, "*Well, look, these things are simply a matter of opinion. You consider it's bad, I consider it's good.*" And there's no absolutes on the subject.

Well, not so much as no absolutes, but it's simply a matter of opinion. "*I know my opinion's as good as yours, old chap,*" he can say. So you can't comment on an action.

Now, that is a very dangerous way to run a society, I can assure you. Societies tend to collapse when this is adhered to. If you were to try and run a society on that basis it would run itself into a hole, it would run itself into a hole rather rapidly.

Usually this concept is associated with hedonism: That whatever I do is right and whatever you do is right, and it's all a matter of opinion, and we all live for today for tomorrow we die.

It's a hedonistic philosophy. And no society has ever flourished using that philosophy. It simply leads to the graveyard very quickly. The society just collapses. It just falls apart. Usually it just falls apart into bloody conflict. That's an end to the society and something more stable takes its place. In other words, it's not a workable or a practical proposition.

So the first part of Axiom 31 is a fault. So with the possible exception of that, TROM and the body of data of Scientology are consistent with each other. And all we can really say is that TROM bears the same relationship to Scientology as, oh, say Einstein's relativity theory bears to Newtonian mechanics. It's just a smoother way of looking at it, and a much faster and a much more practical way of getting the job done. But it does contain some more fundamental truths which were missing from Scientology and so tended to limit the application of Scientology.

I suppose, logically speaking, from a philosophical viewpoint, you could put Scientology within TROM with the exception of these odd little bits and pieces like the first bit of Axiom 31. But you can't put TROM within Scientology, because there's data in TROM which is not known in Scientology.

But there's everything that's known in Scientology in TROM. You'll find that it's all in there. So the senior subject is TROM, I can assure you. It's the senior subject.

But Scientology, with few exceptions, is quite consistent with TROM.

So we do have a philosophical background there, the philosophical background of Scientology. But we can actually take the technology of TROM, and from it get a much more workable philosophy than Scientology could ever have.

And god, Ron worked hard at this subject with the philosophy of Scientology. He really did over the years burn the midnight oil there to try and get a philosophy of Scientology.

And in his later years he even started to get into this subject of ethics, you know, and started to say what was ethical, yet his own axiom, Axiom 31 says that goodness and badness are all alike considerations and have no other basis than opinion. Yet he was in the latter days of Scientology expounding a code of ethics.

Well, this is inconsistency in his own field, and he paid for it. He paid for it. **You can't teach the students, make them learn Axiom 31 by heart on the one hand, and on the other hand insist that they abide by a code of ethics.** They're two things that are logically inconsistent with each other. You see that? There's these logical inconsistencies that caught up with him in the final years.

Code of Ethics in TROM

Well, we're not going to fall for logical inconsistencies of that type. We do not say that goodness and badness are simply a matter of opinion. We know that

there is the subject of goodness and badness, we do know that there's such a thing as ethics.

You will find in TROM a code of ethics. It's written up quite firmly in TROM. And as you live by this code you flourish. And if you don't live by that code, the further you run your life away from that code the less you flourish. But we in TROM, we can go much further than that code of ethics when we talk about the philosophy of TROM.

Code of an Ethical Being:

Never force a person to know a thing against their choice.

Never prevent a person from knowing.

Never force a person to make a thing known

Never prevent a person from making a thing known

The key to the philosophy of TROM lies at Level 5 and the subject of the goals packages. There is an enormous amount of philosophical material there which is readily available once you come to study the goals packages, which gives you the basic philosophy of life which comes from TROM.

Things you never would have believed, never dreamed, and were never dreamt of by Ron in Scientology, stand like steering beacons when you study the goals packages, the true goals packages that we know exist in Level 5 of TROM.

Let's start working and looking at some of these goals packages and this basic idea of the philosophy of TROM. When we look at Level 5, we find Level 5A, we find the 'To Know' goals package; and then at Level 5B we find a whole mass of junior goals packages, the vast majority of which are un-erasable and a tiny proportion of which are erasable.

Now, the first datum that interests us here, and which becomes a part of our philosophy of TROM, is this datum that **you cannot successfully base your life upon an un-erasable goals package**. You follow that?

[Un-erasable Goals: To Degrade, To Destroy, To Blame, To Enslave, To Hate. To Drug, To Trap, To Lie, To Cheat, To Steal, To Profit, To Exploit editor]

Now that's a very important philosophical datum. It's a survival datum. It's more than just something that you sit around and idly talk about in the coffee shops, you know. It's something which is raw survival in this universe. Basing your life upon an un-erasable goals package is a death sentence in this universe. It's a death sentence. It really is. I couldn't stress it more strongly.

Now, this isn't something wishy-washy. This is something you can prove. You can prove it. You've only got to try and erase one of these un-erasable junior goals packages to demonstrate to yourself quite conclusively that what I say is utterly true.

You take the goal 'to hate', say. It's quite un-erasable. Its legs are 'to hate', 'to not hate', 'to be hated' and 'to not be hated'. And sit down and try to erase that as a goals package using the technology of Level 5 and it will kill you.

And if you were to get into life and take up this subject of 'hating' and make that your main spur, your main purpose that was driving you, your main thing that was driving you through life was this urge 'to hate', and so forth, you would equally kill yourself.

So, now, there is something of vast interest, isn't there, vast practical interest as a philosophy of life there.

So it'd be very important to know which goals packages are erasable and which are un-erasable. Well, I can tell you: There's about twenty-five or thirty erasable junior goals packages, the most important of which are listed in the write-up.

If you only had the ones that were listed in the write-up and you didn't know the rest of them you'd be quite safe, because the remainder of them will start to fall out the hamper when you work with the ones I've given you in the write-up.

Because that's the way I found the others; by working with the ones that are in the write-up.

You know, **the goals 'to create', 'to love', 'to admire', and so forth**, the whole list of them (you'll find them in the write-up.) You work with those, and you'll quickly come across the remainder. But all of the remainder are quite subsidiary, quite supplementary.

[Erasable Goals: To Know, To Create, To Love, To Admire, To Enhance, To Help, To Feel, To Control, To Own, To Have, To Eat, To Sex, To Reason, To Surprise - editor]

The most important of the junior goals packages are in that write-up of TROM. You can safely ignore the rest, but you will discover them when you work with the ones in the write-up.

To Reason

The only junior goals package that should have been included in the write-up and never got included was the junior goals package **"to reason"**. It was left out because I didn't spot it in time; I got the whole thing typed up before I researched that area

The legs of this goals package are: "to reason", "to not reason", "to be reasoned", "to not be reasoned". Note the purpose there is "to be reasoned", *not* "to be reasonable"; not, repeat, *not* to be reasonable".

The goals package is "to reason", "to not reason", "to be reasoned", "to not be reasoned". That is the 'to reason' goals package. Because that is a beautiful little goals package, and it belongs on the main list, and you should add it to the main list; and it's a specific one.

The whole subject of reason and logic becomes an absolute joy after you've erased that goals package, where prior to the erasure of that goals package logic and reason can be a very mysterious subject. But the whole subject of logic and reason becomes an absolute joy like poetry after you've erased that goals package.

So it's a very worthwhile goals package to erase, and that's why it belongs on the main list, and why it's unfortunate I couldn't get it on the main write-up. But nevertheless, if you work with the ones that are on the write-up you would come across the goal 'to reason' eventually and realize that it is erasable and you would realize how important it is and you would add it to your list of erasable goals.

Base your Life on the Positive legs of the Erasable Goals Packages

So there's only that tiny number of goals which are erasable. **Now you can base your life on any one of those, or any number or any combination of the positive legs of those goals, and you'd be all right. You could survive in the universe. There's no liability to working with the positive legs of the 'to know' goals package, or the positive legs of any of the junior goals packages. There's absolutely no liability to it, they're quite safe.**

They're all survival, they're all 'life packages', as we call them in TROM. They're life packages.

When you pick up a dictionary, the first thing you're struck by is the vast number of other goals mentioned in the dictionary as in verbs. All these verbs, they're all goals, they're all purposes. Well, a large number of them are synonyms for the life goals; they're the synonyms for the junior goals packages.

But there's an equally or an even vaster number which are completely un-erasable. And the majority of verbs in the English language cannot be formulated into erasable goals packages.

And if you were to base your life on any one of those purposes you'd be running yourself on a one-way trip to the graveyard.

Now this is what I'm talking about when I'm talking about the philosophy of TROM. Here is a way of life, here is a philosophy of life, based upon goals packages which are erasable or goals packages which are un-erasable. It's simply a matter of discovering whether the goals package is erasable or un-erasable.

If it's un-erasable you keep away from it like the plague. You simply don't get involved with it. That's the entire secret. You keep away from goals packages which are un-erasable. You don't have anything to do with them.

You might as well cut your throat, you know, so you don't get involved with those goals packages that are un-erasable.

Because if you don't use them in games play and don't get involved with them, you're immune to them and you survive well.

Now the only unfortunate thing about all this is that the philosophy doesn't become particularly real to a person until they get into Level 5. And Level 5 is a fair way up the line for the average person in therapy.

It may not be far up the line for a person who's had a lot of Scientology auditing. They may get to Level 5 within, oh, I 'don't know, ten, twenty, thirty hours of running solo. They may get there. That would be unusual. But it's possible.

For a person who's never had any psychotherapy, it's going to take them longer than that to get up to Level 5. And it's no good rushing it. They're not going to do any good on Level 5 until they're ready for it. So they've got to work through the steps.

So it's just unfortunate that our philosophy, the philosophy in TROM, is based upon material which is going to be a little bit unreal to people until they've got to the upper levels of our subject. Now that is unfortunate. I wish it wasn't that way. But, unfortunately, I can't make it any other way than it is. We can't run our tech any other way. It doesn't run any other way. Got to do Levels 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 in that sequence.

You might say that the fault lies in the fact that the humans on this planet are in such goddamn lousy case shape. If they were in better case shape they could get onto Level 5 rather quickly. You see that? That's the problem.

The fault lies not in our tech, but in the material we have to apply the tech to. So it's not a technical failure. It's just that the people of earth, the people of this planet, the humans, have never really given much thought on the subject of the state of their case.

Good little compulsive games players that they are, they're always much more concerned with what's going on *out that way* rather than concerned with what's going on inside them.

Compulsive Games Players never look into themselves to solve their problems

You always know the compulsive games player: he always looks exterior to himself for the solutions to his problems. This is almost a definition of a compulsive games player.

You know them by that: they look exterior to themselves for the solutions to their problems. They never look into themselves to solve their problems. They always look for the quick fix out that way. That's the compulsive games player.

The non-compulsive games player, he doesn't live his life like that. He may look outside, he may look exterior to himself for the solution to his problem, but he's just as likely to look inside himself for the solution to his problem. He may use either; he has the choice. He can do both. That differentiates it.

So when you come across that, when you come across a person who endlessly looks exterior to themselves for the solution of their problems, know that this person is a compulsive games player. And this person is going to take a fair while on the earlier steps of TROM before they can get up to Level 5. They're just not going to get up to Level 5 until they've broken this pattern.

They've got to start looking at themselves. They've got to start working through these lower steps and that means looking at themselves.

They're going to have to break this lifelong habit of the quick fix over that way.

When they go for the long-term fix over this way, not the quick fix over that way. That's TROM.

The Compulsive Need for Stimulus

Another way you can tell the compulsive games player is he needs to be stimulated by his environment. **The compulsive games player has a**

tremendous need to be stimulated by his environment, where the non-compulsive games player has far less need to be stimulated by his environment. And by the time he's finished the five levels of TROM his need to be stimulated by the environment is very tiny indeed and is completely under his control, completely under his control.

So there's two quick indicators for the compulsive games player, just to give them to you in passing: is the quick fix over that way. Always looking exterior to themselves for the solution to his problems. And a high need to be stimulated by the environment.

The higher that compulsion for games play is the more time they're going to have to spend on the lower levels of TROM, the more they're going to have to sweat on levels 2 and 3 of TROM. 2, 3 and 4, but mainly 2 and 3. The compulsive games player has a rough time at Level 2. He really does. That's the one. As I said from the write-up: *it separates the men from the boys*. And that's the one that sorts them out, sorts out the compulsive games player, is Level 2.

The non-compulsive games player sails through levels 2 and 3 quite comfortably. But the compulsive games player has a lot of trouble, because they make him look inwards, they make him look at his mind, and that's the one thing he will not do. He will only look exterior to himself for a quick fix to his problems, and Level 2 won't let him do that.

It simply says, *“Look at your mind; just evaluate these things in your mind; start looking at your postulates and considerations. What's the structure of your mind that you're working on? [What non-life goals are you working on? - editor] Let's look at these things, not keep looking out that way to a fix for your problems. Let's fix them. You fix them! Your mind, you fix them.”* That's TROM.

But to return to our main line, which is the subject of the philosophy of TROM and the subject of the goals packages. Don't miss it: our philosophy of TROM is governed by the data at Level 5. Governed by this data at Level 5 and the goals packages. It completely dominates the philosophy of TROM, completely dominates it.

And the only other philosophy of TROM would be what you will find in Scientology. You know, the general (what might be called the background) philosophy, which is common to Scientology and TROM. But the philosophy that differentiates TROM from Scientology is the philosophy that comes from the goals packages at Level 5.

Tests for Erasable Goals Packages

Once the person gets to Level 5 they can easily test a goals package. We have all the tests for the un-erasable goals package at Level 5B.

You know: "*Is it opposed?*" Is the 'to blank' leg of the goal opposed to the 'to be known' leg of the basic package. That's the first test; it's a very fundamental test. That's the first test a person will use when they get to Level 5.

Later on is the ionization test, which I've covered in the supplementary lectures,

People will discover the ionization test for themselves, and the ionization test, the subject of ionization is very helpful.

The ionization test is based upon the fact that the positive legs of any erasable goals package will ionize mass white or colored, whereas all four legs of an un-erasable goals package will ionize a mass black. And the negative legs of erasable goals packages will also ionize a mass black.

So all one has to do when one wants to test a goals package to find out if it's erasable using the ionization test. One just simply feeds/floods any old mass in the universe, just flood any old mass in your mind one by one with the postulates, the legs of the goals package. If all four legs ionize the mass black then this is an un-erasable goals package, the decision's final.

It's not because I say so; it's just a factor of the universe, it's just the way this universe is constructed.

The ionization test is a much simpler test than the test that's given in the write-up. But unfortunately, a person has to be in fairly good case shape to use the ionization test.

So anyone that has been at Level 5 for a while can use it when the idea of putting postulates into a mass is real to them. Prior to that they must use the test given in the write-up, to actually judge if the 'to blank' leg of the package to be tested is opposed to the 'to be known' leg of the basic package. They have to just think about that.

Well, it's a valid test, it's a good test. It got me by, it saved *my* life, that test did. It's a good test. But the ionization test is a better test. But, again, it's not available to the person, until the person's well into Level 5. It's not a technical failure. It's only because of the rather poor case shape of human beings.

If human beings in our society in the last two thousand years had spent more time dealing with the mind and researching the subject of the human mind, and less time researching black boxes and so forth out that way, we would already have a large body of knowledge of the human psyche extant on the planet.

And people would be in better case shape and these things would've been much easier, you see?

Society is Noisily Going Mad

But we haven't got that. We've got a society that's quietly going mad, or noisily going mad, and they need psychotherapy. They need therapy. They don't believe they need it, but they do. They sure as hell need it.

There's no quick fixes over that way; they ran out of quick fixes over that way. And their survival is dependent upon their sanity, it always has been. Their survival is dependent upon their sanity. And our society is not becoming more sane, it's becoming less sane.

The other morning I heard on the radio, they were talking about American society, and the chap he said that one thing about the Americans, he said two per cent of the American population are winning, and they're all billionaires; the other ninety-eight per cent of the society are losers and they haven't got much at all, he says, and the whole society are armed to the teeth. Now, he said, what the Yanks can't see is that that's a recipe for disaster. Well, the man who said that is quite right. But the Yank can't see it.

They still persist on running their society on the basis of two per cent winners, ninety-eight per cent losers and everyone carrying a gun. Well, it's a recipe for disaster. You see that?

But only if you're sane can you see it. If you happen to be fixated into the goals 'to exploit' and the goals 'to profit', and they're all un-erasable goals, if you happen to be fixated on those goals, like the Yanks are, then you'll never get your society straight. The society just runs itself into the ground.

They can't see it, but other people stand off and look at America and see the faults of America. But the Americans can't. You know, they have violent riots in their towns. In Los Angeles they have riots, you know. It didn't do anything for them. All it meant was that they had to get down and photograph the riots and get the riots on the TV screen so everyone could see the riots, they could all stand around and say how bad it all was. But it never occurred to them that that was a signal to do something about their society.

No, it's quite unreal to them. The only thing they understand is their postulates of their un-erasable goals packages that they're stuck in. They got to make a profit. They got to exploit. You see? They're stuck in it. They can't get out of it, can't look outside of it, which is the awful thing about the person getting stuck in an un-erasable goals package.

The dreadful thing is that the person can't think outside of it in the end. They get stuck into it. **They're so stuck in the un-erasable goals package, and it's killing them, and they can't stop killing themselves.**

It's like the alcoholic who's drinking himself to death. He's on the same skid row. He can't stop drinking. Yet the drink is killing him. Yet he can't stop drinking.

Well, that's a perfectly good analogy of a person who's stuck. Dramatizing, and stuck in the legs of an un-erasable goals package. The goals package is killing him, but he's totally addicted to this way of life, he's totally addicted to the legs of this goals package, and he can't get out of it. Even if you show him a way out, he can't get out. He can't get out of it.

His only way out of it is to dig himself out with something like TROM, and get himself out that way. If he sees enough people around him digging themselves out of their problems using TROM And he realizes that it does work, eventually he'll try it, too.

He doesn't have to do it this way, he doesn't have to be in this goals package which is killing him. You see that? Now that's the philosophy of TROM.

On an educational basis, we simply have to discover the un-erasable goals packages, and we simply educate children in school, tell them about the un-erasable goals, and give them the technical reasons why the un-erasable goals packages will kill them. Show them why they can't get involved in this activity.

Tell the kids, it's no good going around and hating; no good going around and destroying; it's no good going around and exploiting; it's no good going around and profiting. All these are un-erasable goals; they'll kill you.

We can't run a society that way. And we can prove it. And here it is.

The teacher writes it all up on the blackboard. He teaches them TROM. There it all is. The children can test it in their own minds, and see it's all there.

There's the philosophy on an educational level. You could teach this to people. It could be taught at schools.

Then our society would start to come off it.

See, at the moment we're like the person who believes in Axiom 31. We live in a society where people believe that goodness and badness are a matter of opinion.

They don't believe there's such things as dangerous activities that lead to the graveyard except the most obvious things, like shooting yourself or jumping off a cliff, and everyone knows that they're harmful.

The businessman doesn't realize how harmful his goal to exploit is, which is the basis of his business activity.

I mean business, as it's run in our society at this time. And Christ, business doesn't have to be run this way. But business is run on the basis that the bottom line of business is to make a profit. And profit is achieved by exploitation. That's the way it's run on this planet in the western society, western world at this time.

They call that business. It's a strange and peculiar variation on this subject of business: it's based upon those two postulates of profit and exploitation. The bottom line is profit, and profit is achieved by exploitation. And both of those goals packages are un-erasable.

Now, it's not immediately obvious to a businessman that the problems in his life are brought about by the fact that he's operating upon un-erasable goals packages. It's insidious; very insidious.

It's only as his life progresses that he realizes that there's something wrong with his life. And he can't see what it is. He doesn't know enough about life. He doesn't know about the goals packages.

He doesn't know that the purposes he's running on are non-life purposes. He doesn't know enough about life. He doesn't know TROM.

If he knew TROM he wouldn't do it. He'd rather, you know, he'd do anything but do what he's doing. He'll realize the insidiousness of it, the danger of it, the awfulness of what he's working himself into.

And so his health collapses after a number of years, you know. His life falls apart. You know, it all comes apart 'round his ears. And he becomes an alcoholic, and he takes up drugs, he tries everything to try to make his life bearable. And it just gets worse and worse and worse.

It never occurs to him. He can't put his finger on it. The trouble is that all his troubles stem from the fact that he's basing his life upon profit and exploitation. And they're un-erasable goals packages, they're non-life activities. The longer he persists with them the more he's killing himself. All he's got to do is stop doing those two things, if they're the things he's doing.

He's only got to stop doing them and his life will start to improve immediately. You see that?

But he can't see that. You can't tell him; because he's got a whole mass of rationalizations and justifications for his activity, you see that, for his life, for his profit and his exploitation and his business. You see?

It's all heavily screened, and it's all built into his psyche. And he's got a thousand reasons why, and a thousand justifications for everything he does, even though everything he does is killing him. That's the problem when the person is into an un-erasable goals package.

Now that's what we're up against. We're now talking about the philosophy of TROM. This is the philosophy of TROM.

What we've got to do. People have got to understand this. They won't really understand till they get to Level 5 then it gets so awfully real to them, so terribly real. I mean, when I got to it, it hit me.

I realized that when my life fell apart, all the times when my life ever fell apart was when I got involved with un-erasable goals packages.

While I was engaged with erasable goals packages it was good roads and good weather. Life was fun. Life was joy.

But every time I got involved with un-erasable goals packages and got into those, life became serious, dull, apathetic, miserable, black, you name it. It all fell apart. You see that?

[Black- see Black Field Case in the Glossary – editor]

That's what happened to people. And that's what's happening to our planet.

We have the technology in TROM to do something about it. We have the philosophy to do something about it, and the philosophy lies in Level 5 and the subject of the erasable and un-erasable goals packages because these are the purposes of life; all of these goals packages consist of purposes, and life only consists of purposes.

Life as we understand it is just life and purposes, you see. There's nothing else in this universe but life and purposes.

There are the life purposes and there are the non-life purposes at the highest level. And you can play the game of life forever, with great fun and great enjoyment, as long as you stay on the life purposes. But once you get off the life purposes and get into the non-life purposes, which are the un-erasable goals packages, you're on the slippery slope to the graveyard.

Now, that is important. There couldn't be any more important data to our society than this data I'm giving you. It's all there in TROM. It's all there at Level 5A and Level 5B in the subject of the erasable and the un-erasable goals packages. It's such a simple datum. It's such a great simplicity. But it leads, when it's applied, it's the difference between a society that's rational and sane and can flourish or a society that is eventually going to destroy itself. It's that difference. It's that important.

Our society at the moment on this planet is sliding further and further into the un-erasable goals packages. Life is becoming more and more desperate.

You can point your finger at any number of causes of this. You can say it's because of the decline of religion, the decline of Christianity. Yes, that might be a

part of it. It's because of the rising birth rate and that we've got too many people on this planet. Yes, that's a part of it. It can be due to this, it can be lack of food, it can be due to any number of things. It could be due to the holes in the ozone layer. Yes, that can be a part of it. Declining number of fish in the sea. Yes, that can be a part of it. All these things can be a part of the problem.

But essentially, what we have is that mankind is sliding more and more into un-erasable goals packages, he's basing his life upon un-erasable goals packages. And these are non-survival, they're non-life goals packages, and they're going to destroy him and destroy the society in which he lives.

He's got to stop doing it. When he stops doing it life will improve. You see that?

Get Your Purposes Right

The first thing he has to solve is to get his purposes right, get the purposes right. Then he can get the environment right.

Mankind always tries to do it backwards. He always goes in for the fix over that way. He says, *"Well, I can be sane and rational, but I've got to get the environment fixed up first."*

No-no, no-no, no, you don't have to fix up the environment to become sane. You can become sane without fixing the environment.

You only need to apply a workable psychotherapy and you can become sane. And you don't have to fix the environment in order to apply a workable psychotherapy. Anyone can sit down and use TROM, without having to go and fix up the environment. You see that?

Mankind is the great expert of solving problems over that way, but he never looks inwards. This is the weakness of the ape, the human ape, is that he's a cheerful little extrovert, you might say. He's always looking over that way and solving.

It's a business of black boxes, solving problems, solving technical problems over that way. And he says, *"We can get all these problems solved, and all these labour saving devices, and get all these computers going, and marvelous things going, and we solve this, we solve that, and life will get easy and everyone will be happy, and everyone will be fine, and the society will run beautifully."* And it doesn't work.

It doesn't work. The more he solves over that way the worse his society gets. This is only because he's totally neglecting the inner world, the world of the postulates.

He doesn't know about those. He's never been interested in those. He doesn't know about these things. And they're catching up with him. You see?

That's what is happening to our society. He can solve the problem; it can be solved. It is solvable, by simply addressing the problem in terms of the postulates. It's not too late to do that. It's never too late to do it. You can always change your mind about a postulate, you see. It's never too late to change your mind. See that? It can always work with a postulate.

Philosophy that Differentiates TROM

So there is the philosophy of TROM. This is the philosophy that differentiates TROM from Scientology. It all boils down to this subject of the first part of Axiom 31 of Scientology, doesn't it? It all gets round to that first bit.

There is Goodness and Badness

There is such a thing as goodness, and there is such a thing as badness. There is such a thing as a dangerous postulate in this universe; there is such a thing as a non-dangerous postulate; there's such a thing as a life postulate; there's such a thing as a non-life postulate. That is the message of TROM. And that is the basic philosophy of TROM. It is to be found in the goals packages of Level 5.

Now this material can be expanded out enormously by people. I won't be able to do this, to carry on the full ramifications of the expansion of this material. I'm going to rely upon others to complete this work. But it only needs a few to grab this material and run with it. Younger men than me, younger people than me, to grab this material and run with it. And it's still not too late. We can do something about this, do something about this planet. We have the data now in the upper levels of TROM to do something about it. And it's never too late to start doing it.

Well, that's all I want to say on the subject of the philosophy of TROM. Thank you very much.

Dennis H Stephens

The Conditions of Life

by Dennis H. Stephens

Today is the 16th of July 1994, and my name is Dennis Stephens. The title of this article is “The Conditions of Life”. Life can be meaningfully considered to be divided into the following four conditions, or states. I will first give the four conditions, and then discuss each one of them in more detail. While a familiarity with the theory of TROM may help a person to more easily understand this article, such a familiarity is by no means necessary to the achievement of such a feat.

Here, then, are the:

Four Conditions of Life:

- 1) The no-game condition
- 2) The voluntary, or non-compulsive, game condition
- 3) The compulsive game condition
- 4) The insanity condition

No Game Condition

The first of these states is the no-game condition, and that is the one we will discuss first.

All of the states are achieved by postulation, by the use of postulates. For one thing we know with absolute certainty in TROM is that this universe only consists of life and postulates. So it's no surprise that each of these four states is achieved by a postulate.

So what is the postulate that governs the no-games state? **Now, the postulate that governs this state is a postulate which prevents the person from making an opposition postulate.** It's a postulate that prevents the person, or prevents the spiritual being, to be more precise, which prevents the spiritual being from adopting an opposition postulate. He simply postulates that he will not make an opposition postulate to any postulate.

So it doesn't matter what postulate he perceives, he will adopt a complementary, that is, a non-opposing, postulate to it.

We know in TROM that complementary postulates, because of their very nature, satisfy each other, therefore produce a mutual vanishment; and therefore produce a vanishment of any mass in the situation.

So the no-game condition is a mass less condition. It is also a timeless condition, because time itself in this universe is only achieved by a postulate. It is also a space less condition, because space in this universe is brought into existence by a postulate. So we have no mass, no space, no time and, needless to say, no energy in the no-game condition.

Native State

The no game condition is roughly equivalent to the *native state* that Ron Hubbard talked of in Scientology. Although, we can, in TROM, define the condition a little better than Ron could, because of our greater familiarity and greater understanding of the postulates and the nature of games play.

Nirvana

Now, it's necessary to understand that the no-games condition is not some highly mystical, esoteric state. This belief comes from the Eastern religions, because in the Eastern religions they have a roughly equivalent state to the no-game condition, called *Nirvana*. But because they don't really understand the postulate structures involved, they have no great understanding of the games condition, and the postulates of the games condition, and of the no-games condition, in the Eastern religion, this state has become highly mystical, and highly esoteric. And so when you hear about this state from the Eastern religions, you think there's something very mystical and esoteric about this no-games state, or the *Nirvana* state.

Nirvana and Dreamless Sleep

As a matter of fact, there's nothing mystical or esoteric about this state at all. In point of fact, everyone has some familiarity with the no-games condition. Every person, when they go to sleep in the night-time, for some period of their nights sleep, they are in a no-games condition.

When they're in the state between dreams, they are in a no-game condition. And as most of their sleeping time, their night sleep is between dreams, and not actually dreaming, for most of the night, most people are in a no-games condition.

So there is the state. Everyone has some familiarity with this; so don't think there's anything esoteric about this state. It's not esoteric at all; there's nothing mystic about it. However, it's quite one thing to lapse into a no-games condition every night when you go to sleep and another to achieve that state deliberately.

Voluntary No-Games Condition

In TROM we can get a person to be able to achieve this state voluntarily, if they so desire. When I say voluntarily, I mean voluntarily in terms of postulates. They're able to, by manipulation, by the creation and un-creation of postulates, to put themselves into this state anytime they want to go into it; then take themselves back out of it again anytime they want to.

They simply do it by the use of postulates. Now this is quite different from a person who is going to sleep. A person going to sleep relies upon their body to put them into this state. They wait for their body to go to sleep, and then they can go into the state. Until their body goes to sleep, they can't go into this state.

Well, we can do better than that. We can do a lot better than that. A person can do a lot better than that when they understand the postulate structure involved. They can actually put themselves into this state anytime they want to.

Non-Compulsive Games Condition

Next we get to the voluntary, or non-compulsive, games condition. Now this one is much more familiar to people. This is a state where a person can play games, or not play games, at will.

They have the freedom of choice to oppose a postulate or to adopt a complementary postulate. They have that choice, so they can, by exercising their choice to oppose a postulate directed at them, they can go into a games condition. Then, by exercising their choice to not oppose that postulate, and to adopt a complementary postulate, they can end that game and go into a no-games condition regarding that situation.

So that is the **voluntary, or non-compulsive, games** state, in TROM. This state is achieved at the completion of **Level 3**.

Once a person has completed the first three steps of TROM, they have arrived into a non-compulsive games condition, into a voluntary games condition. They have regained their ability to do this.

And the upper levels of TROM, **levels 4** and **Level 5**, are devoted to returning to the person their ability to go from the voluntary, or non-compulsive, games state, into the **no-games state**.

It's much more difficult for a person to learn how to go from the voluntary games state to the no-games state, than it is to get them up to the voluntary games state. Do you understand that?

That is why the first three levels of TROM are much easier to achieve than levels 4 and levels 5 of TROM. But certainly, by the time the person has reached the top of Level 3 in TROM, they are a voluntary and a non-compulsive games player.

The state is also achievable by Scientology auditing. And a person who's had very good case gain in Scientology auditing, and has completed many of the grades, has been checked out to clear, and checked out many of the OT levels of Scientology, this person would almost certainly, but not necessarily, be a non-compulsive games player. The state can also, no doubt, be achieved by various Eastern religious practices, and so forth; and has indeed been achieved by many devout Christians.

Most Desirable State

Undoubtedly, the most desirable state for a being to be in, is in the voluntary, or non-compulsive, games state, while having the ability to return to the no-games state by choice. That is the most desirable state for a being to be in.

At any time he wants to, he can play games. And then, by a flip of his postulates, he can simply end the games and go into the no-games state, go into the no-games condition, and there can stay for any length of time he wants to.

The no-games condition can be continued, of course, for minutes, hours, years, centuries; and it's a very useful ability to have, if the planet of your choice happens to be in a nuclear winter or suffering an ice age. You simply shut down as a spiritual being and go into a no-games condition for a couple of thousand years, until things look better again. Then you come out of it and pick up and become a voluntary games player again.

These are just some of the things you can do when you get into the upper levels of ability.

In terms of postulates, the voluntary, or non-compulsive, game state is achieved by simply postulating that there will be a game. By simply postulating that there will be a game and making a particular type of postulate that makes it very difficult for you to accidentally go into a complementary postulate situation. In other words, the person simply postulates, he puts a little stopper on his complementary postulates, so he won't accidentally make complementary postulates and so end his game. But he's got his finger on it. He knows exactly what he's doing. And any time he wants to, he can take the stopper off, change that postulate, go into complementary postulates and retire into the no-games condition.

Compulsive Games Condition

The third state. We're now getting into the first of the undesirable states for a being to be in. This is the **compulsive games condition**. Now, the compulsive games condition is characterized by an inability to adopt complementary postulates. The person simply postulates that they won't adopt complementary postulates. It's as simple as that.

It's not that they've got a little stopper on it. They've definitely postulated that they're not going to adopt complementary postulates. That they're going to be in there pitching until the bitter end. They're going to be in there pitching. They're either going to win the game, or they're going to get overwhelmed.

And they don't think about being overwhelmed. They're only thinking about winning the game. So the only way the compulsive games player knows to end the game, is to either overwhelm the opponent or get overwhelmed, and have complementary postulates enforced upon him, or enforce complementary postulates upon his opponent via overwhelm. That's the only way he knows how to end the game.

The compulsive games state is a highly undesirable state, simply because it's compulsive. The person, once he gets into it, simply cannot stop. He has to be in there struggling. It's all conflict; it never stops. It's all go, and all conflict, and all

battles, and it's all fighting, et cetera. It's all go. It goes on forever like that. That's the postulate that makes it so. The postulates make it so.

Most Common State for Beings

Of all the four states, this is by far the most common state that you will find a being in. If you were to do a statistical survey on this planet, you would undoubtedly find that more beings are in this state than any one of the other states. It's the most common state that the person gets into, is the compulsive games condition.

Probably the worst thing about the compulsive games condition is that the person, while he's in it, will exalt it and say that he doesn't want to be in any other state.

The rationale the compulsive games player will give you for being in this state is, that he says it's the only way he can generate games sensation, it's the only way he can get anything out of the game, and can generate any sensations, by playing games.

What he doesn't understand is that the thirst for sensation only comes about because he is a compulsive games player.

When a person goes into therapy in TROM, and starts to remove their compulsion to play games, as their compulsion to play games lessens, their thirst for sensation lessens, and their thirst for games sensation lessens to the point where they cease to be a compulsive games player, and become a voluntary, or non-compulsive, games player. Then their thirst for games sensation is minimal, if it exists at all.

This is the thing that the compulsive games player can never understand. The fastest resolution of the compulsive games state is undoubtedly the first three levels of TROM. These are undoubtedly the fastest route out, to returning the person back to the state of non-compulsive games play.

Although this can be achieved solo by 95% of humanity, the other 5% will need some assistance early on from a separate therapist; which is a good time for us to introduce the fourth and last of the conditions of life, the insanity condition.

Insanity Condition

Let me say at once that **the insanity condition** is, far and away, the most difficult of the four conditions for a person to understand, simply because in the other three conditions the person is operating upon reason, while the very essence of insanity is unreason. And it's very difficult for a reasonable being to duplicate unreason, or to duplicate insanity.

The urge of the rational being is to shun and to pull away from insanity, to pull away from unreason. So the insanity state is an incredibly difficult state for a person to understand.

Nevertheless, every spiritual being en route through TROM, when they get into level 5 will start to regain a familiarity with the anatomy of insanity. They will get to understand how insanity comes about.

The first thing we would need to know about the insanity condition, is that it's only entered by compulsive games players. Insanity is not a hazard to the non-compulsive, or voluntary, games player. It's only when a person embarks upon the compulsion to play games, are they at risk of going insane.

Proof Against Insanity

Now, this tells us at once that we can proof any person against insanity, by getting them to complete the first three steps of TROM. Once they reach the top of the third level of TROM, they're in a voluntary games condition; voluntary, non-compulsive games condition. And from that point onwards they are proofed against insanity.

But while they're below that level and in a compulsive games state they are always at risk of going insane.

One must understand this very clearly about the compulsive games player. He's at risk of going insane and sliding into this fourth state of the insanity condition.

Essentially, the compulsive games player goes insane when he has no class to occupy in the event of overwhelm in games play. It's as simple as that. That's how it comes about.

What has happened is that his game play has become so compulsive, he's got his life so restricted, he's narrowed his freedoms of choice down so much, that he's now in his last game. And if he loses this game he has no place to go. And then he goes and loses the game. So where else can he go but insane?

The insane person is literally caught in the crack between a postulate and its negative. He's trying to dramatize both postulates simultaneously. He's trying to operate on both the postulate and its negative simultaneously.

He can't stay in the game because he's just been overwhelmed. But he can't go out of the game because he has no other place to go to. So he got to stay in the game. So he's in the crack in between. And that, briefly, in essence, is the insanity state.

Another way to look at the insanity state, in terms of Scientology, would be that the person is simply stuck in an engram. He went into the engram and there he's stuck. He never came out. And there he is today. He's still in that engram. And the engram happened to him twenty-five years ago. And he's still in it. He hasn't made any sense since. He went into that engram and it ruined him psychologically, and he's never really come out of it. And that is the Scientology look at insanity. And it's a very valid look at it. It's a very valid look, because this is, factually, what happens to the person. He gets overwhelmed and there's no place to go, except insane.

I'll be preparing a full logical analysis of this subject of insanity, which will be made available, with various other matters, in supplementary material to TROM. [see the book "01Insanity Point"]

CCH's

We do understand the postulate structure of insanity in TROM. And because we understand it we can do something about it. Although at the practical level, the best procedures for handling the insane are still the CCH procedures of Scientology. And these CCH procedures will be run till such time as the person has completed Level 1 of TROM. And when they pass the test in Level 1 of TROM, they can then go onto Level 2 of TROM solo as a compulsive games player.

Never miss it, when the insane become sane, they are compulsive games players. They went from compulsive games play into insanity. And when they return back out of insanity again, they go back into compulsive games play. So that's where you would pick them up. So that is our fourth level, and completes our four conditions of life.

What may be very difficult for a person with a Scientology background to understand, when they first meet TROM, and meet these four conditions, is that as we move a person up through the conditions, say, up from insanity through compulsive games play, into non-compulsive games play, into the no-games condition, as we move a person up through these conditions in therapy, their

engrams, their engram bank, their reactive bank, as we know it in Scientology, is progressively erased.

The action of changing a person, say, from a compulsive games player to a non-compulsive games player in TROM, will result in an enormous reduction in the amount of their bank; in the amount of bank that they have, or the amount of engrams they have in restimulation, call it what you will. But their reactive bank, as such, progressively vanishes, as they move through the steps of TROM and go up through these various conditions of life.

Some of this bank, some of this reactive bank, will be experienced by the person in route up these conditions. But the vast majority of their bank will fall away untouched, that will be available to them in their standard memory banks in their analytical mind. So nothing is being lost to the individual.

There's nothing magical about this. It's simply that we're working at such a tremendous level of simplicity when we're working with these fundamental postulates, of conflicting and complementary postulates, and the goals packages at Level 5, that vast amounts of complexity in the mind simply fall away, simply resolve, and associated with this complexity is a vast amount of engramic material.

So the engramic material falls away untouched because we're working with this great simplicity. You would have to do this to actually fully comprehend what I'm talking about. But it's quite remarkable. It's quite remarkable. In the final instance, it's not the amount of reactive bank that the person has that determines at which level they are on these conditions. It's the state of their postulates, and their freedom of choice to use these postulates, that determines the amount of reactive bank that they have.

Well I hope this article on the subject of the four conditions of life will be useful to you, and give you a greater reality of just what we're doing with TROM.

Thank you very much.

Dennis H. Stephens

Level 2 of TROM

By Dennis H. Stephens

Now I'd like to give you some more information on the subject of Level 2 of TROM.

Now Level 2 is the level, which is devoted to finding differences and similarities between “then and now” and I'd like to give you some more information on the subject of differences and similarities in order that it may be of assistance to you when running Level 2.

Differences

When we look up the word “difference” in the dictionary we find that the dictionary defines a “difference” as a “non identity”, in other words the dictionary is saying that if two things are different then they aren't identical.

Now this definition of a “difference” in terms of a non-identity is not very useful to us for the following reason.

It's well known in science that to define one thing in terms of the absence of another, never leads us to a useful definition. All good definitions of things come about when we define a thing in terms of something else. When we define a thing in terms of the absence of something else the definition is hardly useful to us at all.

The reason for this is that when we say that two things are different when they are not identical then we are faced with defining “non-identity” in logic. Well we can define “non-identity” in logic, it is not a difficult thing to define but unfortunately it doesn't lead us to equations which we can easily manipulate.

It leads us to what we call in logic “in-equations”, what's called an “in-equation”. We end up with something which is not equal to naught, something which is not equal to zero and such equations are very difficult to manipulate in logic and aren't particularly useful at all.

So if at all possible in science we always try to define something in terms of the existence of something else, if only because such a definition can be useful to us.

Now I have a gut feeling on this subject of defining a “difference” as a “lack of identity”, in other words to say that two things are different if they aren't identical. I have a feeling here that this definition has been wrong down the time track in the western world for some few hundreds of years.

I think it probably started back in the middle ages sometime, maybe 1600, 1700, something like that, when somebody said well we ought to be able to define a difference and they looked across and said “What do think Bill?” and Bill thought about it for a moment and said “Well, if two things are different they aren't identical and that's a good definition of difference isn't it?” and the other person said “Yes, right, we'll put that into the dictionary” and it's been in there ever since.

Nobody's queried it, nobody's really thought about it much, it's been reprinted from edition to edition of the dictionary and it looks alright, the only thing is that it is just about useless from a scientific point of view as a definition.

Now this situation prompted me recently to look into the subject of “differences” and look into it on the track and the universe in general and I quickly realized that there is more to this subject of differences than meets the gaze.

There is a very early game on the subject of “differences” in this universe, which pops up as soon as you start to look at it. And this is the way it works.

You have got these two spiritual beings very early on in the universe you see and one of them has got these two mock ups, ones called, shall we say, is called “A” and the other one's called “B”

They are talking about these two mock-ups, you see, and the owner of the mock-up says, “They are quite different of course aren't they?” and the other spiritual being says “Well, I don't see as how they are different” and the first person says “Well, they are obviously different” and the other guy says “Well, I don't see as how they are different at all”.

Now what the first person, the owner of the mock-ups, doesn't realize is that the other guy is playing games with him, the other guy can quite clearly see the difference between the two mock-ups but in order to play a game he is saying that they are not different.

In other words, he is saying to the owner of the mock-ups, he is saying “prove it, prove that they are different” and the other guy has to go away and think about this.

He thinks “Well how can I convince this other person that these two mock-ups of mine are actually different from each other” so he gives this some thought and then he finally realizes how he could solve this problem.

So having solved the problem he goes up to the other guy and says “Right, these two mock-ups of mine here, you can see how they are different” and the guy says “no, no, he says, I can't see as how they are different”.

He says “Well, there's mock-up “A”, and here's mock-up “B”, you'll notice that mock-up “A” possesses this quality “X” and the other guy nods and says “yes, I do see that”.

He says “Well, now this mock-up “B” over here does not possess this quality “X” right?” Now the guy admits it, he says “Yes, that is quite true that mock-up “B” over here does not possess this quality “X”.

“So therefore”, says the owner of the mock-ups, “The two mock-ups are different”. The other guy thinks about it for a moment and reluctantly has to admit that “Yes, you are right, they are different, if “A” possesses this quality “X” and “B” does not possess this quality “X” then “A” is different from “B”.

Now there is the proof and there is the “game” of “differences” in the universe. The game is simply that in order to establish that “A” is different from “B” one has to establish that “A” possesses some quality, call it “X”, and “B” does not possess this quality “X” and having established that one has now established that “A” is different from “B” and by establishing that “A” is different from “B”, one has proved it, one has proved it against all comers.

Now if you think about this for a moment you see that this is a very excellent definition of a difference, that this guy early on in the universe has actually defined a difference, he defined it in order to have to prove it. He defined it and we can define a difference in that way and it is a perfectly workable definition.

We simply say that “A” is different from “B” if “A” possesses a quality “X” and “B” does not possess this quality “X”. And, by reverse if “A” possesses this quality “X” and “B” does not possess this quality “X” then “A” is different from “B”, see, it's a beautiful definition and note that it's a definition in terms of “existences” and is not a definition in terms “absences”.

Well now it would be very useful if we could reduce this state of affairs to some logical propositions and develop some equations on the subject wouldn't it. We would then have a very workable definition of “difference” in the universe and would be able to compare this definition with what it says in the dictionary. So let's go ahead and do this.

Now when we say that “A” possesses this quality “X” we only mean that the proposition “if A then X”, that's all we mean when we say that “A” possesses a quality “X”, we only mean that the relationship “if A then X” holds and when we say that “B” does not possess a quality “X” then all we mean is that the relationship “if B then not X” holds.

Now it is very easy to manipulate these two relationships, reduce them to symbols and so forth and arrive at some equations, which represent this definition, which represent the universe with this definition.

Now I won't bother you with just how one would feed this material into the "logical" sausage machine and turn the handle and get the answers out. I can assure you that the answers that you get out are quite valid and the answers come out like this.

First of all we have the common class both "A and B". Well that common class is a null class, it doesn't exist, AB is a null class.

Then we have the common class of "A and not B". Well every time we see this class of "A and not B" we see this property... this quality "X".

Then we get the class of "B" and "not A" and every time we see this class we see the property "not X".

Finally when we see the class of neither "A" nor "B" it is indeterminate, we can either see the property "X" or not see the property "X", it is quite indeterminate and that is the universe of our definition.

Now the first thing we would like to know is how does this definition compare to the definition given in the dictionary that two things are different if they are not identical? Well, they are very close actually. Our definition is just a shade stronger than is all.

The only difference between our definition and the definition given in the dictionary is that we are very definite and very positive that if "A" is different from "B" then this common class of both "A" and "B" does not exist.

Whereas the dictionary definition where it says that if "A" is different from "B" then "A" and "B" are not identical, that definition does allow the common class of "AB" to exist. So that is the only difference between the two definitions, ours is just a little firmer and it certainly includes the dictionary definition but ours is a little bit stronger.

We now have to ask ourselves are we justified in taking this extra step, is it true, is it so? Are we justified in saying that if two things are different, if "A" is different from "B" then the common class of "AB" is null and that these two things have no common class.

Well common experience tells us that yes we are. We are quite justified in doing this so therefore our definition is correct and the definition in the dictionary isn't strong enough, it's simply not quite strong enough, it's almost right the dictionary definition but it's not quite strong enough.

The two fellows playing the game early on in the universe, they got it right. By proving the difference he defined it and by using that proof we come up with a workable definition of a difference.

Let's just comment on that a little further. Quite clearly if two things are different, if "A" is different from "B" then quite clearly every time you see "A" you don't see "B", you follow that? In other words, they can't have a common class, if "A" is different from "B" then every time you see "A" you don't see "B" and every time you see "B" you don't see "A" because they are different, you see. And that really does define the difference. That is the essential quality of this subject called "differences", that they have no common class.

Now if you know that about differences, if "A" is different from "B" then the common class of "AB" is null then they have no common class, you understand more about differences than the guy who wrote the dictionary because the dictionary definition does not include that, the dictionary definition isn't strong enough to give you that.

But our definition of a "difference" is strong enough and what is our definition of a "difference"? Right, well here we go, **if "A" is different from "B" then "A" possesses a quality "X" and "B" does not possess that quality "X" and vice versa**, and that is our definition of a difference. We define it in terms of this quality "X".

Now as soon as we define our difference in this way the definition is useful, it immediately starts to become useful. Now before going on to talk about the usefulness of this definition I would like to discuss the definition of a "similarity". We ought really to run these two parallel. So we are now going to talk about the subject of "similarities" and then we will tie up the whole subject.

Similarities

Now when we consult the dictionary on this subject of "**similarities**" we find that the dictionary says that if "A" is similar to "B" then "A" and "B" are alike. Well when we come to examine this we find that this is so.

I have researched this back on the track and this is so and what we really mean when we say that "A" and "B" are similar is that they have something in common and that is the essence of "similarity" that the two things possess something in common. They share some quality... they share a quality or they share a property and that is what we mean when we say that the two things are similar.

Now this is exactly in accordance with the dictionary so there is no variance at all in our definition in TROM for a “similarity” as compared to the dictionary. There is no variance at all. We're completely in line with the dictionary definition there.

We could give a very precise definition of a “similarity” and what would our definition in TROM be of a “similarity”?

Well, here we go: **if “A” is similar to “B” then both “A” and “B” possess this quality “Y” and vice versa.**

Now again reducing those propositions to symbols and pushing them through the logical sausage machine, we end up with a universe that looks like this,

That every time we see the common class of both “A” and “B”, we see this quality “Y”.

Every time we see the common class of “A and not B” we see this quality “Y”.

Every time we see the common class of “B” and not A” we see this quality “Y”

and every time we see the common class of neither “A” nor “B” it's indeterminate. We don't know whether we see the quality...we may see the quality “Y” or we may not see the quality “Y”.

That gives us our universe of the “similarity”.

Any Two Things are Both Different and Similar

Now as we examine the subject of “Differences and Similarities” in terms of our definitions, we see at once that **any two objects, any two things in the universe can be both different and similar simultaneously.** And further than that, one would be hard put in this universe to find two objects that weren't both different and similar.

In other words as you examine any two things you would start to see differences between them and you would start to see similarities between them. Only if you had two objects that were completely identical would you see a different set of circumstances. But look **you don't find two objects in this universe that are utterly and completely identical because all the objects in this universe are separated out in space.**

The mere fact that two objects are occupying different positions in space means that they are different. They are in different positions, we have a quality “X” you see, different location in space. So if two objects are in different locations in space they are different by definition, by our definition of “difference”.

So we don't find, as Ron Hubbard used to say, and said on many occasions, that this universe is stretched, that everything is stretched out, that we don't find two objects in the universe that are actually identical to each other. In this universe the only thing that a thing is identical with is with itself. And that happens to be the truth of the matter in this universe.

So in summary, we now have our definition of a “difference”, we have our definition of a “similarity” and we have discovered that all the objects you are likely to come across if you examine them closely enough, all the objects in this universe, if you examine them closely enough you will find that they do possess differences and you will be able to find similarities between them.

The final rider is that you won't expect to be able to find any two objects in the universe that are identical. If you do find that any are identical just bear in mind that if they are in different positions in space they aren't identical.

Right, well now, between the “then” objects and the “now” objects we are saying that these two objects do not possess a common class.

Bear in mind that is the essential part of a “difference”; **if two things are different their common class is null, they do not have a common class.**

So we are separating out all the “time,” every time we are doing the command on Level 2, the “Difference” command, we're separating out all the “time” and we are running all the “similarities” simply to keep the flow balanced out, that's all.

If we were to keep going on “differences” all the while the flows would become unbalanced. So we go over to the “similarities” to let a person see that the two things can not only be different but can also have similarities, to balance the flows. So backwards and forwards we go.

But all the time we're separating out “then” from “now” and saying that “now” and “then” have no common class. By saying this, and get this, and this is the essence of it, by saying that, we are breaking the command power of the past over the present. In other words we are just kicking at the reactive bank and the command power of the engrams and the whole idea that the past has a command power over the present.

By finding differences and similarities between “then” and “now” objects the person is literally taking over the automaticity of their reactive bank. They are taking over so that they themselves are able to bring things into the present and take them out of the present, noticing the differences and the similarities there.

So they are taking over the complete automaticity of their own bank. And so of course the bank just collapses, because now the person can do consciously, analytically that which their reactive bank used to do. So of course, the reactive bank just fades out of existence.

That is Level 2 and that is precisely why it works.

Well I hope this material will be of assistance and increase your reality of Level 2 of TROM.

Thank you very much.

THE SUPERMARKET PARADOX

By Dennis Stephens

The name of this article is The Supermarket Paradox or reflections on level three of TROM.

Now a paradox can be loosely defined as anything that conflicts with one's preconceived ideas or notions.

An example of a paradox is a man going to a zoo for the first time and seeing a giraffe and exclaiming that there's no such animal. The giraffe clearly contradicts his ideas, his preconceived ideas, of what an animal ought to look like.

How does this phenomenon of the paradox come about? It comes about when a person's idea or model they have in their own mind of the way the universe is, is contradicted by the real universe. And it only happens when they don't know all there is to know about the situation that is in front of them.

There Are No Paradoxes

As a matter of fact, there are no paradoxes in this universe. The whole universe, jogs along on the laws which it is based and upon, with which it's constructed. The universe will not permit any paradoxes.

A thing cannot occur in the universe which is contrary to the laws upon which the universe is constructed, simply because it violates the laws and therefore cannot exist in the universe.

So there are no paradoxes in the universe. But there are an awful lot of beings in the universe that have ideas and preconceptions about the way the universe ought to be which are at variance from the way in which the universe actually is.

Once you grasp that, you see that paradoxes can be rampant. Or to put it another way if a person understood the laws upon which this universe is constructed he would never be faced with a paradox. He would simply look at a situation and whatever he saw would be consistent with the laws of the universe. He would not suffer this phenomenon of the paradox.

So a paradox always occurs and only occurs when a person knows less than he could know about the laws governing the phenomena that are in front of him.

Now there's a very common paradox that a person walks into at level three in TROM. It is so common that I've named it the supermarket paradox and I thought it might be a good idea to say a few words about it to stop people being puzzled by it.

The supermarket paradox occurs when a person gets to level three in TROM and this person believes in such things as memory pictures or mental image pictures. This is how the paradox comes about.

The person at level three is being encouraged by the procedure to examine various incidents or scenes in their life. And they end up examining these scenes in much greater detail than they've ever before examined them.

And hence they start walking into what I call, the supermarket paradox.

The simplest form of the paradox is that a person at level three in TROM picks up a memory scene of being in a supermarket, shall we say, at the point of where they are taking a packet of cornflakes off the shelf and putting it into their trolley.

This is the moment in time that they are dealing with, at level three in TROM, at a certain moment in their therapy session. And this is how the paradox comes about.

They examine the scene and they look around the scene. There are the cornflakes. Let's just put the cornflakes into the trolley. And they look around the supermarket and they become aware of the various bits and pieces in the supermarket. And they become aware of their body in the supermarket. They become aware of their head in the supermarket. And there they stop. There they walk into a paradox.

Or, I could say more precisely, they could very easily walk into a paradox at this point if they happen to believe that their memory scenes, memory pictures, are being generated by something in their brain or some part or some mechanism in their brain. Because they will now find that they're looking at the scene and in the scene they're looking at their body and their brain is in their body.

How can their brain make a picture of the supermarket and in the supermarket is their body and in their body is their brain And in the brain there is the machine or the device that is taking the picture or making the recording? But the device must

be making a recording of itself. Because you look into the scene, look into the supermarket, there's the body in the supermarket and there in the body is the brain. So inside the brain would be the device.

How can this be? How can a device in the brain be recording itself? So you say, "OK it records itself."

Alright, well that only worsens the situation, because if this device records itself, then it must also be making a recording of recording itself. And if it makes a recording of recording itself, it must make a recording of recording itself recording itself. And so on in infinite regression, in infinite series. So the situation has now got worse. You don't get out of it that way.

It worsens the situation we're now into a completely ridiculous situation.

No we're up against the paradox. The paradox is essentially that, "How can the picture of the supermarket be a figment of the brain when the brain is in the supermarket and is a part of the recording. That is essentially the paradox.

Then, of course, is the added difficulty of: "How come all this vast space in this vast supermarket all gets into one tiny brain while this tiny brain is in the supermarket?" You see that's the difficulty too. The special difficulty simply of this problem: How could such a large object, like a supermarket, get into a tiny thing called the brain, while this brain is inside the supermarket, clearly demonstrating that the space of the supermarket is bigger than the space of the brain.

Again a paradox. So we're not only in the supermarket paradox once we start on them we see a whole series of paradoxes. Well I'm only naming some of the most obvious ones.

So we look around the supermarket and we see the body standing there taking the cornflakes off the shelf or putting the cornflakes into the trolley. And there's the body and there's the back of the head of the body. And... Wait a minute!

How can the brain take a memory picture of the back of the head of the body when the brain is inside the body and its only visual output is through the eyes and the eyes are at the front of the head? How can it make a recording of the hair at the back of the head?

But there it is, you're in the supermarket, you're looking at the back of your body and you're looking at your hair. No way! Paradox! Oh, I could go on, you see.

So you say, "OK, enough of that... we'll drop that". This is not a memory recording made by the brain. This is a mental image picture which has something to do with the human spirit. This has got nothing to do with the body. That's why I can see the body in the scene. It's because it's made by me as a human spirit.

Fine – fine – fine. OK.

So when you're in the supermarket taking the cornflakes off the shelf and putting them into your trolley you are occupying the viewpoint of your body. So presumably any recording made by you as a human spirit at that moment in time would have been made from that viewpoint. Right?

Then how come, in recall, it's very easy for anyone to recall that same scene from six foot behind the body? Or two foot above the body. Or three foot to the left of the body. How come?

Paradox!

So you say, "OK no problem there. There's the memory picture – we make the memory picture and we simply move the picture right, to the left, and up and down. So we can get various viewpoints in the picture. The whole thing is just an illusion."

Fine, fine, fine. So you solved that paradox you think?

So you look out around the supermarket and you look out through the wall of the supermarket. And there's a green fence and on top of the green fence... but, wait a minute, wait a minute you've never been outside that supermarket and seen this green fence with your body's eyes. And at the time of the incident you had no awareness of this green fence. So if you had no awareness of this green fence at the time of the incident, how come you've got a mental recording of this green fence?

And there it is, you go back to that moment to the incident and you look across at the wall of the supermarket and you look through the wall. No doubt, there is the green fence. And you look past the green fence and there is a truck parked and there are the wheels on the truck; on the other side of the truck there is a garden fence; and on the other side of that garden fence there is someone's back garden; and in the garden there's a lawn an etcetera, etcetera.

The further you look, you just see more and more universe. More and more town. Just exactly what you'd expect to find if you were there looking through your eyes.

Paradox!

Oh, you say "I'm a spiritual being and I have a machine that makes copies of the whole universe, moment by moment in time. And I'm completely unaware of it. I don't know it's happening. The picture is always available to me. At any time I can refer to these pictures and each picture is a complete picture of the whole universe." Well now that's quite a machine.

All right, let us suppose there is such a machine. Now if there were such a machine it would show up sometime in therapy. Yet there are no reports of such machines ever showing up in therapy. And worse is to come.

If such a machine existed and you created a copy of such a machine and continue to make copies of such a machine, and each copy, by your own postulate, was able to make pictures of the universe and do exactly what the original machine did. Eventually you will take over the automaticity of the original machine and the original machine would start to falter and start to break down. And something would happen, start happening, to your memory pictures. But nothing happens.

You can create such a machine and play with it, and do every known process with this machine. You can create it; un-create it; move it around; chop it up; bring it together; make it produce pictures; have it stop; start it; change it; paint it green; do what you like with it.

You get back to the supermarket. You get exactly the same phenomena as before you played around with the machine. You haven't changed the machine in the slightest.

Now, it's very difficult to conceive of such a machine under those circumstances. Very difficult to conceive the machine; but it's your machine that you used to take pictures, moment by moment, of the whole universe. That you have so little control over that you can't do anything about it by your own creativity in present time. Now that in itself is a paradox.

Now there is a far, far simpler solution to all of these paradoxes. It's a very simple solution and it solves all of them.

That what you're viewing in the supermarket is not a picture of the supermarket; it is not a figment of the brain; it is not something produced by a machine in the brain; it is not something which is produced by a machine in your psyche as a spiritual being.

What you're looking at is the actual supermarket at that moment in time as a spiritual being. In other words: You are looking at that moment in time as a spiritual being. Now this explains the whole phenomena.

There are no mysteries now, this is why you can look through the wall of the supermarket and see the green fence, and why you can see the truck. Why you can see the wheels on the truck and the fence behind the truck. And the person's back yard with the lawn in it. This is why you can see all these things.

Because you're simply looking through states of that moment of time in the physical universe. You are looking at the real universe at that moment in time as a spiritual being. There's a whole universe there for you to view. Now once you grasp that the paradox ends.

You junk the mental image picture theory that you've got a machine that makes pictures. Exit one imaginary machine, it never did exist. You've now got rid of it. No need for it – no need to keep this useless bric-a-brac in your mind. The machine never did exist so you dump it.

Exit this idea that you've got something in your brain that makes all these wonderful pictures. No such thing, nothing in there. Nothing in there that makes pictures.

Nope, it's just you. Just a spiritual being who can look at the "then" scenes and who can look at the "now" scenes, and if the "then" scenes seem a little less real than the "now" scenes it's only because he's made them so.

And that ends the supermarket paradox once and for all. And it ends all supermarket paradoxes of that type, all paradoxes of that type, which you can call supermarket paradoxes.

On that subject your ideas are now completely consistent with the way things are. And so you do not suffer paradoxes anymore on the subjects of memories, memory pictures, memory scenes and so on.

Once you grasp the truth of it the paradoxes go and everything you look at and understand along these lines is quite consistent with the way the universe is. You no longer get the puzzles of the supermarket paradox.

Now I hope this article, in conjunction with the theoretical material on this subject given in TROM, will assist you to resolve these various paradoxes.

Thank you very much.

End of tape.

A Tape of TROM's Level 5

by Dennis Stephens

November 10, 1994

transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 27, 2012

Hello Judith this is Dennis Stephens here and I'd like to thank you for the very welcome tape I received today which is the 10th of November 1994.

It's a very hot day here in the early summer in Brisbane today, although from the very welcome thumbnail sketch of your life you sent me and with your background in Zimbabwe, Rhodesia and in South Africa and also in the outback of the Kalahari Desert, have I got the word right Numidia? Yes, that Desert in southwest Africa. You would be no stranger to heat would you? No stranger to heat at all. So you'd probably be quite at home here in Brisbane on a day like today.

Yes I'm not surprised to hear Judith that there's very little charge on your case on levels 2 and 3 of TROM after all the excellent auditing you've had from Leonard.

Leonard's an old hand at this game, he's been at the game of auditing for many years.

I remember him way back. He was one of my students on course way back in the 1950's, we've known each other many years Leonard and he's a very, very fine auditor, and a very careful, very thoughtful technician is Leonard, so you've been in good hands and it's proven itself by the fact that you sailed through levels 2 and 3 of TROM.

The phenomenon you report at level 4 of TROM of getting some bodily feelings and bodily sensations and so forth which it's not easy to pinpoint the source of; is not at all uncommon. I had this phenomenon myself.

When you get to level 5 you will discover the source of them. They show up at level 4 but you often, at level 4, you don't find the source of them. If you do very carefully timebreak each and every one of these bodily sensations that turn up at level 4 you would find that you will be able to timebreak them back out of existence again. There's no need to walk around with these body feelings. You can timebreak them quite comfortably.

Timebreak a Body Sensation

You simply would experience the feeling in the body then become simultaneously aware of the feeling and aware of the rest of the universe around you in present time and you would find the feeling would then come up to a peak and then would slowly fade out. It would go through the same cycle as anything else that was being timebroken. So you could always get rid of these unknown and unwelcome feelings that show up at level 4 by timebreaking the sensation, timebreaking the feeling.

You were correct to leave level 4. You got bored with level 4, fine that's a sure sign that the level's gone flat. So you got all the gain you could get out of level 4 and now you want to move on to level 5, and that is quite correct, that's the correct thing to do, and also you've done the correct thing, you have a query on it and you got in touch with me.

First of all you took it up with Leonard and now you've decided to come to me to get an answer to your question. Leonard has helped you as far as he could on the subject and I'll be able to now give you the rest of the information that you need. So you've done everything exactly right so far, Judith. So congratulations many people in your position wouldn't have done it as correctly as you, but you've done it exactly right.

Now before we precede, Judith, to answer your question, I'd like you to take out your copy of TROM and turn it to the page with the postulate failure cycle chart on. And when you've done that I'd like to make sure that you've got some corrections that I put in.

Some of the early editions of TROM went out uncorrected. Yours almost certainly is corrected but I just want to be sure that you've got a corrected edition. So would you pick up your postulate failure cycle chart and count off from the left the seventh column. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. The column 7 is the column with all the words overwhelm and overwhelmed in, that's column 7.

Now I'll give you the corrections the way the columns should be printed.

Row 2B. That's row 2B column 7 the word in that square is overwhelm and not overwhelmed. Repeat 2B column 7 the word in that square is the word overwhelm and not overwhelmed.

Similarly on 4B... row 4B column 7 again the word is overwhelm and not overwhelmed.

Similarly, row 6B column 7 the word in that square is overwhelm and not overwhelmed.

Similarly, row 8B the word in column 7 is overwhelm and not overwhelmed.

That's all the corrections, that is the end of the corrections. Now the copy you have almost certainly has it correctly but if it doesn't have it correctly put the corrections in because it does change the sense very slightly of the chart. You might as well get the chart exactly right before you use it. It's important to get it exactly right. That's why I sent out these corrections. There are no other corrections required on the chart. The chart is now exactly as per my research notes cause I have the copy of the printed thing in front of me here.

All right, well now without more ado we'll go in now and answer your question. I will go through the chart as if I'm the subject and I'm running level 5. And I'm starting in at level 1A. I'm starting in at level 1A and my goals package I'm using is the basic "to know" goals package.

Ok? So I'm starting in now at level 1A. Before I start as given in the manual I would timebreak out all the day's activities and also I would make sure that levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been run to no more change. I wouldn't attempt level 5 until those first 4 levels have been run to no more change and also I've timebroken out the day's activities.

Establishing a space in which to work

Right well here we go, level 1A. The first thing we would need is a little bit of space around us. Now it doesn't matter which space you use. You can use the space of the present time universe around you or you can use the space of any past moment in time, it doesn't matter. You're not limited in any form whatsoever; you just need some space in which to work. So it doesn't have to be present time physical universe space. It can be past physical universe time space, follow me? You just need some space there to work.

Level 1A

So umm we're at level 1A and the first thing you would do is put up the others postulate there "Must be Known", the postulate is "must be known" and that is in the class of not self.

Now, it doesn't matter where you put the postulate. Most people prefer to put the postulate into a mass. But there's no reason why you should put it into a mass you can put it into empty space if you want but most people find it easier to put the postulate into a mass, either a created mass of your own choice or into a wall, a part of the physical universe or a fence or a passing car or anything. It doesn't matter where you put it but the important thing is that it's a "must be known" postulate and it's in the class of not self.

That is important, that you must be certain that it's in the class of "others," which I will refer to, for more precision, as the class of "not self."

So you will put up that postulate "must be known" in the class of not self.

Then you create the postulate "must know". Now that postulate is in the class of "self", that's you, right where you are. It's you holding the postulate must know.

So you've got "must be known" over that way, origin.

Receipt, you, where you are, you with the postulate "must know" and if you go over to column 8 on the chart you'll see that the level here is "Forced to know", and it's you being forced to know. Get that?

Doesn't matter what is "known" you don't have to specify, you're just working with the postulates. So you would put up "must be known" over that way in the class of not self.

Don't see yourself over that way doing this. You get yourself right where you are with a "must know" postulate. There's a little danger there that you can say, "Well, I'll get me over that way" well no that's wrong. You get you right where you are with a "must know" postulate. You understand that?

It's you right where you are creating a "must know" postulate then you simply timebreak out anything that shows up. Any sensations that show up, you hold the situation as a cameo, as a scenario, as a scene and you timebreak out anything that happens, anything that shows up you timebreak it.

Timebreak it out till it's gone away and you put the postulates back up again. You put the postulates back up and if more scenes show up from the past you timebreak those back out, have a good look at them, timebreak them back out of existence.

Then put the postulates back up again

And you keep on doing this until you can put those postulates at level 1A with no more change occurring.

That you can quite happily put up the postulate “must be known” in the class of not self over that way while you’re sitting here with “must know” and you have got the idea that your being forced to know and that it's quite ok, nothing happening, and it's all quietened down.

Right you're now ready to move on. You've started to get bored at that level. You've done all you can with that level, it's time to move on.

Level 1B

So we now move from level 1A to level 1B. Now that is signified by you changing your postulate from “must know” to “mustn't know”. Your still at receipt point but you are changing your postulate from “must know” to “mustn't know”.

The postulate “must be known” is still out there in the class of not self but now it's a game. We now have a games condition. We now have the opposition. We now have an opposition situation.

We have “must be known” in the class of not self and “mustn't know” in the class of self and they are opposing postulates and that is a game situation.

So you just hold that; just hold that situation and timebreak out anything that shows up, anything that shows up, there. And you continue with it until there's no more change, you've timebroken out everything and you quite happily have that situation there where you have “must be known” over there in the class of not self and “mustn't know” in the class of self and you can hold that situation and there's nothing else, it's all quietened down, there's nothing else happening and your getting bored with it. And say, “Right, it's time to move on.”

Level 2A

So you now move on from 1B to 2A. Now this involves going from receipt to origin. There's a definite change going to happen now between 1B and 2A.

When you go from 1B to 2A you start off by instead of feeling yourself at receipt point you start to say to yourself, "Well now, I'm in "mustn't know" but now I am starting to originate." You start to originate in "mustn't know" and drive your postulate "mustn't know" across to the other person, to the "must be known", there.

In other words, instead of him being the originator and you being at the receipt. At level 2A it's you the originator of "mustn't know" and you drive him into the receipt of your pan determined postulate "mustn't be known." And you're beginning to get at him, you begin to get at the opponent. So it's you at "mustn't know" and him still holding his postulate of "must be known" but now instead of him being at the origin point he's at the receipt point. But it's still a game.

Again you would do all the necessary timebreaking. The handling of anything that shows up. Clean everything up till you're quite bored with that level and can hold level 2A.

Level 2B

Then you would go to level 2B where now you're going to actually overwhelm the opponent. You still stay in your "mustn't know" postulate. You're originating your "mustn't know" postulate at level 2B and now you drive him. You actually force him. You drive him by sheer power of postulate; you drive him from "must be known" into "mustn't be known"

And you make him comply with your pan determined "mustn't be known" postulate. So he is driven from the "must be known" he held at level 2A, he now goes to "mustn't be known" at level 2B. And level 2B has you, self with "mustn't know" as the origin and the opponent is at "mustn't be known" at the receipt point, there.

So now we've gone through a whole little cycle, haven't we, we've gone through a whole little cycle.

We had the complementary postulates at level 1A of "must be known" and "must know". Now we've gone through two game cycles there and now we've come

back to complementary postulates again but notice that the postulates have changed.

At 2B we have “mustn't know”, “mustn't be known” and we're back with complimentary postulates again but now you're at the origin point and the “mustn't be known” is at the receipt point, but again we've achieved complementary postulates.

And the level here now, it's not a game level. This is the overt of preventing from being known. “Mustn't be know”

Now I really don't have to go any further Judith, because that is a complete little cycle I've run there in 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B. That gives a complete little cycle.

It's actually a quarter of the whole set. And if you can follow that quarter then the rest of the postulate failure cycle chart is three more quarters. That all follow the same pattern, they all follow the same pattern as that first quarter. So if you can follow what I've just given you, you've got it.

Now I just re-checked over your tape and I think I've answered your question.

Your difficulty is lack of understanding that you're dealing purely with postulates. That you're not dealing with effects here on the chart. You're dealing with postulates, that's all your putting up is postulates.

You're not putting up effects. You're not putting up sensations or you're not creating people, you're not mocking up people, you're not mocking up walls or floors or situations. You're simply mocking up postulates and that bugs many people right at the start. They're not used to working with just postulates. Well that is the whole level of level 5, is postulates

That's all we work with at level 5, is postulates. We don't work with anything else, we timebreak out everything else that shows up. We only work with postulates at level 5.

It's an incredible thing to work with. At first it seems very strange and so forth, and very odd and peculiar to be just working with postulates but after a while you get used to it and when you get into level 5 you get to a point eventually where you wouldn't dream of working with anything else but postulates because you get the fastest result working with postulates. And you always work with just postulates and you simply timebreak out anything else that shows up, any incidents that show up, any sensations or any emotions or what have you that show up you simply timebreak them out.

So at level 5 you're working purely with postulates.

Once you grasp that you've got it. You've got it. You really get that, you've got it. You can work then at level 5 and realize what you're doing.

As I said in the write up there, take it steady. You can't overrun these levels at level 5. If you stay on a level longer than you need to run it, all that's going to happen is your going to get bored. So boredom is the sign it's time to move on.

Nothing terrible is going to happen if you overrun a level at level 5 but nasty things can start happening if you leave a level before you should have left it. So it's always best to err on the side of staying on the level a little longer than you need to because as I mentioned in the write up, if you leave a level before you should have left it you can get into a lot of difficulty.

But I've given you the repair for level 5. It's in the text. There's the repair of what you do if this happens to you. If you're leaving a level before you should have left it.

If you do that you'll know all about it, sooner or later, but there's a repair there and I've explained that very carefully in the text and there's nothing I need to add on that subject, it's all thoroughly covered in the write up.

But that's the only real mistake you can make, is to leave a level before you should have left it. It's best to err on the side of boredom. Stay with a level till you're so bored with it that you say, "Oh my God, it's time I moved on. I'm absolutely bored with this. This is getting to easy."

Opponent's postulate won't move

Now what happens if you can't get the opponent to move his postulate? Supposing he's got his postulates stuck there at "must be known" and you can't drive him in, say to "mustn't be known". He's a "must be known" and he refuses to budge.

Ok well just simply mock up lots and lots and lots of him with that postulate. Just keep creating the opponent with that postulate, just keep going. Might take 5 minutes, might take 10 minutes, 15 minutes, half an hour, just keep creating more and more and more of him and more and more, an abundance of him with that postulate. Eventually you'll be able to change the postulate.

So don't quit there. Never feel that there's a sacristy of postulates here. If a postulate fades out put it back. If it fades out on the opponent create it back in the opponent. But make sure the opponent's in the class of not self and you're in the class of self. You are always in the class of self and the opponents always in the class of not self. You get that?

If your postulates fade out you put it back. If the opponents postulate won't easily change, you can't push him through the overwhelm, alright, mock up lots and lots of the postulate he's stuck in, that he insists on staying in.

He insists upon staying in “mustn't be known”, ok well mock up lots and lots of that postulate with the opponent in “mustn't be known”, then we timebreak out anything that shows up, and then we move on.

Eventually you'll always be able to move on. There's no such thing as getting stuck on the chart. If you get stuck you just simply create your way out of the stuck situation. You get the idea?

Your own creativity will always get you out. You just simply have to create the stuck point. Keep creating lots and lots and lots of copies of what is happening... the point that's sticking. Get the idea? Then you move on.

But I'm sure I mentioned this in the write up. But if I hadn't well I'm mentioning it now.

Importance of RI

The final point I'd like to mention on the running of level 5 here is the subject of RI. Now as I mentioned in the write up but I'll mention it again because it's so dreadfully important.

Level 5 will not, repeat not; run in the absence of RI. When it all starts to grind and get difficult and get hard and your field starts to go black and so forth, the most likely explanation is that you've neglected to run RI.

[“field starts to go black” see Black Field Case in the Glossary – editor]

If you don't run you're RI on level 5 and run it copiously, the whole thing is going to grind to a shuddering halt, and you won't know what's happened. You'll think, “Oh my god, I'm... I'm going mad. It's all falling apart.” And all you need to do is just run RI for 5 minutes and it will all come back right again.

So always bear that in mind. It's a good thing to run RI before you start your session on level 5, and it's a good thing to run RI between levels on the chart, and it's a good thing to run RI when the going gets rough, and it's a good thing to run RI at the end of the session, before you leave the session and end the session. In other words you can run it at any time. And don't be sparing on the running of RI.

Now I couldn't over stress the importance of those remarks on this subject of RI. I said it in the write up, I'm saying it again here now. Run RI.

As you get further and further in to level 5 this need to run RI lessens, it lessens, and towards the end you can almost do without it but your never completely free of the necessity of running RI.

The need is greatest at the beginning. When you start level 5 you have a great need to run lots of RI. It does chew up your importance's rather murderously, level 5 does. You've got to repair them. You've got to repair these importances that you're chewing up. The answer is RI. Ok? It's in the write up; I'm just repeating it again to make sure you've got the message.

Don't Abandon the “to know” Goals Package to Soon

One of the great errors you can make early on in level 5 is to abandon the “to know” goals package prematurely. That is a very bad mistake. A person starts in on it and goes round the whole cycle once and says, “Aw well, nothing much happened there and uhh... I think I'll leave the “to know” goals package and start going on to the junior goals packages.”

Well that is a definite mistake. You should stay with that “to know” goals package until you're so bored with it that it's coming out your ears. You know? And that's the time to leave it. And that is a long way ahead I can assure you. That is a long way ahead.

There's absolutely no reason why a person shouldn't stay on that the whole way, that goals package can take you the whole way. No other goals package can. All the other goals packages are junior to that one. That is the senior goals package, that's the granddaddy of them all. There's nothing in any of the junior goals packages that isn't in that basic “to know” goals package, that one's the major one.

Now that's the one you start with and that's the one you stay with as long as you can.

Dropping Back a Level

Never feel ashamed about dropping back to a lower level in TROM. If you have a lot of trouble with level 5 then just simply drop back. Drop back to level 4. You know, if you're having terrible trouble with level 5 and it's too hot for you and the going gets really rough and you've done everything and it's still hot. Ok, just drop back to level 4.

You'll find there's plenty of charge that level 4 will turn up for you, and if level 4's too tough to handle drop back to level 3. Just do straight timebreaking, just do a session of straight timebreaking, and if that's too tough to handle well go back to level 2 and find some differences and similarities.

You can always drop back, you see. Don't be ashamed to do it. I've done it many times with great benefit. There's no loss of face here.

So always be prepared to do that. If the going gets rough at level 5 drop back to level 4, if it's rough at level 4 go back to level 3, if it's rough at 3 go back to 2... you'll arrive at a level you can work at, then you can crawl your way back up the levels again, to get back onto level 5. That's the clever way to do it.

The un-clever way to do it is to say, "Well now I'm at level 5, I must stay at level 5, I mustn't go back that will be a loss of face." No, that's the wrong approach. If you have to go back then you go back. Get the idea?

Self determined and Pan determined Postulates

Now finally, Judith, and I've saved this purposefully for the very last, is the subject of the pan determined postulates. You didn't mention your having any difficulty understanding this so I'm assuming that your pretty well straight forward on it, but I will just cover it for you briefly just to make sure, to be absolutely certain, that your very ok with this subject of the Self determined and pan determined postulates at these levels.

Let's go through our levels again now and just make sure that we know what we're doing here. It's very important that early on when you're working with those goals packages that you put the pan determined postulates in place, otherwise you won't know why the postulates change on the chart.

The whole thing doesn't make much sense except in terms of the self determined and pan determined postulates so if you try and take the pan determined postulates out of the equation the whole thing starts to become rather puzzling. So we have to put them in, particularly early on in therapy.

Later on in therapy they'll become so automatic that you'll know they're there, that you don't really have to bother about them, their obviously there. You know? But early on you've got to consciously put them there so that you can thoroughly grasp the reason why the postulates change when they change, and this whole subject of overwhelm then starts to make sense.

Level 1A

So let's go through our levels we have 1A. Now at level 1A the only postulates there are the opponents postulates. There's his self determined postulate of "must be known" and there's you at your end of the comm. line complying with that.

Actually they are both his postulates and they are his self determined postulate "must be known" and at your end of the line you're sitting there holding "must know" which really is his pan determined postulate, but your calling it your self-determined postulate. You see? You've bought it, you've bought the lie.

So there's only two postulates involved there at level 1A.

Level 1B

As soon as we go to level 1B, which is a games level, you now stop buying the lie, your self-determined postulate of "mustn't know" reasserts itself at the receipt point and with it your pan determined postulate of "mustn't be known" reappears round the opponent at his end of the comm. line.

At the same time you've now clawed your way out of his pan determined postulate. His pan determined postulate is still at your end of the comm. line and his pan determined postulate is "must know" but your not in it. You're not dramatizing it anymore but it's still at your end of the comm. line. So at level 1B there are four postulates. There's the two self determined postulates and the two pan determined postulates and there in the positions I've given.

Level 2A

Similarly at level 2A. Level 2A is a games level so the 4 postulates are still present, they haven't changed. The only difference is that you've moved now from receipt to origin, but there are still the four postulates in play. There are still the two self determined postulates and the two pan determined postulates in the positions I've just given.

Level 2B

Then we move to level 2B and here we have an overwhelm level. Now what happened here is that you've now overwhelmed the opponent. He's lost his self determined postulate; he's now bought your pan determined postulate.

So there's your self-determined postulate of "mustn't know" and he's now bought your pan determined postulate of "mustn't be known". So there are only two postulates on the board and their both yours. There's your self-determined postulate of "mustn't know" and there's your pan determined postulate which the opponent has bought and he's now in "mustn't be known". The opponent's postulates have gone. He's been overwhelmed.

Whenever the opponent is overwhelmed his postulates are gone, they're no longer in play. When you get overwhelmed your postulates are gone and only the opponents postulates are in play.

So at the overwhelm levels there's only two postulates there, but at the games levels on the chart there's always the four postulates, the two self determined postulates and the two pan determined postulates.

It's very difficult to explain this in words. It's much simpler once you start to put it out there in your mind and do it. You'll see it immediately. But as I said unless you see the need for these self determined and pan determined postulates, unless you see why we have to get the pan determined postulates, you never understand why the postulates change on the chart and the whole chart becomes rather meaningless to you.

But put the pan determined postulates in, then it starts to make an awful lot of sense. And suddenly it, clicks and you say, "My god yes, I've got it, I get it, I get the whole thing. I see what Dennis is talking about." After that it's easy.

It gets so easy after a while with the pan determined postulates, they are so obviously there, you put them there so naturally that you don't have to think about them anymore, you know?

They're so obviously there it's like going out shopping in the morning and it's daylight and so obviously the sun's above the horizon, it's that sort of obvious.

Still you're always putting the pan determined postulates there when they ought to be there. You get it?

You never cease to do it, but it becomes second nature to you after a while. It's just that early on in therapy you must do it very consciously and you must be very consciously aware of doing it otherwise the chart won't make any sense to you.

End of tape

Goals Package Construction at Level 5B

By Dennis Stephens

Date: September 7, 1994

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

July 11, 2012

Today is the 7th of September 1994 and I'd like to talk to you about the subject of goals package construction at level 5B.

Now without a shadow of a doubt the most heavily booby trapped and mine fielded area at level 5 is this subject of composing junior goals packages and using them in therapy.

I've already, in the write up, instructed the student and advised the student to, as far as possible, stay with the prepared list of junior goals packages.

Never the less I have gone ahead and taken all the bugs out of this subject now and I can give you this information that will allow you to compose your own goals packages at level 5B, provided that you follow a few simple instructions.

Rule 1, Goals Cannot Oppose the “ to know” Goal

Now so far on this subject I've already mentioned two rules and the first of these rules is that you have a proposed goal and you want to know whether it's erasable so the first rule is that no meaning of the “to blank” leg of the proposed goal must be opposed to the “to be known” postulate. Now that's our first rule.

If any meaning of the goal you have in mind or the “to blank” leg of the goals package you have in mind is opposed to the “to be known” postulate, well you can just write it off. It's a non life goals package and it will kill you if you try and erase it, it's a non life package.

That's our oldest rule, it's in the write up, it's our oldest rule, it still applies.

Note there that no meaning; I've generalized it there from “meaning” to “no meaning” of the “to blank” leg. Most goals have more than one meaning and you should look a goal or purpose up in a good dictionary before formulating it or attempting to formulate it into an erasable goals package at level 5B.

Check all the meanings, if any one of the meanings are opposed to the “to be known” postulate then the goal cannot be formulated into an erasable goals package and that is final. So check all the meanings.

To Change

An example of the need to check all the meanings is the goal “to change”. It has the legs “to change”, “to be changed”. It looks quite innocuous but when you look up the meaning of “to change” in the dictionary it becomes quite clear to you that “to destroy” is also within the meaning of “to change”, that you can consider “to destroy” as a meaning of the verb “to change”, and because that meaning is opposed to the “to be known” postulate the whole of the “to change” postulate is unusable.

You'll find that it just won't come apart in therapy. It is in fact an unusable goal, it's a non life goal, and if you put it up and try and run it you will see that it's a non life goal simply because some of the meanings of the goal “to change” are opposed to the “to be known” postulate. So always check your goals in the dictionary before you attempt to formulate it into a goals package at level 5B.

Rule 2, Ionization

Alright, so much for number 1, now number 2. This is the easy one. This is our ionization rule. Our goal is unusable if either of the positive legs of the proposed goals package ionize mass black. If either of the positive legs of the proposed goals package ionize mass black then it's a non life goal and we cannot formulate it into an erasable goals package.

Rule 3, Single Word Goals

Now the third one. Now this is a new one. Only single word goals can be formulated into erasable goals packages.

To Start

Only single word goals, e.g. "to start" has the legs "to start," "to be started". It's a single word.

To Make

Let's try the compound goal which has more than one word in it, "to make known". Now that looks innocuous enough, doesn't it? I can assure you that it's un-erasable because "to MAKE known" has got "to make" in it which is a goal in its own right, "to make" and then the "known" there, it's got this idea of known in it there.

Now the goal "to know" is an erasable goal and the goal "to make" is an erasable goal. It has the legs "to make", "to be made", quite an erasable goal. But the combination of the two of them "to make known" is un-erasable. Why? Because it's cross packaging, your cross packaging two goals there. You see that? So "to make known" cannot be formulated into an erasable package because it violates this rule of the single word goal. Only single word goals can be formulated into erasable goals packages.

And also under this heading delete all unnecessary verbiages, all unnecessary words in your goals package construction. Words like “upon” or “to” etc. these odd conjunctions. Just lop them off, they're redundant, they're always redundant.

You're going to work with a single word goal and it's got to be “to blank” and the “blank” is a single word goal and over the other side there is a “to be blank” and in there you've got a single word goal too.

To Grow

There are no odd conjunctions thrown in to make it look right, or to make it seem sensible and so forth. Just lop them off, they are redundancies, or they might even simply be modifiers like “to grow petunias” well the goal there is “to grow”. “to grow petunias” is simply a specific application of the goal “to grow” so it violates our general rule of therapy that we always address the general before we address the particular, so that goes out too.

So there's no exceptions, it's always a single word goal. For whatever reason it's a single word goal.

Right that's number three.

Rule 4, Suffixes

Now number four we get into this whole subject of suffixes. We're now into the grammar of the English language and we have to know a little bit about grammar to avoid a number of pitfalls. Now a suffix in English is an ending which is put onto a word to change its use.

For example we have the suffix “ing” we can stick “ing” onto verbs and when we stick the ending “ing” onto a verb we turn the verb into a noun and it becomes what is called in English a verbal noun.

For example we take the verb “to eat”. The verbal noun here is “eating”. Well we can't use the “ing” ending on the end of a word when we want to use this verb in the goals package.

If you're going to use it you're going to have to take the “ing” off, because when it's got an “ing” on it, it's a noun and it's no longer a verb so therefore it's no longer a goal so therefore it can no longer be formulated into a goals package.

So the “ing” has got to come off. What you have left may or may not be useful to you, may or may not be erasable, but certainly while it's got “ing” on the end you can't use it. Get the idea? Off comes the “ing” suffixes. They've got to come off.

The next one is the “ble” suffix. These turn verbs into adjectives and the “ble” suffixes are called verbal adjectives. Again here we have the verb “to eat” and we have eatable or sometimes we use the word “et-able” but eatable still exists in the language and eatable is a verbal adjective but it's not a verb so you can't use it in a goals package. So off comes the “ble” suffixes there. They have to come off. Whatever you have left may or may not be useful.

Now while I'm on the subject of “ble” there's a very common one here that will fool you, and this is the goal “to be responsible”. That will fool you, that will fool almost everyone, that will, “to be responsible”.

To Be

You look at it, you say, “Well that's a goal, “to be responsible”. Well the goal there, the purpose there is “to be” the word responsible is a verbal adjective.

The word responsible is not a goal, it's a verbal adjective, you see? So your only goal there in “to be responsible” is the verb “to be” which is not really what you're trying to do is it? You see? So no, you can't use it.

The word responsible is quite interesting I'll briefly give you it's history. It's quite an interesting word. It comes from the field of law, the legal eagles.

When we take the “ble” off responsible we get response and response, of course, is the verb “to respond”. Well the verb “to respond” in English means “to answer” and the law in the middle ages needed a word in the English language which meant that a person was answerable for their actions and the word they chose was response and they made it into responsible and that's what responsible means in law. It means a person is answerable for their actions, responsible. You see that?

But it's not a verb. It looks like a verb when you say, “to be responsible” but the verb is “to be”. You get it? So you can't use “to be responsible” if you want to address the subject of responsibility in therapy the correct goal is “to cause”.

To Cause

The correct goals package is the “to cause” goals package which has the legs “to cause”, “to be caused”; “to not cause”, “to not be caused”. That will directly address the subject of responsibility in the human psyche.

Now the next suffix we need to look at is this NESS suffix. The “ness” suffix. Now we stick “ness” onto the end of words when we want to convert them into a condition or a state.

I'll give you an example of the construction here of the use of the word “ness”. Let's take the verb “to eat” we turn it into eating which is a verbal noun but the state of eating is eatingness, we stick N E double S on the end.

Well almost needless to say when any word that's got N E double S on the end and has been turned into a state or a condition by the addition of the suffix N E double S it cannot be formulated into an erasable goals package. So off has to come the N E double S. Ok?

Now the final suffix that is of interest to us and somehow will confuse us is this ISE or sometimes it's spelled IZE. the “ise”, “ize” suffix. Now this is a verbalization suffix. It turns nouns and adjectives into verbs when we add that suffix to the word. For example, the word “real” is an adjective. We can turn it into a verb by adding “ize” on the end. It then becomes “to realize”. Get it?

But what do we mean when we say “to realize” well we mean “to make real”. That's what “to realize” means in its actual context, in its actual meaning, in its actual construction. So we have a complex verb here. We have the verb “to make”. Now the verb “to make” is erasable but when it's mixed in with this subject of “real”, nope, it won't erase.

Because it's simply a modification of the verb “to make”, is “to make real”, it's a class of makings, “to make real”. Nope, it won't work. You can erase the goal “to make” but you can't erase the goal “to make real”. Get it? Your crossing up, your crossing packaging.

So off has to come the “ise” and the “ize”.

Another example: “to exteriorize” means “to make exterior”, but it's quite unerasable because it's got the verb “to make” stuck in the middle of it because “to exteriorize” means “to make exterior”. You get the idea?

So you can't use any of these verbalizations of “ise” or “ize” endings to make erasable goals packages.

Just take the “ise” and “ize” off and see what you've got left. See if there's a similar word in the language that can be used and formulated into a goals

package. It certainly can't be formulated while it's in the form of "-ise", "-ize".
Get it?

Cause and Effect words

Now that ends our formal rules. If you follow each of these rules you'll do fine you'll pick your way through the minefield.

Now just another one I want to give you. It's not a rule but it's just a general observation. There are many postulates, verbs and so forth in our language, which have become associated with "causation" and there are other verbs in the language which have become associated with "effect" and this can fool you. Sometimes you get a verb, which because of its association with cause or its association with effect can upset you and throw you when you are trying to put it into a goals package form. A very common example of this is the goal "to interest".

To Interest

Now "to interest" in our society is usually regarded as an effect activity.

Ron Hubbard pointed out on many occasions that the causative aspect on the subject of interest is interested and the effect is interesting. Well you can go along with that idea if you want to.

The truth of the matter, of course, is that any purpose can be causative or it can be effect. You know? Strictly speaking any purpose in the language, any goal is a causative activity. All of them are. Some of them you can regard as an effect but it's merely a later consideration.

But this subject of interest, while you believe this idea of causation and effect on the subject of interested and interesting you'll have trouble putting that goals package together. The correct goals package on this subject of interest is "to interest" and "to be interested", "to be interested" ending in D.

Now that will erase, that is an erasable goals package and it's the only goals package in this subject of interest that is erasable. It's a single word. It's not opposed to the "to be known" leg it fits all the rules and there's absolutely nothing wrong with it. And when you look at it you say, "Oh my God, yes that's it, that's the one." You see.

But if you're caught on this subject of cause and effect you'll overlook it, every time. Get it?

It's just because the verb "to interest" is regarded as an effect activity and the cause is supposed to be at the other end of the comm line. Actually it's a load of bullshit, both "to interest" and "to be interested" can be causative activities.

So be wary of those goals which by their very meaning or usage in society have a very strong cause or effect component. They can often throw you and confuse you and make it very difficult to put such a goal into an erasable goals package.

Finally, I would like to again remind you at level 5B that's it's far better to spend a little time on the proposed goals package to get it right, to make sure it's erasable, than it is to go off like a bull out of the gate and start to use the thing.

There's two possibilities that will defeat you here, if you're cross packaged it might take you a month or three months of work to find out that you're crossed packaged.

Remember cross packaged goals grind on forever without producing any change. I mentioned this in the write up. They're not particularly insidious they don't particularly do you any harm but you've simply got two goals packages crossed up together and they just grind on forever. Nothing erases, nothing nulls, nothing reduces, the whole thing just jogs on forever.

Well if you want to waste time for three months I suggest you do that. You see that?

Now the other possibility that will fool you is that you get into an un-erasable package. Well some of these un-erasable packages can be quite insidious. So if you say, "Oh, well I'll always find out, you know, there's no need to bother to go through all these rules that Dennis has suggested. I'll just run the goals package and I'll soon find out if it's doing me any harm."

Well it may take quite a while for you to discover that it's harming you. It's not an immediate thing, you know, I mean, your head doesn't fall off immediately. It may take a week or two to start falling off.

And the longer you run this goal before you finally realize the damn thing is a non life goal the more damage it will do. By this time you've got an awful lot of bad effects from running it, you've probably got a black field, you've probably got a lot of mis-emotion about you, you've got a heavy mass impacted all around you. It could easily take you quite a number of hours to repair the ravages by running RI and timebreaking and getting back to the "to know" goals package to put it all back together again.

[Black Field – see Black Field Case in the Glossary – editor]

At the end point you get it all back together again and what have you got to show for your two weeks work? Nothing!

You've got nowhere, it hasn't done you a bit of good. So the wise thing to do is to spend a little time at the beginning and follow the rules of making sure to the best of your ability that you're dealing with an erasable goals package before you start.

Now I can't make it any clearer than that, can I, can't make it any clearer than that.

If you're not prepared to spend this time on these goals to put them together and to package them at level 5B then I strongly suggest that you don't get into the field of composing your own goals packages. That you stick to the prepared list that I've given you in the write up.

Now you can play with those to your heart's content. They're all erasable. They've all been tested so if you don't want to muck about with rules and regulations stick with the prepared list of goals I've given you in the write up.

But if you want to play around with reformulating your own goals packages at level 5B then for god's sake follow the rules because it will be easier in the long run, it's always easier in the long run to follow the rules and get it right before you start.

You know, be 99.99% certain that your goals package is erasable before you even start. Now that gives you a great confidence, doesn't it, a great confidence.

If you've only got a slight confidence that your goals package is erasable or you're not sure, then you don't know if any changes that occur in the session are due to the fact that the goals package is producing normal therapeutic effects of change in your psyche. You don't know whether the effects you're getting are because of that or whether the effect that your getting are due to the fact that it's an un-erasable goals package, you just don't know, do you?

So get it right before you start. Get that certainty, and the only way to get that certainty is to follow these rules that I've given you.

Rule 5, No Within Games Goals

Now there's one final rule which I've left till last because this is the one that can get you into more trouble than all the other rules put together. It's undoubtedly the most insidious aspect of this whole subject of formulating goals packages at level

5B, and this rule states, **if a goal has no meaning outside of games play it cannot be formulated into an erasable goals package at level 5B.**

This one will catch you more than any other one. This is the sneaker, yah, this is the sneaker.

Such goals as, for example, “to lose” or “to win”. Even the most innocuous one of all “to play” even this one cannot be formulated into an erasable goals package.

In other words, what I'm saying here is that the goal to be formulate-able into an erasable goals package must have some meaning outside of games play. You get it?

It's got to have some meaning outside of games play, if it has no meaning outside of games play. If it's totally within the subject of games play it is for sure un-erasable.

Games Goals and Civilization

Some of mankind's most dearly cherished purposes in life are games goals. The purposes of compulsive games players.

Some of his most cherished purposes are things he bases his whole society upon and wonders why his society never gets off the ground. He wonders why there's always injustice and intolerance and death and murder and rape and so forth in his societies. Some of these goals that he bases his societies on are games goals.

For example an absolutely integral part of the political system called capitalism is the goal “to profit”. Well “to profit” is a games goal. When you come to set this goal up at level 5B and try and erase this goal you rapidly discover that it's a completely un-erasable goal.

Another allied goal to “to profit” is the goal to “to exploit” which is another facet of the capitalist system. And again you put up the goal “to exploit” and it's completely un-erasable, it's a games goal. See? It has no meaning... Exploitation has no meaning outside of games play.

Profit has no meaning outside of games play. So you get the message? You get what I'm saying here?

This is the most insidious of all of them, most insidious of the non-erasable goals at level 5B. They look erasable but they're un-erasable because they have no meaning outside of games play.

If you can understand that, you can spot them, you will be free of the lot. That's the final yawning chasm. If you can walk over that yawning chasm, then you've got the lot, you've got the lot.

So that's all I can give you on the subject of formulating goals packages at level 5B, and I hope this material is useful to you.

Thank you very much

End of tape

Level 5C - To Sex Goals Package

By Dennis Stephens

May 28, 1993

Hello Greg, this is Dennis here. Today is the 28th of May 1993 and I want to take up with you this very vexed subject of sex, and in general and in particular the “to sex” goals package.

Let me say at the outset that the “to sex” goals package is undoubtedly the most difficult goals package you will ever come across in therapy, or a human being would ever come across in therapy. The reason for this is twofold.

One is that games play is compulsive in the “to sex” goals package because the human body has adopted gender specialization and the other is that games play in the “to sex” goals package, as far as the body is concerned, is very heavily influenced by the certain considerations to do with the genetic track of the human body particularly the ape period, mankind's immediate ancestor, the ape.

The combination of those two factors makes this a very difficult subject to get apart, that's why I'm giving you the information on the subject of the “to sex” goals package. It's doubtful if anyone would get the package apart without doing the research that I've done.

And to save you from having to do this research I'm giving you the data.

With this data you can get the package apart rather easily and without the data you'd have to simply sit down and, like I did, discover the data and work out why the package is not erasing.

“ Sex” as a Noun and a Verb

Now the very first thing we need to know about this subject of sex and the way we're using it in this technology is that I'm using the word sex both as a noun and as a verb. In the English language itself the word sex is only a noun. Sex is not a verb in the English language. But I have verbalized the noun and am using sex as a verb, quite intentionally and quite purposefully and for simplicities sake.

There is no verb in the English language, which means exactly the same as the verb “to sex”. There's the verb “to copulate”, the verb “to inseminate” etcetera, there's lots and lots of these verbs but they all mean slightly different things than “to sex”. The verb “to sex” is quite unique in its meaning.

There is a verb in the old Anglo Saxon language that means exactly the same as the verb “to sex” and that is the verb “to fuck” but that is a dead language and the verb “to fuck” is a dirty word in the English language so we shall verbalize the noun and use the verb form of the noun “to sex.” We shall verbalize it and call the verb “to sex”. Ok? Simply for convenience sake.

It's quite in order to do this in the English language, it is quite in order to verbalize nouns as long as you let people know that you're doing it when you're doing it, otherwise it can be very confusing.

Gender

Now the other thing you need to know is that I'm using the word gender. We talk about the gender of a noun, the gender of a word and so forth, it's a grammatical meaning. The word gender is, strictly speaking, in the pure English language a grammatical term, but more and more these days the word gender is coming into use in the language to replace the word sex.

Strictly speaking we would say that the child is of the male sex when we mean that he's a boy. He's a male. Well you would say he is of the male sex. But more and more these days people are saying, and I believe correctly, that he is of the male gender. The word gender is coming into use in place of the word sex where the word sex is used as a noun.

The word sex is not a very good noun, it's a far better verb than it is a noun. The word gender is the better noun as far as a human being is concerned.

When talking about the sexual nature of the person and whether the person be a male or a female the word gender is a better word, I think, than to say that the

person is of the male sex or the female sex. I think that sounds rather stilted but that is the correct use of English.

But I'm not going to use it that way. I'm going to use the word gender and I'm going to use the word gender in the sense I've explained it. That when I say that a person is of the male gender I mean that he is a male.

I don't mean that the word male is a masculine word in the English language. I'm not using the word gender in a grammatical sense. I'm using it in a definite life and livingness sense to do with real human beings in the real universe.

All Sexuality is within the “ to Sex” goals package

Now the first thing you need to know is that the whole subject of sexuality resides within the four legs of the “to sex” goals package. There's no aspect of sex, which is outside of that goals package.

Now that might be a very difficult thing for you to grasp immediately but I can assure you that it's the case and as you work more and more with the “to sex” goals package in therapy you will come to understand the truth of it. That when this “to sex” goals package is erased in therapy then the whole subject of sex is erased from the human mind.

Now the spiritual being can do this, can erase the subject of sex from his psyche. But you must clearly understand that because your body is also active on the subject of sex. That you share the “to sex” goals package in common with your body and you will not erase the subject of sex from your body.

Your body is active on the subject of sex just like it's active on the subject of eating and so on. The “to sex” goals package is a bodily goals package and you share it in common with your body.

So when we talk about erasing the “to sex” goals package we mean the spiritual being can erase this goals package out of his psyche but your body will still retain all of its sexuality. In fact, the sexuality of your body will be enhanced after you've erased the “to sex” goals package.

Erasing the "to sex" goals package won't influence the body at all, and you should make no attempt to erase the sexuality of your body. You can only make your body very sick by interfering with its gender and its sexuality and its various sexual mechanisms.

Simply leave it alone, it's part of the mock up, you won't change the mockup. You'll simply make it very sick if you attempt to, but you can, and it's very beneficial to erase the subject of sex from the human psyche.

Just in passing I can tell you at this stage that no one in the whole of the human history, to the best of my knowledge, has ever erased the “to sex” goals package out of their psyche or the subject of sex out of their psyche, apart from people who worked with this technology of mine.

Now I may be wrong in that, there may be various Indian mystics and various Chinese eastern mystics that have done it and it's gone unrecorded so I won't be adamant on the subject but I will say as far as I know, and my research is quite extensive on this subject, the best that people have ever done with other psychotherapies, that I know of, is to produce a reduction, a relief and to gain some insight into the subject of sexuality.

Well we can go a lot further than that. We can naturally erase it from the psyche and, as I say, to the best of my knowledge it has never been done before.

So when you finally succeed in erasing the “to sex” goals package in therapy you can pat yourself on the back, you can give yourself a “Well done!” pat on the back because you've done something that no one else has ever done except the people doing this therapy. We're the only ones that have ever done it to the best of my knowledge.

You also need to know at the very outset that the subject of sex would erase very easily from the human psyche if the body had not adopted compulsive games play on the subject of sex.

Compulsive Games Play in the “ to sex” Goals Package

Now what do I mean by compulsive games play on the subject of sex as far as the body is concerned? We better clear this up right from the outset.

Now what do I mean? Well, I mean that the body has adopted gender specialization. Human bodies are either “male and not female” or “female and not male.” We don't find human bodies that are both male and female, nor do we find human bodies that are neither male nor female.

Now in line with our knowledge of compulsive games play in a goals package we know that there's an identification between the postulates in the goals package.

False Identifications in the “ to sex” Goals Package

In the “to sex” goals package it's the “to sex” postulate that is identified with the “to not be sexed” postulate. That is the identification, that “to sex” equals “to not be sexed” $X=(1-Y)$ and “to be sexed” equals “to not sex” $Y=(1-X)$. They are the false identifications that bring about compulsive games play in the “to sex” goals package.

[See Identification in 03 Expanding on Level 5 for an explanation of how the identification occurs. Editor.]

[Identification means the being has adopted two postulates, "must sex" and "must not be sexed". He must sex someone else but must not be sexed himself. Subjectively these postulates are equal to the being but objectively sexing and being sexed are not identical so are a false identification.- editor]

Now there is another false identification that comes about here on the subject of the human body and in the subject of sex that you should know about. Because the male operates in a male body and he operates exclusively on the “to sex” postulate and the female operates exclusively on the “to be sexed” postulate then there is a false identification in the genders amongst humans at a bodily level. And the false identification is that “a male equals a non female” and “a female equals a non male”.

[Note. The postulates here refers to the to sex game played by the being and the gender refers to the to sex game played by the body- editor]

So we have two false identifications, one that “to sex” equals “to not be sexed” $X=(1-Y)$ and “to be sexed” equals “to not sex” $Y=(1-X)$ they're the false identifications of the postulates, and then we have the false identification of the genders. We have “a male equals a non female” and “a female equals a non male” and both those identifications are false. They're all false identifications.

But they are extant and you will find your body subscribes to them and believes in them quite implicitly. If it weren't for this fact, if it weren't for the fact that you are attached to a mockup, your attached to a body, your attached to a genetic life form that is so devoted to compulsive games play on the subject of sex then the “to sex” goals package would erase rather easily in therapy.

If you were a free spirit wandering around in the universe and you weren't attached to a body that had adopted compulsive games play then the "to sex" goals package would be a very easy one to erase. If it posed you any problem at all, even if you were interested in the subject, which you probably wouldn't be, it certainly wouldn't pose you any problems in therapy. It's only because you're attached to a body that's adopted compulsive games play on the subject of sex that you will have any difficulty erasing this subject in therapy.

Most of this lecture then, you will find, will be taken up on some of the peculiarities of the body's sexuality, which you will need to know about in order to erase the "to sex" goals package in therapy. So that is the why for this very strong stress on the body's peculiarities on the subject of sexuality, on the human body's peculiarities, I should say.

But before we discuss these peculiarities in detail it's an excellent idea to take a short look at the subject of sexuality amongst life forms in the universe at large to see how this subject ever got into existence and what it's all about.

Asexual Reproduction

Well sex, of course, is the subject of reproduction and how life forms reproduce themselves and you should know that the simplest of life forms simply don't reproduce sexually at all. They reproduce asexually and they reproduce by a system called cell splitting. They are usually single cell creatures like bacterium or amoeba or viruses and when they want to reproduce the cell simply splits itself into two and the two halves go their separate ways and become fully grown creatures in their own right. Cell splitting, it's asexual reproduction.

Now the problem with cell splitting, as far as a life form is concerned, is that the reproduction is a clone. In other words there's no new genetic information in the off spring than there was in the parent. The off spring are identical genetically to their parents and there's never any new genetic material that gets into the life form, and this is a liability to a life form because it means that the life form cannot easily change against a changing environment, cannot easily adapt to the environment. It's very difficult for organisms which reproduce asexually to change. They can but it's difficult for them to do so.

They overcome their difficulties by an enormously rapid reproduction rate, but you can learn about this if you want to study it up, you want to study bacteriology and virology and you learn how these little tiny creatures overcome these difficulties, but generally speaking that is the liability there.

In order to overcome this difficulty way back along the line the creature said, 'Well we'll have to do something about this.' and they came up with a system,

and this system they came up with is called sex, the system was called sex. And they reproduce sexually.

Sexual Reproduction

Now the way the creature reproduces sexually is it builds a specialized sex cell. It builds one or more special sex cells which contains all of its genetic information and it's designed to fuse with a sex cell of another creature of its own type which may have a slightly different genetic pattern. The two sex cells fuse and they become a separate organism and the separate organism has 50% of its genetic information from one of its parents and 50% of its genetic information from the other one of its parents, and the offspring thereby benefits from having the genetic information of both of its parents and this allows it to survive better in the universe.

And it really does. Sex is a wonderful survival mechanism in the universe. It gives the creatures that reproduce sexually a definite edge over those that reproduce asexually.

Never the less you will still find simple creatures that reproduce asexually. You can see them if you go out and buy even a cheap microscope and go down and get a bit of pond water and put a drop of it on the slide of a microscope and you sit and watch the amoeba and the paramecia reproducing by cell splitting.

They are doing it all the time all day long millions and millions of them in a drop of pond water. You'll watch them there doing it, they're still doing it, they've been doing it for millions of years and unless mankind blows the planet up they'll still be doing it in millions of years time. The system does work, asexual reproduction.

But that doesn't concern us for we're concerned with the sexual reproduction.

Sex Cells

Now about these two specialized sex cells, one is called a female cell and one is called a male cell, the difference between the two cells is quite interesting.

The male cell is the mobile cell, the active one, and it seeks out the female cell, the male cell is usually very small. Its main characteristic is mobility and it's

simply nothing else but a mobile mass of genetic material. It has usually a very short life, it doesn't live very long but it's mobile.

The female sex cell is much larger. It's also called an ovum or an egg. It contains a lot of food material so it can live for a long while and it's not mobile. It stays put and it relies upon the male cell to come to it, and the male cell fertilizes, as we say, the female cell. The female cell doesn't seek the male cell, the male cell always seeks out the female cell.

Now there's the difference between those two types of sex cells.

This is common for all creatures that use sexuality. There's the male cell and the female cell and the male cell is the active one and the female cell is the large one that stays put and it's the female cell which when fertilized becomes the new creature.

The little tiny male cell disappears inside and is absorbed by the ovum. That would be another way to put it. But it contributes half of the genetic material to the egg and then the egg goes ahead and splits. Cell splitting takes place and the egg then grows into and becomes the new creature. And so on as you can read about in the biology textbooks.

Now this subject of the sex cells is very important to the subject of sexuality because as far as your body is concerned the whole subject of sex is the game of the sex cells. That's the totality of it as far as the body is concerned. The whole of the body's sexuality is devoted to getting its sex cells married up with the sex cells of someone of the opposite sex. That is the whole idea.

So, as far as the body is concerned, sex is the game of the sex cells, is the sex cells game.

Now bear that in mind, the sex cells are the be all and end all of the body's sex game, they've got no other purpose as far as the body's concerned, the subject of these sex cells. That is it. That's sex as far as your body is concerned, is the sex cells.

Bisexuality

Now there's another system of sexual reproduction. In fact there are two well known systems of operation that creatures use to get their sex cells together and so forth in the universe. And the first of these is what we call the bisexual creatures. Now this was no doubt the first system. And a bisexual creature is also known as a hermaphrodite. Bisexual, hermaphrodite mean the same thing.

It means that the creature contains both male and female sex cells. It's a hermaphrodite, it's a bisexual. And the creature's male sex cells cannot fertilize its own female sex cells, usually there's a device to prevent this happening. But the creature's male sex cells can fertilize the female sex cells of another creature of its type and also its own female sex cells can be fertilized by the male sex cells of another creature of the same type.

A good example of the hermaphrodite, the bisexual, is the earthworm. All earthworms are bisexuals and many plants are. Many trees are bisexuals they have both male sex cells and female sex cells

Now it's a very efficient system, the bisexual system is, and from a biological point of view the only reason that's known why a creature got off the bisexual system of reproduction, is because of increasingly compulsive games play in the "to sex" goals package. That leads to gender specialization and that is the second type of system that the creatures use.

Unisexual

They cease to be bisexual and they become unisexual. They become either males or females and not both. Now some trees are like that. Some trees are masculine trees and they have feminine trees of the same type and most so called higher mammals are of that type. They're either male creatures or they're female creatures and they're not both. And certainly the ape family falls into that category and human beings fall into that category. The male body only contains male sex cells and the female body only contains female sex cells and that's what we call gender specialization.

When we say gender specialization it's a phenomena of the sex cells, it's not a phenomena of anything else. It's simply a matter of a male body is a body that only contains male sex cells and a female body is a body that only contains female sex cells, and that's the gender specialization at a sex cell level. It's the only level that really means anything.

Let's quickly tie up this subject of bisexuality and unisexuality with our classes here, our logical classes.

Bisexual Classes

A bisexual creature because it can be both male and female can hold that class and can in any particular sexual encounter be male and not female and in another sexual encounter it can be female and not male. The only thing that it can't be is neither male nor female. So the bisexual can occupy three of the four possible classes. He can be both male and female, he can be male and not female and he can be female and not male. I say he but I should say he or she. So three of the four classes the bisexual can handle.

Unisexual Classes

But the unisexual class creature can only handle one of the classes. He can't be both male and female, so he is either "male and not female" or "female and not male" and he can't be "neither male nor female." So he can only be one of the classes.

So bear that in mind, that when the creature stops being bisexual and takes up unisexuality each individual creature drops two of the classes. The bisexual can occupy three out of the possible four classes. The unisexual creature can only occupy one, he's either a "male and not a female" or he's a "female and not a male," that's one out of the four classes he can occupy. So it's important to grasp that.

It follows immediately from that, that it's very hard to conceive of a bisexual creature having any sexual problems because he's both male and female. So there can't be any great conflict in his mind between masculinity and femininity, can there? And that's the base of all conceivable problems on the subject of sex, you see. Your bisexual doesn't have any sexual problems.

If you could converse with an earthworm, the earthworm would have great difficulty in understanding the idea of a sexual problem because the earth worm simply doesn't have any sexual problems. He can't have, he's bisexual. You see that?

It's only creatures that are unisexual, that have taken up gender specialization that have sexual problems, and I can assure you that all of them do. All animals that have taken it up have sexual problems.

Insects that have taken up gender specialization have sexual problems. They don't talk about them because they can't talk really but if you examine them you'll see that they do have problems.

And mankind certainly has problems on the subject of sex because his body has taken up gender specialization. If his human body was bisexual mankind would have no sexual problems.

What would the logical set look like that the male and the female are occupying?
What would the set look like?

There's considerable reduction. I won't give you all the reductions and so forth that come through from asexual beings right the way through hermaphroditism and the bisexual down through the gender specialization. It would just take me too long to write them all down. And I've got them written down, I've noted them but we're only interested in what the human beings situation is. What the reduction is for the human being.

Well this is what it looks like for a human being. The human being is either a male or a female.

Let's take the male. Well, what does he operate on? We're talking about the male body here now, we're not talking about the male spiritual being, we're talking about the male body.

Well the male body operates on the "to sex" postulate and the "to not be sexed" postulate. And he contains male sex cells and no female sex cells.

[The male operates on the postulates I must sex others and I must not be sexed by others. Editor]

Now the female operates on the "to be sexed" postulate and the "to not sex" postulate and the creature contains female sex cells and no male sex cells.

And that's the two sets, those are the two classes. Those two classes constitute the universe of human sexuality at the bodily level and they are the only postulates that are used and they are the sex cell configurations.

So that's what it looks like if you were to write it down on a bit of paper, that's what it looks like.

But you might say to yourself, "Well, wait a minute, hold your horses Dennis, are you trying to say Dennis that the human body, a human male body cannot go into the "to not sex" mode?"

That's true, it can't. It's fixed in, "to sex".

Well how does it move then up and down the scale? Does it ever move beyond the zero point?

No, it never does, a male body is fixed in the "to sex" mode, Plus "to sex". It never goes over the zero point and goes into "to not sex" it's always in "to sex" it

just simply moves up and down in intensity. Goes high intensity “to sex”, low intensity “to sex” but it never crosses the zero point.

Similarly with its “to not be sexed” postulate. A male body goes high intensity “to not be sexed”, low intensity “to not be sexed” but it's always in the negative side, it never goes over the positive line, never goes over the positive into “to be sexed” cause that would be the feminine postulate, you see? You follow that, a little bit tricky until you get the hang of it.

Similarly with the female, the female body is only in “to be sexed” and positive. Stays on the positive side, never gets into “to not be sexed”, only into “to be sexed” and “to not sex”.

Stays on the negative side of “to not sex” never gets into the “to sex” and that's the way it looks and just as the male moves up and down, high to low intensity of his “must sex”, I'll use “must sex” instead of “to sex” from this point onwards, I'll use the enforcement of the postulate.

The male goes high intensity “must sex” down to low intensity “must sex”. Similarly the female goes from high intensity “must be sexed” down to low intensity “must be sexed” and as far as the body is concerned it responds to these relative movements just as if the postulate was moving over the zero point.

In other words the relative intensity of the postulate is sufficient to permit the games play to occur. You follow that?

I could write this down much easier on a piece of paper, it's not easy to explain it verbally, but I think I can get it through so you understand it.

It's simple a matter of relative intensity, the creature is stuck on the positive side or stuck on the negative side of its postulate and it moves up and down the positive or the negative side of its postulate and it can still play games by moving up and down. It's a restricted games play.

But although this is true for the body, when you're erasing the “to sex” goals package in therapy you always, repeat always, use the positive and negative postulates. You use “must sex”, “mustn't sex”, positive negative; “must be sexed”, “mustn't be sexed” positive negative. You use the whole range.

The spirit, the human spirit can use the whole range. The body because of its gender specialization has got itself stuck. Well ok, that's the body's problem but you don't have to get yourself stuck. You follow that?

So that's what the sets look like and the body can operate on them, it's a bit limiting, but it manages it, and you can see the sort of limitations it gets into by its obsession with compulsive games play. It would do a lot better if games play wasn't compulsive but the body's got itself stuck with compulsive games play in the “to sex” goals package so it has to suffer the consequences.

So, I want you to bear with me on this material I'm giving you. I'm just playing some of it back and it does sound very complex but there's a good reason for it. It will all start to come good, it will, just bear with me and read it over and over until you've got it clear in your own mind. Just bear with me at the moment.

Now let's go for a little bit of light relief, you might say, we'll get off the part about the body and we will take up what might be called ideal games play. The ideal games play in the "to sex" goals package, the body does follow this within its limitations and this is an ideal version of games play in the "to sex" goals package.

The Must Sex" " Mustn't Be Sexed" Game

The game would start with the male, he's the active one, the moving one, he directs a "must sex" postulate at the female.

The female, we'll talk about human beings here, would on detecting this "must sex" postulate she immediately goes into her "mustn't be sexed" mode and opposes the postulate.

Immediately sexual sensation is generated at the boundary between these opposing postulates and both the parties enjoy the generation of the sexual sensation.

And now the female must be careful not to come on too strong with her "mustn't be sexed" postulate because if she comes on too strong with it she will overwhelm the male and drive him from "must sex" into "mustn't sex".

In other words he'll feel he's been given the cold shoulder and his postulate will change from "must sex" to "mustn't sex". He will simply lose interest in the female if she comes on a bit strong.

And if this happens the female immediately notices that he's flipped from "must sex" to "mustn't sex" now. And he's now in "mustn't sex" she's in "mustn't be sexed", they are now occupying complementary postulates, there is no more sexual sensation being generated between them and the game has ended.

So to keep the game going now she has to do something about it. She knows she's come on a bit strong so what she does now, she flips over to "must be sexed", she flips over to a positive postulate. She gives him the "come hither" sign.

Soon as she goes into "must be sexed" and he's still in "mustn't sex" the postulates are again opposing each other, sexual sensation is again being generated and which they can both sense and enjoy.

But immediately this happens the male, of course, he now sees the “come hither” signal; he regains the interest in the female. He now flips back to his positive “must sex” postulate.

She, of course, senses this and immediately she senses it, in order to keep the game going because they're now in a complementary postulate situation again, in order to keep the game going she now has to flip over back to a negative, to a ‘mustn't be sexed’ postulate and thereby keep the sexual sensation being generated.

So what it amounts to is that no matter which postulate that the one player creates and directs at the other, the other one will mock up and generate and put out the opposing postulate and so you'll always get the sexual sensation being generated.

Now this becomes what we call a ritual mating dance between the couple, and it just goes on and on and on. They circle round and they get closer and closer during the game and eventually the terminals close completely. But the game is still being played exactly as I've mentioned it until physical sex is embarked upon. And even at the point of physical sex we get this same postulate structure occurring at the physiological level.

The males “must sex” postulate at the physical level, effort level becomes a forward pelvic thrust, the males “mustn't sex” postulate becomes a backward pelvic withdrawal.

The females “must be sexed” postulate becomes a backward pelvic thrust and finally the females “mustn't be sexed postulate becomes a forward pelvic withdrawal.

Now as you examine these physical efforts, these bodily efforts that occur during coitus, as you examine them you are immediately struck by that fact that there's no difference physically between the males “must sex” postulate, with its forward pelvic thrust and the female's “mustn't be sexed” postulate which is a forward pelvic withdrawal.

Similarly there's no difference between the females “must be sexed” postulate of a backward pelvic thrust and the males “mustn't sex” postulate of a backward pelvic withdrawal.

It's simply a matter of a rose by any other name smelling as sweet, you see? There's no difference between the forward pelvic thrust and the forward pelvic withdrawal and the backward pelvic thrust and the backward pelvic withdrawal. They are the only two motions involved. You see?

And this is exactly what we would expect to occur because of the false identification between “must sex” and “mustn't be sexed” and “must be sexed” and “mustn't sex” in the “to sex” goals package at the bodily level. Because of this false identification we would expect these physical efforts to be identical and they are identical. Do you see that?

So when I say at the physiological level that the body is completely addicted to this false identification that “must sex” equals “mustn't be sexed” and “must be sexed” equals “mustn't sex” I'm on very firm ground because I can prove it at an effort level in the body. It shows up at the effort level during the sex act.

Now looking at this tape I see that we're getting towards the end of this tape so umm... let's just run it off to the end of the spool, Greg, and pick it up on the other side.

There we are, back again, side two same date.

Now there's one other physiological muscular action, which I haven't mentioned that goes with these sexual postulates. First of all we'll take the female.

The female when she's in her “must be sexed” mode with the backward pelvic thrust is a relaxation of the muscles of her vagina and also a relaxation of the sphincter muscle on her rectum. When she goes into her “mustn't be sexed” mode the muscles in her vagina contract closing the vagina up, closing the tubing off, and also the sphincter muscle in her rectum contracts.

Similarly for the male, the male when he's in his “must sex” mode with his forward pelvic thrust, he hasn't got a vagina, of course, but when he's in his “must sex” mode the sphincter muscle on his rectum will contract and when he goes into his backward pelvic withdrawal, his “mustn't sex” the sphincter muscle on his rectum will relax.

Now the significance of these I'll explain later. There is some significance and that's why I'm mentioning it.

Now obviously the immediate effect of the vaginal muscle contracting in the female “mustn't be sexed” mode is to allow her to grip his penis when he's thrusting with his forward pelvic thrust. As he thrusts into her vagina, she grips it and that increases the sexual sensation and when he withdraws his penis she relaxes it, relaxes the vaginal muscle on the return action. So the effect of this is to enhance the sexual sensation in the coital act between the partners. That's the immediate effect there.

Now the coitus proceeds usually at a more and more frantic rate until the point of orgasm is reached. Now orgasm has its own definite postulate structure and it's one that you should know. Orgasm is reached at a definite point in the cycle.

Orgasm

Now the male achieves orgasm when he becomes convinced that he has deprived the female of her “mustn't be sexed” postulate and has driven her from “mustn't be sexed” into “must be sexed”. That is orgasm for the male.

The female goes into orgasm when she becomes convinced that she has deprived the male of his “mustn't sex” postulate and has driven him into “must sex.”

Now these are completely subjective considerations. But practiced lovers can manage it so that they have their orgasms simultaneously. It's simply a matter of conviction between them.

These are entirely subjective considerations but that is what orgasm consists of. At the point of orgasm, complementary postulates maintain, the male in his “must sex” and the female in her “must be sexed”.

Sexual sensation drops after the point of orgasm and everything drops off to zero. But the act has been completed, the ejaculation of the sperm occurs and some few hours later if all goes well one of the sperm will meet up with a female egg cell and fertilize it and the female will be inseminated and become pregnant which is the whole purpose of the game as far as the body is concerned.

Now when you examine these various physical efforts at the bodily level during coitus although they do make sense during face to face coitus which is what is normally practiced by mankind, by human beings, they make a lot more sense when the male enters the female from the rear which is the ape mode, the original mode of the ape.

For millions and millions of years man's ancestors, the male entered the female from behind.

This so called missionary position where the couple are face to face during the sex act is a “Johnny come lately” of the last few thousand years. So it's no surprise that the physiological efforts at the bodily level make a lot more sense when the male enters the female from the rear.

Well there is the sex act at the basic physical level in terms of the postulates and in terms of the muscular actions of the human torso.

Sexual Ionization of Body Parts

And next it behooves us to take up this subject of sexual ionization of body parts because that's an important component in our understanding of bodily sex.

Now the first thing you should understand about bodily sexual ionization, the sexual ionization of the human body, is that it's fixed. It doesn't vary from one month to another, it's quite fixed. This is because the human beings don't have a sexual season like animals do.

The apes, cats, dogs, most mammals go into a sexual season and they reproduce during the sexual season. When they are out of season they're not interested in sex at all.

But because the human being is in sexual season all year round his ionization is permanent on his body. If it was permanent on animal bodies they would be in season all the year round. It is this ionization that determines whether a creature is in sexual season or not.

Now the sexual ionization, as I say, is fixed in humans and we'll now discuss what this sexual ionization is.

It starts at birth; it's faint in birth. It increases in childhood but it's still faint. It steadily increases during childhood and it shoots up to a maximum at puberty and stays at that level for the rest of the person's life and fades very slowly in old age. But even in extreme old age the ionization still remains much as it was at puberty. Ok there's the cycle, that's what we're looking at.

Ok, now which body parts are ionized and ionized with what? As I give you these ionizations some of them are quite obvious but some will come as a great surprise to you, I'm sure.

First of all the sexual ionizations of the male body. The male penis and the male testicles have a "must sex" ionization, permanent "must sex" ionization, and the only other permanent sexual ionization on the male body is the male rump and the male rectum has a permanent "must be sexed" ionization.

Now the sexual ionizations of the female body are the area of the vagina. The vulva in the female have a permanent "must be sexed" ionization. Also the area of the rump and the rectum have a permanent "must be sexed" ionization and also the female is the proud possessor of a vestigial penis called a clitoris and this vestigial penis has a residual "must sex" ionization.

Also in the mature female the breasts have a transient "must be sexed" ionization, but it's transient, it's not permanent and I don't really consider it in this study because we're only interested in the permanent ionizations at this stage.

So there are the ionizations of the male and female bodies. As I say some of them are obvious and some of them are no doubt surprising to you.

We'll take up the female ionizations first. The surprising one there is the sexual ionization of the clitoris. That one is not immediately obvious but it is there.

There's no equivalent ionization in the male vagina simply because the male has no vestigial vagina so there's no equivalent ionization there. But the female does have a vestigial penis and it's ionized with a "must sex".

Now this phenomenon is upsetting to the female. You find she's got the back half of her body permanently ionized "must be sexed" and she's got this little tiny vestigial area of the front, which is ionized "must sex". Well "must sex" is a male ionization superimposed at the front of an otherwise female body with its heavy "must be sexed" ionization of the back.

Now the female, you'll find, tends to occupy the back of her body and she tends to regard as her sexual identity the back of her body and this little bit at the front tends to go into the class of not self.

Of course, you remember because of the sexual double bind the class of "to sex" and "to be sexed" cannot both exist simultaneously in the same class so the female cannot both be in the class of "to be sexed" and be in the class of "to sex" at the same time. So if she's in the feminine class of "to be sexed" then this little bit at the front, this masculine ionization in the clitoris must be in the class of not self. And she tends to put it off and dissociate herself from it.

Lesbianism

And you will find that this slight dissociation, and oh it can't be intense, this sexual dissociation in the female, her femininity and this little masculine component in her clitoris, is the basis of lesbianism in the female. If she concentrates very heavily and gets involved very heavily with sex to do with the clitoris rather than to do with her vagina and vulva then she can easily find herself involved in lesbian practices with other females. But if she concentrates exclusively on the feminine side which is the sexuality associated with her vagina and vulva and rump etcetera then of course she escapes the lesbianism.

So there is the source of lesbianism in the female. Worth knowing if you ever want to erase it in therapy. But bear in mind even if it doesn't show as lesbianism there's always conflict in the female sexuality between her "must be sexed" ionization which she considers her own sexual identity of the rear and this little bit of vestigial penis at the front which is ionized with a "must sex" postulate.

So there's always conflict in her mind, she doesn't escape conflict at all. She doesn't escape it. She's got her own sexual conflict in her body. All is not in harmony, because of that vestigial penis that she's got. It upsets her. It's upsetting to her, fundamentally. I mean it upsets the harmony of her body.

Now over to the male. The high “must sex” ionization on the male penis and the male testicles is quite obvious and to be expected and doesn't need any further discussion but what on earth is the male doing with his buttocks, his rump and his rectum having a “must be sexed” ionization?

Thereby Hangs a Tale

Ah thereby hangs a tale and we'll have to tell you this tale so you'll understand this. This is the source of homosexuality in males and it's a great puzzle to every male, and I have got to the source of it. I do know where it comes from and I'll give you the data. Once you understand where it comes from it will stop bothering you.

Now to understand it we have to go and look back to creatures living in the wild. If you examine various creatures living in the wild in colonies particularly herbivores, creatures like stags, kangaroos and so forth you'll find in their mating season there is an enormous carnage or loss of young males in fights.

They get into fights. This is well known, you can read it up in any book on zoology and you can go out into the wild and see these deer's fighting each other during the mating season.

What happens is that the mature male deer, he's a big fella and he collects a harem. He has his own harem of female deer and he guards them quite possessively.

The young males grow up and as they grow up to be sexually mature they cast envious eyes on the big bucks harem, you see? And all the time they're nosing around and trying to get a bit of sex from these female deer of his harem, and, of course, he doesn't care for this one little bit. So they end up in fights and you find the stags fighting.

Well the fights are to the death amongst stags and amongst kangaroos.

Kangaroos have got exactly the same mating habits and the fights are to the death amongst the kangaroos too.

And unfortunately the young stags stand no chance against these big stags and they just simply get slaughtered. If they are not slaughtered their maimed and go

away to die in misery and the whole thing is very wasteful of the young male breeding stock.

You might argue, of course, well it's nature's reding of tooth and claw, it's survival of the fittest. Yes, yes but it's still wasteful if it can be avoided.

You see a species survives best if it reserves it's fighting for creatures which aren't of its own species. In other words, when a species starts to fight amongst itself it's an inefficient scene because its fighting its own species, you see, it's fighting itself. It survives much better, a species does, if it reserves it's fighting for creatures that are not of its own species. You understand me?

So when I say it's wasteful, I mean exactly that, it's very wasteful and the stags and the kangaroo's have never solved this problem, but the apes did. They solved it.

Now the problem also exists among predator's lions and tigers, they've got similar mating habits. Now they've solved it too but their solution is quite a different solution to the ape solution. So it doesn't concern us.

The apes solved it and we're interested in that because the apes are mankind's immediate ancestors. We're descended from the apes at a physical body level so we're very interested in the ape's solution to that problem and it's very relevant to this subject of the feminine ionization on the rear end of the male human.

Now there's no doubt that some millions and millions of years ago the ape too suffered this carnage amongst their ape colonies every year in the mating season. The young adolescent apes would come up and there'd be the big ape there with his harem and the young adolescent would be driven by his sexual urges to fight the big fella and he would almost invariably lose. He would lose and carnage would occur. But the apes, possibly because the apes were a little bit smarter than many other animals, came up with a solution to it. And their solution worked.

We can imagine a hypothetical scene, that one day some young adolescent ape was fighting to the death with the large ape who owned the harem and it had got to the point where he realized that he was being slaughtered and if the fight continued he was going to get killed. So he, in desperation, said to himself, "Well what the hell, is there any way I can prevent myself from getting killed here? This big fella's going to kill me and he's not going to relent until he's killed me. I can't do anything about it."

So in final desperation he suddenly remembered, this young adolescent ape had watched the female apes and he realized that the male ape, the dominant male ape, could always be appeased by a female ape.

This is true in the ape kingdom, the female ape can always appease the angry male ape by presenting her rump to him. Soon as she presented her rump to him, he mounts her sexually, makes a few pelvic thrusts and dismounts and honor is satisfied, you might say, and he goes his way, and she goes her way.

And this adolescent ape millions and millions of years ago fighting the big ape he must have realized this. The adolescent must have spotted this and in desperation to save his own life he offered his own rump to the male ape, and the male ape, of course, once a rump is offered to him he immediately assumes that this must be a female he's fighting so he did the thing his native conditioning would cause him to do. He simply mounted the adolescent male ape made a few pelvic thrusts dismounted and went his way.

We can presume that the adolescent male ape must have breathed a sigh of relief, he saved his life and more importantly his solution worked so next time he came along to the harem he knew how to save his life. He had experience, he had the experiential factor here of knowing how to solve the problem. He could fight to the point where he was losing the battle. Then he knew that he could always end the fight by acting as a female.

And so he no doubt used this mechanism there. But other eyes were watching him, lots and lots of other apes were watching.

As in any other animal colony, there are lots and lots of youngsters who watch the fights with great interest. It's of great significance to them these fights are and lots of young male apes must have been watching this adolescent ape when he presented his rump and they learnt too, and they spotted it so when their turn came to try and become the leader of the tribe and take on the big fella, they learnt how to save their life too. And, because apes are pretty smart. They were pretty quick learners, you know, for things like that and it got into their culture and it spread.

Now why would it spread through the ape colony, through the ape culture?

Well simply because those who practiced it, those who practiced this system survived. The adolescent ape who practiced this system survived and the adolescent ape who practiced it, he eventually would grow up and become a fully mature male ape and would go off and get a harem of his own.

If he didn't practice this system there's a good 80% chance that he'd get slaughtered and he would never survive and his genes would never be passed on to posterity. So the ones that adopted this system had their genes passed on to posterity, the ones who didn't survive didn't have their genes passed on.

So after a few thousands of generations of apes you would expect to find by pure Darwinian evolution that all the apes in the colonies in the area would be practicing this same system. This solution to the problem of how to stop the carnage.

Now, you might ask, "Well it's a good solution for the adolescent male ape but how does it benefit the big fellow? Does it help him?"

Yes, it does, as a matter of fact, it's a good solution for him cause look, as soon as the adolescent ape whose fighting him for dominance quits the fight and offers

his rump he's gone into the female universe. He's offering his rump up with a "must be sexed" postulate on it. So he's become feminine. And while the adolescent ape is in the feminine universe he can't be in the masculine universe because of the double bind. Follow?

[The must be female and not male double bind - editor]

So as far as the big fellow is concerned he can keep all the adolescent apes in the community in the feminine valence, if he can keep them in the feminine valence they are not in the masculine valence, or, let's not use valence we'll use universe, while they are in the feminine universe they are not in the masculine universe and if there not in the masculine universe they are not interested in his female harem. They leave his females alone. You see?

So it does benefit him too. So it benefits both of them. The young apes get benefited, it saves their lives. The older ape gets benefited as it stops these youngsters pestering his flock all the time. He just has to assert his authority once or twice, they use the mechanism and after that the feminine ionization is there and that's it.

Then he can leave them amongst his females, they won't interfere while there in the feminine valence and their likely to stay in the feminine universe while he's present and as he never strays very far away from his harem, just his presence keeps these adolescents in the feminine universe, keeps them out of their masculine universe. So it works for all parties concerned, you see.

And it's purely a male thing, it's got nothing to do with the females, I mean, the reason that the female ape gets her rump and her rectum ionized with a "must be sexed" postulate is because of the close proximity of these body parts to her vulva and her vagina.

In fact in sexual play with apes she almost certainly gets her rectum entered many, many times by sheer accident and so you quite expect the female ape would have a positive "must be sexed" ionization on her rump and on her rectum. It would be quite natural for this to be. So it doesn't concern the female at all.

In other words she always did know how to appease the male, she simply presented her rump to him. It was the young males who had to learn how to do it to save their lives.

And they did learn, and most importantly for our purposes, the purposes of human beings, is that we are related to them. And we are the descendants of those apes and we have the same physiological ionization.

You see it wasn't long for these apes before they were being born with this ionization. It can happen by genetics. That eventually all the males in the colony by usage and by games play would end up with a "must be sexed" ionization of the rump. Well, that could only go on for a few thousand years, after that they'd be born with a positive ionization, it's the way the body is. You know?

You can find this in any book on evolutionary theory, by simple usage the body adapts to it eventually. And so we would expect the male apes would be born with a positive “must be sexed” on their rumps and rectums. And today male human beings are the same, they are just born with it, born with that ionization.

Now the problem is, although this mechanism is of tremendous survival value to the apes in their colonies. The feminine ionization on the rump and rectum on the male is of no earthly use in our society. You see that? The things just a complete nuisance and because nobody knows where it comes from, you can't look it up in a book anywhere and find out about it cause all these sexual postulates are a mystery. Nobody knows about ionization of body parts because they're not aware of them. The whole things just a complete mystery.

We have a vast number of human males wandering around the planet believing they are homosexual because they're aware of this positive ionization on their rear end, the positive feminine ionization. The thing becomes a psychological nightmare.

Just as the female tends to dissociate from the front of her body we find the male tends to dissociate from the rear of his body. His masculine identity tends to be at the front of his body associated with his penis and testicles and this bit behind him, he comes to dissociate himself from.

He can't be both in the class of “to sex” and in the class of “to be sexed” the double bind says so. He can't do it, so he has to dissociate. If he's in the class of self and the self is in the class of “must sex” then the “must be sexed” component on his rear end must be in the class of not self. There's the dissociation.

Now we have the perfect dissociation and this is what happens with the male, and the male easily goes into homosexuality.

Similarly with the female, she can associate with the masculine ionization on the clitoris and easily go into lesbianism, which is just as great a mystery to the female as homosexuality is to the males.

So by examining this subject of ionization we have an immediate solution to two of the greatest sexual problems that have been with human beings for millennia, the subjects of lesbianism and homosexuality, we see where it comes from.

Now, you might say, if this is so, how come the zoologists haven't spotted it? I mean they have been studying these apes intensively for the last 50 years and for the last 100, 150 years casually. Why haven't they spotted it?

Well, of course they're aware of the mating habits of the ape. They know all about the male apes turning the rump to the dominant male who owns the harem. They know all about it, it's written up in all the zoology books. But what they don't know about, and what we know about, is the four sexual postulates of the “to sex” goals package. And we also know about this subject of body ionization, the ionization of body parts, that the zoologists don't know anything about so they

cannot correlate the subject of the mating habits of the ape, they cannot correlate that with homosexuality in the male. Follow?

There's simply no way they can do it because the missing links in the chain are the postulates of the "to sex" goals package and the whole subject of the sexual ionization of human body parts. Once you know of the ionization of the body parts it sticks out like a sore thumb. It's obvious why; it's obvious where he gets his feminine ionization of his rump from. And it's equally obvious that he isn't going to erase it in therapy, it's a genetic thing, it's quite natural.

There's no good in fighting it. He's born with it and he will die with it, just as the female is born with the male ionization on her clitoris. She's born with it and will die with it and so she might as well learn to live with it. There's nothing odd about it, nothing odd about the males' feminine ionization of his rump.

Now this is it. If you understand this, really get it, it would help you enormously to take the "to sex" goals package apart. If you don't understand it or you fight it or reject it as you might well do, then I can assure you, you simply won't get the "to sex" goals package apart in therapy. Now you understand me?

I'm not making this up, I'm not a writer of science fiction. I'm simply a research psychologist and this data has popped up when I've been researching the subject of sex and you need the data. You need the data because you will use the data in order to erase the "to sex" goals package in therapy

Ok, well now we've got this absolutely clear.

Gender Symbols

Ok finally the last thing I want to say is about this subject of gender symbols.

Now the subject of gender symbols is very interesting to mankind. First of all, all gender symbols are gender specific and the gender symbol is caught up in the double bind on the "to sex" goals package.

Every gender symbol that you come across will follow the pattern that "must sex" equals "mustn't be sexed" and "must be sexed" equals "mustn't sex" and it also follows the pattern of male equal non female and female equals non male.

In other words it follows the double bind of the "to sex" goals package as far as the body's concerned. And because the gender symbol follows this double bind you cannot erase them in therapy until you have erased the "to sex" goals package

Now this is dreadfully important, you could simply waste hours in therapy trying to erase gender symbols out of the mind at level 5C, and you simply won't do it until the "to sex" goals package has been erased at level 5B. Once you've erased the "to sex" goals package at level 5B then all the gender symbols at level 5C will erase easily.

Now I'm not going to say it again. I've said it once and that's it. That's the truth of the matter that's the way it is. So don't waste time trying to erase gender symbols until you've erased the "to sex" goals package at level 5B.

Now let's talk a little bit about gender symbols. They're of considerable interest to mankind particularly the subject of clothes. Most gender symbols are clothes. There are some that are non clothes but the most important ones to human beings are clothes.

Now why would this be? Well it comes from this fixed positive ionization of the body parts in humans and **the only way the human being can feel free to move from the positive to the negative side of the postulates in the "to sex" goals package is to cover up the fixed positive ionization on his body parts.**

In other words a girl, say, with her fixed "must be sexed" ionization will wear a dress. Without the dress on there's not much she can do, I mean, there's the body part and it's got this fixed positive "must be sexed" ionization which is visible there, but she feels that if she covers it up with a dress she can change the ionization of the dress from "must be sexed" to "mustn't be sexed" at will. You see that?

Even though the body part underneath still retains its fixed ionization, the female can set out and face the world in games play and change the ionization of her gender symbols. You see that? So this gives her more fluidity, more flexibility in sexual games play.

Similarly with a male and his clothes. He likes to wear his clothes because he can change the sexual ionization from "must sex" to "mustn't sex" with his clothes. But he can't change the sexual ionization of his body parts cause their fixed. So you'll find that humans, in sexual games play, almost invariably prefer to wear clothes rather than conduct sexual games play without any clothes on.

Without any clothes on they are rather limited in their sexual responses, but when they've got their clothes on they can show an almost infinite range of sexual responses and the whole thing is done with gender symbols and most of these gender symbols are clothes.

Now do you see the role of the gender symbol in human sexual games play? I summarized it very briefly. I'm running out of space on this tape but there is the absolute essence of it.

You can test the truth of what I'm saying by an examination of children and one of the great tests of increasing sexual maturity in a child is their use of clothes.

When they are infants and very young children they just run around, doesn't matter. Doesn't concern them if their wearing clothes or not.

As they mature as they grow older children prefer to wear clothes simply because of the sexual ionization on their body is increasing and they feel less comfortable walking around without any clothes on, so they prefer to put clothes on so they can play the little childhood sexual games that they do play. And they all play them, children do.

The little sexual games that they play with each other, they can play while they've got their clothes on. And that's why older children prefer to keep their clothes on. And for younger children it doesn't bother them, you see?

So there's plenty of experimental evidence to back up what I'm saying on the subject of gender symbols in humans, the evidence is all there if you care to look at it. In fact every bit of data I've given you on this tape, there's plenty of evidence to back it up. You'll find evidence in life and livingness to back up everything I've said. It's all there. Once you know it you'll find the evidence to back it up.

I've had to find this material out by doing this research and finding it and digging it out. Once you've got the data you'll easily find the observational evidence to back up the theoretical material I'm giving you. It's all there, you'll find it there if you care to look.

Finally, how do you approach the data on this tape? Well, try and accept the data even if it might feel strange to you, might feel abhorrent to you. Even if you feel you may be repulsed by it don't reject it out of hand. Just accept it as being provisionally true, as being possibly true. Just bear in mind that it may be provisionally true, while your working with the "to sex" goals package in therapy.

As you come to work with this "to sex" goals package you'll find that more and more material show up and this data I've given you will start to make sense.

If you reject this data out of hand that I've given you on this tape you will never erase the "to sex" goals package in therapy. If you reject it all out of hand I can tell you that you will still be trying to erase the "to sex" goals package when you're an old man with a long white beard.

Now on the other hand if you use this data I've given you on this tape and work with the "to sex" goals package you can erase every sexual quirk that anyone has ever conceived of out of the human mind. You can erase the lot. You can even erase Sigmund Freud's carpet slippers and you can't do better than that can you? So that's it.

Bye bye for now. All the best.

end of tape

02 TROM Level 5C – Loose End

by Dennis Stephens

July 7, 1994

Hello Greg, Dennis here. This is the 7th of July today and on this tape I hope to be able to cover three rather important loose ends. The first might be called “Bubbles Revisited” and for this I'm grateful to you Greg, for drawing my attention to something on a recent tape, which allowed me to look into the subject of bubbles again and come up with some more material which correlates bubbles with an important aspect of the mind.

Merchant of Fear, Energy Thief, Vacuum, The Black Hole in Space and Bubbles

At many times during his research in the 1950's Ron Hubbard came up with some related phenomena to the bubble the first of this was his mention in the 1950's of the personality called “The Merchant of Fear”. This was a rather depraved being.

The main characteristic of this depraved being was that this person seemed to sort of suck you dry emotionally, acted sort of like an emotional sponge. You would talk to this person for a while and feel emotionally depleted, quite exhausted emotionally. Ron just mentioned it and then went on to other things.

Then later on in the 1950's he did some more work on this and came up with the phenomena of what he called The Energy Thief. Now the energy thief phenomenon was a related phenomena and it's obviously the same phenomena as

the merchant of fear. He is a person that, again, emotionally sucks you dry in conversation and tears your havingness to shreds. I was present when he lectured on this subject; it was a very good lecture he gave on the subject.

Again, there the matter rested. Then late in the 1950's he came up with the phenomena of The Vacuum, which he researched some more and he discovered that the vacuum had this peculiar property of sort of slurping in energy and again if a person was dramatizing this they would show the characteristics of the energy thief and the merchant of fear. This was the phenomena of the vacuum from the whole track, which gets into restimulation in present time and the person who is dramatizing this would be sitting in the vacuum and acting as an energy vacuum.

It kept cropping up in Ron's research and he never resolved it and he kept adding bits to it as the years went along and we see a progression from the merchant of fear through the energy thief to the vacuum. It obviously kept cropping up on the subject of havingness because Ron had a havingness process in mocking up masses and pulling them in on yourself.

Well that would tend to restimulate the vacuum effect and you would get these masses flying in at times and they used to call them avalanches and I think, although I can't be certain of this, I think the phenomena there came from the work he did on that havingness technique, mocking up masses and pulling them in. It would certainly restimulate the vacuum and anyway whatever the source was of his research on it culminated, as far as I know in the late 50's there with the phenomena of the vacuum.

Now another name for the vacuum was the Black Hole in Space and it was an energy slurp. It would simply slurp energy from the being. He would put energy out towards this thing and it would simply gobble up his energy and again it would drain him dry emotionally, and he would feel quite exhausted and his havingness would get shot and there were the phenomena of the vacuum and so forth and the various other names.

[“Must not know” and “must not be known” are complementary postulates. Directing a “Must not know” at a “Must not be known” postulate will meet no resistance. The “must not know” will merge with it's complementary postulate “must not be known” and the two postulates will cancel each other. The apparency is the Must not Know will dissappear into emptytness. –editor]

And so we have all the little phenomena's. Let's go through them again, we have the merchant of fear, the energy thief, the vacuum and the black hole in space.

Now I've come across these phenomena in auditing preclears, particularly the black hole in space and it's a very nasty phenomenon if you ever come across it.

If the person hits it on the track it can be very nasty indeed. It throws the e-meter violently about the place and throws the preclear emotionally about the place too. It's a very nasty incident and produces an enormous amount of fear of the black hole, simply because it's slurping the persons energy and they daren't go near it.

They feel, otherwise they're going to get lost into the black hole. They'll vanish. They feel they will completely lose their identity by being slurped into the black hole.

Alright now so much for Ron's research along those lines, I mean, he did a lot more work on this. I've just given you a resume here. If you want to hear his actual lectures you would have to pick them up and listen to them. He gives a lot more material than I've given here on this brief resume. But I've given you the essence of the material.

Now we know from my research that there is this phenomena of the bubble that when a "mustn't be known" postulate is parked in the void and you come along and direct a "know" postulate at this "mustn't be known" postulate that a bubble of energy will appear around the "mustn't be known" postulate and you will get the phenomena of the bubble. And we know that these bubbles do occur. There was a period on the track where these occurred and we have a technique for getting rid of the bubble.

[Note. Directing a "Must Know" postulate at a "Must not be known" postulate creates a games condition. The IP barrier forms and game sensations is generated. This will appear as the bubble in space. —editor]

Null " to know" Goals Package

The bubble is the manifestation of something from nothing, of getting energy coming into existence from a non existence, something from nothing. And I developed the null-"to know" goals package to handle the bubble and erase the bubbles. All this I've given you on the previous lecture on the subject of the bubbles. So far so good.

[null "to know" goals package consists of making a null the subject of the "to know" junior universe as Dennis does with a dress or a cat at level 5C. Editor]

[I have not found a previous lecture on bubbles in the research notes I have. Editor]

But all I've given you was what happened if you directed a "know" postulate at the bubble. But then again what would happen if you were to direct a "must be known" postulate at the bubble? Well now, I should have mentioned this on my last tape.

The reason why I didn't mention it on my last tape is a very interesting reason. With the bubble phenomena on my track at no point on my track did I ever direct a "must be known" postulate at a bubble. I only ever directed a "know" postulate

at a bubble and so I had no subjective data of what would happen if you were to direct a “must be known” postulate at the bubble.

Of course it's obvious from basics what would happen if you were to direct a “must be known” postulate at the bubble. What's going to happen is the energy that you direct at the bubble is going to go towards the bubble which is essentially a “mustn't be known” postulate that's sitting in the void and as soon as it gets under the influence of the “mustn't be known” postulate it's going to go black and start to disappear. So you're sitting there, your directing energy towards this bubble and your energy is going into the bubble and disappearing, is vanishing, you see.

That's the effect that you're getting. You don't know what's in the bubble, you see, all you know is that your directing energy at the bubble and your energy is disappearing, hitting the “mustn't be known” and is going black and vanishing.

You must realize that a “mustn't be known” postulate is an un-mocking postulate. I mean if you put a powerful enough “mustn't be known” postulate into an energy mass, the energy mass will simply vanish. It's the non existence postulate, “mustn't be known,” it's the non existence. It's the way you unmock things, you see.

So you got a powerful “mustn't be known” postulate sitting in the void and you direct a “must be known” postulate at it you're going to feel yourself being sucked dry, that's the effect there. But as long as you keep directing “must be known” postulates at it you're going to lose your energy all the time. It's going to keep disappearing under the influence of this powerful “mustn't be known” postulate sitting in the void.

So you get the effect of the phenomena that Ron Hubbard was mentioning there in his research.

Now the interesting thing that I never correlated with Ron Hubbard, I knew of his research, of course, but I never correlated it with the bubble phenomena simply because on my own track I'd never done this thing. I'd never directed a “must be known” at the bubble. I had to do it in present time. Create the bubble, put the postulate in the bubble and direct the “must be known” postulate at the bubble and immediately got the connection straight away between the vacuums, the merchant of fear, the energy thief and the black hole in space. The whole thing just fell immediately into place because there was the exact phenomena that Ron Hubbard reported in the late 50's.

So we can add to our knowledge of the bubble, we can take this material from Ron Hubbard there, that a person inside the bubble dramatizing the universe of the bubble will give all the manifestations of the black hole in space, the “mustn't be known” postulate.

In other words, this person almost certainly would have a black field and they would, when you talk to them, they would tend to emotionally dry you out. You

will feel your havingness getting shot in their presence; this is the energy thief, and also the degradation there.

[see Black Field Case in the Glossary – editor]

The loss of havingness leads to a feeling of degradation, and the person who's collapsed into the bubble would of course be degraded and we get this phenomenon of the degraded being in the bubble. The phenomena of the merchant of fear so all the ends tie up now.

That this is what would happen if your person was to approach a “mustn't be known” postulate sitting in space and direct a “must be known” postulate at it. They could get overwhelmed by the “mustn't be known” postulate. They'd lose all their energy to it and finally succumb to it and sink into the “mustn't be known” postulate and they could be dramatizing this in present time, and they could actually be a bubble personality, what we would call a bubble personality.

I think that's a better name than energy thief or merchant of fear, it's a bubble personality. They show the manifestation of no substance. Their personality is all airy fairy, no substance, there's nothing there. Every time you try and pin them down there's nothing there. And all the time there's the uncomfortable feeling that you're in the presence of nothing. There isn't anything there. Their sitting in the middle of a bubble and the essence of the bubble is that there's nothing there.

And all of us have no doubt met this type of person. I've met this type of personality. As soon as Ron Hubbard mentioned the phenomena back in the 50's I recognized the personality and I also recognized it from auditing preclears because the phenomena had shown up in auditing on whole track but I didn't recognize what it was, many auditors had spotted it, but I didn't recognize what it was, but as soon as Ron clarified it we all knew what it was there.

So tying up all the loose ends now on the subject of the bubble. You can expect that some personalities will be inside the bubble and they will be an energy thief. And you'll find your havingness get depleted. They will tend to be a bit degraded as a personality and so on.

And also you can expect to feel the bubble personality. When you come across this personality in everyday life there is a sort of a lack of substance to them. They're airy-fairy, there's no depth to them there. And you would also experience the manifestation of loss of energy

So there, Greg, that wraps up the whole subject now. We can tie up the subject of the bubble there. You get the phenomena of the bubble itself forming around the “mustn't be known” postulate as a characteristic of directing a “must know” postulate at it. If you don't direct a “must know” postulate at it you won't see much of a bubble.

If you direct a “must be known” postulate at a “mustn't be known” postulate, no bubble will form, you'll just get the energy slurp. You'll just lose the mass that

you direct at the bubble. The mass will tend to be unmocked by the “mustn't be known” postulate.

So there's nothing fearful about this. The correct thing to do if you come across something which is slurping your energy? Well, simply realize what it is, that it's a “mustn't be known” postulate and simply duplicate it. It's ok, it's a “mustn't be known” postulate that's what it is. It isn't anything mystical.

Physicists in modern science have come up with a phenomenon called the black hole in space where objects disappear in this thing which seems to be a bottomless pit. Well now whether these things exist in the physical universe, they probably do, they may be a manifestation of the bubble phenomena in the actual universe of physics, in the actual real universe in present time, in the galaxy. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if they are there.

So we do have the manifestation of the bubble still floating along in the universe in present time and it hasn't left us, it's still with us. It's the phenomena of the bubble and it's known in the subject of physics as a black hole.

So there, that ties the ends up on the subject of the bubble. The only thing left now is to ask does any of this modify in any way our technology regarding the bubble?

No it doesn't, we just have to realize that the junior universe of a vacuum is a non existence by definition. If you look up the word vacuum in the dictionary you'll find that it's defined as a non existence and an absence of mass. So the term vacuum and non-existence are pretty well synonymous.

So you'll be very careful that when erasing a vacuum from the mind. It can be made the subject of the null “to know” goals package at level 5C bubbles and it will erase as such in that goals package.

Postulate Failure Chart Null

Postulate Failure Chart- Null				
	Self	Other		
1A	MKN	NMBK	MO	Forced to know Null
1B	MNKN	NMBK	G	
2A	MNKN	NMBK	G	
2B	MNKN	NMNBK	OO	Preventing Null from being Known
3A	MNKN	NMNBK	MO	Prevented from Knowing Null
3B	MKN	NMNBK	G	
4A	MKN	NMNBK	G	
4B	MKN	NMBK	OO	Forcing Null to be Known
5A	NMBK	MKN	MO	Forced Null to be Known
5B	NMNBK	MKN	G	
6A	NMNBK	MKN	G	
6B	NMNBK	MNKN	OO	Preventing from Knowing Null
7A	NMNBK	MNKN	MO	Prevented Null from being Known
7B	NMBK	MNKN	G	
8A	NMBK	MNKN	G	
8B	NMBK	MKN	OO	Forcing to Know Null

Codes

MKN	Must Know Null
MNKN	Must Not Know Null
NMBK	Null Must Be Known
NMNBK	Null Must Not Be Known
MO	Motivator / Overwhelmed
OO	Overt / Overwhelm

	Origin of effect
	Receipt of effect
	Recurring Pattern
	Break in Pattern

The junior universe of a vacuum cannot, repeat, cannot be erased as the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C because the vacuum is a non existence it has to be made the subject matter of the null “to know” goals package at level 5C bubbles.

The mass, the actual mass of the bubble, the actual sensation mass that surrounds the bubble that can be made, because it’s an existence, that can be made the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C. So the bubble, the junior universe of bubble, that is just the sensation mass, can be erased from the

mind at level 5C. Can be erased from the mind by making it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C.

But that won't break the phenomena down. Inside the bubble is the nonexistence and you have to erase the bubble phenomena. You must erase the junior universe of non existence, making it the subject matter of the null “to know” goals package at level 5C bubbles as I've already mentioned on the earlier tape.

So all we really have to do is just to be very careful when dealing with this junior universe of the vacuum, that you'll have to treat it as a synonym for the junior universe of non existence and use it and erase it within the confines of the null “to know” goals package and you'll be fine.

It erases like a lamb, it does. Once you've erased the null “to know” goals package at level 5C bubbles. Then none of this material has any charge on it at all, it's all as dead as a mackerel, it doesn't rate a flicker on my bank, none of it does, not a flicker. Even doing the correlation and playing with it there's just simply not a flicker. The whole secret is to erase the junior universe of non-existence in the null “to know” goals package.

Once you've got that nulled down and erased then the whole subject of bubbles is dead. It just deader than a piece of dead mutton, it is, as far as charge is concerned.

Right, well that wraps up the subject of bubbles.

Additional Data on Sex

Next I want to give you some additional data on the subject of sex. I wanted to include this in the original tape but unfortunately the spool wasn't long enough. And I had to leave it off and as it was the least important of the material this was the material that got deleted. Well now I'm on a new tape and I've got a bit of tape to spare here. I can give you this new material.

Gender Obsessive Postulate Situation

This is the material on the subject of GOPS. Now these GOPS are the initials of Gender Obsessive Postulate Situation.

It's a rather clumsy term but it's the best descriptive term for the phenomena I know of, without going into vast complexities of material which I haven't yet introduced and don't want to introduce at this stage because my research just isn't complete on it. So we'll call it a GOPS at this stage. Later on if I complete my research on this material I'll call it something else but at this stage we'll call it a GOPS.

Now an almost universal sexual problem that human beings have is, and this applies to both males and females, is puzzlement as to whether particular sexual activity that they engage in, one that they use to derive sexual sensation, whether this is a masculine or a feminine activity. And it can be very puzzling.

When one considers the almost infinite variety of sexual quirks that the human mind is capable of producing it's no surprise that this puzzlement occurs amongst human beings.

The problem arises when the person gets involved in some sexual activity which they find sexually stimulating and then the activity may not appear to match their gender completely so they say to themselves, "Well am I out of gender?" you know, the male might say, "Well I'm engaging in this activity, is it a homosexual activity? And if it is a homosexual activity then therefore if I am engaging in this activity I'm a sort of secret homosexual." And he starts to worry about it. And he can't resolve it so the whole thing becomes a sort of an unresolved problem and sits there in his mind as an unresolved problem.

You see how this could be? And it's only because of the vast number of sexual quirks that occur on the subject of sex.

There are more sexual quirks than there are quirks on any other of the goals packages, you know. There are a vast number of sexual quirks that human beings are capable of.

Well fortunately in this technology it's very easy to resolve this problem once and for all. We can take any quirk in the human psyche. Any conceivable quirk in the human psyche, which is a behavior which generates sexual sensation and we can determine with utter certainty whether this is a masculine pursuit or whether it's a feminine pursuit. And this is the subject of the GOPS, the gender obsessive postulate situation.

Now if you recall on the earlier tape on the subject of the "to sex" goals package, I mentioned almost briefly in passing that the male goes into sexual orgasm when he drives the female from "mustn't be sexed" into "must be sexed" and the female goes into sexual orgasm when she drives the male from "mustn't sex" in to "must sex".

You remember that material it's on the earlier tape there. The male deprives the female of her "mustn't be sexed" postulate and drives her into "must be sexed" and thereby goes into orgasm.

The female, her orgasm is depriving the male of his “mustn't sex” postulate and thereby driving him into “must sex” and that's her orgasmic situation.

Now these orgasmic situations are the peak intensity of sexual sensation so this particular postulate configuration, this particular postulation situation becomes obsessive to the gender. That's the essence of what I'm getting at here. That's why I call it a Gender Obsessive Postulate Situation.

The male becomes obsessed with activities that deprive another person whether a male or a female, that deprive another person of their “mustn't be sexed” postulate. And drive them into “must be sexed”. He becomes obsessed with this postulate configuration, with this postulate situation.

Similarly the female becomes obsessed with the postulate situation where she is depriving another, whether a male or a female of their “mustn't sex” postulate and driving them into “must sex”.

In other words these GOPS situations become associated in the mind with peak sexual sensation. You see that? And equally importantly they're quite distinctive.

The male has no interest in the GOPS of driving a person from “mustn't sex” into “must sex”. It simply leaves him cold. He simply doesn't generate any sexual sensation for himself in that situation. It's not a peak sexual experience for him, at all. Yet that same situation is very significant to a female, you see that?

Similarly with a female, to the female the situation of “mustn't be sexed” being driven into “must be sexed” leaves her completely cold, you see that? Has no significance for her at all.

So these situations are distinctive of gender. We can separate gender, in other words, by the sexual quirk that the person has and is using to generate sexual sensation.

Or it could be, doesn't need to be a sexual quirk, it could be just ordinary straight sexual relationship, good normal sexual relationship, there. They are separated out too.

So this is of tremendous value to us on this subject of sexuality. All we have to do is to know what the sexual situation is that the person is engaged in, which they're using to derive sexual sensation, and note it's postulate structure in terms of the sexual postulates of the “to sex” goals package.

In other words see what sort of a sexual situation it is, once we've spotted it we know, it's going to be one or the other, it's going to be one of those two, it can't be anything else. See the person's either in a male universe or he's in a female universe.

If he's in a male universe it's the male GOPS and if the person's in the feminine universe it will be the female GOPS. The only evaluation required is to take the

situation and interpret it in terms of the sexual postulates of the “to sex” goals package. You see that?

But that's not difficult if you know the postulates. If you know the postulates there you can see at a glance. This never poses any difficulty, never poses any difficulty at all.

I'll give you an example of this that will clarify the situation. I had a preclear once many years ago in London that had a sexual quirk to do with wearing Wellington boots and he used to get sexually aroused if females were wearing Wellington boots. It used to give him an erection; he used to get sexual arousal. And he was always pestering his girlfriends to wear Wellington boots.

Well this was fine, the only trouble was that if he wore Wellington boots himself he would again get sexually aroused and the problem was that it used to worry him as to whether he was masculine or feminine. He didn't know whether it was a masculine quirk or whether it was a feminine quirk. He didn't know whether he was a homosexual or not. That was the main worry.

He enjoyed his little game with the Wellington boots, that wasn't what was bothering him. What was bothering him was he didn't know whether he was in his male universe where he reckoned he ought to be or whether he was in the feminine universe where he decided he didn't ought to be. See?

Well now we could solve this right away, the person could solve this right away, there. Quite obviously the female wears the Wellington boots. If he wears the Wellington boots he's the female. But look it's still the male getting the sexual arousal. So the Wellington boots in some way must be associated with the male orgasm. You see that?

It's a male pushing the female through from “mustn't be sexed” into “must be sexed”.

I can't tell you any more than just the barest details of it but essentially it would have been a male activity simply because of this consideration the female is more easily sexable when she was wearing Wellington boots. It made her more sexable, more sexy and more amenable to sex.

I recall him telling me that, that was definitely part of it there, that it made her more amenable to sex, so there we are.

That somehow wearing the Wellington boots was depriving the female of her “mustn't be sexed” postulate. So therefore it's a male GOMS therefore he was a male, he was in the male universe. You see how you could evaluate this?

Now this can go to quite extreme lengths this evaluation, it can. How about a male who derives sexual pleasure from being raped by another male, it gives him an erection. How about that? Now which universe is he in, is he a male or is he a female? Is he in a male universe or is he in a female universe?

He's in a male universe, he's not in the female universe. Why? Why is that? Well the GOPS, the gender obsessive postulate situation that is giving him the sexual thrill, giving him the erection is a person being driven from "mustn't be sexed" into "must be sexed" which is the male GOPS, you see that.

The fact that his body is being driven through the "mustn't be sexed" into "must be sexed" has got nothing to do with it. He's not occupying that side of his body when it's happening to him, you see. He's the other side deriving the sexual pleasure... occupying the male side of his body during the sexual assault and enjoying the sexual sensation as a male would enjoy it. You see that? So he's in the male universe at that point.

See it's not difficult to sort it out. It's simply a question of which of the GOPS's is the one which is sexually stimulating to the person and that determines their gender.

Now I'll give you an example of a male that's in a female universe. We have the case of a male who wears feminine clothes in order to sexually arouse other males. Now here the GOPS is driving other males from "mustn't sex" into "must sex". In other words he's trying to deprive them of their postulate "to not sex," trying to force them "to sex." you see, by wearing feminine clothes. So this male is in the feminine universe and he's being sexually stimulated by a feminine GOPS.

Take some feminine examples. Let's take the example of a mother who has a queer sexual perversion, who derives sexual sensation and sexual pleasure from dressing her son in female clothes. Now which universe does that put her into?

Well it puts her into the male universe. It's a male GOPS situation because she's driving her son from "mustn't be sexed" into "must be sexed" by making him wear feminine clothes. So therefore she's in the male universe. It's a male universe GOPS situation.

On the other hand a mother with a sexual quirk where she derives sexual sensation from dressing her daughter in boys clothes would be in the female universe. And why would that be? Well by dressing her daughter in boys clothes she is driving the daughter into a "must sex" situation, she's masculinating her, you see, driving the daughter from "mustn't sex" into "must sex" by forcing her to adopt all these male gender symbols. So therefore it's a feminine GOPS situation and she's in the feminine universe when she practices this perversion.

You see they can all be sorted out, Greg. I think I've given you enough examples here now to see it doesn't matter how peculiar the perversion, providing the person derives sexual sensation from the perversion you can always determine which GOPS it is and thereby determine which universe, whether male or female, the person is in.

So there's the mechanism of the GOPS, it's a very valuable mechanism. It's something that any sexual therapist would give his back teeth to know about, you

know. I mean it solves so many problems, instantly. It's an instant solution to so many human sexual problems.

Finally on this little section on the subject of sex I'd like to anticipate some questions I'm likely to be asked on this subject of whether there's any use of the bubble technology in the erasure of the "to sex" goals package. Well the answer is no. The answer is no. Even though we have a situation where we have a male with male sex cells and no female sex cells and female body with female sex cells and no male sex cells, I've thoroughly researched this whole area in terms of bubbles and the answer is no. The answer is no there's no bubble situation that I've come across on the subject of sex.

In other words, the "to sex" goals package will erase without using the bubble technology on the subject of sex cells.

It wouldn't be technically wrong to address the junior universe of no male sex cells within the null "to know" goals package or the junior universe of no female sex cells within the null "to know" goals package. It wouldn't be technically in error to do so but I've never come across a situation where it would be required to do so, and certainly one wouldn't dream of doing so until one had erased the general junior universe of non existence within the "null to know" goals package. But anyway, as I say, I haven't come across any need to do this I've thoroughly researched this whole subject of bubbles in relationship to sex there and it's a dead end. It really is, it's a dead end.

It was very promising when I first came across it. I thought, "Well, well this will be an absolutely fertile ground for bubbles." And it isn't, it isn't. It's a dead end.

So there's no point in it, there's no future in it, and although you can certainly erase those null universes of no female sex cells and no male sex cells if you want to but I don't think you'll get anything out of it. It's a dead end.

So I thought I'd mention this in passing to answer a question which I might be asked in the future on the subject of the relationship of bubble technology and the erasure of the "to sex" goals package. The answer is, it's not necessary. You don't need to back up our bubble technology on the subject of the "to sex" goals package regarding sex cells.

However there are some conceivable games people might play with gender symbols and the absence of gender symbols where you could use the bubble technology. Where a person gets involved in playing games with the absence of gender symbols. But look this material here is not necessary to run in order to erase the "to sex" goals package. The "to sex" goals package will erase quite independently of the subject of gender symbols as I mentioned to you on the main tape.

You know, actually it's the other way around. That you won't erase gender symbols until you've erased the "to sex" goals package. So although you may use the bubble technology, may have need for the bubble technology on the subject

of gender symbols, on playing games to do with the non existence of gender symbols it doesn't apply on the sex cells game which is the game associated with the erasure of the general "to sex" goals package in therapy.

So I hope that will answer the questions that haven't arrived yet but undoubtedly may arise in the future. Ok, so much for that.

Identity and Purposes, Entities

The third and final thing I want to take up on this tape is the subject of identity and purposes and to wrap up this subject of level 5C.

Now the first thing we need to know about an identity is, of course, that it is a junior universe, that the class of identities are within the class of junior universes. It's a type of junior universe, see, it's an identity.

The only difference we see between the idea of an identity and the idea of a junior universe is that the identity we usually consider as being alive or, as the main class of junior universe consists of both life and non life objects, entities. Ok?

Junior Universe Only Consists of Postulates

Now, one of the propositions that some people find very difficult to grasp is that a junior universe and that includes identities, of course, only consists of purposes. It's very difficult for some people to grasp this, they think that there's something else there.

In other words, the great illusion in this universe is that a junior universe, identities etc. consists of other things than postulates. Or if they do consist of postulates, they consist of postulates plus other things. Well this just isn't so. The junior universe only consists of postulates.

This isn't just an idle speculation I can actually prove this statement because in my research on many occasions I've erased postulates from the mind and discovered that junior universes are erased too.

For example, the junior universe of masculinity consists of, and only consists of, the postulate "to sex" and the postulate "to not sex". Now how do I know this to be simply so? Well simply because when you erase the "to sex" goals package, in

which two of the four postulates of the “to sex” goals package are the postulate “to sex” and the postulate “to not sex”, you find that the junior universe of masculinity has erased too.

Now if the junior universe of masculinity consists of other things than those two postulates then there would be a residue left after the “to sex” goals package was erased. Wouldn't there? But there is no residue. When you come to test the junior universe of masculinity at level 5C after you've erased the “to sex” goals package you find there's absolutely nothing there. That it's gone, it's erased, it went when you erased the “to sex” goals package.

Similarly with the junior universe of femininity, which only consists of the two postulates “to be sexed” and “to not be sexed”, that too erases when the “to sex” goals package erases, thus proving that it only consists of those two postulates.

So I'm on very firm ground when I say this. It's not just an idle opinion. I'm on very firm ground.

So our very first principle to do with level 5C will tell us the lower road to erase using junior universes is first of all to null down the “to know” goals package at level 5A, as far as we can.

Then to get in at level 5B and null, well more than null, but collapse or erase as many junior goals packages as we can at level 5B. And, only then, to even start looking or even consider going on to level 5C.

You see there's a very good reason why step 5B precedes step 5C in the procedure. Step 5C simply doesn't run until you've run step 5B, and we see why it won't run, because the junior universes at level 5C consists of the postulates found in the junior goals packages at level 5B.

In fact the only junior universes that will hang fire, that you'll find at level 5C that are hanging fire are those which have got postulates in them to do with junior goals packages, which as yet have not been erased or collapsed at level 5B.

As you're picking up these junior universes at level 5C on the basis of interest, your interest will naturally go to the ones which are un-erased. You see, your picking them out there and they won't erase, they haven't erased. The only reason they haven't erased is because the purposes are hanging fire on un-erased and un-collapsed goals packages at level 5B.

And why are these junior goals packages hanging fire at level 5B? Why didn't they erase at level 5A? Well they didn't erase at level 5A because the person considers the purpose of these junior goals packages to be independent of the four legs of the general “to know” goals package.

If the person considers the purpose of the junior goals package to be within the purposes of the general “to know” goals package of course then the junior goals package will collapse and erase when you're nulling at level 5A. You see that?

Or to put it another way when you finally erase the “to know” goals package at Level 5A all the junior goals packages at level 5B will have been erased and all the junior universes at level 5C will have been erased.

So when you finally do erase the “to know” goals package at level 5A there isn't anything left at level 5B and there's nothing left at level 5C to erase. Follow that?

The theory behind this is very simple and I'm giving it to you here. If you can grasp this you get the whole thing and you'll have no trouble on level 5A, 5B and 5C. If you don't get it you'll struggle.

Level 5 Procedure

So your procedure, you start in at level 5A, you null 5A down as far as you can go. It may go through to erasure, fine, marvelous.

If it does then you won't have to do anything at level 5B or level 5C, but with the vast majority of people it will hang fire, it will null down and then stop.

Well that's the point you leave 5A and go on to 5B. You say to yourself, “Right, I've got some junior goals packages which I consider independent of the “to know” goals package.” and you find them at level 5B on the basis of interest but you select them off the prepared list I've given you.

I've given you a list of the most important of the junior goals packages at level 5B. You select off that list initially. Till you've exhausted that list. Till there's nothing on that list which is of any further interest to you.

Then when you, and every time you erase or collapse a junior goals package at level 5B you always go back and re-null the “to know” goals package at level 5A. You must mop up that extra charge. And backwards and forwards you go.

When you can't find anything on the prepared list I've given you, and there's still some charge around you say to yourself, “Ok.” You can then start looking for junior goals packages of your own if you want to.

I've given you how you can find them and how you can find if they're erasable or not. But finally you're going to get to a point on level 5B where you can't find any more junior goals packages of any significance. It's all gone very quiet but the “to know” goals package still won't erase, won't go to erasure.

Right, that means that you're now finished with 5B temporarily. You've got to go onto 5C now.

So you go onto 5C and on the basis of interest you find a junior universe. Now the first thing you do with a junior universe is run it. Make it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C. That's the first thing you do.

If it erases that's fine, you've finished with that one. Then re-null the basic “to know” goals package at level 5A.

Every time you erase a junior universe at level 5C you always re-null the “to know” goals package at level 5A. You must do this to mop up your charge; otherwise you'll keep building up charge on the basic package, which will stop you in your tracks eventually. You got to keep that basic package nulled.

But sooner or later at level 5C you're going to come up against one that won't erase. You try it at level 5C and it just grinds on. You make it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package and you can't erase it. And so, right , what do you do then?

Well you say to yourself, “This junior universe must consist of some purposes which belong in an un-erased or un-collapsed junior goals package at level 5B and it's up to you to find out where it is.

So you sit down and list out the purposes and functions of this junior universe that is hanging fire. Just list them off. Just write them down on a bit of paper if you want to.

Then you pick the most important, this is the test, the most important of these functions or purposes and use that. You say, “Right, well there you've got this purpose, now you've got to find the goals package.” You've got to find the goals package at level 5B and formulate that purpose into a goals package at level 5B.

Or if you do so and it's un-erasable then you've got to find an erasable one. Here, I've given you that technology that'll do that so I won't repeat that again.

You're going to find an erasable goals package at level 5B that's hanging fire that contains the purpose of the hanging fire junior universe at level 5C. Then having found it you erase or collapse that junior goals package at level 5B.

And as soon as you erase or collapse that junior goals package at level 5B you immediately go back to level 5A and re-null the basic package.

Then go back to 5C and have another look at your junior universe. You now test that junior universe once more back in the basic package; it may go through to erasure now. If it doesn't, then ok, go back to your list of its functions, purposes.

Find another purpose, then find another junior goals package at level 5B and do the same procedure again.

Erase that or collapse that then go back and re-null the “to know” goals package at level 5A

Then back to your junior universe at level 5C and retest it within the “to know” goals package.

All the time your nibbling at it, you see. Every time your nibbling at it your breaking it down, breaking it's purposes down, erasing it's purposes, eventually there'll be nothing left. It will just fall apart. Be nothing there. Now that's the way you do Level 5C.

So the key datum here is that every time you erase or collapse a junior goals package at 5B or every time you erase a junior universe at level 5C you must, repeat must go back to level 5A and re-null the basic package. That is vitally important.

Otherwise you'll just be leaving yourself with charge on that basic package and your therapy will grind to a shuddering halt. Got to keep that basic package at level 5A nulled down.

Then one day you'll go back to the basic package and re-null it down and it will go straight through to erasure and all of them have gone now. All of the junior universes have gone and all your junior goals packages have gone and your basic package is gone. The whole lots gone, and nothing, none of them will show on an E-meter, it's all gone, the whole lots gone.

You won't be able to find any goals packages or any junior universes that will move an E-meter in the slightest. You've done it. You've got that. Ok, you have now completed level 5.

Well that's the routine, that's the way you do it. And so I see I'm getting to the end of this tape. I'll wish you good luck on level 5C.

Bye bye for now.

End of tape

03 Level 5C (Overts)

by Dennis Stephens

March 23, 1994

[An overt act is not just injuring someone or something; an overt act is an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics. (HCO PL 1 Nov 70 III)]

This is the 23rd of March in 1994 and today I want to take up this subject of level 5C(overts) at the level of therapy of level 5C, which is very late in therapy.

At this level of therapy the only thing that can prevent a junior universe from going through to erasure is that the person is continuing to compulsively commit overt acts against that junior universe in their present day life.

Now note that statement very carefully, it's a very precise statement. I'm not saying that the only thing that can prevent a junior universe from erasing is overt acts against that junior universe. No, I'm not saying that at all. There are many things that can prevent a junior universe from erasing in therapy, but we've covered all of them by the time we get to the end of level 5C.

So if we get to the bottom of 5C and we still have junior universes that are un-erased, and will not erase in therapy, then the only reason for this state of affairs is that the person is continuing to commit, probably, almost certainly unknowingly, their committing overt acts against that junior universe in present time games play, or potentially they will commit overt acts against that junior universe if they come across it in life

Now this is an important datum and a very important subject too, this is important to us simply because if these junior universes hang fire at level 5C then the "to know" package at level 5A is prevented from going through to erasure. You understand that?

So therefore level 5 cannot be completed. Level 5 will not complete if level 5C won't complete and in the final stages the only thing that's going to be linked to

completion of level 5C is overt acts against the junior universes, against those junior universes that hang fire at level 5C.

Everything else has been covered. We've taken the purpose of the junior universes apart, we've erased the junior goals packages that contain these purposes, we've done everything.

We've got the junior universe apart. So as far as the junior universe is concerned we've dismembered it. So why won't it erase? Well the only thing that will hold it is that the person is overting against the junior universe.

It's not the fault of the junior universe. It's the person is holding this thing in suspension in his mind so that he can overact against it.

Now that's the thing you have to understand. It's a conscious decision by the individual, though unknowing admittedly. It's a constant unknowing decision on the part of the being, to hold this thing in suspension in their mind in order to play this rather silly game of committing overt acts against it in life. And because their doing this the terminal, the junior universe at level 5C will not erase and therefore level 5A will not erase and the "to know" goals package won't erase and we cannot complete level 5.

So we have to do something about it. Now you might say, "But surely we have a very good technique at level 4 for handling overt acts?"

Well remember we take up at level 4 the 8 classes of overts and motivators on the "to know" goals package. Yes indeed we do. It's a very good technique but, and get this very clearly, it is not proof against the person who does not regard his action as an overt act. You see that?

You see, picking these things up at level 4 depends upon the person regarding his action as an overt act. If he regards them as an overt act he can pick them up at level 4, and they will come apart at level 4 routinely. But supposing he's committing some overt acts against junior universes which aren't picked up at level 4 simply because he does not consider them to be overt acts.

In other words, he's justifying his behavior. He's justifying his overt act.

He's like the SS guard, you know, as he's herding another flock of Jews into the gas chamber he's saying, "Well I'm an honorable man, I'm not committing any overt act, I'm just doing my duty. I'm not doing anything wrong here." He says as he herds another flock of Jews into the gas chamber.

Now here you see a person who's justifying his overt acts. He's calling it something else than what it is. It's an overt act but he's calling it something else. Well we don't know what he's calling it but he's justifying it, and while he continues to justify his overt act it will slip through the filter at level 4. See that?

It simply won't pick it up. If it crosses his mind he'll say, "Oh no that's not an overt act. That's nothing, that's nothing, that's alright... it's ahh... I'm just doing that. It's just a part of life, you know." He won't see that as a discreditable thing.

So it slips through the filter at level 4. He gets onto level 5, runs the "to know" goals package, takes a lot more charge off his case. Flattens off level 5B, gets onto 5C and gets stuck there... gets stuck right at the end with one or more junior universes that won't erase. See it?

Now I didn't have this problem in therapy. I didn't have this problem. I cleaned them all up at level 4. I got the lot. I'm too old a hand on this subject of overt acts and motivators but this material is going out to people who haven't got my profound understanding of the subject of overt acts and motivators compounded of 30 years experience as a practicing therapist.

In that period of time you do learn a bit about the subject of overt acts and motivators and justifications and so forth.

So I can confidently predict that on the write up of TROM as it stands today people are going to go through the levels to 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and get right to the end 5A, 5B, 5C and then get stuck at 5C cause they can't erase these little junior universes at level 5C, and they're going to get worried about it and won't know what's going on and they won't realize that they're overting because they're justifying their overts. You see? And the whole of their therapy will grind to a shuddering halt at that point.

All right now what are we going to do about that? I know it's going to happen, it will happen for sure. Well we can do something about it, very easily.

The Innocuous Question

Well now, first off, it's no good asking this person or assuming or saying to the person, backing up some technique to them which implies they're committing overts against these terminals. Because they're justifying their overts so we can't use an overt act technology that is overtly designed to handle overts, you see that, because it's an invalidation. An invalidation.

If this material was obviously overts it would show up at level 4. You see that? And if the person realized during the running of level 5 that these were overts, it would have handled at level 5A. See, level 5A will handle overts too.

So when you're running the general "to know" goals package that will handle overts and motivators of the goals package. That will handle overts at level 5A too. But it skipped through 4 and it skipped through level 5A. Get it? So it's no

good saying, "Well what the persons' going to have to run is something like: "what have you done?" And "what have you withheld?" No, flunk that won't work, it won't work. It invalidates the person. You see?

They're sitting with one or more junior universes which will not erase and they don't know why they won't erase because they're not aware that there running overts on these things. So we need a technology, which isn't going to invalidate them but at the same time it's going to run out these overts. And that's a problem.

Running Overts Out at Level 5C

And we have such a technology. There is such a technology that will do this. We can actually run out overts. There's a set of commands we can use that will run out overts most elegantly and most efficiently without ever mentioning that they are overts. Without even implying that they are overts and to do this we use the justification mechanism of the human mind.

Now what is the biggest justification for an overt? What's the biggest justification?

Let's go back to the SS guard who's herding Jews into the gas chamber. If you were to ask him, you say "Now look you're herding these Jews in there, now what are you doing?" he says, "Well this is Hitler's final solution to handling the Jews." You see that, that's what he'd say. That would be his answers. He'd say, "We're simply handling the Jewish problem."

Note the verb there, "to handle", see it. He's justifying his overt act under a mantle of "handling" and there is the euphemism.

It's a euphemism. It's a pure euphemism. It's an overt act but he doesn't call it an overt act he's saying he's "handling".

You know the mafia boss turns round to his lieutenant and he says, "Go out and handle so and so and so and so." He means go out and blow them up with a bomb or go out and mow them down with a machine gun but he calls it euphemistically "handle."

An army commander might say the same thing when talking to his lieutenant. He'll say well we need to handle hill 4 don't we gentlemen. Well you take your troops out and we'll mop up that pocket of enemy units on hill 4. We'll get that situation handled." Again the euphemism "handled".

Now the verb "to handle" is a very interesting. The goal "to handle" is a very interesting goal, a very interesting goal indeed.

Now the first thing we need to know about this goal “to handle,” is, is it erasable? Yes it is erasable.

The goal “to handle” means, if you look it up in the dictionary, “to handle” means to manage. The word handle comes from an Anglo Saxon root. We get the word hand, the word handle comes from the word hand and both of them come from the Anglo Saxon root, but the word manage comes from the Latin. Comes from the Latin word for hand, *manus*. We get the word manage comes from the Latin for hand and handle comes from the Anglo Saxon for hand, but both mean the same thing.

So “to handle” means “to manage” and if you define it as that it's erasable, it's erasable. If you define “to handle” as “to manage” it's erasable, but if you define it in a destructive sense then it's an un-erasable goals package.

Actually the goal “to handle” is within the goal “to control” it's a subdivision of the goal “to control” and in the write up of TROM I mention that the goal “to control” will not erase unless you define it as “to direct the disposition of,” which is the definition of the word control. So again we find that the goal “to handle” which is within the goal “to control” is only erasable providing you define it exactly as per the dictionary definition “to manage”. So it's an erasable goal.

First Address the Goal "to handle"

So the first thing we have to do at level 5C is to address and erase or collapse the goal “to handle” and that's the first thing the person has to do. He has to go back to level 5B, in other words, pick up this goal “to handle” and either erase it or collapse it as a junior goals package.

The legs of the goal “to handle” are “to handle”, “to not handle”, “to be handled”, “to not be handled” and it's an erasable goal provided you define the goal as “to manage”. Follow so far? It's an easy one.

By the time you get to 5C, I mean, by the time a person might need to do this technology the goal “to handle” might have already erased. So I mean it wouldn't be any surprise to discover when you go to erase it or collapse it, it's already erased or collapsed, it might have already been done.

It certainly would have been erased or collapsed if you've addressed the goal “to control” in therapy. Cause if you've erased or collapsed the goal “to control” the goal “to handle” will have also gone. That would have gone to because the goal “to handle” is within the goal “to control”.

Right, well so far so good, that is the first step of level 5C-Overts is to erase or collapse the goal “to handle”.

Second, Formulate the Therapy for Overts

We then formulate our process. You see we can now work with this goal “to handle” because we've erased it. It's an erased package. So we're now confident there's no residual charge of conflict in the package itself. In other words, we can use the legs of the package with full confidence that there's no charge on the bank on these legs of the goal “to handle”. It's an erased goal or collapsed goal and their quite null. So we have to do that step. We must do that step of erasing or collapsing the goal “to handle”.

Having done that we can then formulate our therapy commands to run out the overts that are on these junior universes.

Now the easiest way I can explain this is to give you an example and work through the example and we'll create the commands as we go.

Let's assume that the junior universe that won't erase is a dress, a dress, D R E double S. a dress. Let's assume that is the junior universe that will not erase at level 5C.

First Pair of Commands

Now the first command that we back up on the subject of the dress is “How have you handled a dress?” repeat “**How have you handled a dress?**”

Now there are two comments I'd like to make on the command.

First off that you'll note that there's no suggestion that there is an overt act. The command you're using does not suggest that there are any overts, yet I can assure you that if the person has ever committed any overts on a dress that auditing command will find them. It will peel them off. It will locate them. I can assure you of that. With the provision I've already given on the tape that the goal “to handle” can either be defined constructively or destructively.

Now note the use of the word “you”. “How have YOU handled a dress?” you might say, “That as the person is running solo he could say, “How have I handled a dress?” Well I tested both of these and the first one seems to run best. Seems to

be more incisive and so forth, but it doesn't really matter. You could ask, "How have I handled the dress?" as your running solo, but my advice is to use the third person, "How have YOU handled a dress?" and realize that the question is being addressed to you. You are addressing it to yourself.

In other words that you're the therapist addressing the subject in the session and the question you the therapist are addressing to the subject is "How have you handled a dress?" get it?

And having received the question you then proceed to answer it. You don't have to acknowledge it to yourself. You can dispense with that formality but I think that you will find that to use the third person "How have YOU". that is more incisive and I think you will find that that runs best, although to say "How have I handled it?" is not an error. That will run too. I think that you will find that saying "How have YOU handled a dress?" will run better than saying "How have I handled a dress?"

All right now how long do we run that command for? How long do we run that command for? Well we run that command until there are no more answers. Note that! **We run it until there are no more answers.** Now that's something new.

You'll find that when you run it to no more answers you're also running it to no change. It's quite safe. It's safe to use this in this instance. To run to no more answers because we're going to run another command which is the reverse of it so it's quite safe to run this.

It's not safe to run all commands in therapy to no more answers but in this instance it's quite safe to do so because we're running its reverse as well. So it's quite safe.

You run this to no more answers and you'll find that when there's no more answers that this is the point of no change in the session. So we run it to no more answers.

All right that's command number one. Now our next command, command number two is the exact reverse of command number one, it's "**How has a dress handled you?**" repeat "How has a dress handled you?"

Now I'll give some comments on that command.

Now of course this command won't run overts, this command runs motivators but this is the other side of the flow. We have to run this flow, we can't just keep running overt, overt, overt all the time. We have to reverse the flow. So were going to reverse by saying, "How has a dress handled you?" It's a flow reversal here and again you run that to no more answers.

Now it might seem a very peculiar command. It will certainly be a peculiar command for somebody very early on in therapy, but I can assure you very late in therapy a person will be able to answer it quite readily. It's not a difficult

command for a person very late in therapy. They would easily see how the dress has handled them, how a dress made them do certain things, and so forth. They would easily be able to answer the question, where a person early on therapy would have difficulty with it.

But we're not running this procedure early on in therapy. It's the last thing being run so the person has the whole command of their creativity at their disposal.

All right so we run that to no more answers which will be a point of no more change. Then when there are no more answers to that one we go back to one. And again run, "**How have you handled a dress?**" And we run that to no more answers then we go over to two and run "**How has a dress handled you?**" and run that to no more answers.

Backwards and forwards until neither of them have any more answers. Then we're finished with that. We're finished with that pair of commands.

Second Pair of Commands

And we now move into our second pair of commands. There are only four commands in the procedure; we've now covered two of them. And we'll go into the second pair.

We've now used up the "to handle" leg of the "to handle" goals package, haven't we? So now we swing over to the other side of the goals package "to be handled".

So the person asks themselves now, "**How has a dress been handled?**", "How has a dress been handled?" That is command number three. We don't specify handled by whom. It can be handled by self or it can be handled by not self, we don't specify by whom. It's very general, a general command, "How has a dress been handled?", and again it's run to no more answers. Ok, an easy enough command to run.

Then we go to command number four. This is the final command of this set, is "**How have you been handled?**", "How have you been handled?" and that again that is run till no more answers. And when number four has gone to no more answers you go back to three and you alternate three and four until neither three nor four have any more answers.

Now number four seems a peculiar command. It seems an almost irrelevant command, "How have you been handled?" Well the purpose of the command is flow balancing. It's simply a comparison; it's a flow balancing comparison there. It allows the person to see, to compare the way a dress has been handled in the

universe, he can now compare that to the way he has been handled in the universe. So he can now get a comparison, there.

See it's simply a comparison; you're completing your flow pattern and making sure you're not making any unbalanced flows here

Now if those four commands are run exactly as I've given them to you, and they are run to no more answers, both pairs are run to no more answers. The terminal, the junior universe will erase at that point in therapy. You may not know it's erased but it will have erased

End of tape

04 Erasability of Junior Universes

By Dennis Stephens

April 6, 1994

Today is the 6th of April 1994 and I'd like to take up two subjects the first of which is the subject of erasability and later on I want to take up the subject of "The Philosophy of TROM." [see the first lecture in this book]

We are now in a very fortunate position to be able to finalize the subject of the erasability of junior universes at level 5C, to finalize it once and for all. I can say now with great certainty that this area is now explored completely and finally.

Here then is the data. Any junior universe, repeat, any junior universe can be erased from the mind at level 5C. The reason for this is very simple. If the junior universe has any existence in the universe then it's erasable at level 5C, it can be made the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level 5C and erased.

Why is this? Well it's to do with a little identification that belongs in this universe; it's to do with the basic law upon which this universe is evidently built. The identification is that the idea, the concept of an existence is identical to the concept of "must be known", the concept of existence and the concept of "must be known" are identical concepts.

In other words if a thing exists in the universe it "must be known" in the universe, and if a thing must be known in the universe then it exists in the universe. This is an identification. And also we have that if a thing doesn't exist in the universe then it "mustn't be known." And if it "mustn't be known" in the universe then it doesn't exist in the universe. Again it's this proposition that is derived from the basic law upon which this universe is based.

Just to briefly remind you of the basic law. The basic law states that "the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known." That is the basic law upon which this universe is constructed and we can deduce from this basic law, I won't go into the logic of how, the mechanics of how this can be done in logic, but I can assure you that we can validly deduce from that law this idea that the concept of existence is identical to

the concept of “be known”, and the concept of non existence is identical to the concept of “not be known” or “be not known”, and from this state of affairs we can say with great certainty that any existence, and a junior universe is an existence, so any junior universe can be erased from the mind by making it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C.

Now the only thing that can prevent the erasure is that the junior universe has become ionized with one or other legs of a junior goals package. Now that's the datum we didn't have. That's the new datum. Once you grasp this you'll get the whole picture. The only interfering factor is this subject of the junior goals package.

If a junior universe is not interfered with or not involved in games play, with some junior goals package then it will erase readily at level 5C by making it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C. You see that?

But if that junior universe is interfered with or is involved in games play with some junior goals package which is then considered independent of the basic package, that's important, it's then considered to be independent of the basic package, then when you come at level 5C to try and erase this junior universe it won't erase at level 5C because of the interference it's getting from the junior goals package.

I'll give you an example of this and you see it very clearly.

Now let's take the subject, the junior universe of a dress. You know, what girls wear, D R E double S, a dress. Now undoubtedly there are some people that would get to level 5C and say, “Ok, well I'll erase the junior universe of a dress and make it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package and it erases like a lamb.

Now one thing we know about these people is that they have not been playing games with dresses and they have not got this junior universe of a dress ionized with any of the legs of the junior goals package. You got all that? We know that immediately, otherwise it simply wouldn't erase.

But other people will get to level 5C, try and erase the junior universe of “dress” and it won't erase. So they have to say, “Well what is the purpose or what is the function of a dress?”

See what we're hunting for is the junior goals package here. See? We're looking for the junior goals package that's interfering. When we ask for the function we're asking for a junior goals package, aren't we? See that?

It's a sneaky way to ask for it. We ask for the function of the dress and a person writes down the functions of the dress. And, he only has to look at the dress and he will get the functions. He doesn't have to go hunting very far. He has only got to look at the dress and there is the ionization of the dress. So he says, “Well now it's ahh... femininity... dress is associated with femininity ... it's got a feminine

function he would say, it's got a feminine function. We say a dress has a feminine function in our society. He's reading it off the dress, you see, he's picking up the feminine ionization of the garment. See? Cause it's got an exclusive feminine usage in our society. See there?

But what is the ionization here? Well the ionization is the “must be sexed” postulate. The dress is ionized “must be sexed” and the “must be sexed” postulate of course is a postulate from the “to sex” goals package and the person has got the “to sex” goals package considered independent of the “to know” goals package and BINGO he can't erase the dress at level 5C by making it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package. See that?

So he has to now get down... knuckle down and erase the “to sex” goals package to break the interference. He gets that erased and he has to do all the checks, which I've given you on the earlier lectures, he then has to make it the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C, check if it will now erase. If it doesn't he has to go find another purpose of the dress until eventually he goes back and it erases. You've now got rid of all the purposes.

But the purpose will show as ionization in the junior universe. And just to refresh your mind on the subject of ionization, which I have covered on an earlier lecture, when we say ionization we simply mean the flooding of a mass with a postulate, that's what we mean when we say ionization, the flooding of a mass with a postulate.

So if a dress has a “must be sexed” ionization, what we mean when we say that is that the dress is flooded with a “must be sexed” postulate, which is the feminine sexual postulate, which is what you would expect if the dress is so closely associated with females. It would pick up the ionization of their primary sexual postulate, which it does.

So see it in terms of ionization and you understand it. You understand where it picks up the function from and you don't have to go hunting for the ionization saying, “Well, well, well what's the ionization of this junior universe?” You've only got to look at the junior universe and read it off the junior universe. It's right there when you look at the junior universe, if you know what to look for.

If you can't read the ionization directly off the junior universe now you will be able to do this by the time you've got a fair way through level 5, I can assure you. The subject of ionization gets very real to you. But if you can't read the ionization, well, you simply ask, “What is the function of the dress?” For when you list the function of a dress you'll pick up the ionization.

There are two ways you can do it, you can simply look at the junior universe and you'll either read it off the junior universe or you just say, “Well what's the function of the junior universe?” One way or the other you'll get the ionizations and then you just apply the technology as I've given it and then eventually you'll get the dress erased. You see that?

Now this is what we mean by erasability.

Now there's one final thing I have to tell you on this subject. It's a dreadful pitfall, it's one I fell into and I had enormous trouble with it and it's one way to generate an enormous amount of mass in your mind and it's terribly difficult to get rid of and it's one way to get yourself in an awful mess and that is to try and play with this idea that you can make a junior universe the subject matter of a junior goals package.

I can tell you now with utter certainty and absolute conviction that you can't. That you can't make any junior universe the subject matter of any junior goals package. You just can't do it.

Now why can't you do it? Ok, I didn't know this until recently. So I've now got the whole thing out. I now know why you can't do it.

This is the way it goes. To be erasable within a goals package the junior universe has to only consist of the two postulates, the "to be blank" and the "to not be blank" postulates on that side of the goals package. If a junior universe only consists of those two postulates then it could be made the subject matter of that junior goals package and would erase.

Now that is a true technical data. But unfortunately the only goals package, repeat, the only goals package of which this is true is the "to know" goals package because the junior universe is an existence and because of the identification between existence and "be known" and non existence and "not be known" that's an identification in the universe itself based upon the basic law of the universe, because of this peculiar identification, there, any junior universe that exists in this universe is erasable within that "to know" goals package, and it's not erasable within any other junior goals package.

The simple truth of the matter is none of the junior goals packages have this identification that we have in the basic package.

In the basic package we have the identification between existences and "be known". You see that?

None of the junior packages have this identification so you can't get an erasure of a junior universe by making it the subject matter of one of these junior goals packages. You see that?

I'll give you an example. Let's go back to where we were dealing with the dress and the "to sex" goals package. You will think, "Well there might be various things that could be made the subject matter of the "to sex" goals package." Well as a matter of fact there aren't any junior universes, which can be made the subject matter of the "to sex" goals package.

You say, "Well that's peculiar is there anything in the universe that is sexable?" Yes, but the only thing that's [chuckle] the only thing in this universe, which is

essentially, which is truly sexual, that can truly be sexed, I should say, is the “to be sexed” postulate. Everything else is not quite right.

I used to think when I first researched the “to sex” goals package that the junior universe of female sex cells was erasable within the “to sex” goals package but it took me a month or two fiddling around with it to realize that they weren't erasing, nothing was erasing. I was just getting a lot of mass showing up that was all. It all looked very significant but the end point was I got absolutely nowhere and I had to abandon it.

It was just another interesting way to generate mass, so that one went away.

But I thought, “Well the junior universe of femininity, God, that ought to be erasable within the “to sex” goals package.” Nope, again, it isn't quite right. Femininity isn't exactly sexable... it isn't exactly sexable, it's not exactly sexable, the only thing in this universe that is exactly sexable is the “to be sexed” postulate. Get it?

So whatever junior universe you make the subject matter of the “to sex” goals package won't work, you won't get erasure. See that? The only things you can erase in the “to sex” goals package, in other words, are the four postulates of the package, they will erase one against the other, and the whole package will go. But to try and use the package as an erasure tool at level 5C gets you into the soup, gets you into a hole, gets you into a mess, and the reason why is the reason I've just given you.

The only identification between the junior universe and a goals package is in the “to know” goals package with its identification between the junior universe of existence and the “to be known” postulate and that is a true identification in this universe and because of that and because the junior universe, if it exists it is an existence in this universe. Once it exists it's erasable within the confines of the “to know” goals package. And it's only erasable within the confines of the “to know” goals package.

So one gorgeous way to booby trap this whole subject is to get in and say, “Well now we can make junior universes the subject matter of junior goals packages.” Nope, you get nowhere. And eventually you just pile up more and more lies.

It's a lie, you see. You're just peddling the lie. And you just pile up more mass, more mass, more mass, then in the end the effect is the same effect as if you were trying to erase an un-erasable goals package. It's slower, but the effect is eventually the same. You will eventually just dig yourself a hole in the graveyard and get into it. There's no way out that way.

That's my final words on the subject. Bear them very carefully in mind. You won't find any reference in the write up of TROM to making junior universes the subject of junior goals packages and now we know the reason why.

I knew it then, I knew you couldn't do it but I didn't know why you couldn't do it. Now I know why you can't do it. I'm giving you the reasons why. So don't fall into that trap. It's a yawning chasm for the unwary. It's the subject of making junior universes the subject matter of junior goals packages so don't do it. Ok?

You erase junior universes at level 5C exactly as per the way I've given you in the main write up. There's sufficient material in the main write up to do it. All the supplementary tapes give you is the reason why and amplifies the material and points out the booby traps.

So the final message on the subject is don't think there's any quick way of erasing junior universes in the junior goals packages, it's a booby trap. There's no way out that way. The only way it can be done is the way I've given you. There isn't any other way to do it, and I can prove it.

And almost as a post script on the subject of erasing junior universes at level 5C, don't forget the data about Snoozer the cat, you remember, I said early on in the write up there that you tend to pick something a little bit too tough to handle so don't be surprised even though you've erased all the junior goals packages associated with a junior universe at level 5C and you've cleaned up all its ionizations and you've got it all ready to go, it still won't erase, it's just a little bit too tough to erase for you.

Well remember Snoozer the cat, get inside it, remember, I said in the write up, Snoozer the cat. You can't erase the cat well settle for his whiskers then work through the cat bit by bit till you get the whole lot erased. You can always do that too. But do that after you've cleaned up the ionizations and cleaned up the functions of the junior universe. Get the function cleaned up first and then, if necessary, and it's still too tough to erase at level 5C, well then get inside it, treat it like Snoozer the cat and get inside it and erase it a little bit at a time. One way or the other you'll get there.

end of tape.

Glossary

Anaten. 1 . an abbreviation of analytical attenuation meaning diminution or weakening of the analytical awareness of an individual for a brief or extensive period of time. If sufficiently great, it can result in unconsciousness. (It stems from the restimulation of an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness.) (Scn AD)

2 . simply a drop in ARC to an extreme. (PAB 70) 3 . the physiological by-product of unconsciousness. (SOS, Bk. 2, p. 170) 4. dope-off. (Abil 52)

Clear- the term clear has risen from the analogy between the mind and the computing machine. Before a computer can be used to solve a problem, it must be cleared of old problems, of old data and conclusions.

Dianetics 1 . DIA (Greek) through, NOUS (Greek) soul deals with a system of mental image pictures in relation to psychic (spiritual) trauma. The mental image pictures are believed on the basis of personal revelation to be comprising mental activity created and formed by the spirit, and not by the body or brain. (BPL 24 Sept 73 V)

2 . Dn addresses the body. Thus Dn is used to knock out and erase illnesses, unwanted sensations, misemotion, somatics, pain, etc. Dn came before Scn. It disposed of body illness and the difficulties a thetan was having with his body. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)

3 . a technology that runs and erases locks, secondaries and engrams and their chains. (HCOB 17 Apr 69)

4 . Dn could be called a study of man. Dn and Scn, up to the point of stable exteriorization, operate in exactly the same field with exactly the same tools. It is only after man is sufficiently exteriorized to become a spirit that we depart from Dn; for here, considering man as a spirit, we must enter the field of religion. (PAB 42)

5 . a precision science. It stems from the study and codification of survival. (COHA, p. 148)

6 . a system of coordinated axioms which resolve problems concerning human behavior and psychosomatic illnesses. (5110CM08B)

7 . Dn is not psychiatry. It is not psycho- analysis. It is not psychology. It is not personal relations. It is not hypnotism. It is a science of mind. (DMSMH, p. 168)

8 . the route from aberrated or aberrated and ill human to capable human. (HCOB 3 Apr 66) Abbr. Dn.

Difference. 1. The concept of differences in this universe, a concept that A is different from B is essentially the concept that A and B have no common class.

2. in actual practice you have to bond A to some quality X and bond B to the absence of X or not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to some quality Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

E-meter 1. The E-meter is a religious artifact used as a spiritual guide in the church confessional. It is an aid to the auditor (minister, student, pastoral counselor) in two-way communication locating areas of spiritual travail and indicating spiritual well-being in an area. (HCO PL 24 Sept 73 VII)

- 2 . Hubbard Electrometer. An electronic instrument for measuring mental state and change of state in individuals, as an aid to precision and speed in auditing. The E-meter is not intended or effective for the diagnosis, treatment or prevention of any disease. (Scn AD)
- 3 . used to verify the preclear's gain and register when each separate auditing action is ended. (HCOB 5 Apr 69R)
4. Electropsychometer. (HCOB 23 Aug 65)
- 5 . the meter tells you what the preclear's mind is doing when the preclear is made to think of something. The meter registers before the preclear becomes conscious of the datum. It is therefore a pre-conscious meter. It passes a tiny current through the preclear's body. This current is influenced by the mental masses, pictures, circuits and machinery. When the unclear pc thinks of something, these mental items shift and this registers on the meter. (EME, p. 8)

Floating needle. 1. "An idle needle, one which is drifting slightly to the right and slightly to the left very easily and gently, denotes a comfortable status of mind on the part of the patient, and tells the practitioner that he is nowhere near any subject that distresses him, or, if it follows an emotional outburst, tells him that the outburst itself is spent, and that the subject now can be abandoned for the moment." [JOURNAL OF SCIENTOLOGY, Issue 1-G (Aug. 1952), ELECTRONICS GIVES LIFE TO FREUD'S THEORY]

2. "It means an idle, uninfluenced motion, no matter what you say about the goal or terminal. It isn't just null, it's uninfluenced by anything (except body reactions). Man it's really free. You'll know when you see one. They're really pretty startling. The needle just idles around and yawns at your questions on the subject." [E-meter Essentials (1961)]

3. "Floating needle, free needle are the same thing. What does one look like? Once you've seen one you'll never make a mistake on one again. For it floats. It ceases to register on the pc's bank. It just idly floats about or won't stand up even at low sensitivity." [HCOB 2 Aug. 65, RELEASE GOOFS]
4. "It is the idle uninfluenced movement of the needle on the dial without any patterns or reactions in it. It can be as small as 1" or as large as dial wide. It does not fall or drop to the right of the dial. It moves to the left at the same speed as it moves to the right." [HCOB 21 Oct. 68, FLOATING NEEDLE]
5. "Pcs and pre-OTs OFTEN signal an F/N with a 'POP' to the left and the needle can actually even describe a pattern much like a rock slam. Meters with lighter movements do 'pop' to the left." [HCOB 7 May 69R, Issue V, FLOATING NEEDLE]
6. "A floating needle is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle. That's what an F/N is. No other definition is correct." [HCOB 21 Jul. 78, WHAT IS A FLOATING NEEDLE?]
7. "Free Needle: It means the same as a floating needle (F/N), which is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle, back and forth, back and forth, without change in the width of the swing except perhaps to widen as the pc gets off the last small bits of charge. Note that it can get so wide that you have to shift the Tone Arm back and forth, back and forth, to keep the needle on the dial in which case you have a Floating Tone Arm." [E-Meter Essentials (1996)]
8. "The reason a clear's needle is so free (and you've seen, certainly, how an E-Meter needle gets sticky, then freer and freer) is that his thought is separated from a matter, energy, space, time consequence." [HCOB 17 Mar. 60, STANDARDIZED SESSIONS]

Free Needle 1. "A needle which shows none of the reactions described above. It floats back and forth easily, registering only the body, its breathing, heartbeats, etc. While needle free, no facsimiles are being impinged on the body." [HCOB 30 Apr. 60, ACC TRs]

2. "A real F/N means the pc is out the top, an ARC Br needle means he's out the bottom. He ceases to mock up, through grief." [HCOB 5 Oct. 68, ARC BREAK NEEDLES]

HASI Hubbard Association of Scientologists, International. (PAB 74)

To Be Known also making known and bringing into existence
-1. When you first arrived at this universe as a spiritual being you looked around and thought it would be an interesting game to play. It would be fun to communicate with the other beings here.

However you quickly realized that in this universe you can't play games if no one recognizes you exist.

In order to play games or communicate with other beings you must be noticed, must be recognized to exist, you must "be known."

This is what Dennis means by "to be known". You want "to be known" by others so they will communicate with you and allow you to play the games with them. Also you want the effects you create to be known by others so if you grow a garden and share the tomatoes with your friends you can say that you want tomatoes "to be known" by you and tomatoes "to be known" by others. -editor

2. This is the creative postulate to bring something into existence and to make it known.

3. Life is a spiritual quality. Life can bring things into existence. That which is brought into existence is called an effect. All effects are intended to be noticed by others so they include the postulate "to be known."

To Know – this is the postulate to learn, experience, perceive something. It exactly complements and satisfies the postulate “to be known.”

L Ron Hubbard- Lafayette Ronald Hubbard, better known as L. Ron Hubbard and often referred to by his initials, LRH, was an American pulp fiction author as well as the author of "Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health" published in 1950 and the founder of the Church of Scientology.

Mind- 1. pictures which have been made of experiences and plotted against time and preserved in energy and mass in the vicinity of the being and which when restimulated are re-created without his analytical awareness. (SH Spec 72, 6607C28)

2 . a literal record of experience plotted against time from the earliest moment of aberration until now plus additional ideas the fellow got about it, plus other things he may have mocked up or created on top of it in mental mass, plus some machines, plus some valences. (SH Spec 70, 6607C21)

3 . a network of communications and pictures, energies and masses, which are brought into being by the activities of the thetan versus the physical universe or other thetans. The mind is a communication and control system between the thetan and his environment. (FOT, p. 56)

4 . the purpose of the mind is to pose and resolve problems relating to survival and to direct the effort of the organism according to these solutions. (Scn 0-8, p. 76)

5 . a natively self-determined computer which poses, observes and resolves problems to accomplish survival. It does its thinking with facsimiles of experience or facsimiles of synthetic experience. It is natively cause. It seeks to be minimally an effect. (HFP, p. 33)

- 6 . the human mind is an observer, postulator, creator and storage place of knowledge. (HFP, p. 163)
- 7 . the mind is a self-protecting mechanism and will not permit itself to be seriously overloaded so long as it can retain partial awareness of itself. (DMSMH, p. 165)
- 8 . the mind is composed of energy which exists in space and which condenses down into masses. (SH Spec 133, 6204C17)

Overt act- 1. an overt act is not just injuring someone or something; an overt act is an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics. (HCO PL 1 Nov 70 III)

- 2 . an intentionally committed harmful act committed in an effort to resolve a problem. (SH Spec 44, 6410C27)
- 3 . that thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (ISH ACC 10, 6009C14)

Preclear or PC- 1. a person who, through Scn processing, is finding out more about himself and life. (PXL, p. 20)

- 2 . a spiritual being who is now on the road to becoming Clear, hence preclear. (HCOB 5 Apr 69)
- 3 . one who is discovering things about himself and who is becoming clearer. (HCO PL 21 Aug 63)

Problems and Solutions - 1. As Dennis describes above a being when he feels he needs problems will not solve an existing problem without creating one or more new ones.

2. Routine 2-20 from the book *The Creation of Human Ability* by L Ron Hubbard 1962. "The auditor asks the preclear *What kind of problem could you be to mother?* and when the preclear has found one, *Alright, can you be that problem?* And when the preclear has become it, *Can you see your mother figuring about it?* and whether the preclear can or not, *Give me another problem you could be to your mother? Can you be that problem? etc.* , until communication lag is flattened."

Scientology - 1. it is formed from the Latin word scio, which means know or distinguish, being related to the word scindo, which means cleave. (Thus, the idea of differentiation is strongly implied.) It is formed from the Greek word logos, which means THE WORD, or OUTWARD FORM BY WHICH THE INWARD THOUGHT IS EXPRESSED AND MADE KNOWN: also THE INWARD THOUGHT or REASON ITSELF. Thus, SCIENTOLOGY means KNOWING ABOUT KNOWING, or SCIENCE OF KNOWLEDGE. (Scn 8- 80, p. 8)

2. Scientology addresses the thetan. Scientology is used to increase spiritual freedom, intelligence, ability, and to produce immortality. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)

3 . an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (HCOB 9 Jul 59)

4 . a religious philosophy in its highest meaning as it brings man to total freedom and truth. (HCOB 18 Apr 67)

5 . the science of knowing how to know answers. It is a wisdom in the tradition of ten thousand years of search in Asia and Western civilization. It is the science of human affairs which treats the livingness and beingness of man, and demonstrates to him a pathway to greater freedom. (COHA, p. 9)

6 . an organization of the pertinencies which are mutually held true by all men in all times, and the development of technologies which demonstrate the existence of new phenomena not hitherto known, which are useful in creating states of beingness considered more desirable by man.

(COHA, p. 9)

7 . the science of knowing how to know. It is the science of knowing sciences. It seeks to embrace the sciences and humanities as a clarification of knowledge itself. Into all these things – biology, physics, psychology and life itself – the skills of Scientoloa can bring order and simplification. (Scn 8-8008, p. 11)

8 . the study of the human spirit in its relationship to the physical universe and its living forms. (Abil 146)

9 . a science of life. It is the one thing senior to life because it handles all the factors of life. It contains the data necessary to live as a free being. A reality in Scientoloa is a reality on life.

(Aud 27 UK)

10 . a body of knowledge which, when properly used, gives freedom and truth to the individual. (COHA, p. 251)

11. Scientoloa is an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (Abil Mi 104)

12 . knowledge and its application in the conquest of the material universe. (HCL 1, 5203CM03A)

13 . an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful. (HCO PL 27 Oct 64)

14 . an applied religious philosophy dealing with the study of knowledge, which through the application of its technology, can bring about desirable changes in the conditions of life.

(HCO PL 15 Apr 71R)

Serfac service facsimile, service mechanism. 1. these are called "service facsimiles." "Service" because they serve him. "Facsimiles" because they are in mental image picture form. They explain his disabilities as well. The facsimile part is actually a self- installed disability that "explains" how he is not responsible for being able to cope. So he is not wrong for not coping. Part of the "package" is to be right by making wrong. The service facsimile is therefore a picture containing an explanation of self condition and also a fixed method of making others wrong. (HCOB 15 Feb 74)

2 . this is actually part of a chain of incidents which the individual uses to invite sympathy or cooperation on the part of the environment. One uses engrams to handle himself and others and the environment after one has himself conceived that he has failed to handle himself, others and the general environment. (AP&A, p. 7)

3 . it is simply a time when you tried to do something and were hurt or failed and got sympathy for it. Then afterwards when you were hurt or failed and wanted an explanation, you used it. And if you didn't succeed in getting sympathy for it, you used it so hard it became a psychosomatic illness. (HFP, p. 89)

4 . every time you fail, you pick up this facsimile and become sick or sadly noble. It's your explanation to yourself and the world as to how and why you failed. It once got you sympathy. (HFP, p. 89)

5 . that facsimile which the preclear uses to apologize for his failures. In other words, it is used to make others wrong and procure their cooperation in the survival of the preclear. If the preclear well cannot achieve survival, he attempts an illness or disability as a survival computation. The workability and necessity of the service facsimile is only superficially useful. The service facsimile is an action method of withdrawing from a state of beingness to a state of not beingness and is intended to persuade others to coax the individual back into a state of beingness. (AP&A, p. 43)

6 . that computation generated by the preclear (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others. (HCOB 1 Sept 63)

Similar – 1. the definition of A is similar to B is that the class of A and B has members in it. It is not a null class. If A and B is not a null class then A is similar to B. however this definition lacks conviction.

2. in actual practice you have to bond A to X and bond B to not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

Somatic, 1. by somatic is meant a pain or ache sensation and also misemotion or even unconsciousness. There are a thousand different descriptive words that could add up to a feeling. Pains, aches, dizziness, sadness – these are all feelings. Awareness, pleasant or unpleasant, of a body. (HCOB 26 Apr 69)

2 . body sensation, illness or pain or discomfort. “Soma” means body. Hence psychosomatic or pains stemming from the mind. (HCOB 23 Apr 69)

3 . this is a general word for uncomfortable physical perceptions coming from the reactive mind. Its genus is early Dn and it is a general, common package word used by Scientologists to denote "pain" or "sensation" with no difference made between them. To the Scientologist anything is a somatic if it emanates from the various parts of the reactive mind and produces an awareness of reactivity. Symbol: SOM. (HCOB 8 Nov 62)

4 . the word somatic means, actually, bodily or physical. Because the word pain is restimulative, and because the word pain has in the past led to a confusion between physical pain and mental pain, the word somatic is used in Dn to denote physical pain or discomfort, of any kind. It can mean actual pain, such as that caused by a cut or a blow; or it can mean discomfort, as from heat or cold; it can mean itching – in short, anything physically uncomfortable. It does not include mental discomfort such as grief. Hard breathing would not be a somatic; it would be a symptom of misemotion suppression. Somatic means a non-survival physical state of being. (SOS, p. 79)

Valence - an identity complete with bank mass or mental image picture mass of somebody other than the identity selected by oneself. In other words, what we usually mean by valence is somebody else's identity assumed by a person unknowingly. Dianetics and Scientology Technical Dictionary