

03 Expanding on Level 5

By Dennis Stephens

Edited for Print 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	9
The Unstacking Procedure	11
Postulates, Goals, Purposes and Intentions	13
Don't ask the PC to Oppose His Goals	16
The Universe in which we Live only Consists of Life and Postulates	19
There's only Two Types of Lies in this Universe	23
Constructing the Goals Packages	23
Intensity Scale of Goals	25
Scale of Opposition goals	27
Listing	27
To Know compliments To Be Known	28
Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Repair	30
Where Does all the Mass Come From?	30
Sensations	32
Erase the Dog Process	34
Proof the "To Know" goals package is basic to all goals packages.	37
Importance	37
The Know Component	38
Unstacking Procedure, Evaluation	40
Cross Package	45
30 Erasable Goals Packages	50
The "To Reason" Goals Package	50
Erasing Goals Packages and Knowledge	52
Anatomy of the Mass in the Universe	53

The Surprise Game	55
The Surprise Game	60
Surprise and Not Know	61
Basic-Basic Solo Games	62
The Playmate	67
Liability in the Surprise Game	70
Voices in their Head	72
Dissociation	76
No Such Thing as Entities	80
Dissociation	82
The Haunted Mind Theory	83
The Hidden Influence	84
Anything Influencing Your Mind You Can Communicate With	85
Communication Theory	85
The Anatomy of Dissociation	86
Common Manifestations of Dissociation	86
The Bouncer	87
Entities	88
Compulsion	88
Multiple Personality Disorder	89
Schizophrenia	89
Paranoia	90
Ron and Sexuality	91
The Solution to the Subject of Dissociation	93
He Can't Stop It.	95
Never Took My Finger off the Machine	97
Therapy	98
What is an Identity?	99
How to Get Rid of Entities	100

The Problem with NOTS	102
Somatics and Effort	104
Dissociative Phenomena is Cumulative	105
Common Personality Types and Frequency	106
To Be Known Leg 1	106
To Know Leg 3	106
To Not Know Leg 4	107
To Not Be Known Leg 2	107
What type of incidents Upset You?	108
To Be Know	108
To Know	109
To Not Know	110
To Be Not Known	110
Dissociative Personality Type	111
Addendum - Addressing Entities	113
Reason	115
The Exclusion Postulate	116
All Postulates Limit the Possible and Thereby Define the Reasonable	119
Until a Postulate is Made Everything is Possible	120
That Which is Reasonable is That Which is Consistent with the Postulate	121
In the Absence of Postulates the Concept of Reason is Meaningless	122
We can Define Reason as a Complementary Postulate	123
All Games Must Be Unreasonable	125
Game Defined	125
The More Conflict There Is the Less Reason There Is.	126

The Class of the Knowable is Coextensive with the Class of Those Things Brought into Existence To Be Known.	127
Two Futile Activities in this Universe	130
Knowing and Time	132
Games Play Only Consists Fundamentally of These Two Futile Activities	133
Dictum of Aristotle	134
Law of Complimentary Postulates	135
How Games Become Compulsive	137
Identifications in Compulsive Games Play	142
Must Be Known's Identification	143
Must Know's Identification	144
Mustn't Be Known's Identification	144
Identification and Dianetics	146
The Double Bind	147
False Identifications	148
Exclusion Postulate	148
Twin Postulates in 5A Therapy	153
Troubleshooting Level 5	154
Level 6	157
Expanding on Level 5, Sex	158
Ionization Test	159
All Erasable Goals Packages Have Two Positive Legs	160
The Old Test of Erasability	161
Four Tests of an Unerasable Goals Package	162
Cure for Running Unerasable Goals Packages	163
The Games Goals	164
Games Goals are Insidious	165
Junior Goals Packages	167

The “To Eat” Goals Package	168
The Eating Game	170
The “To Sex” Goals Package	171
Games Play in the “To Sex” Goals Package is Totally Compulsive	172
Asexual Reproduction	173
Sexual Reproduction	173
Bisexual Reproduction	174
Masculinity and Femininity	175
The English Word Sex	177
Gender	178
The Sex Game	178
Orgasm	181
Compulsive Sex Games Play	184
Homosexuality is not Psychological	190
Gender Symbols	193
Sexual Modesty	194
Glossary	197

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 Unstacking Procedure

By Dennis Stephens

November 3, 1992

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 28, 2012

(Note Unstacking Procedure was developed by Bill Nichols, who did a simple application of GPM and R6EW tech to form a new level called, "Unstacking," which is also still used in Meta psychology. The basic process of R6-EW consists of these two commands: " What am I dramatizing?" "What would oppose that?"-Editor 2012)

Hello, Greg, this is Dennis Stephens here and the date is the third of November 1992. I hope this tape finds you well. Although I will have acknowledged the receipt of your data by phoning you I'd like to formally acknowledge the receipt of the letter from you. It arrived yesterday as a matter of fact. And I'm glad that you were able to decipher my typing.

I'm sorry I typed that material on both sides of the sheet of paper; it no doubt didn't help you. I was... chuckle... I was going through a period in late 1978 where my havingness was rather bad and that's why I was typing on both sides of sheets of paper.

I repaired my havingness sometime after that, I don't do that these days; I write on one side of sheets of paper, but anyway you managed to get it duplicated and no doubt you'll soon get the material onto your floppy disk. So good of you to put this material on the disk for me.

Now the main purpose of this tape Greg is to evaluate the "Unstacking Procedure" which I promised I would do for you. And in order to do that I've got to give you a fair bit of background data. So we shall press on with the background data then we'll go into the evaluation of the "Unstacking Procedure."

Thank you very much for sending it, by the way.

As soon as I read the Unstacking Procedure, of course, I recognized the leopard by his spots. In other words I recognized the Hubbard technique.

It's a direct offshoot of the Hubbard goals procedures of circa 1961 to 1964. I'd say around the vintage of 1963, I would put that material, although he has modified it because there are things in there which I'm not familiar with. So there are modifications to the procedure but never the less, essentially it's the material that Ron was working on in 1963.

Now I was very fortunate that I happened to be at Saint Hill in 1962 right in the middle of the material that Ron was working on the subject of goals. I'll give you a little bit of background material here.

He started work, as far as I know, Oh, I'm pretty certain about this because I heard the history of the material, history of his research in 1962. We had to hear it as part of the Briefing Course. He started his research into goals in 1961 and by 1962 he was well into it and I won't go into the various techniques that Ron produced but, just to say that his original approach was to find a main goal in the preclear and then try and find out what was opposing this goal, and then somehow get the goal erased. That was his general idea.

His researches in Scientology up to this point had inevitably lead him to the fact that the final top level material in Scientology the highest possible level of Scientology material would be on the subject of purposes and postulates and goals. Anyone who researches in the field of the mind eventually ends up with this one way or the other, they might get there by different routs but they always end up there at that point. Ron ended up there in 1961. He'd started out in 1950 with Engrams and incidents and charge and Secondaries and then he'd gone through various other procedures and so forth and finally in 1961 he got to the end of the road and he was facing the wall there, he had to get through this barrier of the postulates.

Postulates, Goals, Purposes and Intentions

By the way, I'm going to use the word postulate interchangeably with the word goal and interchangeably with the word purpose and interchangeably with the word intention. So postulate, goal, purpose, intention are synonyms, and I'll explain this later in the tape but just bear with me for the moment.

I mention it because Mr. Nichols in his Unstacking Procedure differentiates between these factors, but we'll talk about that later.

When I got to Saint Hill and started to get into the auditing material on goals one thing that struck me was the terrible state of their E-meter needle response.

I mean I was in the presence of a number of the old timers of Dianetics and Scientology. Some of them had been on the course a longer time than me.

They'd been on the course for some months and they'd been fiddling around with these goals procedures. I happened to audit some of them and some of them had to audit me and quickly I knew that these people were basically in pretty good case shape cause some of them I knew as people in the outside world not just as fellow students on the course but I was struck by the terrible state of their needles, the terrible state of their needle responses.

Almost invariably they had, with very few exceptions, a high tone arm and stuck needles. I was one of the few exceptions. Maybe 10% of the course were exceptions and it wasn't until much later that I realized why I was an exception and probably the reasons why some of the others were exceptions. But anyway that was one of the first things that struck me about this research was what it was doing to these peoples tone arms. In fact the insensitivity of the old Mark IV meter was one of the reasons why Ron developed the Mark V meter during this period. That the sensitivity of the Mark IV was insufficient to read through these high tone arms and stuck needles. He needed a more sensitive instrument so he developed the Mark V.

It was also quite apparent that the people on the goals procedures were not getting anywhere case wise. Although they were all hopeful, everyone was hopeful that we would actually get something out of it the general tendency was that the people were worse off case wise than they had been when they started the course. Although that wasn't mentioned, that was the general sort of impression that there was.

As I say I knew many of these people before they'd come on the course and they were in far better case shape prior to going on the course than they were while on the course. So obviously it was hitting them hard, and these people had a wack of auditing, you know. And the vast majority of them were clears and lower level OT's and had been for many years, me included.

So that's a little subjective look at what was going on at Saint Hill.

Ron started off, as I say, finding goals and then he got into this subject of end words, that came later, about 1963. Then he got into the subject of the implant GPM's which eventually became parts of the Clear Procedure.

He abandoned the idea of finding goals on the preclear. He simply wrote them down, whole lists of them and swore that they were all part of implants and swore that this is what you had to do, and left it at that. In fact he sort of despaired.

I think that he secretly knew that he'd failed in that area of research. He patched it up as best he could, but I know I left Saint Hill in not very good case shape and over the years afterwards I met many of the casualties of that period of auditing at Saint Hill.

Every so often in Sydney some ex Saint Hill'er who'd been there doing goals in 1962 to 1964 would sort of wander into Sydney and look me up and, you know, we'd have a little session and I'd have him on the meter and see, "Oh my god, that this whole area was a major engram on his case."

Some people did really suffer. One girl in Sydney I know, I don't think she's recovered yet. Unfortunately we hadn't gotten the procedures to repair the situation and I had no real repair for it. And nobody had a real repair for it; we didn't even know what was going on.

All we knew was that if you weren't careful when you mucked around with goals that you ended up with a high tone arm, a stuck needle and the preclear was getting a lot of sensations and he usually had a black field.

[see Black Field Case in the Glossary - editor]

He'd lose his pictures, his field would go black and he'd feel as if he was getting a lot of breeze blowing. What they used to call "winds of space", used to feel as if there was a light breeze blowing on his face all the time. This, of course, was just energy impacting around his face. Energy deposits, because it was affecting the skin.

They were in pretty bad shape. The people that went on the course in good case shape survived it but there was a minority that went on that briefing course in 1961 and 62 who were in rather bad case shape when they went on course and it really hit them hard. This material did.

Many of them, case wise have been in a mess ever since. I don't know whether they've got out of it to this day because there's no repair in Scientology, there's no repair to what happened to these people in Scientology.

Don't ask the PC to Oppose His Goals

There's only my own research. Many years later I discovered what had happened to these people and got the repair out for it. I know the repair; I don't think it's generally known outside my research exactly how to take this situation apart.

What I'm leading up to is this datum that when you muck around with goals and purposes, you're Ok. you can ask the preclear for goals and purposes and postulates as long as you don't ask him to oppose them.

Get that very clearly, you're quite safe, any auditor in the world can work with goals and purposes and intentions as long as he doesn't ask, "What would be the opposition goal for that goal?" Now once you ask that question you walk where angels fear to tread. There is the danger point. There is the line that Ron crossed and it all went wrong from that point onwards.

And I didn't know why it went wrong, none of us knew why it went wrong, and none of us had the repair to put it back right. It was just endless repairs. even the repairs were being repaired and the repairs that were repairing the repairs were being repaired. It just all fell apart at that point. In fact I would go so far as to say that this was one of the main causes of the decline of Scientology.

Ron Hubbard, case wise, took an enormous pounding on this. It hit Ron very hard indeed, case wise. He looked absolutely terrible in 1962 when I was over there.

I knew he was under enormous restimulation, you could see it. He was bravely struggling on with his research. The research was killing him. And he was trying everything he knew to get this subject of goals out right.

He never did get it right and case wise he never did recover. He went downhill case wise. It hit Ron as hard as it hit anyone. Case wise he went downhill badly from 1964 onwards, even though he abandoned work on goals, went on to other things, still he couldn't lift that material. He couldn't lift that restimulation.

And the datum here is that you can work with goals and purposes, it's quite safe as long as you don't ask that key question, "What would oppose it?"

You can do anything else with a goal or a purpose. You can mock them up, you can have other people mock them up, you can ask what purpose would a thing have. What's the purpose of a cat? What's the purpose of a dog? What's the purpose of a brick? What's the purpose of a house? You know?

What purposes have you had? You can do this with goals, you can get him to write up long lists of goals, I mean the auditors got enormous freedom on this subject but he must not, having got a purpose or a goal he must not ask, "What is the opposition goal?" unless he knows exactly what he is doing. If he doesn't know exactly what he's doing, doesn't know the complete anatomy of the subject of goals and purposes in the mind he'll rapidly worsen his preclear and he won't know what's going on. And he won't be able to repair it.

The effect is that, if you muck around with goals and the opposition to goals and ask that question, "Who or what would oppose a goal?" and you don't know the complete anatomy of what's going on, your attempt to use this technology, the attempt to run these processes and so forth will act as a major engram on the preclears case, as a major Engram. And this is what happened to the Scientologists on the Briefing Course, the auditing was an Engram.

If you ever get one of these people that were at the Saint Hill Briefing Course between 1961 and 1964, the whole of that period when they worked on goals, you will find, the whole of that area will sit on their case like an engram. It will respond exactly like an engram. As you come up to it the needle will start to jiggle as you get closer to it the needle will go into rises, then as you start to talk about the Briefing Course you'll see the needle rise and you'll see the tone arm rise. It's just as if the preclear was approaching a major engram, a major engrammic experience which he cannot confront.

One of the things that I spotted myself after I left the Briefing Course. I got to work with some of these people, trying to repair, and every one of them without exception who'd been at the Briefing Course, soon as you tried to talk to them about it or any of them wanted to talk to you about it, because they were so upset about it, soon as they started to talk about the Briefing Course 1961 to 1964 and the auditing that they had, up would go their tone arm and the needle would stick and it was just as if you were talking about a major engram on their case.

So that's the first moral of the story there, it's a rather grim message, it's rather grim, Greg, that there is a limitation on the subject of working with goals and purposes. **Don't ask that question, "Who or what would oppose a goal or a purpose?" unless you know exactly what you are doing and that unfortunately does mean a familiarity with my research.**

As far as I know, I don't know as anyone's got a complete repair for this except myself. I have the complete repair for it. Ok so far so good.

The Universe in which we Live only Consists of Life and Postulates

Now let's press on with our background material. The real reason why the upper level tech of Scientology or the upper level tech in the mind devolved around this subject of postulates is that the universe in which we live only consists of life and postulates. **The universe in which we live only consists of life and postulates.**

By postulates we mean purposes, intentions, goals they are synonyms as far as I am concerned. So the universe in which we live only consists of life and postulates.

Well once you understand that you can see how fundamental this subject of postulates is, and why one has to get it right before one gets involved with it. You don't get any second chances on it. Once you start to oppose postulates you don't get any second chances.

What I'm trying to say here is that you have a fair amount of latitude when you're working with objective processes like getting the preclear to go around and touch objects. You can do a pretty botched up job of auditing and still the preclear will get a bit of case gain.

When you're dealing with masses in the mind, pictures and so forth, you can do a pretty botched up sort of auditing job and the preclear will still get some gain out of it, unless he's in rather bad case shape, but you'll get some gain out of just the fact that he's moving up and down the time track and looking at a few pictures he'll get a bit of case gain.

This is the old 10% that Ron used to talk about, you know, 10% of cases will get better no matter what you do, and this was the 10%.

But when you get onto postulates, uh uh, you lose that.

You're ok as I say as long as you don't ask that question, "Who or what will oppose?" You can do what you like with postulates as long as you don't ask that question. They'll still make good case gain on a preclear.

But if you ask that question you've got no latitude. You do it right or you kill the preclear, eventually you'll kill him. You have got to do it right. It's too close to the top of what life consists of, what this universe consists of. Postulates are the very building blocks upon which the universe is composed. So you better get it right, otherwise it all falls apart.

Now my entry into the subject of goals came in 1978 when I started to do my own research. First of all I researched and got out my lower levels of 1, 2, 3 and 4. Then I had nowhere else to go in my research except into postulates and I sweated blood over postulates, just like Ron Hubbard did, in my own research. But fortunately I had the benefit of hindsight.

I knew what had happened in 1962, in this briefing course. I was there, I knew what had happened, had seen what had happened to the preclears so I knew something was odd about this, so I avoided the pitfalls. In other words I started afresh; I didn't take Ron's research as gospel.

You see Ron went into his research in 1961 on the subject of goals and the subject of oppositions on goals, he made an assumption, and the assumption was an incorrect assumption and it was because this assumption was incorrect that all his later troubles on the subject of goals and postulates and so forth fell around his ears. It's an assumption that almost any Scientologist would make and would get wrong, and the assumption was wrong, Ron got it wrong.

He assumed that if a preclear has got a goal or a purpose there and he expresses it to the auditor, if the auditor asked him, "Who or what would oppose that goal or purpose?" that a preclear is in a position to give him the correct opposition as far as the preclear is concerned.

You see, it's a natural thing to do. Say, "Well it's the preclears goal so he would know what would oppose it." You see? Quite naturally, it's the preclears business, it's his mind, he knows what opposes what is in his mind.

Yes, but their wrong opposers. This is the joker in the pack, if the preclear knew what truly opposed the purposes in his mind he wouldn't have the mind. What he believes is the opposition goal is wrong opposed, that's why it's in his mind. It's a lie. It's an incorrect opposition. That's why it's stuck there, it's a lie.

If it was the correct opposition it would vanish by inspection. There would be nothing engrammic about it. It wouldn't be sitting there as a mass in his mind. You see the engram bank consists essentially of lies. You see that? So if it's sitting there, there must be a lie in it.

Ron said this many times, "There's got to be a lie in it," he'd say, "or else it wouldn't be there" if it was the truth it would unmock. Ron Hubbard knew that. We've known that in Scientology for many years. If it was the truth it would unmock. In fact there's an axiom which says so.

So when the auditor says to the preclear, "Who or what would oppose this goal?" and the preclear says, "Oh, so and so, and so and so."

Now it doesn't matter how this preclear tells you this. He might give a flash answer, the preclear might give a flash answer, or the auditor might give him a sheet of paper and say, "Write down all the oppositions and we'll meter check them." Doesn't matter how he does it, you'll end up with the wrong opposers.

You can't get the right one, because the right one isn't in there, hmm... see it? You can't win. It was a "no win" situation from the word "go" on Ron's research. Soon as he asked that question, "Who or what would oppose?" he was doomed to failure because the right answer was not in the preclears engram bank. The only thing that was in the engram bank was the lies and that's why they're in the engram bank.

The little bit of logic there you have to get past and it wasn't till 1978 that I spotted the flaw, I said to myself in 1978, "Well if everything the preclear offers up on the subject of oppositions is a wrong oppose how the hell do you find the right oppose? **What is the correct opposition?**" **Well it's a logical construct. You have to construct the correct opposition logically by what is reason in the universe.**

In other words, the correct opposition is not a matter of opinion it's fixed by the nature of this universe and everything else is false.

It's either the correct opposition or it's a wrong oppose. It can't be partially correct. It's either exactly right or it's a wrong oppose and if it's a wrong oppose it will kill the preclear. It will just add to his bank, because it's another lie.

There' s only Two Types of Lies in this Universe

You see, Greg there's only two types of lies in this universe. You can say that a thing exists when it doesn't exist. Or you can say that a thing doesn't exist when it does exist.

Or another way to put it, you can say that a thing is true when it's false or you can say a thing is false when it's true.

Now when he gives you the wrong oppose, he's saying he thinks it's true but it's false. See that? He's giving you the best one in the world. He says, "Yes, I believe this opposes. This is the correct opposition." But it's the false opposition. It's false because he got it out of his bank, you see? So it's a lie.

He's saying something is true which happens to be false, even though he believes it, he believes the lie, but it's still false, because he got it out of his bank.

Constructing the Goals Packages

So I sit	Goal	Opposition Goal	had to down
	Negative Goal	Negative Opposition Goal	

and logically say to myself, "Ok, well what would oppose a goal?" and started to construct the goals packages and I found that, every goals package has four goals; there's the goal, there's the goals negative, its opposition goal, and the negative opposition goal. And these are the four goals in the package. There are only four in the package and there are only four in every package, never less than four, never more than four. There can't be, the universe say so.

Goals Package

Let's take the goal "to know". Now you can try this test on almost anyone. Say you come up to a person, particularly someone in good case shape, don't try it on people in rather bad case shape because you wouldn't expect them to give you the right answer.

I remember one guy came through Sydney, he just came back from the Briefing Course or somewhere from the Sea Org and he was so clear you could almost see the harbor bridge through him, and I got to speaking to him, and I asked him. I thought I will just check it out, see how he is on the subject of goals.

I'd already started my research and I asked him, I said "What would be the opposition goal to the goal "to know"? What would oppose the goal "to know"?"

And he looked at me, he said "Why the goal to not know." and I immediately knew that he knew nothing about goals. You know, he just hadn't got it. The goal "to not know" does not oppose the goal "to know". The goal "to not know" is the negative of the goal "to know". It's not the opposition.

Intensity Scale of Goals

You see, this is the way it works. You start with a scale on the subject of the goal. Now right on the top of the scale you have a very intense goal "to know" and the goal gets less intense, less intense, less intense until you reach a zero point where there is no intensity of the goal "to know" so there's no goal there at all, as it loses its intensity the goal itself vanishes so you get a zero point where there's no goal then you go over the zero point and now your into the negative goal to not know. You get a very tiny goal "to not know" and as you intensify that goal you get more and more intensity of the goal "to not know" until you reach maximum intensity "not know".

So there's the scale that goes from plus maximum intensity goal "to know" which is "MUST KNOW", big "MUST KNOW," goes down to zero point where there's no goal at all then it goes minus maximum on the other side as "mustn't know", maximum "mustn't know". See that?

MUST KNOW
 MUST KNOW
 MUST KNOW
 Must know
 Zero
 Mustn't know
 Mustn't know
MUSTN'T KNOW
MUSTN'T KNOW

But "must know" doesn't oppose "mustn't know." One is simply the negative of the other. They're not in opposition. This is the logical construct, you see?

So I say to myself, "What is, the goal "to know" actually in opposition to?" Well the goal "to know" is opposed to the goal "to not be known".

I mean, if you're trying "to know" something the purpose that frustrates you most and exactly frustrates you is the purpose "not to be known." You see that? Once you think about it, it's obvious that is the exact opposite goal.

You're trying "to know" and somebody over there is trying "not to be known." You're saying "must know" and he's saying "mustn't be known". That is the exact opposition.

So on one side of the fence we have "must know" on the other side of the fence we have "mustn't be known" and the negative of "mustn't be known" of course is "must be known" and low and behold what do we find. We find that "must know" and "mustn't be known" are exact opposite goals but because of that scale I mentioned where they go from plus to minus the goal "mustn't know" is the exact opposite of the goal "must be known". Get it?

Must Know	Mustn't Be Know
must know	mustn't be know
Zero	No goal
mustn't know	must be known
Mustn't Know	Must Be Known

Scale of Opposition goals

There are the four postulates. There's positive "to know", negative "to not know", positive "to be known", negative "to not be known" and "to be known" is opposed by "to not know", and "to know" is opposed by "to not be known". There are four postulates in the package and there's nothing else in the package. When you think about it that's the complete package. There's only those four. That is the whole subject of knowing, is in that package. There is the whole subject there.

Anything else is a wrong oppose. Any other opposition to the goal "to know" except the goal "to not be known" is a wrong oppose. It has to be.

Listing

Now the strange thing is that you could use a listing technique on a preclear. You could sit any preclear down and say, alright let's take the goal "to know". You say, "Alright now who or what would oppose the goal "to know"?" I want some opposition goals here, what would oppose, not who or what, say, "What would oppose the goal to know?" "What would be the opposition to the goal "to know"?"

Write them down. Give him the paper and he writes them down and he writes you a list 20,000 long. He's got everything on his list. You go over the list and ask him what he thinks about the list. He gives you some ideas and whether you null the list or whatever you do with the list, he finally ends up with one and he says, "That is the one." And it's the wrong one. And worse still you go over the whole list and nowhere on the list do you find "to not be known". It isn't even on the bloody list.

Why isn't it on the list? Because it's not in his bank and he's ransacking his bank looking for the answer and the answer isn't in there so he can't put the correct answer in his list, cause it's not in there, you see?

The correct answer is a logical construct. To give you the correct answer he'd have to think about it analytically. He would have to say, "Well what would be the exact opposition to the goal "to know"? He'd have to figure it out, work it out logically in terms of pure reason. Then he could give it to you but he'd never list it out. You see that?

Ok, so you formulate the goals package on a logical construct. You take these goals "to know" with its opposition "to not be known" and the goal "to not know" with its opposition "to be known" and you work with those Magic.... Then the magic occurs.

All the wrong opposers blow. You work with those four postulates and all the wrong oppositions on the subject of knowing that he's got in his whole mind will eventually blow, because you're working to the truth, you see? Those four are the truth.

To Know compliments To Be Known

The truth of the matter is "to know" exactly complements "to be known". They are exactly complementary. There's absolutely no opposition between those two goals. They exactly complement each other.

Left to themselves they would close the distance and collapse in on each other unless you held them apart. They're complementary postulates, "to know" and "to be known". Similarly "to not know" and "to not be known" are complementary postulates. Again left to themselves they would collapse in on each other, and they cancel each other out. Literally they cancel each other out.

If you have somebody walk in with a great desire “to be known”, you know the sort of person he’s all the time going around wanting people to look at him and once they have gets in their faces.

Well if you sit around and look at him and know him and watch him and so forth. Everyone sits around and admires him and looks at him and watches him, you’ll eventually wear out his postulate “to be known”, because you’re complementing it exactly and eventually it will fade out. He simply would not be able to hold the postulate against that complementary postulate. You see that?

So the two complementary postulates vanish each other. The opposition postulates stay there forever. So there’s the pure magic.

If you want to address the subject of knowingness and get all the wrong opposers and all the wrong mishmash of upsets in his bank. If you want to clear the whole lot out on the subject of knowingness. You would address in therapy the four postulates “to know”, “to not know”, “to be known”, and “to not be known”.

They are the whole subject anyway, you see? You will address those and while you work those all the rest will start to come apart the whole tangled web of wrong opposers will unravel and you will be left with nothing. You have simply erased them.

You simply erase the bank. That’s the magic that occurs there when you work with the exact goals package. All the wrong opposers come apart. You’re left with nothing, just the four postulates and because the two complimentaries vanish each other you end up with a handful of nothing, see. And you’ve got the perfect erasure of the bank.

Saint Hill Special Briefing Course Repair

Now this was the repair I didn't have for the victims of the Saint Hill Briefing Course experience of 1961 to 1964. I didn't have this repair until 1978. Till 78, 79 before I had the full repair there, and it's the only repair I know of.

If you want to take this whole subject of the miserable life upsets they have had, the fact that these upsets are still going down the track and the whole of their Briefing Course experience is sitting there like a major engram, the correct thing to do will be level 5A of my procedure. That would take it apart cleanly... it did it for me.

I can look over my Briefing Course experience now and the E-meter yawns at me. There's absolutely nothing there. It's absolutely clean. There's nothing there at all. There's no charge on that at all. It's gone.

I've meter checked it, so forth. Gone! Been gone for years. But it wasn't in 1975. Like all the rest of the people who've been on that course I had a hell of a lot of charge on that material. It was sitting on my case like a major engram, too. And I was in pretty darn good case shape. God knows what it was doing to people who were in worse case shape than I was in.

Where Does all the Mass Come From?

Ok, so much for that Greg, we now press on.

I said earlier on that we live in a universe that only consists of life and postulates. Well where does all the mass come from? I mean, it's obviously not mocked up mass in the universe.

How come there's so much mass in the universe

It's not been created mass. It's not directly created mass. It just doesn't work out that way. It's not created mass. If it was created mass it would come apart rather easily, but no, it's not created mass, the mass of this universe.

If you've ever tried to erase a sideboard in a room in present time you know what I'm getting at. This stuff does not come apart very easily and it's not mocked up mass.

If it was simply mocked up mass you'd only have to get the idea it was somebody else's mockup, it would start to thin down and a gang of you could sit around and start to erase sideboards very easily using the upper level tech of scientology. Any good low level OT's in Scientology, a gang of them could sit together and could spend their Sunday afternoon un-mocking sideboards, un-mocking bits of walls and floors, you know, if they wanted to. They could do it. But it doesn't work out that way. You can't take this stuff apart. Now why doesn't it come apart easily?

Well it isn't mocked up mass that's why it doesn't come apart. If it's not mocked up mass then what the hell does it consist of? Well I'll tell you what it consists of: postulates. But how the hell could a postulate look like a mass? Well it's the way you look at it.

Is there any other way that the mass could come apart? We've got a universe that consists of life and postulates and that's all it consists of fundamentally.

Well is there any other way that mass could get into this universe except by mocking it up? That's really the problem you're faced with. You've got a universe that consists of life and postulates and mass starts to turn up in the universe. Well it either gets there because it's directly created by life or it comes through some other method.

Well, there is another method by which it gets into the universe. This is the unknown method. This is the secret method and this is where 999.99 parts out of a thousand of the mass in the universe comes from. The rest of it is somebody else's mockup, or peoples mock-ups.

Sensations

But let me briefly talk a little about the subject of the sensations. Now we've known in Scientology for a long while, sensations are a sort of mass, there a sort of a mass.

A sensation is not an emotion. Sensations are not emotions, their different from emotions. Emotions are little masses too, but sensations are somewhat different. And it wasn't understood where these sensations came from in Scientology. We sure as hell knew that they existed because everyone's got them but nobody seemed to quite understand just how they came about and what they were.

Well one of the things that I discovered when working on the subject of postulates in opposition was that sensation occurs at the boundary between opposing postulates. Sensation is generated, to be more precise. **Sensation is generated at the boundary of opposing postulates.**

We have this datum that sensation is generated at the boundary between opposing postulates. Now this is an important datum because this is the essence of where the vast majority of mass in this universe comes from.

You see, there's a scale of sensations which goes from very, very light down through very, very heavy sensations. As the space closes and the intensity of the postulates increases the quality of the sensation changes and is more perceived as mass rather than as a sensation.

I don't want to get too involved in this Greg because it gets into material where I'm still researching, but I can say at this point with absolute certainty that the vast majority of the mass in this universe comes about at the boundary between opposing postulates and is essentially sensation mass. It's mass that's brought about in games play where the conflict between opposing postulates generates fused postulates and the mass tends to condense out.

[see 01 insanity Point Lectures for a detailed description of how mass and sensation are generated by postulates in opposition. Editor]

There's various mechanisms of condensation but essentially if you were to examine the mass you would see it's scrunched up postulates where they are jammed in, pushed in hard together where you get a postulate scrunched up hard against its opposition postulate.

Supposing you had two goals, you had a goals package and you had the two opposing postulates of the goals package there in opposition. Well at the boundary between the opposing postulates you would find both postulates there scrunched up and that would be the sensation, that scrunched up postulate.

Where the two are jammed together that would be the sensation. Because the mind can't easily, or the person, or life cannot easily duplicate or perceive that scrunched up postulate, it sees it as mass. That's why you see the sensation as mass rather than perceiving it as a sensation.

That is the essence of it. But as I say my own research isn't complete on that. But I'm absolutely certain that that is the mechanism. That's how the mass in the universe comes about. It comes about through conflict and games play. It's a generated mass. It's not a created mass, it's a generated mass and it consists of postulates scrunched up.

In actual fact you would find the mass is generated in any goals packages. There's four postulates in the goals package, the mass is generated between any two opposing postulates in the goals package. The mass would actually consist of scrunched up mass of all four postulates in the package. You always find all four postulates present in the mass. I know the postulate configuration there but there are certain aspects of it that I'm not completely satisfied with, so I won't go into it because I don't like to go off half cocked in these letters.

But what I've given you so far you can take it as the way it is. Seems a bit peculiar at first glance to see sensation as mass but I can assure you it's a postulate configuration.

When you look at it you don't see it as a postulate configuration you simply see it as a mass. It's a confusion, if you like. You say, "Well there's a postulate so scrunched up and it's so confused that I can't see it as a series of postulates. The postulates are all scrunched up in there, tangled up in a mass, so I see it as a mass rather than as a series of postulates," and that's the essence of it.

But the important datum here is that the mass only consists of postulates.

Erase the Dog Process

Now you can prove this, that a mass only consists of postulates, you can actually prove it in auditing. It's a technique I developed a couple of years or so ago, long after I needed the technique.

You could take any creature but it works well on a dog or it will work on an inanimate object. Suppose the preclear's upset with a dog.

You could erase the dog from his mind by asking him, "What is the purpose," or function of a dog?" Usually if it's a living creature you say purpose, if it's an inanimate object you'll say function.

You can put him on the meter and you say, "What is the purpose of a dog? and the preclear tells you, and you take up each one of the purposes of the dog.

Preclear says, "Oh dogs bark." And you say "**Well how do you feel about that?**" "Oh," he says, "I have this terrible thing, we used to live next door to a dog that barked all the time. It drove me mad." You take this up and you run this material, you see, till he was all right about that purpose. His needle floats.

And you say, "**Is there any other purpose that a dog has?**" and he says, "Well they bite people." "Oh, well how do you feel..." He says, "Oh, I got bitten by a dog once. He says. And so you run that material there. You see?

See what you're doing here, your discharging the dogs' purposes, his opposition to the dogs' purposes. But you're not mentioning the word oppose, you see. You're not mentioning the word oppose. You're saying, "**What's the dog's purposes?**"

Eventually you go through all these purposes and get them all squared around and he feels alright about a dogs purposes. He feels better about those purposes.

Then you say to him, "**What purposes have you had or got towards a dog?**" and then you take up this side of the coin. "Oh, well I've always had this urge to kick a dog, you know." "Oh well, how do you feel about that?" you find some incidents where he kicked dogs, and he secretly kicked dogs and done all this, that and the other thing, see, and you go along with this till you got all his purposes out regarding the dog.

And you go back to the dog, “**What are the purposes of a dog?**” and see if any more material showed up and you keep going backwards and forwards on these purposes towards the dog and the dogs purposes towards him.

Low and behold, magic, the dog would vanish out of his mind, because you’ve erased all the purposes, you see? He’s now got all the purposes there and he’s got them sort of squared around and you haven’t mentioned the dog’s package, but the technique is powerful enough to erase the dog out of his mind. And it proves that all that is present there are the purposes.

You could do it with a house brick, you know. You could erase a house brick. If a person has got house bricks in his engram bank you could say, “**Well what’s the function of a house brick?**” and he’d tell you and you run that and get clear, square that all around and then get some more functions of a house brick and then get his purposes towards a house brick. And you do this backwards and forwards until there’s no more charge on it and at that point you’d find that house bricks had erased from his mind. You see?

Because there nothing else there. A house brick is essentially a purpose, you see? There’s nothing else there but the purpose. You follow?

So that’s a little technique there, and it proves that the mass essentially is a mass of purposes and there’s nothing else there but purposes.

There are other ways to erase things from the mind but that is one way to do it, without getting too involved in goals packages. It takes longer. There are quicker ways to do it ,like by using the goals packages as in my procedure, but that will do it. Takes longer but it will get there in the end, and it proves that all that is involved is the purposes. There’s nothing else involved.

A dog is a living creature running on a set of purposes and a house brick only consists of purposes. And so on, see?

We live in a universe that only consists of life and purposes, that's all there is, the rest is illusion.

Proof the “ To Know” goals package is basic to all goals packages.

Now there is another point I want to get into before I go on to an evaluation of the Unstacking Procedure. I mentioned earlier and you'll find in my research that I sent you, the idea that the “to know” goals package is the basic goals package, and since I wrote that material I can actually prove that this is so.

I didn't have the proof at the time when I wrote those notes up and I'm in a position now to give you the proof. That the “to know” package is the basic of all goals packages.

Importance

The proof is a very simple proof. To understand it we have to understand the subject of importance.

Now the importance of a goal is the enforcement of a goal. It's the “mustness” of a goal.

When a goal is trivial, the purpose is trivial. It has very little intensity but as the goal becomes more important to us, as we strive to achieve this goal in life we increase its intensity and the goal is now a “must.”

Take the goal “to know”. It starts off just as a slight need to know, we really don't care whether we know or not. Then we must know, you see it, MUST! Well the “must” is the enforcement of the goal.

Now any goal can have an enforcement, "must." We can increase the mustness of any goal. We have the goal "to help" beginning with a light enforcement. Not much enforcement. Not like the heavy, "Must Help!" You see. Heavy enforcement of the goal.

Any goal can have an enforcement or mustness. All the word simply means is the enforcement of the goal.

When we're enforcing a goal we're trying to convince the opponent of our purpose. We're having trouble getting our message across to him, you see. So then we increase the intensity of the purpose, the mustness of the purpose, in order to get it through to the opponent. In other words we are trying to win the game. So we increase the intensity for that reason. So it's a conviction phenomenon. The mustness is a conviction phenomenon and we're trying to make it known to the opponent.

Now you get it? The mustness, the enforcement of the goal is done to make the goal known to the opponent. The only reason we increase the mustness of the goal is to make it known to the opponent, but "to be known" is the basic goals package.

The Know Component

The enforcement of any goal is its "know" component. It's got a "must be known" component of the goal and "must be known" is a part of any goal in life. It's the enforcement part. And more than that, as we take the enforcement out of the goal, as the enforcement comes out then eventually when all the enforcement is gone from the goal there's no goal left.

You see, if you “must know” you’ve got the goal then, heavy “must know” but as you take the mustness, the enforcement out of the goal it becomes more and more trivial, more and more trivial, more and more trivial, until there’s no mustness in it at all. Well at that point the goal is gone.

You can’t have a goal without some intensity in it to achieve the goal, you see that? Without any intensity at all you are down to zero. You reach the zero point on the scale. So without the mustness there’s no goal.

Just like you’ve got a cat, well you take all cattishness out of the cat and you end up with nothing. You can’t have a cat without any cattishness, you see?

It’s the same with a goal; you can’t have a goal without some mustness in it, got to have some mustness in it just like the cat has to have some cattishness. Otherwise you lose all the cat. So you lose all the goal when you take all the enforcement out of it. But the enforcement component is the “must be known” component. See that? It’s driving it across to the opponent, trying to get the goal across in games play.

So, that determines the existence of the goal. We find that the basic package, the “must be known” package, which is the “to know” goals package is the basic goals package, and all the other goals packages are really within that package.

It’s the proof! That is the proof of the fact which comes out in practice. It works in practice that the basic package is the basic package and it will do all those magical things.

You can play around with junior packages and get into an awful mess and you run the basic package and it all comes back right again.

And it’s why you have to do level 5A before you play around with any other packages, you must do 5A. You’ve got to get that one right and when that one is erased the whole banks erased, the whole lots gone. That is the basic package.

The only reason a person has to run anything else but level 5A is because they don't believe that the "to know" package is basic. They believe there are other things in their mind except knowingness and there isn't. There's nothing else in there, except the four legs of the "to know" goals package that's all that's in there. All the rest is just illusion.

Unstacking Procedure, Evaluation

So much for that, Greg, now we can go into the evaluation of this Unstacking Procedure.

Now before we get into it you might reasonably ask how can I evaluate this procedure without having run it on me or run it on anyone else. Well I can answer that very easily, it doesn't need running on me because I tried to run it and it's all flat.

It's all flat because the subject of goals and purposes, with me knowing the basic packages and knowing the basic theory of it, there's just simply nothing there.

I just read through the material yesterday and there's a little bit of charge on reading on the wrong opposers when I was on those awful wrong opposers in the examples he gives. They were a bit scrunchy. And I sort of yawned those off, they were a bit awful they were.

So apart from that there was nothing there. The material doesn't need running on me, because there's simply nothing to run. So that answers your question.

And if I wanted to run it on someone else well I simply wouldn't, because the flaws he's got in the procedure and I'm sure that Mr. Nichols himself would realize these flaws once he got his paws on my data. Once he got his paws on my data he'd realize his flaws just as Ron would have realized the flaws.

I wasn't able to give my research to Ron Hubbard. It was just too late, I never could get it to him. I knew if I posted it on to him that it would never get to him and I didn't know where he was in 1979. I didn't know whether he was still at sea or...? I know his health was poor. I didn't know quite where he was. He was surrounded so much, you know, the comm. line I had to the old man was gone and I didn't want it to go to some half crazed secretary who wouldn't know its importance and wouldn't be able to evaluate it properly. And so I didn't bother.

I just couldn't get it to him. There was no way I could get it to him so I just had to leave it and hope it would come right for him in the end.

But anyway, back to the Unstacking Procedure. First off I better clarify why postulates and intentions, goals and purposes are regarded as the same breed of cat, are all synonymous with each other. It comes from where the word postulate comes from in English language.

The word postulate comes from the old Latin *postulare*: to demand; and the idea of demand is the very essence of a postulate. When we postulate something we are demanding that something is going to happen.

We make the postulate "to know" and we want "to know". There's something we want, we are demanding something, demanding to know. You see?

This "must know" the word is correct there and when I say that a postulate is the same as a purpose is the same as an intention I'm on very firm ground in the English language, because that is where the word comes from. The word root is from the Latin to demand. So that my usage is correct.

In Nichol's glossary, I'll just look his glossary up... hang on...

Interestingly enough, Greg, you can always tell how much a person knows about the mind or some aspect of the mind by looking in their glossary of terms. You know, if they've got off beat definitions of phrases and off beat definitions of words you know they've got some hang ups on that subject. It's quite interesting to go straight to the glossary, it's quite revealing. Looking for what his definition of a postulate is, I know it's slightly off beat from mine but I can't find it so I'll have to abandon it. But I can assure you Greg, that mine is more in line with the dictionary definition of a postulate. You look it up in a dictionary you'll find that it's essentially, it's a purpose with an intention.

When a scientist is making a computer model he has certain postulates he feeds into his model and they are his basic postulates. He calls those postulates rather than intentions. That is to say the basic postulate he's using on his model so people know what he means, but essentially the postulates put in are purposes, they are essentially purposes.

I think I better clarify that once and for all. Let's take this word significance. Now he has a different idea of significance than I do. He defines significance "the conceptual and factual content of an experience such as the ideas encountered in study as opposed to a phenomenal content such as pictures or objects," it says. He goes on for another sentence.

Now this is a complicated understanding of significance. **The significance of a thing is simply the purpose plus its importance.** That is the totality of significance, there isn't anything else to do with significance except purpose and importance. When we say significance we say what do the things signify, what does it mean?

The word significance has the same root as the word signal. What are the signals it's sending us? What does it mean? So if we know what it means, then we know what its significance is. But its meaning is essentially its purpose, its function, that is its essential meaning. So we're down to function again.

So significance is purpose plus the importance, that's all. A thing might have many purposes and each purpose may have an importance but essentially when you take a significance apart you're taking apart postulates, you're taking apart intentions, purposes, and that's all. There's nothing else there. He gives the example of motherhood as a significance. Yes, motherhood is a significance but what is motherhood? Well motherhood is the state of being a mother and what is being a mother? Well the identity of being a mother is the identity of a person who is operating on the goal "to mother", the purpose "to mother".

We say that when a person is operating on that goal "to mother" they are a mother, see that. When we examine this concept, this significance of motherhood, we see that it's to do with mothers and mothers are to do with the goal "to mother", the postulate "to mother". You see? So we're back to purposes again. You see, so significance is essentially... it's a purpose. A significance is a purpose plus an importance, that's all it is, that's all a significance is. You can take any significance and reduce it down to a purpose plus an importance.

So he hasn't got a really good grasp of significance there. He hasn't got a good understanding of significance.

Now this izingness he sticks on as a suffix at the end. I read that bit over and over again and I don't see why he's doing this and it seems to introduce a false note into his material.

I mean I've gone around kicking plenty of cats in my life but I've yet to engage in kickizingness of catizingnesses.

Kickizingnesses of catizingnesses, I just don't do it. I kick cats. So sticking izingnesses on the end has got nothing to do with life, as far as I'm concerned and it may have a lot to do with Mr. Nichols's bank but it's got nothing to do with life and I'm only really concerned with the fact that they exist in life.

I just don't see this izingness... I don't see where it all comes in, it's an added complexity which doesn't seem to do anything except make it more complicated. And as William of Occam with his razor, said "never add hypotheses unnecessarily."

I'm a great believer, he's a great friend of mine Occam is, so I don't believe in adding hypotheses unnecessarily just for the sake of making a thing more complicated.

Maybe I'm doing the man an injustice. Maybe there is a good reason why he has to use this strange suffix on the end of all his goals but I've read it and reread it and reread it and I just cannot find out why you have to do this and why it won't work if you don't do it. So I just assume it's some peculiarity of him. Or some peculiarity he's gotten from someone else and he's got himself stuck with, but certainly "izingness" is not something that I stick on the end of my goals and people don't go round and talk about "izingness".

They don't say, "Well I had a good game you know, I had a good day of eating ice creamingnesses, you know. or eatingnesses of ice creamingnesses." They say, "I had an ice cream." You know?

I'm sorry, Greg, I've got a very simple mind, you know, I hate unnecessary complexity if I can avoid it.

But what we have in this procedure, essentially he puts up this dichotomy, he gets the goal and he asks the preclear for the opposition to the goal.

Flunk! He shouldn't do that, that's one thing you mustn't do because he'll only give you a wrong oppose.

Every example he gives there he's got a wrong oppose. There either wrong opposers or their cross packaging. That's the other mistake. That's a gross error to cross package, you know. So the wrong oppose is bad enough but a cross package is absolutely, you know. I mean it's completely inexcusable.

Cross Package

To cross package is to take a goal out of one goals package and oppose it to a goal which is out of another goals package. It's like putting the goal "to know" and opposing it to the goal "to not sleep." You know, that's cross packaging. So that there opposed to each other, the goal "to know" and the goal "to not sleep" are opposed to each other.

Well that's cross packaging. It's a wrong oppose but it's also a cross packaging so it's an even bigger Flunk. An even more severe wrong oppose. It's not even in the same area, it's on another subject.

So anyway, somehow he gets the goal and he gets the wrong oppose and then he has to spend hours and hours, as you would expect, using all sorts of Scientology techniques to discharge what turns up.

The old serfac technique comes into action, he gets all sorts of techniques come into action trying to discharge, and get this dichotomy which is just two wrong opposes in opposition to discharge and they simply won't discharge.

[serfac - service facsimile - It is a computation that the pc adopted when, in an extreme situation, he felt endangered by something but could not it'sa it.

It is called a service facsimile because he uses it; it is "of service" to him.

Aberration, anybody's aberration on any subject, has been of some use to them at some time or other. You can trace it back. It's been of some use, otherwise they wouldn't keep mocking it up. But now, if you put it up against survival standards, you'd find it very non-survival.

The pc adopted this because he couldn't stand the confusion in a situation. So he adopted a safe solution. A safe solution is always adopted as a retreat from the environmental restimulation. He adopted a safe solution in that instance and he survived. His safe solution became his stable datum. He has hung onto it ever since. It is the computation, the fixed idea, he uses to handle life, his service facsimile. LRH]

There's no reason why they should, they've got nothing really to do with each other, you know, their just wrong opposers. They'll just sit there forever.

So he tries to get them to discharge, so he has to work for hours and hours asking these various questions and so forth, ransacking the past, he's bending over backwards trying to make these damn things erase, and they won't erase cause their wrong opposers.

Ron was doing exactly the same thing. He was using all sorts of techniques to try and get these wrong opposers to discharge and they wouldn't discharge cause they were wrong opposers. They were simply incorrect oppositions and so they would just sit there. And that's what this guy is doing too. You know?

Now what do I think is the overall effect of doing the procedure of the Unstacking?

Well if it was done in very careful hands it might take 50 hours before the tone arm will go up to 5 and stick. But eventually that will be the end point. That's where it would go and I don't think he'd get much else out of it.

Oh, you know, running up and down the time track asking for incidents that might be good. You might get some benefit out of that. Asking for incidents, the preclear might get good gain out of erasing a few incidents or reducing a few incidents but the overall effect of this wrong oppose, I think, would swamp out any benefit he'd get and I think the overall tendency would be for the case to tighten up and for more and more mass to appear and the tone arm to relentlessly rise and eventually stick and it would need a repair.

You'd have to run my level 5A to get the preclear back where he was again.

Now the aspect that I noticed in your summary of it, what you said that it seems to run all right but it seems to run over that way. Well yes it does, it's all over that way, the technique is the person as an observer and he's sitting watching this bank which is over that way.

Well my experience of erasing postulates in preclears is they have to get into the postulate and get their paws dirty. They have to get in there and own the postulate and get the feel of the postulate, and get into the postulate. They won't erase otherwise. You can't just put it all over that way and sit and watch it erase like you're watching a TV set. Nothing happens. You spotted this yourself. You said that there's not much efforting, it doesn't seem to do much.

No, it wouldn't do because it's all over that way so the whole thing will become a rather intellectual exercise. It's all over that way. So that's my other criticism of it there.

When I'm asked to evaluate it, it's like being asked to evaluate some of Hubbard's material on goals and postulates and purposes back in the 1960's because the material is so similar. I would lay a bet that this guy was on the Briefing Course in 1961 to 64. I'd lay a bet and that he's been sitting holding this mishmash, this engram he collected between 1961 and 1964 and sometime along the line he got in there and tried to use what he knows and he's modified it and reckons he's got some benefit out of this procedure and he's gone ahead and published his procedure and called it "Unstacking" but essentially I would lay a bet that Nichols is, although the name doesn't ring a bell with me, I'd lay a bet that he got caught on this procedure either directly at Saint Hill or somebody's run it on him and he's got stuck with a major engram on his own track. This material has become a major engram on the track and he's trying desperately to take it apart.

You see thetans never give up. You stick him with something. All these characters at Saint Hill between 1961 and 1964 who got stuck with this material of Ron's, this goals material, you know, they've all been trying to figure it out, most of them are probably still figuring it out today. They never give up. They never give up trying to solve it.

I never gave up till I solved it. Took me neigh onto 1978 before I got it apart, got it solved. I never gave up and I don't think any of the others gave up. They don't give up, people don't give up on this one. You lay a major engram in and they'll work at it until they get it resolved and I think that's what Nichols has done. He's trying to get it resolved.

He maybe had a bit of early success with this idea but I don't think it would do anything eventually but end up going nowhere. It can't do, Greg, it can't go anywhere but run into wrong opposers and cross packaging and **the end point of wrong opposers and cross packaging is a high tone arm and a stuck needle and a black field and winds of space** and eventually they lower the coffin lid on you, gently, and take you off to the cemetery and say, "Rest in Peace." That's the only endpoint.

You know, as I said early on, on the tape when you play around with postulates in opposition you've got to get it right. You've got no leeway whatsoever. No leeway whatsoever. You either get it right or you kill the preclear. It's an awful thing but there it is.

That's why my injunction there on my own research material is not to hand it out to mentally unstable people because they simply cannot duplicate it and they won't do it right. They'll do it wrong and it only needs the slightest alteration or alter-issness of technique of level 5A and my level 5A becomes a time bomb. You know?

I mean I know more ways to louse up preclears doing a slightly alter-ised 5A so it becomes a very dangerous procedure. That will eventually kill everyone that it's tried on, it'll louse them up. That's why my injunction that it must be duplicated exactly and it mustn't be handed out to mentally unstable people who can't use it properly.

So much for the "Unstacking Procedure", Greg, I can't think of any more on the subject. I think I've covered it pretty well there.

30 Erasable Goals Packages

Since I gave you my research data I can tell you now there's no more than about 30 erasable goals packages in total. About 25 to 30 and the major ones you have there. I did discover some others that are erasable which can be tacked onto the list if you want to tack them on.

The “ To Reason” Goals Package

Probably the most important one is the goal “to reason” it has the goals “to reason”, “to not reason”, “to be reasoned” and “to not be reasoned”. They are the four legs of the goal “to reason”. It's a very good goal. It takes apart the subject of logic in the preclear's mind and squares him around on the subject of logic.

If a person is having trouble on the subject of reason and logic and so forth that would be the precise goal to run on him, the goal “to reason”. And it's a specific for people who have trouble reasoning. It's a valuable goal so you can add the goal “to reason” there, into the set.

But there's only about 25 or 30 erasable goals there that can be formulated into erasable goals packages. All the other verbs in the English language cannot be formulated into erasable goals packages, so it tells you how limited we are.

The granddaddy of all the erasable goals is the goal “to know” that's the key one.

The other thing I'd like to say Greg is that anyone who repeats this research will discover an enormous amount of material about the human mind and life and the universe and so forth in the psyche and the laws that govern the universe while their doing the research, if they care to write these things down and so forth.

I mean I've got stacks of notes on the stuff that came up when I was running this material but it's not really relevant to hand it over to people... just be quite unreal to them.

But when they run the material themselves it will become real to them and they will rediscover it so I don't have to tell it to them, they'll discover it for themselves. They'll come up and say, "Oh, yes you know so and so, and so and so" and I'll say, "Oh yes we know about that." And it will pop up. In other words they will discover it themselves when they are running level 5 of my material there.

So there's much more to my material than what I've given you but I've given you what you need to run the material; to run and erase the mind and the rest of it comes out in the wash.

You will discover the rest while you're using the material I've given you, so I don't have to really give you any more. Any more would be a luxury and it can be very confusing and I don't want to overburden anyone with it because until a person gets to work on it and starts to work with the material some of this upper level material can get quite unreal.

That's why I didn't go on and give you more material on the anatomy of sensation, the anatomy of mass in the universe.

I've got more data on it but it's so wild and woolly and I simply can't prove it any way at this stage so I'm simply not going to go into it, I won't be drawn on the subject of it.

Erasing Goals Packages and Knowledge

So that's another aspect there, Greg, of this work worth bearing in mind. It all comes out in the wash. I think I mentioned it in the research there. I said that erasing a goals package is like doing the university course on that subject of the goals package. It's the equivalent of doing a university course. You become an absolute expert on the subject of that goals package. You really know about it if you erase the goals package. Doesn't matter what the goal is.

Supposing you wanted to become an expert on the subject of help, well if you want to really know about the subject of helping and what helps, all about it. Well just sit down and erase the "to help" goals package. It's quite erasable and by golly you'll know about help! You'll be able to spot help in society and you'll be able to spot no help, how help gets aberrated, you'll know all about help and you can look back at what Ron wrote and say, "Yep the old man was quite right, he got it right. He knew about it. He got it all out." And similarly with any other goals package.

It's very educational. It's not only therapeutic; it's highly educational to erase a goals package.

Anatomy of the Mass in the Universe

Going back for a moment to the subject of the anatomy of the mass in the universe a person doesn't really have to know this anatomy, you know. One came into the universe without knowing the anatomy of it and one can walk out of this universe without knowing the anatomy of it. You don't have to know the exact anatomy of the walls and tables and floors and so forth that this universe is made of before you can get out of this universe. Really it's sufficient to know that they consist of postulates in a scrunched up postulate configuration and really that's sufficient. That's all you really need to know. Of course you need to know about the goals packages and so forth and erase them and get rid of the mind and so forth. Then you can start thinking about walking out of the universe. Well that's about wraps it up, Greg, I can't think of much else to go on to. It's coming towards the end of the tape anyway, I don't want to get into anything else and have the tape run out on me.

If you're still in touch with Bill Nichols, the guy who developed the Unstacking Procedure it's quite ok with me if you want to send him a copy of my material, he might be very interested in it. In fact you might save his life.

His tone arm should be getting up pretty high by now if he's still working on the Unstacking Procedure, he should be using a Mark 14 meter by now which has super sensitivity and he should be looking for little drops of tone arm between 6.9 and 6.85 on his meter. [laughs] should be getting pretty high, that tone arm, by now.

I'm only joking, I hope he's not that bad. But anyway you certainly have my permission to ship him off a copy of my data.

Also I have no objection if you make a nominal charge to people for your duplicating costs of this material when you send it off to them. I think that's something entirely up to you. I certainly have no objection as long as you make it quite clear that it's you that's charging and not me that charging it. They're your charges and not my charges. I leave that entirely to your discretion, your good sense, who you send the material to. I'm sure your quite aware of the limitations as well as I am so I leave it entirely up to your good sense. Ok, Greg, well that's about it. I hope to hear from you soon and if I can send you some more data or anything else to clarify I'll be pleased to do so. I don't mind if you communicate with me by tape or whether you communicate with me by letter. I see that on the letter you wrote in nice big print, with my bad eyesight if you do write a letter make the print nice and large or you, as I say, if you've got a tape recording facility then by all means record a tape. I can play back tapes here quite comfortably so I'm quite happy to converse with you by tape. Recording a tape is far easier for me than writing. Writing is very difficult for me these days because of my bad eyesight. Even a typewriter's getting beyond me. So that's why this material is on a tape rather than written. It's much easier for me to record with microphone than it is to write or use a typewriter. Well that's about that at the moment Greg so I'll say Ta Ta to you and umm... all the best and again thank you for duplicating my material and bye for now. Bye bye. End of tape

The Surprise Game

By Dennis Stephens

August 16, 1994

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 10, 2012

Today is the 16th of August 1994 and I want to take up today the subject of surprise and the subject of delusion and various other related subjects.

This tape is most closely associated with tape number 2 of this set [titled "Dissociation"] and it will be advisable to put the two of them together actually, tape 2 and this number tape , which will be tape number 14. They do come out as a pair, these two tapes do.

[the lecture "Dissociation" follows this lecture- editor]

Now the subject of surprise is one of the more interesting psychological subjects, the subject of surprise is. The reason for this is that it's a rather unique subject. It's the only postulate that you can make in this universe and be absolutely certain that it's going to work.

As far as I know if you postulate that you will have a surprise then you will in fact get the surprise.

The postulate simply never fails. If you postulate that you will have a surprise then you will have a surprise, and that's all there is to it, but the mechanism is quite fascinating and I hope to be able to explain it on this tape.

In order to do so it will be of interest to take up one of the more obscure paradoxes and this is known as "the paradox of the surprising blackout." And this is the way it goes:

An army commander calls all his troops together in the main hall one evening about 7 o'clock and he says to them, "In order that we should be prepared for every contingency," he says, "and be on the alert," he says, "One evening this week Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or Friday and sometime between 7 o'clock in the evening and 9 o'clock in the evening I will arrange that we're going to have a surprising blackout. All the lights will go out so you must be prepared to have torches handy to go to your action stations and we will go into the mode of a surprise attack on the military installation."

So he goes ahead on his blackboard and gives all the details of what he wants everyone to do and so forth, and he dismisses the men and they all wander back to their barracks and sit and talk about this surprising blackout.

And then the barracks room lawyer speaks up and says, "Look chaps," he says, "this whole thing... there is something very odd about it."

He said, "There's something very odd about it."

He said, "Look, clearly he told us that this surprising black out is going to occur one evening this week, Monday between 7 and 9, Tuesday 7 to 9 so on right up through Friday and 7 to 9."

Well, if this is so," says the barracks room lawyer, "quite clearly the surprising blackout can't occur on Friday evening because if we haven't had it up till 9 o'clock Thursday evening, obviously it's going to occur Friday evening and then it won't be a surprise will it?"

And all the men agree that this is so. "So the surprising blackout can't occur on Friday."

"So," he said, "by similar reasoning it can't occur on Thursday evening, because if we know it can't occur on Friday so therefore if it hasn't occurred Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday it must occur on Thursday, see.

"But then again if it occurs on Thursday it won't be a surprise."

And they all nod their heads in agreement that his reasoning is quite impeccable.

And he said, "Now by similar reasoning, it can't occur on Wednesday evening and it can't occur on Tuesday evening and it can't occur this evening, so this surprise blackout simply can't occur."

And at that moment all the lights went out and they had a surprise.

Now what on earth is going on here? The barrack rooms lawyer's reasoning is quite sound. It's quite sound. Well, how come they got the surprise?

He'd proved by cold hard logic that they couldn't possibly have a surprising blackout. Yet they had one, they had the surprise and because they just proved they couldn't have one then when it happened they of course got the surprise.

Now what's going on here?

Well let's have a look at this.

Now bear in mind what the military commander told them. He told them that they were going to have a surprising blackout.

Now if he'd of just told them that they were going to have a blackout on one of those evenings, either Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday evening then, of course, they wouldn't have been able to use this reasoning that they used, and so forth, and they would have simply said, "Ok, well the blackout is either going to occur Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or Friday and they would have gone about their business knowing that one of the evenings they were going to have a blackout. And the thing wouldn't have been a surprise at all.

They would have maybe got up to Thursday evening and said, "Oh, well it's going to be tomorrow evening sometime." But there would have been no paradox there at all; everything would have been quite straight forward.

The lights would have gone out either Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday or Friday between 7 and 9 o'clock in the evening, you see, and they would have had their military exercise.

But the commander didn't say that. He said, "You'll have a surprising blackout." And because he said that they made this reasoning, which is quite valid reasoning on the basis of what he said and arrived at an erroneous conclusion.

Their conclusion was obviously false because they concluded that the surprising blackout couldn't occur. But it did occur and they got their surprise. So therefore, although their reasoning was valid their premises were false. They were basing it on a false premise.

So what was the false premise they were basing it upon? Well the false premise they were basing it upon was that they were going to have a "surprising" blackout.

Look, the military commander told them, "You're going to have a surprising blackout." Now that was false, the truth of the matter was they were going to have a blackout. You see that? That's the truth of the matter.

When he said, "You're going to have a surprising blackout." That was false. There was a lie in the statement. You see, once he said you're going to have a blackout the blackout can't be a surprise, but he just told them they're going to have a blackout, you see. So it can't be a surprising blackout because he's just told them that their going to have a blackout. Get it? So it can't be a surprise.

So therefore the blackout they're going to have is a non surprise. But they all, once they agree and say, "Oh yes, we're going to have a surprising blackout." They buy his lie. And once they buy the lie, of course, all the deductions they make turn out to be false because they are based upon a false premise.

Then, of course, they end up in the ridiculous state of affairs where they say, "Well, we can't have a surprising blackout." And then of course the lights go out and they have their surprising blackout, where they all get a surprise.

And, of course, they all agree to the postulate that there would be a surprising blackout, so the postulate came true. The military commander said there would be a surprising blackout and there was a surprising blackout. Get it?

You see the paradoxical nature of the situation. And the fact that what I said earlier on in the lecture that the surprise is the only postulate I know of; that if you make this postulate you can be absolutely sure that your going to get the surprise. Never fails.

The Surprise Game

Well why doesn't the postulate ever fail? Alright, to understand that I better give you another example.

Back in the 1950's in London there used to be a game us auditors played and it's based upon a very, very old game on the time track.

Very early in this universe there was a game called the "Surprise Game". You see, a being goes up to another being and says, "Look now," he says' "imagine this box here." And, "Yes," says the other being and he imagines a box. "Just imagine," he says, "when you open the lid of this box and look inside you will get a surprise. Just agree that that will be so." And the other being says, "Alright. I agree that when I open up the box and look inside I will get a surprise."

Then the first being says to him, "Ok, now go ahead and open the box and look inside." So he opens the lid of the box that he's just mocked up. Opens it and looks inside and, of course, gets a surprise. See?

"What a marvelous game," you see, surprise game. And we used to play this game in London. Ron Hubbard introduced the game there. He told us it was an early track game and many of us checked it out and found it is so. You can find it, you can find this game on anyone's timetrack, very early on. I used to play this game with all the other auditors. We used to play it on each other and get other people to play this game and get our preclears to play this game.

I noticed something quite interesting about this game, that people who couldn't make the game work were heavy cases. In other words, if a person could make this game work, you could try this game on them and they could open the box and get a surprise they were pretty easy running preclears. They weren't in any great case difficulties.

But when you got someone to explain the thing to them and got them to do it and they opened the box up and never got a surprise, then this was a difficult case. But we never figured out why this was so.

It was so, and other auditors spoke to me about it and they checked it out, too, and they also found that all the people that could make this game work were easy running preclears. And all those who couldn't make the game work were rather heavy cases.

And there the matter sort of rested. I couldn't figure out why it was. Must be something to do with games, you know, must be something to do with this game of surprise and there the matter was dropped.

It was only many years later when I was researching in the area of TROM that I began to put all these bits together, on the subject of surprise and tied it up with various other things and could understand why when a person can play this game their a pretty easy running PC. When they can't play this game, they never get the surprise when they open the box up, they're a rather difficult case.

Surprise and Not Know

Well now, before we proceed we would have to go ahead and know a little bit more about this subject of a surprise.

Before you can be surprised in this universe, before you can have a surprise you have to be willing to "not know" something. Now that is absolutely fundamental to this game. If you are willing to "not know" something you can always get a surprise. Now almost anyone can do this, but a person who is in pretty good case shape and has good control over their "to know" postulates and their "to not know" postulates can actually do this most markedly.

That is they can always make their life most surprising by upping their willingness to “not know”, by just increasing their willingness to “not know” or put it another way to decrease their willingness to know. See?

And if you do this, increase your willingness to “not know,” you’ll find that life becomes a constant series of surprises.

If on the other hand you increase your willingness to “know,” which amounts to decreasing your willingness to “not know,” all the surprises go out of your life. See?

And you can juggle these two postulates, “to know” and “to not know”, balance them up so that you can get just the right amount of surprise in your life that makes life interesting for you. It’s simply a matter of balancing the willingness to know against the willingness to not know and getting it to the level which gives you just the right amount of surprise that you think is just right for you.

It’s entirely a matter of juggling those postulates “willingness to know” and the “willingness to not know.”

Basic-Basic Solo Games

Well now let’s return to our surprise game, our game with the box, where the spiritual being postulates that when he opens the box he will get a surprise and then he goes ahead and opens the box and gets the surprise.

Now, of course, this game could be played solo. It’s a completely solo game. In fact it’s the earliest solo game I know of in the universe. There’s no earlier solo game than the surprise game.

It’s sort of basic-basic on this subject of solo games a person could play with themselves, the surprise game.

And this is an important point which will come up later in the talk. So bear that in mind that this is a basic game on the subject of solo games, it's basic, it's a basic solo game is the surprise game.

Now let's examine this surprise game a little bit more carefully. The person mocks up the box and he says that, "When I open the box I will have a surprise." And when he opens the box and looks into the box he does get a surprise. Now let's just examine carefully these steps here. He mocks up the box and he agrees or postulates that when he opens the box and looks inside the box he will get a surprise. Well quite clearly he has to "not know" what is in the box. But look, there's nobody else putting anything in the box except him. Right?

So this is where the "not know" bit comes in. You see?

In order to play this game there's various things he has to be able to do. First of all he has to be able to "not know" then he has to be able to do something. Mock something up and not know that he's doing it.

In other words he's got to be able to play a game with himself. All these are requisites to being able to play the surprise game. Now you're beginning to see why the person who can play this game in the universe isn't in a difficult case condition. And why people who can't play this game are rather heavy cases.

Anyone who can play games with themselves and can manipulate their "know" and "not know" postulates to such a degree that they can play the surprise game with themselves. They still have considerable control over those postulates, don't they?

And if they've got that much control over the "to know" postulate and that much control over the "to not know" postulate, which happen to be two of the postulates out of the basic goals package, if they've got that much control over these fundamental postulates in that basic goals package, there can't be all that much wrong with their case. You see that?

It means that the basic "to know" goals package isn't charged up.

Bear in mind, we know that now, but we didn't know it back in the 1950's. But we know that now. That goals package is fundamental. Get it?

So the diagnostic aspects that I discovered back in the 1950's relating this ability to play the surprise game and an easy running preclear. And relating it to a person's inability to play this game and the rather heavy running PC, was a correct observation.

Now let's press on.

Now if you think about this for a moment, let's take a spiritual being who is very adept at playing the surprise game. Well if he was very good at playing the surprise game and very good at being able to mock things up like this and get surprises, he would be almost self complete in terms of games, wouldn't he. He would be able to create his opponent there, which is really him mocking it up. He would be able to mock up an opponent and play a game with his opponent but the opponent is really his own mock up.

I mean, let's not kid ourselves, with this whole thing of the surprise game. There is nobody else involved but him. There's nobody reaching into that box putting things in there against his will, against his choice. The whole thing is being done by him.

And he gets the surprise, but it's him that's putting things in the box or taking things out of the box and changing the conditions in the box and making all the mock-ups and such. He's playing the whole game and still getting the surprise and it's all done through the dexterous use of the "to know" and the "to not know" postulates.

You can't disprove this as a proposition, but we could say that a spiritual being only got involved with games with other beings in this universe when his surprise game became boring to him, when he could no longer be surprised or sufficiently surprised in his own universe surprise game.

I'm not seriously suggesting that this is the way it happened but I will point out that it could have happened that way.

That a being with very excellent control over the four postulates of the "to know" goals package could play some very involved surprise games with himself and could keep himself amused there, very amused.

Well now let's just pause here and consider this surprise game from a therapeutic point of view.

Quite clearly when we run the basic "to know" goals package at level 5 when were handling the four postulates of the "to know" goals package, we're clearly improving the person's ability to handle those four postulates and therefore improving their ability to play the surprise game. Right?

Is there any other goals package that we could use that more specifically addresses the surprise game? Yes there is. There's the "to surprise" goals package. Now the "to surprise" goals package, the four postulates of this goals package are:

To surprise

To not surprise

To be surprised

To not be surprised

And, wait for it, the package is erasable.

You can test this, whichever way you like. You can test the ionization. You can put the postulates “to surprise” and “to be surprised”, into a mass and you will find that they ionize mass white or colored. Or you can do the earlier test with it and discover the postulate “to surprise” is in no way opposed to the “to be known” postulate of the basic package. So the “to surprise” goals package is erasable and when you test it, the third and final proof, of course, is that when you test it and run the package in therapy it does actually erase. It’s an erasable package. I erased it some time ago, it’s quite an erasable package.

Now a person who can easily play the surprise game with themselves has next to no charge on that package but a person who cannot play that surprise game has one hell of a lot of charge on that package.

They can have so much charge on that “to surprise” package that they do best to abandon it and realize that the surprise package is within the “to know” goals package, which it is really, it’s a part of the “to know” goals package because the whole of the subject of surprise is absolutely fundamentally bound up with this subject of knowing and not knowing as we already discussed.

So it’s no surprise to discover that once you realize that the “to surprise” goals package is so closely associated with the basic package that it will collapse. It will quite easily, quite readily collapse and so it’s an easy one to erase but it’s very diagnostic of the heavy case.

If a person has trouble with the “to surprise” goals package you can know that they’re going to have a lot of trouble with the “to know” goals package and they’re going to have a lot of trouble on the subject of knowing and not knowing.

The Playmate

Now, as I've already mentioned, the surprise game is the earliest solo game on the track and the "to surprise" game leads quite naturally into what is the second earliest solo game on the time track.

The way it happens is this. The person plays the surprise game, and bear in mind in the surprise game there's no opponent actually mocked up. The opponent is there but the opponent is only there because of the games players postulates. His postulates, his know and not know postulates that he's using in the surprise game give the illusion of the opponent. Right?

Well, eventually the person playing the surprise game thinks to himself it would be a nice idea to actually create the opponent whose putting things into the box or whatever the surprise is. In other words he creates an identity over there that's giving him the surprise and this would be a natural extension of the "to surprise" game. Now this is the game called "The Playmate"

It's a definite point on the track, you can find it. The game is playmate.

Actually the word surprise will read quite strongly on the meter if this area is charged. It is with many people and the word "playmate" will read on the meter too. They are definite games on the time track, is the "playmate" and "surprise" games.

Now there's the "surprise game", which leads into the game of the "playmate".

Now the "playmate" is the being he mocks up to play games with. See? That's his "playmate".

And at this point on the track of the “playmate” you’ll find the spiritual being goes into great conversations with his playmate and the playmate’s always with him and he carries this mockup of his playmate around with him and no matter what he’s doing the playmate’s always sitting there and if he gets into any difficulties he’ll always have a little word with the playmate.

Now as I’m speaking these words do you recognize something from childhood on the subject of the playmate? Recognize something that is common to almost all children in childhood? Yes you’ve spotted it, the teddy bear. The teddy bear.

The teddy bear phenomenon in human childhood is a direct throwback, you might say, to the playmate game from the early track in this universe. The child simply mocks up the playmate. The young child mocks up the playmate and he personifies it as the teddy bear.

And we see this young child, this young toddler carrying this teddy bear around with him all the time. He converses with it, often not in English, in some language that’s best known to himself and he won’t be parted with it. When he goes to bed every night he takes his teddy bear with him. And the teddy bear is in bed with him all night long. When he plays his games in the house during the day his teddy bear is sitting there watching him.

And if you watch the child you’ll see him converse with the teddy bear. He’ll say something to the teddy bear and you’ll see the child stop and he’s looking at the teddy bear and the teddy bear is speaking to the child. You can’t hear it, of course, but the child is conversing with his playmate. The teddy bear is very real to the child.

If you've ever picked up this period of your own time track, of your early childhood, you'll realize that what I'm saying is completely true and factual. That the playmate is a definite solo game that all children, don't want to say all, but darn near all children play.

The surprise game which is a predecessor on the track, the surprise game precedes the playmate game but strangely enough the surprise game is just a little bit too intellectual for the young child. So he'll play the playmate game with his teddy bear. It's as if he needs the substance of the teddy bear, he needs the identity there. Something he can lay his hands on, something he can see to play the playmate game.

But essentially it's the surprise game plus mass, that's all the playmate game is. It's the surprise game plus the mass of the identity that is his playmate and can be his opponent in the games that he plays.

Now what happens to the playmate game in childhood?

Where does it end up? Well the child drags this teddy bear around with him usually for some months and then one day you find the child no longer has the teddy bear and the child is ignoring the teddy bear, and the game is over.

It's as if the child got bored with the teddy bear. I remember in my case, I simply got bored with it. I simply, got bored with the game. I decided there were better games to play out in the real universe and I didn't need this teddy bear, need this playmate anymore. I could stand on my own feet. I didn't need to keep conversing with the playmate. I realized that there was nothing he could tell me that I didn't know myself so that ended the game. And I think that's how most children end the game, they simply get bored with the game and that's the end of the teddy bear.

And Mum picks up the teddy bear and puts it in the cupboard and there it stays forever. The child's finished with the teddy bear.

Now it's no surprise, no pun intended here, now it's no surprise to discover that any ill effects of the playmate game can also be erased and handled in the "to surprise" goals package because the playmate game, the game of the playmate, is basically the surprise game. It's just got that extra bit of mass in it. And it's got the personification of the opponent in terms of the playmate. You get it?

So the little "to surprise" goals package will handle the "to surprise" game and the game of the playmate. It will not only handle it in childhood, in this lifetime for you, but it will handle it over the whole track for you. It will run the whole track, run the game out whole track.

It will also run out more than that as we will discover as we go on.

Liability in the Surprise Game

Are there any pitfalls, any liabilities to the surprise game? Or more importantly, are there any pitfalls or liabilities to the game of the playmate?

Yes there are. There's one, and as far as I know, only one liability to this game. And this liability is quite an important subject.

The liability is that the person believes that their playmate is alive in its own right. I'll give it to you again, it's so important I'll make sure that you've got it, I'll repeat it to you again. **The liability of the playmate game is that the person can come to believe that the playmate is alive in its own right.**

Now clearly such a belief is a false belief. The playmate is nothing else but a mockup. And once the person says to himself or comes to believe that his teddy bear or his playmate or whatever it is on the track is alive. If sometime in the playmate game he comes to believe that the playmate is alive in its own right, he's in trouble because it's false and the lie will persist.

And once he believes his playmate is alive in its own right he starts to oppose the playmate and now he's in opposition with his own psyche and there is the danger.

Now this material I've just given you on this tape is the lead up material to the material on tape 2.

[taped letter to Greg Pickering, Dissociation Jan 12, 1993 which follows]

You remember I gave on tape 2 the subject of the machines and the subject of the fixed solution to the problem and I talked then about dissociation. Well this material I'm giving you now precedes that on the time track. It precedes it.

Or another way to look at it, you might say that the mental machines that I spoke about in the second lecture are really just another name for the playmate. Yes you could look at it that way if you wanted to. That they are simply one in the same thing.

But, never the less, this bit of the tape, this lecture up to this point, this material I've been giving you belongs prior to the material I gave on tape number two and putting the whole lot together. You now get the whole cycle of this subject of dissociation.

This whole subject of the cycle of dissociation starts with the surprise game goes through the game of the playmate and then all falls apart if the person gets into later trouble with dissociations. Starts to dissociate in their later life, it's because they believe that the playmate is alive in its own right, and that's the basis of their troubles on it. You see that?

That's the basic of their troubles on this game. The playmate game falls apart at that point. You get it? And all their troubles with dissociation start at that point because they then start to go into opposition with parts of their own psyche, which is dissociation.

So, this material I'm giving you here in collaboration and conjunction with the material on tape number 2 gives us the whole picture and gives us everything we need to know to resolve this subject and understand this subject of dissociation in the human psyche. I can tell you now we've got the lot. We've got it all.

Once we understand the basic game, the earliest game on the track, the game that the person plays with themselves, the surprise game, which leads into the game of the playmate, which is the game of the teddy bear in childhood and that's the "key in" you might say of the early track game. If the person falls into this terrible trap of believing that their playmate or their teddy bear is alive in his own right, their doomed from that point onward. They go into mental dissociation and their primed for schizophrenia.

Voices in their Head

They are primed to entities in their mind. They are primed to having voices talking to them. Their primed to all the horrors that you can read about in any psychiatric text book on this subject of dissociation.

Not everyone who makes this mistake in the playmate game will go insane. No obviously not. But potentially they can. The mistake has been made. You get it?

And we've now got all the data and all the material to handle it. Case wise all we have to run is the "to know" goals package. Level 5 takes it apart. Level 5 plus the "to surprise" goals package, that little subsidiary one, the "to surprise" goals package.

And if the person has entities and so forth, they can be, as I've already pointed out, they can be handled at levels 2 and level 3 of therapy, too.

They can be timebroken at level 3 and differences and similarities with entities can be found at level 2 and the whole subject of entities can be made the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level 5C.

So we have the four addresses to this subject of mental dissociation at level 2, level 3, level 5A and level 5C. And we've wrapped up this subject now, we've wrapped it up completely, this whole subject of dissociation has been wrapped up.

Now do you see what I meant when I said, "this tape should be run concurrently with and is a pair with tape number 2 with this set." The two of them form a pair and we can now wrap up this whole subject of dissociation.

So as far as therapy is concerned all we're adding on this tape is the "to surprise" goals package. It's just a junior goals package; you can add that at level 5B. The "to surprise" goals package, you can throw that in.

So really strictly speaking you can handle dissociation, entities, and so forth at level 2, level 3, level 5A, level 5B with the "to surprise" goals package and at level 5C by making the junior universe and entities the subject matter of the "to know" goals package.

So there are our five addresses in TROM to this subject of dissociation, and I can assure you, in those five levels we can crack this whole subject, because we now know where it comes from. We now know all there is to know about this subject of dissociation. We've now got it licked.

We can know why Ron's technique of OT 3 failed to handle the entities. The OT 3, as anyone who's attempted it knows, it goes on forever, and it does not flatten.

Now why doesn't it flatten? It won't flatten simply because while the person believes that these entities are alive in their own right he's caught in the lie. And while he's caught in the lie the process will not flatten, he can't get rid of the entities. Get it?

He's simply falling into the trap that he fell into in the playmate game. He keeps saying that the playmate is alive in his own right, that's the lie. He isn't, his playmate is his own mockup.

While he believes that the playmate is alive in his own right he starts building up mass on the playmate and he starts to oppose the playmate, he starts to go into dissociation. That's why the tone arm rises when you dealing with entities on OT3 you get a high tone arm and a stuck needle. Why? Because you're building up mass, you keep calling the lie.

In OT3 we have this unfortunate situation. It's a ridiculous situation. If the preclear or the clear whatever he likes to call himself with his right hand is trying to audit out entities while holding them in place with his left hand by insisting their alive in their own right then he's playing games with himself and doesn't know he's doing it. Once he knows he's doing it he can stop doing it.

But the only way he'll ever find out he's doing it is to do the levels of TROM that handle this material. Then one day he'll say, "My God! With my left hand I'm saying the entities exist and their alive in their own right, with my right hand I'm trying to erase them out of my psyche. Well how mad can I get."

Then they'll go. Then they erase. That's an end to it. He's now finished with his dissociation. He's broken through and understood the truth of the matter. And he's now finished and can now erase the surprise game and erase the game of the playmate and erase the entities. The whole lot now will go. Gone. End. That's it.
End of tape

Dissociation

By Dennis Stephens

January 12, 1993

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 17, 2012

Hello Greg this is Dennis Stephens here and the date is the 12th of January 1993. I thought I'd get round to giving you a detailed reply to the tape you sent me in December about the upper level Scientology tech.

Our weather here in Brisbane is typical tropical Brisbane weather. We have two types of summer weather here.

By the way, were you born in Brisbane, in which case you probably know the weather here better than I do. Your mother lives here and maybe you were born here and lived here most of your life, but as far as I'm concerned we only have two types of summer weather here.

When the monsoon trough moves down over the tropics we get the tail end of it down here and it makes us very humid and cloudy and very wet. Then once in a while, hopefully, when we're very lucky, some cool air breaks through from the south, the wind, which has been in the north east from the Coral Sea, goes round to the South East and becomes the South East Trade Wind which is probably the real wind for this latitude in the summer and the weather goes back to perfect, just a little overnight rain and beautiful blue skies and big fluffy masses of cumulus during the day, typical sub tropical summer weather.

Ok, now to proceed with our reply in detail on the tape that you sent me. First off it's a pity that I never will be able to meet Bill Robertson because he's now deceased. I would have liked to have met the gentleman because people who do research in this field are very few and far between, very, very thin on the ground, as they say, are people who do research into the human psyche and into the human spirit.

You've only got to look into the field of psychiatry to see how few and far between researchers are in the field of the human psyche. Because the techniques of psychiatry are very little different than they were 20 years ago. There hasn't been any great development there in the field of psychiatry, indicating that there are not many people actively doing psychiatric research.

Oh, there's no doubt lot's of psychiatrists spending lots and lots of funds in universities and so forth getting absolutely nowhere but they're not doing anything useful, coming up with any practical breakthroughs in their subject, in their field. Material today in psychiatry is much the same as it was 20 years ago.

No doubt the rarest of all researchers into the human psyche are those who do research into their own psyche. That is very rare, very rare indeed. For every 10 that do research into other peoples psyche there's only about one who does research into their own psyche, which is why I would like to have met Bill Robertson. Was he very old when he died? Was he an old person or did he die somewhat unexpectedly.

You mention in your tape that you've got a stack of data there about a foot high of paper so his research must have been very productive while he was active, to get a stack of paper a foot high.

I was interested in your preliminary remarks on the subject of NOTS because I'm familiar with the NOTS procedure, I was also familiar with the fact that the procedure tends to go on forever, having known a person who was working on NOTS and he seemed to be getting absolutely nowhere very fast.

I don't know whether he's still working on it or whether he's given it away. One should always be very, VERY suspicious of a technique where material seems to vanish then seems to come back into the mind again. In other words, you get rid of something and something else takes its place and you get rid of that and something else takes its place and this goes on forever and ever.

One should be very suspicious of such a technique for there is something fundamentally in error when this occurs.

The error is usually that your simply on the wrong track. That what you think is going on is not what's going on and there's something entirely different going on.

When I used to talk to this guy who was doing these NOTS and we used to talk about the procedure and I tried this procedure, this NOTS it just didn't mean a thing to me. I worked really hard at it. It just didn't mean anything.

I could mock up these entities and I could move them around and put funny hats on them. I could do anything with them but there's one thing I couldn't get the things to do and that is, do what they were supposed to do according to the textbook. You know, I used to try really hard. I used to try and mock them up, I used to miss own them. I'd say, "Somebody else is mocking them up" and I put them here and I put them there and I get other people to move them around and I create abundances of them, I'd create scarcities of them. I'd do everything to them but nope, nothing used to happen. The E-meter just used to sit there, tone arm at 3 with a floating needle and the whole thing just used to yawn at me and after a few weeks of fiddling about with this I finally said to myself, "Well this god damned procedure is flat on you Dennis Stephens. You're just wasting time." And then the needle really freed up and started to float nicely so obviously that was the correct thing. The process was flat on me.

My own research, in other words, my own work I'd done, my own level 5 technology had flattened the process if the process ever needed flattening and it was flat on me when I started it so I had nothing to report on the subject of NOTS except that it was flat on me when I attempted it. I just couldn't get any of the phenomena that other people got, other people reported or any of the phenomena that this guy reported.

He used to explain some of the phenomena he was getting to me. I certainly got nothing compared to the phenomena he was getting.

All right, well so much for the preliminary remarks Greg.

Now to get down to the meat as they say.

What I'm going to say is possibly a little bit revolutionary but I'm going to have to say it because it's very real to me, and it's the way I see the procedure.

One has to be very careful indeed when one comes across a phenomena in the human psyche. One has to be very careful indeed before one determines that this phenomena is being created by any other entity than the preclear.

No Such Thing as Entities

Even though the preclear will swear over a stack of bibles that this thing in his mind has nothing to do with him, one has to be very careful indeed to agree with him on this subject. I myself in all the research I've ever done, and I can assure you Greg that I've ransacked this psyche of mine. I mean if I want to tune up my theta perceptics one of the old procedures I do is a little "Opening Procedure by Duplication" between two MEST objects in present time. That's the sort of a limbering up exercise for me. So I'm no slouch at the subject of OT work.

[Opening Procedure by Duplication. See Glossary -editor] But I can assure you in all the OT work I've ever come across and worked on, I've never come across anything in my psyche that is anything but my own creation, my own mock-ups. I never come across any entities. I haven't yet. Don't come across them. I have never come across them.

Now that might come across as startling to you, never have in all of my research. Nowhere in the levels in my own technology. Nowhere in the lower levels of my own tech. Nowhere in the upper levels of my own tech. Nowhere in all the materials of Dianetics back in 1950 that I ran. In the hours and hours of scientology techniques that were run on me and various other techniques and items that were run solo including the clearing technology. In none of it, ever, have I found any entities in my psyche. Now that's interesting isn't it?

So one has to be very careful when one comes across something in one's psyche which one believes is some entity in present time that's influencing them in present time.

Now I'm not just saying this because I've never found any. Because I can assure you that the insane asylums all over the world are full of people who will swear on a stack of Bibles that they've got things in their minds which are alien to them. They swear that their mind is haunted by beings who are influencing them. The insane asylums are full of these people. And it's one of the first things that a person dealing with the insane or mentally disturbed, has to become familiar with. I mean you can walk up to any psychiatrist and talk about entities in your mind and he will just yawn at you. He's heard it all before. He has it every day, five days a week, his working days. And when he gets called out on the weekends he's called out to people who've got entities in their minds, and they're all as nutty as bloody fruitcakes. Every god-damned one of them.

Not one of them turn out to be anything else but "miss-owned circuitry" in the bank.

So I say this advisedly, Greg, there's really two types of people in this universe, two types of beings. There are those who swear that their mind is haunted by entities at the drop of a hat. You know they'll just swear at the drop of a hat that their mind is haunted by entities.

And those who've never seen an entity ever. There are two types, there are definitely two types of people. And I'm one of those who've never seen one. There aren't any as far as I'm concerned, and there are those who swear that their mind is haunted with entities.

The concept of the entity in the mind, that a thetan, a degraded thetan or an OT thetan, which is a separate thetan from self is influencing self is a peculiarity of certain sections of humanity.

Now quite clearly whoever did this research and developed this technique of NOTS is one of the types of people who believes in the haunted mind theory and who has entities, and he no doubt grabbed upon this idea of entities and developed this idea of NOTS.

The technique simply couldn't have been developed by a person like me because I've got no reality on the concept of entities. It's the last thing I would develop, is a technique on the subject of entities simply because as far as I'm concerned they don't exist. I've never had any, you know, never had any reality on then.

Dissociation

Now this phenomenon of the haunted mind, which I choose to call the haunted mind theory is known in psychiatry, they have a technical word for it in psychiatry and it's as good a word as any. They call it dissociation. DISSOCIATION. Not to be confused with disassociation, to disassociate. To disassociate means to not associate with someone, but in psychiatry dissociation has a very precise definition, and is the shutting off of one part of the mind by the main part of the mind and classifying this shutoff part of the mind as the class of not self.

The Haunted Mind Theory

In other words the person simply compartmentalizes their psyche into the class of self and not self. There's the bit that their inhabiting which they call self and there's the bit over there which their now opposed to which they call not self. And this becomes the haunted mind. And the person will swear over a stack of bibles that that bit over that way is not them. Even though fundamentally they are mocking it up and making it go through all the motions that it's going through. Now this is a classic miss ownership situation. Here they are mocking something up, putting it on automatic, having it go through various motions and everything, endowing this entity with life with one hand and with the other hand denying that they are doing it.

Now is it any wonder that when they get into this area with these entities that their tone arm goes up high and their needle sticks. Is there any wonder when that happens that there is this classic case of miss ownership.

One would have thought that some Scientologist down the line faced with a preclear or a clear, as they say, working with NOTS who's plagued with a high tone arm, first of all plagued with an endless process that never flattened and his tone arm had gone up high and his needle is stuck that surely the guys tech would have come in and he'd said to himself, "Good God what the hell is going on here? Have we got a classic miss ownership? There's something wrong here. This tone arm shouldn't be this high and this needle shouldn't be this sticky with this preclear or this person." You see that?

But no, they all blithely go ahead with the whole denying theory. They don't apply their own tech to the subject.

There's obviously something very odd going on when a person starts dealing with these entities and ends up with a high tone arm and a stuck needle. This is a serious case manifestation; it's a serious manifestation that there's a high tone arm and the stuck needle, it means that there's something seriously wrong in the session.

I mean only a complete idiot would try and audit through a high tone and a stuck needle. You know?

When I used to train auditors in HASI. This was one of the things that I used to get into and I used to stand and beat over the students heads. If you get a high tone arm and a stuck needle you better do something about it. You just don't blithely press on with a high tone arm and a stuck needle. There's something seriously wrong in the session. You better find out what it is.

Could be the guys got a present time problem. He's got a nail in his shoe that's hurting him or we don't know what, but it's giving him a high tone arm and a stuck needle. So you better do something about it. Ok so much for that.

The Hidden Influence

Another name for the haunted mind theory is the theory of the hidden influence. Now some people do honestly believe that their mind can be influenced by entities of which they know not what of.

In other words, they believe that their behavior can be influenced and they have no way of ever finding out who the influencer is. Who is doing the influencing? And they genuinely believe this.

Of course this is a lot of bull shit. This is a complete violation of communication theory.

Anything Influencing Your Mind You Can Communicate With

The truth of the matter is that if anything is influencing your mind, if anything is capable of influencing your mind or influencing you as a personality then you are quite capable of communicating with it, with this entity and finding who it is and what it is and finding out all about it.

You'll find a note to that effect in my research there. In other words, there aren't any such things as hidden influences.

The whole thing is a complete lie. It's a lie to scare the kiddies, see that. There's no such thing.

If you believe there's such thing as hidden influences you end up with a haunted mind. The truth of the matter is that you can only be influenced by those things that you are capable of discovering.

Communication Theory

If it can influence you then you can discover it. You see that? It's just two way communication. If someone can communicate with you then you can communicate with them. The fact that they can communicate with you means that you can communicate with them.

If something can touch you then you can feel the touch. See that? It's the way it goes. It's two way communications in the universe. If somebody's going to influence you and move you around and cause you to do things then you're quite capable of being aware that this is happening.

So there is no such thing as a hidden influence. It's One of these delightful little fictions somebody dreamed up to scare the kiddies.

Well I can assure you Greg that there is a large percentage of the inmates in our insane asylums who will swear over a stack of Bibles that such things as hidden influences do actually exist. See they know that they exist, that's why they're in the insane asylum.

By the way, reverting back to the high tone arm and stuck needle, for a moment, you mentioned on your tape that the current fad or at least one of the current fads on the subject of high tone arm and stuck needle in HASI is to blame it on overrun.

Well certainly overrun can produce high tone arm and a stuck needle, there's no doubt about that, but to say that that is the only cause of it is simply untrue. There's many, many causes of a high tone arm and a stuck needle, many phenomena can bring this about in the human psyche and overrun is only one of the causes.

Now without more ado let's get into the anatomy of dissociation. I mean I've been talking about dissociations and so forth. Well can we do anything about it? Is the phenomenon solvable?

Oh, yes indeed. The subject of dissociation has a definite anatomy of which I am very familiar and it has a very easy solution.

The Anatomy of Dissociation

Common Manifestations of Dissociation

Before going into the anatomy of dissociation I think I better give some of the more common manifestations of dissociation. Unless you are aware of this Greg, you may be surprised at the ramifications.

The Bouncer

The simplest manifestation of dissociation is, of course, the old Dianetics circuit, where the person has a command there in the mind which commands him to do things.

He may have say, a bouncer, that bounces him up and down his time track, that's a circuit, a little postulate, sort of shut off from him which is commanding him there, which he's quite aware of but he's powerless to do anything else but obey it. That's probably the simplest manifestation of dissociation, is the circuit, which Ron covered very well in Dianetics Modern Science of Mental Health. He spoke very well on the subject of the circuit. He covered the phenomena very well. He obviously researched it very thoroughly, the subject of the circuit.

By the way this whole subject of dissociation was skirted by Ron in his research. He nibbled at the corners of it but he never came to grips with it head on, Ron didn't. He never came to grips with it.

The reason he never came to grips with it head on, this is only a personal opinion here, is I believe that he himself suffered with dissociation. As I say more about this subject of dissociation you'll see why I believe that Ron suffered with it. So of course he was inhibited in his research on the subject because of the fact that he was personally involved in it. That he was a dissociative personality himself so he couldn't really come to grips with it objectively. And he never did in the whole research of scientology. He nibbled at the corners of it but he never got right down to grips with it. But, anyway let's press on.

Entities

Between the circuit and compulsive behavior would be these **entities** in the mind which we come across on the subject of NOTS. You know? Their simply little circuits, that's all. And they don't indicate the persons insane or anything. Their just little split off circuits. They are just down there at the same level as circuitry.

So it's not a serious phenomenon at all. It's quite mild, just mild dissociation. It's the same level as circuitry. It's between circuitry and the person who is under a mental compulsion. It's certainly not as severe as a mental compulsion. It's certainly not anyway near as severe as a multiple personality.

Compulsion

The next most severe level of dissociation would be a person under a compulsion to do something, or compulsive behavior, where a person is very aware of being compelled to do a thing.

It may be when they go out walking they mustn't walk on the cracks between the paving stones and they feel compelled to avoid the cracks on the paving stones. They mustn't put their foot on a crack; they must put their foot between the cracks. It's a compulsion there and that's dissociation.

Or it may be a compulsion to do any behavior. Compulsive behavior is a manifestation of dissociation. It's not a severe manifestation. There's much more severe ones than that, but it is essentially a part of the mind which is split off which is now commanding the main psyche to do something and the main psyche is obeying it, and the person is powerless to not obey the commands.

Multiple Personality Disorder

Now the next level of severity. We leave the normal types of neurotic or ordinary behavior, the ordinary type of person. We are now moving into what are classified in psychiatry as a psychosis and probably the least severe of these would be the multiple personality. Where the person manifests one personality for a spell and then that personality disappears and they become an entirely different person.

If you read the book "The Three Faces of Eve" this is well documented.

In psychiatry it's not a common condition but when it does occur it's most startling. It's a manifestation of dissociation and the psychiatrist or the therapist's job is to marry up all these entities and get them back to one bit again. You've got a split personality.

You've got a shattered personality; you've got to put the bits back together. When you get all the bits back together you get one personality again, all the rest have gone. That is a manifestation of dissociation.

Schizophrenia

Above multiple personality, more severe than a multiple personality is the schizophrenic, schizophrenia. Where the person hears voices and compulsions to act and do things. The person is being told to do things by voices that talk to him and so forth. Whole sections of his mind are shut off and he's under compulsive behavior. All the manifestations of schizophrenia which one can read about in any textbook of psychiatry.

This is a severe manifestation of the dissociative personality.

Paranoia

Equally severe is paranoia, the paranoia, the paranoiac. He believes that the world is against him. It's a psychotic condition, he believes that people are plotting, that there are entities out there that are plotting and he unreasonably believes that he's being influenced by these entities. And they're all out to get him, they are all out to destroy him. This is the paranoiac.

Schizophrenia and paranoia go together. You get the classification of the paranoid schizophrenic, the two go together, sometimes their separate, sometimes there together. Now this is the reason why I believe that Ron Hubbard was never able to complete his research and never did. Well not complete, and never did come to grips with this subject of dissociation in Scientology. That is because I happen to know from personal experience of Ron that he was markedly paranoiac. He was definitely a paranoiac personality, was Mr. Hubbard.

It was quite obvious when talking to him. I used to go out and have dinner with the guy. And we used to sit and burn the midnight oil and so forth, and chat and drink together. And it was quite in the way he used to talk, it was quite obvious that he felt that he was being got at.

He used to generally believe that the psychiatrists were ruining Scientology. And I used to argue him, I'd say, "Ridiculous Ron, just leave them alone, they're not doing us any harm. We leave them alone, they'll leave us alone." "No, Dennis," He used to say, "No, No, there... there's all sorts of things happening." He'd say, "There's funny things going on, on our comm. lines and it's the damned psychiatrists. They're out to get us. And we've got to get them first."

And after a while I began to realize that this guy was paranoiac. I was dealing with a paranoid personality.

It wasn't marked, I mean he wasn't insane but he was a paranoid personality, was Ron Hubbard.

Oh, it showed on many occasions in Scientology. Many times he showed paranoid behavior. I'm not the first person or the only person to have known that Ron Hubbard was paranoid, had marked paranoid tendencies.

So it would be no surprise to me that a man with that degree of paranoia would have difficulty in researching this subject of dissociation because he himself would dissociate quite badly, and would tend to have bits of his own psyche shut off and acting quite independently of him.

And he would be unable to determine whether they were genuine bits of his personality or whether they were other thetans in present time dictating to him. And he'd be unable to determine this because of his own paranoid tendencies.

So that's why I believe he never was able to complete this research and thoroughly research this subject of dissociation. He should have done, you see. It was odd, considering the importance of the subject that he never did come to grips with it.

Ron and Sexuality

There's another area of the mind, while I'm on the subject of areas of the psyche that Ron Hubbard never come to grips with. Ron Hubbard never came to grips with the subject of sexuality, either.

You hunt through the textbooks of Dianetics and Scientology and apart from the good old prenatal coitus engrams of book one and a bit on blanketing in "The History of Man" you will hunt in vain for anything on the subject of sex in the textbooks of Scientology or in his lectures come to that. That Ron was very quiet on the subject of sex.

Well when you consider how important sex is in the subject of human beings lives you would think it would have far greater mention in the subject of Scientology than it actually had. And so we can probably assume, and I happen to know for a fact that he did have lots and lots of trouble on the subject of sex, did Ron. And he was quite unable to do research on that subject. Anyway that's a digression.

Getting back to those manifestations of dissociative personality; it's quite broad, isn't it. Goes from a simple circuit, through compulsive behavior, through the phenomena you see in NOTS and through compulsive behavior into the realms of psychosis. In fact apart from various degenerative conditions of the mind, to do with old age or alcoholism or poisoning and so forth, dissociation is the common denominator of most insanity.

That's the vast majority of people in insane asylums, who are classified as insane, are dissociative personalities. The only other types of personalities that are classified as insane is the dementia's of aged people, or alcoholic dementia, dementia from poisons and that pretty well wraps it up.

There aren't any other psychoses.

So you can see how important the subject of dissociation is, and how strange it is that it was never researched by Ron Hubbard, never fully researched. It was quite interesting when you start to study this subject of dissociation you realize that this whole thing is a great big hole in Scientology called, "Where's Dissociation?" Ron never mentioned it, never mentioned the whole subject called dissociation, interesting. In case you think I'm maligning Mr. Hubbard, I'm not. I still think that he's one of the greatest psychotherapists of this century. In fact he may have been the greatest because of his contributions to human knowledge of the mind; his contribution is second to none.

The man was a genius in his field but that still doesn't get away from the fact that he was markedly paranoid and was a dissociative personality and had lots and lots of troubles on the subject of sex. That's the truth of the matter.

Well I see this tape is running towards the end. I'll just stop it and have a look at it.

No, it's not running towards the end. It's my eyesight that's running towards the end. I've just taken it out and had a close look at it there's a good 3 or 4 minutes on this. So I won't go over. I'll probably run off the end of the spool.

The Solution to the Subject of Dissociation

So let's now go into the subject of the solution to the subject of dissociation.

Now the subject of dissociation, the basis of it is our old friend the subject of problems and solutions. A person has a problem, this is the way it works out, the person, usually in childhood, has a problem and they solve the problem and the solution works. [laughs] That's the key point the solution works.

So every time they get this problem they put this solution into action and the solution keeps working. The solution eventually becomes automatic, this is the key point, this is.

The solution becomes an automatic solution and every time a problem turns up the solution goes in and the thing becomes more automatic. Eventually they create a little entity, the child will create a little entity in his mind, which puts the solution in as soon as the problem comes in. We all do it.

And then the problem comes along and automatically he will put the solution into effect there.

Now the intensity, the degree to which he puts the automaticity in varies from person to person. Although we all do this, some go completely overboard on it, and create a fully fledged entity complete with a purple hat or what have you, and create an identity that goes with the purpose or the function and the whole thing is sort of mocked up, there. And this is the dissociative personality.

And where another person, a person like me, simply created it as a little machine, a little survey mechanism but it never really was granted much life and so it never did get itself into anything special. It is just a little survey mechanism that will put the postulate into action when the problem turned up. It will put the solution into action you see?

So although we all do it, we all do it to varying degrees and the dissociative type of personality does it to a marked degree and the type of personality who doesn't dissociate in later life only does it to a very minor degree.

So that's the essence of it there Greg, is the fixed solution which goes into action. Then one day, inevitably what happens is that one day the fixed solution goes into action and horror of horrors it doesn't solve the problem. And this is awful, see. Always up to now the solution has worked and suddenly it stops working.

Why would this solution no longer work? Well of course it could be any number of reasons, times change, different circumstances. Nothing stays the same for very long in this universe as we all know. So one day inevitably his fixed solution is no longer going to work. We know that for absolute certainty.

Well I know for absolute certainty I'm getting to the end of this spool so I'm going to switch it over. I'll see you on the other side of the spool Greg.

Just run it on to the end and I'll start right close in on the other side. So just run the spool till the end.

Well here we are back again on side two Greg. Same date. You might have noticed about half way thru the first side of this tape that the background music stopped. I switched it off. I switched it off because there is no need for it any more. The external noises stopped, ceased to distract me so I switched off the background music because it was no longer necessary. It's now quite outside.

He Can't Stop It.

Moving along on the subject of problems and solutions. Yes we have the fixed solution and then one day he finds it doesn't work, it no longer works. It is the inevitable end to all fixed solutions, that one day they don't work.

And then, of course, he tries to stop the solution from going into action. Then the fun starts because he can't stop it. He can't stop the machine from working. He set it up to act automatically you see and he can no longer control of the machine.

Now this is where he does a very stupid thing, a very stupid thing. He opposes the machine. He now opposes the thing. And he says, "This is now compulsive behavior. I don't want to do this anymore but I find myself doing it.

Every time X happens I do Y, and I don't want to do Y every time X happens and I must stop myself from doing Y every time X happens."

See he opposes his fixed solution. Now this is where the trouble starts.

Up to now every things all right, no problem at all. The correct thing he should have done at this instance was to create lots and lots of machines and put them over that way. Machines that were doing this thing for him. In other words he should have duplicated his exact sequence up to that point, of creating the automaticity to put in the solution automatically. He should have consciously done what the machine was doing for him automatically. In other words he should have duplicated the machine.

Now Ron had this technology he knew this very thoroughly and I learned this from the old Man may back in the 1950's. See he got that bit out all right. He knew about the automaticity the fixed solution and so forth, so there's nothing new about what I'm telling you up to now.

It's standard Scientology tech unless they've gone and lost it. Unless they've lost it.

I don't know what they're doing down there these days. They might have lost it. But anyway Ron had that tech. he understood that but he didn't talk of it in terms of dissociation, he talked about it in terms of problems and solutions. He didn't relate it to the subject of dissociation like I'm doing.

So anyway the person makes this mistake, he now opposes the fixed solution, of course he can't stop the machine from working so now he puts it over that way and goes in and raises his flag and goes into a great games condition with his own fixed solution.

Now again, some personalities do this much more than others. Some do it very little. Some seem to think it's a stupid thing to do, to go into opposition to their own machinery and they simply don't do it. They somehow skirt round and unlock the machine. They don't do it.

Never Took My Finger off the Machine

I never did it. I ransacked back through my childhood, for this mechanism. I can't find myself ever having done it. I used to set the machines up but I always knew that it was me doing it. I never took my finger off the machine even though the machine was running automatically I could always leave my finger on the machine and always stop the machine. See I never took my finger off it. Maybe that was the secret of my success; I never took my finger off the machine.

But some people take their finger right off the machine, put it in the class of not self then when they want to stop the machine, they can't stop the machine because now the machine is over that way. It's out of their control by their own postulates.

It's not that the machine runs out of control or by any other postulate than theirs. I mean soon as you put a thing into the class of not self you're now saying that it's no longer going to obey your postulates.

That's what you mean when you put a thing into the class of not self. It's no longer going to obey your postulates. It's now acting under other determinism. It's now acting under somebody else's postulate.

So you've got nobody to blame but yourself if you set up a machine, put it in the class of not self and then wonder why you can't control it anymore. The machine never does anything else but obey your own postulates, so you can't blame anyone but yourself. And you can blame yourself for being damned stupid.

Anyway, some people will do it and they get caught in this mechanism and this would be the dissociative type of personality.

They end up with this machine over that way that their now opposed to, they've now got a split off part of their psyche, this automatic machine over that way.

And the next thing you know they've got an entity there and or a cluster of entities, all on the associated subject.

Because you know from NOTS that the entities tend to cluster on similarity of subject. They associate in the mind under similarity of postulate. Similarity of subject matter and that's no great surprise to anyone that this should happen cause that's the way the mind gets built.

But, never the less, this is the anatomy of the dissociation, Greg, this is how it comes about.

Therapy

Now what is required to be done about it in therapy? Well in my own therapy, nothing. It simply comes out in the wash at level 5A, by the time the person's done level 5A.

Just to remind you what level 5A consists of. A person is putting up postulates and creating postulates themselves and then they're putting up postulates in the class of not self, created by others. Their mocking up others creating postulates in the class of not self and their creating postulates in the class of self. They're working all the time with this class of self and not self with very powerful postulates at level 5A.

Well after they've been doing this for 10 or 20 hours all their automatic machinery is shot to pieces, they just tear it apart, because you see, their now an expert at creating things in the class of not self. It's as easy for them to create things in the class of not self as it is to create things in the class of self, it doesn't make any difference to them. I mean, I can mock up things in the class of not self just as easy as I can create them in the class of self.

I can mock up other people mocking things up just as easy as I can mock things up myself. I know which is which, I keep them quite separate. One's just as easy for me to do as the other. No great difficulty in it.

Most people unless they've worked on this subject, you ask them to mock something up they mock it up in the class of self. It never occurs to them to mock it up in the class of not self, unless you ask them to do so and some people have a lot of difficulty doing it, they can't mock things up in the class of not self. They say, "Oh, no, I can't do that."

Well, all that comes out in the wash at level 5A on my tech. They get over that by the time they finish level 5A. They've just broken this machinery down, all the entities have gone. So this is my solution to the problem of dissociation is level 5A. It's not a specific address to it. It simply comes out in the wash at level 5A because it's covered in level 5A.

When you are done with level 5A you have broken all the entities down. They've all gone, because they're only just the postulates in the class of not self.

What is an Identity?

Look Greg. Let's understand. What is an identity? Let's understand what an identity is, and how an identity comes about in the mind.

An identity is simply a collection of postulates. Now the postulates come before the identity. This is a very important datum.

It's not that you create an identity and then the identity starts operating on certain postulates. That isn't the way it works. It works the other way around. You get the postulates first. There are the postulates, the postulates go into action and then we say, "Well a person who uses those postulates is a blank." See that?

And we will call this person the identity of a "blank". You know, a fisherman is a man who fishes. His postulate is "to fish". You see that?

But first, how did the identity of the fisherman ever come about. Well one day somebody started fishing, you see. Then somebody else started fishing, and they started fishing and they said, "Well, we need an identity for this.

Who is the person who's doing the fishing? Well, fisherman, he's now a fisherman, so they invented the word fisherman and the word gives us the concept of an identity there. And now we have the identity of a fisherman. But the identity of a fisherman comes later than the postulate "to fish", see that? And it stems from the postulate "to fish".

How to Get Rid of Entities

So you come across an entity in the mind, your tendency is to say well I must try and get rid of this entity.

Flunk! That's the wrong way to go about it. The correct way to take an entity apart in the mind is to find out what postulates it's operating on. Is just to find out its postulates and one by one take over control of those postulates. Create them yourself. I mean, it could be just creative processing, it could be as crude as that or it could be something as sophisticated as my level 5A.

But, it amounts to the same thing. You're going to get in there and try and take over the creation of these postulates, then the entity collapses . Once you've got rid of the postulate, you stop creating the postulate that the entity is based upon, the entity vanishes because the entity only consists of the postulates. It doesn't consist of anything else but postulates.

A fisherman, the entity of a fisherman, the valence identity of a fisherman, doesn't consist of anything else but the postulate "to fish." Plus the postulate "to be human" we might say, but that's common to all human identities, the postulate to be human.

The thing that differentiates out the fisherman is the postulate “to fish”, see that? And once you’ve erased the postulate “to fish” out the mind the fisherman’s gone. And that’s the easiest way to erase a fisherman from the mind, is to erase the postulate “to fish”.

The hard way to go about it is to try and erase the fisherman without touching the postulate “to fish”, that is the hard way to go about it. You might get there, you might get lucky. But it’s the hard way to go about it. **The correct way to go about it is to address the postulate. Then the entity, the identity, call it what you will, vanishes.**

That’s why in my therapy I only work with postulates I don’t work with identities, don’t work with entities because I don’t have to. I work with postulates, the identities, the entities, come out in the wash, they all do.

I knew that according to my research data. The identities consist of postulates, that’s all they consist of, so you only have to work with the postulates in the class of self and in the class of not self and all the entities and identities and so forth come out in the wash.

And they do, they fly off at level 5A. They fly off in all directions quite violently. They all come apart. So that’s the way I would do it in my therapy.

Now there are other ways you could do it. There are lots of ways you could skin this particular cat, called dissociation. You could treat the thing purely as a problem in “problems and solutions” and back up Scientology tech to it. You could get the person to mock up a machine that creates entities, mock up a machine that creates these postulates, mock up a machine that creates postulates that become entities. Then mock up lots of machines. Now become the machine, have other people mocking up the machines. You can do creative processing.

You can take him back into childhood and pick up the points when he created the solution to the problem and date it, find the moments in time when he first came across this postulate and set the machinery up. Do it that way. That might be a hard way to do it by the way but you could do it that way. It could be done Dianetically, but the fastest way to do it would be with my tech and Level 5A. I swear it, the fastest way to do it.

It's not the only way to do it, there are lots and lots of ways you can do it if you understand the mechanism involved, the mechanism of the entity, the mechanism of the identity. Basically it's a problem; it's the old problems and solutions technology.

The Problem with NOTS

Just in passing, when you mentioned on your tape at the beginning of your tape you were talking about NOTS and the phenomena they came across in NOTS. I had to play this back over, I thought this was most peculiar but no it was the way you said it. And it was quite true, I quite believe it.

You said that when they were trying to put intentions into mass, they were starting to come up scale and OT, they were starting to put intentions out in the environment and they started to get somatics in auditing. As soon as they started to put their intentions out into the environment they started to get somatics. So then they sat down and tried to figure a technique to handle the somatics. Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! Breach of the auditor's code!

Look if you had a preclear walking around, your running 8C on a preclear and your walking around the room and your getting him to touch objects in the room and he turns on somatics, now what does the auditors code tell, you to do? It doesn't tell you to sit down and try to figure out a process to handle the somatic does it?

The auditor's code is very precise on this subject, it says that you continue the process as long as it's producing change and then you stop doing the process. That's in the Auditor's code. So you're walking the preclear around the room touching objects, if he turns on somatics, you go on with the process. To do anything else is a Flunk. It's a code breach.

It's one of the things that separate the auditors from the non auditors. The auditors go on with the process as long as it's producing change while non auditors don't do that.

That separates the auditors out from the psychiatrists, that one does. The auditors go on and flatten the process and the psychiatrists quit.

But Hey, we get onto the subject of upper level tech and the person now out in the environment putting postulates into the environment and they start to turn on somatics. The correct solution to that problem is to go on putting postulates in the environment and flatten the process. Get that?

There never was any need to invent the NOTS you see? It always was an unnecessary solution. All they had to do was flatten the god damned process.

If this OT's getting somatics every time he puts postulates out in the environment, fine, start of session auditing command place some postulates into the environment, thank you. Your getting a somatic . Thank you very much, we're going to continue this process here. Here's the next command, put some more intentions into the environment. Oh, your somatics are getting worse. Ok, we're going to continue this process.

You know, just auditing, routine auditing. Don't have to be a level 14 auditor to handle that sort of situation. You know, a level 1 auditor can handle that. Continue the process as long as it's producing change.

This is what startled me. I could hardly believe that somebody of the technical expertise of a David Mayo would fall so easily into such a simple trap of not flattening a process and coming along and inventing an unusual solution. So, bit peculiar isn't it.

Someone around here's a bit obsessed with the subject of entities. Now the odd thing is that if you were to take a person, a newly fledged OT and he starts putting purposes into the environment and he turns on a somatic, if you were to go on with the process eventually it would turn off. Eventually the somatics would turn off.

Somatics and Effort

He may discover, however, and I've come across this phenomena, he may discover that the cause of his somatics is that in putting the postulates into the environment he's creating effort in his own body and these efforts go into counter efforts in his own body and the conflict between the effort and the counter effort in his body is causing a somatic. In other words he himself is generating the somatic in his own body by creating efforts in his own body when he's putting postulates out in the environment.

Maybe he's trying to use his body by trying to get the postulates out into the environment by using body effort. Some people will do this, they are stuck in effort. And they try and project mentally using the effort band and the end point of that is that they're going to get somatics in their body.

All this will come out in the wash if you simply continued on with putting intentions in the environment eventually the preclear could know if he was doing this. He'd eventually know where he was getting these somatics from. "Oh, oh, I'm putting all this effort into my body, that's where the pain is coming from." In other words it has nothing to do with his track it's simply a present time phenomena.

So that phenomena could occur. But anyway that would come out in the wash that was simply just another reason why he's getting the somatics. But the correct procedure would be to apply the process.

So I'm afraid David Mayo's gone down in my estimation. I always had a rather high regard for the chap as a Scientologist but if he fell for that one he definitely needed to do a retread, he did, if he fell for that.

Dissociative Phenomena is Cumulative

Probably the most awful thing about the dissociative phenomena is that it's cumulative. A person has one failure, has their first failure as a child say, and they get a machine that goes out of control. Some bit of their mind goes out of control and they shut that bit off over that way and they finally get that bit all quietened down and the next time they get into this it happens more easily. In other words, failure breeds failure, and the next thing they know their well into a haunted mind and you will get the dissociative type of personality.

Now I can give you more data on the type of personality that is going to become dissociative. The type of postulates that this person will be operating on. I can even give you that, and that's about as far as I can go on the subject is tell you the dissociative type of personality.

Common Personality Types and Frequency

Do you remember the four basic postulates in my level 5A? “to be known,” “to not be known,” “to know” and “to not know,” they’re the four basic postulates. They’re the ones that I work with at level 5A. Well now, it should be no surprise to anyone that people tend to fixate into one or the other of these four postulates. And they tend to base their modus operandi in life on one or the other of these postulates. Now the two positive legs of the “to be know” goals package are the favorites.

To Be Known Leg 1

The most common is “to be known” that is the most common of all the postulates that you will find a person dramatizing in life.

The person is a circuit and often starts off quite creative, an extrovert. All this is in my research notes by the way. I’ve no need to repeat it. You can find it by reading it up there. [see the book “The Resolution of Mind, A Games Manual”]

To Know Leg 3

The next most common is the “to know” personality. This person tends to be introspective and studious, wanting to learn.

To Not Know Leg 4

Now, far less common are the negative type of personality. **First of all "to not know" that's the next most common one, "to not know",** this person is a rejecting type of personality. He simply doesn't want to know.

To Not Be Known Leg 2

And the least common of all is "to not be known" type of person. Virtually in hiding, they are a hiding type of personality, the retiring type of personality.

Now the thing is that when you audit the negatives. When you get a person who's into "not know" or dramatizing "not know", when you take the person who's into "not know" and you audit him he comes up scale and he starts to go over more and more to the "to be known" postulate.

In other words the cycle of the person in the "to be known" postulate is that his opterm, his opposition terminal is "to not know". That's the enemy is "to not know" and he takes on the characteristics of the "to not know".

Now the further he goes down scale the more he goes into the valence of "to not know" so as you audit him and he's into "not know" as you audit him and bring him upscale eventually you'll bring him back up to the "to be known" postulate. So actually the person who's stuck in "to not know" when you audit him he comes up scale and you find he's a "to be knower". That's where he really belongs.

And similarly with a person who's stuck in "to be not known" he's the opposition terminal of the "knower" of the "to know" postulate.

And the knower operating the postulate “to know” he will eventually go into “to not be known” so he eventually goes into hiding. And as you audit him he comes out of the hiding and goes back into the “to know” postulate. So really there’s only the two, “to be known” and “to know” they are quite distinctive personality types, quite distinctive.

The knower’s make good scientists and so forth, studious, tend to be academic, thoughtful, so on.

The "to be known" is the extrovert, outgoing, active, great sportsman, so on, you know. I don’t need to belabor the point, you see the differences between the two types of personality, right away.

But of the two types of personality, the type of personality that is more likely to become dissociative is the “to be known” personality simply because the “to be known” personality is opposed by rejection.

[He's upset if his own machinery rejects his control. -editor]

What type of incidents Upset You?

To Be Know

Before I go on I better explain this a little bit to you.

You can always pick which postulate goes with a person. You’ve only got to say to the person, “Alright now, what sort of incidents upset you in your life? What type of incidents upset you?”

You say this to the person and he says, “Oh, well things I don’t like in my life. I don’t like being rejected. I don’t like rejection.” Yes, he finally decides that sort of thing. “I am really very sensitive to rejection.”

Well you don't have to look any further he's a "to be known". He's operating on the "to be known" postulate because the opposition terminal to "to be known" is "to not know" which is rejection. He gets rejected, see. The "not know" of rejection. So that's his opposition terminal. So you can always tell.

To Know

The person who is dramatizing the "to know" postulate his opposition terminal is "to be not known" so you say to him, "Now what sort of incidents in your life have upset you most?" and he thinks about it for a while and you think, "Well he's going to say being rejected."

No, he's not particularly worried about rejection, this type of personality. The thing that upsets him is deprivation. He can't stand being deprived of things. He can't stand being prevented from knowing things. You see his opposition terminal is preventing him from knowing things. He's being prevented from knowing. It's the thing that gets him.

He doesn't like secrets. His opposition terminal is a secreted person, you see there. His opposition is hiding things all the time and depriving him of things. He hates being deprived of things. So he says. "Well, the worst thing in my life is being deprived of things and being prevented from knowing things." They are the things he detests most, you see. So he tells you that and you know where he is, he's a knower.

To Not Know

Now the person who is stuck in “to not know” you say to him, “What sort of incidents in your life upset you most and he says, “Tell you that right away. I can’t stand people inflicting things on me. I just hate infliction. Inflictions a terrible thing.” he’ll say.

This persons stuck in “not know” his opterm is the “be known” and the “be known’s” an inflictor. From the characteristics of the “be known” “must be known” personality. The be known goes round inflicting things on people and the “not knower” he can’t stand that. He can’t stand having things inflicted on him. So that’s the incidents he doesn’t like. He doesn’t like anything inflicted on him.

To Be Not Known

And your “be not known” personality, you say to him, “Well now what sort of incidents upset you most in your life?” and he thinks about it and says, “Well the worst things that happen in my life are to being forced to reveal things. Is to be found out.” and they are the worst things that could happen to him.

You see he’s a secreted type of personality and he’s opposed to the knower. He can’t stand people, who want to know things. He can’t stand their curiosity, their inquisitiveness and all the worst upsets he’s had in his life were of being forced to reveal things. So his upset is revelation. He’s upset by revelation, being forced to reveal things, being forced “to be known” that’s his upset.

So there’s your four you see. So you can tell which postulate of the four the person is dramatizing by asking what sort of incidents upset them most, and it’s quite distinctive.

There's no doubt, you won't get any cross types. People do fall into one of those types or another, there's no doubt about it.

You won't find a person to say, "Oh, well I don't like rejection, I don't like being rejected and I don't like being deprived of things." Oh, no you won't get that. You won't get that much crossed up.

It's quite distinctive, you know, the person who doesn't like being rejected, he doesn't mind being deprived of things. He doesn't care for it particularly but it's no great deal with him. And the person who doesn't like being deprived of things, although he doesn't like being rejected, it doesn't really bother him, not really, you know. It's not his game, you see. You see how that would be? So it's quite distinctive.

Dissociative Personality Type

Now the reason why the dissociative personality is more likely to be a "be knower" is, because he's out going, he puts up these postulates, these fixed solutions, you see. And then one day he tries to change the fixed solution and he can't and immediately he feels that he's being got at. That his own machinery is rejecting his orders, his commands. And he gets really very upset about this and this is why I think it's the basis, I can't prove this, but I think this is why some personalities are dissociative and some aren't.

I think it depends upon this basic postulate they are operating on and I'm sure it's the "be known" personality who is the sucker for dissociation. The "know" personality is quite immune to it. He's quite immune to dissociation.

I'm basically or I used to be, the postulates are so feint with me now, but I used to be, before I did my own level 5A, I used to be a "knower" and that used to be my favourite postulate, you see. But it's certainly my case that I'm not a dissociative personality; I never have been even when I was a knower. I was dramatizing that postulate quite heavily as a young man. I was not a dissociative personality, never have been in this life time.

But there's plenty of evidence to back up what I'm saying although I can't prove it without doing lot's more research on lots of other people which I probably will never get the chance to do at this stage. But I would lay a bet on it that the dissociative personality is fundamentally operating on the "to be known" postulate and I know for a fact that the paranoiac personality is always operating on the "to be known" it's the only postulate he operates on.

Now that's not to say that every person operating on that postulate is paranoiac. No, no, but if you find a person who's got paranoiac tendencies this person is basically a "to be known" personality.

Hubbard was basically a "to be known" personality and he was markedly paranoiac. And I've known quite a number of paranoiac people in my lifetime and every one of them showed all the characteristics of the "to be known" personality. There all extroverts, all outgoing, all outgoing in their natures and so on. They showed all the manifestations of the "to be known" personality.

So there's quite a lot of correlation there between those basic four postulates and life, Greg, they're not just something I dreamed up, and they just sit there in my research. They're real living things that sit in real living people in the environment and the more you work with them the more you come to realize that they are just what I say they are the four basic postulates.

They don't come any more basic than those four. And the person gets those straightened out at level 5A.

And as he works with those, gets those out of the way it kicks great big holes in their bank, great big holes, great big chunks get kicked out of their bank.

Blimey old buddy, I see that I'm getting towards the end of this tape and I'm going to close off now. It's getting towards 9 O'clock, half past 9, it's 9:15. Getting a bit tired, I may have a bit more space on this tape. I might fill it. I may not before I send it off to you. Anyway I'll bid you good night for the moment. Ta ta for now.

Addendum - Addressing Entities

This is an addendum to the tape made some time later and in listening to the tape I realized that I forgot to mention another application for TROM, the resolution of the subject of entities from the mind.

Generally speaking it's not advisable to address the subject of entities in the mind unless they interfere with therapy. So unless they interfere you wouldn't get involved with this subject. One would simply proceed on through the levels but if entities did interfere with the running of TROM they can be addressed right from level 2.

There's nothing at all to prevent a person from putting up an entity and finding some differences and similarities between an entity and a present time physical universe object. In other words simply treat it as a part of the mind. The entity is a part of the psyche and can be treated as such and if it shows up in therapy it should be treated as such. So if the entity interferes with therapy at level 2 then it should be addressed at level 2 and the entity or entities should be put up and differences and similarities found between the entity and present time physical universe objects.

Similarly at level 3, if entities interfere at level 3 they can be timebroken against present time physical universe objects. For the vast majority of people the whole phenomena will be gone by the time the person gets to the top of level 3. But never the less, if the phenomena does persist, it will, of course, as I mentioned on the lecture, the level 5A will hit at it.

It will fall apart at level 5A and if it doesn't fall apart at level 5A, Oh my God it should have gone by then, you can always, if there's any residual phenomena hanging around you can simply make the junior universe of entity the subject matter of the "to know" goal package at level 5C, and that, so help me, will be the end of it. That will be the end of it.

So the subject of entities, to recapitulate, can be addressed at levels 2, level 3 and level 5A will get at it, get at the subject, as I mentioned on the main lecture and also it can be addressed specifically and finally at level 5C.

So there's the little addendum I wanted to make on the subject of entities. But just to repeat again so you've got the message. You do not address entities unless they interfere with therapy. You just continue on with the therapy unless they interfere. But if they do interfere in the running of TROM then you address them in the way that I've suggested it at these various levels.

Thanks very much.

End of tape

Reason

All the subject of reason limits the possible and defines the reasonable

The most reasonable postulate is a complementary postulate

A game is a contest in conviction between opposing postulates

Therefore all games are fun, and no game is reasonable,

And if resolving the mind is a reasonable activity,

Then it is not a game,

But that does not prevent it from being fun.

D.H.S.

The Exclusion Postulate

By Dennis Stephens

April 20, 1993

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

July 1, 2012

Hello, Greg, this is Tuesday the 20th of April 1993 and I thought I'd cut a tape for you expanding some of the background material of level 5.

It occurred to me the other day that while I have this material available I may as well give it to you mainly because anyone doing level 5 will come across this data but it will take them some time to put it together into a coherent form, which I've done.

It took me some time to do it. So anyone doing the exercises will find this data particularly useful because it will help clarify the material that shows up.

Under this same heading would be the theory material that I gave you on the two recent tapes. One on the subject of **Dissociation**, you recall that material on the subject of dissociation, and the other theory material I sent you on the tape on the subject of **Unstacking**, remember my reply on the subject of Unstacking.

Well both those tapes, one on the subject of Dissociation and the reply to the subject of Unstacking, contain very useful background material on level 5, which I won't repeat because I know you have the material.

Sooner or later on level 5 it's necessary to jump in at the deep end, so to speak, on the subject of postulates and the universe and this time is about now on the subject of the theory.

I've already talked about universes and all universes consist of life plus postulates, that's all they consist of, there's nothing else in any universe but life and a postulates. Anything else you consider is in there is purely an illusion, is a slight of hand. There's nothing else in any universe that you could conceive of but life and postulates.

So the physical universe in which we live, in which we share follows that same rule in that it's a universe and it's based upon a postulate structure, it's based upon certain laws, this universe and many of the physical laws of this universe have been discovered by scientists using their measuring equipment and their observations but these physical laws of the universe are deductions from the basic laws of the universe.

In other words the universe is based on laws very much more fundamental than the laws of physics and you would have to expand the subject of physics considerably to include life before you could expect to uncover the basic laws upon which this universe is constructed by studying the subject of physics.

The subject of physics as we understand it today on this planet is far too limited because it doesn't include the subject of life and because of that limitation it cannot encompass the basic laws from which this universe is constructed.

But that doesn't mean that we won't come across these laws when we're working with a person in therapy, particularly when we get into the upper level tech at level 5, because we're dealing with the very building blocks upon which any universe is constructed, that is life and postulates.

And levels 5A, 5B, and 5C are devoted to this subject of handling postulates in the mind. So we're very close up against the subject of universes and what a universe consists of and what this universe consists of when we're working with level 5.

So it's no real surprise that sooner or later when a person is working at level 5, particularly on level 5A, when he's working with the fundamental, the basic, the fundamental goals package, the "to know" goals package. Whilst working with that goals package he will come across the absolutely fundamental law upon which this universe is constructed.

I clearly remember the day when I was having a session, some years ago, when it suddenly dropped out the hamper in the middle of the session. There I was working along and suddenly, Bang, I was suddenly in possession of the basic law upon which the physical universe is constructed.

There's no great secret about this law, it's just that it's [chuckle] it's very deeply hidden if you happen not to know where to look for it.

The place to look for it, of course, is amongst the goals packages and particularly on the "to know" goals package. You start working with that and the basic law of this universe is going to drop out the hamper. Bang!

It's bound to drop out sooner or later for anyone working on level 5A, which is why I'm mentioning it here, because it may be a surprise to them, they might come across it and they might not know what it is. And they might think, "Oh, it's just another postulate."

All Postulates Limit the Possible and Thereby Define the Reasonable

Well, I can assure you that it isn't just another postulate, that it is the basic law of this universe and I'll give it to you now. It is provable; demonstrably provable as such that it is the basic law because it explains so much of the phenomena that occur in this universe.

But before I give you this basic law, I better give you something which is common to all universes. This law is common to all universes, not just the physical universe in which we live. **This is that all postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable.** Now that should be written up in letters of fire. Maybe if you can't write it in letters of fire you should write it up on a post card and pin it up in your auditing room wall.

Until a Postulate is Made Everything is Possible

All postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. Once you understand that, you understand that proposition, you understand an awful lot about universes. You understand that until a postulate is made everything is possible. That any postulate, no matter what it is, limits the possible.

For example if a person says, "Alright well now the law is that no car will travel at more than 80 kilometers an hour on this stretch of road." Well that's the law. Well how does that limit the possible? Well it limits the speed of the cars on that stretch of road, you see?

I can make another example: maybe you make a postulate and say, "Well I'll go to Cannes this week end." Well, how does that limit the possible? If you go to Cannes you're not going to go anywhere else which is not Cannes, are you? You see? So you limited your options, as they say, or you limit your possibilities. And no matter what postulate you make you'll find that any postulate that you make will limit the possible. So the first thing about a postulate is, any postulate limits the possible that's its fundamental purpose, to limit the possible. Now how about this second bit, and thereby defines the reasonable." Now that is really something. The subject of what is reasonable in this universe is a terrible puzzle; it's a great puzzle.

People bang the table and say, "Well this is reasonable and that is unreasonable." And they talk about what is reasonable and what is unreasonable but if you say to them, "What is reason and what is unreasonable and what is reasonable?" they can't define the terms.

They'll give you an example of something they consider is reasonable and they'll give you an example of what they consider is unreasonable, but they cannot define reasonableness, unreasonableness or reason itself. They simple cannot define them.

If you were to talk to a physical scientist you could get closer to a definition of reason. If you were to talk to a logician you'd get even closer to a definition of reason because logic is the science of reason but even the logicians don't grasp this fundamental relationship between postulates and reason. I think most of them would if you were to give it to them. They'd say, "Oh, Yes, I sort of knew it but I didn't know it in those words."

But the average person simply doesn't understand the subject of reason he doesn't understand what is reasonable and what is unreasonable, although he'll give you endless examples of what he considers reasonable and what he considers unreasonable.

That Which is Reasonable is That Which is Consistent with the Postulate

So all postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. Now how does a postulate define the reasonable? Well this is the way it goes. That which is reasonable is that which is that which is consistent with the postulate. It's really as simple as that. [chuckle] Give it to you again, "**That which is reasonable is consistent with the postulate.**"

Example, if the postulate is that every house in Australia will have a roof on it. In other words if a law says that no house shall be sold without a roof. All houses would have a roof.

Then it's reasonable if you buy a house to expect the house to have a roof on it, because it's consistent with the postulate which is that all houses in Australia will have a roof on them. See that?

And if you were to buy a house and you look up and notice that it hadn't got a roof on it, that would be inconsistent with the postulate which says that all houses will have a roof on them and so you could say, "Well, this is unreasonable." I shouldn't have expected to buy a house without a roof on it. You follow?

In the Absence of Postulates the Concept of Reason is Meaningless

So that's the connection between reason and the postulate and there's no other senior definition of reason in this universe. Reason is only that which is consistent with a postulate. That is to say that in the absence of postulates the concept of reason is meaningless.

In the absence of postulates the concept of reason is meaningless. The concept of reason only has meaning in the presence of postulates and that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with a postulate.

In other words, the postulate defines what is reasonable. It defines it because that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with the postulate.

So there's nothing difficult about this. It's very simple. It's so simple, this is, so simple, that you almost have to make it more complicated in order to understand it.

It's so terribly simple, but life gets so involved in this subject of what is reasonable and what is unreasonable that it forgets the basics and forgets the simplicities and so you come up to a person and say, "Well, What is reasonable? What is unreasonable? What is the definition of reason?"

I don't know how many people in Australia you can walk up to and say, "What's a good definition of reason?" I don't know how many people will say "All postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. And that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with a postulate." you know. You might find somebody else in Australia who would say that but I think it is very doubtful, very doubtful in deed. I'll tell you what, I wouldn't have said it until I'd done level 5 of my technology and till I'd got myself a few yards deep in level 5 and understood about universes and got the basic postulate of this universe out and so forth.

I wouldn't have answered that. I didn't know what reason was either; I was just like anyone else. I couldn't relate it to postulates. If you can't relate it to postulates you can't relate it to anything, because the subject of reason won't relate to anything else.

We can Define Reason as a Complementary Postulate

Now can we actually get more precise on the definition of reason than to say that reason is that which is consistent with a postulate? Yes we can. We can go one little step further and we can define reason as a complementary postulate. **Reason is a complementary postulate.**

Now how did that come about? Well that which is most consistent with a postulate is its complementary postulate, you see? You can't get more consistent with a postulate than the complementary postulate to that postulate. So the complementary postulate must be the very essence of reason regarding a postulate.

In other words, a person wants to "be known" say, he's operating on the "to be known" postulate, the most reasonable thing you can do regarding that person is "to know" him. You see that?

That's the most reasonable thing because that is the absolute essence of, the totality of the consistency. That is as consistent as you can get with his postulate. His postulate is "to be known" and if you adopt a "to know" postulate which is the complementary postulate of "to be known" then you will be as reasonable as you can get. You will be as consistent as you can get with his postulate.

So reason is a complementary postulate in this universe and that is the most precise definition there is in this universe of reason. It is a complementary postulate.

This tells you immediately that the opposition postulate is as unreasonable as you can get. A person has the postulate "to be known" and about as unreasonable as you can be is "to not know", "to not know" him, because it's [chuckle] totally inconsistent with his postulate.

His postulate is "to be known" and your directing a "to not know" postulate towards him. Well you couldn't get any more inconsistent with his postulate than that. and you couldn't get more unreasonable as far as he's concerned, than that. You follow?

All Games Must Be Unreasonable

Now this definition of reason being a complementary postulate tells you immediately that all games because they contain conflicting postulates must be unreasonable.

Game Defined

A game is a contest in conviction and contains opposing postulates by definition that is the definition of a game. It's a contest in conviction. There are two people trying to convince each other of opposing postulates. So all games must be unreasonable, follow?

It drops out straight away from the datum that reason is a complementary postulate. If reason is a complementary postulate then all games are unreasonable. There's no reason in conflict, it's an unreasonable activity, see, it's an unreasonable activity.

I mean it might be fun, games might be fun but so help me they're not reasonable. I mean you've got 22 men in two football teams standing on a football field and they are about to start a game of football.

It's not reasonable for them to play this game of football. The reasonable thing to do, if they want to be reasonable at all about it is at the beginning of the game one of the men to pick up the ball and run it down and put it in the opposing goal. You see that?

If the idea is to get the ball into the goal between those two posts well they might as well pick it up, run it down and put it down there, if that's their purpose.

It's not reasonable for 11 of them to try and get that ball into the goal and the other 11 to try and stop it from happening. That is not reasonable. It is not a reasonable activity... it might be a lot of fun but it's certainly not reasonable. See that?

The More Conflict There Is the Less Reason There Is.

So that's just an example of an unreasonable game. Well it's no more unreasonable than any other game. The fact that the conflict is there, the fact that the postulates are opposing each other is the very essence of unreason because reason is a complementary postulate.

Then this tells you right away that when a person comes up to you and says, "What we need in our society is more conflict and more competition and so on." That they're also saying that we need more and more unreason, you see that? The conflict, the competition and so on and the opposition all produce unreason. The more conflict there is the less reason there is, and so on.

A tremendous amount of data starts to make sense once you understand these basics. All drops out of this hamper, if all postulates limit the possible and therefore define the reasonable, and the reasonable is a complementary postulate. Ok now, I could expand that material out considerably. Once a person grasps it they can expand it out themselves; it has enormous ramifications.

Now we'll go on and get the basic postulate of this universe.

The Class of the Knowable is Coextensive with the Class of Those Things Brought into Existence To Be Known.

So here we go. The basic postulate upon which this universe is constructed is “The class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.” I’ll repeat it. The class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.

Now that’s a pretty big mouthful, that is, I better break that down into little bits and we’ll examine it in detail.

What do we mean? What do we mean by the class of the knowable? Well that is the class of those things that it’s possible to know. And that’s all we mean when we say the class of the knowable. We mean the class of those things it’s possible to know.

Now, “The class of the knowable is coextensive with”, well that is a technical term, it’s not a difficult technical term, it’s a term used in logic. It means two classes are coextensive it’s a term a logician would use when he means that the members of these classes are identical in their characteristics. They have identical characteristics.

So, loosely speaking we could say instead of the phrase “is coextensive with” we could say “is identical with” or “is the same as”. That would be a loser way to say it, but the precise technical logical way to say it is “coextensive with”, that is the precisely correct way to say it. That the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.

Now what is this class of things brought into existence to be known? Well that is just what it says, the class of things that are brought into existence to be known. So the law says, the basic law of the universe says that the class of the knowable is identical, is the same as, the class of those things brought into existence to be known. That's all it is saying in so many words. That's what the law means.

Now before I go on talking about the basic law of the universe I want to give you a very valid, a very useful deduction from this law, which is of everyday use in society and of tremendous use in science and is well known and so forth. But I'll give it to you as a deduction from the basic law of the universe.

I could give it to you in terms of Boolean algebra but that wouldn't help, wouldn't make it any clearer either, unless the person listening to the tape understands the Boolean algebra it would be just as mysterious. So I better give the deduction to you in terms of formal logic, so here we go.

If the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.

Then a thing is either knowable by reason of existing, or is not knowable by reason of not existing.

Therefore a thing either exists or it doesn't exist.

Therefore a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

Yes, I've just replayed that over, it's not garbled so no need to repeat it. Not garbled so it is exactly straight the way it should be on the tape.

Now this proposition that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously just happens to be the basic postulate or the basic law upon which the science of logic is constructed. The law, according to the textbooks was first discovered by Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, some 2000 years ago when he said that the most fundamental of all philosophical principles is that "A thing cannot possess and not possess a quality."

Now certainly Aristotle based his own logic, his grasp of logic and all his writings on logic and all his subject of logic on that principle, and Aristotelian logic held fast in the whole of the western world for something like 1,850 years.

So all that happens today, all that happened in 1,850 or about 1,850 years after Aristotle was that a guy called George Boole an English mathematician came along and took that basic principle that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously and expressed it mathematically, and used it as the basis of the algebra of logic. The algebra of the logic of classes, which is called Boolean algebra, and thereby made logic into a mathematical subject rather than a philosophical subject.

At least he turned the logic of classes into a mathematical subject rather than a philosophical subject, and the Boolean algebra is based upon that same proposition "That a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously," which is itself a valid deduction from the basic law of this universe.

Interesting isn't it that the basis of logic, the basis of the science of reason as we understand it in our world, is the basis in the science of reason. And it's no different in the eastern world of India and China. Their science is based upon the same postulate, I assure you. It's no different.

In other words, when you take propositions apart using that basic law that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously you start to build up a science of logic.

Well if you try and build up a science of logic without that basic law you end up with a mess. You just end up with a dogs breakfast, and you end up with unreason. You have to have that basic law in there, you see, that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously. Aristotle was completely right when he said that the most fundamental of all philosophical principles is that a thing cannot both possess and not possess a quality.

Now one day when I get a bit of time, and it's one of these things I mean to do and I keep putting it off, I'm going to sit down and write down the basic law of this universe and see what other valid deductions there are from this basic law, but that one, I know, is a valid deduction.

That a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously produced the science of logic. I'm just wondering what other valid deductions can be made from the basic law which could be used as the basic for other sciences and for other human endeavors.

As I say I just haven't got around to doing it. It's one of the things I keep meaning to do and haven't done. There are no doubt many other valid deductions that can be made from that basic law upon which this universe is constructed.

Two Futile Activities in this Universe

Now let's examine this basic law of the universe more closely. What is it telling us? Well it tells us essentially that there are two activities in this universe which are utterly and completely futile.

One of these activities is to try and know something, which doesn't exist. Now that is the essence of futility, because you simply can't know it unless it exists. If it doesn't exist it's unknowable. The basic law of the universe says so.

So if a thing doesn't exist in the universe it's absolutely futile to go around and try and discover it. Yet people spend half their lives trying to discover things that don't exist. It's true, they do.

Of course, the person believes that this thing might exist, or believes that it does exist, so he keeps searching for it. But never the less if it turns out that the thing doesn't exist they've wasted their time because there's nothing there. They won't find it if it doesn't exist.

Now the other futile thing to do in this universe is to go out of your way to not know things that do exist. See that? That's the other futile thing to do. In other words, not knowing things that do exist when the basic law of the universe tells you that this whole idea of trying to not know things that exist is futile. If the thing exists it's knowable, if it doesn't exist it's not knowable. So you can waste an awful lot of time and get yourself all upset by trying to discover things that don't exist or trying to not discover things that do exist.

As Ron Hubbard explained in Axiom 11, you know, "the futility of not isness" yet people do it all the time, you know, they've got this painful memory and they spend half their life trying to blot it out of their mind. Well they're not going to do it are they? They're just going to make themselves miserable, ruin their health one way or the other.

Why? Well the basic law upon which the universe is constructed says you can't do it. If it exists it's knowable and no amount of endeavoring to not know it is going to change that in the slightest. If the thing exists therefore it's knowable.

Knowing and Time

The thing existed at that moment in time in the universe. It may not exist at this moment in time now, but it existed at that moment in time. If you put your attention back to that moment in space and time you will find that event occurring. So you better know it then. When you know it, you can then go off and do other things. You see?

While your "not knowing" it you can get yourself into an awful mess. You see that?

But this, of course, is basic in the understanding of Dianetics and Scientology. **That what you resist you become.** You know? What you not know you end up getting wrapped round your neck. I mean there's a thousand ways Ron has expressed this in Scientology and quite rightly so too, but again you see, it's a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is constructed. It gives you the only two futile things in the universe.

The first thing is to try and know something, which doesn't exist, and the other futile thing is to try and not know something, which does exist. Both of them are the essence of futility in this universe.

I meant these things simply aren't of a matter of opinion, you know, they are not of a matter of which school you go to, you know.

Your living in a universe, your acting and working and so forth totally within a universe and your subscribing to the laws of the universe and the basic law of the universe your subscribing to tells you that "it's futile to try and know things that don't exist and it's futile to try and not know things that do exist."

Games Play Only Consists Fundamentally of These Two Futile Activities

Yet all of games play contains these possibilities. When we examine the game, what we call "games play" we find people doing these things. They try to discover things that don't exist and they try and not know things that do exist.

You could say that fundamentally games play only consists of these two futile activities, which is why games play fundamentally is a very futile activity in this universe.

Actually there's nothing wrong with playing games as long as you don't have to play them. If you can take them or leave them they can be fun, but when you have to play them, you're doomed, because you're stuck on this futility. You go into unreason and you end up just nailing the coffin lid down on yourself. You're gone. Why? You've violated the basic law of the universe.

So there's quite a lot that even at a superficial level starts to fall out of this subject of the basic postulate upon which this universe is constructed. We immediately understand what games play consists of and what the futility of it is.

But bear in mind that the basic law of the universe does allow games to occur, you see. The law sets the universe up and says the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.

I mean, it doesn't forbid you, doesn't say that you can't go around and try and know things that don't exist. It doesn't forbid you from trying "to not know" things that do exist. It allows this to be possible, but you'll never succeed.

It doesn't actually forbid you from trying. The law says you can't make it but it does allow the possibility for the games to occur. You see?

So there's a certain subtlety involved here, but of course any purpose, any goal and any law is a limitation of the possible and only by limiting the possible is it possible to set up any forms of games play.

You have to have some limitation of the possible and that is the basic limitation in this universe, is the basic law upon which this universe is constructed.

Dictum of Aristotle

Now we know as a valid deduction from the basic law of the universe that classes of objects obey what's known as the dictum of Aristotle, which in modern terminology would be that "A thing either exists or it doesn't exist and a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously" and by use of this proposition you can formulate a very workable logic.

This logic would explain the relationships between classes of objects in the universe itself. This is the subject of logic and the logic of classes, Boolean algebra.

Don't miss this, don't miss this in the slightest that the classes of objects in this universe, their logic is totally determined by this proposition "A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously", which is a direct deduction from the basic law of the universe. It does determine the basic logic of classes utterly and completely and it's up to us now to ask this simple question, "How about the subject of postulates?" Do they obey exactly this same law of classes?

In other words, a thing either exists or it doesn't exist. Well how about postulates? Is that true for postulates and is that the only law that's true for postulates?

Well let's examine it.

Well what we're looking at here is the difference between a postulate and an object. We're trying to see if they are different in their nature.

Well now, one difference immediately comes to mind. Take a postulate, say the postulate “to know”, all right. You can start off with a high intensity postulate “to know” and it’s on a scale and as the intensity of the postulate lessens, gets less and less and less, it will go down to a zero point where there is no postulate then it will go over the zero point and will reappear in the negative. You get a very faint “to not know” postulate,” and that “to not know” postulate could be intensified up to a maximum intensity of maximum “to not know”.

Now this is different from an object. An object doesn’t obey that rule at all. For example: you’ve got this lump of rock, you know, and you have it in full intensity and you reduce its intensity and you get a point of zero intensity and then there’s no rock and then it goes into minus, a little minus intensity of a rock and it goes into more minus until you get a maximum intensity of no rock.

No, no it doesn’t work with rocks. It works for postulates; it doesn’t work for rocks so there’s an immediate difference between the postulate and an object in the universe.

So must bear that in mind.

Law of Complimentary Postulates

Now is there any other law, which applies to postulates, which doesn’t apply to objects in the universe?

Yes there’s one other law, which applies to postulates which doesn’t apply to objects in the universe. This is the law of the complementary postulate.

Now you’ll become aware of this when you start working with postulates at level 5, that complementary postulates satisfy each other and vanish each other. Complementary postulates satisfy each other and vanish each other.

Now what this means is, for example, you put up a “to be known” postulate and by its side you mock up a “to know” postulate, and the two postulates satisfy each other and they cancel each other out and they will vanish each other. And you will find that the two postulates after a second or two will be gone. And you say, “Where have they gone to?” Well they cancelled each other out.

You’d have to mock them up again and if you wanted to hold them in existence you would have to continue to create them and hold them in existence. Soon as you let them go they satisfy each other and they vanish. So there’s the law of the complementary postulate.

Now that’s a peculiar law to postulates which doesn’t apply to objects in the universe, is that complementary postulates vanish each other, satisfy each other and produce a mutual vanishment.

So we have two laws there which are applicable to postulates which aren’t applicable to classes of objects and we now must ask ourselves the question does the law which is applicable to objects, in other words, “A thing cannot exist and not exist simultaneously”, is that applicable to postulates?

Well, yes it is. A postulate cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously, so that obeys the same law as the law of objects and the law of classes. So the classes of objects and objects in the universe just obey that one law, one fundamental law. A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

But postulates natively obey these three laws. We have the law of the scale where the postulate goes from the maximum plus intensity through zero point and no postulate down to a minus maximum intensity. We have that law.

And the next one is the law of the complementary postulate whereby a postulate plus its complementary postulate satisfy each other and cause their mutual vanishment.

And thirdly and finally that a postulate cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

Now those three laws are the only three laws, which govern the behavior of postulates in the universe. They're the only three laws. There aren't any others.

Now the law of the complementary postulate, the law which says that a postulate plus its complementary postulate satisfy each other and cause their mutual vanishment has some very important influence on games play in the universe.

How Games Become Compulsive

The effect of this law is as follows: if you can imagine people playing a light hearted games and so forth and having a desire to play games and they want to get their game going and keep their game going. Every time they happen to accidentally match up with complementary postulates the game ends. The game simply stops you see. And the postulates vanish. They satisfy each other and they cancel each other out and the postulates disappear.

You imagine a games player saying, "Oh damn I've managed to get complementary postulates again so after a while, in games play, in the universe, there's always this tendency to avoiding the complementary postulate situation because it, unnecessarily, from the point of view of the games player, ends the game.

So this class of both the postulate and its complementary postulate tends to vanish out of games play. That's one of the first things you see go out of games play in the universe, is the lack of appreciation for the fact that you can end the game by adopting complementary postulates.

First of all it is regarded as a nuisance to end the game because they want to keep the game going to enjoy the sensation of the games play and so to accidentally in the heat of the moment, happen to accidentally match their complementary postulates ends the game, the game stops, you see, and the game unmocks.

So they come to avoid the complementary postulates. And so the effect is to concentrate more and more on the opposition postulates and less and less on the complementary postulates, and the effect of this is to make the games play more and more compulsive. You follow that? You see how that would be? It follows directly from the law of the complementary postulate. If you go into a game in the beginning you know the laws, and know everything about it. You want to play the game. You want to play games and well one thing you want to avoid is to end the game. You want to get the game started see, so you avoid the complementary postulate. Then when the game gets started the tendency is to forget about the complementary postulates because you're trying to avoid the complementary postulate situation, it tends to go out of games play. Then when you try to end the game you've forgotten how to do it. I know it sounds silly but this is the way it comes about and games play then tends, because of the law of complementary postulates, tends to go from light hearted, casual, voluntary games play, it tends to go into compulsive games play. It becomes compulsive once the players lose the ability to end the game with complementary postulates and they lose the ability simply because they no longer will allow the game to end. In the early days of playing the game it was a nuisance to end the game with complementary postulates so they put it to one side, and said we won't use complementary postulates to end the game and then they forgot about it and they lost it, you see. They lost the ability.

And they then got into compulsive games play, because once you take the complementary postulates out of the games situation you're only left with the game situation. You see this? The complementary postulates have gone.

Look let's put it this way, let's imagine what we call a postulate set. You see there are only two positive postulates in an erasable goals package. There's the postulate plus it's negative plus the complementary postulate plus it's negative. That's four postulates in the set.

Let's call the postulate X. so there's X and the negative, which is "not X". and there's the complementary postulate to X we'll call that B and there's "not B" which is the negative of B. so there's only X and "not X" and B and "not B". Those are the four postulates.

[A game class is two of these postulates in opposition - editor]
So there are only four classes in the set. There's XB, X "not B", "not X" B and "not X" "not B". Follow? That's four classes. That exhausts the possibilities of the system. See that, that exhausts the possibilities.

But XB is a complementary postulate class because X and B are complementary postulates; and "not X and "not B" are complementary postulates and they're the ones which are avoided. So the tendency is for those to go out of games play and the game then to consist of just X and "not B" and/or "not X" and B. see that?

Now this is a technical term "compulsive games play" and it's defined as the state when complementary postulates have vanished out of the postulate set and the set has been reduced to the two classes of X "not B" and B and "not X". And the two complementary classes of XB and "not X" and "not B" have gone out of the set, and that is the technical definition of compulsive games play.

The games play is compulsive simply because it cannot be ended. There's no way to end the game at this point because the complementary postulates have gone. The opposed people cannot occupy those complementary postulates because there out of the set, you see.

The sets just reduced to the games classes. Their postulate classes, one is gone, two is present still, three is present and class four is gone so your left with just classes two and three which are the two games classes, and that is the technical definition of compulsive games play.

And that is how games play becomes compulsive in this universe, it stems from the law of the complementary postulate.

Now in terms of the "to know" goals package what would this look like, a compulsive games condition? Well the person is either in a state of "must be known" facing an opponent who "mustn't know" or he's in a state of "must know" facing an opponent who "mustn't be known" or visa versa giving a total of four possible games classes in all.

In other words, whichever one of the four postulates in the set he's in, he's facing the opposition postulate. That's another way to put it. The set reduces to only two games classes but there are four possibilities because there are four postulates in the set.

So whichever postulate he occupies he's always facing the opposition postulate. He's never facing a complementary postulate because they've gone out of the set. Now that is compulsive games play.

Now there is one other characteristic that goes with compulsive games play and that is that the law of scale that goes with the postulates of "maximum intensity down to zero point and out through to minus intensity" vanishes. That law goes out and simply becomes plus intensity or minus intensity.

In other words the person is in there pitching full steam the whole time and there's no zero point, there's no point ever where there's no postulate in games play. They're simply full intensity all the time they're playing the game.

The game is continuous, in other words, there's no point where they stop playing it.

They can't stop playing it. You see? It's compulsive so there's no zero, there's no null point, there's no zero point on the scale for any of the postulates, so that law of the scale goes out when we go into compulsive games play.

So in compulsive games play the law of the complementary postulate has gone out, and also the law of the scale, has gone out.

All that's left is the law of "A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously". In other words that same law that governs the objects in the universe, it governs objects and classes in the universe.

So once the postulate set goes into compulsive games play, once games play becomes compulsive, postulates obey exactly the same law, logically, as do classes and objects in the universe. And the postulates can be manipulated as such in a logical system, which is very interesting.

While we're dealing with compulsive games play we can use the same logic for postulates as we can for classes, but once we go into non-compulsive games play, voluntary games play, we have to realize that we can't use the same logic for postulates that we can for objects because the postulates obey two other laws. And you understand that?

These are technical basics that we're dealing with.

It would actually be possible to formulate a mathematical logic, which allows for these extra qualities of postulates in the natural native state including all the laws that govern postulates. In other words, a logic which governs postulates in non compulsive games play.

If I get some time one day I might see if I can formulate such a logic but it's not really necessary to do so. Any logical constructs you would need or I've ever needed when dealing with postulates are included in the application of Boolean algebra to postulates. Boolean algebra has always been sufficient for understanding compulsive games play.

So I simply treat the postulates as if they were objects and classes of objects, and so forth, and the answers come out right, of course, simply because in compulsive games the postulates can be handled as if they are objects. The logic is the same.

Now all this might seem very far-fetched and violent and one might be wondering what this has got to do with everyday life and every day auditing experience, and so forth. Well it does have some very important ramifications, compulsive games play has. It does allow us to get a tremendous understanding of life.

For example, what are the relationships in our XB postulate set when the games play is compulsive. When the XB class is reduced to zero and the (not X) and the (not B) class is reduced to zero, and the set only consists of X and (not B) or B and (not X), just what is the relationship between X and B.

Identifications in Compulsive Games Play

Well the relationship between X and B is that $X = (\text{not } B)$, that is the relationship between the postulates. Ouch! We have an identification in the set, an identification occurs within the set, in the postulate set in compulsive games play.

[If X is not equal or not bonded to B then it must be bonded to (not B). So by postulating X is not equal to B we are also postulating $X = (\text{not } B)$.

The alternative is that X is bonded to no postulate but that would mean a no games condition and no game sensation so that will not happen for a compulsive games player. Editor] Once compulsive games play is undertaken, there's an identification between two of the postulates in the set and the identification is between X and (not B) . $X = (\text{not } B)$ and $B = (\text{not } X)$, another identification in the set.

In other word if the games play became compulsive in the "to know" goals package then "to know" in the mind, would become identical with "to not be known" and "to be known" would become identical with "to not know".

Now is there any justification for this, any application of this, do we certainly see this sort of thing going on in everyday life? Indeed we do... indeed we do.

Must Be Known's Identification

Let us take an example of the person who is compulsively assertive. He's "being known," he's making his presence felt, he's laying down the law, he's thumping the table.

Well if you've ever met such a person or been in the presence of such a person you'll know one thing this person cannot do. That is he cannot "know" anything. He cannot receive any communication while he's in that state of mind.

[note Dennis is stating that the "must be known" is adopting the "must not know" of his opponent and applying it to himself. This is an "exclusion" postulate which he discusses in the next section. Editor]

So he's in a state of "must be known" and "not know" and the two are identical. While he's in the state of "must be known" he's in a state of "not know." So he can't know, he can't receive any communications, while he's in this state of compulsive "must be known".

If you've ever tried to talk to an angry person you'll see this same thing. He's assertive, he's angry.

You can't get through to him while he's angry. He's got to cool down. Once he cools down then you can talk to him, converse with him. He'll then receive more messages. But while he's in this state of compulsive "must be known" he can't receive messages, simply because "must be known" equals "to not know". The identification is in the set.

Must Know's Identification

All right let's give another example in the "to know" goals package the "Must Know" postulate can become compulsive. And when the person becomes compulsive "Must Know" can be associated with the person wanting to hide.

We get the example of the old lady peering out from behind her curtains and watching people walking up and down the road. You see? We get the nosey parker hiding in the bushes, You see? Compulsive "Must Know" with compulsive "Mustn't Be Known". So "Must Know", "Mustn't Be Known" become the identification there.

[Nosey Parker- a London park groundskeeper "parker" who spies on young lovers in the park-editor]

Mustn't Be Known's Identification

Also in the "to know" goals package when it becomes compulsive a person who is in a state of "Mustn't Be Known", in a state of hiding, you'll find that they are always furtively looking out to see if anyone is looking at them.

Everyone's aware of this phenomena of the person in compulsive hiding. The person's hiding in a house say, they've got all the shutters drawn, the urge to put aside a shutter and peer outside and see if anyone's looking in is almost irresistible. You see?

The "to not be known" is identified... is equal to, is identified with the postulate "to know".

Finally in the "to know" goals package the person is dramatizing "Must Not Know" he's highly rejective, highly rejecting, well he's going to be noisy.

I don't know whether you've noticed this, you probably have, but all protestors are noisy. I've never heard of people quietly protesting. Well a protestor is dramatizing a "not know" postulate and he does it noisily. There's no such thing as a quiet protestor. See?

"Not Know" is identical with "Must Be Known" and "Must Be Known" is assertive, so he's asserting his protest because the "Not Know" postulate is identified with the "Must Be Known" postulate.

So we have plenty of validation of this datum from the basic "to know" goals package, and it applies to every other goals package too, I can assure you. It's not peculiar to the "to know" goals package that identification is there in compulsive games play. That the $X = (\text{not } B)$ and $B = (\text{not } X)$ in the postulate set in the goals package

In terms of propositions; the propositions are if X then $(\text{not } B)$, if $(\text{not } B)$ then X , if B then $(\text{not } X)$, if $(\text{not } X)$ then B , they are the propositions if you want it in terms of propositions and the identification is $B = (\text{not } X)$ and $(\text{not } X) = B$ and $X = (\text{not } B)$ and $(\text{not } B) = X$. they are the identifications in the set.

Identification and Dianetics

43 years ago in 1950 Ron Hubbard published a book called "Dianetics Modern Science of Mental Health" and in that book he postulated a thing called the reactive mind and he said that the logic of the reactive mind contains an identification of $A=A=A$. You recall that? In Dianetics it was one of the foundation stones of Ron's reactive mind theory, was the identification in the reactive bank " $A=A=A$ " and the analytical mind, he said, didn't contain this identification. The reactive bank was locked into a fixed identification pattern. Now, could it be. Could it just be! Could it just be that when we look at compulsive games play with the compulsive identification in the postulate set, are we looking at the same phenomena that Ron Hubbard was looking at when he said that a reactive bank contains an identification of $A=A=A$. could it be?

Yes it is! It is! We are looking at exactly the same phenomena when we're looking at compulsive games play we're looking at the $A=A=A$ of the reactive mind.

Now Ron, Dear Ron, for all his tremendous qualities as a man, as a researcher and he was a genius, but he was no logician, and he was unable to put this subject onto a logical foundation.

I've been able to do this and been able to put this subject together, and we have got the subject of postulates and the laws governing the postulates, games play, compulsive games play and the identification and we're back where we were. We're now validating Ron's data of 1950.

This is it! This is it. We've found it. He never could find it. He could never explain why the reactive bank had an $A=A=A$ identification but now we know why it's in there.

It comes from compulsive games play and we know how games play gets compulsive in the universe from the postulate set. We have the whole thing now. We've got all the bits and all the bits fit together, we've completed Ron's work on the subject of Dianetics in terms of the identification in the reactive bank.

So is it any wonder at level 5 when we erase these goals packages and break these false identifications in the postulate sets at level 5, level 5A and level 5B where we erase the goals packages and break these identifications that we're just breaking up the reactive mind itself.

Yes, exactly. That is exactly and precisely what we are doing. We're breaking up the $A=A$ of the bank. We're just tearing the bank apart at level 5.

The Double Bind

There's a technical name we use for an identification in a postulate set or an identification in any general set and that is a double bind, I use the term double bind to indicate a false identification. A false identification is a double bind in a postulate set.

The term double bind is not originally my own. I first came across the term double bind in a reference to a book written by an anthropologist by the name of Gregory Bateson who wrote a book in the 1950's, I believe, or round about then 1940's 1950's, and he used the term double bind in terms of an identification. I don't know exactly how he used the term because I never read the book, I've only read references to the book, but I do know he used it in terms of an identification so I'm carrying on the use of the word when we talk about this false identification.

[Gregory Bateson published in 1936 "Naven: A Survey of the Problems suggested by a Composite Picture of the Culture of a New Guinea Tribe drawn from Three Points of View" (Cambridge University Press). You can look up an article about him in Wikipedia that mentions the double bind. Editor]

False Identifications

And it is false, I mean, let's face it, in a postulate set to say that "to know" is equal to "to not be known" and that "to be known" is equal to "to not know", I mean, let's be realistic these identifications are false, they are false identifications. They are a pack of lies. They are whoppers of the first order. They're false identifications. So when we call these false identifications of the postulate set we call them double binds, double bondings, double binds.

And one of the prime objects of level 5A and level 5B is to break these double binds in the postulate sets, to break them in the reactive mind. To return the persons thinking back to the rationality of non compulsive games play and breaking the false identifications.

To return to being able to once again see similarities and differences between things, what Ron so beautifully explained in Dianetics, that the analytical mind works in differences and similarities and the reactive bank works in identifications.

Exclusion Postulate

Now there's just one final subject I want to cover on this matter of the compulsive game play, and that is the subject of what's called the Exclusion Postulate.

We see that when games play becomes compulsive that there is always a false identification. That when the person is in one postulate he's actually in two postulates and it's called twin postulate games play. It's a compulsive games player with twin postulate games play.

He's quite incapable of adopting only one postulate.

Whenever he adopts one postulate he adopts its twin, the one it is identified with so he is always in two postulates. He's in a games postulate and he's in this other postulate which is somewhat hidden, you don't have to search for it very far, it's there if he's in a state of compulsive games play. And we call this other postulate the Exclusion Postulate.

[Keep in mind the Exclusion postulate is the identification postulate discussed in the previous section. Editor]

Now, why do we call this postulate the Exclusion Postulate?

Well simply because it excludes him, it excludes the games player out of the class of the opponent. Out of the class he's trying to drive the opponent into.

In other words his games postulate is trying to drive the opponent into a certain postulate and his exclusion postulate keeps him out of that class that he's trying to drive the opponent into.

In terms of the "to know" goals package if the person is operating on "to be known" and the games player is compulsive, his opponent would be occupying "to not know". So the person occupying "to be known" would also be operating on a "to not know" postulate but the "to not know" postulate will be keeping him out of the class that he's trying to drive the opponent into.

Now you say, "Well, what the devil? Why doesn't he want to go into that class?" Why doesn't he want to go into that class?" Well it's not particularly obvious in the "to know" goals package but let's take a more destructive goals package.

Let's take the goal "to stab." Now a person in a stabbing game has two things he wants to do he wants to stab the opponent but he doesn't want to be stabbed. So the games play is compulsive. He's occupying the class of "to stab" and "to not be stabbed".

His games postulate is "to stab" and his exclusion postulate is "to not be stabbed" and the postulate "to not be stabbed" keeps him out of the class of "to be stabbed" which is the class he's trying to drive the opponent into.

The opponents in the class of "to not be stabbed" and he's trying to drive this guy from "to not be stabbed" into "to be stabbed".

But the last thing the games player wants is to end up in that class himself. You see that? He doesn't want to be stabbed. We call it an exclusion postulate, that is the best name for the postulate.

So when we look at compulsive games play we're looking at twin postulate games play. The second postulate is always there.

There's the games postulate and the exclusion postulate and the exclusion postulate is always identical to the opposition postulate of the games postulate. The exclusion postulate is identical to the opposition to the games postulate.

In other words if his games postulate is "to stab" the opposition postulate is "to not be stabbed". Well that's exactly what his exclusion postulate will be.

So he's in two postulates

Now one of the reasons I've cut this tape for you is that these exclusion postulates; this twin postulate games play shows up with a vengeance when you start dealing with some of the junior goals packages at level 5B, and it can show up at level 5A and you start wondering what the hell's going on when you find these.

The person will find themselves in two postulates. They've got their games postulate and suddenly this other postulate turns up which is the opposition postulate and their sitting there saying, "Oh my god what am I doing with the opponents postulate?" so this is why I'm explaining it, it's an exclusion postulate.

This is how I discovered it. It was only later that I put the logic together. First of all I discovered it empirically. I found it in auditing. I found it in session, then explained the phenomenon.

The Exclusion Postulate. I first realized what it was for and then I realized it was identification in the set, and put the set together and got it all out. You see? It all started to come out. So this is one of the reasons why I am cutting this tape. When the games play is compulsive there's always twin postulate games play, the person is in two postulates. He's got a game postulate, whatever that game postulate is and there will be an exclusion postulate that sits there too and keeps him out of the class that he's trying to drive the opponent into, keeps him out of that class.

Or if you want to put it the other way the exclusion postulate is identical to the opposition postulate to the game postulate. It's identical to the opposition postulate to the game postulate. So we can see two players in compulsive games play, going back to our XB set. The first player is in the class of X and he's got an X games postulate and a "not B" exclusion postulate and the other player opposing him has got a "not B" games postulate and an X exclusion postulate, and there the two have ding-donged at each other.

The general rule of compulsive games play is that in any game there's only one games class involved. In other words there's only two postulates involved between the two players. He's using X as a games postulate and "not B" as an exclusion postulate and his opponent is using "not B" as a games postulate and X as an exclusion postulate. So there are only those two postulates involved in any game.

They have got two of them and they've both got the same two but one of them is using one as a games postulate and he's got the other one as an exclusion postulate and the other guy is using the other one as his games postulate and he's got the other one as his exclusion postulate.

It's a little bit complicated to explain it but it's very simple when you write it down and when you draw it out on a piece of paper. You see the exclusion postulate and you see why I called it an exclusion postulate because it keeps the person out of the class he's trying to drive the opponent into.

When games play becomes compulsive it can become very undesirable to end up in that class. A person might be committing some pretty nasty overt acts in compulsive games play and the last place he wants to end up is to be in the same class as the opponent is being driven into. You know? Like the example of the stabbing, you know. It's all right to go around stabbing people but it's not all right to be stabbed.

[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)]

You know it's all right for Adolph Hitler to kill 6 million Jews but one thing Hitler didn't want to be was a dead Jew, one that had just been gassed in one of Hitler's gas chambers. You know. That was an intolerable place for him to be. You see? I'm sure Hitler had a very strong exclusion postulate to not be gassed, to not be a gassed Jew. [Chuckle] So much for that.

Twin Postulates in 5A Therapy

The question arises, does this subject of twin postulate games play make any slightest difference to level 5A, the actual techniques of level 5A practical?

Nope, not in the slightest, once you become aware that they exist you just do the technique exactly as I've given it. The fact that you're operating on twin postulates doesn't have anything to do with it. You treat them as single postulates then you win, every time.

Now you don't have to do anything about these twin postulates just know them as theory and know that they are a part of compulsive games play.

You do level 5A and level 5B exactly as I've given it. It comes apart that way and it won't come apart any other way I can assure you because the twin postulates of compulsive games play is based upon a false identification.

It's got a lie built into it. The identification is false so any attempt to introduce twin postulates into therapy is doomed to failure because you're simply dramatizing the lie. The truth is single postulates. You'll win at level 5A and level 5B when you work with single postulates. You lose all the time if you try and introduce twin postulates to level 5A and level 5B, so just note that down.

I've tried it. I've tested it all, it only works on single postulates so don't try mucking about at level 5A and level 5B with twin postulates. You'll just knock yourself into apathy and make yourself miserable. You're just dramatizing the lie. Just dramatizing the $A=A=A$ of the reactive bank.

Troubleshooting Level 5

Now, finally I want to end up this tape with just a word on the practical of level 5 here, and relate it to what we've been talking about. When you get some area of the bank or the mind which simply refuses to come apart at level 5, level 5A, level 5B, level 5C, doesn't matter what it is.

You sweat at it and it simply refuses to erase. Then search for the double bind, look for the false identification. You should have that written up on your auditing room wall, "Search for the double bind." It's always present, there's always a false identification in there somewhere.

You've got a goals package with a false identification in it, with compulsive games play in it and there's a false identification in there somewhere and that is the cause of why it won't come apart

Now this is absolutely fundamental, it's the only thing that will stop it from erasing at level 5. There's nothing else that will stop it. You've simply got a false identification in it and you haven't spotted it. It's in there somewhere. You're going to have to find it.

You know you may get to level 5C, this happens quite often, you get some object there at level 5C your trying to erase it and you can't erase it at level 5C, well it's probably associated with a goals package which has got a false identification in it. You know, the object has got itself mixed up in games play with this goals package and has become important to the goals package. And the goals package has got itself important to the object. And the object has got itself related to this goals package and the games play in the goals package has become compulsive and you can't get rid of the object in the mind.

Well what you've got to do, you got to knuckle down and erase that goals package. Then the object will vanish, it will erase easily. There are no exceptions to this rule. If it's not coming apart at level 5 A, B, or C there's a double bind, there's a false identification and there's a goals package here somewhere and you haven't erased the goals package. There's a false identification and it's to do with the goals package there. There's a goals package with a false identification in it, which is associated with this area and it simply won't come apart until you break the identification in the goals package.

So don't try and put me through hoops, poor old Ron Hubbard used to be put through hoops on this, you know, people write in and say, "I've done all your techniques Ron, and nothing happened" and boy Ron had to burn the mid night oil. Well I'm not going to go through hoops on this one cause I know, I've burned the mid night oil myself on this and there aren't any exceptions.

If it doesn't come apart at level 5 then you haven't completed level 5. There's a false identification, there's a goals package in there somewhere and with a false identification and that's all that can stop it from erasing at level 5.

That is very important data. It's only this A=A=A of the bank this false identification of compulsive games play that can prevent erasure at level 5 and that is what level 5 is there to take apart.

It needs this powerful technique of level 5 to break this false identification in the goals package. Only level 5 will break it, but sometimes you get stuck on the false identification and you say, "Well level 5's not enough to break it." Well, it is, if you back it up to the right area it is powerful enough to break it.

So it's no good trying to put me through hoops on this one. If you write to me and say, "Well I tried it all and I still got this thing and it won't erase at level 5."

I'll say, "Well, just complete level 5. Go back and go through level 5A again. Go back through level 5B. Find another goals package, there's one there somewhere." And the chances are that it's one of these goals packages that I happen to know has a false identification in it.

Like the "to sex" goals package. I happen to know that one has a false identification in it.

Ever since human beings adopted gender specialization and human beings were born either as males or females it's got a built in false identification, that goals package has. So if you get anything associated with sex and it won't erase well just erase that, because if you erase that "to sex" goals package then it will all come apart.

I've been through all these hoops myself, Greg, on this one you know. I burnt the midnight oil, I've said to myself, "Dennis, there's got to be other techniques here to take these things apart." and, "I can't get these apart."

Every time I've said that and I've looked into it further, I've realized I've come across a god damned false identification of a goals package there which I hadn't spotted and once I took the false identification apart, took the compulsive games play apart, erased the goals package, it all came apart swimmingly. It all came apart exactly as the textbook said.

So I wanted to say those final words on this subject. It's all there at level 5A, B and C plus the little bits I've given you, that little addendum I gave you there. It's all there, you don't need any other practical to take a bank apart.

Level 6

I'll say it now, if I ever come up with a level 6. It won't be anything to do with taking the bank apart it will be to do with something quite different. It will be something to do with the anatomy of creating sensations or something like that. It will be something quite different than this whole subject of the reactive bank because as far as I'm concerned that is a solved problem at level 5. Level 5 ends that.

You start taking the bank apart at level 1, you continue with levels 2, 3, 4. You finish it at level 5 and when you're finished level 5 that's the end of the bank. It's gone. There's nothing else there. There's no bank. There's no more bank left, that's it. And if there's still bank there, then you haven't completed level 5.

Now that's my final words on the subject and I'm not going to be burning midnight oil on the subject. I've done enough burning of midnight oil on my own bank without burning midnight oil on other peoples.

So I see I'm getting to the end of this tape, so all the best for now and Ta ta.

end of tape

Expanding on Level 5, Sex

By Denis Stephens

May 6, 1993

Hello Greg, this is Dennis here and today is Thursday the 6th of May 1993 and although I'm cutting this tape on this date I won't send it to you until you get back from the USA because you've got enough on your plate at the moment. So I'll delay sending it to you until I'm sure your back.

Now this tape is the fourth and I assure you the final tape of background material for level 5 of my technology. It's the fourth and final and it's in addition to the one on the background material, which is my reply on the subject of Unstacking and it was also in addition to the one I sent you on the subject of Dissociation and it's in addition to the recent one I sent you which covers the subject of Exclusion Postulates and so forth The recent one, which was just a few weeks ago. So there are a total of four in all, Greg, in addition to the level 5 material. Whether you issue them as separate to the original write-up or whether you somehow add it as an addendum to the original write-up is entirely up to you. I don't mind actually either way. It's background material, that's all. It's simply expansion, background material.

The level 5 as it stands; as I've given it to you is sufficient, it's all there.

These four tapes would help a person in doing level 5. Levels 1 to 4 are quite ok, they don't need any expansion, but level 5, this background material, would help. These four tapes would help a person doing the background material on level 5.

So I leave it entirely up to you the way in which you issue it. I suppose if pushed my preference would be that it would be issued as a separate material, as just background material to level 5 of the technology.

Ionization Test

Now there are two things I want to take up on this tape. First is the subject of ionization.

Now almost everyone who's done any high school physics is familiar with this subject of ionization and anyone who has switched on a strip bulb is also familiar with a practical application of this subject of ionization.

Just briefly in the physical universe if you pass a positive electric charge through a gas the gas tends to ionize, the molecules are ionized positively and some, I don't know which ones, but some of these elements when so ionized, will glow. Neon, for example, glows a yellow orange color, some glow green, some glow white in color, some a ruddy color.

And this is the basis of strip lighting.

To make a strip light they simply evacuate the air out of the bulb, put in an inert gas, which they know will ionize and they coat the inside of the tube with something which will amplify the ionization effect. And the overall effect is that they get a 40 watt strip bulb, strip lighting, this principle is ionization.

Anyway that's the principle in electricity in the physical universe of ionization.

Now I'm using the word to explain a principle that will show up at level 5 and will puzzle a person unless they know what's going on.

The subject of ionization occurs when a person, usually in the grades of OT, starts to put postulates into mass in the universe. Whether he's putting postulates in the mass of the physical universe in present time or whether he's putting postulates into the mass of the universe in the past or whether he's putting it in the mass of his pictures, doesn't make any difference. When he starts putting postulates into mass this phenomena of ionization will occur and it's a useful one to be familiar with.

Now this is the way it works. That as soon as you put any postulates into any mass you're going to trigger this subject of ionization.

Now the rules of ionization, as far as postulates are concerned, are very straightforward and very simple. And I'll give them to you so you'll know what to expect when the phenomena shows up.

All Erasable Goals Packages Have Two Positive Legs

First of all let's consider any erasable goals package, let's take the "to know" goals package the basic goals package "to know" but it is applicable to any erasable goals package. All erasable goals packages have two positive legs and for example in the "to know" goals package the two positive legs are "to know" and "to be known".

Now if you put either one of those two postulates into mass, the mass will ionize either white or colored. The usual ionization color is white or it may be a creamy color or yellowy color. The mass will actually go white or go yellow or creamy or it may go colored, any color of the rainbow but that's very uncommon. The most common effect is white or creamy.

The two negative legs of the "to know" goals package, that's "to not know" and "to not be known" the mass will go black, will ionize black.

Now that is true for the "to know" goals package and it is true for any erasable goals package, it's true for any erasable goals package. So immediately ionization gives us another test for an erasable goals package.

The Old Test of Erasability

We already have an old test for an erasable goals package; is the "to blank" leg of the goal opposed to the "to be know" leg of the basic package? If the positive "to blank" leg of the goal being tested is opposed to the "be know" leg of the basic "to know" goals package then the goal is un-erasable.

Example: the goal "to destroy". Well the goal "to destroy" is obviously opposed to the goal "to be known" if somebody's trying "to be known" and somebody comes along and tries to destroy them, they are obviously opposed to their postulate "to be known" so the goal "to destroy" cannot be formulated into an erasable goals package.

That's our old and a reasonable test, and it's a very valid test. It's a test that you should always undertake. You should always under take that test.

So we can add to that one, we can add now the subject of ionization we simply put the two positive legs of the goals package to be tested, the “to blank” and the “to be blank” legs of the package to be tested. We put the postulates into mass in the environment and see what happens. If it ionizes white or colored then it’s erasable. If it ionizes black it’s unerasurable. So the difference between an erasable goals package and an unerasurable goals package in terms of ionization is that with an erasable goals package, the two positive legs will ionize mass white or colored and the two negative legs will ionize the mass black. Whereas a non erasable goals package all four legs of the goals package ionize the mass black. So there’s the test, a very simple test.

Unfortunately it can’t be used much early on in therapy. A person has to come up the line a bit and get familiar with putting postulates into mass before the ionization effect begins to show up in any detail. So it’s a later on test. Unfortunately it can’t be used much with any sensitivity early on. But never the less it’s a valid test.

Four Tests of an Unerasurable Goals Package

So to finish off this subject of ionization I’ll give you the four tests of an unerasurable goals package. It’s very vital to determine whether a junior goals package is erasable or unerasable. If you can determine it before you play with it in therapy you can save yourself a lot of heart ache, a lot of apathy, a lot of misery and a lot of upset, because trying to erase unerasurable goals packages is murder, is blue murder, I can assure you.

So it’s very important that we have a whole battery of tests we can use. So we can be absolutely sure from the very outset that any goals package we wish to test we can find out immediately whether it’s erasable or unerasurable.

So the first test is if it's unerasable the positive "to blank" goal is opposed to the "to be known" leg of the basic package. That is our first test and that's still our most important test. That's the one you should always try first. It's an obvious test so that is the one you do first.

Now the second one is If the two positive legs of the goals package you're testing ionize mass black then it's an unerasable goals package.

Now there's a third test which is an awful test but it is a test. The goals package is unerasable if you get a black field, and a rising tone arm, much apathy with no relief when you try to erase the goals package. I'll give it to you again, you get a black field, a rising tone arm, much apathy with no relief, get that, that's important, there's no relief, with no relief when you try and erase the goals package in therapy.

[see Black Field Case in the Glossary - editor]

Cure for Running Unerasable Goals Packages

If you do this, the cure for this state of affairs, the only cure for the apathy and the black field and the rising tone arm, the only cure is to re-null the "to know" goals package at level 5A. That's the only cure is to re-null the "to know" goals package at level 5A and all the unwanted symptoms will vanish by magic if you do that. That's one of the magic's of the basic "to know" goals package.

The Games Goals

Now the fourth one, there's a class of goals which are called games goals. Now a games goal has no meaning outside of games play. That is the definition; it is a technical definition of a games goal.

An example of a games goal is "to win" or "to exploit", or "to play". Quite clearly the goal "to win" has no meaning outside of the games play. The goal "to exploit" has no meaning outside of games play. The goal "to play" has no meaning outside of games play. You see that? So that's a technical definition, they're games goals.

Now the datum is that all games goals are unerasable. They're unerasable. The reason why they are unerasable is because the games goal has no meaning outside of games play, it has no complementary postulates and therefore it won't erase.

See it has no meaning outside of games play. A game, you see, consists of conflicting postulates and if a goal has no meaning outside of games play then it only consists of conflicting postulates. It has no complementary postulate, therefore it will not erase in therapy. It cannot erase in therapy because it has no complementary postulates in the set.

For example: what we call technically a game goal has a one game class postulate set. Let's take the goal "to exploit", I'll show you what I mean by this.

We take the goal "to exploit". The only class in this set that is active in the goals package is "to exploit" versus "to not be exploited".

When you look at the game of exploitation it's always that. That is the only game that is played in the set is "to exploit". Somebody's an exploiter and he's trying "to exploit" somebody else who doesn't want to be exploited." So it's "to exploit" versus "to not be exploited" and that's the only class in the set.

Nobody's going around wanting "to exploit" and finding people who want "to be exploited".

Nobody's going around wanting "to be exploited", and being opposed by somebody who doesn't want "to exploit" them.

Nobody's going around not wanting to be exploited and somebody over there who doesn't want to exploit them.

These are all null classes in the set. The only class that has any meaning in the set of a games goal is the goal "to exploit", as the example shows the goal "to exploit" versus "to not be exploited".

So it's a one games class postulate set. It's a one games class goals set, so there's no complementary postulate so the games goals will not erase in therapy. They are unerasable.

Games Goals are Insidious

The games goals are rather insidious. They're very insidious; it took me a while to puzzle them out.

I got a call on games goals while I was researching this material and they won't erase and they showed all the effects of un-erasability. You get the apathy, you get the rising TA, the rising tone arm, you get the black field and so forth, but the "to blank" leg of the goal doesn't apparently oppose the "to be known" leg of the basic package, and they don't obviously obey the ionization rule.

[see Black Field Case in the Glossary - editor]

You can get the goal "to play" for example and you can put that goal out, "to play" and "to be played" and you'll find that they don't obviously ionize black when you ionize mass with the goal. So they tend to pass the ionization test.

But once you spot that they're a games goal you avoid them like the plague. They're certainly unerasable. There's no way in the world you can erase a games goal in therapy. It's because it's got no meaning outside of games play. It's simply a goal, which is part of games play.

And because it's got no meaning outside of games play it's unerasable, because it's got no complimentary postulates in its set. Follow?

Those are the four tests of an unerasable goal. The opposition test, being the first one. It's opposed to the "be known" leg of the basic package. The ionization test. All four legs of the unerasable goals package ionize mass black. The third one is you get a black field with rising TA, apathy with no release when you try and erase the goals package, that's the third one. And the fourth one, an unerasable goals package is a games goal.

And these are the only four. There aren't any others, you've got all of them there now. I know of no others. There are the four.

By the use of those four criteria you can sort out whether any goal is erasable.

I mean, obviously the list is complete because if you were completely uncertain the final thing to do is to simply test the goal. Try and erase it. And if it starts to kill you it's unerasable. And there's no relief and the tone arm goes up if you're using a meter or your field goes black and you get lots of apathy and the tone arm goes up and so forth and there's no relief. Well it's obvious it's an unerasable goal. And that's the final test. It's a pretty awful test to have to make but it is a test.

So we can test them all, within that set of four tests we can test any goals package set. We can always come up with a positive answer one-way or the other. We can find out whether a goal is erasable.

There's a lot more to this subject of ionization but that's its immediate application to level 5. That's its immediate practical application to level 5 is this subject of testing for an erasable or unerasable junior goals package.

Junior Goals Packages

My final words on the subject of junior goals packages is stay with the list that I've given you.

You have a list of the most important junior goals packages, there's only a dozen or so of them, and you have them plus the goal "to reason", that's an important one and should be added to the list. Outside of that list that I've given you there's probably another 20 or so, 15 or 20 that can be found, which are erasable but their of minor importance and they will all come to light on the list that I've given you.

So fiddling around looking for obscure erasable junior goals and hoping that that will provide salvation for you is really one way to waste time in therapy. The key goal is the goal "to know" at level 5A, concentrate on that and then when that goes null on you and you can't get any more change out of that then go on to level 5B and work on the list that I've given you and then go on to level 5C, and then call it a day.

Don't spend hours and hours fiddling around chasing up obscure junior goals packages and testing them for erasability, it's a complete waste of time. I've given you all the important ones, the "to know" goals package and the important junior goals packages, all the rest are quite trivial anyway, so you really don't have to do any searching at all, cause I've given you the data.

The “ To Eat” Goals Package

Now the remainder of this tape I want to take up bodily goals packages. They do have some importance in therapy. You will find them on my list of junior goals packages. Well two of them. There's the goal “to eat” and the goal “to sex”.

The human spirit shares these goals with the subject of the body, the body is acting on both those goals packages and so they do need a little bit of amplification, those two goals packages do.

The easier of the two to erase is the goal “to eat”. That is really a breeze. Unless the person has a lot of specific psychological difficulties on the subject of eating, and that's only a minority of the population. These people know who they are, if they have eating problems.

I don't mean things like indigestion, I mean definite psychological problems. You know, the person is overeating or compulsively eating or compulsively starving.

If their doing either of those things they've got a specific eating problem and the goal “to eat” will be a specific cure for the condition, but this is a minority of the population.

For the majority of the population, the goal “to eat” although it's shared between the human spirit and the body, they both share this goal, the goal is erasable, and it's a very easy one to erase.

Now why is the goal “to eat” a very easy goal to erase?

Because, and here is the key datum, because games play in the “to eat” goals package is not completely compulsive. It's not completely compulsive.

The human body, normally, most of the time, operates on the basis of “must eat” and “mustn't be eaten” that is the most common class it sits in. It “must eat” and it “mustn't be eaten”.

So that's one class in the set but the other class in the set "mustn't eat" and "must be eaten" the human body can just get into that class. So that class is available to the human body. And so it can occupy the four classes of "to eat" and "to be eaten" and "to not eat" and "to not be eaten".

In other words the human body can just occupy all four classes in the set and so games play is not completely compulsive.

The key is that the human body can just tolerate being eaten. It can only just barely tolerate it, it doesn't like being eaten, but it can just barely tolerate it and because it can just tolerate it the goals package "to eat" is very readily erasable.

It doesn't pose any great difficulties to the average person. It will only pose difficulties to a person who has psychological difficulties on the subject of eating. That person can expect to have a ball erasing the "to eat" goals package.

So when I say the human body can have some slight tolerance to being eaten but doesn't care for it, I'll give you an example of that.

For example, even a tiny thing like a mosquito bite or a gnat bite, which is a tiny insect, you know, a very tiny insect taking a little tiny bite out of the human body. The body's response to that is enormous. It simply doesn't like having even little bits nibbled off of it by other life forms but it can survive it. It doesn't completely go into apathy and die when somebody tries to eat it. It does have some slight tolerance to being eaten, but it doesn't like it one little bit. But it can tolerate being eaten to some slight degree.

So that's its saving grace on the subject of eating and it allows the "to eat" goals package for the majority of the population to be fairly readily erasable. And it's no great deal, the "to eat" goals package is. It erases rather readily and it's not particularly therapeutic.

But it will be highly therapeutic to those people who have specific eating problems and either because their compulsive eaters or compulsive starvers. They will have a ball as I say on the “to eat” goals package.

The Eating Game

I'll give you the main strategy of the eating game that all life forms use.

The whole idea of winning the eating game, how to win the eating game. The inner secret of the inner secret is to try and convince your opponent that you're inedible, that you can't be eaten.

If you can convince your opponent that you can't be eaten you've won the eating game and that is the main strategy of life forms. Their strategy is to go around and convince other life forms that they can't be eaten and they are inedible.

If you can do that you've won the eating game. It's a pretty miserable game but there it is. That's the main strategy.

You find plants doing this, you know, they fill themselves up with rather poisonous chemicals and along comes an animal and takes a nibble off the plant and the animal goes away and gets a tummy ache and the animal recons “Well I won't eat that plant again.” And the plant says, “Ha Ha I've now convinced that animal that I'm inedible.” You see? So the animal won't eat him anymore. So there it is, he's won his eating game.

So that's the main strategy in the eating game, is to convince your opponent that your inedible. And really it's a very simple game. It's an almost naive game, the eating game is, because that's its only strategy.

The “ To Sex” Goals Package

Ok, so much for the “to eat” goals package, now we come to the “to sex” goals package and I wish I could say the same thing for the “to sex” goals package, but it’s a bodily goals package, the human spirit shares this goals package with the human body and the two jog along there.

You think, “Oh well, the “to eat” goals package is a bit of a breeze, we just hope that the “to sex” goals package is a bit of a breeze.”

Well the average human being when he walks into the “to sex” goals package, he will walk into a brick wall. He will go kathumk, thud, flunk and he will end up flat on his face. So I do need to give you some background data on the “to sex” goals package.

I’ve had to wrestle this data out the hard way, really I have. I mean it’s been a slugging match getting this data out and finding out there’s an awful lot of significance in this subject of sex in human beings.

Put it this way, if there was a malevolent God who knew all about goals and goals packages and was sitting up on high and looked down on earth and saw all those human beings and he, with malice aforethought, decided to make the subject of sex absolutely unerasable for human beings psychologically he couldn’t have done a better job of it the way it is. He couldn’t have done a better job.

It is virtually unerasable except with a highly specialized technology such as we have here at level 5. Level 5 will get this goals package apart. It will get it apart but I can assure you there’s nothing else will get it apart. There’s nothing that I know of.

Freudian psychotherapy won't get it apart. Scientology won't get it apart. Dianetics won't get it apart. Hypnosis won't get it apart. I know of no other psychotherapy or any form of psychological approach that will clean up this subject of sex out the human mind and completely relax the human being on the subject of sex except this technology that I have. So that's the position on the subject of sex.

Games Play in the “ To Sex” Goals Package is Totally Compulsive

It's a nightmare which you pick your way through and unless you know what you're doing you're going to fall flat on your face. Now the reason that it's a nightmare, the basic fundamental reason that the “to sex” goals package is a nightmare is simply because the human body has adopted gender specialization.

Human beings are born either as males or as females. They are not born as both and they are not born as neither therefore as far as the human body is concerned the “to sex” goals package is a compulsive games play. Games play in the “to sex” goals package is totally compulsive as far as the human body is concerned.

Now it will be useful to give some background material on the subject of sex and to see how it got into existence in the universe because this will give a person some idea of what they are up against.

Asexual Reproduction

Very simple life forms like bacteria, viruses etcetera they don't use sex as a means of reproduction. They reproduce asexually and they do this by cell splitting.

The bacterium when it wants to reproduce it simply splits itself into two bacteria and the two go their separate ways and this is the same for viruses and the same for paramecium and so forth you see floating around in a pond.

Now cell splitting is cloning. So as far as the biological traits, the genetic traits, the offspring is exactly the same as its parent. If a bacterium splits in half, the two halves biologically and genetically speaking, in terms of their DNA and so forth are completely identical. There's no difference at all. And evidently for a long while in the universe this went on.

And the old cell splitting of single cell creatures still goes on. You can see it in any pond if you care to get a decent microscope and have a look you'll see it going on. You can see these single cell creatures splitting.

Sexual Reproduction

As life forms became more complicated, more complex, there was a move, an urge in life towards a more comprehensive way of reproduction, something which allowed them to get more data, you might say, in their genetic structure and so the subject of sex came into operation.

And essentially the system is very simple. You get two members of the species, they both contribute a cell and each cell they contribute contains half their genetic material. The two cells combine and grow up and becomes a separate individual and it shares the genetic material of both of the parents.

You might say the two beings give birth to the other creature and this works better. It does work better as far as survival is concerned, because it allows more variation of genetic material, it did allow these primitive creatures to survive better.

Now the earliest life forms. The earliest attempt along these lines was that the two cells that were contributed became a male cell and a female cell. And early on there was very little difference between the two cells but later the female cell became larger and more complex and the male cell became the very rudimentary sperm.

Bisexual Reproduction

In the earliest creatures we find that any creature could be both male and female. Now these are known as the bisexual creatures. There are plenty of them about on the planet still today. They are bisexual creatures, and they are both male and female.

Many trees are both male and female and although their male cells can't fertilize their own female cells, they've got some provision in their genetic code which prevents this from happening. Their male cells can fertilize the female cells of the same type of tree providing it's another tree and their female cells can be fertilized by the male cells from another tree of the same type of tree.

So the creature gets a double advantage it gets a double advantage there by being both male and female it can reproduce in two ways you might say.

Earth worms are also bisexual. They are also known as hermaphrodites, that's the other word for them, the Greek root hermaphrodites, they're both male and female.

In other words two earth worms can meet up and each creature is both a male and a female and the male part of an earthworm can join up sexually with the female half of another earthworm and at the same time its own female half can be joined up with the male half of another earth worm. So they're both capable of fertilizing and being fertilized. Bisexual creatures are very common.

Well as games play became more and more compulsive on the subject of sex in the universe. And this is the only reason why it came about. The games play became more and more compulsive, became more important, the subject did, so that eventually the creatures split off and no longer were bisexual. They began to adopt gender specialization.

You'll find some trees, for example, some trees are bisexual and other trees are male trees and female trees. So some trees have adopted gender specialization and certainly most higher level creatures have, reptiles and mammals and man, all the higher birds, they've all adopted gender specialization to a greater or a lesser degree.

Some birds can become male and female, you know, if they lose a male in their tribe one of the females becomes a male. They've all sorts of peculiar mating habits, some creatures have, but the tendency as evolution progresses is towards more and more gender specialization. And the peak is reached in mankind with his complete gender specialization where he's either a male or a female.

Masculinity and Femininity

Now before we go any further we must take a very close look at this subject of masculinity and femininity. These are little junior universes masculinity and femininity, they are junior universes.

Now the junior universe of masculinity has an anatomy. The junior universe of masculinity only consists of the postulate “to sex” and the postulate “to not sex”.

And the junior universe of femininity only consists of the postulate “to be sexed” and the postulate “to not be sexed”.

Now that is about as fundamental as you can get on the subject of masculinity and femininity, they are the basic postulates that govern masculinity, femininity.

Masculinity consists of the “to sex” and the “to not sex” postulate. Femininity consists of the “to be sexed” and the “to not be sexed” postulate. And those junior universes consist entirely of those postulates.

Remember I said that this whole universe in which we live only consists of life and postulates. So it’s no surprise to us that masculinity in its final anatomy only consists of postulates, and these are the postulates. There’s nothing else there, basically there’s nothing else there.

It will take you a long time to get that amount of reduction but I can assure you that I’ve worked it through and that is the reduction and that is the junior universe of masculinity and that is the junior universe of femininity. They are the postulates that those junior universes consist of.

And armed with that data you can take the “to sex” goals package apart. Without that data you won’t get it apart, you need that datum to get it apart. That’s the key data, that you might say is the inner secret of the inner secret. The postulate anatomy of masculinity and the postulate anatomy of femininity, once you’ve got them it all starts to make sense.

The English Word Sex

Before we press on I'd like to mention one of the more curious things about the subject of sex in the English language. That in English the word sex is a noun it is not a verb. This means, in English, we have no verb on the subject of sexual intercourse, for example. We can't use the verb "to sex," it's not strictly the right use of the English because the word sex is a noun. It is not a verb. So when we use the "to sex" goals package I'm using it slightly not in accordance with the English language. The Anglo Saxons had a verb "to sex" they called it the verb "to fuck" that's Anglo Saxon, but evidently the English are far too genteel to have a verb of that nature.

Sex is a noun, it's not something that is done. Sex is something which exists, you see, somehow it comes into existence spontaneously, I'm being funny, I'm being sarcastic. It's most peculiar.

In some languages in the world the word sex is a noun and a verb, but certainly as we're using it in therapy the word sex is a noun and a verb. I'm using it in that context, as a noun and a verb. So "to sex" is a verb, I'm using it as a verb. In other words I'm verbalizing the noun, which is a very common thing to do in the English language and I'm doing it for our purposes.

So, language purists, I'm sorry but I'm not going to get into complicated verbs like "to inseminate" or...or "to procreate" none of which mean exactly the same as "to sex". If you don't like the word "to sex" then use the word "to fuck" as that means exactly the same as "to sex" does. It's the old Anglo Saxon, and it's a swear word in our English language so even that's not quite acceptable. So we're going to use "to sex".

Gender

Now another curious thing about our English language on the subject of sex is the word gender. The word gender is not supposed to be used in terms of masculinity and femininity as applied to people. It's only supposed to be used in terms of words of a feminine nature and so forth.

In other words it's a literary term. It's a grammatical term and the word gender is strictly speaking a grammatical term and you couldn't really say that man is a male gender or female is a female gender. That is not strictly the correct use of the language, but never the less, I'm going to use it in that sense, to hell with the language purists.

If I use the word gender I mean it strictly in the physical sense of masculinity, male gender, female gender, in terms of human beings and human bodies.

One is almost lead to the inescapable conclusion that the people that put the English language together were very repressed on the subject of sex which is an opinion I would not disagree with.

The Sex Game

Right, well now the time has come for us to take up this subject of how the sex game is actually played between males and females and to how the postulates actually work in the sex game. It's necessary to understand just what's going on. Usually the game is originated by the male amongst humans. It's not common in all life forms but amongst humans it usually starts with the male.

He puts out his "must sex" postulate and he directs this towards the female of his choice and she upon sensing this postulate will immediately go into a "mustn't be sexed" mode. Now as soon as she does this of course sexual sensation will generate at the boundary between the two postulates because they are opposition postulates.

So we have him pursuing her, he's saying "must sex" and she's saying "mustn't be sexed" and she's being pursued. And that goes on and two things can happen there, the most common thing is that in the initial stages the female must be very careful not to overdo her "mustn't be sexed" postulate because in the initial stages if she pushes that postulate too hard she'll drive the male from his "must sex" postulate over to his "mustn't sex" postulate in which case he will lose interest in her.

The situation will then be that she's in "mustn't be sexed" and he's in "mustn't sex" and of course they are complementary postulate so there's no sexual sensation being generated and the game stops. See?

So the female has to watch that if that does happen, that she overdoes the "mustn't be sexed" postulate and drives him into "mustn't sex", then she must immediately, and will immediately switch over to her "must be sexed" postulate. She'll switch over to her "must be sexed" and give the come hither sign and this will resurrect his flagging interest now because sexual sensation is again being generated between the females "must be sexed" postulate and his "mustn't sex" postulate so the game is sexually interesting again. Sexual sensation is again being generated. He will see her "come hither" and start to pursue again.

As soon as he starts pursuing again he goes into his "must sex" postulate, of course as soon as she senses it she will go back into her "mustn't be sexed" postulate again. And so that is the full cycle that goes on there.

That's courting, that's the courting play between the sexes. The interplay of the male using his "must sex" and "mustn't sex" postulate and the female using her "mustn't be sexed" and "must be sexed" postulates.

The two are used so that sexual sensation is continually generated by the conflicting postulates. The idea is to optimize the game so that sexual sensation is always being generated between them.

The tendency is, because of the game sensation generated there by the conflict between their postulates, that the distance tends to close, tends to close up. So the two tend to get closer and closer together, and all going well, if the courting goes well, they get closer and closer and closer together until actual physical contact occurs,

But still the same postulate structure occurs the male goes into "must sex" the female will go into "mustn't be sexed" and if she overdoes it and he goes into "mustn't sex" then she will go into "must be sexed" and then he will go back from "mustn't sex" into "must sex" again and she will go back into "mustn't be sexed" so the postulates are always conflicting.

But as long as you bear in mind that the postulates are always conflicting and that the male moves between "must sex" and "mustn't sex" and she moves between "must be sexed" and "mustn't be sexed" and then you've got it. You understand it. As long as you realize they are both striving for conflicting postulates.

So the mystery of the sort of strange courting dance between males and females is understood in terms of postulates. You can trace it out and you will see that it is exactly as I say it is.

Eventually we get to the point where actual coitus is embarked upon but we still get this same pattern of postulates. The male “must sex” postulate now becomes a forward pelvic thrust with his erected penis and the female goes into a “mustn’t be sexed” postulate which is a forward sexual withdrawal. Then the male goes into a backward pelvic withdrawal, that’s his withdrawal of “mustn’t sex”.

The female while he’s in that mode will go into her “must be sexed” which is a backward pelvic thrust and so you still see the same cycle, the postulates are still in opposition to each other but now we’re entering into a bodily level.

We have the male with his “must sex” postulate as a forward pelvic thrust and his “mustn’t sex” postulate translates into a backward pelvic withdrawal. The female’s “must be sexed” postulate translates into a backward pelvic thrust and her “mustn’t be sexed” postulate translates into a forward pelvic withdrawal.

Orgasm

The tendency of course as the terminals get closer and closer and coitus starts is for more and more sexual sensation to be generated and the game becomes more and more frantic until the point of orgasm is reached.

Now orgasm is a definite point on the cycle and has a definite postulate structure, and you should know about the structure of orgasm.

Now a male goes into orgasm when he deprives the female of her “mustn’t be sexed” postulate and drives her into “must be sexed”. He uses his “must sex” postulate to deprive her of her “mustn’t be sexed” postulate and drive her into “must be sexed”. When he considers this has occurred, and it’s purely a subjective consideration, when he considers this has occurred he will go into orgasm.

The female goes into orgasm when by the use of her “must be sexed” postulate she deprives the male of his “mustn’t sex” postulate and drives him into “must sex” and when she considers she’s done this she too will go into orgasm.

The partners can actually work it between them, when their skilled at the subject, so they both achieve orgasm at the same moment. It needs a little bit of practice but most couples usually manage to do this, and they can both achieve orgasm at the same moment.

There is the postulate structure of the male orgasm. It’s a question of depriving the female of her “mustn’t be sexed” postulate, then he will go into orgasm. And the female goes into orgasm when she considers she’s deprived the male of his “mustn’t sex” postulate and he’s driven into “must sex”, and then she will go into orgasm.

So there is this mysterious subject of orgasm and its postulate structure.

Well you say, “So far so good, how is it that we’re in a difficult subject? I mean, how come this doesn’t come apart routinely? You know, it ought to come apart, we seem to have it all straight.” Well there are one or two little flies in the ointment. The first of them is, and maybe you’ve spotted it already, is in these bodily motions on the subject of sex, these pelvic thrusts. Now the human beings have adopted over the millennia face to face coitus which is a most peculiar position for them to complete the sex act. If you go back to their nearest ancestors, the apes, the chimps and so forth, the male chimp mounts the female from behind and this is very common in all mammals, the male mounts the female from behind.

This used to happen in humans too but for the last few millennia they've adopted the front to front coital position as the more common. Well it still can be practiced, the mounting the female from behind, it can still be practiced and is practiced by humans, but never the less the more common position known as the missionary position, I believe, is the male and the female both facing each other front to front. But let's consider the ape for the moment. Let's consider an ape. Now a male ape, all his sex life would be in front of him, a peculiarity of a male ape. Now he shares this with the male human that all a male human's sex life is in front of him. When he looks out the sex is occurring in front of him because the female is always in front of the male in the sexual position so it's true for an ape and it's true for a human. So the human male and a male ape all his sex life is in front of him. But the female ape, she's mounted from behind and it's only fairly recently in human history that front to front copulation has occurred amongst human beings. There are many more millennia that females were entered from behind on the genetic track.

So the human female in common with the female ape all their sex life happens behind her. Nothing happens in front of her. If she's entered sexually she's always entered from behind and this is why the motions of the female of the "to be sexed" and the "to not be sexed" pelvic thrust are in terms of a rear entry. The female, remember, what was said in coitus between the male and the female, the female "must be sexed" postulate is a backward pelvic thrust, which makes a lot of sense if the male is behind her but makes no sense at all if the male is facing her from the front. But never the less it still applies to human females. They still retain their ancestry on this subject and that in terms of physical efforts on the body for the human female the actual physical effort of "must be sexed" is a backward pelvic thrust and "mustn't be sexed" from a physiological level is a forward physical withdrawal.

She still interprets her sex life all happens behind her, the female does, even though she engages in front to front coitus. Now you ought to know that, otherwise you don't understand these physical motions of pelvic thrusts and the way they work together.

Compulsive Sex Games Play

Now you remember I said earlier on that the games play is compulsive in the "to sex" goals package in humans. Now what do I mean by that?

Well the "to sex" postulate is identical to the "to not be sexed" postulate and the "to be sexed" postulate is identical to the "to not sex" postulate in terms of the set and we see this identification very clearly when we get to the physiological efforts in coitus amongst humans.

For example, the female "must be sexed" is a backward pelvic thrust but in terms of pure musculature that is exactly the same as the male "mustn't sex" which is a backward pelvic withdrawal. There isn't any difference between a backward pelvic withdrawal and a backward pelvic thrust they are identical in terms of musculature action. So the female's musculature action in her "must be sexed" postulate is identical to the male's musculature action in his "mustn't sex" postulate. They're identical.

And similarly the male with his forward pelvic thrust of "must sex" is exactly identical in terms of muscular action to the female's forward pelvic withdrawal. There is no difference between a forward pelvic thrust and a forward pelvic withdrawal. Call it one way or the other but they're identical in terms of muscular action.

So you see what I mean when I say that in the human body the games play is completely compulsive. The postulates at a muscular physiological level are identical in motion. You follow? So in games play as far as the human body is concerned "to sex" is a compulsive games condition. The identification is complete there.

Now what is the identification in the compulsive games play between the genders? We see the identification between the postulates. Well the identification between the genders is that a male equals a non female and a female equals a non male. They are the identifications. Male equals non female and female equals non male.

That's just simply another way of expressing the concept that "to sex" equals "to not be sexed" and "to be sexed" equals "to not sex", it's just another way of expressing it, in terms of the genders. This is not surprising when you consider that the junior universes of masculinity and femininity only consist of the postulates, that I mentioned, only consist of postulates, the "to sex" postulates.

You might write it down on a piece of paper so you'll see it immediately that the identification of the genders is that a male masculinity is non femininity and femininity is non masculinity.

It's cute isn't it.

So when I say there is an identification in the "to sex" goals package, a false identification there, in compulsive games play, I can prove it. I can prove it.

At the physiological level the muscular contractions which the human bodies undergo during the sex act, there's an identification between the contractions. So there's the proof, there's the proof.

So this is not just some airy fairy all up in the air that I happened to dream up one bright afternoon while thinking about the subject. No, no there is definite evidence to back up what I'm saying when I say there's a false identification in the "to sex" goals package and the subject of humans and that games play is compulsive in that package at a bodily level. In other words you can erase the "to sex" goals package psychologically but your body will still be in a compulsive games condition on the subject of sex. You can't do anything about that. It's the way the creatures built.

It's built in so you can't do anything about that. So that is the next important datum to understand that although you can erase this subject psychologically and understand it completely and understand fully what's going on you will not change your body one iota on this subject, nor should you even attempt to try. You'll only upset the body.

That's the way the body is, that's the way the body is designed, that's the way the body is built. It's built that way and that's the way the mockup is and you'll only ruin its health if you try to do much about it. So just leave it alone.

Just erase the goals package for you and understand the body, and understand its peculiarities on the subject of sex and its peculiarities on the subject of compulsive games play in the "to sex" goals package.

Well you still might say. "Well where's the trouble, why won't it all come apart rather easily? If it is just as you say?" Well I wish it were as simple as I just said it, but there's one little fly in the ointment and it's a rather nasty fly which does really muck the whole thing up and make it very difficult to take apart. And make the whole subject very confusing.

Let's go into it. We now know enough about this subject of sex to tackle this peculiarity in the human body. It's a purely physical peculiarity of the human being. It doesn't apply to all animals, it applies to many, but it certainly applies to the human animal, to the human body.

Now as I say the human body either comes in male or it comes in female. Now if it's a male body it has testicles and a system for producing male sperm and it has a penis which is a device for delivering the sperm and it has the ability to erect the penis when it's mature to get the sperm into the female. Now it has all this equipment there. And this equipment starting off even in very early childhood has a positive "to sex" ionization. It's there permanently in the body.

Now it's not there permanently in all mammals simply because some mammals you might say, I'm not actually sure of this because I'm not all that good on the subject of animals, I not a biologist, but many animals come into sexual season and go out like dog's do.

Dogs aren't in season all year round. They have a mating season. Dogs and cats only have a certain mating season. So for most of the year their simply not interested in sex, dogs and cats, but they have a certain mating season where they become quite frantic on the subject of sex and copulate and have their young and then it's all over and done with and the rest of the year their not interested in it any more.

Well human beings aren't like that.

During the mating season with animals their bodies ionize sexually. They get a sexual ionization on their gender parts but human beings they are in sexual season all year round. So their genitals areas are sexually ionized permanently, 365 days a year and 366 days on leap years. All the year round, you see? There's a sexual ionization.

And what is this sexual ionization? Well in the male the penis, testicles that area is permanently ionized with a "to sex" postulate, the plus "to sex" postulate. It's faint at birth, it increases in childhood slowly and jumps in puberty and from puberty onwards it's quite intense, it's there all the time. Never goes away. Doesn't reverse. It's there all the time.

It increases as sexual excitement increases. When the male has an erection there's a much more intense positive "to sex" ionization in the genital area than when his penis is inert it can go down to almost zero when it's inert but it's always plus, it's never zero, it's always plus.

Similarly with the female, her vagina is chronically ionized "to be sexed", a chronic "to be sexed" ionization. It can become intense when she goes into sexual play or it can fade out to almost nothing when she's at rest, but it's never at zero, it's always plus, it never goes minus, it's always plus, there.

So that is something that you have to know about the human body is that it has a permanent ionization.

Right, so far so good. Is that all on the subject of ionization?

Well if that was all we wouldn't have any trouble. We could get this goals package apart, it would be a piece of cake if that was the only ionization but unfortunately it isn't.

It's a strange thing that gender in humans doesn't occur until the second week after conception.

If you talk to a physiologist and you look at a prenatal child gender occurs about the second week in the prenatal period. Prior to that there's no sign of any gender. Then about two weeks on the male foetus starts to produce penis and testicles and the female body starts to produce a vagina and female sex cells and so forth and the male also produces male sex cells.

You may not know this but even a young boy will have male sex cells. He hasn't got many but he's still got some sperm in the testicles, he still has some male sex cells. And even a young girl has a collection of female sex cells in the ovaries but they are not in any position to be fertilized or to move into the womb or what have you. Neither is the boy in any position to ejaculate his sperm. This has to wait until puberty occurs but you should know that the sex cells are present even at birth in humans.

Well they are not there in anywhere near the quantities that they will be later on in life.

Ok well so far so good. But what is this fly in the ointment? Well that's the way it goes prenatally but unfortunately we get this child, it's conceived and it starts off as two cells and the two cells split become four cells and after two weeks there's thousands and thousands of cells and then they suddenly go into gender, but, and this is the sleeper in the pack, this is the one you have to know, this is the one that causes all the trouble. There is a residual ionization of the other gender in any gender.

In other words a male not only has quite a strong ionization of "must sex" in the area of his penis and testicles but he has a very faint feminine ionization in the area of the vagina which he doesn't have.

It's ridiculous isn't it. In other words, although the body tries its hardest to separate the males and the females completely it doesn't quite succeed and there is always some residual ionization of the other gender in all bodies.

Similarly with the female, she will have a strong "must be sexed" ionization in her vagina but she has a very faint "must sex" ionization in her vestigial penis which is her clitoris. So she too has the residual male sexuality there.

It's more obvious in the female because she does actually have a vestigial penis, a clitoris.

The male has no vestigial vagina but he still has the residual female ionization in that area of the body around the area of the buttocks. And this is always very puzzling to all males. They don't understand it and it's very puzzling to them. But it shows up in therapy and you best understand it. It's a very natural phenomenon.

It varies from male to male and female to female. I mean all males have a strong "to sex" ionization in the area of their genitals, penis and testicles but some have a very weak "must be sexed" ionization in the area of their buttock, others have quite a strong one, quite strong residual there.

Similarly with the female, some females have a very faint “must sex” ionization in the clitoris and other females have quite a strong one. And this is the basis of the homosexuality in males and lesbianism in females. If the ionization becomes too strong, this residual ionization becomes too strong the person can actually sexually become the opposite sex. In other words a male with a very powerful “to be sexed” ionization in the area of the vagina he doesn’t have, and all around the area of his buttocks can easily adopt a female role in sex with another male and not do any male sexing at all, and purely occupy a female role and become a homosexual. Similarly a female with a very high positive male ionization in her clitoris can start pursuing other females sexually and become a lesbian. And it explains lesbianism in females and explains homosexuality in males.

Homosexuality is not Psychological

Now this is a quite natural phenomenon. It’s not psychological, it’s not a psychological phenomena. It’s purely a physiological phenomena and it’s not anything that can be changed by therapy. You just buy this when you buy the mockup. It is part of the way the body is built. And I’ve researched all around this area very thoroughly and I can assure you that it’s not changeable. You follow that? That ionization there, your body ionization is fixed, pretty well fixed from birth onwards. There’s nothing much you can do about it except drive yourself crazy. Many men realizing that the back part of their bodies have a slight feminine ionization worry themselves half to death. They think their homosexual and they go on a great rampage to try and prove their sexuality.

They start beating up females, they become an absolute bloody menace and all they are doing is they are making themselves and everybody around them miserable. But they can't change it. It isn't going to change and they might as well accept the fact that it's a part of their physiological nature, and similarly with a female.

So when you come across homosexuals and lesbians and so forth realize that it's a physiological function you're dealing with there and although it can be helped by therapy you're not going to change that physiological ionization of their body.

But you can erase the "to sex" goals package and you have to erase the "to sex" goals package to get them to understand what is going on. Nobody is going to understand what is going on until they've erased the "to sex" goals package in therapy.

When they've got it erased they will understand exactly what is going on and before they've got it erased they'll have difficulty with it, so the trick is to erase the "to sex" goals package in therapy. It will erase and knowing this background data I've given you on this tape will help the erasure.

Now the final thing you should know on this subject of ionization is that because of the body's split between males and females, the male usually occupies the front of his body. And he regards this, the penis and testicles the "must sex" area of ionization, he regards it in the class of self. The bit behind him, the area of the vagina he doesn't have, buttocks and so forth which is ionized "must be sexed" with greater or lesser ionization, that he regards in the class of not self.

He can't have them both in the class of self because the "to sex" goals package is in the state of compulsive games play because masculinity equals non-femininity and femininity equals non-masculinity so they can't both be in the same class, they can't both be in the class of self.

So the male tends to retreat to the front of his body and regards this little bit of feminine ionization at the back of him as in the class of not self. The female tends to retreat to the back of her body and she regards her powerful "must be sexed" ionization in the class of self and she tends to regards this very faint "must sex" ionization in the clitoris in the class of not self.

All genders do this, all males and females do this, and they can't have both these ionizations in the class of self. If one of them is in the class of self then the other one's in the class of not self, and so on, at a physiological level.

Psychologically of course you can erase the whole package. You can occupy the "must sex" and "must be sexed" postulates simultaneously, you see that. But the body can't do it.

So if you're going to go into the body and occupy the body universe, and you're going to be a male then your residual female ionization is going to be in the class of not self.

And if you're a female and you're going to enter into the female universe of the body then the residual male ionization in your clitoris is going to be in the class of not self and this is inevitable simply because the body has adopted gender specialization and THAT is the trouble.

Now if you can follow everything that I've given you, here I've given you all the data now on this physiologically, sufficient to get it apart. And I've given you the hot gen, given you the works.

["Hot Gen" - In World War II Air Force slang "gen" meant "Inside information", so, getting the "Hot Gen", meant getting the latest gossip.]

There's enough bugs in this to make it almost impossible to get apart. I mean, poor old Sigmund Freud, he spent his whole life trying to get it apart and he didn't even discover the "to sex" postulates. He didn't even know the goals package so, of course, he got absolutely nowhere but it was a valiant try, I mean, one must give him full marks for trying but he never even discovered the goals package. But even he advanced on what was known before, I mean he did well, but he never got to first base.

But now we've got it, got the whole gruesome giddy story out on the subject of sex. We have the goals package, we have the compulsive games play in the body and we have that the human spirit can play this game too.

The human spirit can erase it, we have the body ionizations and we have the game and the residual ionizations and how they affect the game. If you can put all that lot together and see it then it will help you a lot when you come to erase the "to sex" goals package in therapy.

Gender Symbols

Another couple of points I'll go into rather briefly. The subject of gender symbols, you'll find that you'll have difficulty erasing gender symbols. Gender symbols are symbols that represent gender. They're usually clothes, like male clothes. The male wears certain types of clothes and they'll become male gender symbols. Females wear certain types of clothes, skirts and so forth, a skirt is a female gender symbol. Trousers are a male gender symbol and so on.

You will have a lot of trouble erasing these gender symbols at level 5C until you've erased the "to sex" goals package at level 5B so don't muck about with them, you won't get them erased at 5C until you've erased the "to sex" goals package. Once you've erased the "to sex" goals package at level 5B all the gender symbols will erase routinely.

This is simply because the gender symbols have got an ionization. Every gender symbol has an ionization of one or more of the postulates of the "to sex" goals package and while that goals package is alive and un-erased you'll never erase the gender symbol. Never, never in a month of Sundays will you erase it.

The trick is to erase the "to sex" goals package, when you've got that erased all the gender symbols will erase like lambs. You can erase them at level 5C, they'll all stand up and nod and will be erased and wish you goodbye on their way.

They'll all go out the mind very easily and very quickly. So, so much for gender symbols, that's the only thing you need to know about them. Don't burn the midnight oil trying to muck about erasing gender symbols at level 5C until you've erased the "to sex" goals package at level 5B.

Sexual Modesty

Next thing is briefly the subject of sexual modesty. I've got just a brief note on the subject of sexual modesty.

Because the sexual ionization is chronic in the human body, and it's always positive, it's rather offensive to the spiritual being so he always tends to cover up the area of the genitals in order to get the postulate out of the positive into the negative. In other words a male's penis is positively ionized "must sex." Well he gets fed up with this, so what he'll do is he'll cover it up and the thing he covers it up with he ionizes with "mustn't sex". You see? Now he's retained his freedom of choice.

Similarly with the female, she will cover up her area of the vagina and her buttocks there, which are ionized "must be sexed", she'll cover this up with a skirt and so forth. Then she can ionize the skirt "mustn't be sexed" and she regains her freedom of choice.

It helps her in sexual games play. When she hasn't got any clothes on it's very difficult for her to change the ionization because the body's got a fixed ionization. So you'll find that the humans prefer to have clothes on in sexual games play because it allows them to play the sex games more easily because of the fixed ionization of their body gender parts. Follow that? So this is the basis of sexual modesty. There's no great mystery about it, it's a very natural thing.

There's nothing I've said on this tape which changes in any way the way you run the "to sex" goals package in therapy. You run the "to sex" goals package exactly as I've stated so far and there's no change at all. You run it exactly the way I've said in the write-up. None of this data changes it in the slightest. This is all background data which you'll find of inestimable value once you start playing with the "to sex" goals package at level 5B.

You'll find, you'll suddenly be working with the package and then something will happen and you'll think, "Oh Christ yes, Dennis mentioned that on the tape, now I understand; now I can see what's going on here." And if you haven't got this little bit of data you'd be floundering around and wonder what the hell's going on. And when you've got the data it will come apart easily.

You'll have a much easier trip erasing that "to sex" goals package than I had I can assure you, because I had all this phenomena show up and I had to figure out what the hell was going on too.

You don't have to do this. I've done it for you so you should have a rather easy trip on this "to sex" goals package because I've taken all the bugs out for you.

So well that's about it Greg. The "to know" goals package is the toughest one of all to erase. But the "to sex" package will run it a close second only because of the gender specialization of the human body and the peculiar sexual ionization of the human body and that is the only reason why it is a toughie. Once you understand these ionizations you've extracted the teeth out of the "to sex" goals package in therapy and it will surely erase rather easily.

But never the less, it is the second most difficult one to erase. It is a toughie and I can assure you there's no other way to take the subject of sex apart in humans than to erase that goals package. There isn't any other way to do it. It's just simply cannot be done. You've got to get that package erased. When you've got the package erased you've done it. And until you've got the package erased you haven't done it. And the package is erasable. I can assure you it is erasable because I've done it.

But even when you've got the package erased your body will still contain its sexual peculiarities and it's sexual ionizations and so forth. It won't change those in the slightest. You'll just have to learn to live with them. But at least you'll understand them and they won't bother you anymore.

Well we'll leave it at that. We're coming up to the end of the tape so I'll post this off to you when I know your back from your holiday. So bye bye for now.

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)

1 0 . 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)

1 2 . knowledge and its application in the conquest of the material universe. (HCL 1, 5203CM03A)

1 3 . an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful. (HCO PL 27 Oct 64)

1 4 . 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