

05 The Game Strategy

By Dennis Stephens

Edited for Publication by

Pete McLaughlin

Second Edition May 2014

Cover Design by Leona McLaughlin

Cover Image © 2013 Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved.

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	7
The Game Strategy	9
Game Strategy Defined	11
Number 1. Fixed Solution	12
Number 2 Generates Game Sensation	13
Number 3. Secrecy	13
Number 4. Must Be Known to Work	16
Running Solo	21
Therapy for GS's	22
If it won't Erase	24
The Compulsion to Move	27
Zugzwang	28
Zugzwang Example	31
Game Loss is Inevitable	33
The Losing Game Option	33
Senior Encompassing Game	34
Zugzwang Defined	36
Zugzwang Logical Propositions	37
Zugzwang Analysis	38
Avoiding Zugzwang	42
Forcing Zugzwang on Others	43
The Surprise Game	45
The Surprise Game	49
Surprise and Not Know	51
Basic-Basic Solo Games	52

The Playmate	56
Liability in the Surprise Game	59
Voices in their Head	62
Second Addendum to Theory Section	65
Affinity, Communication, Reality and Understanding	66
Communication is the Action of Creating	
Complementary Postulates	66
Code of the Ethical Being	67
Within-Game Ethics Continued	68
Blame and Guilt	68
Creating the Mind	69
Freedom	71
It Seemed Like a Good Idea At the Time	73
Vengeance	79
Stimulus Response Mechanism	81
Vengeance Defined	82
Games Play Must Be Compulsive	84
Postulate Set Reduced to a One Game Class Set	84
Vengeance Goals Packages	87
Non Life Goals Packages	89
Vengeance Goes on Forever	90
Dissociation	93
Bill Robertson	94
No Such Thing as Entities	96
Dissociation	99
The Haunted Mind Theory	99
The Hidden Influence	101
Anything Influencing Your Mind You Can Communicate	
With	101

Communication Theory	102
The Anatomy of Dissociation	103
Circuits and the Bouncer	103
Entities	104
Compulsion	104
Multiple Personality Disorder	105
Schizophrenia	106
Paranoia	106
Ron and Sexuality	108
The Solution to the Subject of Dissociation. He Can't Stop It.	109
Never Took My Finger off the Machine Therapy	111
What is an identity?	112
How to Get Rid of Entities	114
Problem with NOTS	115
Somatics and Efforting	118
Dissociative Phenomena is Cumulative	121
Common Personality Types and Frequency	121
What type of incidents upset you?	124
To Be Know	124
To Know	124
To Not Know	125
To Be Not Known	126
Dissociative Personality Type	127
Addendum - Addressing Entities	128
Glossary	131

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 Game Strategy

May 10, 1994

By Dennis Stephens

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 2, 2012

Ok, and I want to talk about one of the more fascinating of the mental mechanisms. This is the subject of the game strategy. We usually use the abbreviations for game strategy and call it a GS.

The GS is a fundamental mental mechanism. So therefore, as you work through the practical exercises. You'll come across it piecemeal and if you hear this tape it will put the whole picture together for you. You'll understand what you're dealing with.

Eventually, of course, you would put the whole thing together for yourself. You would understand the mechanism. Anyone who's worked solo for a while or even with other people will recognize this mechanism.

They may have come across it in therapy, piecemeal, bits here, bits there but I think they'll find that when they hear this talk on the subject it'll put all the ends together for them and they'll understand the mechanism in total, the mechanism of the game strategy. The GS.

The Two Methods to Win Games

There are in life, and they're in life and livingness only, there are in fact two ways to win a game. **The first method is the direct power of postulate method. The use of the direct postulate.**

One simply goes out, meets the opponent head on and crashes through his postulate with yours and drives him into overwhelm. That is the direct postulate method of winning games. That's method number one.

That has got nothing to do with game strategies. That is not a strategy. That is simply going out and winning games by direct power of postulate. So that's got nothing to do with game strategies.

But the second method is the method of winning games by the use of a game strategy.

So we define a game strategy as a method of winning games below the use of a direct postulate. Give it to you again; **A game strategy is a method of winning a game below the level of a direct postulate.**

Now very clearly this is a vast field. This is a vast field, so what we need to do is to define our game strategy, is to put the limits to the field that we're looking at and until we've defined it we'll be at sea.

It's not a particularly easy one to define, a game strategy, because of its broad application. But when you examine the following I think you'll find that it does cover the subject of the game strategy.

I found no exception to this definition. It's, as far as I'm concerned, a complete definition of a game strategy.

Game Strategy Defined

Right, here we go, a game strategy:

In order to be a game strategy a thing:

- 1. must be a fixed solution to a problem**
- 2. must generate game sensation**
- 3. must be kept secret from the opponent or he or she will counter it with ease**
- 4. must be known to work by having been successfully used by self on others and by others on self**

That is the end of the definition.

If a thing possesses all of those four qualities it definitely is a game strategy. If it only possesses one or two or less than four of those things it may or may not be a game strategy. It may be one and you simply haven't found all of it.

But certainly, if you find something in your mind that possesses all of those four qualities it is a game strategy and all game strategies possess all four of those qualities, so it is a definition.

Now there's two more; numbers five and number six. These aren't a part of the definition but they are qualities of the GS, and if you know them they'll help you in your understanding. That the GS is an overt act and is therefore culpable. That's number five

Number six, exposure of a GS always produces shame.

I think when you examine the foregoing that you will find that they're necessary and sufficient conditions for the understanding of this mental mechanism called the games strategy. The GS.

[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)]

Number 1. Fixed Solution

And now we'd better go ahead and start expanding this material to get an understanding of it.

The easiest way to get the understanding is to go through the definition bit by bit. Now we'll start off with number one, it must be a fixed solution to a problem. Well, yes, the GS must be a fixed solution to the problem.

Well what is the problem? Well the problem is how to win the game below the level of the direct postulate.

Well there may be a number of reasons why a person can't use a direct postulate. They may have insufficient power of postulate to win the game or they may have sufficient power of postulate but winning that game is against the law, so they can't win it by power of postulate. You see that?

But, never the less, they may have a desire to win that game but they can't use direct power of postulate because the society inhibits the use of that power of postulate. So they mustn't use it, so then they have to go into the games strategy. So it's always a fixed solution to a problem. It's a solution to a problem, and it's a fixed solution to the problem.

Note that word, "fixed solution", in the earlier part of the supplementary lectures I talked very lengthily about the subject of the fixed solution and I'm not going to talk about it on this tape. I'm not going to cover that material again. The subject of the fixed solution is very germane to this subject of the game strategy but it is a separate piece of technology and I refer you to the earlier tape.

[the fixed solution is presented in the lecture "Dissociation." see the table of contents for Dissociation -editor]

[Note - Dennis explains how a fixed solution comes about in number 4 below - editor]

So the game strategy is a fixed solution to a problem. It's always a fixed solution.

Like all fixed solutions it may eventually become a problem in its own right but that comes later in the cycle. It's always a fixed solution, even when it's a problem it's still a fixed solution. It's always a fixed solution to a problem. So much for number one.

Number 2 Generates Game Sensation

It must generate game sensation. That is absolutely fundamental again. It's got to generate game sensation. **The application of the game strategy has got to win the game, you see, or at least it's got to produce some game sensation or show a semblance of winning the game, otherwise the thing is useless.**

So a part of the game strategy is that it must generate game sensation. If this activity you have in mind doesn't generate game sensation then I can assure you that it's not a game strategy. It's not a game strategy. It must generate game sensation. There must be some sensation generated by this activity, this behavior pattern.

All right so much for that, now number three.

Number 3. Secrecy

It must be kept secret from the opponent or he or she will counter it with ease. That's number three. It must be kept secret from the opponent.

Well this is obvious on first principles. If the person could win the game by direct power of postulate they wouldn't need the game strategy and the game strategy will only work when it's kept secret from the opponent.

Now bear that in mind it must be kept secret from the opponent or he or she will counter it with ease.

Now this poses an interesting thing, this air of secrecy about the game strategy infects the whole subject of the game strategy.

The game strategy starts off by being a secret and it's always a secret. It can be so secret that it becomes even a secret from the person whose using it. He forgets why he is using it after a while it's so secret. You know?

It not only must be kept secret from the opponent but it ends up being kept a secret from him too. He finds himself in a compulsive behavior where he's lost contact with why he's doing it. So this is a definite part of the pattern, is this secrecy. So in terms of our "to know" goals package, the postulate structure of the GS would be that it's a "must be known to self". At least early in the cycle it "must be known to self" but it "must be not known" to the opponent.

See. It's a "must be known" to self but "mustn't be known" to the opponent. That's the postulate structure of it.

And this throws a very strange complexion on the subject of the game strategy, very strange complexion.

It's almost paradoxical, the game strategy is, and that's why it's not easy for researchers to cobble all the little bits together. I mean, Ron Hubbard in Scientology, he had various parts of the game strategy. He knew various bits of the game strategy but he never put the whole thing together and called it a game strategy. He had bits and it was the secrecy part of it that was beating him all the time.

It eluded me for a long while until I began to understand it, but the game strategy as a strategy is an existence, so as an existence it's a "be known" it's a "be known". But a part of its strategy is that it "mustn't be known" to the opponent. So it's got this "be not known" component to it.

So as far as the person is concerned, he can know the strategy but it "mustn't be known" to the opponent otherwise it's useless. The opponent can counter it with ease.

So it's got this double edged effect. Do you get that? It's a "be known" it's an existence but at the same time it "mustn't be known" to the opponent and so there's a secrecy component in it and this holds it in suspension in the mind. This is why it doesn't easily erase. Why it's very difficult to handle in routine therapy.

The game strategy construction is an analytical construction, it is not a reactive construction. In other words it's not a reactive thing; it's a thing of the analytical mind. It's a thing that a person cobbled together themselves.

So you must understand that about it. It's not something which has its genesis in the reactive bank. It is something which has its genesis in the analytical mind of the individual, who has a need to win games and creates the game strategy in order to win the game.

So if you understood the whole of a particular game strategy and got all the bits of it together and could see it in terms of a series of postulates or a one to one postulate, or as a pattern of behavior and could wrap it all up, this game strategy could be made the subject of the "to know" goals package at level 5C.

It is an existence in its own right, the whole thing is an existence and it is erasable at level 5C as an existence. You must never forget that. That it is an existence and it therefore is a junior universe and therefore is erasable at level 5C.

But you've got to understand for any particular game strategy you've got to get all the bits out before you can do that. You've got to get it all out. That's why I'm giving you this data to help you get it all out.

So it must be kept secret from the opponent or he or she will oppose it with ease. That's number three.

Number 4. Must Be Known to Work

Now number four. It must be known to work by having been successfully used by self on others and by others on self.

Now this number four gives us the genesis of the game strategy. This tells us where the person got the game strategy from. 99.9% of game strategies you will come across in the psyche have their origins in childhood.

The game strategy might not have been fully developed in childhood. It might not have been until adolescence or later life that the thing became a fully fledged game strategy in the persons psyche but the origins of it are in childhood.

The idea of a particular game strategy, the seeds of it, always come from this fact, that the strategy has been used successfully on them. The first thing that happens is somebody uses this strategy or something very similar to it on them and it works and the child realizes this is a useful technique. They see this work, and they think, "Well, gee, that really worked on me" and then they start cobbling it and putting it together and start using it on someone else and they find it works on someone else.

And so then they start to use it. Then they start to put it into action, and eventually it becomes the permanent fixed solution to this problem of how to win a particular game.

But its genesis is always present, there's no exceptions to this rule, the person didn't create the idea, they didn't sort a pick it out of a cloud or dream it up or anything.

Those two factors are actually present that the GS has been used on them successfully and they have successfully used the GS on others. Those things are always present on every GS and don't miss it. If you miss it you'll never get the roots from the GS out. Those two factors are always present.

This is where the person gets the conviction that it works. He has double conviction that it works because it worked on him and he's made it work on others. So he has an unshakable belief in the efficacy of his GS.

What better belief could he have in the efficacy of the GS than that it's been used successfully on him and he's used it successfully on others.

So he knows it works. So he puts it into action.

As you examine the GS you'll realize that there's something sneaky about every games strategy, simply because they are withheld from the opponent.

There's a withhold factor in there, that the opponent is not part and parcel of what is going on. In fact, in order for the thing to work the opponent must be in the dark as to what is happening and that is an essential part of any GS. Number 3 it must be kept secret.

Now quite apart from the fact that it must be kept secret, because if the opponent discovers it, it's useless, quite apart from that, the GS is an overt act. In its own right it's an overt act. It's not considered an appreciated act it's not a loving act. Anyone who's been on the receiving end of a GS they would say that someone was committing an overt act against them, A sneaky overt act because it's not an obvious one. It's not all out in the open, it's covert. There's a coyness about the GS which makes it unpleasant, makes it very unpleasant.

So you'll find that every GS is an overt act and therefore culpable, is blameworthy. You're not supposed to have GS's in polite society you're not supposed to have them.

Now this fact produces enormous conflict in the mind of the games player. On the one hand he has the compulsion to play games and win games and there's certain games he considers that he cannot win by direct postulate, by direct power of postulate.

So he has to use a game strategy in order to win them. He has the compulsion to win them and so he has a compulsion to use the game strategy mechanism, but on the other hand every time he uses the mechanism he builds up in his mind a burden of guilt.

He knows he didn't ought to be doing it, he didn't ought to be using the mechanism because the GS is an overt act and is therefore culpable. He can be blamed for doing it. Also that the GS must be kept secret, it's got to be kept secret otherwise it doesn't work.

Now you're beginning to get the pressure cooker effect on the games player here. On the one hand he considers that he must use the GS because he can't use anything else to win games. So he's got to keep using the GS but every time he puts it into action he adds to his burden of guilt and the GS eventually becomes like a powder keg in his mind.

He keeps piling up the overts every time he uses it but he daren't mention it to anyone cause their culpable acts. See it's an overt act. You see the cliff stick the compulsive games player gets himself into by the use of the GS, the games strategy mechanism.

(Note - Cliff stick - computer game in which a stick figure repeatedly jumps off a cliff and performs various maneuvers. The player gets points on performance but the stick man always ends up dead at the base of the cliff.-Editor)

He ends up with a powder keg in his mind that is getting bigger and bigger and bigger and the fuse is getting shorter and shorter and shorter, so it should come as no surprise to you to discover that the sudden exposure of a highly charged GS can produce the most violent reactions in therapy and in life that are known, and can be known.

Some of those sudden inexplicable homicides that you read about in the newspaper and hear about on TV are undoubtedly the result of a sudden exposure of a GS.

For instance in a marriage situation if either the husband or the wife suddenly exposes the spouses GS and the powder keg blows, the sudden flush of shame and guilt just tears the person's mind apart explosively and they'll pick up a knife, a gun or anything and kill the other person.

The urge is to destroy the other person whose trying to break their GS because once it's exposed it's useless and so it's a destructive exposure.

The psychotherapist is aware of the mechanism. Ron Hubbard caught the flavor of this, you remember his mechanism of the "missed-missed withhold" in therapy. He caught this. He'd have preclears blow in session when a withhold was missed. He used to say the "missed-missed withhold", you know, and the mechanism there.

What he was seeing as missed withholds were really parts of game strategies and they had a powder keg type of charge on them and the preclear wasn't certain whether the auditor knew about it or whether the auditor didn't know about it.

And it was upsetting the preclear in the session and making the preclear ARC breaky and eventually the preclear would blow the session. He didn't quite know whether the auditor knew or whether the auditor didn't know about his GS.

But Ron didn't know all the factors of the GS. He knew the explosive withhold there and he introduced the mechanism of the missed withhold and the ARC break. He knew of the mechanism even though he didn't know how the powder keg produced that much charge.

Well we know why the powder keg comes about. We know the anatomy of the GS. We got the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4. We know how it comes about and how the conflict between the need to use the GS and the need to keep it secret builds up charge.

And we know the fact that an auditor, a separate therapist can quite inadvertently blow the powder keg into view at any moment in therapy, so the preclear will either blow therapy, kill the therapist or take off to China, or do anything in that instant of the exposure of the highly charged GS.

You don't know what the persons going to do. Their an irrational being in that instant when the powder keg blows. You don't know what's going to happen. So the explosive GS exposed; never miss it. The explosive GS exposed.

Every separate therapist should thoroughly understand this mechanism. Anyone who wants to spend their life professionally as a psychotherapist should understand this mechanism and should understand the anatomy of what a game strategy is and understand it's complete anatomy so they know what happens when the preclear blows in the session. They've hit a GS.

It never happens for any other reason. It's the only reason a preclear will blow in a session. It's the only reason he gets so terribly upset and ARC broken when there no palpable reason that the auditor's done anything wrong.

The sessions going along fine, there's no flub by the auditor, he's running the right process, everything's going fine, suddenly the preclear ups and blows. What happened? Well he touched the corner of a GS. The explosive GS exposed.

It's too much for the preclear. The preclear quits. The person with the GS is in an impossible position, it's culpable but he's got to keep using it because it's the only way he knows to generate the game sensation and he's got to keep generating sensation which the GS produces for him.

So he's in a compulsion to use the GS because it works so he can't stop using it. It's a fixed solution to a problem, he can't stop using it. He's got to use it to generate the sensation and to win the game but on the other hand it must be kept secret. No one must know about it.

So is it any wonder that the charge builds up on the GS and that exposure of the GS in the therapy session can produce an explosive effect on the preclear. It puts him in an impossible position. The thing mustn't be exposed but it is being exposed. It can be shattering on the individual, the sudden exposure of a game strategy.

So bear that in mind, the power of the mechanism. I'm not talking about Patty-cakes here. I'm talking about sheer mental charge here man, the real charge in the mind is in the field of GS's.

You'll find more charge on this subject of game strategies than you'll find on any other aspect of the human psyche. The sheer charge, the powder keg there. Man it's quite incredible, quite incredible.

Running Solo

Of course, when a person's running solo they don't have any trouble, do they? There they are both the therapist and the patient. They're both. They are the auditor and the preclear. So there's no charge. So they can examine their GS's in peace and quiet without any charge at all.

Without any explosive charge, they'll feel the emotions of the shame if there was any time when their GS was partially exposed or they thought they might be exposed, they will feel the shame. And they'll feel the guilt, the pile of guilt on their GS, they'll feel all that and they'll be aware of the powder keg, and they can take the thing apart but it will not blow when they are running solo.

It can't blow because there is no exposure. The person who is erasing the GS is the owner of the GS.

You can take your own GS's apart in absolute safety, there's going to be no homicides, you're not going to end up shooting yourself, I can assure you, there's no homicide, the powder keg never explodes. It just dissolves and finally it vanishes. Now the subject of GS's is very broad. I'm not even going to attempt to give you an example of a GS. I'm not going to even attempt it because the subject is just too broad, but I've given you the definitions and there's 1, 2, 3 and 4. If it fits 1, 2, 3 and 4 then it's a GS and there's the two subsidiaries number 5 and number 6. If you know that about it, it's a GS.

Therapy for GS's

Now I will tell you how you handle them in therapy.

Commonly what happens with a GS is that you become more and more aware of it as therapy progresses. That you become aware of this bit here and there's a bit there then you start to put the behavior together and recognize a pattern.

The person may be doing it quite unconsciously. Like all fixed solutions, eventually they are below the conscious awareness of the person.

But as the therapy proceeds the person will become more and more aware of this behavior and then they start to think, "Well there's a GS" and then they start to put the bits together and they get 1, 2. It fits 1, it fits 2 and it fits 3, "My God it fits 4. God it's a GS." You see?

Now they can start looking at it, and say, "Well now, this is interesting, I've got a GS." He didn't know he had one.

What can he do about it. Well he should proceed on with the ordinary therapy. He should proceed on with the ordinary therapy right until the point where he gets to level 5C. That is the place where you would address a GS if you wanted to address it particularly, this particular thing, you could address it at level 5C.

They are not amenable to addressing as a specific entity prior to level 5C and that is the place where you would address them if you wanted to address them.

And the GS is addressed just like you would address any other junior universe at level 5C. There's no difference.

There's no difference and they come apart like a lamb at level 5C, they do. There's no trouble at all.

What would you do at level 5C? You get to a point eventually where you know all about the GS, you know about the 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 you've got the lot. You know everything there is to know about this GS in your psyche.

Then what you do is you classify it as a universe. You classify it as an entity. You just classify it as a person, an identity that has these characteristics, desires to put this GS into action, there. Get the idea?

You're simply classifying the thing as an entity. You're imagining an entity in your mind that is putting this GS into action.

Now I realize that this is a bit of compartmentalization, but it's quite safe to do it this late in therapy, no harm will come of you. No danger of compartmentalizing your mind this late in therapy. You're not going to go schizophrenic I can assure you. There's no danger. No danger to it.

I wouldn't recommend you play around with this at level 2 or level 3, but at level 5C there's such a little charge left on the mind that it's quite safe to do it. So you sort of imagine an entity who has a fixed urge to put this GS into action and you specify each part of the GS in the entity in words.

To give you an example, it might be with a ridiculous example. A catfish trapper might be the sort of thing you'd end up with. This would be the identity you're dealing with. A catfish trapper, someone who's got a GS which compulsively traps catfish. You see?

Well then you simply take the catfish trapper and make that identity the subject matter of the “to know” goals package at level 5C and proceed to erase.

If it won't Erase

Now if the identity doesn't erase, we know why it doesn't erase. There's only one reason why it won't erase this late in therapy and that is that there are purposes associated with the identity which have to do with junior goals packages at level 5B, so you'd have to look at this.

Maybe the word trap, you'd have to say, “Well all right, a catfish trapper traps. Well the goal “to trap” is un-erasable so you'd have to find an erasable goal wherein the goal “to trap” is located. Well the goal “to free” contains the goal “to trap” in its negative legs so you'd have to then sit down and erase the goal “to free”. See that?

Then having erased that, you go back and check the general “to know” goals package. Then you go back to level 5C and pick up your catfish trapper again and go ahead with your erasure at level 5C.

You follow that? In other words, it's a standard erasure of the junior universe, there. You're not doing anything special. All this I've explained before. It's all in the write up of how to do it, of how you handle a junior universe at level 5C. You're treating it routinely as a junior universe at level 5C.

But you need to specify it, to get it into words. Don't just have it as an airy idea in your mind, get down to the nitty-gritty.

What is this identity doing? Well he's a catfish trapper that sums him up, he's a catfish trapper. That's all he does. That's necessary and sufficient to describe him. Then you can use him; then you can use him in therapy.

Until you've got him specified, got him nailed down in words you won't get any success at level 5C. While it's just an airy fairy thing in your mind you'll just flounder. But soon as you can get the junior universe specified and named at level 5C then you can proceed with the erasure.

Now so help me, there's no more to the erasure of the GS at level 5C than that.

The vast majority of the charge on the GS comes off before you get to level 5C, you're only dealing with the last 2 or 3% of charge this late in therapy. All the rest of the charge has come off in the preceding therapy steps. So don't expect to see any fireworks at level 5C. The thing will erase like a lamb. Come across quite easily.

But I'll tell you something quite interesting, the "to know" goals package will not erase, the general "to know" goals package will not erase in therapy while you have some outstanding GS's still running in your life. You've got to get rid of these GS's before the general "to know" goals package will erase. So that is the general rule there.

Remember the general rule when you get to level 5, top of level 5B if that "to know" package won't erase then the only thing that could be preventing the erasure is a junior universe, which caused us to invent level 5C in the first place.

So it's quite consistent with our rules that the ongoing GS in the psyche, un-erased, can and will prevent the erasure of the general to know goals package at level 5A and prevent the completion of level 5.

So it's a particular type of junior universe, a particular nasty and insidious type of junior universe, but that is all the GS is. You'll find it's a junior universe.

But it has those particular qualities and you'll have a lot of fun with the GS's till you finally tame them and come to grips with them and to understand them. They are more common than you think. You've got more than one. Everyone has more than one, but your first one will be the toughest. When you've got that one erased the second one's easier because you know what to look for. You know the breed of cat.

And after you've done 2 or 3 of them the rest will go by inspection, you won't have to do anything, you'll just have to think about them and they will blow. They'll fall apart. So that's the subject of the GS. It's a fascinating subject, absolutely fascinating.

Ron Hubbard never got all of it. He got nearly every part of the GS except the whole mechanism; he never put it all together and understood the mechanism exactly as we've got it here in TROM.

But there's the mechanism and I wish you good luck with its resolution.

End of tape

The Compulsion to Move

By Dennis Stephens

May 10, 1994

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 6, 2012

Today is the 10th of May 1994, the same date as the lecture on the other side of this tape and I want to talk to you about what is undoubtedly the most puzzling of all the mental mechanisms.

It is not only the most puzzling but is also evidently the one that's least understood. There is not even a word in the English language which gets close to describing the mechanism.

Yet the mechanism is very common; causes considerable stress to every games player, particularly compulsive games players who are highly trained to the mechanism and under certain circumstances the games loss that the mechanism can bring about can ruin a person's life.

Although on the other end of the spectrum the game loss can be quite trivial, but never the less there's a broad spectrum of possible game loss associated with the mechanism. So it's far from a trivial mechanism.

When I first discovered this mechanism in my own psyche during my research I started to hunt up my psychology books and general reference books and I could find absolutely no trace of this mechanism.

Zugzwang

And I was hard put upon to find a title that would describe the mechanism till I remembered that the mechanism occurred in the game of chess. The noble game of chess contains this mechanism, and in chess the mechanism is called zugzwang. So we will adopt that title and use the word zugzwang to describe this mental mechanism.

The word **zugzwang** is a German word and the word zugzwang in German describes the mechanism exactly as it occurs in the game of chess. The translation of the German word **zugzwang is "the compulsion to move."**

Although the translation of this word is not an exact description of the mental mechanism it's close enough for our purposes.

So we will call this mental mechanism "zugzwang." It's as good a name as any and better than most.

I'd better start off by explaining how the mechanism occurs in the game of chess. What is zugzwang in chess?

Well zugzwang occurs in chess when a player although it's his move and his position is quite sound, any move he makes is a bad move and will lead to inevitable game loss. However, one of the rules of chess says that the player, when it is his turn to move, he must make a move or he will forfeit the game by violation of the rules of chess.

So the unfortunate player in zugzwang is faced with two losing game options. He either makes a move and loses the game by making a bad move or he loses the game by not making a bad move, and loses the game by breach of the rules of chess.

So to celebrate that they call the mechanism zugzwang in chess, which means literally the compulsion to move. The player is beaten by the compulsion to move.

Even in the game of chess we see this quality that is reflected in the life game that the player is under no particular threat and yet suddenly because of this compulsion to move he loses the game.

And similarly in life the player can be jogging along in games play, everything seems to be going well, when suddenly an event occurs. The next moment, he's facing a situation, he's in zugzwang. He hits a zugzwang situation and immediately goes into game loss. And it can be tremendously puzzling to the player because he just doesn't know what went on, what's happening.

He's not under a tremendous duress from the opponent. He's not under tremendous duress from the universe, but because of the particular circumstances that occur game loss is inevitable. And that's the situation he finds himself in. It's a most puzzling situation.

What makes it particularly upsetting for the games player is that he can't really blame anyone for the zugzwang. He doesn't know quite how he got overwhelmed, how he lost the game, because he's under no particular duress from anyone. And it's just because of the particular circumstances he finds himself in that he goes into game loss.

So psychologically the mechanism hangs fire on the time track. Nearly anyone who's been zugzwanged in life, and most people have, you'll find that the incident will sit there as a great puzzlement. They just don't know how it happened. They don't know quite what happened. They don't understand the mechanism of what happened to them and the unfortunate thing is that they don't understand what happened in the incident.

The incident contains a "not be known", contains a mystery and while the incident contains a mystery it won't erase. And while the incident won't erase, of course, the "to know" goals package won't erase.

You can't erase the "to know" goals package in the presence of mysteries, you see.

So the whole of level 5 can be prevented from completing because of a zugzwang incident sitting on a person's track.

This is why I'm mentioning the mechanism; I have to mention it to you because you may need this data to get it apart.

You may get the incident apart and discover it all for yourself. A person could do this like I discovered the mechanism in my own research, but never the less, this tape would be helpful to you, particularly if you'd tried and tried and tried and then despaired. Well this tape would then solve it for you, because I do understand the exact anatomy of zugzwang and the solution to zugzwang does occur. I do explain it in this tape. Now without more ado I think the best approach would be to give an immediate example from life of zugzwang.

Zugzwang Example

A wealthy businessman decided that he'd like to engage upon a little tax evasion and so he writes on his tax return form that he's made a large donation to a well known charity, when in fact, of course, he hasn't. And completes the tax return and sends it off to the tax office and thinks no more about it.

A few weeks later he gets telephone call from the charity thanking him very much for his donation and asking him when they can expect a check.

Now granting only that this businessman regards any unnecessary expenditure of money to the tax office or to the charity as a game loss, granting that, granting that and only granting that, then the man is zugzwang.

Now let's examine this situation. First off it is quite clear what has happened. That he sent his tax return in and because there's such a large amount of money involved in the donation to the charity that the tax office had contacted the charity and asked if it's true that he has made this donation to the charity. The charity upon receiving this information from the tax office said to the tax office, "We'll investigate, hang on, we'll let you know" and have thought to themselves, "Right, well... we can well get a good donation here." So they're very hopeful and they immediately contact the businessman and work on the basis that he's made this donation and they just simply want to know when they can expect to get the check. See?

So they're hopeful and the tax office is simply doing their job. Now that's how the situation came about, quite clearly. Now when we examine this situation we see that the businessman isn't under any tremendous duress here, is he? There's no overwhelming force being directed against him, yet his game loss is inevitable. What could he do?

Well the first thing that he could do is pay the charity the amount that he said he would pay them in his tax return. He pays the charity. The charity then report back to the tax office that they've received the check from the from the businessman and that satisfies the tax office, and so their happy.

And the charity is happy, the tax office is happy but the man has lost the game because he's now paid, in his own mind, an unnecessary expenditure of money to the charity, so he suffered game loss.

So that's one option. The other option he can make is to not pay the charity, but if he doesn't pay the charity, the charity are bound to report back to the tax offices that they've received no donation from this businessman to their charity in that financial year.

Now because of the large amount of money involved on the tax return the tax office is bound to take some action on this and they will fine the man for forwarding a false tax return. So again, he suffers game loss here; he's now paying out unnecessary money to the tax office.

So if he pays the charity he loses the game and if he doesn't pay the charity then he has to pay the tax office and again he loses the game, so either way he's going to lose the game. So we say he's zugzwang and the game loss is inevitable.

Now I could give you many more examples of zugzwang but I won't do so because that example is quite sufficient for our purposes and is a good typical example of zugzwang. Not every zugzwang contains an intent on the part of the game player to break the law or do anything untoward but, never the less, that example is quite typical, quite typical of the zugzwang situation.

Game Loss is Inevitable

Now the first thing we must understand about zugzwang situation is that game loss is inevitable, don't miss that one. Game loss in zugzwang is inevitable. The person isn't going to get out of the game loss, it's inevitable.

One way or another he's going to lose the game. And it's our goal our purpose on this tape to discover just what is going on and why this is inevitable.

Well there are a few technical terms and technical things we need to look at and examine. Then we can go ahead and do what we call a zugzwang analysis and you will see when we've completed the analysis the whole picture becomes very clear.

The Losing Game Option

So first of all let's take up the first of these technical terms. The first of our technical terms we need to look at is this subject of a losing game option.

Now this is a technical term in games play. It's a technical term and is defined as follows. A losing game option is any action that the player is free to undertake that he knows will lead to game loss. **Any action that the games player is free to undertake that he knows will lead to game loss.** End of definition.

So there are two things about the losing game option that are important. One is that there is freedom of choice in it. **A person is free to engage upon this action or is free to engage upon the action or not to engage upon the action.** There is no compulsion. There's a free action.

And the other is that they know, are consciously aware, **they do know that if they engage upon this action they will lose the game.** That's why we call it a losing game option.

Now every postulate that a person operates on in games play can have a number of losing game options. I'll give you an example of this and you'll see what I mean.

If a person is operating on the purpose to survive then a losing game option is to throw themselves off a cliff. They know that if they throw themselves off a cliff they will lose the game; they will not survive.

They also know that Losing game option A is "throw themselves off a cliff" and Losing game option B might be "to shoot themselves through the heart with a bullet" and both will cause them to die and cause them to lose the game when their running on the game postulate to survive.

So you see that any game can have a large number of losing game options. You see that?

It's not a one to one proposition. Not a one to one relationship between a postulate and a losing game option.

The other thing you need to know about the relationship here, between a game postulate and the losing game options is that **if the game postulate changes the losing game options change.** That much is obvious on first principles but I thought I better mention it for completeness sake.

Senior Encompassing Game

Now the next technical thing we need to understand with this mechanism of zugzwang is the concept of a senior encompassing game.

I won't give a precise definition of this I'll simply describe it to you and you'll understand what it is.

By its name it's obvious that the game the person is playing is surrounded by a larger game.

An example of a senior encompassing game is all the games on this planet are played within the physical laws that govern this universe. So the laws that govern the physical universe are a senior encompassing game to any games that are played on this planet.

Another example of a senior encompassing game can be the laws of the country or the laws of the land in which you live. You may be playing certain games within the country in which you live but you're playing these within the structure of the laws of the land.

Generally speaking senior encompassing games fall into two types. Their either the laws of the physical universe itself or their the laws of the land or the laws that your operating on in the society in which your living.

They may be something as simple as the laws of the game of chess, but they're, never the less, an agreed upon set of laws that when you play a game of chess you abide by these laws. So there again they are a part of the society in which you live. So there are, generally speaking, only two types of senior encompassing game, the laws of the physical universe itself, and the laws of the society in which you live.

Ok so much for that.

Now zugzwang comes about and this is the inner datum of the inner datum about zugzwang, zugzwang comes about in games play when a situation arises where the senior encompassing game impinges upon the game of the player and produces a relationship between his losing game options of a particular type.

Let's call any two of the losing games options of a postulate, A and B. So we have this postulate and any two of its losing game options of this postulate we'll call A and B.

In a zugzwang situation the senior encompassing game, because of the circumstances, impinges upon the player and causes his losing game options to be related in the form "if not A then B"

Now I'll go through it again. The zugzwang situation occurs when the situation is such that the senior encompassing game impinges upon the game of the player and causes any two of his losing game options of a postulate to be related in the form "if not A then B" and that is zugzwang.

Zugzwang Defined

I'll give you a formal definition of zugzwang, **"A player is said to be zugzwang when any two of the losing game options of a postulate, call them A and B, are brought into the relationship "if not A then B" by the impingement of a senior encompassing game. The game loss in zugzwang is inevitable."**

Now when we look at that definition we see why the games loss is inevitable. It's inevitable simply because if the person's games options or losing game options I should say are in the relationship "if not A then B" then if a person doesn't embark upon losing game option A then he must embark upon losing game option B and therefore would lose the game.

So he's in a "no good choice" situation, he's in this cliff stick of either losing the game by adopting losing game option A or if he doesn't embark upon game option A then he will embark upon game option B and lose the game. See that? That is the zugzwang. That is the zugzwang mechanism.

Now if you followed the complexity of this through so far you'll see that it's not surprising that the mechanism is very deeply buried and is very little understood. Why people get so terribly puzzled when they get zugzwanged. They simply do not understand the mechanism.

Zugzwang Logical Propositions

You have to be a bit of a logician. You have to be a bit of a psychologist and you have to be a bit of a mental researcher like me before you could even get close to understanding the mechanism of zugzwang in life.

For those of you who are logically inclined I can give you the logical propositions, the logical postulates of zugzwang. The person is operating on game postulate X, shall we say, and game postulate X has at least two losing game options which we will call A and B. OK?

There's our background, and zugzwang occurs when the senior encompassing game impinges and brings about this following situation. We have "if A then not X," "if B then not X", "if not A then B" just those three propositions, that's the end of those three propositions.

Now when you examine those three propositions in logic you will find that one of the valid deductions from those three propositions is that postulate X is reduced to zero. That those three propositions hold X equal to zero. In other words, postulate X cannot maintain. In other words it goes into loss. That's why the game loss is inevitable in Zugzwang. Postulate X cannot succeed, it can only fail under those circumstances. So for the benefit of logicians who may be listening to this tape that is the logic of zugzwang and if you write it down on a piece of paper and do the necessary piece of logical deduction you'll see that what I say is true. That's the logic of zugzwang.

Zugzwang Analysis

Now let us apply what we know to what we call the zugzwang analysis. Now the most difficult part of the analysis is understanding what we're doing, in other words if you've understood this so far the rest is easy. The difficult bit is behind us on the tape.

A zugzwang analysis is simply consists of isolating losing game options A and B. once you've got them it will stand out like a sore thumb there in the relationship "if not A then B" then you'll see why the games loss was inevitable.

So zugzwang analysis simply boils down to getting the situation at the point a zugzwang occurred, picking up the situation on the track at the point where zugzwang occurred. When you became aware that game loss was inevitable there and listing your losing game options.

Just list them, there won't be many. Usually there's only two, three, four, half a dozen at the very outside.

Most commonly there are just two, call them A and B and you will see at a glance that your faced with a situation of either adopting A or if you don't adopt A then you must adopt B. But because A and B are both losing game options, game loss is inevitable. And once you've done that you understand the zugzwang.

The mystery comes out of the zugzwang. You see how the senior encompassing game has forced game loss on you. That peculiar relationship of "if not A then B" between the two losing game options in the situation. If you understand that, then you understand everything about the zugzwang in that situation and it collapses.

You don't really need to know what your game postulate was once you start listing your losing game options. The postulates that these losing game options are associated with or connected to will pop into your mind so that you will discover the game postulates.

There's only one postulate that's involved. There's not a number of postulates. It's just one postulate that goes into failure in zugzwang, and it is the failure of that postulate that brings about the game loss.

There are not a number of postulates that go into failure in zugzwang, there's just the one.

Now let's apply this analysis to our examples of zugzwang.

First we'll apply it to the game of chess. Well here the application is so trivial that it will fall apart as we touch it.

Here are the losing game options. The player has two losing game options. Option A he makes a move, bearing in mind they are all bad moves and losing game option B is to refuse to make a move.

Well the senior encompassing game here is the laws of chess. That's the senior encompassing game, and when he's in the zugzwang situation then he's in a situation where "if not A then B" maintains, the laws of chess insist on that. Now that's the senior encompassing game impinging upon the particular game of chess that's being played.

In other words he's faced with the situation where if he doesn't make a move then he's refusing to make a move and if he's refusing to make a move he loses the game by default, by violation of the rules of chess. In other words that's losing game option B. see that?

Now there's the analysis of zugzwang in chess.

The postulate that the player is operating on in the game of chess is "to not lose the game", to not lose it.

The chess player is always happy to either win the game or draw the game, his goal is not to lose it. So that's his postulate and his two losing game options will deny this postulate.

Ok that completes the analysis in the chess game.

Now let's apply the analysis to the business man and his donations to charity. Well let's start off with the postulate here. The postulate I've already given is that "the businessman doesn't want to make any unnecessary expenditure of money." That's his postulate.

So his losing game option A is "to pay the charity." That's losing game option A, and losing game option B is "to pay the tax office fine."

Now the senior encompassing game here is the laws of the land and is the laws of the tax office system, which says that under certain circumstances the tax office is bound to check up on what people put on their tax returns. That's a standard part of their operating procedure, is to make checks, particularly when there's large amounts of money involved. So that's the laws of the land and that's the laws of the senior encompassing game, and this senior encompassing game steps in and zugzwangs him.

The senior encompassing game impinges upon this game that he's playing and enforces this relationship of "if not A then B" between his losing game options and says that if you don't pay the charity then you will pay the tax office fine. "If not A then B", and thereby reduces him to zugzwang and inevitable game loss. You get it?

And you see how easy it is. Now all the bits are easily explainable. The whole mechanism comes apart when you understand the postulate, the losing game options, the senior encompassing game and this peculiar relationship of "if not A then B", that under certain circumstances the senior encompassing game can impose the losing game options.

What always puzzles a player about zugzwang is that he makes a postulate, which is not in opposition to any postulate in the universe or any law of the society in which he lives, necessarily. He makes this postulate and the next thing he knows is that the law of the universe or the law of the society enforces game loss upon him.

This is what makes it so terribly puzzling. He doesn't understand the mechanism of the senior encompassing game and the fact that he is not living in a vacuum. He's living in a society, he's living in a universe and this universe can impinge and can impose upon him and can upset the affairs of mice and men. You see what I'm getting at here?

This is what he doesn't grasp. When the person understands this, understands that there is such a thing as a senior encompassing game and that he's got games within games, then he starts to understand the zugzwang mechanism.

He just adds to that this subject of the losing game options and that peculiar relationship that gets imposed upon them of "if not A then B" between any two of the losing games options of a postulate then that's the whole picture.

Now this analysis will take apart any zugzwang situation. The data I've given you on this tape is sufficient to take apart any zugzwang situation.

If you've got an incident on your track when you were zugzwanged then you pick up the incident at the point where game loss became inevitable. Where you suffered the inevitable game loss.

And that's the point to address and that's the point where you will most easily find your losing game options and most easily find the senior encompassing game and so forth.

It will all be there in that instant in time where the senior encompassing game imposed itself upon the junior game you might say and imposed zugzwang upon it. That's the point where you pick up the incident.

If you pick it up at that exact point all the data I've given you, all the bits will be there. They'll just fall, BANG, into place, bang, bang, bang, bang.

The zugzwang will come apart and you'll understand, possibly for the first time in many years just how come you lost that particular game.

Avoiding Zugzwang

A games player if he understands this mechanism very thoroughly and is able to change his postulates very quickly can avoid zugzwang.

In other words his postulates are in a fluid state, he can avoid the zugzwang because there's always intimations that it's happening. He always gets some time even if it's only for a few fractions of a second

Sometimes he's got days, weeks, months but he's always got some time in which to change his postulates and avoid the game loss.

In the game of chess it's inevitable. He can't avoid the game loss in chess because the rules of chess are quite inflexible, quite fixed and he abides by and agrees by those rules and so forth.

But let's take the example of the businessman. At the point where he received that phone call from the charity thanking him for his donation and asking when they can expect to receive a check. If at that point he changed his mind about what he considered game loss and regarded the expenditure of money to the charity as good, then he would avoid zugzwang, avoid game loss.

In other words if he no longer regarded it as a game loss to pay the charity, he can escape the zugzwang. He could write out a check for the charity and say, "Well I'm not losing the game when I pay the charity." So he could simply write out a check for the charity and everyone would be happy and he would not lose the game. If he can change his mind and adopt that mental attitude.

The non compulsive games player could do that. The compulsive games player can't do that, so he suffers the zugzwang.

So as I said earlier on, on the tape, **the people most likely to suffer zugzwang are the compulsive game players.** They are in a state of compulsive games play which fixes their postulates.

Their fixidity of postulates fixes them to such an extent that they can't change their postulates at a moment's notice when they have to in a zugzwang situation so they go into inevitable game loss. So it's the compulsive games player that suffers the most zugzwang. The non compulsive games player can avoid it.

Actually it's a very interesting observation upon our society, and how little is understood about life and games play in our society that this mechanism of zugzwang is not understood. I can assure you that the mechanism is totally not understood in our society and the fact that it is not understood is a total indictment upon our society in terms of how much it understands about life and games play, because the mechanism isn't a difficult one to take apart if you study it and are familiar with a few basics of life and livingness. Finally and very briefly there is a connection between the subject of zugzwang, overwhelm and the subject of the game strategies.

Forcing Zugzwang on Others

Quite obviously if you're in a frame of mind to do so and you know the losing game options and postulates of your opponent and the senior encompassing game of your opponent it's not difficult to set up a situation which puts your opponent in zugzwang and therefore inevitable game loss.

There are a number of game strategies called zugzwang game strategies. They used to be regarded in life as rather fiendish. Nobody really understands them but they can be highly workable by people who do have some understanding of this mechanism and have an urge to use such game strategies. So be prepared to find a connection between the subject of zugzwang and the subject of game strategies in life and livingness.

Well I see I'm coming up to the end of this tape now. I don't want to run off the end so we will close at this point. I hope this material was helpful to you. Bye, bye for now.

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.

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 the 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." "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 we are 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 collared. 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, 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. 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. They are 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?

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, they can be handled at levels 2 and 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 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

Second Addendum to Theory

Section

Cause is the action of bringing an effect into existence, taking an effect out of existence, knowing, or not-knowing. That which is brought into existence, taken out of existence, known, or not-known is called an effect.

Thus life, in all its manifestations, is causative.

Causation is the common denominator of all life impulses.

Causation is achieved by **postulates**. A **postulate** is a causative consideration. A consideration is defined as a thought, or idea.

Life can believe itself to be an effect, but that belief is itself a causative consideration.

Responsibility is the willingness to assume causation. A being can assume causation for anything.

The only liability to assuming causation is to run the being out of games. The only liability to not assuming causation is to give the being a surfeit of games.

Thus, as games become progressively more compulsive, the willingness to assume causation (responsibility) is seen to lessen.

Unwillingness to assume causation is thus a measure of the compulsiveness to play games in a being.

Affinity, Communication, Reality and Understanding

Complementary postulates enhance affinity; conflicting postulates lessen affinity.

Thus, affinity is the willingness to create complementary postulates. Love is the expression of affinity.

Reality is the degree to which complementary postulates are created. Thus, as games become progressively more compulsive things become progressively less real to the being. Things are only as real as one is creating complementary postulates regarding them.

Communication is the Action of Creating Complementary Postulates

When two or more beings adopt complementary postulates regarding a creation they share that creation, which is now a co-creation. They are said to be in agreement regarding that creation. Thus, agreement is a shared creation.

Beings, by means of their willingness to create complementary postulates (**affinity**) and by actually creating complementary postulates (**communication**), achieve co-creation (**reality**).

Thus understanding is achieved between beings.

Games, because they contain conflicting postulates, lessen **understanding** between beings.

A right action is a lovable action; it is an action that one is willing to create complementary postulates with.

A wrong action is an unlovable action; it is an action that one is unwilling to create complementary postulates with.

Thus, the concept of right and wrong is a concept brought about by games. There is no absolute right and no absolute wrong. What is considered right or wrong is relative to the being and the games he is playing. Thus, what is considered a right action in one society can be a capital offense in another.

Code of the Ethical Being

However, although the subject of what is right and what is wrong is within games there is a senior ethic. This is the subject of the right way to play games.

This ethic, being about games, is not relative to the being and the games he is playing and is thus not within games. This ethic is the Code of the Ethical Being.

- 1.NEVER FORCE A PERSON TO KNOW A THING AGAINST THEIR CHOICE.
- 2.NEVER PREVENT A PERSON FROM KNOWING.
- 3.NEVER FORCE A PERSON TO MAKE A THING KNOWN.
- 4.NEVER PREVENT A PERSON FROM MAKING A THING KNOWN.

While games are played within this ethic they retain all their element of fun, but cease to be the traps they become when played outside of this ethic.

The only safe way to play games is to play them within this ethic. But the being can only play within this ethic while games are non-compulsive.

Therefore he needs to address the subject of games with a view to taking the compulsion out of them. Thereafter he'll be able to play within the ethic, and enjoy games forever with no liability to his beingness.

Within-Game Ethics Continued

A game's rule is an agreement between beings denoting permissible (right) play.

Play outside of the rules is considered improper and therefore wrongful play. Laws are game's rules denoting permissible play in a society.

Thus, to accuse another of a wrong action is to accuse him of acting outside the rules of the game; it is to accuse him of unethical behavior.

Blame and Guilt

A being, having lost a game played fairly within the rules, can either accept the loss or attempt to imply that the victor had committed wrongful play. These are the only two choices open to him.

If he (the loser) can convince his opponent that he has committed wrongful play he (the victor) will believe that he has behaved unethically and did not win the game fairly. The action of assigning causation for wrongful (unethical) play to an opponent is called **blame**.

If the opponent accepts the blame he feels **guilt**.

Not wishing to behave in an unethical manner the guilty being resolves not to play in such a manner again. This, of course, is the precise effect intended by the blamer, who, now having succeeded in limiting his opponent's willingness to act, is more easily able to overwhelm him.

Thus, **blame** is seen as an attempt to lower another's willingness to act by invoking the suggestion of wrongful play, and thereby make him easier to overwhelm.

The **Blame/Guilt** mechanism is pure games play. The purpose of **blame** is only to permit the blamer to win games. Unable to win games any other way, and having the need to win games, he resorts to the **blame** mechanism in order to do so.

In that any life game has a near infinite number of possibilities within it, and that it is clearly impossible to draw up games rules for all of them, the **Blame/Guilt** mechanism is always available to a games player.

There is always some action he can point his finger at, declare it wrongful, and so attempt to make his opponent feel guilty - and thus use less than his full abilities in the playing of the game.

As a wrong act is essentially an unlovable act, the use of the **blame** mechanism is pure emotional blackmail: I'll withdraw my love (affinity) from you if you persist in acting in such a manner that prevents me from winning the game.

Creating the Mind

However, **blame** has the liability of having to convince the other being that a wrongness has occurred. **So the blamer has to keep the wrongness in existence in order to convince the other that it has occurred.**

Thus we find the blamer having to keep whole sections of his **mind** in existence in order to convince others that he has been wronged. It is a terrible price to pay for his compulsion to win games, but it clearly shows the limits to which beings will go in order to do so.

The **Blame/Guilt** mechanism breeds compulsive games play. Compulsive games play breeds the **Blame/Guilt** mechanism. They are inseparable, and where you find one you will always find the other.

By means of the **Blame/Guilt** mechanism life finally degenerates into a frantic attempt to make others guilty while equally frantically resisting their attempts to do the same thing to you.

At this level life is seen by the player as one vast sea of wrongness containing one tiny island of rightness - himself. And he knows above all things that if he stops assigning wrongness (**blame**) for even one instant his island will sink, and he will drown and be lost forever in that sea of wrongness.

It's not that the compulsive blamer is always right, it's just that he has a vast need to be right.

He is always right. Even when he is wrong he is right. And he'll still be protesting his rightness when the coffin lid is nailed down on him. For he knows how to win games: always make sure that self is right and others are wrong. It becomes his epitaph.

This is how the subject of right and wrong got into games play. And games have never been the same since. It has no other significance.

Once it is understood for what it is, it will be found to resolve with no other address than by use of the exercises in the Practical Section.

As the compulsion to play games lessens, the need to invoke the **Blame/Guilt** mechanism also lessens, and finally vanishes. It always was a crummy mechanism, and games are much more fun and healthy without it.

Shame is guilt exposed. [Shame is my guilt exposed to others. Editor]

Ridicule is the exposure of guilt. [Ridicule is others exposing my guilt. Editor]

Shame/Ridicule form a pair like Blame/Guilt, from which they were spawned.

Freedom

All of freedom lies within the concept of freedom of choice. When one is no longer free to choose one has lost all the freedom there is. The basic freedom of choice is between making and not making a postulate.

In life this translates into the freedom of choice to play or not play a game. Thus, to the degree that the playing of games becomes compulsive freedom becomes lost.

All entrapment is to be found in the compulsive playing of games. The route from entrapment to freedom, then, lies in the regaining of one's freedom of choice to play or not play games. As the being got himself into this trap, then only the being can get himself out of this trap.

One being can show another the route out, but the trapped being must walk this route out himself. Thus, one being cannot free another; he can only help him to free himself.

You will never find freedom 'over that way'; no matter how thoroughly you ransack this universe in search of freedom you will only discover more and more traps. Indeed, the search for freedom over that way is one of the basic traps of the universe.

You can say to another being, Free me, and with the best intent in the world he will only succeed in making you into his slave. The very best he can do for you is to show you the nature of life and games, and indicate the route out of the trap. The rest is up to you.

This is the basic truth about freedom. Outside of this truth lie the freedom games: games which cash in on the desire of every compulsive games player to be free.

We always tend to imagine a slave master as a rather muscular man armed with a large whip. Such a man is not even a novice at the gentle art of making slaves, for all the very best slaves are voluntary slaves and would not give up their slavery for anything. They are convinced that they are on the 'road to freedom', and need no whips to keep them on it. To trap you while promising to free you is probably the oldest game in this universe. This is the game of the 'freedom maker'. He makes slaves out of those who walk a road to freedom that he has created for them.

All the very best traps in this universe are clearly marked, "The Road to Freedom".

The game of the freedom maker is big business in this universe, and always has been - simply because the willing slave, deluded into walking the road to freedom, is always more than happy to work long hours for next to no pay, and so create enormous wealth for the slave master.

The places where his willing slaves toil on their road to freedom are called Freedom Factories. (This is a slang term). The universe is strewn with them. Whole planets have become vast freedom factories. Very probably the first extra-terrestrial visitor to this planet will be an agent from a local freedom factory - scouting the territory to see if it's worthwhile setting up shop here.

The whole technique of the freedom maker is to suspend a carrot called 'freedom' in front of the person's nose. The carrot is on a string joined to a stick, the other end of which is attached to the person's back. Once the device is in place the person will follow the carrot forever down the road to freedom created by the freedom maker.

Freedom is the only goal that a being will permit himself to be put into slavery in order to achieve.

Ponder these words as you ransack this universe in search of freedom, for the gates of the freedom factories are always open, and a new slave is always made most welcome while the carrot is being suspended in front of his nose.

The subject of freedom has always been bigger business in this universe than the subject of power. This is because the carrot of freedom is always considered a more valuable carrot than the carrot of power.

It has been said that a man will sell his soul in exchange for power. What, then, is he willing to sell in exchange for promised freedom from the compulsion to be powerful? Why, his freedom, of course! It is the only thing he has to offer in exchange for such a prized goal. Hence the game of the freedom maker and freedom factories.

It Seemed Like a Good Idea At the Time

Reasons why for a postulate always come later than the postulate for which they are created as the reasons why. The postulate always comes later than the desire to make that postulate. The sequence is always: Desire - Postulate - Reasons why for that postulate.

The reasons why for a postulate are only justifications to convince others that the postulate is reasonable. Thus, reasons why are only created in order to justify a postulate, and always come later in time than the postulate.

The postulate, in turn is always later than the desire to achieve the effect which the postulate puts into action.

The closest you can ever come to a 'reason why' for a postulate is that it seemed like a good idea at the time.

Now this is not something dreamed up by me after a heavy night reading Alice in Wonderland. It happens to be the truth of the matter. (Something I believe that gifted mathematician who wrote Alice suspected too.)

The fact that the mere suggestion we function in such a manner sends those with a mechanistic view of the mind crawling up their own synapses is only indicative of how little they know about the mind, and how trapped they are within the whole subject of reasons why and conviction in general.

Now it is true that a being, feeling unable to dream up convincing reasons why to justify a postulate, will not make that postulate. But these are reasons why for not making a postulate, not reasons why for making a postulate.

The truth is that a being never needs a reason why for making a postulate until he has made that postulate, and needs convincing reasons to justify it to others.

His postulates stem from his desires, his desires stem from his urge to be alive and in there playing the game.

It's easy to see how the general belief that the reasons why for a postulate preceded the making of the postulate came about.

The being, having made a postulate and now having to dream up convincing reasons why he made that postulate in order to make the postulate appear reasonable to others, will always swear on a stack of bibles that his reasons for making the postulate existed prior to the making of the postulate.

For to admit otherwise is to open him up to the charge that he's making postulates without due reason why, and then justifying them afterwards. The only way he can defend his postulate as being reasonable is to swear that the reasons for making the postulate existed prior to the making of the postulate. Eventually he comes to believe his own lie, and becomes trapped in a 'web of reason'.

If a being ever needed a reason why to make a postulate then the first postulate ever made in the universe could never have been made, for at the time it was made no reasons why for postulates existed.

That first postulate could only have been made from a desire to achieve a certain state of affairs. That is the way it was then, and that is the way it has been ever since. First came the desire, then the postulate - and only later were reasons why invented to justify the postulate and make it convincing to others.

View reasons why as pure and simple conviction phenomena and you have the entire flavor of all this.

The mind, then, is full of convincing reasons why one should not make postulates, but it contains no reasons why a postulate has been made.

Of course, one can always point to some part of the mind and assign it as the reason why one has a compulsion to kick cats, say, but this assigning is coming later than the postulate to kick cats.

If you wish to be free of your compulsion to kick cats you need to address this postulate to kick cats, and the whole subject of cats and kicking. There is clearly a compulsive games condition here between you and cats.

Ransacking your mind and assigning reasons why to your compulsion to kick cats will not help you in the slightest. Any person can sit down and invent an infinity of convincing reasons why they have to kick cats.

It's a very interesting intellectual exercise, and can give insight into the whole subject of justification and reasons why in general, but don't expect it to do anything about your compulsion to kick cats.

That can only be resolved by resolving your compulsion to play games with cats.

The mind, then, is only resolved by addressing postulates, and the subject of games which are postulates in conflict. Reasons why for the postulates always come later than the postulates, and so have no part in the resolution of the postulates in conflict.

When you fully grasp this you will stop ransacking your mind in a futile attempt to discover the reasons why for your current mental state. For the only reasons why you will discover there are the ones you are putting there now, and they are all later than the event.

It's futile searching a stable for a horse that has gone; but it's bordering on the ridiculous to search a stable for a horse that was never there, and then convince yourself that the piece of straw you find is really the horse.

It is only ignorance of the truth of this matter that causes patients to spend years with psychotherapists in search of the reasons why for their troubles, and why psychotherapists waste their own and their patient's time in such a futile search. The only justification for the activity is that it's profitable for the therapist, and the patient always lives in hopes that he might one day get somewhere.

Whole 'schools' of psychotherapy have grown up professing to know the 'real' reasons why of behavior, and they vie with each other to see who can be the most convincing. As it's possible to invent an infinity of convincing reasons why for any facet of the mind this activity has unlimited prospects for future games play, but bleak prospects for helping people to resolve their compulsion to play games.

Once you grasp the truth about this subject of postulates and reasons why you will also learn to cut through the smoke screen of reasons why that others throw up to justify their postulates, and be able to see their naked desire and postulates clearly exposed.

The brush salesman may give you a thousand convincing reasons why you ought to buy his brush, but all of them come later than the fact that he desires to sell a brush to you.

Life gets very simple once you realize that the correct sequence is: Desire - Postulate - Reasons why (Invented) for the postulate.

The subject of reasons why gets combined with the **Blame/Guilt** mechanism. Thus, a person may search their mind for the reason why of some unwanted mental condition. Having found (assigned) a reason why that is convincing to them, they promptly **blame** it for the unwanted mental condition.

This is compounding the lie, and only traps them further in the **Blame/Guilt** mechanism, and in the whole subject of conviction and justification.

The unwanted mental condition is essentially a postulate, which is held in place by the compulsive games condition with its opposition postulate within the goals package. Only when addressed in this context will the unwanted mental condition resolve.

Some modern 'schools' of psychotherapy are what is known as evaluative schools. The practitioner of this type of school does not search in the mind of his patient for the reasons why of the patient's difficulties, for he has already convinced himself that he knows the 'real' reason why for everyone's difficulties.

Therapy (if it can be called such) with this type of practitioner is not a matter of searching for anything, it is purely a matter of the practitioner convincing the patient of the practitioner's beliefs.

As some of these beliefs seem very strange to their patients - and to most other people, come to that - it can take years to convince them. (All the difficulties in convincing are ascribed to the patient's resistance to accepting the truth.)

Even after conviction has been achieved the patient still has his unwanted condition, but he now also possesses a thoroughly convincing argument as to why he has that condition.

These schools have come a long way from the definition of a workable psychotherapy (one that can vanish unwanted mental conditions.)

I suppose the acquisition of a set of convincing reasons why one has a mental condition is an improvement upon not having such a set, but it's a very poor substitute for being free of the unwanted mental condition.

Vengeance

By Dennis Stephens

September 26, 1994

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

June 15, 2012

Today is the 26 of September 1994 and I want to take up today this subject of vengeance. Vengeance.

Vengeance is one of those fascinating mental phenomena that people get so interiorized into that they find it incredibly difficult to evaluate or to study or to find anything about.

You can ransack all the books on psychology in the libraries and so forth and you will find this subject of vengeance mentioned. You will find it described. You will find examples of it, particularly in clinical psychology and so forth, but no where will you find the mechanism of vengeance explained.

Now this is true also in Dianetics and Scientology. Ron did excellent pioneer work on the overt act motivator sequence. He defined the overt act and he defined the motivator, both of which you'll find defined in the write up of TROM. And you put those two together; the overt act motivator sequence and we have the subject of vengeance. But nowhere in Dianetics and Scientology does Ron say why the mechanism exists. How come the mechanism?

He describes the mechanism admirably but he does not give the rationale behind the mechanism. Apparently it was unknown to Ron.

But Ron was in excellent company because it seems to have been unknown to every other psychological researcher on this planet.

But you might say it's a perfectly natural mechanism, that if somebody does something harmful to you it is natural and instinctive to do that harmful thing back to them.

Oh? Why is it natural? Why? That's what we've got to ask, is why. Why the mechanism? It's not as obvious, it's not as rational, it's not as reasonable as you might suppose.

The more you examine this, the more irrational the mechanism becomes. For example somebody comes along and punches you. Why do you feel an urge to punch them? Of all the things you could do, of all the infinite responses you could make, why do you feel the urge to punch them after they punch you? Why not, as Jesus Christ said, why not turn the other cheek? You see?

Of all the choices there, why that one? And until you can answer that question you don't understand vengeance. But in TROM we do understand the mechanism and we do understand why a person receiving a punch will feel compelled to punch the person who punched him.

In other words, why he feels compelled to get into this subject of vengeance.

Stimulus Response Mechanism

The mechanism of vengeance is what might be called a stimulus response mechanism. It's not a considered response. It's not a thing of the analytical mind. It's a response mechanism. It's what some brands of psychologists would call a stimulus response mechanism.

You can see this. You see a group of boys on their way to school in the morning. There they are walking along carrying their books and suddenly for no reason that we know of one of the boys will swing on and punch one of the other boys in the back.

You know, it's a nice sunny morning and he felt like doing it so he did it.

Now watch the other boy, watch the second boy who was punched. He doesn't stand there and say, "Now, what is my response to this?" His response is immediate and instant. He will go straight in, and attempt to punch the boy who punched him. And preferably punch him in the same part of his body that he received the punch. It's an exact replica.

The stimulus is so powerful that the second lad would have to be restrained from punching the boy who punched him. He would have to be restrained.

What is the basis of this mechanism? How come this mechanism? Well that is the subject of this talk.

Vengeance Defined

We ought, I suppose, at the outset give some form of definition of this subject of Vengeance. And I won't attempt to define it accurately or precisely but let's just say that loosely vengeance can be defined or described as the urge to give back to a person some unwanted action that they performed against you.

You receive an unwanted action and your urge is to give back that unwanted action to the person who gave it to you.

That is essentially vengeance. I mean we could chitter this up and end up eventually with a very precise definition but I don't want to do it at this stage because until we understand the subject of vengeance our definition will be very shallow, very incomplete.

Now to understand this mechanism of vengeance we have to look at the goals packages because the goals packages give the interchange of postulates and counter postulates in life.

In other words, the answer to this subject of vengeance, the reason why, of the subject can only be found in the subject of the goals packages.

So let us look at the "to know" goals package, where games play is non compulsive. That is the most wide open of all the goals packages, the basic goals package when games play is non compulsive. We couldn't have any less restrictions, in other words.

So let's look at this and let's imagine that one person is occupying the "must be known" postulate and his opponent is occupying the "mustn't know" postulate and let us assume that this game goes on in progress and that "mustn't know" wins the game.

Now at the point where he wins the game he drives "must be known" into "mustn't be known". We get the postulate change. "Must be known" goes through the IP barrier and then goes into "mustn't be known".

So at this point in time, let's call the person who is operating on "must be known" we'll call him person A and the victor in the game is person B. B was working with the "mustn't know" postulate.

Well person A receives the overwhelm and moves from "must be known" to "mustn't be known". Now person A's postulate that he's using against the universe is "mustn't be known".

But this isn't vengeance, is it? This isn't vengeance.

There A received an overwhelm. He received something he didn't want. He didn't want to be driven from "must be known" into "mustn't be known" but he was driven into it so he received an overwhelm. His postulate was overwhelmed.

He lost the game but where's the vengeance here?

The person overwhelmed him. He was overwhelmed by "mustn't know" but his postulate changed from "must be known" to "mustn't be know". It didn't change from "must be known" to "mustn't know".

He's not now firing off a "mustn't know" postulate back at the person who overwhelmed him, is he? So there's no vengeance. Well that's very strange isn't it? Where's the vengeance? How come vengeance gets into games play?

Well, you need some limitation of the goals package in order for the mechanism to show itself. Now what sort of limitation do you need?

Well there are two limitations you need on the goals package to make vengeance occur, and once these limitations are made in the goals package vengeance will occur and always occur in the goals package. So we can nail it, we can nail it completely. Now what are these two limitations?

Games Play Must Be Compulsive

The first limitation on the goals package is that games play must be compulsive in the postulate set, in the goals package. In other words, the complementary postulate situation is out. That's reduced to zero. Games play is compulsive. The four classes in the set have been reduced down to the two games classes.

I'll refer you to my talk on supplementary lecture 3 on this subject of compulsive games play. Just review that material if necessary so that you understand exactly what we mean by compulsive games play.

[see 01 Insanity Point Lectures - editor]

So the postulate set is reduced now down to two games classes. That's the first requisite. Compulsive games play must occur in the set.

Postulate Set Reduced to a One Game Class Set

Now the second requisite is that the postulate set must be reduced down to a one game class postulate set.

Now as you recall there's a definite way of doing this. The person reduces it from a two games class postulate set down to a one game class postulate set by simply refusing to occupy one of the games classes. Or, in other words, the postulates in that games class are reduced to zero and that reduces the set down to a single game class.

In the general case for the first limitation we have to take the XY set and reduce that set down to the classes of X and 1-Y and that's the first game and the other game is Y and 1-X. and that's the second game.

Well by making Y equal to zero and 1-X equal to zero the person now has reduced it down to a single game class postulate set of X and 1-Y because the other classes aren't available to him. Those postulates have been reduced to zero, he decided not to use them.

So that's how it's done. All this is mentioned on supplementary lecture 3.

All right now let's see how this would work out in an actual example.

Let's take the goal "to punch", the example of the school boys. Now the goals package, "to punch" has the purposes "to punch", "to not punch", "to be punched" and "to not be punched".

Reduce that down to a one game class postulate set, let's reduce it down to the class of "to punch" and "to not be punched". That's the single game class. "to punch and "to not be punched."

The game of "to be punched and to not punch" is reduced to zero. Nobody wants to be punched.

Now let's look at a game situation. We have player A, he's occupying the "to punch" role and player B is occupying "to not be punched" role and both of them have got this set reduced down to a one game class postulate set. Right?

This time player A wins the game. He punches and he drives his punch home. So player B's postulate "mustn't be punched" is overwhelmed. Now it goes into "must be punched" right?

So now we have a complimentary postulate situation. The game ends. Player A has won the game. And the situation now is "Must punch" and "must be punched", overwhelm, end of game.

Now let's take the viewpoint of player B. he's now driven into "must be punched."

But he's already agreed that "must be punched" is not a game he can play so he can't use that postulate in games play.

And he can't use the "mustn't be punched" postulate because that's in overwhelm. He's just lost that game, so he can't use that postulate.

So he can't stay on that side of the goals package, can he? All the postulates on that side of the goals package are now unavailable to him.

So he has no choice but to do a valence flip over to the other side of the package.

[Remember from the level 5 chart at 1A when overwhelmed the player valence shifts to a new game at 8B. - PM]

So he arrives on the other side of the package and the two postulates on the other side of the package are "must punch" and "mustn't punch".

But "mustn't punch" he's already agreed is not a playable game because the set is reduced down to a one game class. So he goes into the postulate "must punch" and that's the one he uses.

And so he just goes ahead and punches. So there is the vengeance. You see it?

It's all that can happen when the postulate set is reduced down to a single games class, vengeance is all that can happen. The person is in a "must punch" "mustn't be punched" game, receives a punch, he valence flips over to the other side of the package and punches. That's all he can do, just like the school boy walking along the road, somebody punches him. The only thing he can do is punch back.

He has to flip over to the other side of the goals package. His "mustn't be punched" got overwhelmed so he flips over to the other side of the goals package, quite compulsively, and dramatizes "must punch".

And there is the explanation of the vengeance mechanism. It's the only explanation of the vengeance mechanism. There is no other valid explanation of the mechanism cause this happens to be the truth of the matter.

So in TROM with our understanding of the goals packages we have for the first time, and to the best of my knowledge, the first time in all of human history an understanding of the vengeance mechanism we can actually say why it happens. For the first time we can take this phenomena of vengeance out of the class of "Oh well, it's just human. It's just a human foible." Take it out of the class of that and now reduce it down and say, "it happens because of so and so, and so and so."

And nail it right down to the boards. We've got it.

Now we know that vengeance will only occur when a goals package is reduced down to a single game class postulate set. So all we now have to ask is under what circumstances or what sort of goals packages can be reduced down to a single game class postulate set.

Well the answer is any goals package can. If games play becomes sufficiently compulsive within the goals package it eventually will be reduced down to a single game class postulate set. It can apply to any goals package, but there are some goals packages by their very nature, which intrinsically can only have a one game class postulate set.

Vengeance Goals Packages

Now what sort of goals are these? These are the highly destructive goals, the destructive goals. To give you an example, let's take the goals "to destroy". Now the goal "to destroy" has the postulates in it to destroy, to not destroy, to be destroyed and to not be destroyed.

Let's give the enforcements, "must destroy", "mustn't destroy" , "must be destroyed" and "mustn't be destroyed". Well quite clearly the only playable game in that goals package is "must destroy" versus "mustn't be destroyed".

Now why is that? Well the other game is “must be destroyed” versus “mustn't destroy” but how on earth can you win a game when your postulate is “must be destroyed?” Every time you win with that postulate you lose, because you're destroyed. Get it?

So that is an unplayable game. So the “to destroy” goals package only has one games class in its postulates set, which is “must destroy” versus “mustn't be destroyed”. So any destructive action, any goals package where the “to blank” postulate is a destructive postulate will contain and only contain a one game class postulate set and when we see this goals package in life we will always see vengeance associated with it.

It's not that there's a choice, on these goals packages or put it this way, in general when the goals package has been reduced down to a single game class postulate set, any time we see games play within that goals package we will see vengeance. Now you see how we've nailed it. We've now pinpointed it. We've pinned it to the boards haven't we. We've got it, got the whole subject of vengeance down.

Returning to our example of the school boys we can now see the goal “to punch.” The goals package there has the legs “must punch”, “mustn't punch”, “must be punched” and “mustn't be punched”.

But the only game that's playable in that goals package is “must punch” versus “mustn't be punched”. The other game of “must be punched” versus “mustn't punch” is an unplayable game, because the postulate “must be punched” is a self destructive postulate. A person can't win in life occupying that postulate so that game is an unplayable game.

That is why when we see the schoolboys walking on the road; one punches the other, why the boy who is punched immediately punches back. It's all he can do. There's nothing else he can do in the "to punch" goals package because that goals package by its very nature has been reduced to a one game class postulate set.

Non Life Goals Packages

Now these destructive goals packages, these so called non-life goals packages are very common, they are very common. And each and every one of them has a single game class postulate set and each and every one of them will manifest vengeance in the goals package. Once the person gets into the goals package their into vengeance.

Now this is a tremendously valuable technical datum, gives you a tremendous understanding of the human psyche and a tremendous understanding of this phenomenon of vengeance. You see how the person gets into this subject of a destructive goals package. You know people spend their whole lives in this goal of vengeance.

You know, you can get family feuds that go on for generations and every few years the feud bursts out and they go out and start firing rifles at each other, and killing each other and they all come back and bury their dead and it all quietens down and they lick their wounds and they then plot vengeance against the other family again and then a few years later it's on again and they are killing each other again.

And it can happen internationally. I mean, for hundreds of years the countries of Germany and France have been at vengeance with each other. These two countries have got a constant overt act motivator sequence. It's been going on for hundreds and hundreds of years. Just read up you're history books, either Germany's invading France or France has been invading Germany and it's been going on and on, and it will just go on and on, you see. It just goes on forever unless you understand the mechanism and can stop doing it and just erase the whole god damned stupid mechanism from the mind.

Vengeance Goes on Forever

Once the person gets stuck in a goals package which has been reduced down to a one game class postulate set, their into vengeance. And once into vengeance it goes on forever.

There's no end to vengeance. And that is the final thing you should know about vengeance, it never ends. It's got no end, no postulate to end it.

If there ever was a mechanism in this universe which ensured that the universe would go jogging along forever it would be the vengeance mechanism, the overt act/motivator sequence. It just absolutely guarantees it.

You know, a person can get so far stuck into vengeance that the only reason that he stays alive is in order to reap vengeance upon the opponent, that's the only thing that's keeping him alive. Without that he would die [chuckle] but it's sufficient motivation to keep him alive.

You know it can get that bad. And the whole mechanism keeps this universe jogging along. Keeps compulsive games play jogging along in the universe, this mechanism of vengeance, and now we can understand it in TROM.

And understanding it we can do something about it.

Now as I say, any goals package, by compulsive games play, can be reduced down to a single game class postulate set, but it's fairly rare on a life goals package, fairly rare.

In the "to know" goals package I can't conceive of a person being able to operate in life with that "to know" goals package reduced down to a single game class postulate set, but there are some junior life goals which can be. Where vengeance can occur.

In the "to sex" goals package you will see vengeance and that's a life goals package. There is such a thing as sexual vengeance. So it can happen in a junior life goals package but I can't conceive of it happening in the basic "to know" goals package. It has happened in a junior life goals package.

But by far and away the vast majority of vengeance comes about when a person gets stuck in one of these non life, destructive junior goals packages like "to destroy" or "to punch" or "to blame" or "to degrade" or you know, there's an army of them, there are thousands of them.

They get stuck in one of these non life junior goals packages and this goals package has only got a one game class postulate set.

And once they get into the non life goals package their into vengeance and it's going to kill them and it's going to destroy them eventually. But they're going to destroy an awful lot of people around them in the mean time before it eventually destroys them.

It's a very nasty mechanism

Or to put it round the other way if we could ever end this subject of vengeance on this planet in mankind. If we could just take mankind and end the subject of vengeance. Get him psychologically to a point where he stopped using it, he just finishes with it, that's it. We would have a utopia on this planet. If we could just end that rather stupid game called vengeance. And it is a very stupid game, I can assure you.

As you come to study this subject and study the material I've given you on this tape you will realize not only the utter futility of vengeance but the sheer maniacal stupidity of it. Well I see I'm running out of tape here and so I am going to have to close off now. So I hope this material is of use to you and thank you very much.
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 and 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.
[deleted Dennis' comments about the weather and Dolby tape recording. - PM]

Bill Robertson

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 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 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 about a foot high 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. There is something fundamentally in error when this occurs. The error is usually that you're 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 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. 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 I do a little "Opening Procedure by Duplication" between two MEST objects in present time. That's the sort of a limbering up exercise for me, that is. 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 and so forth, 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, I don't come across them. I have never come across them.

Now that might come across as startling to you, I 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, the clearing technology. With 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 ones psyche which he believes is some entity in present time that's influencing him 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. That 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 their 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. 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 which is influencing self is a peculiarity of certain section 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 them.

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 they are 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 of course is a classic mis-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 there is this classic case of mis-ownership.

One would have thought that some Scientologist down the line faced with a preclear or a clear, working with NOTS who was plagued with an endless process that never flattened and his tone arm had gone up high and his needle was stuck, that surely the guys tech would have come in and he'd have said to himself, "Good God what the hell is going on here? Have we got a classic mis-ownership?"

There's something wrong here somewhere 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 is 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. That there is a high tone arm and the stuck needle, 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 something. We don't know what it is but it's giving him a high tone arm and a stuck needle. 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.

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 of our insane asylums who will again 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 recent 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 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, well can we do anything about it? Is the phenomenon solvable?

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

The Anatomy of Dissociation

Common Manifestations of Dissociation

First of all the anatomy of dissociation. Well first of all 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.

Circuits and the Bouncer

The simplest manifestation of dissociation is 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 there, 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. 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. They are 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 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. 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 ever read the book "The Three Faces of Eve" you will find it's well documented there. 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

More severe than a multiple personality is the schizophrenic, schizophrenia. Where the person hears voices and has compulsions to act and do things, be told to do things by voices that talk to him and 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 dissociation, of the dissociative personality.

Paranoia

Equally severe is paranoia, the paranoid. He believes that the world is against him. It's a psychotic condition, he believes that people are plotting against him. 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 paranoid. 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 is because I happen to know from personal experience of Ron that he was markedly paranoid. He was definitely a paranoid 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 mid night 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 with 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 got to get them first."

After a while I began to realize that this guy was paranoid. 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 or 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 there 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 or thoroughly research this subject of dissociation.

He should have done so, 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. 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.

But that gives you some idea, going 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 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, dementia's or alcoholic dementia, dementia from poisons, so forth, 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.

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. That's 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 of troubles on the subject of sex. That's the truth of the matter.

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, usually in childhood, 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. The solution becomes automatic, 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, there, 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.

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 service mechanism but it never really was granted much life and so it never did get itself into anything special. It was just a little service mechanism that will put the postulate into action when the problem turned up. 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 as 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 and we know that for absolute certainty.

He Can't Stop It.

We have the fixed solution and then one day he finds it doesn't work, it no longer works.

It's the inevitable end to all fixed solutions, is that one day they don't work. And then, of course, he tries to stop the solution from going into action.

That is when the fun starts. 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. 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 thing was 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, 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 way 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. 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 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.

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 runs by any other postulate than their own. I mean as 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 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. And so 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, cause you know from NOTS that the entities tend to cluster in 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.

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, level 5A consists of a person creating postulates themselves, in the class of "self", and then they put 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 on 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, if 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've done level 5A you've 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, after they started fishing 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 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.

Problem with NOTS

Just in passing, 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 started to come up scale and OT 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. You know? To do anything else is a Flunk. It's a code breach. It's just, you know, 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. This separates the auditors out from the psychiatrists, this 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 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 Efforting

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 it 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. Have 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 know" goals package are the favorites. 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, of the four. The most common you will find them dramatizing is "to be known" this circuit personality,

The person is a circuit and often starting 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. These are the characteristics of that personality. [see the book "The Resolution of Mind, A Games Manual"]

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

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.

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 you get a person who's into "not know" or dramatizing "not know" or dramatizing "to not be known" and you audit them, you take the person who's into "not know" when 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 it.

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 knowner" that's where he really belongs, up there.

[This is the exclusion postulate tech. As "must be known" becomes more compulsively dramatizing "must be known" he also dramatizes "must not know". You can't tell an angry man anything. see the book 03 Expanding on Level 5, Section: The Exclusion Postulate, How Games Become Compulsive. Editor] And similarly with a person who's stuck in "to be not known" he is the opposition terminal of the "knower", you see. With the knower whose opposed to the postulate "to be not known" 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 in to 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" as he is losing to his opterm "must not be known" goes into hiding himself to escape the opposition. Editor]

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.

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 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 know" 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 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 faint 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 favorite 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, his postulate that he's operating on is “to be known” 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 paranoid. And I've known quite a number of paranoid people in my lifetime and every one of them showed all the characteristics of the “to be known” personality. They all extroverts, 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. 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 the way it kicks great big holes in his bank, great big holes, great big chunks get kicked out of his 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 to 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 address 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

Glossary

Anaten. 1 . an abbreviation of analytical attenuation meaning diminution or weakening of the analytical awareness of an individual for a brief or extensive period of time. If sufficiently great, it can result in unconsciousness. (It stems from the restimulation of an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness.) (Scn AD)

2 . simply a drop in ARC to an extreme. (PAB 70) 3 . the physiological by-product of unconsciousness. (SOS, Bk. 2, p. 170) 4. dope-off. (Abil 52)

Clear- the term clear has risen from the analogy between the mind and the computing machine. Before a computer can be used to solve a problem, it must be cleared of old problems, of old data and conclusions.

Dianetics 1 . DIA (Greek) through, NOUS (Greek) soul deals with a system of mental image pictures in relation to psychic (spiritual) trauma. The mental image pictures are believed on the basis of personal revelation to be comprising mental activity created and formed by the spirit, and not by the body or brain. (BPL 24 Sept 73 V)

2 . Dn addresses the body. Thus Dn is used to knock out and erase illnesses, unwanted sensations, misemotion, somatics, pain, etc. Dn came before Scn. It disposed of body illness and the difficulties a thetan was having with his body. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)

3 . a technology that runs and erases locks, secondaries and engrams and their chains. (HCOB 17 Apr 69)

4 . Dn could be called a study of man. Dn and Scn, up to the point of stable exteriorization, operate in exactly the same field with exactly the same tools. It is only after man is sufficiently exteriorized to become a spirit that we depart from Dn; for here, considering man as a spirit, we must enter the field of religion. (PAB 42)

5 . a precision science. It stems from the study and codification of survival. (COHA, p. 148)

6 . a system of coordinated axioms which resolve problems concerning human behavior and psychosomatic illnesses. (5110CM08B)

7 . Dn is not psychiatry. It is not psycho- analysis. It is not psychology. It is not personal relations. It is not hypnotism. It is a science of mind. (DMSMH, p. 168)

8 . the route from aberrated or aberrated and ill human to capable human. (HCOB 3 Apr 66) Abbr. Dn.

Difference. 1. The concept of differences in this universe, a concept that A is different from B is essentially the concept that A and B have no common class.

2. in actual practice you have to bond A to some quality X and bond B to the absence of X or not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to some quality Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

E-meter 1. The E-meter is a religious artifact used as a spiritual guide in the church confessional. It is an aid to the auditor (minister, student, pastoral counselor) in two-way communication locating areas of spiritual travail and indicating spiritual well-being in an area. (HCO PL 24 Sept 73 VII)

- 2 . Hubbard Electrometer. An electronic instrument for measuring mental state and change of state in individuals, as an aid to precision and speed in auditing. The E-meter is not intended or effective for the diagnosis, treatment or prevention of any disease. (Scn AD)
- 3 . used to verify the preclear's gain and register when each separate auditing action is ended. (HCOB 5 Apr 69R)
4. Electropsychometer. (HCOB 23 Aug 65)
- 5 . the meter tells you what the preclear's mind is doing when the preclear is made to think of something. The meter registers before the preclear becomes conscious of the datum. It is therefore a pre-conscious meter. It passes a tiny current through the preclear's body. This current is influenced by the mental masses, pictures, circuits and machinery. When the unclear pc thinks of something, these mental items shift and this registers on the meter. (EME, p. 8)

Floating needle. 1. "An idle needle, one which is drifting slightly to the right and slightly to the left very easily and gently, denotes a comfortable status of mind on the part of the patient, and tells the practitioner that he is nowhere near any subject that distresses him, or, if it follows an emotional outburst, tells him that the outburst itself is spent, and that the subject now can be abandoned for the moment." [JOURNAL OF SCIENTOLOGY, Issue 1-G (Aug. 1952), ELECTRONICS GIVES LIFE TO FREUD'S THEORY]

2. "It means an idle, uninfluenced motion, no matter what you say about the goal or terminal. It isn't just null, it's uninfluenced by anything (except body reactions). Man it's really free. You'll know when you see one. They're really pretty startling. The needle just idles around and yawns at your questions on the subject." [E-meter Essentials (1961)]

3. "Floating needle, free needle are the same thing. What does one look like? Once you've seen one you'll never make a mistake on one again. For it floats. It ceases to register on the pc's bank. It just idly floats about or won't stand up even at low sensitivity." [HCOB 2 Aug. 65, RELEASE GOOFS]
4. "It is the idle uninfluenced movement of the needle on the dial without any patterns or reactions in it. It can be as small as 1" or as large as dial wide. It does not fall or drop to the right of the dial. It moves to the left at the same speed as it moves to the right." [HCOB 21 Oct. 68, FLOATING NEEDLE]
5. "Pcs and pre-OTs OFTEN signal an F/N with a 'POP' to the left and the needle can actually even describe a pattern much like a rock slam. Meters with lighter movements do 'pop' to the left." [HCOB 7 May 69R, Issue V, FLOATING NEEDLE]
6. "A floating needle is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle. That's what an F/N is. No other definition is correct." [HCOB 21 Jul. 78, WHAT IS A FLOATING NEEDLE?]
7. "Free Needle: It means the same as a floating needle (F/N), which is a rhythmic sweep of the dial at a slow, even pace of the needle, back and forth, back and forth, without change in the width of the swing except perhaps to widen as the pc gets off the last small bits of charge. Note that it can get so wide that you have to shift the Tone Arm back and forth, back and forth, to keep the needle on the dial in which case you have a Floating Tone Arm." [E-Meter Essentials (1996)]
8. "The reason a clear's needle is so free (and you've seen, certainly, how an E-Meter needle gets sticky, then freer and freer) is that his thought is separated from a matter, energy, space, time consequence." [HCOB 17 Mar. 60, STANDARDIZED SESSIONS]

Free Needle 1. "A needle which shows none of the reactions described above. It floats back and forth easily, registering only the body, its breathing, heartbeats, etc. While needle free, no facsimiles are being impinged on the body." [HCOB 30 Apr. 60, ACC TRs]

2. "A real F/N means the pc is out the top, an ARC Br needle means he's out the bottom. He ceases to mock up, through grief." [HCOB 5 Oct. 68, ARC BREAK NEEDLES]

HASI Hubbard Association of Scientologists, International. (PAB 74)

To Be Known also making known and bringing into existence
-1. When you first arrived at this universe as a spiritual being you looked around and thought it would be an interesting game to play. It would be fun to communicate with the other beings here.

However you quickly realized that in this universe you can't play games if no one recognizes you exist.

In order to play games or communicate with other beings you must be noticed, must be recognized to exist, you must "be known."

This is what Dennis means by "to be known". You want "to be known" by others so they will communicate with you and allow you to play the games with them. Also you want the effects you create to be known by others so if you grow a garden and share the tomatoes with your friends you can say that you want tomatoes "to be known" by you and tomatoes "to be known" by others. -editor

2. This is the creative postulate to bring something into existence and to make it known.

3. Life is a spiritual quality. Life can bring things into existence. That which is brought into existence is called an effect. All effects are intended to be noticed by others so they include the postulate "to be known."

To Know – this is the postulate to learn, experience, perceive something. It exactly complements and satisfies the postulate “to be known.”

L Ron Hubbard- Lafayette Ronald Hubbard, better known as L. Ron Hubbard and often referred to by his initials, LRH, was an American pulp fiction author as well as the author of "Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health" published in 1950 and the founder of the Church of Scientology.

Mind- 1. pictures which have been made of experiences and plotted against time and preserved in energy and mass in the vicinity of the being and which when restimulated are re-created without his analytical awareness. (SH Spec 72, 6607C28)

2 . a literal record of experience plotted against time from the earliest moment of aberration until now plus additional ideas the fellow got about it, plus other things he may have mocked up or created on top of it in mental mass, plus some machines, plus some valences. (SH Spec 70, 6607C21)

3 . a network of communications and pictures, energies and masses, which are brought into being by the activities of the thetan versus the physical universe or other thetans. The mind is a communication and control system between the thetan and his environment. (FOT, p. 56)

4 . the purpose of the mind is to pose and resolve problems relating to survival and to direct the effort of the organism according to these solutions. (Scn 0-8, p. 76)

5 . a natively self-determined computer which poses, observes and resolves problems to accomplish survival. It does its thinking with facsimiles of experience or facsimiles of synthetic experience. It is natively cause. It seeks to be minimally an effect. (HFP, p. 33)

- 6 . the human mind is an observer, postulator, creator and storage place of knowledge. (HFP, p. 163)
- 7 . the mind is a self-protecting mechanism and will not permit itself to be seriously overloaded so long as it can retain partial awareness of itself. (DMSMH, p. 165)
- 8 . the mind is composed of energy which exists in space and which condenses down into masses. (SH Spec 133, 6204C17)

Overt act- 1. an overt act is not just injuring someone or something; an overt act is an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics. (HCO PL 1 Nov 70 III)

- 2 . an intentionally committed harmful act committed in an effort to resolve a problem. (SH Spec 44, 6410C27)
- 3 . that thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (ISH ACC 10, 6009C14)

Preclear or PC- 1. a person who, through Scn processing, is finding out more about himself and life. (PXL, p. 20)

- 2 . a spiritual being who is now on the road to becoming Clear, hence preclear. (HCOB 5 Apr 69)
- 3 . one who is discovering things about himself and who is becoming clearer. (HCO PL 21 Aug 63)

Problems and Solutions - 1. As Dennis describes above a being when he feels he needs problems will not solve an existing problem without creating one or more new ones.

2. Routine 2-20 from the book *The Creation of Human Ability*" by L Ron Hubbard 1962. "The auditor asks the preclear *What kind of problem could you be to mother?* and when the preclear has found one, *Alright, can you be that problem?* And when the preclear has become it, *Can you see your mother figuring about it?* and whether the preclear can or not, *Give me another problem you could be to your mother? Can you be that problem? etc.* , until communication lag is flattened."

Scientology - 1. it is formed from the Latin word scio, which means know or distinguish, being related to the word scindo, which means cleave. (Thus, the idea of differentiation is strongly implied.) It is formed from the Greek word logos, which means THE WORD, or OUTWARD FORM BY WHICH THE INWARD THOUGHT IS EXPRESSED AND MADE KNOWN: also THE INWARD THOUGHT or REASON ITSELF. Thus, SCIENTOLOGY means KNOWING ABOUT KNOWING, or SCIENCE OF KNOWLEDGE. (Scn 8- 80, p. 8)

2. Scientology addresses the thetan. Scientology is used to increase spiritual freedom, intelligence, ability, and to produce immortality. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)

3 . an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (HCOB 9 Jul 59)

4 . a religious philosophy in its highest meaning as it brings man to total freedom and truth. (HCOB 18 Apr 67)

5 . the science of knowing how to know answers. It is a wisdom in the tradition of ten thousand years of search in Asia and Western civilization. It is the science of human affairs which treats the livingness and beingness of man, and demonstrates to him a pathway to greater freedom. (COHA, p. 9)

6 . an organization of the pertinencies which are mutually held true by all men in all times, and the development of technologies which demonstrate the existence of new phenomena not hitherto known, which are useful in creating states of beingness considered more desirable by man.

(COHA, p. 9)

7 . the science of knowing how to know. It is the science of knowing sciences. It seeks to embrace the sciences and humanities as a clarification of knowledge itself. Into all these things – biology, physics, psychology and life itself – the skills of Scientoloa can bring order and simplification. (Scn 8-8008, p. 11)

8 . the study of the human spirit in its relationship to the physical universe and its living forms. (Abil 146)

9 . a science of life. It is the one thing senior to life because it handles all the factors of life. It contains the data necessary to live as a free being. A reality in Scientoloa is a reality on life.

(Aud 27 UK)

10 . a body of knowledge which, when properly used, gives freedom and truth to the individual. (COHA, p. 251)

11. Scientoloa is an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (Abil Mi 104)

12 . knowledge and its application in the conquest of the material universe. (HCL 1, 5203CM03A)

13 . an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful. (HCO PL 27 Oct 64)

14 . an applied religious philosophy dealing with the study of knowledge, which through the application of its technology, can bring about desirable changes in the conditions of life.

(HCO PL 15 Apr 71R)

Serfac service facsimile, service mechanism. 1. these are called "service facsimiles." "Service" because they serve him. "Facsimiles" because they are in mental image picture form. They explain his disabilities as well. The facsimile part is actually a self- installed disability that "explains" how he is not responsible for being able to cope. So he is not wrong for not coping. Part of the "package" is to be right by making wrong. The service facsimile is therefore a picture containing an explanation of self condition and also a fixed method of making others wrong. (HCOB 15 Feb 74)

2 . this is actually part of a chain of incidents which the individual uses to invite sympathy or cooperation on the part of the environment. One uses engrams to handle himself and others and the environment after one has himself conceived that he has failed to handle himself, others and the general environment. (AP&A, p. 7)

3 . it is simply a time when you tried to do something and were hurt or failed and got sympathy for it. Then afterwards when you were hurt or failed and wanted an explanation, you used it. And if you didn't succeed in getting sympathy for it, you used it so hard it became a psychosomatic illness. (HFP, p. 89)

4 . every time you fail, you pick up this facsimile and become sick or sadly noble. It's your explanation to yourself and the world as to how and why you failed. It once got you sympathy. (HFP, p. 89)

5 . that facsimile which the preclear uses to apologize for his failures. In other words, it is used to make others wrong and procure their cooperation in the survival of the preclear. If the preclear well cannot achieve survival, he attempts an illness or disability as a survival computation. The workability and necessity of the service facsimile is only superficially useful. The service facsimile is an action method of withdrawing from a state of beingness to a state of not beingness and is intended to persuade others to coax the individual back into a state of beingness. (AP&A, p. 43)

6 . that computation generated by the preclear (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others. (HCOB 1 Sept 63)

Similar – 1. the definition of A is similar to B is that the class of A and B has members in it. It is not a null class. If A and B is not a null class then A is similar to B. however this definition lacks conviction.

2. in actual practice you have to bond A to X and bond B to not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

Somatic, 1. by somatic is meant a pain or ache sensation and also misemotion or even unconsciousness. There are a thousand different descriptive words that could add up to a feeling. Pains, aches, dizziness, sadness – these are all feelings. Awareness, pleasant or unpleasant, of a body. (HCOB 26 Apr 69)

2 . body sensation, illness or pain or discomfort. “Soma” means body. Hence psychosomatic or pains stemming from the mind. (HCOB 23 Apr 69)

3 . this is a general word for uncomfortable physical perceptions coming from the reactive mind. Its genus is early Dn and it is a general, common package word used by Scientologists to denote "pain" or "sensation" with no difference made between them. To the Scientologist anything is a somatic if it emanates from the various parts of the reactive mind and produces an awareness of reactivity. Symbol: SOM. (HCOB 8 Nov 62)

4 . the word somatic means, actually, bodily or physical. Because the word pain is restimulative, and because the word pain has in the past led to a confusion between physical pain and mental pain, the word somatic is used in Dn to denote physical pain or discomfort, of any kind. It can mean actual pain, such as that caused by a cut or a blow; or it can mean discomfort, as from heat or cold; it can mean itching – in short, anything physically uncomfortable. It does not include mental discomfort such as grief. Hard breathing would not be a somatic; it would be a symptom of misemotion suppression. Somatic means a non-survival physical state of being. (SOS, p. 79)

Valence - an identity complete with bank mass or mental image picture mass of somebody other than the identity selected by oneself. In other words, what we usually mean by valence is somebody else's identity assumed by a person unknowingly. Dianetics and Scientology Technical Dictionary