

**The Unstacking Prodecure**  
By Dennis Stephens  
November 3, 1992  
Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin  
June 28, 2012

(Note Unstacking Procedure was developed by Bill Nichols, who did a simple application of GPM and R6EW tech to form a new level called, "Unstacking," which I believe is also still used in Metapsychology.)

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

When I... I'm sorry I typed that material on both sides of the sheet of paper it no doubt didn't help you. I was... chuckle... I was going through a period in 19... in late 1978 where my havingness was rather bad and I was... that's why I was typing on both sides of sheets of paper.

Umm... I repaired my havingness some time after that, I don't do that these days, I write on one side of sheets of paper, but anyway you managed to get it ahh... managed to get it duplicated and no doubt you... your...you'll soon get it onto your ahh... the material onto your floppy disk.

So good of you to put this material on the disk for me.

1:15

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

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

1:42

Soon as I read the Unstacking Procedure I, of course, I... I recognized the leopard by his spots. In other words I recognized the ...the hubbard technique. It's ahh... direct offshoot of the umm... the Hubbard umm... goals procedures of circa 1961 to 1964. I'd say around the vintage of 1963, I would put that... that material, ahh... although he has modified it because there's things in their which umm... I'm not familiar with. So he has... there is modifications to the procedure but never the less, essentially it's the material that Ron was umm... working on in 1963, that he was working on in 1963.

2:25

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

2:40

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

03:25

His researches in Scientology up to this point had lead him to... inevitably lead him to the fact that the... that the final up... top level material in Scientology the... the... the highest possible level of Scientology material would be on the subject of purp... purposes and postulates and goals. Anyone who researches in the field of the mind eventually ends up with this umm... one way or the other, they might get there in different roots but they always end up there at that point.

04:00

Ron ended up there in 1961. He'd started out in 1950 with Engrams and incidents and charge and secondary's and then he'd gone through various other procedures and so forth and he finally in 1961 he got to the end of the road and he was facing the... he was facing the wall there, he had to get through this barrier of the postulates.

04:21

#### Postulates, Goals, Purposes and Intensions

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

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

04:50

When I got to Saint Hill and started to get into the auditing material on goals one thing that struck me was, I mean I was in the presence of a number of the old timers of Dianetics and Scientology, some of them had been on the course for some... some... longer time than me. They'd been on the course for some months and they'd been fiddling around with these goals procedures and I happ... happened to audit some of them and umm... some of them had to audit me and ahh... quickly I knew that these people were basically in pretty good case shape cause some of them I knew as people in the outside world not just as fellow students on the course but I was struck by the terrible state of their needles, the terrible state of their needle responses.

Almost invariably they had... the whole course at that time, with very few exceptions had had a high tone arm and stuck needles. I was one of the few exceptions. Maybe 10% of the course were exceptions and it wasn't until much later that I realized that why umm... I was an exception and probably the reasons why some of the others were exceptions.

05:52

But anyway that was one of the first things that struck me about this research was that what it was doing to these peoples tone arms. In fact the old Mark IV meter was ahh... one of the reasons why Ron developed the Mark V meter was during this period. That the sensitivity of the Mark IV was insufficient to read through these high tone arms and stuck needles. He had... he needed a more sensitive instrument so he developed the Mark V.

06:17

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

06:47

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

07:05

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

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

He abandoned the idea of ahh... finding goals on the preclear. He... he simply wrote them down, whole lists of them and swore that their all part of implants and swore that ahh... that this is what you had to do and left it at that. In fact he sort of despaired. I... I...think that he secretly knew that he'd failed in that area of research. He patched it up as best he could and did the best job he could on it. and ahh... but I know I left Saint Hill in not very good case shape and over the years afterwards I met many of the casualties of that period of auditing at Saint Hill.

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

08:25

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

All we knew was that ahh... if you weren't careful when you mucked around with goals that you ended up with a high tone arm, a stuck needle and the preclear was getting a lot of sensations and he usually had a black field, he'd lose his pictures, he... he... he... his field would go black and he'd feel as if he was getting a lot of breeze blowing. What they used to call "winds of space", used to feel as if there's... there's a light breeze blowing on his face all the time.

09:14

This of course was just energy... energy impacting around his face, energy deposits because it was affecting the skin. And ahh... there were in pretty bad shape. And umm the people that went on the course in good case shape survived it but those who went on the course, there was a minority that went on that briefing course in 1961 and 62 were in rather bad case shape when they went on course and it really hit them hard, this material did. Many of them they simply, their case wise they've been in a mess ever since, I don't know whether they've got out of it to this day because there's no... there's no repair in Scientology, there's no repair to what happened to these people in Scientology.

09:51

Don't ask the PC to Oppose his goals

There's only my own research, many years later I discovered what had happened to these people and umm... and got the repair out for it. I know the repair, I don't think it's generally known outside my research exactly how to take this situation apart, but the... the truth of the matter is that while... what I'm leading up to is this datum that when you muck around with goals and purposes your... **your Ok, you can ask the preclear for goals and purposes and postulates as long as you don't ask him to oppose them.**

10:28

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

10:55

And I didn't know why it went wrong, none of us knew why it went wrong, and none of had the repair to put it back right. It was just endless repairs, even the repairs were being repairs .... repaired and the repairs that were repairing the repairs were being repaired. It just all fell apart at that point.

11:13

In fact I would go so far as to say that the ahh... that this was ... one of the main causes of the decline of Scientology. Ron Hubbard, case wise, took an enormous pounding on this. It hit Ron very hard indeed, case wise, subjectively, himself. He looked absolutely terrible in 1962 when I was over there.

11:34

I knew he was under enormous restimulation, you could see it. He was bravely struggling on with his research, the research was killing him. And he was trying everything he knew to get this subject of goals out right, he never did get it right and case wise he never did recover. He went downhill case wise. It hit Ron as hard as it hit anyone. Case wise he went downhill badly from 1964 onwards, even though he abandoned work on goals, went on to other things, still he couldn't lift that material. He couldn't lift that restimulation.

12:09

And the datum here is that ahh... unless.... safer you can work with goals and purposes, it's quite safe as long as you don't ask that key question, "what would oppose it?" You can do anything else with a goal or a purpose. You can put...put the goal, you can mock them up, you can have other people mock them up, you can ask what purpose would a thing have. What's the purpose of a cat? What's the purpose of a dog? What's the person... purpose of a brick? What's the purpose of... of a house? You know?

12:36

What purposes have you had? You can do this goals, you can get him to write long lists of goals up, I mean the auditors got enormous freedom on this subject but he must not... having got a

purpose or a goal he must not ask what is the... the opposition goal unless he knows exactly what he is doing?

If he doesn't know exactly what he's doing, doesn't know the complete anatomy of the subject of goals and purposes in the mind he'll rapidly worsen his preclear and he won't know what's going on. And he won't be able to repair it.

13:10

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

13:39

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

14:19

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

14:50

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

15:17

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

15:26

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

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

15:55

And uhh... you can call postulates, postulates we mean purposes, intentions, goals their synonyms as far as I am concerned. So the universe in which we live only consists of life and postulates. Well once you understand that you can see that umm... how fundamental this subject of postulates is, and that ... why one has to get it right before one gets involved with it.

16:20

You don't get and chance... you don't get any second chances on it. Once you start to oppose postulates you don't get any second chances. I mean, what I'm trying to say here is that you got a fair amount of latitude when you're working with objective processes like getting the preclear to go around and touch objects. You can do a pretty botched up job of auditing and still the preclear will get a bit of case gain.

16:40

When you're dealing with masses in the mind, pictures and so forth, you can do a pretty botched up sort of auditing job and the preclear will still get some gain out of it, unless he's in rather bad case shape, but you'll get some gain out of it, just the fact that he's moving up and down the track and looking at a few pictures he'll get a bit of case gain. This is the old 10% that Ron used to talk about, you know, 10% of cases will get better no matter what you do.

17:00

And umm... this was the 10%.

17:05

But when you get onto postulates, uh uh, you lose that. You're ok as I say as long as you don't ask that question, "Who or what will oppose?" You can do what you like with postulates as long as you don't ask that question. They'll still make good case gain on a preclear. But if you ask that question you've got no... no latitude. You do it right or you kill the preclear, eventually you'll kill him. You got to do it right. It's too close to the top of the... of what life consists of, what this universe consists of. Postulates is the building blocks of the... the very... the very building blocks upon which the universe is composed. So you better get it right, otherwise it all falls apart.

17:47

Now my entry into... my entry into the subject of goals... came in 1978 when I started to do my own research. First of all I researched and got out my lower levels of 1, 2, 3 and 4 then I had nowhere else to go in my research except into postulates and I sweated blood over postulates just like Ron Hubbard did in my own research. But umm... fortunately I had the benefit of hindsight. I knew what had happened in 1962, in this briefing course. I was there, knew what had happened, had seen what had happened to the preclears so I knew something odd about this, so I avoided the pitfalls. In other words I started afresh; I didn't take Ron's research as gospel.

18:37

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

19:15

He assumed that the preclear... if a preclear's got a goal or a purpose there and he expresses it to the auditor, now if the auditor asked him "who or what would oppose that goal or purpose?" that a preclear is in a position to give him the correct opposition as far as the preclear is concerned. You see, it's a natural thing to do. Say, "Well it's the preclears goal so he would know what would opposes it." you see? Quite naturally, it's the preclears business, it's his mind, he knows what opposes what in his mind.

19:51

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

20:22

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

20:40

Ron said this many times, "There's got to be a lie in it," he'd say, "or else it wouldn't be there" if it was the truth it would unmock. Ron Hubbard knew that. We... we... we've known that in

Scientology for many years. If it was the truth it would unmock. In fact there's an axiom which says so.

20:55

So when the auditor says to the preclear, "Who or what would oppose this goal?" and the audi... and the preclear says, "Oh, so and so, and so and so." Now it doesn't matter how this preclear tells you this. He might give a flash answer, the preclear might give a flash answer, or the auditor might give him a sheet of paper and says, "Write... Write down all the oppositions and we'll... we'll meter check them." Doesn't matter how he will do it, you'll end up with the wrong oppose.

21:21

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

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

22:28

In other words the... the opposition to a... the correct opposition to a goal is not a matter of opinion. The opposition to a goal ... the correct opposition is not a matter of opinion it's fixed by the nature of this universe and everything else is false. It's either the correct opposition or it's a wrong oppose. It can't be partially correct. It's either exactly right or it's a wrong oppose and if it's a wrong oppose it will kill the preclear. It will just add to his bank, cause it's another lie.

23:10

#### There's only Two Types of Lies in this Universe

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

23:20

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

23:32

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

23:59

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

24:11

So I had to sit down and logically say to myself, "Ok, well what would oppose a goal?" and started to construct the goals packages and I found that you, when you read through my research you'll see the construct there, that there's four goals in a goals package. Every goals package has four; there's the goal, there's negative, it's opposition goal, and the negative opposition goal. And there is the four goals in the package. There's only four in the package and there's only four in every package, never less than four, never more than four. There can't be, the universe say so.

25:06

Let's take the... the goal "to know". Now you can take this test... try this test on almost anyone. You take... you, say you come up to a person, particularly someone in good case shape, don't try it on people in rather bad case shape because you wouldn't expect them to give you the right answer. But I've done this with good... you know, I mean, I... I... I remember one guy came through Sydney, he just came back from the Briefing Course or somewhere from... from the Sea Org and he was so clear you could almost see the harbor bridge through him and uhh... I got to speaking to him and uhh... I asked him, I said, I thought I just check out, see how he is on the subject of goals. I'd already started my research and I asked him, I said ahh... "What would be the opposition goal to the goal "to know"? What would oppose the goal "to know"?"

25:53

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

26:11

You see, this is way it works. You start with a scale on the subject of the goal. Now right on the top of the scale you have a very, very intense goal "to know" and the goal gets less intense, less intense, less intense until you get... reach a zero point where there is no intensity of the goal to know so there's no... there's no goal there at all, as it loses its intensity the goal itself vanishes

so you get a zero point where there's ... where there's no... no goal then you go over the zero point and now your into the negative goal to not know. You get a very tiny goal "to not know" and as you intensify that goal you get more and more intensity of the goal "to not know" until you reach maximum intensity "not know".

26:57

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

MUST KNOW

MUST KNOW

MUST KNOW

Must know

Must know

Zero

Mustn't know

Mustn't know

Mustn't know

MUSTN'T KNOW

MUSTN'T KNOW

MUSTN'T KNOW

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

27:38

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

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

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

28:25

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

29:10

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

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

30:05

### Listing

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

30:36

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

31:01

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

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

31:33

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

32:00

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

The truth of the matter is "to know" exactly complements "to be known". There exactly complementary, there's no, absolutely no opposition between that goal... between those two goals. They exactly complement each other. Left to themselves they would close the distance and collapse in on each other unless you held them apart. They're complementary postulates, "to know" and "to be known". Similarly "to not know" and "to not be known" are complementary postulates. Again left to themselves they would collapse in on each other, and they cancel each other out. Literally they cancel each other out.

32:59

If you have a somebody walk with a great desire "to be known". You know the sort of person he's all the time going around wanting... wanting people to look at him all the time and once they've correct and get in your face.

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

33:32

So the two complementary postulates vanish each other. The opposition postulates stay there forever. So there's the pure... pure magic. If you're wanting to address the subject of knowingness and get the whole subject... all the wrong opposers and all the wrong mishmash of upsets in his bank. You want to clear the whole lot out on the subject of knowingness you would address in therapy the four "to know", "to not know", "to be known", and "to not be known". They are... they are the whole subject anyway, you see? You will address those and you... magic... all... while you work those all the rest will start to come apart the whole tangled web of wrong opposers will unravel and you will be left with nothing. You simply erased them. You simply erase the bank. And that's the erasure. That's the magic that occurs there when you work with the exact goals package. All the wrong opposers come apart. You're left with nothing, just the four postulates and they themselves... because the four postulates... the two complimentaries vanish each other any way you end up with a handful of nothing, see. And you've got the perfect erasure of the bank.

34:58

Now this was the repair I didn't have for the victims of the Saint Hill Briefing Course experience of 1961 to 1964. I didn't have this repair until 1978... 78, 79 till I had the full repair there, and it's the only repair I know of that if you want to take this whole subject of their... their... their miserable up... life upsets they had, the fact that these upsets are still going down the track and the whole of their Briefing Course experience is sitting there like a major engram. The correct thing to do will be level 5A of my procedure. That would take it apart cleanly... it did it for me.

35:42

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

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

36:17

#### Where Does all the Mass Come From?

Ok, so much for that Greg, we now press on and umm... I said earlier on that umm... the mass... we live in a universe that only consists of life and postulates. Well where does all the mass come from? I mean, it's obviously not mocked up mass in the universe. How come there's so much mass in the universe

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

If you've ever tried to erase a sideboard in a room in present time you know what I'm getting at. This stuff does not come apart very easily and it's not mocked up mass. If it was simply mocked up mass you... you'd only have to get the idea it was somebody else's mockup, it would start to thin down and a gang of you could sit around and start to erase sideboards very easily using the upper level tech of scientology. Any good... good... good grade ... low level OT in Scientology, a gang of them sit together and could spend their Sunday afternoon unmocking sideboards, unmocking bits of walls and floors, you know, if they wanted to. They could do it.

37:40

But it doesn't work out that way. You can't take this stuff apart. Now why doesn't it come apart easily?

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

39:05

I see I'm getting towards the end of this tape and umm... I... I think drove on this side a bit more and the go at... turn over to the other... to the other side of the ahh... to the other side of the tape.

I have to keep my eye on the tape otherwise I'll run off the end of the spool.

38:30

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

39:07

Well there is another method that it gets into the universe. This is the unknown method. This is the one... the secret method and this is where 999.99% ... no 999.99 parts out of a thousand of the mass in the universe comes from. The rest of it is somebody else's mockup, or peoples mockups.

Well we turn over the other side of the ahh... spool and we'll get on with this subject umm... of a... get on with this subject of how it comes about.

But let me briefly talk a little about the subject of the sensations. Now we've known in Scientology for a long while, sensations are a sort of mass, there a sort of umm... there a sort of a mass, a sensation is not an emotion. A sensation are not emotions, there different from emotions. Emotions are little masses too, but sensations are somewhat, somewhat different. And umm it wasn't understood where these sensations come from in Scientology. But we sure as hell knew that they existed cause everyone got them but nobody seemed to quite understand just how they... how they... how they came about and what they were.

40:36

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

So now we'll finish this side and go on...do it... go on the other side of the tape.

41:07

Just ahh... just run the tape off the end of the spool, Greg and I'll get back with you on the other side.

ahh ... Here we are , Greg, back on side 2 same date, afternoon, side 2.

41:26

We have this datum that sensation is generated at the boundary between opposing postulates. Now this is... it's an important datum cause this gives you... this is the essence of where the vast, vast majority of mass in this universe comes from.

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

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

42:53

There's various mechanism of condensation ahh... but essentially if you was to take the mass... examine the mass you would see it's ... it's scrunched up postulates where there jammed in...

pushed in hard together where you get a postulate scrunched up hard against its opposition postulate and you find all...

Supposing you had two goals packages... you had a goals package and you had the two opposing postulates of the goals package where there in opposition. Well at the boundary you would find both postulates there scrunched up and that would be the sensation ... that... that scrunched up postulate, where the two are jammed together you would umm... you... you... would find... that would be the sensation. Because the mind can't easily... or the person or life cannot easily duplicate or... or perceive that scrunched up postulate ... that it sees it as mass. That's why you... you see the sensation as mass rather than perceiving it as a sensation.

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

44:26

In actual fact you... you would find the mass generated in any goals packages... there's four postulates in the goals package, the mass generated between any two po... any two opposing postulates in the goals package would... the mass would actually consist of a scrunched up umm... scrunched up... of all... scrunched up mass of all four postulates in the package.

You always find all four postulates present in the mass, I do know that... they are... I ... I know the postulate configuration there but ahh... there's certain aspects of it that I'm not completely satisfied with, so I won't go into it cause I don't like to go off half cocked in these letters.

45:11

But umm... so far that... what I've given you so far you can take it as the way it is. Seems a bit peculiar at first glance but you can see... to see sensation as mass but I can assure you it's a postulate configuration. If the configuration then you look at it and you don't see it as... as... as a postulate configuration you simply see it as a mass. It's a sort of confused... see it as a confusion, if you like. Say, "Well there's a postulate so scrunched up and it's so confused I can't see it as a series of postulates, all scrunched up in there, tangled up in a mass, so I see it as a mass rather than as a series of postulates, and that's the essence of it.

45:52

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

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

That umm... you could take a mass or... or... or... or any terminal there and umm... you could say, supposing you take a dog... or hold on... not a dog... and animal... a creature but it works just as well on a dog or it will work on an inanimate object. Suppose the preclear's upset with a dog.

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

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

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

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

See what you're doing here, your discharging the dogs purposes. His opposition to... but you're not mentioning the word oppose, you see. He's really smart. You're not mentioning the word oppose. You're saying, "what's the dog's purposes?"

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

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

And you go back to the dog, "Well are any umm... What are the purposes of a dog?" and see if any more material showed up and you keep going backwards and forwards on these purposes towards the dog and the dogs purposes towards him. Low and behold, magic, the dog would vanish out of his mind, cause you... you've erased all the purposes, you see? He's now got all the purposes there and he's got them sort of squared around and you haven't mentioned the dog's package, but you... you... you... the technique is powerful enough to erase the dog out of his mind. Just there... and it proves that... that uhh... that uhh... that all that is present there is the purposes.

You could it with a house brick, you know. You could... you could erase a house brick. If a persons up... if a persons got house bricks in his engram bank you could say, "Well what's the function of a house brick?" and ahh... he'd tell you and you run that and get clear... square that

all around and then get some more functions of a house brick and then get his purposes towards a house brick. And you do this backwards and forwards until there's no more charge on it and at that point you'd find that house bricks had erased from his mind. You see?

49:12

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

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

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

52:02

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

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

50:17

Proof that the "To Know" goals package is the basic of all goals packages.

Now another point I want to get into before I go on to an evaluation of umm... the Unstacking Procedure. I mentioned earlier and you'll find in my research that I sent you the umm... the idea that the "to know" goals package is the basic goals package, and uhh... since I wrote that material I can actually prove that this is... there... I didn't have the proof at the time when I wrote those notes up and I'm in a position now to give you the proof. That the basic... that the "to know" package is the basic of all goals packages.

50:52

### Importance

And it comes about... the proof is a very, very simple proof umm... to understand it we have to understand the subject of importance, importance.

Now an... an importance of a goal is the enforcement of goal. It's the mustness of a goal uhh... when a goal is trivial, the purpose is trivial, it nee... has very little intensity but as we, as the goal becomes more important to us, we strive to achieve this goal in life we increase its intensity

and the... and we... well the goal now is ... is in... it's got... it's a must. In other words, take the goal "to know" it starts off just as life, you know, we really don't care whether we know or not. Then we must know, you see. It must. Well the must is the enforcement of the goal, see that.

Now any goal can have an enforcement, must. We can put the mustness of any goal. We have the goal to ahh... the goal "to help". We must help. Beginning to be a light, you see. Not much enforcement. Not like the heavy Must help. you see. Heavy enforcement of the goal, ok?

Any goal can have an enforcement or mustness. M U S T N E double S, mustness. all the word simply means the enforcement of the goal.

Umm... the enforcement of a goal. When we're enforcing a goal we're saying that the goal... the only reason why we enforce it is to try and... is to try and convince the opponent of their purpose. Their having trouble getting our... our message across to him, you see, so when we increase the intensity of the purpose, the mustness of the purpose, in order to get it through to the opponent. In other words were trying to win the game. You see. So we increase the intensity for that reason.

52:32

So the ahh... It's a conviction phenomena. The mustness is a conviction phenomena and we're trying to make it known to the opponent.

52:39

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

52:53

### The Know Component

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

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

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

Just like you've got a cat, well you take all the cat... the cattishness out of the cat and you end up with nothing. You can't have a cat without any cattishness, you see? It's the same with a goal, you can't have a goal without some mustness in it, got to have some mustness in it just like the cat has to have some cattishness. Otherwise you lose all the cat. So you lose all the goal when you take all the enforcement out of it. But the enforcement component is the "be known"... must be known" component. See that? It's the... it's driving it across to the opponent, trying to get the goal across in games play.

54:38

So, that... and that... that determines the existence of the goal we find that the basic package, the "must be known" package... that that package contained in the "must be known" which is the "to know" goals package is the basic goals package, and all the other goals packages are really within that package. It's the.. it's the proof, that is the proof of the fact which comes out in practice. It works in practice that the basic package is the basic package and it will do all those magical things.

You can play around with junior packages and get into an awful mess and you run the basic package and it all comes back right again. And why you have to do level 5A before you play around with any other packages, you must do 5A. You've got to get that one right and when that ones erased the whole banks erased, the whole lots gone. That is the basic package. The only reason a person has to run anything else but level 5A is because they don't believe that the "to know" package is basic. They believe there's other things in their mind except knowingness and there isn't. There's nothing else in there, except the four legs of the "to know" goals package that's all that's in there. All the rest is... is just... is just illusion.

55:51

#### Unstacking Procedure, Evaluation

So much for ahh...so much for that, Greg, now we can go into the evaluation of this proc... Unstacking Procedure. Now before we get into it umm... you might reasonably ask how can I evaluate this procedure without having run it on me or run it on anyone else. Well I can answer that very, very easily, umm... it doesn't need running on me because I tried to run it and it's all flat. It's all flat because the subject of goals, purposes with me, knowing the basic packages and knowing the basic theory of it, there's just simply nothing there.

Umm... I just read through the material yesterday and umm... there's a little bit of... a little bit of charge on reading on the wrong opposers when I was in... on those awful.... Those awful wrong opposers in the ... in the examples he gives they... they were a bit scrunchy. And ahh... I sort of yawned those off, they were a bit awful they were. So apart from that there was nothing there. So umm... the material doesn't need running on me, because there's simply nothing to run. So that answers your question, and uhh... if I wanted to run it on someone else well I simply

wouldn't, because it's ahh... I know that it's ahh... the flaws he's got in the procedure and that... I'm sure that Mr. Nichols himself would... would realize these flaws once if he... once he got his paws on my data. Once he got his paws on my data he'd realize his flaws just as Ron would have realized the flaws.

I wasn't able to give my research to Ron Hubbard. It was just too late, I never could get it to him. I knew if I posted it on to him that it would never get to him and I didn't know where he was in 1979. I didn't know whether he was still at sea or... I know his health was poor. I didn't know quite where he was... he was surrounded so much, you know, he just... the comm. Line had gone to the old man so I didn't want it to go to some... some... some half crazed secretary who wouldn't know it's importance and wouldn't be able to evaluate it proper. And so I didn't both, I just couldn't get it to him. There was no way I could get it to him so I just had to leave it and hope it would... it would come right for him in the end.

58:05

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

The word postulate comes from the old Latin *postulare*: to demand; and the... the idea of demand is the very essence of a postulate. When we postulate something we're demanding that something is going to happen. We... we... we make the postulate "to know" and we... we... we want "to know", you know, there's something we... we want a... demanding something. Demanding to know. you see? This must know. so it... it's well... its... it's ... the word is correct there and when I say that a postulate is the same as a purpose is the same as an intention I'm on very, very firm ground in the English language, because that is where the word... the word means that... it comes from the word, Latin to demand, the word postulate. So that my usage is correct.

59:21

Umm... in his glossary he ahh... I just... I'll just look his glossary up... hang on...

Interestingly enough, Greg, you can always tell how much a person knows about the mind or some aspect of the mind by looking in their glossary of terms. You know, if they've got off beat definitions of phrases and off beat definitions of words you know they've got some hang ups on that subject. It's... it's quite... it's quite interesting to go straight to the glossary, it's quite revealing.

59:46

Searching through his .... Looking for what his definition of a postulate... I know it's ... it's slightly off beat from mine but I can't find it so... so I'll have to abandon it. But umm... I can

assure you Greg, that mine is more in line with the dictionary definition of a postulate. You look it up in a dictionary you'll find that ahh... that it's essentially it's a purpose with intention.

They ahh... use it... he's using science... the word postulate. When a scientist discovered... making a computer model he... he... he ...he's ummm ... he has certain postulates he feeds into his model and they are his basic postulates. He calls those postulates rather than intentions, there. That is to say the basic postulate we're using on his model so people know what he means, but essentially the postulates putting in are purposes their essentially purposes.

1:00:37

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

Now this is a complicated understanding of significance. The significance of a thing is simply the purpose plus its importance. That is the totality of significance, there isn't anything else to do with significance except purpose and importance. When we say significance we say what do the things signify, what does it mean. The word signify... significance comes the word... same root as the word signal. What are the signals it's sending us? What does it mean? So if we know what it means, and...we... we know...we know what its significance is. But it's meaning is essentially its purpose, its function, that is it's essential meaning. So we're down to... down to...down to function again.

1:01:47

So significance is purpose plus the importance, that's all. A thing might have many purposes and it might... each purpose may have an importance but essentially when you take a significance apart your taking apart postulates, your taking apart intentions, purposes, and that's all. There's nothing else there.

1:02:03

He gives the example of motherhood as a significance. Yes, motherhood is a significance but what is motherhood? Well motherhood is the umm... motherhood is the state of being a mother and what is being a mother? Well the identity of being a mother is the identity of a person who is operating on the goal "to mother", the purpose "to mother".

1:02:30

We say that when a person is operating on that goal "to mother" they are a mother, see that. So we're, when we examine this umm... this concept, this significance of motherhood, we take it down we see that it... that it's to do with mothers and it's to do... and mothers are to do with the goal "to mother", the postulate "to mother". You see? So we're back to purposes again. You see,

so significance is essentially... it's a purpose. A significance is a purpose plus an importance, that's all it is. That's all a significance is. You can take any significance and reduce it down to a purpose plus an importance.

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

1:03:13

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

Umm... I don't umm... I mean I've gone around kicking plenty of cats in my life but I've yet to engage in kickizingness of catizingnesses. Kickizingnesses of catizingnesses, I just don't do it. I kick cats, I'm sorry, umm... so I'm ... i... stick... izingnesses on the end has got nothing to do with life, as far as I'm concerned and it may have a lot to do with Mr. Nichols's bank but it's got nothing to do with life and I'm only really concerned with... with ... with the fact that they exist in life.

I just don't see this izingness... I don't see where it all comes in, it's an added complexity which doesn't seem to do anything except make it more complicated and as Occam, William of Occam with his... with his razor which said that never... never add hypotheses unnecessarily, I'm a great believer, he's a great friend of mine Occam was, so I don't believe in adding... adding hypotheses unnecessarily in order to make a thing... just for the sake of making a thing more complicated.

1:04:38

Maybe I'm doing the man a misjus... misjustice... an injustice. Maybe there is a good reason why he has to use this strange suffix on the end of all his ... all his goals but I've reread it and read it and reread it and I just cannot find out where he says ... why you have to do this and why it won't work if you don't do it. So I just assume it's some peculiarity of him. Or some peculiarity he's gotten from someone else and he's got himself stuck with, but certainly "izingness" is not something that I stick on the end of my goals and umm... people don't go round and talk about "izingness". They don't say, "Well I had a ... a good game... you know... I had a good day of .... Of eating ice creamingnesses, you know. or eatingnesses of ice creamingnesses. They say, "I had an... I had a ,, I had an ice cream. You know?"

1:05:32

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

But what we have in this procedure, essentially he puts up this dichotomy, he gets the goal and he asks the pre... asks the preclear for the ahh... the opposition to the goal. Flunk! He shouldn't do that, that's one thing you mustn't do cause he'll only give you a wrong oppose.

1:05:54

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

1:06:23

### To Cross Package

To cross package is to take a goal out of one goals package and oppose it to a goal which is out of another goals package. It's like putting the goal "to know" and opposing it to the goal "to not sleep" you know, that's cross packaging. So that there opposed to each other the goal "to know" and the goal "to not sleep" are opposed to each other. Well that's cross packaging. It's a wrong oppose but it's also a cross packaging so it's an even... even... it's an even bigger Flunk. And even more severe... even more severe wrong oppose. It's not even in the same area, it's on another subject.

1:06:57

So anyway he... somehow he gets these... he gets the goal and he gets the wrong oppose and then he has to spend hours and hours, as you would expect, using all sorts of Scientology techniques, the old serfac technique comes into action, he gets all sorts of techniques come into action trying to discharge, and get these this dichotomy which is just two wrong opposes in opposition and they simply won't discharge. It's all... there's no reason why they should, they've got nothing really to do with each other, you know, their just com... wrong opposers. They'll just sit there forever. and so he tries to get them to discharge, so he has to work for hours and hours and hours asking these various questions and so forth, ransacking the past, he's bending over backwards trying to make these damn things erase, and they won't erase cause their wrong opposers.

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

1:08:09

Now what do I think is the overall effect of doing the procedure of the Unstacking? Well if it was done in very, very careful hands it might take 50 hours before the tone arm will go up to 5

and stick. But eventually that will be the end point. That's where it would go and that's what the... I don't think it would uhh... I don't think he'd get much else out of it.

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

1:09:10

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

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

1:09:42

**Well my experience of umm... erasing postulates in preclears they have to get into the postulate and get their paws dirty.** They have to get in there and own the postulate and... and ... and get the feel of the postulate, and get into the postulate. They won't erase otherwise. You can't just put it all over that way and sit and watch it erase like you're watching a TV set. Nothing happens.

1:10:02

You... you spotted this yourself. You said that the efforting, there's not much efforting, it doesn't seem to do much. No, it wouldn't... it wouldn't do cause it's all over that way so it's... the whole thing will become a rather intellectual exercise. It's all over that way. So that's my other criticism of it there.

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

1:11:25

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

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

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

1:12:45

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

1:13:11

That's why my injunction there on my own research material not to hand it out to mentally unstable people because they simply cannot duplicate it and they won't do it right. They'll do it wrong and it does... only needs the slightest alteration or alter-iness of technique of level 5A and ahh... level... my level 5A becomes a time bomb. You know? I mean I know more ways to louse up preclears doing a slightly alter-ised 5A and it becomes a very, very, very dangerous procedure. That will eventually kill everyone that it... it's tried on, it'll louse them up. That's why my injunction to not... it must be duplicated exactly, and it's mustn't be handed out to unstable... mentally unstable people who can't use it properly.

1:14:00

So much for the "Unstacking Procedure", Greg, I can't think of any more on the subject. I think I've covered it pretty well there. Just finish off while we've got a little bit of tape here.

1:14:10

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

### The "To Reason" Goals Package

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

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

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

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

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

I mean I could... I've got stacks of notes and so forth. The stuff that came up when I was running this material but it's not really relevant to hand it over to people... just be quite unreal to them but when they run the material themselves it will become real to them and they will rediscover it so I don't have to tell it to them, they'll discover it for themselves. They'll come up and say, "Oh, yes you know so and so, and so and so" and I'll say, "Oh yes we know about that." And it will pop up. In other words they will discover it themselves when their running level 5 of my material there.

So there's much more to my material than what I've given you but I've given you what you need to run the material to run and erase the mind and the rest of it comes out in the wash. You will discover the rest while... while you're using the material I've given you, so I don't have to really give you any more. Any more would be a luxury and it can be very confusing and I don't want to overburden anyone with it. because until a person gets to work on it and starts to work with the material some of this... this upper level material can get quite unreal.

That's why I didn't go on and give you material... more material on the anatomy of sensation, the anatomy of mass in the universe. I've got more data on it but it's so wild and wooly that

umm... and I simply can't prove it any way at this stage so I'll simply not going t go into it, I... I... I won't be drawn on the subject of it.

1:17:35

### Erasing Goals Packages and Knowledge

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

1:18:07

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

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

### Anatomy of the Mass in the Universe

Going back for a moment to the subject of the anatomy of the mass in the universe one... a person doesn't really have to know this anatomy, you know. One can walk... one came into the universe without knowing the anatomy of it and one can walk out of this universe without knowing the anatomy of it. You don't have to know the exact anatomy of the walls and tables and floors and so forth that the universe... this universe before you can get out of this universe. really it's sufficient to know that they consist of postulates in a ... they consist of postulates in a postulate configuration... a scrunched up postulate configuration and really that's sufficient... that's all you really need to haft to know... and of course you need to know about the goals packages and so forth and erase them and get rid of the mind and so forth. Then you... then you can start thinking about walking out of the universe.

1:19:45

Well that's about wraps it up, Greg, I can't umm... think of much else to go on to. It's coming towards the end of the tape anyway, I don't want to get into anything else before the tape... and have the tape run out on me.

Umm... if ahh... if your still in touch with Bill Nichols, the guy who developed... who developed the Unstacking Procedure umm... you could umm... it's quite ok with me if you want to send him a copy of my... my material, uhh... he might be very interested in it. In fact you might save his life. He ahh... his tone arm should be getting up pretty high by now if he's still working on it... if he's still working on the Unstacking Procedure, he should be... he should be using a Mark 14 meter by now which has super sensitivity and he should be looking for little drops of tone arm between 6.9 and 6.85 on his meter. [Laughs] should be getting pretty high, that tone arm, by now. I'm only joking, I hope... I hope he's not that bad. But umm... anyway you certainly have my permission to... to ship him off a copy of my data.

1:20:54

Also umm... also I ... I ... I have no objection if you make a nominal charge to people for your duplicating costs of this material when you send it off to them. I think that... that's something entirely up to you. So umm... I certainly have no objection as long as you make it quite clear that it's you that's charging and not me that charging it. They're your charges and not my charges. I leave that entirely to your discretion, your good sense who you send the material to. You're... I'm sure your quite aware of the limitations as well as I am so I leave it entirely up to your good sense.

Ok, Greg, well that's about it. umm... I hope to hear from you soon and ahh... if I can send you some more data or anything else to clarify umm... I'll be pleased to do so. I don't mind if you communicate with me by tape or whether you communicate with me by letter. If you... I see that on the letter you wrote nice big print, with my bad eyesight if you can... if you do write a letter make print... make the print nice and large or you, as I say if you've got a tape ... tape recording facility then by all means record a tape and I've got... I can play back tapes here quite comfortably so I'm quite happy to converse with you by tape.

Recording a tape is far, far easier for me than writing... writing is very, very difficult for me these days because of my bad eyesight. Even a typewriter's getting beyond me. So ahh... that's why this... that's why this material is on a tape rather than written. It's much easier for me to record with microphone than it is to write or use a typewriter.

Well that's about that at the moment Greg so I'll say TaTa to you and umm... all the best and again thank you for duplicating my material and ahh... bye for now. Bye bye.

End of tape

1:22:47