

Insanity Point Lecture 5
Postulates, Self and the Obsessive IP
By Dennis Stephens
August ?, 1994

Transcribed by
Pete McLaughlin
May 24, 2012

This is the fifth and final tape in the set on upper level technical data of TROM and like it's ... like its predecessors it mustn't be separated from the other members of the set.

The title of the lecture is ahh... Postulates, Self and the Obsessive IP.

One of the most puzzling aspects of the IP to the beginner is the fact that the being does not perceive the IP in its exact form that the... that the person... that the being perceives the IP as mass and not as a postulate configuration.

Actually this isn't as unusual as it... as it sounds at first glance because the ahh... we must remember that the ahh... as we noted in... that the IP is imbedded in an area of confusion. We know that when a person goes through the IP state in games play that ahh... as they go into the IP they go into confusion, then they go into the IP and as they come out the other side of the IP again they go through this state of confusion and ahh... it's well known umm... Ron Hubbard has documented this on many occasions that ahh... that a being... a spiritual being tends to see ahh... a confusion of particles ... a confusion as a mass rather than as a...as a... than what it actually consists of.

1:52

In other words instead of seeing a ahh... a collections of randomly moving particles the being will perceive it as a mass, and this is... this is generally true. So it's no real surprise that the ahh... that the spiritual being tends to view the IP, or not tends to but does view the IP as a... as a mass and not as a postulate configuration. And... and when we also add to this the known fact that the... that the rational mind abhors the IP condition and simply almost flatly refuses to experience it. So the combination of those two things that the being umm... tends to view a confusion as a mass and we add that to the fact that the ahh... that the rational mind abhors insanity, abhors the IP state. It is indeed no surprise at all that the ahh..that the IP state, the IP barrier is seen as the spiritual being, is perceived by the spiritual being as... as a mass.

03:14

Now we must ask ourselves umm... just what does the spiritual being associate this ahh... this mass with. Well umm.. it clearly doesn't associate it with the IP state because ahh... that is ahh... he's unwilling to experience. Umm... so what does he associate the IP state with?

Well we know there's two IP's in the set, don't we. Let's consider the XY set and let's consider a being that ahh... is umm... occupying the X postulate as his game postulate. And umm... that postulate is in the class of self. And he's... he's umm... his opposition postulate is 1-Y and there is the barrier between them and he looks across and sees the barrier there as a mass.

04:19

Now what does he associate... in terms of IP's ahh... you know, in terms of sensation what does he associate this sensation with, in terms of the postulates or as close as he can get to the IP state? What would he associate... what would he associate it... what would he associate the barrier with? What would he associate this sensation that he's sensed with? What would he, in terms of postulates?

04:44

Well now umm... this isn't as difficult a question to answer as we might believe at first glance. In fact it's an extremely easy question to answer. Let us, first of all, consider umm... what happens when the person with the X postulate ahh... wins the game. What does he associate with winning the game? Well when he wins the game he notices that the opponent is driven into the class of ahh... Y... he not only notices if he's perceptive the opponent is driven into the class of Y but he notices that the... the opponent goes ... seems to go through this mass, this barrier which we call the IP barrier and tends to experience the postulates umm... there or goes through a confusion of postulates and then ends up in the postulate Y.

05:47

So when the games player in X, when he wins his game he sees 1-Y go through a period of confusion, of postulate confusion, and then up in the overwhelm of Y, and this he associates with winning the game.

06:05

Now the thing he associates with losing his game is himself being driven through a period of confusion and ending up in the postulate of 1-X, being driven into 1-X.

So it's no real surprise to discover that the... that the situation or the thing that the person... that the being associates with winning his game is the IP over the other side of the barrier. In other words umm... the person in the X, playing with the X postulate associates game sensation with the Y(1-Y) IP because that is the one that's associated with his winning of the game, you see. So that to him is game sensation.

Every time he... every time ahh... he wins his game the opponent gets driven through that... through that IP, see there. So that? So that's the one he...he...he associates game sensation with. With the... see he could alw... in other words the reason for the association is that he... by using

his X postulate, his game postulate he... he... generates the sensation and he sees it in terms of the game loss over that way. And he sees the other person going int... through from 1-Y into Y so he... he associates that IP with his X game. And he does not associate his own game loss with the game sensation.

08:15

Now this reasoning is quite general, this reasoning is quite general.

To put it another way, lets come in from another angle the... the ahh... the IP in... if...on his... on his side of the fence, on his side of the barrier is the $X(1-X)$ IP, isn't it? That is the one... if he loses the game then that's the one he's going to go through. The IP on the other side of the barrier, that I.E. the IP in the class of "not self" is the $Y(1-Y)$ IP. So he will associate the game sensation in the game with the $Y(1-Y)$ IP and he doesn't associate the game sensation with the $X(1-X)$ IP.

09:14

In fact **he won't register that as sensation at all. The only one he registers as sensation would be the IP on the class of not self.** Now this rule is absolutely general. It's so general that you can define, in the goals package; you can define which postulate the being is operating on by the IP that he regards as game sensation. You can determine... you can determine which umm... which side... which postulate he's operating on. Or at least, when I say which postulate, which postulate or its negative he's operating on.

09:58

In other words if he's operating on X or 1-X then the IP that he considers to be sensation will be the $Y(1-Y)$ IP. And if he's operating on the Y or 1-Y then the... the IP then the regards as ahh... as sensation will $X(1-X)$ IP.

10:21

The General Law of Game Sensation

Now this leads us to the general law of game sensation in the postulate... in the... in... in the goals package, the general law of games sensation. And this law... this law... **this law states that the IP that the games player regards as game sensation is the IP that is within the class of not-self.**

10:49

Now on a previous lecture I've already pointed out how the games player as his play becomes more and more obsessive that ahh... more compulsive I should say, as he becomes more and more compulsive that he becomes more and more obsessed with the generation of game sensation. So we find that as the games player becomes more and more... as the games player becomes more and more compulsive that the player becomes more and more obsessed with

this... with this... with the sensation and becomes more and more obsessed with the generation of this particular IP.

11:37

This is what we would predict and this is what we actually find does happen in games play and this is so much so, it's so marked, that we call this IP the obsessive IP, the obsessive IP.

12:00

So of the two IP's in the... in the ahh... in the goals package the one in the class of self is not registered as an IP at all, it's got nothing to do with sensation as far as the games player is concerned, it doesn't generate any games sensation for him and it's simply associated, if he associates it with anything, it's associated with game loss.

12:24

But the one where his attention is fixated and the one which is very important to him and the one which we call the obsessive IP is over there in the class of not self and it's very easy to... very easy to isolate this IP. You've only got to know what the games player's games postulate is. Once you know this game postulate you know what the obsessive IP is because the obsessive IP is the IP that doesn't... doesn't contain his game postulate. Get it?

12:55

That isolates it immediately. You see there's only two IP's in the set and the obsessive one is the one that doesn't contain his game postulate.

Equally, of course, if we knew that this ahh... particular games player was obsessed with a particular IP in a particular goals package we would be able by simply looking at the IP he's obsessed with, we would know which side of the goals package he is on. We could ahh... we could determine that it's either a postulate or its negative. We would know which side of the game he was on, which postulate he regards in the class of self.

13:42

So ahmm... it's a two way... it's a two way proposition and we would never be let down. And there are no exceptions to the rule. The rule as I say is a completely general rule.

Now let's give some examples of this rule, and umm... it might seem a little bit ahh... little bit long winded the way I've approached it, and so forth but I... I... but I've approached it in this manner because I want to really... to really grasp it and understand it.

It's not an easy one to grasp and umm... because it... it... it can seem a little strange at first glance. You might say to yourself, "Well surely the IP on his side of the barrier, the one which he... is in the class of self would be the one that would be much more real to him, much more important to him in games play." But it... But that is not the way it is. That is not the way it is.

14:34

The one that the person regards as important and the one that he regards and associates and the only one he associates with the generation of game sensation is the in the class of not-self. That's the general... that's the general law. If you understand that you can understand a tremendous amount about life and livingness and sensation and gives you an enormous predictability on game.... On games play and... and.. the...and goals packages and so forth in everyday life, as you...as you'll begin to understand before we get to the end of this lecture.

15:14

To Eat Goals Package

Now let's take a very, very simple example. Let's take the ahh... say the "to eat" goals package. Now the "to eat" goals package is one of the more interesting goals packages. I haven't said very much about it so far in the supplementary lectures, in fact it's hardly mentioned in the write up. It's umm... it's one of the bodily goals packages, one of the two bodily goals packages, and ahh... it's a very, very easy one to ahh... to erase with the average person unless they... unless their into such things as ahh...umm... a starving themselves to death or overeating. Unless they've got some very heavy compulsions and inhibitions on the subject of eating the goals package will erase quite comfortably.

16:03

The umm... just in passing I better...better give you some data I have on the "to eat" goals package because it won't appear anywhere else. Umm... the....you would think off hand that there would be a double bind in that goals package. That games play would be completely and utterly compulsive in the "to eat" goals package like it is in the "to sex" goals package but that is not so, that is not so.

16:37

The umm...the... or to put it another way, the human body does have a very tiny tolerance of being eaten. See if games play was completely compulsive the ahh...and it got itself down to a one games class set, the goals package was down to a single games class the... the body would be of "to eat" and "to not be eaten", wouldn't it. That would be the final remaining class, games class in the set... in the goals package, but the body can get into the other games class, it can just get into it. And that is the class of "to be eaten" and "to not eat".

17:21

It doesn't like being in it, in that class, but it can just get into it. umm... what makes me so sure that the body can just get into it is, and the fact that the.. . the... the body like being in that class is the enormous reaction that the human body does have to being eaten.

Umm... you get this little tiny insect like a mosquito comes along and sticks his proboscis in... into you...into your arm and takes a... a microscopic amount of blood away from you as it's dinner and ahh... flies away and your arm produces quite an enormous bump, and you get a similar thing with a nat bite or an ant bite. In other words the bodies reaction to such a tiny nibble from such a tiny insect is quite uh... quite un-proportional to the amount of damage that's being done to the body. So one can conclude from this that the human body has a very, very great intolerance to being eaten. It doesn't ... simply doesn't like being eaten at all. It reacts violently to other organisms that ahh... that want to take a nibble out of it. But never the less, it can be eaten and it does have some ahh... some tolerance of being eaten even if the tolerance is only very, very slight.

18:51

It's a very.... It's a fascinating goals package, as you erase the "to eat" goals package you... you would ahh... umm... you would learn all sorts of things about this subject of eating. Amongst animals umm... the... the big game amongst animals, of course, is "to eat". You'd think well it would be the same amongst plants, but no it's not. Amongst plants the ... the big game in the "to eat" goals package is not "to eat" amongst plants. Plants for many, many millions of years have... have umm... have polished up all their possibilities on the subject of eating. You know, they've perfected their root system and their system of umm... their system of photosynthesis, of getting their... of converting the carbon dioxide in the air and the sun light and combining the two together to produce their... to produce their... their ahh... their umm...their chemistry and that...that's all been set up a long, long while ago. So the...the... the postulate "to eat" in the plant is umm... they pretty well got to the limit, you know. The plant, all plants that are running around today, well not running around, but all plants today are pretty well... got to the limit on that. Now their... the big game amongst plants is to not be eaten. That is the big game and uhh... if plants are evolving at all, their evolving more and more in that direction of "to not be eaten".

20:26

In other words they haven't reached their limits yet, their still exploring the possibilities there.

Ahm... we humans ought to be very grateful to ... to these plant... the...the plant kingdom's umm... subject of not wanting "to be eaten" cause they... the plants produce all sorts of umm... all sorts of very interesting drugs that we...we...we use in medicine. The vast majority of these drugs are simply in the plant to prevent the plant from being eaten. You know, you take the ahh.... You take the marijuana plant with it... which has got in its leaves and stems has got the drug cannabis. Well, and cannabis, of course, as anyone whose tried it, is a... is a bit of a mind bending drug. And umm... it's quite clear the purpose of this drug is to deter animals from eating it.

21:23

You know you get this... you get this little zebra and he comes along and takes a nibble at this cannabis plant and the cannabis blows it's mind and the zebra goes whoopee and gets a high and

goes off tries to mate with a lion and that's the last that's heard of the ahh... of the zebra. You see?

21:47

So, that plant is not going to be eaten by that zebra again. You get the idea? That's just, you know, gives you one example there.

Sometimes the chemicals used in the plant are quite lethal to animals, they are, they can be extremely poisonous. In fact some of the most violent and most deadly poisons known to mankind are plant poisons. The only other really deadly ones that are known to mankind are the animal venoms of the spiders and the snakes. But the plant kingdom has got its own set of rather nasty venoms, it has.

22:27

And ahh... you... you know every ahh... person who goes into the woods and picks... picks what he thinks are mushrooms and takes them home to ... takes them home for the evening meal is likely to find out that... that... that not everything that looks like a mushroom is edible. Some of these ahh... some of these a... some of these little plants contain some rather nasty venoms.

And the reason all these chemicals are in the plant is to prevent the plant being eaten... eaten by animals, so that the game of the plant is... is big business amongst plants, not being eaten. And the plants are always doing a lot of work on this subject and improving their possibilities of not being eaten.

So the big game amongst plants is to not be eaten. But the big game amongst animals is "to eat;" you see it's a slightly different stress between the animal kingdom and the plant kingdom.

23:23

Now when a person operating on the "to eat" postulate the obsessive IP would be the "to be eaten/to not be eaten" or in terms of enforcement, the... the "must be eaten" "mustn't be eaten" IP. That would be the ahh...that would be the obsessive IP that we would predict and that is the one we do find.

If you examine that IP in therapy and get the idea... get... get close to that IP, you'll find yourself rapidly into the subject of digestion and the whole subject of... your right at the very core of this whole subject of eating, you are, as far as the human beings concerned. And his whole idea of whether he can digest this food and whether he can actually survive it and whether he can eat it and the whole thing is... his whole fixation as a being in terms of eating is on that... is on this subject of ahh... ahh... "to be eaten/to not be eaten", you know, the IP. That must be eaten/must be eaten IP is what he regards as the sensation of eating. If you want to know what the sensation of eating is why it's the IP must be eaten/mustn't be eaten. That IP is the sensation of eating

24:52

If you don't believe this is so, if you don't believe what I say is so you should simply get the idea of must be eaten and must be eaten... mustn't be eaten, must be eaten, mustn't be eaten, must be eaten get the idea of the IP there and you will find it will produce quite some queasy sensations in your... in your tummy. Whereas the IP must eat/mustn't eat doesn't affect the body in the slightest. So I can tell you which one is the one that the body is obsessed with, the body is obsessed with the must be eaten/mustn't be eaten IP, which is what the... which is the one we would predict because the body is obsessed with the eating and not being eaten, that is it's obsession but it's game postulate is "to eat". That's for sure that... that's the body's game postulate. Is to eat and that, of course, we would predict that ahh... the obsessive IP would be must be eaten/mustn't be eaten IP.

25:53

And that is the one that is ahh... is the one... that is the obsessive IP and when we come to test this experimentally with a human body.

So simply on the subject of eating we can ahh... we can ahh... we... we... see evidence straight away.

26:12

By the way any queasy effect playing with the "to eat"... the IP's of the "to eat" goals package can be easily resolved by simply erasing the "to eat" goals package. So I wouldn't umm... I wouldn't sud... recommend that you ahh... you play with the IP's... of the "to eat" goals package until you've erased the "to eat" in therapy. I wouldn't recommend it; otherwise you can give yourself quite a queasy tummy.

26:39

Once the "to eat" goals package is erased, of course, out of your psyche it won't matter what you play with on the subject of the "to eat" goals package it won't adversely affect your body.

26:52

Must be Killed/Mustn't be Killed IP

Now I'd like to give you another example. I'll take up the example already mentioned of the ahh... of the adolescent lads driving their car 60 miles an hour out towards a brick wall to get the thrill, so called, of seeing how close they can get to the wall when they pull up.

Now what is the postulate structure, what's the postulates here and what are the IP's here? Well umm... the actual postulate here is "to kill" and the thing on the receiving end of their postulate, of course, is their body. That they...that... their game postulate is "to kill" so the IP is the ahh... must be killed/mustn't be killed IP.

Now the game is to drive the car and therefore their body, which is in the car, as close as possible to that IP. Clearly if they hit the wall at speed the body will go through the IP, go through the wall as well probably, but will go through the IP mustn't be killed/must be killed and go into the overwhelm of must be killed. They will succeed in killing their body. They will win their game, you see. See that?

28:34

But the game sensation as far as the adolescents are concerned is that IP must be killed/mustn't be killed and their seeing how close they can get to that IP. How close they can drive their body to it, to that IP, without killing their body. And their doing... the purpose of the game is to pick up the sensation from the must be killed/mustn't be killed IP. And now that you understand that game in terms...we can see that game you can understand it in terms of the IP's, the winning the game, the losing the game, the IP's and the postulates.

29:18

It's a... It's a... It's a... a nice little example of what we would predict and what we see in practice. Once he... once you understand the IP's and the game postulates and the IP's, the class of self and the class of not self, you can take a little example like the adolescent boys in their car, driving their car at 60 miles per hour toward a wall, and suddenly the whole thing makes enormous sense, doesn't it?

Now before I explained it, you see, it didn't make all that much sense, the idea of a gang of lads getting into a car and driving it at 60 miles an hour towards a wall in order to experience a thrill. It was a bit tricky to understand this in terms of postulates. But once we got the... once we see it...got the IP's we know what the sensation consists of exactly. We can put the whole thing together and now we understand the whole situation. We understand it much more than the adolescent boys ever understand it.

30:27

However, it's a... not until we take up let's say the subject of the "to sex" goals package that this ahh... this subject of ahh... self postulates and the obsessive IP really starts to become valuable to us, really starts to become valuable.

When I discussed the ahh... discussed the subject of the "to sex" goals package on one of the earlier supplementary tapes, if you recall, I said that umm... that the male becomes obsessed with depriving the female of her "mustn't be sexed" postulate and driving her from "mustn't be sexed" into "must be sexed." Do you recall that material?

Well that was really just a sort of a...ahh... a wives saying without ment... of explaining it without mentioning the IP's the truth of the matter is the male as he operates on a "to sex" postulate. His obsessive IP is the must be sexed/mustn't be sexed IP.

So what really obsesses him is the depriving the female of her

‘mustn’t be sexed’ postulate driving her through the mustn’t be sexed/must be sexed IP into “must be sexed” and ahh... it is that situation that... that brings about the male orgasm, the male sexual orgasm.

32:25

Now similarly for the female, she operating on her “must be sexed” postulate umm... is obsessed with depriving the male of his “mustn’t sex” postulate and driving the male through from “mustn’t sex” through the mustn’t sex/must sex IP into “must sex” and that is her, the female, orgasmic situation.

33:03

So... in the “to sex” goals package, never miss it, to the male sexual sensation is the must be sexed/mustn’t be sexed IP and to the female sexual sensation is the must sex/mustn’t sex IP.

Now this state of affairs is tremendously valuable to us on the subject of sexuality because it allows us to ummm... determine with invariable accuracy, you know, and I stress the word Invariable accuracy, we can determine whether a being is in the male or the female universe when discussing this person’s sexual quirks.

Now this is something that Sigmund Freud would have been...well he would have given his back teeth for this bit of information, to be able to do this. And it’s something that’s been puzzling sexual therapists all the way down the line, you know. The ... there’s...you know there’s... there’s more sexual quirks per square inch of humanity than there are quirks on any other subject under the sun, you know.

34:27

And people do get very, very worried about their sexual quirks, and what worries them about their sexual quirks is that they... they don’t know whether... that there in the male universe or in the female universe, this is what basically bothers them.

I remember I had a preclear in London there back in the days when we were running engrams and this... this... this chappie had a... he had a sexual quirk and umm... his sexual quirk was that umm... it used to give him a sexual thrill if his... if a girl was wearing Wellington boots, rubber Wellington boots, used to turn him on sexually, you see. He would get an erection and so forth, and he was always pestering his girlfriends to ahh... to wear rubber Wellington boots, you see.

35:26

And ummm... Now this... this was a harmless enough sexual quirk but the unfortunate thing about it was that if he wore rubber Wellington boots he would also get sexually aroused and his problem was, as he expressed it to me, he didn’t know whether he was being masculine or feminine. He wanted to know whether he was... well he.. he feared that he may be homosexual

because the... you see he was sexually aroused when the girl was in the Wellington boots but if he wore the Wellington boots he was sexually aroused too, he was... he would get an erection again you see.

36:16

So he just wondered... began to wonder about his masculinity. He wondered whether he was a male or he was a female.

Well now unfortunately in those days we were running engrams and uhh... there wasn't too much ... to much I could bring to bear on this subject. We cleaned up his prenatal bank, I remember that, we found out that umm... it was a cont... what you might call continuing problem that his dad apparently had the same... the same fixation upon Wellington boots and umm... that had got into the prenatal coitus engrams and uhh... the thing had got passed on to his son through his childhood and so forth.

It was a rather complicated story but never the less it was one of these continuing... continuing aberrations, you might say, or continuing quirks that were being passed down the ... passed down the male line, from father to son. God knows how many generations it had been passed down. But never the less he'd certainly got this quirk, and as far as we knew that ahh... he'd inherited it from his dad.

I was able to take a lot of tension off this situation for him and he was certainly nowhere near as bothered about it as ahh... when... when he left me as when he arrived but I won't go so far as to say I erased the whole of the... whole of the thing... I couldn't have done because I didn't know anything about the "to sex" goals package and I didn't know anything about sexual sensation. Given that same PC today we would... I know it would have been very, very easy to resolve the whole thing. But umm... never the less he was very happy and he went... he went on his way and thanked me very much for what I'd done for him. But never the less there was an example of a sexual quirk there that was bothering the person.

38:14

Ok, well let's examine that sexual quirk now and find out... we can determine with great accuracy which universe this ahh... this person was in. Was he in the male universe or we he... was he in the female universe?

38:33

Well umm... he was very sure of one thing, very sure of the fact that... that ahh... that girls in Wellington boots... when girls wear Wellington boots it made them more amenable to sex. That was what was in his mind. That was the basis of the quirk, was that ahh... he had this idea, this fixed idea that if a girl wore Wellington boots it made her more sexy and she was more... more ahh... in favor of going to bed with him, at least that was what he... in other words it made the girl more amenable to ... to sex.

39:13

Well now once you know that we now know that the ahh... the quirk there, the thing that was umm... because the ahh... the thing that was exciting him was actually the subject of the IP must sex/mustn't be sexed. You see that? Because it was the... the ... the fixation was upon the female being more amenable to being sexed. You see, you see that? Being more amenable to sex.

39:50

So clearly that was the IP. That he was... that was the obsessive IP. He was obviously in the "must sex" postulate and the female was clearly in ... over the other side of the fence. So he was clearly in the male universe. Fixed it right away, we fixed him, fixed it right away.

40:16

Remember as I said early on in this lecture if you know the obsessive IP you can determine the postulates... that the person... the game postulate that the person is operating on. You can determine which side of the goals package they are on once you know the obsessive IP, and if you know which side of the goals package they are on you know what their obsessive IP is. You see that?

So knowing that the... that he regarded that... that umm... wearing Wellington boots made the ggg... made girls more amenable to be sexed, fixed him right away... put that into the class of not self so he must be on the other side of the package over on the "to sex" side of the package which is the male side of the package. So you see it? Straight away is solved that problem.

41:05

But umm... what, you might ask, about umm... he himself being sexually aroused when he wore Wellington boots himself, how come? Well surely that was an example of ahh... of umm... of him being out of gender. Nope he's still in gender because... look... it's still the person wearing wellington boots is more amenable to be sexed and that is what's turning him on so he's still in the male gender even though it's his own body. Did you get it?

41:43

It doesn't matter, the rule... the rule is that ... the rule is that ahh... it's the IP, it's the obsessive IP. It doesn't matter if the obsessive IP is associated with his own body or someone else's body or where it is. If he's turned on by that IP and that IP means sensation to him and that IP is must be sexed/mustn't be sexed then he is a male. Now ...now did you get that?

42:19

It fixes it...fixes it. it's got nothing to do with whose body's involved, it could be a girls body, it could be his body, another man's body, his own body, a male body, or you can be a female...

with a female body, it doesn't ... I mean a female can have the same thing. But whoever is fixated upon that IP is in the male universe. You see... you get it?

42:49

Their fixated upon the must be sexed/mustn't be sexed IP they are a male and if their fixated upon the must sex/ mustn't sex IP their a female. It fixes it.

43:06

Gender Obsessive IP's

Now the ahh... the IP's of the "to sex" goals package the two IP's there we call them the gender obsessive IP's. That the general...in a general goals package we just call them the obsessive IP's but ahh... because they fix gender, fix it thoroughly, nail it to a... I mean you nailing gender to the boards here, you know. You just fixing it absolutely rigidly. Because it fixes gender we call those the gender obsessive IP's so for the male the must be sexed/mustn't be sex IP is the male gender obsessive IP and the must sex/mustn't sex IP is the fe... female gender obsessive IP.

44:06

Now let us take some more example of this and we'll see how umm... we'll see how it works out, the various quite common quirks. And don't kid yourself on the subject of sex if you've ever audited any number of preclears, like I have, you'll realize how common sexual quirks are and how bothersome they are to people and how much time they spend worrying about them.

One... one of the more worrisome sexual quirks that male's suffer with is fear of homosexuality. Now this is a sort of common situation that occurs say to a young man or to an adolescent he get's set upon by a pack of other adolescents or a pack of men and gets raped and because this sexually excited him he begins to believe that he was... that he's a homosexual.

It's awfully common, it's awfully common, can happen in childhood to young boys in childhood. It can happen at schools and so forth. Some lad gets picked upon and feminized by the other boys and he gets... the lad gets a sexual thrill out of it, gives him a sexual kick and he thinks, "Oh my God, I'm a homosexual!"

45:33

Well now let's examine this situation in terms of what we know. Let's take our adolescent boy that's ahh... that's pack raped, and he gets a sexual thrill out of it. Well the IP here is clearly the must be sexed/mustn't be sexed IP. That's the one he was driven through, his body was driven through. His body was driven through... driven... his body was driven into must be sexed, in the rape situation. He was driven... his body was driven through the must be sexed/mustn't be sexed IP and driven into "must be sexed" but while this was occurring he got a sexual thrill from it, right? Well he's in the male universe isn't he? It's his gender obsessive IP. So naturally he would get sexually aroused by the presence of this gender obsessive IP even though it's his own body.

He would be aroused by it if it was happening to a female nearby him it's his gender obsessive IP. You see that?

46:50

Will give him sexually, will be sexually aroused. But the puzzle is what worries him he thinks, "Well it didn't ought to happen on his own body." Well why not?

The rule is as I said that it's ahh... it's the relationship between the game postulate and the obsessive IP. It's got nothing to do with the gender of the body. It's simply to do with the ahh... the postulates; we're only concerned here with the postulates. It's got nothing to do with the body, just the god damned postulates that or involved. You see that?

47:23

Once you understand that, you've got it. So that the, this young worrying about being a homosexual is completely... completely false, there's nothing... there's nothing wrong with his sexuality.

This incident where he was pack raped and he got sexually aroused by being pack raped doesn't mean he's a homosexual. It doesn't indicate any... any... any... there's no suggestion in the incident that he's anything else but a male.

But he would have to understand this technology and work at the "to sex" goals package, and so forth, and get to a point of understanding this technology before he could... he could ... he could grasp this and breathe a sigh of relief, and realize what's going on.

48:11

Alright now, now what about another, there's another male, he's got a sexual quirk he get's sexually aroused. He likes to wear feminine clothes and he get's sexually aroused umm... when he... when he arouses men and makes them sexually interested in him when he wears sexual clothes.... when he wears feminine clothes. Now which universe is he in?

48:42

Well, what's the ... what's the IP here? He's actually drive... by wearing feminine clothes he's driving the other male over that way, he's depriving them of their "mustn't sex" postulate isn't he? He's making them sexually interested, therefore he's driving them into must sex and therefore he's in the feminine universe. It's a... It's a feminine sex game, that is. He's clearly a... now this male is clearly out of... out of... out of gender. He's out of his masculine gender and he's into feminine gender. You see that?

49:20

We fixed this one, fixed that one there... there ... that's where he is.

49:29

This ahh... this cross... this cross clothing of children into clothes of the opposite gender and so forth by various parents is a fertile area for sexual quirks. Let's take an example, let's take a woman say with a sexual quirk to dress her son as a girl, she dressed her son as a girl and it gives her a sexual thrill. Now which universe is she in?

50:10

Now, I don't think there's a psychoanalyst or a psychotherapist on the planet who could solve that one. They would nearly always get it wrong. Well let's examine the IP here; by dressing her son in feminine clothes she is going to deprive him of his masculinity, right? She is, in effect, giv.... The... the... the sheer presence of all the.. of the ionization of all these feminine garments around the young lads quite weak male sexuality would simply drive him into the female universe and would deprive him of his "mustn't be sexed" postulate and drive him into "must be sexed" so the IP that is giving this person a thrill is the must be sexed/mustn't be sexed IP. She's driving her son through that IP into "must be sexed."

51:18

Now this is the male.... Male, this is what gives the male the sexual kick so when she does this she's in the male universe. Only a woman in the male universe would get a sexual thrill from dressing her son as a female.

Now what about the woman who dresses... gets a sexual thrill from dressing her daughter as a boy? Well. The presence of all these masculine garments around the rather weak feminine sexuality of the... of the female child would drive the child umm... would deprive the child of their "mustn't sex"... of the female child of her "mustn't sex" postulate and drive her into "must sex". In other words it would mascul... masculinize the chil... the young girl... but, so what's the IP here? Well the child will be driven through the mustn't sex/must sex IP into "must sex" well that's the feminine gender obsessive IP. So the mother would do this to her daughter is in the female universe. It will be a female sexual quirk.

52:45

So you see that whatever the situation is whatever the quirk is... the sexual quirk is. That by the use of this technology, this understanding of the IP, of the gender obsessive IP and because we can tie up the gender obsessive IP with the gender, which fixes which side of the package we're on we can always, without exception, knowing the quirk and knowing just the barest information about the quirk, and so forth and just the effect of the quirk has on the person we... we... we can determine ahh.... Whether the person is in the male universe or the female universe.

53:34

Quite, quite interesting isn't it, quite interesting, that we can do this and thereby resolve so many of these problems. Now any... any sex therapist would, you know, they'd give anything for this technology and they're very welcome to it. I hope it helps them, I really do, I hope it helps them. It's about time someone came along and ahh... and solved humanities ahh... problems on the subject of sex. You know there's so much garbage written, there's whole libraries of garbage written in books on the subject of sex. It's about time someone come along and ahh.. and spoke the truth on the subject and settled everyone's minds so they knew exactly what the score is on this subject. And they can put their minds at rest

54:31

So a person with a sexual quirk, knowing this technology, they've only got to look at the IP's and so forth and they'll know at a glance which universe there in. they'll know sexually whether they're in the male universe or they will know whether they're in the female universe. It's as simple as that.

54:48

So you see this umm... this subject of ahh... of umm... sensation and the IP, self and the postulate has got enormous ramifications, doesn't it. It doesn't sound very much when we start in on it but we now find that uhh... it's of enormous social value in our society not... not just on the subject of sex. I mean if it... if it can only... If it was only useful on the subject of sex it would be... it would be wonderful data... wonderful information, but bear in mind it applies to every goals package as I've already indicated with the examples of the young lads. Adolescent boys driving their car into the brick wall. And the example of the "to eat" goals package. there's other examples there, so it applies to any goals package

55:56

Well I hope this umm.. this information... this data on this subject is ahh... proving useful... proved useful to you and ahh... thank you very much.

56:08

End of lecture

