# 01 Insanity Point

By Dennis Stephens

June 1994

The Insanity Point

Edited for publication by

Pete McLaughlin

Second Edition May, 2014

Cover design by Leona McLaughlin



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

# Table of Contents

# Introduction

The original book "The Resolution of Mind, A Games Manual" was written from the research notes of Dennis Stephens by Greg Pickering in 1978 and published in 1979.
Dennis Stephens research into the mind and how to resolve it continued after the publication of TROM and by 1992 he felt he had much new material that needed noting down.
Dennis dictated to cassette tape his research notes over the two year period from 1992 to 1994. Those research notes remained unpublished until I found them in Australia in 2010.
I typed up the transcripts which I found very difficult to read so I edited them to improve their readability and this series of books is the results.

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

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

06 TROM Therapy Manual

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

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

Be sure to visit **www.tromhelp.com** for more information about TROM and the TROM therapy methods. Also join the TROM email group at http://lists.newciv.org/mailman/listinfo/trom.

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

Sincerely

Pete McLaughlin

May 2014

# 01 Insanity Point

By Dennis Stephens

June 30 1994

Today is the 30th of June 1994 and this is the first of the lectures on the upper level tech of TROM, and I want to take up with you the subject of insanity.

## Sanity Defined

The word insanity or more precisely the word sanity comes from the old Latin word *"sanus"* meaning healthy, so presumably insane means unhealthy. But that meaning has long since been modified in English and the only connection, these days, between the subject of sanity and the subject of health is we could say that a person who is insane would have an unhealthy mind. That would be about the only connection. There's no other connection between the word health and the word sane that I know of in modern English.
However, it has long been known by mankind that there is a connection between this subject of sanity and this subject of reason. And also, it's been known, that unhealthy people, particularly unhealthy people with unhealthy minds don't reason to well. So there's a connection there.

In our modern society, the word insane is largely used in a legal sense. More and more, only the legal profession has any use for this term of insanity, the term insane and this subject of insanity.
The medical profession gave the term away many years ago because of their conflict within the medical profession on what the word means. These days the medical profession talk about psychosis, in the subject of psychiatry, they talk about psychoses etc., which they have some form of definition for, and there they stand.
But on the subject of insanity, they won't have a part in its legal sense and one can understand why.
You see the problem that the law has with the subject of insanity started many years ago when some bright young barrister pleaded his client innocent of a crime on the grounds of insanity. And once he did this, of course, the legal profession had to have a definition of insanity, to find out if the person was on one side or the other side of the line.
In other words, they were looking for a definition of insanity. I believe this was some time in the 19th century in English law. They came up with a definition of insanity, a legal definition. I believe they called it the M'Naghten rules, which said that a person, and I'm paraphrasing it here, that a person is insane if he doesn't know what he is doing or if he does know what he's doing, but he doesn't know that what he is doing is wrong. That's roughly a paraphrase of the M'Naghten rules, and you'll find that that rule is, with various modifications, taken in various parts of England, Australia and so forth as the legal definition of insanity. Also, many states of America have adopted it or very similar rules.

But quite clearly, such a definition of insanity is useless from a medical point of view and that's why the medical profession simply won't have a part of it. They're quite happy with the term psychosis which they can fit into a medical structure. They can't fit this legal definition of insanity into a medical structure so they have no use for it.
Well, quite frankly, neither can we. We can't use the legal definition of insanity either. The lawyers and solicitors and legal eagles might be able to make sense of this definition but it's as completely useless a definition for a social scientist or a psychologist, as it is for a medical doctor. It's quite useless, and so we must abandon it too. It's of no use to us when we're talking on the subject of insanity.
If we want to understand this subject of insanity we ought to have some form of a definition for it, which means we've got to hang it onto something. We've got to connect it to something. We just can't have it hanging there all by itself in space. We've got to define it. To define it means we've got to connect it to something else in the universe.

## Reason

Well the thing that insanity or sanity connects itself most obviously to is this subject of reason. That is the thing it is most obviously connected to. As I pointed out earlier, it's been well known that insane people do not reason very well. They reason very badly. And people with unhealthy minds reason very badly. It's been well known for many centuries that this is so.
So the most obvious thing to define sanity and insanity is in terms of reason and that is what we do in TROM. We don't talk about health and healthy minds but we're very much concerned with this subject of reason.

## A Thing Cannot Both Exist and Not Exist Simultaneously

Now, in TROM we know, this is not an original discovery in TROM, but we know in TROM that reason in this universe is based on this proposition that **"A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously."** Now that is a definition of reason, a basis of reason in the whole field of logic and in the whole of the sciences.

The whole of science accepts that as a basis of reason, that that is the basis of reason. In fact the whole science of logic is based upon that premise that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously. So that is reason in logic. It's the subject of reason in science and it happens to be the subject of reason in the universe at large.

When the scientists and the logicians adopted that as their basic premise of reason and based the subject of logic upon that they were on very firm ground because it turns out that the proposition that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously is a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is evidently constructed.

So we're on very firm ground in TROM when we say, "Ok, we're going to start relating this subject of sanity to reason and insanity to unreason."

Now, once we do this we've completely left mankind at large behind, because mankind at large as you probably know and have noticed has almost as many definitions of insanity as there are people.

It's an incredible thing if you go up to a person and say, "Well what do you think…what is insanity?" and you'll get as many different answers as there are people. Now the reason why you get this phenomenon is that nobody knows what reason is. You see?

If you don't know what reason is you won't know what unreason is and if you don't know what unreason is you're going to have trouble with this subject of insanity, because there's obviously a connection between this subject of unreason and insanity. Now you see why mankind has trouble with this subject.

The endpoint that mankind gets to on this subject of insanity is that he says, **"Well any person who disagrees with me is insane."** Now that's the final fling of the compulsive games player. You know. If you disagree with me you must be insane because you disagree with me. And I'm sane. I'm obviously sane; therefore if you disagree with me you must be insane. And that is the final step of the compulsive games player.

This might be a method of settling games. It might be a very valid idea for getting rid of the opponent. I mean history shows a vast number of occasions where people who've disagreed with the establishment have been clapped away in insane asylums or maybe even executed, simply because they disagreed with the establishment. They've been pronounced insane and vanished. They've gone never to be seen again. And this is still happening today on the planet.

You can go to various countries in the third world and anybody who disagrees with what the president, say he publishes his disagreement with what the president says and the following day the man's gone, never heard of again. You know? His body is dumped out at sea somewhere. That's it, you know? He's gone. Obviously insane, done with him, he disagreed with what the establishment said.

You see this is what the compulsive games player considers as reason and unreason. The man is obviously insane because he disagrees with me.

This is about as far south as it can go. It's about as unreasonable as you can get on this subject of reason I can assure you, because we know what reason is.

Reason's got nothing to do with “Might being right.” It's got one hell of a lot to do with whether the thing can both exist and not exist simultaneously in the universe. Now you get the drift of what I'm onto here?

Mankind at large doesn't know anything about this subject. Only the scientists know a bit, because they've studied logic. Logicians know about it. They know a bit about reason. The scientists know a bit about reason but mankind at large doesn't.

People who have never studied science or studied logic, studied mathematics have no vaguest idea of what reason consists of. Really they have no idea.

Outside of this field of natural philosophy a person has no idea of what reason consists of, that includes the law, that includes business people, and so forth. They simply have no idea. It's not part of their training. So they have no concept of what reason is. So they have no concept of what insanity is. So, of course, they can pick any wild idea out of thin air and say, “Well that's as good definition of insanity as any.” You see that?

That is what's happening in our society all the time on this subject of insanity. There are almost as many definitions of insanity as there are people simply because people don't know what reason is and if they don't know what reason is they don't know what unreason is. If they don't know what unreason is they can't connect it up with this subject of insanity, so they can't get a good definition of insanity, but we can. We can do better than that.

Now, I have to give you this little digression because you may believe that our society knows a lot about insanity. The truth of the matter is it knows nothing about insanity simply because our society at large doesn't know anything about reason. It can't define it.

You go up to a person and say, “What do you think is reason? What's the definition of reason?” He can't tell you. He doesn't know.
He will call himself a reasonable man. You say, “Are you reasonable?” He'll say, “Oh, yes. I'm a reasonable man.” You say, “Ok, what is reason?” He can't answer the question. Now that is a very strange state of affairs isn't it?
A man will call himself reasonable when he can't define reason. How unreasonable can you get? That's just about as unreasonable as you can get, isn't it?
But, enough of this digression, let's get back onto the main road.

## Insanity Defined

Well now we're ready to give our definition of insanity. We're in a position to do it. We've tied it up with the subject of reason. We know what reason is. So we know what unreason is. So we can define insanity. Now this is the definition that we use in TROM.
Here we go. A person is insane when they believe that a thing can both exist and not exist simultaneously.
That is the definition of insanity that we use in TROM. A person is insane when they believe that a thing can both exist and not exist simultaneously.
Now as you listen to the definition it doesn't seem particularly world shattering does it? I mean the earth didn't move under your feet as I read it to you. But that is the definition of insanity. It ties it up completely with the subject of unreason.

But although, it doesn't sound particularly earth shattering as we proceed to tie it up to our existing technology of games play I can assure you the datum will become more and more earth shattering. So you will start to almost feel the planet move under your feet when you start thinking about this subject

## Prerequisite for insanity

Now the first step on this road is what we might call, and is probably very correctly called, the prerequisite for insanity. And again this is not understood outside of TROM.
By the way, Scientology had no definition for insanity. Note that! We have a definition in TROM for insanity. Scientology had no definition for insanity. You can hunt through Ron's works; he never bothered to define it. I don't think he ever really came to grips with this subject of reason, unreason and insanity himself, certainly not closely enough to define it within his subject.
But we've come to grips with it and we can define it.

## Insanity and Compulsive Games Play

But as I say there is a prerequisite to this subject of insanity, a very interesting prerequisite, which ties it up to the subject of games play. Now here is the prerequisite of insanity.
Here we go; a person only goes insane when they believe that they have no class to go into if they are overwhelmed in games play.
[Class means a role to play in a game - PM]

Now what do we mean by that? Well it's pretty self-explanatory isn't it? A person can only go insane if they have no class to go into if they are overwhelmed in games play.
In other words a person can reduce their postulate set down to two games classes. And while they've got two games classes their ok. They can go into one games class and lose the game and they will get driven into the other games class and their still ok. They've got a game they can play. But what happens if they reduce their set down to a single game class set?
Now we tie this material up with what I mentioned, I believe on supplementary tape number 3, this subject of the postulate set and the reduction of the goals package. Recall that material? There on supplementary tape number 3.
[See the book 03 Expanding on Level 5, Section: The Exclusion Postulate, How Games Become Compulsive.-PM]
If the goals package or more correctly the postulate set is reduced down to a one game class postulate set and the person is using this postulate set in games play and is actually in this games class and actively playing a game from this sole remaining games class and loses the game. Gets driven into overwhelm, he has literally no place to go.
You might say, “Well he'll simply go into one of the other games classes. No he can't, because he's postulated that he can't go there. His last overwhelm said no, his last overwhelm, when he last left that class he said, “Well I can no longer play this game. I can no longer stay in this game. I've got to get out of this game. It's not playable by me anymore.” So he reduced that possibility down to zero.
Now the last possibility is reduced down to zero. So where is he going to go?

## He goes insane!

Well I'll tell you where he goes. He goes insane. He loses his marbles. And that's what happens.
And that's the connection between insanity and compulsive games play. And it's a tremendously valuable connection. Once you grasp it all sorts of things start to make enormous sense.
It tells you immediately that only compulsive games players go insane. And it also tells you that every compulsive games player, given enough time, will eventually go insane.
Once the person reduces the goals package down to two games classes, that's the state of compulsive games play, eventually it's going to get reduced down to one games class. Compulsive games play starts with two games classes, then it gets reduced down to one games class and at that point every time he starts to use this class in games play he's putting his sanity on the line, because if he loses the next game he loses his sanity.
He's gone. There is no other place he can go but into insanity.
And our problem is to put forward this scheme, to show how this occurs. And to get it all written down so it's understandable. So you can see it clearly. And it's not an easy thing for me to do because we're dealing with the very essence of unreason.
Don't kid yourself. I wouldn't be giving you this data if I didn't know, with absolute certainty, that it's correct.
I first discovered this data some years ago but I put it on the back burner for further testing so I wouldn't go off half cocked. But now I'm absolutely certain that this is it, that I've got the data on insanity. I know exactly what insanity is, and it is what I'm saying it is.

That right at the heart of every insanity you will find this compulsion to make a thing both exist and not exist simultaneously, or the urge to try and operate on a postulate and its negative simultaneously.
One way or another, the insane person is trying to do the impossible. And it is impossible. It defines the impossible in this universe, this attempt to operate on a postulate while working on its negative.
You can't both go to China and not go to China simultaneously. If you try this you will go mad. That is insanity. You get it?
Now another datum that immediately falls out the hamper once we know this prerequisite for insanity is the practical thing of, "How could a person proof themselves against insanity?"

## How a person can proof themselves against insanity.

Now we know how to do this in TROM. We know how a person can proof themselves against insanity but it's not understood in any other field of psychotherapy. It's not understood in Scientology.
It's just generally known in Scientology that if a person is cleared that they won't go mad. But it wasn't understood why. We know why. We can explain why it is. We're running on a senior datum here than the other psychotherapies. We can correlate this material so closely because of our quite profound knowledge and understanding of games play.

So how can we proof a person against insanity? The simple way a person can be proofed against insanity, all they have to do is do Levels 1, 2, and 3 of TROM. Solo. That's all they have to do. Anyone who's achieved the first three levels of TROM has proofed themselves against insanity.
Why? Because by the time the person gets to the top of Level 3, they are no longer a compulsive games player. They've taken so much charge off their game compulsions that their game compulsions are now no longer game compulsions. They play games still but the compulsions are gone. The intensity of charge is off their bank by the time they get to the top of Level 3. They've taken enormous charge off their case and they are no longer a compulsive games player. And because their no longer a compulsive games player they have no danger of ever going insane.
They cannot be driven insane in life any longer. They can be made miserable but they can't be driven insane.
Your compulsive games player can be both made miserable and driven insane and the proof is proofing of the individual with the first three levels of TROM.
A person doesn't have to go as far as Level 4 or Level 5. They don't have to erase all the goals packages in their mind. Oh no, that's not necessary, just Levels 1, 2 and 3 completed solo is sufficient to proof any person against insanity.
Now that is a tremendously important datum. And it's a datum that stems directly from our understanding of how insanity comes about.
Quite clearly if a person is not a compulsive games player they haven't reduced their games down to a single game class, and if they haven't reduced their games play down to a single games class, then they're not putting all their eggs in one basket. Are they?
And as they haven't got all their eggs in one basket they can suffer overwhelm and always have a place to go to. They will always have a class to occupy in the event of overwhelm.

Unlike the compulsive games player whose reduced his games classes down to one. If that one gets overwhelmed he's got no place to go except to lose his marbles, which he promptly does.
Now I want to give you an example of this so you'll see it very clearly. You'll see how this would go.
I'll go through an example, and work the example through with you carefully and you'll see exactly how the person goes insane. And we'll relate it exactly to the postulates involved.

## Boolean Algebra

But before I do so I have probably a little bit of bad news for you.
In order to truly understand this subject of insanity we need enormous precision in our reasoning which cannot be obtained by the use of just words. So in order to achieve this precision I've got to use the algebra of logic which is Boolean algebra. I will have to lapse into this symbolism.
I'm sorry. My apologies but if I attempt to do it otherwise I'm simply going to fail and the whole tape will just degenerate into a mass of verbiage. I won't get my point across. So I'm going to have to use logical symbolism.
So that means I'm going to have to define my symbolism as I go, and explain exactly what the symbolism means. Then you can grasp it.
It's not a difficult subject. I'm not going to turn you into a logician or anything like that. I'm just giving you the absolute fundamentals of it here so you can understand the terms and see it in terms of the symbolism.
Einstein had this same problem with his relativity theory. It's generally recognized that it's quite impossible to explain Einstein's relativity theory in words to anyone.

But once a person understands sufficient advanced mathematics it's quite understandable. When they see the mathematics, it all makes sense but they can't put it into words.
This is simply because the mathematics is a much more precise tool than the English language. I'm up against the same problem trying to explain and discuss this subject of insanity while just using words. The words just aren't precise enough. I will have to lapse into the symbolism of logic in order to achieve the precision required to get the job done.
So my apologies, but I do have no choice. Up to this point I've got through. I managed to write the write up of TROM. I've given all these supplementary lectures and you've only had just a nodding acquaintance with the algebra of logic.
I've mentioned it in just a few bits and pieces here and there but now I'm afraid I am going to have to go a little bit further into it and explain a little bit more of it in order to complete this upper level tech of TROM. It's a complicated subject and we need the precision of the algebra.
So here we go.
First of all I'll give you the symbolism I am going to use and then I'll discuss some of the relationships and their deductions one from another. But first of all the symbolisms so somebody listening to this can actually write it down on paper and see the symbolism.

## X and 1-X

When we put down a symbol, say “X” that really means “X” exists. If we want to put down “not X” we write that down as “1-X” and, in other words, all we're saying there is that the absence of X is everything in the universe except X. So it's “X” is, X exists, and “X” doesn't exist is 1-X the whole universe less X. See that?

## (Brackets)

Normally, for convenience sake we surround the 1-X with a Bracket, so when I'm going to give you 1-X, I'll give it to you in the form (1-X). Get that?
Now there's going to be nothing else inside the brackets except 1-X or 1-Y. It will be 1, minus sign, and a symbol. That's all that's ever going to turn up in the brackets. So there is nothing complicated inside the brackets, except the one minus the symbol. That's all that's going to be in the brackets.

## Equal = and Not Equal to ≠

Right, next are the signs that we're going to use.
First is the equal sign. Well the equal sign is in arithmetic and we use it in logic exactly the same as it's used in arithmetic. It means identical. **Equal sign means identical with**. So equals is just exactly the same meaning as used in common arithmetic.
But we use another sign in logic and that is the sign of ≠. Not equal to. And the sign we use for that is the ordinary equal sign of arithmetic but we slash it through with a line 45 degrees to the horizontal. It slashes through the equal sign. It literally crosses it out. And that is the sign for not equal.
Now fundamentally in logic the statement or the sign ≠ simply means that equality is not the case. That's what it means. **Equality is not the case**. It's not equal. See? Equality is not the case. That's all the symbol ≠ means.

[Note - The equal sign and not equal sign have special meaning in TROM of a Bonding or Identification in addition to equality.

X=(1-Y) E.g. Since "must sex" gets game sensation from "must not be sexed" these two postulates are identified with sexual sensation for the "must sex" game player. This game sensation identification is expressed by X=(1-Y) or Y=(1-X).
X is bonded to not Y, X=(1-Y), means X has begun applying the (1-Y) postulate to himself. X with the "must sex" postulate is also working on the "must not be sexed" postulate for himself. X does not want to be at effect of the "must sex" postulate he is forcing on others.
Game sensation is generated by the action of bonding a postulate to its negative. E.g. (X=(1-X) or X(1-X)) at the boundary between opposing postulates. Sexual sensation is generated by finding an opposing games player and causing them to want to have sex with you. Changing their must not sex to must sex.
X≠Y - means the player with postulate X decides not to allow a complementary postulate situation because it will end the game. The game player at X will change his postulate to (1-X) any time (1-Y) changes to Y so the postulates remain in conflict and the game sensation can continue to be generated.
X≠0 - means the class X has some members in it.
X=0 means there are no members in the class of X.
X+Y=0 means that both X=0 AND Y=0.
X+Y=1 means that the universe either consists of X OR it consists of Y or it may consist of both. It's indeterminate.
XY+X(1-Y)+Y(1-X)+(1-X)(1-Y)=1 this is the complete universe of discourse for the X and Y postulates and their negatives in the rational universe. This is all the possible game classes that can exist between two conflicting postulates. Depending on the actual postulates involved some classes may be empty.
X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1 means the games player has been overwhelmed and his universe of discourse consist of his postulate bonded to its negative. He has reached the insanity point. These are the two game classes in the irrational universe. - PM]

## 0, Zilch, Zero, Nothing, Naught and Null

Now in logic zero means the same as it does in ordinary arithmetic and ordinary algebra, it means nothing, zilch, naught. So, **X=0 means there are no items in the class of X items.**

## 1 Unity and Universe

One, the figure "1" means universe, or more precisely the universe of discourse. It's the totality of the existence classes, the totality of things that can exist in the situation. We express that with the figure "1". So the only numbers that appear in the logic are zeros and ones. We don't have any other numbers. It's a much more simple mathematics than ordinary mathematics.

## Class

Now a class is a group whose members all posses the same quality or qualities. I'll give it again, **A class is a group whose members all posses the same quality or qualities**. Example, Men are a class, you consider men as a class because they all posses the same quality or qualities. Black beings are a class, a class of black beings; they possess the quality of blackness and the quality of beings so they are black beings. So that's a class. There's a class of black beings and a class of men. They are examples of classes.
So that's what this mysterious word class means. These definitions I am giving you are pretty well standard definitions in the field of logic, so they are scientific definitions in the science of logic.

I am sure if you were to refer to a logical text book you'd find much more hairy definitions than I am giving you but they boil down to what I'm giving you. These are probably much more precise than the textbook definitions would be but these are good enough for us.

## Common Class

Next, we have the definition of a common class. Now a common class is a class whose members all posses the qualities of two classes. Give it to you again. **A common class is a class whose members all possess the qualities of two classes.** An example of a common class would be black men. Each of the members of the class of black men would possess the qualities of black beings and of men. So they would be the common class of black beings and of men. So they become the class of black men, you follow. This is quite straight forward. The common class

## Null Class

Now I've given you the definition for a common class. Now the next thing the next definition we have is a null class. Null is Latin meaning not any.
**Now a Null class is a class having no members. A null class is an empty class**. Give it you again; a null class is a class having no members. E.g. green cats, they are a null class. There aren't any green cats, as far as I know. I've never come across one. And I've never heard of anyone coming across a green cat. Cats don't come out in that color. Therefore green cats are an empty class.

Cats are a class with members in. The class of cats is a well defined class, with the creatures cats. And green objects and green entities they're a class in the universe. Both those classes exist. The class of green objects exists, green things exist. They're a class. And the class of cats exists, but the common class of green cats does not exist. It's an empty class. So that's what we mean when we say a null class.
The null class is a class having no members. It's an empty class. And the moral here is there is no way you can combine these particular classes together and have a common class. You must always bear in mind some of these permutations and combinations of classes might be null in the real universe. You might be able to use them in a logical system in an imaginary universe, but in the real universe they're a null class.

## Plus + means either AND or OR

Now I better also at this point give you the meaning of the plus sign "+" in logic. The plus sign is slightly different from its use in ordinary arithmetic and algebra. In logic the use of the plus sign depends upon what's on the other side of the equation.
For example, if we have X+Y=0. It means that both X=0 and Y=0. And the combination of X+Y=0 means that both of them =0. Get that?
So X+Y=0 means exactly the same as X=0 and Y=0. We put them together and say X+Y=0.
But when we say "X+Y=1." We can't use that additive definition when their equal to one, when their equal to the universe.
X+Y=1 has the meaning that the universe either consists of X or it consists of Y or it may consist of both. It's indeterminate. It may consist of both.

In other words, it's an either/or situation. But we don't know whether it's what they call inclusive OR or the exclusive OR. So we don't know, but when we have an equation equal to one the plus sign is disjunctive. We can't just add them together like we can in arithmetic. Quite disjunctive, it's definitely an either/or situation. **Either it is X or it is Y or it is both**. That's the way it's generally interpreted in logic, the equation X+Y=1. [disjunctive - serving to disconnect or separate)- PM]

## X≠ 0

Now, what about the equation X is not equal to naught "**X≠0"? Well that means that X is somewhere in between X is equal naught "X=0" and X equals 1 "X=1"**. It certainly doesn't mean that X equals naught "X=0" and it certainly doesn't mean that X equals 1 "X=1", it's in between. **What it means is that some X's do exist**. See that?
It's not the case that X doesn't exist. That is precisely what X≠0 means. It means that it is not the case that X doesn't exist. X may be equal to 1 in that set of circumstances. We don't know. But it is not the case that X does not exist, and that's what X is not equal to naught "X≠0" means.
Little bit complex until you get to grips with it, the use of that not equal "≠" sign but I can assure you it all makes sense.
It's only by the way in the last 50 or a hundred years or so that the logicians have got out the use of these signs and brought them to the precision that they are today.

The history of logic is a very fascinating history if you like to read it up. It's the history of how not to do it. There's no more precise subject than logic and when you read up the history of it, it's quite amazing how many great logicians have got it wrong. Particularly on this subject of what is meant by the not equal sign and how we interpret the question of sum in logic. Well we can do it in modern logic but they couldn't do it a hundred years ago. But we can do it today.

## X≠ 0 versus X=0

It must be clearly understood that the sign X is not equal to naught "X≠0" is the complete antithesis of X equals naught "X=0". You see that? It's the antithesis. It's the complete opposite. The opposite of X equals naught "X=0" is X is not equal to naught "X≠0".
The antithesis of X=0 is not, repeat not, X=1. See that?
If X≠0, X may equal 1 but we just don't know. It's certainly not equal to naught and we express that by saying "X≠0". See that?
Or put that another way, some X's do exist. That's another way to look at it. Use the word "some"
Ok, now what about X+Y≠0?
Well the easiest way to understand X+Y≠0 is to realize that X+Y≠0 is the antithesis or the opposite of X+Y=0. That is to say it is the antithesis of X doesn't exist and Y doesn't exist. It's the antithesis of that.
So it means that some X's exist or some Y's exist or some of both exist. With the added implication that it may be the case that X=1 or Y=1 or both X and Y are equal to 1. That can be the interpretation of X+Y≠0. It simply means that it's not the case that X+Y=0.

## How Insanity Comes About

Well that's the end of the snappy basic course in Boolean algebra. We're now going to press on with our material and it's time that we took up this example that I mentioned to you so we can understand clearly how this subject of insanity comes about and exactly what it looks like when it does come about.
We're now in a position to do this because we're now in a position to use our symbolism very precisely.
Now for our example I'm going to use the example that I gave in the original write up of TROM about the Barber of Seville.

## The Barber of Seville

Do you remember the example I gave of the Barber of Seville, which is a well known historical logical paradox? I'll just refresh your memory.
Remember the king gets fed up with seeing the men of the town wandering around with scruffy beards so he puts a notice up in the town square which says that, “Henceforth, on pain of death, all the men of this town will be clean shaven. Only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber.”
Later on in the day the town barber saw the notice and promptly went insane. Now why did he go insane? Because he couldn't obey the edict, so he was facing execution by the king. And so he did the only thing he could do he went insane.
Now let's examine exactly what the problem is here.

In order to take this problem apart the easiest way is to put our postulate set together and tick off the possibilities. Clearly we've got a postulate set here of a person who shaves themselves.
Let's nominate the letter **S** as a person who shaves themselves and the letter **B** is a person who is shaved by the town barber.
So each person in town has two options, to be shaved by himself or shaved by the town barber.
So we're looking at the SB postulate set.
Clearly they are postulates. “To shave oneself” is a postulate. To be shaved by the town barber is a postulate too. They are both postulates so it's a postulate set we are looking at here.
Postulates:
S to shave oneself
B to be shaved by the town barber

## Cross Packaging

Both postulates aren't in the same goals package so there's a bit of cross packaging going on here but it's still a postulate set. It's not a goals package as we would understand it but it's certainly a postulate set. Cross packaging is not germane to this situation so we'll discuss it later.

[Note! In a correctly made goals package both goals will exactly complement each other as do "to eat" and "to be eaten" or "to sex" and "to be sexed." "To shave" and "to be shaved" are complementary but the limited goals of "to shave oneself" and "to be shaved by the town barber" are not exactly complementary goals so are cross packaged. - PM]

Now first of all let us write down all the possibilities in this set. Well there are the four possible classes. In other words, each person in town can either be shaved by the town barber or shaved by himself and this gives four classes of people in the town. There are SB, S(1-B), (1-S)B, (1-S)(1-B), they are our four classes that we recognize and we're going to add in this class that we'll call an Insanity Class. We will add it into the set and we will see how it fits in.

## Four Classes of the Package

SB, to shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber
S(1-B), to shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber
(1-S)B, to not shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber
(1-S)(1-B), to not shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber
The insanity class is the class of B(1-B) and for completeness sake we will the make another insanity class of S(1-S).

## Insanity Classes

B(1-B) to be shaved by the town barber and to not be shaved by the town barber
S(1-S) to shave oneself and to not shave oneself
So we have in all six possible classes here of our set.

Now normally if we were doing a logical analysis of this particular problem we would simply restrict ourselves to the first four classes. The last two classes would be made equal to naught by the basic law of reason in the universe which says that B(1-B)=0 and S(1-S)=0 by the basic law of reason in the universe both those classes would be null classes. So they can be cancelled out. But we're going to leave them in for the sake of completeness because we're dealing with this subject of insanity. You see? So we've got to put them back in again. In they go so we've got six classes.

## The Six Classes

Let's start ticking off our six classes from one to six. So, I'll assume you've got them written down and just number them in the order I gave them to you from one through to six starting with the reason classes and 5 and 6 will be the two insanity classes.

Six Classes
1. SB, to shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber
2. S(1-B), to shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber
3. (1-S)B, to not shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber
4. (1-S)(1-B),to not shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber
5. B(1-B) to be shaved by the town barber and to not be shaved by the town barber simultaneously
6. S(1-S) to shave oneself and to not shave oneself simultaneously

Now you realize in this analysis we're only really concerned with the town barber we're not really concerned with the men of the town. So we'll restrict the analysis to how the kings edict affects him because if you care to look at it you'll see that it affects the men of the town quite differently than it affects him. So we're only concerned in the analysis with how it affects the town barber.

## Limitations on the Game Class Set

Now before we go on to discuss what the king said and see how that affects the situation we must first of all discover if there are any limitations to the set by the very nature of the postulates themselves.
When we examine this we find that that is actually the case. That this town barber doesn't have a full freedom of choice even regardless of what the king said.
For example, it's quite obvious that if the barber shaves himself he is being shaved by the town barber. And it's equally obvious that if the town barber is being shaved by the town barber he is shaving himself. Now it is those two propositions straight away that affect the set.
Now the first of these propositions if the barber shaves himself he is being shaved by the town barber knocks out number 2 in our set “S(1-B)”, that goes out.
2. S(1-B)=0, to shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber equals naught
And the second of these propositions knocks out number 3 in the set. So you'll just knock it right out and reduces number 3 to zero.
3. (1-S)B=0, to not shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber equals naught

So the town barber has got a reduced set straight away regardless of what the king said. He's only got 1 and 4 plus the two impossible insanity classes.
1. SB, to shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber
4. (1-S)(1-B),to not shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber
5. B(1-B) to be shaved by the town barber and to not be shaved by the town barber
6. S(1-S) to shave oneself and to not shave oneself
So he can either shave himself and be shaved by the town barber or not shave himself and not be shaved by the town barber. They're his only options. They are the only options.
So those are his options as he approaches the notice board and reads the notice in the town square about the king's edict, bear that in mind, they are his only options

## Consider the King's Edict

Now let us consider the king's edict. The first thing the king says, "Hence forth on pain of death all the men of this town will be clean shaven." Well what he's saying here is that this class, class number 4, the class where the person neither shaves themselves nor is shaved by the town barber. That class is reduced to zero. Get it?
4. (1-S)(1-B)=0,to not shave oneself and not be shaved by the town barber equals naught
So we imagine the town barber, reads that first part of the edict, and he says, "Oh, yes, on pain of death all the men of the town will be clean shaven. Oh", he says, "I have to shave myself. I can't grow a beard anymore."
See, so he's OK so far. So 4 goes out. So that leaves him with just 1. He's only got one class he can occupy in the reason part of the postulate set. That is to both shave himself and be shaved by the town barber.

1. SB, to shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber
Now notice that his set has been reduced to a one game class set. Remember this is not a goals package but the same principle applies, that we started off with four classes in the reason part of the set and we've now got it down to one. There is only one reason class that he can occupy in that set and that is to shave himself and be shaved by the town barber.
Ok, so the barber now reads on and the next part the king's edict says, "All those and only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber."
Now there are two propositions there. The first of these propositions is that all those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber.
Now this proposition means that number 4 of our set goes out to zero. Yes, yes that's right number 4. The king is simply being repetitive. The proposition means exactly the same as saying that "henceforth all the men of the town will be clean shaven." Logically they mean exactly the same thing.
Now when you're doing a logical analysis it's not at all unusual to find the persons' utterances are highly repetitive. That's ok it doesn't affect the analysis. You say, "Ok, well number 4 now is definitely out, defiantly equal to naught."
Now that leaves us with the final part of the king's utterance. Now the final part is, "Only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber."
Now this proposition, "Only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber." Means exactly the same as saying that, "all those who are shaved by the town barber won't shave themselves." which in terms of our set reduces class 1 in the set to zero.
1. SB=0, to shave oneself and be shaved by the town barber equals naught

Now then up to this point the barber has read the edict and he's been OK. He's read the first part the edict about men in the town being clean shaven and he says, “Yes, that's alright, I'll have to shave myself.” And he reads the second part the edict, “All those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber, he says, “Yes, that's all right, that's fine, I'll shave myself.” But, then he gets to the third part of the set, “Only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber.” Crunch! Bang. He's in trouble, because his final remaining set has been reduced to zero. He can't obey the edict.

He is in the class of SB and the edict is driving that class into zero. So the effect upon the town barber is the edict drives him out of his last remaining class, the SB class. While he's desperately trying to stay in the class

Now let's take a pause here for a moment and understand exactly what this unfortunate barber's problem is, or another way to look at it, what his problem isn't. He doesn't have any problem shaving himself. That is not his problem. He has no difficulty on this subject of shaving himself.

So this little insanity class of S(1-S) number 6. We can reduce that to zero. We can wipe that one out. That's not his problem. That one goes out.

6. S(1-S)=0 to shave oneself and to not shave oneself equals naught

Now his problem is the fact that he's the town barber, because if he weren't the town barber he could shave himself. It's only because he's the town barber that he can't shave himself. The edict only prevents him from shaving himself because he's the town barber. So his problem is that he's the town barber.

So you understand that he has no problem shaving himself. His difficulties is one of identity, it's an identity problem. So it's this equation of being shaved by the town barber that is the root of his problem. Being shaved by the town barber or not being shaved by the town barber. If he could not be shaved by the town barber he'd be all right. You see?
He'd be alright because he could then shave himself and not be shaved by the town barber. But he can't do that while he's being the town barber. You see his problem. It's an identity problem.
So as he stands there looking at the notice board his mind will go from must be shaved by the town barber but I can't be shaved by the town barber.
When he says "I can't be shaved by the town barber" it's just another way of saying "mustn't be shaved by the town barber".
So his mind goes from "must be shaved by the town barber" but that's impossible because the edict says I can't be. So I mustn't be shaved by the town barber but that's impossible too because I'm the town barber so I must be shaved by the town barber. Got that?
No, the edict won't let me. So I mustn't be shaved by the town barber but I am the town barber so I must be shaved by the town barber, mustn't be shaved by the town barber, must be shaved by the town barber,… one… two… one… two … faster… faster… faster until he hits the point "must be shaved by the town barber" and "mustn't be shaved by the town barber" both postulates simultaneously, both with the same intensity. BANG. At which point he loses his sanity.
5. B(1-B)=1 to be shaved by the town barber and to not be shaved by the town barber equals 1
Now if you can follow that, you've got it. So our set now reduces to:
The first four classes are zero, there all zero classes
And class 6 we've agreed that is a zero class

And the 5th class is “1”, his existence class.
He is now in the insanity class of both “must shave himself” and “mustn't shave himself” simultaneously.
Now, factually, this may solve his problem for him, as far as the king is concerned or it may not. The king, I mean obviously while he's insane he's going to grow a beard, so the king if he was harsh, he might say, “Well we'll execute him anyway, he didn't obey the edict.” Then again the king might take pity on him because he's insane and relent, thus saving his life.
So it may or may not solve his problem, but that's what's going to happen to him. He's going to go insane.
Or to put it another way while he is fixed in the identity of the town barber insanity is his only option in the situation. It's his only option because it's the lesser evil to being executed. That's the other option, but that's a worser evil, so he will accept the lesser evil and lose his sanity.
Of course, he would have no problem at all if he hadn't been fixed in the identity of the town barber.
Now let us assume that he was a non compulsive games player and has completed his first three levels of TROM and so could have occupied the identity of the town barber or not. He could be the town barber or not be the town barber at will. Then he would have no trouble at all.
He would have simply read the edict and said, “Ok, What will happen is,” he said, “I'll shave myself, when I shave myself I won't be the town barber. But when I'm shaving other people in the town, other men in the town, I'll be the town barber.” So he goes back to work. End of problem. Get that?

So, he would have simply gone back to his barber shop noticed it was full of customers put on his identity of being the town barber and proceeded to shave them. And when he'd got rid of all his customers he would have simply removed his identity of the town barber and hung it on the hook in the barber shop and then he would have shaved himself, quite leisurely. And when he got himself shaved he would have put his identity of the town barber back on all ready to receive the next customer.
Now I can assure you that if you'd been following this through carefully and closely you now know much more about that logical paradox than the guy who dreamed it up. Because you now know all about the insanity side of it, which he obviously didn't. He clearly never knew.
So you know one hell of a lot about that logical paradox, but we can see how useful that little logical paradox was to us. What it gives us by using it. We can use it to understand how a person goes from compulsive games play into insanity.

## IP Defined

Now this class, we'll call it the general class X(1-X)=1, now that is what we call the insanity class. That's a definition. X(1-X)=1, X and not X simultaneously
That is a definite term. We call that an insanity class. We have a name for it in TROM, which is a more generally used name we call it an IP.
Now IP, the letter “I” and the letter “P” they are the initials of Impossibility Point, or Insanity Point. I. P.
An IP is always in the form “X(1-X)=1” it's the essence of insanity, the very basis of insanity and that's the general expression of it. It is “X(1-X)=1”. And IP is short for Insanity Point or Impossibility Point.

It's an impossibility point because in this universe it's impossible to maintain that class and retain one's sanity. It is quite impossible to hold that class.
In other words, it defines the impossible in the universe. The only thing that's truly impossible in this universe is the IP. Is "X(1-X)=1." That is truly impossible and it's the only thing that's impossible in this universe.
You simply can't do it. It's the only thing that can't be done in this universe. You can't both go to China and not got to China simultaneously. You can't both be the town barber and not be the town barber simultaneously.
It is impossible and it's the only thing that's impossible in this universe and it's something you should remember and understand very clearly.
It defines the impossible so when we assert that datum that "X(1-X)=1" we are asserting that the impossible can exist.
But that's insane. The impossible can't exist in this universe, because the laws of the universe say it can't exist, but it can exist, it can't exist….that is insane. We're into insanity.
See that? And that's the basis of insanity.

## Mocking up Insanity

You can get the idea of insanity, of how an insane person feels by mocking up an IP and getting into it.
I wouldn't suggest you do this if you're at all mentally unstable but if you've completed a few levels of TROM you can do it without any danger to your mental health.
You simply get the idea that you must go to China, and the idea that you mustn't go to China and go from one postulate to the other. Then do it faster and faster, from one postulate to the other, backwards and forwards. Until your holding both postulates simultaneously.

At the point where you're holding them both simultaneously you'll start to feel a sort of a glee of insanity, a sort of a spinney feeling in your psyche. Well that's the time to quit, because that's when you're going into the IP. That's the point you're going insane, you're going into the insanity.
We understand it so clearly now that we can simulate it. But of course there is no real danger that you'll go insane when you do it yourself because you're doing it all consciously, you see.
But you can simulate the feeling of insanity by getting the idea of going to China and not going to China, simultaneously. Or the idea of making any postulate and its negative and holding both postulates simultaneously….trying to achieve both postulates simultaneously.
It's a spinney feeling. There's a sort of glee of irresponsibility attached to it. It's a certain definite emotion that's attached to it that goes with the IP and trying to achieve the IP. It's the emotion of insanity.
Ron Hubbard knew about it. He called it the glee of insanity, but he didn't know its' logical construct.
We understand it in TROM. We've got it in TROM. We know about it.
But Ron was right when he said there was a glee associated with it. There is. There's a glee.
There's a sense of irresponsibility and a glee there, and a definite spinney feeling. A definite feeling as if the world is spinning around under your feet. And you feel as if you might take off into space at any moment. It is a definite spinney feeling.
Though you can subjectively create the emotion, the feeling of insanity, now you understand its postulate structure.

## Deductions from X(1-X)=1

Now this postulate “X(1-X)=1” has some very interesting deductions, very interesting deductions. I'll give them to you. I won't prove these deductions but they can be, I can assure you, every one I'm giving to you can be proven very easily in Boolean algebra.
X(1-X)=1, X is and is not simultaneously
Here we go. We can deduce from “X(1-X)=1” that “X +(1-X)=0.”
X +(1-X)=0, neither X exists nor not X exists.
In other words it's a state of affairs where neither X exists nor not X exists. Get it?
X + (1-X)=1, either X exists or not X exist or both exist
“X +(1-X)=0” now that's a state of unreason because reason maintains that “X +(1-X)=1” that's what reason maintains.
But unreason, insanity, the IP, says that “X + (1-X)=0”
X +(1-X)=0, neither X exists nor not X exists.
Now this is a particularly interesting deduction from our point of view because it tells us that while the person is in the IP state the reasonable part of the postulate set is reduced to zero.
Take the part of the barber while he's in the state of both being a barber and not being a barber simultaneously. Then B+(1-B)=0. In other words B=0 and (1-B)=0 but look, if B=0 two of four classes in the reason part of the set go out and if (1-B)=0 the others go out, so the whole set goes to zero.
So the person cannot be, if they're in the insanity class, they can't be in one of the sane classes of our proposition. Once they go insane, in other words, they can't utilize the other part of the set.

In other words they're either sane or they're insane on this subject. If they're insane on the subject then they're not sane. They can't be both sane and insane in the same postulate set. In other words, if the barber's in the state of B(1-B)=1, the rest of the set is equal to zero. And the proof of it I've just given to you.
Because if X(1-X)=1 then X + (1-X) = 0 that maintains. That's the first of the interesting deductions.
E.g. B(1-B)=1 to be shaved by the barber and to not be shaved by the barber simultaneously
B+(1-B)=0, to be shaved by the barber does not exist and to not be shaved by the barber does not exist
Now let's look at the second of the interesting deductions. That if X(1-X)=1 then X=(1-X). X becomes equal to Not-X. In terms of our barber once he goes into the IP of B(1-B)=1 then being shaved by the barber is identical to not being shaved by the barber. There is no difference in his mind in being shaved by the barber and not being shaved by the barber. The two are completely identical with each other. That's the other deduction.
E.g. If: B(1-B)=1, to be shaved by the barber and to not be shaved by the barber simultaneously. Then B=(1-B), being shaved by the barber equals being not shaved by the barber from the relationship X(1-X)=1
So those are the two enormously useful deductions about the IP from the insanity class, or the IP as we call it. They're the two valid deductions from the IP.

## When X(1-X)=1 then X=(1-X).

The existence equals its absence and that is insane I can assure you. That is insanity.

## Fear of Insanity

Now once you start to work with these IP's you rapidly start to lose your fear of them. The vast majority of humanity is absolutely scared of this subject of insanity. The one thing they fear most in their lives is that they will go insane, that they will lose their reason. See it's a mortal dread.
The compulsive games player has a mortal dread of going insane. It's as if he somehow senses that he's putting his life on the line, putting his sanity on the line every time he plays a game that he's getting close to the edge.
That the more compulsive the games play he gets into and the hotter the game gets, the closer he starts walking to insanity. He doesn't know exactly what's happening but he senses it happening.
Every compulsive games player knows this. He knows that as the game heats up more and more he's walking closer and closer to the gates of hell, to the gates of insanity. And sometimes the games player will tell you this.
It's written up in books, you know, written up in novels and so forth. That men, under enormous pressure have said “I walked to the very edge of insanity and just managed to claw myself back at the last moment under extreme game duress, you know, and they write these stories up and they write these experiences up. They're well documented.
But this is the view of the compulsive games player who's caught up in compulsive games play.
How about to the non compulsive games player, or the person whose completed Levels 1, 2, 3 of TROM and is well on his way through Level 4 and 5, or a person who has completed Level 5? It's a toothless tiger. There's nothing in it. It doesn't mean anything. He knows, the person understands insanity, he knows what it is. He knows its postulate structure. And he certainly isn't going to get involved with it.

He isn't going to go around trying to drive himself mad, even if he could; he isn't going to do it. There's no point in it.
So to the non compulsive games player, to the completely rational person, the person whose completed at least the first three levels of TROM and understands this material I've given there and understands the nature of insanity and understands the IP state the whole subject of insanity is a toothless tiger. He no longer dreads insanity.
He can sit there and try and go to China and not got to China simultaneously. It's a game. It doesn't mean anything to him. It's just another interesting game, a thing to do. You know, try and go insane. I mean this quite seriously.
Once you understand this material and you've cleared off your first three levels of TROM, and are well on the way, you'll lose all your fear of insanity. Just like you'll lose all your fear of your bank, insanity will go too. You'll find this subject of insanity is not a dread, something you wake in cold sweat at 4 o'clock in the morning and wonder if you're going insane. No it's just a toothless tiger. That's the one thing you know that you're not going to do. Get it?
So don't think that it's a terrible thing. That even a person, when they've completed all their TROM they've got to be very careful not to go insane. No there's nothing there. There's no charge on it.
Put it this way, that by the time you've completed the five levels of TROM you'll put yourself on an E-meter and you can try your hardest to both go to China and not go to China and nothing's going to happen on that meter, except a little tick maybe. Nothing awful is going to happen. It will hardly read on the meter. So you're dealing with a toothless tiger I can assure you. There's absolutely nothing there.

The total danger of insanity is to the compulsive games player. To him it's a definite hazard. To the non compulsive games player insanity's not a hazard, it's not even a problem. If he understands it, it's a joke. You know? It's a giggle. It really is, it's a giggle. And it's certainly a toothless tiger. There is no monster lurking there in the deep recesses of his mind ready to swallow him up.
I'm giving you the last monster in the deep recesses of the mind, this fear that you will go insane. Well it's a toothless tiger. There's nothing there if you do your exercises, if you do Levels 1, 2, 3 of TROM, plus you know this material.
Now I couldn't make it any clearer, could I? I couldn't make it any clearer than this.

## IP and the Goals Package

Ok, now the example I've given you, the barber in the Barber of Seville is an example which is one of a postulate set but it's not an example of the use of this data on the subject on a true goals package as we understand it. Now I want to next give you the full data in terms of a goals package.
[Note in a goals package the postulates exactly complement each other. For instance "must sex" and "must be sexed" or "must eat" and "must be eaten". PM]
We'll pick up a general case. A general goals package, the XY goals package where say X is the "**to blank**" postulate and Y is the "**to be blank**" postulate. And we're now dealing with the general case in the XY goals package. It's a postulate set still but it's a very specialized postulate set called the goals package. OK?
The "to blank" Postulate Goals Package
1. XY, to blank and to be blank (complimentary postulates)
2. X(1-Y), to blank and to not be blank (conflicting postulates)
3. Y(1-X), to be blank and to not blank (conflicting postulates)

4. (1-X)(1-Y), to not blank and to not be blank (complimentary postulates)
Now I want to give you all the reductions in the set and give you the symbolism as we go so you've got the whole picture. So there won't be any doubt in your mind as to what's happening. You'll be able to write it all down on a piece of paper and understand it.

## Non-compulsive games play

Now the person first enters into the situation there as a non compulsive games player. He does this by making the postulate X is not equal to Y. "X≠Y." He makes that postulate. [Note- "X≠Y" means the player must prefer one goal more than the other or there will be no game. If going to China and not going to China are equally unimportant you will not make a game to achieve either goal. PM]
If he doesn't make that postulate he could lose the whole set by complementary postulate because at any time he can accidentally make X equal to Y "X=Y" and when X equals Y of course the whole set vanishes as I explained earlier. So to prevent this happening accidentally he simply makes the postulate that X≠Y.
[When X=Y there is no difference between X and Y or no preference of one over the other so there can't be a game. If going to China and not going to China are equally unimportant to you, you will never oppose anyone who wants to go to China. - PM]
Now, let's expand that postulate and see what it looks like: the postulate X≠Y becomes the symbolism X(1-Y) + Y(1-X)≠0

Now all that means is that at least one of those two classes has got members in it and therefore exists, and both of those two classes are games classes, you see? And while at least one of them exists then the whole set won't vanish. So that little relationship there, that X≠Y holds the postulate set in existence, and prevents the whole lot vanishing by accidentally making the postulate that "X=Y".
Simply postulate that X is not equal to Y and from that point onwards the set remains in existence for you and you can then become a non compulsive games player in that set.

## Compulsive Games Play

Ok, so much for that. Now the person goes ahead, shall we say, as a non compulsive games player and the games play becomes more and more important in the postulate set until eventually games play becomes compulsive. And at the point where it becomes compulsive it's made compulsive by the postulate that X equals not Y, or in terms of symbolism that X=(1-Y).
Now how does that look in terms of our symbolism? Well the set now looks like X(1-Y) + Y(1-X) = 1 see the difference, before those two classes were not equal to zero now there equal to 1.
[When X(1-Y) + Y(1-X) = 1 the player has raised the importance of games play or the need for game sensation to the point where only conflicting postulates are allowed between the opponents. PM]
While those two classes are equal to 1 they become the whole universe of discourse, the whole universe of the postulate set so therefore the complementary postulate classes of XY and (1-X)(1-Y), both of these classes can have no existence.

XY, to blank and to be blank (complimentary postulates)

X(1-Y), to blank and to not be blank (conflicting postulates)
Y(1-X), to be blank and to not blank (conflicting postulates)
(1-X)(1-Y), to not blank and to not be blank (complimentary postulates)

The only existence classes are the two games classes. So games play is now compulsive. The person has two games classes. He can occupy either one or the other. He's a compulsive game player with the option of either occupying X(1-Y) or Y(1-X).
[The opponents are switching between their postulate and its negative as needed to maintain the conflicting postulate situation. - PM]

## Single Game Class

Now the games play continues in the universe until eventually the player suffers overwhelm of one of his classes. Let's say the X class suffers overwhelm and in his own mind he considers he can no longer occupy that class. In other words, he considers now that X=0.
But as soon as X=0 then (1-Y) must also be equal to naught because remember he's made this postulate that X=(1-Y), which is the same as saying that Y=(1-X), so as soon as he loses X, X=0, he would also lose (1-Y). So X=0 and (1-Y)=0. Both maintain.
[When X=0 the player can no longer hold the X postulate. He moves to his only remaining postulate 1-X, he is no longer interested in finding an opponent in 1-Y and is only looking for an opponent with the Y postulate. PM]
So he's now left with this single game class of Y(1-X)=1. He's now reduced it down to a single game class postulate set.
[X is now stuck in the (1-X) postulate. - EDITOR]

From this point onwards he's putting his sanity on the line every time he plays this game with these two postulates, because if he suffers overwhelm in the game and he loses the game he's going to go insane. The only place he's able to go is into the insanity class, into the IP's

## Insanity

Well let's say he succeeds for a while. But sooner or later by the very scheme of things he's going to get overwhelmed, and what's going to happen?
Well, before we discuss what happens lets briefly just review the position.
He's made the postulates X≠Y. [X is more important than Y or vise versa]
He's made the postulate that X=(1-Y). [Compulsive games play begins]
He's made the postulate that X=0, [Can't hold the X postulate any more]
And he's also got the postulate that (1-Y)=0. [Not interested in finding an opponent with 1-Y]
And he's in a games class of (1-X). [The last postulate in the XY set he is able to hold]
That's his games class. Remember that's his last games class is (1-X).
He's got this other postulate there which is bonded to (1-X)=Y
So he's got this other postulate of Y because (1-X)=Y so he's in this double class of (1-X),Y.
(1-X) is the game postulate, (Y) is the exclusion postulate.
[(1-X) is trying to drive Y into (1-Y) but he doesn't want to be driven into (1-Y) himself so he adopts the Y postulate for himself to keep himself from being forced into (1-Y). See the section on the exclusion postulate in 03 Expanding on Level 5 for more on this. - PM]

Now that's his position.
Now the opponents postulate is inexorably driving him from (1-X) into the X. That is to say the opponent is inexorably bonding (1-X) to X. In other words the opponent is driving him into the identification X equals (1-X).
You see he can't leave (1-X). That's his last haven. That's the last point he can go in the set. You see? He has no other place to go so he hangs on to that grimly. But inexorably he's being driven into X.
But this identification, (1-X)=X, can't take place while he is still holding the identification (1-X)=Y. Because if (1-X)=Y and (1-X)=X and X=(1-Y) then (1-X)=(1-Y) and then X=Y and the whole set will go. He'll lose the whole lot, the whole game will vanish and that is intolerable.
So that can't happen. He simply has to break the bonding to (1-Y). The identification that X=(1-Y) eventually breaks. He breaks that bonding. That snaps. He's now free. The (1-Y) is now free of the X and the (1-Y) bonds to the Y and we have the identification Y=(1-Y), quite separate and free of the X postulate.
Meanwhile the (1-X) postulate has been under pressure from the opponent to go into X and for exactly the same reasons the (1-X) postulate breaks it's bonding with Y and snaps into identification with X, (1-X)=X and becomes the other IP in the set.
The set now reduces to X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1, with the player in the IP X(1-X).
Now why is he in there? Because (1-X) was his last games postulate. That was his last sense of self identity. He was the games player using that (1-X) postulate so that's where he sticks and that's the IP he ends up in.
Can he move across to the other IP? No he can't do so. He can't move across to the other IP although it's still a part of the set, but he can't move across to it.

But to explain why he can't move across to it, and continue on with this tape we'll have to go onto a new tape. Because I'm running out of…I'm running off the end of the spool here. End of tape.

# 02 Insanity

Insanity Point Lecture 02

July 3, 1994

By Dennis Stephens

This is the third of July 1994 and this is the second tape in the sequence where we are discussing the subject of insanity, IP's etc. This tape is a direct continuation of its predecessor and should always be accompanied by its predecessor, for obvious reasons.
We have discovered the IP set of X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1 and it is necessary at this stage to discuss the qualities and nature of this IP set and I hope to be able to answer questions on this subject of the nature of this IP set in what follows.
The first question we must take up is the one that's hanging fire from the last tape and that is the question of whether the person stuck in the X(1-X) IP can move across to the Y(1-Y) IP, and I said that he cannot do this and we now have to find out why this is so.
When working with IP's in logical analysis it is a very useful ruse de guerre(trick of war) to substitute in place of the little IP another symbol. For example, if instead of the IP set that we have there, we replace it with the set of A+B=1, where A= the IP X(1-X) and B = Y(1-Y) so we're now using a substitution set.

Now the interesting thing is that when we use this substitution, of course, we have now left the Insanity Class and were back into reason again, because this A+B=1 set can be manipulated in logic, in terms of reason again. So we're back on the main road and it saves wear and tear on the mind and it saves wear and tear on the fingers writing out all these little X's and not X's all the time. So it's quite legitimate to do this.

So the question arises now that we've got an A+B=1 is the + inclusive or exclusive. Well we know from when I mentioned the subject of interpreting A+B=1 in logic. Remember I said that we have to find out whether it's the inclusive or exclusive "OR". That in the A+B=1, the A and the B are quite disjunctive, they're quite separate from each other and we just want to find out how much separation there is.

You see the problem is that you can write A+B=1 and it can either mean that the class AB plus the class of A and not B and the class of B and not A = 1 or it might simply mean that the class of A and not B plus the class of B and not A =1. Now both of those can be expressed in terms of A+B=1. You see the problem?

One is the inclusive OR and the other is the exclusive OR. One includes the possibility of both A and B, as a common class and the other one excludes the possibility of both A and B as a common class. So our problem here is to find out, with these IP's and the question, "Why can't the person move from one IP to the other?", can this common class of both IP's exist?

Well let's put it together. The AB class becomes, in terms of the IP's. It becomes X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1. That becomes that class. It's a separate class so we must make it equal to 1.

And when we look at this class, we immediately see that if that is so then X=Y, and (1-X)=(1-Y). But that can't hold, because the person, remember, the games player in his decent down through into compulsive games play has postulated that X≠Y, he has to make this postulate otherwise he'll lose the whole set, if he accidentally postulates that X=Y. You see that? So his old postulate of X≠Y is still running so that prevents the common class of the two IP's from existing. So that class is equal to zero. Now let's go over the AB set, because it's easier to express there, it now becomes A(1-B)+B(1-A)=1. It's the exclusive OR. So the person is either in one of the IP's and not in the other IP, or is in the other IP and not in the first IP.
Now that is a simple double bind. I refer you to the double bind technology.( see the book 04 Bonding breaking)
It's exactly analogous to the example I gave you in the double bind tech of the young man who couldn't get a job because he was inexperienced. You remember that double bind on an earlier tape? Well this is a similar thing, it's a straight forward double bind and it locks the person in the IP that he was in when he went into the IP state.
In our example the person, remember, his last game postulate was (1-X). So he goes into the X(1-X) IP. And the other IP although it is in the set still, it's not available to him. It's over that way and he can't get to it because he's locked out by the mechanism of the double bind.
So that answers that question. If you follow this through you see the reasoning behind that.

## Twin IP's…TIPS

Now before we proceed any further we ought to name this baby we have our hands on. We've got two IP's with a plus sign in between them and their equal to 1. We ought to name this.

Well, we do have a name for it in TROM, we call it a TWIN IP. And the initial is TIP. That is T I P. TIP, it means twin IP's. Twin IP's.
And its initials are TIP, usually with the S because it's plural they are Twin IP's…TIPS.
So henceforth when I refer to twin IP's what I mean in the general case, the IP's X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1 that's what I'm referring to when I'm talking about the twin IP's.

## Four Characteristics of the IP State

Now we're in the fortunate position in TROM of being able to define these TIPS. This state of twin IP's. We're able to define it, which virtually means that we can define the IP state.
There are four characteristics to the IP state, which do define it. And if a person manifests these four characteristics then he is in the IP state. And if he's in the IP state he will manifest these four characteristics.
So it's a definition of the IP state I'm going to give to you now. And it's something you should know if you want to understand this upper level tech in TROM. You should understand this definition of the IP state.

### The First Phenomena – Identification

Now the first of the characteristics of the IP is identification. In the IP state a postulate is identified with its negative. A postulate is identified with its negative. Now that is the first of the characteristics.
It's quite self explanatory and it's quite obvious, and you can see it in terms of the symbolism and you can see how it's comes about. So I don't really have to say any more about that at this stage.

## The Second Phenomena – Motionlessness

Now the next characteristic of the IP is motionlessness. That is lack of motion. Now let's discuss this briefly.
Quite clearly if a person is operating upon a postulate and it's negative he's in a state of motionlessness. For example, if a person is both striving to go to China and striving to not go to China he isn't going any place. He is in a state of absolute stillness. He isn't moving. And why is he in a state of stillness? Well the two postulates there are simply contradicting each other. One is the exact contradiction of the other. And so they stop each other. They simply stop each other BANG. Right there, BANG. Get it?
So there's no motion in the IP state. There's no motion. It's a state of motionlessness. It's a stop motion. It's a point of stop motion. There is no motion in the IP state.
If you don't believe this you should get the idea of trying to go to China and trying to not go to China simultaneously. And you will quickly realize that while you're holding these two postulates you aren't going anyplace.
It's not that you can hold those two postulates and while holding the postulate to go to China and holding the postulate to not go to China you can then go to South Africa. No, no you can't do that. While you're holding the postulate to go to China and the postulate to not go to China you can't go to South Africa.
Why not? Because it contradicts the postulate to go to China, get it?
So that is the second of the characteristics of the IP is motionlessness. No motion. Complete lack of motion.

## The Third Phenomena - Timelessness

Now the third characteristic of the IP is timelessness. Or if you like there's another name for it, we also call it a time stop. Essentially it's a state of timelessness. Actually this stems from the motionlessness, but this is the way it works out.
Every postulate has a time component to it. Time is required in order to put a postulate into action. So the being in the universe, when he's playing games with the postulates, he's always creating a little time, even if he is doing it automatically and unknowingly. He is always endeavoring to create a little time in which to fulfill his postulates. So he keeps doing this continuously and hence the whole universe jogs along through time. You see that?
So, there's a time component to every postulate and without the postulates there could be no time component. The time component vanishes when the postulate vanishes. The time component vanishes because the time is bound in to the universe. The time is built into the postulate structure of the universe.
As I've said many times, this universe only consists of life and postulates, but the postulates need time in order to fulfill themselves. So if you're in a state where there are no postulates then there is no time. It does follow there.
But we know that the IP state is a state of their postulates. Remember that if X(1-X)=1 then X+(1-X)=0. Both the X and the 1-X are zero. So in the IP state there are no postulates and therefore there is no time. There is no time in the IP state. There is a timelessness.
Actually it's more of a time stop. What happens is time jogs along right the way up to the point that the postulates went into IP and time stops at that precise instant. It's a time stop rather than the timelessness, but we refer to it as timelessness, in the IP state. But the onset of the IP state is the time stop, that's where time stops.

And this is quite well known in the field of psychiatry, that a person will actually go insane at a certain moment in time. They may stay insane for six months or a year and maybe they get some treatment or maybe for any number of reasons suddenly the person snaps out of it and they look around and say, "Where am I?" and they say, "Well you're in this institution." And he says, "Well what date is it?" and he's got a whole year missing out of his life.

Time stopped for him, you see, at the point where he went into the IP state a year previously. Now he's come back out the IP state and he's now back into the sanity again.

This is so common in psychiatry that it's documented. If you read up books of psychiatry and the treating, of the insane and so forth it's very common.

And people have memory lapses where they go into insanity and there for a period of time they have no memory of the period inside the insanity. They come out of it and they've lost a period of their life.

The doctor says, "Can you remember being in here for a year?" and he says, "No, the last thing I remember was receiving that telephone call from Uncle Ben. And after that there's nothing. I don't recall anything." "Ah, yes," says the Doctor. He understands. "Yes, yes…you've had a nervous breakdown." He's been insane. He's been in the IP state and now he's snapped out of it.

So there's a time stop there, in the IP state.

Now I don't have to remind listeners to this tape who have studied the subjects of Dianetics and Scientology about being stuck. They know all about this subject of being stuck on the time track.

I would refer you to the connection between this material that I'm talking about now, the IP's being stuck in time and the fact that a person can be stuck on the time track. So I just point it out at this juncture that there is a connection between being stuck on the time track and the IP state.

You can be stuck on the time track for other reasons than IP's but sure as hell if you went into an IP state you'll be stuck there. That's where your attention will be stuck. It will stick your attention because there is no time in the IP state.
If a person went into the IP state and then came out again there will be a little time stop there which would hold his attention at that point in time. We'll discuss this a little more when we're talking about Sensations.
At this juncture I'll just remind you that the phenomena does exist and to relate this subject of time stop and timelessness of the IP state to what you know of being stuck on the time track and the Engram bank.

### The Fourth Phenomena -Mass

Now the fourth phenomena that characterizes the IP state is the phenomena of mass.
Now I won't go in and talk about this because I'll be discussing it much more fully when we talk about sensations and the anatomy of sensations in section “04 Sensations” of this book. So at this stage just bear it in mind the fourth characteristic of the IP is mass.

## Characteristics Necessary and Sufficient to Define the IP State

So there we have the four characteristics of the IP. The identification between a postulate and its negative, the subject of motionlessness, timelessness and mass, they are the four characteristics and they do define the IP state.

They are necessary and sufficient to define the IP state. By that I mean that there may be many other characteristics of the IP state but those four are necessary and sufficient to define it.
Right, now various questions are going to arise from the last section of the preceding tape. We now have a person in the twin IP's X(1-X) and there's the other IP of Y(1-Y). You've got these twin IP's and these are equal to 1, and the person's either in one or the other but they're stuck in the X one, the X IP.
And the immediate question comes to mind that a person's going to say, "Well wait a minute Dennis. Hold your horses. Didn't you say that X=0.(X is an empty class) Isn't that a part of the compulsive games play that the person went into when he reduced his goals package, his postulate set down to a one game class he postulated that X=0 and he postulated that 1-Y=0. And now you've got X reappearing in one IP and 1-Y reappearing in the other IP. How do you account for that Dennis?"
Well very simply. I'll draw your attention to the fact that in the IP state when X(1-X)=1 then X+(1-X)=0. So in the IP state all X, (1-X), Y and (1-Y) are all equal to naught.(All empty classes) See? So that there's nothing there in terms of reason, you're looking at a different state. You've moved from the state of rationality into a state of irrationality.
I know it's peculiar. And you say, "Well if none of these postulates exist then how come we're equating them to 1?" Well we are, by convention, we are saying that these exist in the insanity state. You see that?
Otherwise we can't use the logic. But you must bear in mind that all the postulates in the IP state are equal to zero. It's a direct deduction from the fact that it's in an IP state. The IP state is impossible in terms of reason, you see? It's quite impossible.

Therefore the postulate doesn't exist. [Chuckle] Obviously. So that answers that question of how come the person can be in the IP X(1-X) when he's previously postulated that X=0. But when he goes into that IP he postulates 1-X=0, too. The whole lot goes, when he goes into the IP. So that answers that query. [Note. if the person is in the insanity state he is still trying to go to China and not go to China but time has stopped. He is not moving either direction, so the postulates are not functioning. By convention they are shown as being there only because that is the last postulate the person was working on and marks where he is stuck.-PM]

Now a few brief words on the social aspects of what we're talking about here. When a, so called, sane person meets an insane person the first response the sane person has is to believe that the insane person is playing a game, he's putting him on. And he's inclined to sort of slap him on the back and say, “Ok, that's very good…ahh…that's a good game. Ok, now snap out of it and talk to me.”

It takes him some little while to grasp that the insane person is not putting on an act. It's not an act. He actually is the way he is and it's not a sham, it's not a front. It's not something he is putting on consciously and can put on and take off at will. He's stuck in it. And the strange logic of the insane is something the insane person is stuck with.

And once the sane person or the so called sane person realizes this, he's abhorrent of insanity, so he pulls away from it as if it's the plague. And it's no exaggeration to say that the study of insanity is the most difficult of all studies that a person can undertake.

Working with the insane burns out more psychiatrists than any other field of medical practice, the burn out rate amongst them is absolutely incredible. It's a very trying occupation, for a sane person to try and understand insanity. And this is largely because of ignorance of the state.

Now we in TROM we are no longer in ignorance of the state of insanity we do know it's postulate structure. When you see a person who is insane you know fundamentally that they've got a postulate, you don't know what the postulate is, but somewhere they have a postulate and they're trying to operate on that postulate and it's negative simultaneously. That is what they're trying to do, and that is why they're insane, and they are locked in this state.

The alternative to being locked in this state is even worse than the state that they are in, you see that? Like the barber in the Barber of Seville, he goes insane but the alternative to going insane was even worse, he would be executed. And that was even more intolerable than the insanity. And this is true for every insane person. There is an alternative but it's always worse than the insanity so they choose the insanity rather than the worse option.

Now this abhorrence of insanity is so intense this pulling away from insanity that I expect people to have enormous difficulty understanding the material on this tape. Even people who've completed the first three levels of TROM are going to have some difficulty understanding it. I know this because I had difficulty understanding it when I first discovered it. And so, I make no bones about it, I found it an incredibly difficult subject to work in, to get the basics out.

The rational mind simply abhors the IP state. It abhors insanity. It's the complete antithesis of rationality. You see? The rational mind works on the proposition that X(1-X)=0 and the insane person is working on the proposition that X(1-X)=1. And it's a complete contradiction.

You couldn't be more contrary to the rational mind. It's the complete antithesis to the rational mind. And the rational mind abhors it and shuns away from it. So I won't be surprised if anyone hearing this tape thinks that I've lost my marbles. That Dennis Stephens has finally gone mad with his TROM.

That would be one extreme reaction to listening to these tapes and the other, the most moderate reaction, would be that a person would have incredible difficulty understanding what the hell I'm talking about.

Even those who are familiar with logical analysis, you know, familiar with Boolean algebra and don't have any problem with the symbolism. Unless their well advanced in TROM, well advanced through the levels, they're going to have some difficulty grasping this material, simply because the mind abhors the subject of insanity.

You've only got to look at the history of the way we treat the insane. All down history the minority class of humanity that has been treated the worst during the whole of history has always been the insane. No minority group has been treated like we've treated the insane.

Even in this century we've been hacking their brains out with ice picks and subjecting them to violent electric shocks all under the name of helping them. I mean, how on earth do you expect to help a person when you're subjecting them to violent electric shocks and hacking bits of their brains out? Gives you some idea of the abhorrence the rational mind has of insanity and the fact that the state is simply not understood.

You think of the worst things that it's possible for a group of people to do to a minority. The very worst that a majority group could do to a minority group then you pick up a history book and read back through history and you'll find that somewhere, sometime a majority group has done this to the insane. No exceptions. They've done it. It's there on the track. All the horrors have been done to the insane. No minority group has been so badly treated by mankind as are our insane brothers and sisters.

So don't be surprised if you yourself listening to this material find it difficult to grasp, if you find yourself shuddering away from it, if your tendency is to say , “Well, this is interesting but Dennis is probably wrong.” And so on.

Well I can assure you that Dennis isn't wrong. What I'm giving you is correct. It is correct.
As I said right at the beginning of this material that I discovered this stuff some years ago, and I put it on the back burner. I thought, "I just want to be absolutely certain of this before I mention it to anyone." But as more and more data piled up it became obvious that this is exactly right. This is exactly the way it is. And all I've done over the years is perfect the technology.
A few years ago I couldn't have presented it in such a coherent form as I can present it now. I've rounded it off in the last few years. But essentially it hasn't changed, it's still the IP technology, the upper tech of TROM.
The subject of the IP is the subject of insanity and also finally an understanding of this subject of sensation.
In order to help people to understand the IP state I will give you another postulate configuration. Another way of looking at the subject of insanity, and another way of looking at compulsive games play, as a more diagrammatic representation, which may make more sense, may help more people to grasp what I'm getting at.
Now first of all, I'd like to give the diagrammatic representation of the compulsive games state. Now this is a state where we're still discussing the XY set, and the postulates that are holding are $X \neq Y$ and $X=1-Y$ or more precisely in terms of our symbolism $X=(1-Y)$. That is the compulsive game state.
Now we can represent this as a matrix, a diagrammatic. There is a way of doing it diagrammatically which may be of assistance to you instead of seeing it in terms of the logical symbols. Some people's minds do better with diagrams than they do with symbols. It's the difference between the geometer and the algebraist. The algebraist works best with symbols and the geometer works best with pictorial representations.

So here we go, let's see if we can express this compulsive games state diagrammatically. Let's imagine a square.
Ok now in our square in the top left hand corner of the square we put the symbol X. In the bottom left hand corner of the square we put the symbol 1-Y in the top right hand corner of the square we put the symbol Y and in the bottom right hand corner of the square we put the symbol 1-X. Ok?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | | Y |
| | | |
| 1-Y | | 1-X |

And there we've got our square with four corners and there's a symbol in each corner.
Then between the top left hand corner symbol, the X, and the bottom left hand corner which is a 1-Y we put an equal sign so we have X=1-Y.
Then between the bottom left hand corner symbol 1-Y and the bottom right hand corner symbol of 1-X we put a not equal sign.
Then between the bottom right hand corner symbol of 1-X and the top right hand corner symbol of Y we put and = sign. And between the top right hand corner symbol of Y and the top left hand corner symbol of X we put a not equal sign.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | ≠ | Y |
| = | | = |
| 1-Y | ≠ | 1-X |

## Compulsive Games State

Now if you look at that and examine it you'll see that it's virtually saying that X is not equal to Y, 1-X is not equal to 1-Y, Y is equal to not X and X is equal to not Y and that defines the compulsive games state. So there's that one. When you've got that written down put that to one side. That's the diagrammatic representation of the compulsive games state. I'll now give you the diagrammatic representation of the IP state. Put up your square and in the top left hand corner we have an X symbol, in the bottom left hand corner this time we have a 1-X symbol and in the top right hand corner we have a Y symbol and in the bottom right hand corner we have a 1-Y symbol.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | | Y |
| | | |
| 1-X | | 1-Y |

Now working our way round from the top left hand corner, between the top left hand corner symbol of X and the bottom left hand corner symbol of 1-X we put an equal sign. And between the bottom left hand corner of 1-X and the bottom right hand corner of 1-Y we put a not equal sign. And between the bottom right hand corner of 1-Y and the top right hand corner of Y we put we put an equal sign. And between the top right hand corner of Y and the top left hand corner of X we put a not equal sign. And this defines our IP State.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | ≠ | Y |
| = | | = |
| 1-X | ≠ | 1-Y |

## IP State

We have X is equal to 1-X and Y is equal to 1-Y and X is not equal to Y and not X is not equal to not Y. Now that is our IP state.
Now when you examine those two squares carefully and you'll notice that all that's happened, the only difference between the two is that the bonding has changed.
The X has changed its bonding. Instead of being bonded to 1-Y, X is now bonded to 1-X and Y instead of being bonded to 1-X is now bonded 1-Y. It's a change in the bondings or the identifications, more strictly speaking, the correct word I should use would have been **identifications.**

This is a double bondings. But the double bondings have changed. And that is the only difference between those two squares. Now if you can understand that and grasp that you can see the very essence of the basic difference between compulsive games play and insanity. There's just that simple change of bonding. If you can grasp it, it will go click in your mind and you've got it. You'll see it instantly and all the mystery about insanity will vanish out of your mind. You'll see it clearly, just a simple flip of bonding from the compulsive games state to the IP state.
And that's what happens to the unfortunate compulsive games player, his bonding flips. And he flips into the insanity bonding. Then he's gone. He's gone into insanity
Just to round off and complete your diagrams under the diagram for the compulsive games state we'll write the symbolism for it, which is $X(1-Y)+Y(1-X)=1$, with $X \neq Y$ and $X=1-Y$.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | ≠ | Y |
| = | | = |
| 1-Y | ≠ | 1-X |

Compulsive Games State

X(1-Y)+Y(1-X)=1

With X≠ Y and X=1-Y

Alright now under the diagrammatic representation the square for the IP state we'll write in the symbolism for that which is X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1 with X≠Y and X=1-X and Y=1-Y and lest you forget it X(1-X)=Y(1-Y). That final identification is just to remind you that there is a double bind there.
[Note: the formula for the double bind is X(1-X)=Y(1-Y) which reads the insanity point for X is bonded to or equals the insanity point for Y.-PM]

## The Loop

[Note the introductory lecture "The Loop" is included in this book. See the table of contents.-editor]

Now on a previous supplementary lecture I introduced the subject of the Loop. And this is a very useful piece of information in this context of sanity and insanity because it gives us the clearest difference between the subject of insanity and the subject of sanity. In other words, we can express sanity in terms of the loop and we can express insanity in terms of a loop. And once you put them side by side and compare them you immediately see the difference between sanity and insanity.
Now let's give you first what we shall call the sanity loop. Now there's three parts to the loop, like any loop, and the first part is the postulate and the postulate that goes with sanity is the postulate that a thing is itself. **A thing is itself**. And that is expressed by X=X.
Now another way to express that postulate is to say that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously, and that is expressed by X(1-X)=0. Now another way to express that is to say that a thing either exists or it doesn't exist. And that is expressed by X+(1-X)=1.
[The three elements of the loop are the Possible X+(1-X)=1, the Impossible X(1-X)=0 and the Identity X=X. -Editor]
All three of those elements are identical to each other and are simply various methods of saying the same thing. If you were to think about this very carefully and very closely and ponder it and look at those three carefully it would begin to occur to you that they are exactly what they say they are, that they are different methods of saying exactly the same thing
So much for the sanity loop.

## Insanity Loop

Now let's have a look at the insanity loop.

First of all we will look at the postulate. Now the postulate in the insanity loop is **"a thing is its absence"** and this is expressed by X=(1-X). Another way to say this is to say that a thing both exists and doesn't exist simultaneously, and that is expressed by X(1-X)=1.
Now another way to say this is to say that neither a thing nor its absence exists, and this is expressed by X+(1-X)=0.
[The three elements of the Insanity loop are the Possible X(1-X)=1, the Impossible X+(1-X)=0 and the Identity X=(1-X). - Editor]
Now just as in the sanity loop, all the elements in the insanity loop are identical to each other but there is one difference here, there's one difference between the two loops, in this respect, in the sanity loop, not only are all the elements in the loop identical to each other but all the elements in the sanity loop are true in this universe.
Now, in the insanity loop all the elements in the loop are identical to each other but each of them is false in this universe.
The sanity loop is the very essence of reason in this universe. The insanity loop is the very essence of unreason or insanity in this universe.
Now the rationale behind that last statement is a very simple one. The sanity loop, the element X(1-X)=0 is a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is constructed, therefore that element is true in this universe, therefore the other two elements in the sanity loop are also true in this universe because they are identical to the first element, and the identification is a true identification.
In the insanity loop on the other hand, every element of this insanity loop is a complete contradiction of its partner in the sanity loop and therefore it's false in this universe, even though the internal identification between the elements of the insanity loop is a true identification.

Now, as I said earlier, if you duplicate exactly what I've just said on this subject on the difference between sanity and insanity you will have the clearest possible understanding of the difference between these two subjects in this universe.
Now, sooner or later, somebody's going to raise this question and say, “Well, how can you be sure Dennis that the insanity postulate is X=1-X and that the insanity postulate is not X≠X?”
The answer to that question is very simple. The insanity state depends upon the postulates of X and 1-X. They have to both be of the same intensity for the state to occur. And that can only happen when X=1-X. if we simply say that X≠X that isn't sufficient to give us that identification. The identification may be there but it's not implied. But once we say X=1-X we're definitely saying the intensity of X is identical to the intensity of 1-X, and that is necessary to the insanity state. **The insanity state does not occur unless a postulate and its absence or a postulate and its negative are both being held with exactly the same intensity.**
Now once you have X=1-X then the rest of the loop follows. Everything else in the loop follows. You get that?
The postulate X≠X simply is insufficient to establish the insanity state in this universe.
What it establishes I don't know, but it certainly doesn't establish the insanity state in this universe. It's simply not a strong enough postulate to establish it.
There is definitely an identification in the insanity state. The insanity state like the compulsive games state is a compulsive state.
There is identification in the state. So it requires to be based upon a postulate which has an identification in it, and the postulate X≠X contains no identification.

So from that viewpoint there's another angle from which you can understand it. The postulate X≠X is insufficient for our purposes here, because the insanity state like the compulsive games condition which precedes it in life, and from which it is derived is itself a compulsive condition and contains identifications all of which happen to be false.
Now I think we've picked our way through the mine field very carefully and precisely. From this point onward it gets easier. If you can understand it up to this point you've got the subject of insanity understood. And the whole subject of the IP and Twin IP's and so forth is within your grasp. And the rest of this material is easy. We're over the hump in other words
Now it's necessary from this point to be very clear what we mean when we talk about insanity in relationship to a person in therapy.

## Brain Damaged Persons and Insanity

We've got to now talk about some aspects of human case conditions. There is such a thing as a brain damaged person. Now this is a medical fact that people can develop brain damage which can affect their behavior.
Some people can be born brain damaged and their behavior will be affected by this brain damage for the remainder of their life.
Now some types of brain damage produce in the individual manifestations and characteristics which appear to be identical to insanity. And for all we know the individual, the spirit manifesting there, may also be insane.
You see we've got the spirit and we've got the body. We can have a rational spirit trying to function through a brain damaged body and therefore giving the manifestation of being insane.

Or we can have an insane spirit manifesting through an undamaged brain and giving all the manifestations of insanity.
But we can also have this state of affairs of an insane spiritual being manifesting through a brain damaged body, and again manifesting insanity. This will be very rare indeed,
Now all these three possibilities can occur. Or there's the fourth possibility of a rational spiritual being operating through an un-brain damaged body. That would be the fourth possibility, and that completes the whole set now. That would cover all the possibilities.
Now it must be clearly understood that when I'm talking about this subject of insanity I'm only talking about the spiritual being and his postulates. I'm not talking about brain damage.
Brain damage is a medical phenomenon. If you wish to know about brain damage you should go and consult a doctor and consult the medical textbooks, consult the literature on this subject which is quite extensive.
Medicine knows one hell of a lot about the symptoms of brain damage. We know an awful lot about it. But, I give you this advisedly, don't make the mistake of assuming that a brain damaged person is insane just because they manifest very peculiar behavior.
The human spirit behind it may be insane or may not be insane. And you cannot prove his state of sanity or insanity if he happens to possess a damaged brain. You simply won't be able to determine it by his behavior if he possesses a damaged brain. Now do you understand that?
On the other hand our mental hospitals are full of individuals, who, to use the vernacular, are as nutty as a fruit cake and there is nothing wrong with their brains at all.

You subject their brains to every test known to medical science and their brain cannot be differentiated in any way from the brain of a sane and rational human being. There is nothing wrong with this person's brain that any medical detection can determine yet the person is as nutty as a fruit cake. They are insane.

Now that is the sort of insanity I'm talking about. That here we have a spiritual being whose insane and that's the subject we're talking about.

We're dealing with the human psyche; we're not dealing with the human brain.

Unfortunately diseases of the brain or injuries to the brain or malfunctions of the brain can produce behavior, which superficially look like insanity, looks like insane behavior.

So you see that this subject of brain damage muddies the water up, doesn't it? It muddies the water considerably.

If you want to deal with the insane, the first thing you better find out, if you want to deal with a person that superficially gives the manifestations of insanity, you better go and have them thoroughly examined by a medical doctor. Put them through all the tests known to medicine, x-ray their brain and so forth, the whole works to find out if they are suffering any brain damage.

If this person is not suffering any brain damage whatsoever, then you will know for certain, for absolute certainty that the procedures that we use to handle insanity in therapy, will benefit this person, will snap them out of the insanity. We know this for absolute certainty.

But if this person, who manifests insanity, has all these tests done on them and the tests determine and show quite clearly that this person is brain damaged then you do not have this guarantee. You do not have the guarantee.

The therapy will certainly improve the person but we don't even know that we're dealing with an insane spiritual being, it may be the case that we've got a rational sane spiritual being trying to operate through a brain damaged body in which case the techniques we're running are inappropriate. You follow me?
Bear in mind the four classes that I gave you. You've got a sane being operating an un-brain damaged body, you've got a sane being operating a brain damaged body, or you've got an insane being operating a non-brain damaged body, or it can be an insane being operating a brain damaged body.
You see a person that's manifesting insanity, well the only thing you know for sure when you see an insane person, a person manifesting insane behavior, is that this person isn't in the class of beings that is a rational being occupying a non brain damaged body. He can't be that class, but he may be in one of the other of the three classes. You don't know.
You have to subject this person to medical tests to find out if their brain damaged, and if it turns out they have no brain damage we know then for sure that the insanity must be to do with the human spirit and our therapy techniques for handling insanity will work. But we don't have this guarantee in any other circumstances.
If this person is brain damaged our therapy may or may not help the person. It probably will help him but we have no guarantee. Simply because we don't know about this variable called brain damage.

## CCH's (Control Communication Havingness)

Now what are the techniques to best help the insane person. What are the techniques we use? Well they are the CCH's. CCH 1 to 4.

The four CCH's as given out by L Ron Hubbard back in the late 1950's, about circa 1957…58 round about that period. He developed these 4 delightful little CCH procedures there. And I mentioned in the write up any person who cannot pass level 1, cannot pass the test in level 1 of TROM, requires running the CCH's with a separate therapist. They should run the CCH's with a separate therapist until such time as they can pass the test in level 1.

It's quite distinctive, once those CCH's have gone flat on them they will pass the level 1 test providing they're not brain damaged. Get that proviso, providing they're not brain damaged.

If the waters are muddied up and you've got a brain damaged preclear, well, I don't know? Your guess is as good as mine. My entire specialty is in the human spirit the human mind, the human psyche, I'm not an expert on brain damage. So you will have to go and consult elsewhere to find out how to handle brain damaged people. I'm not an expert in that field so I can't help you.

Now this tells you that from a common sense point of view if you've got some preclear that's manifesting a high degree of irrationality and has done so for some years and you want to take this person on in therapy well for god's sake get this person tested for brain damage before you do anything. Just find out what you're dealing with.

If the tests say the person is brain damaged, well you know then where you stand. If the tests turn out that the person is not brain damaged well, ok that gives you some confidence that your CCH's, and so forth, are going to eventually get the person up to a point where they can pass level 1 of TROM. Then they will be able to run solo. You get it?

But if a person is brain damaged you don't have this assurance. I don't know what's going to happen. You run CCH's on a brain damaged person. I don't know. I've got no data on it. Don't think they've got any data down at the Church of Scientology either.
My best guess is that the techniques would benefit a brain damaged person, but certainly, I'd be very surprised if it did anything to cure their brain damage. If the CCH's cured their brain damage, I'd be very surprised to hear that. But it would no doubt benefit the person. It certainly wouldn't harm them. But don't expect a brain damaged person to ever, and this is the point really, this is the bottom line, don't really expect the brain damaged person to ever be able to TROM solo. You know? Just don't expect it.
You may be able to help them with the CCH's but it's doubtful if they would ever pass the level 1 test to be able to get onto level 2 solo. They might, but I think you could consider yourself very lucky if they did or their brain damage would be very minor.
But as I say, if you're dealing with a brain damaged preclear you're on your own mate. You're on your own. It's not my specialty. I can only advise you, but I must tell you I'm not an expert in that field.
But I am an expert in the field of the human spirits who are operating bodies which aren't brain damaged, I do know a lot about those. I can help you in that area, but I can't help you in the area of brain damaged human beings. You should go and consult with medical specialists on that subject, they can tell you much more than I can.

## What do CCH's do?

Well, let us consider a person that is an insane spirit or a person who needs the CCH's run. Let's just say we have a person who can't pass the test at level 1 because the human spirit is insane, but this person has no brain damage, let's take that case. That's an area we can talk about.
What is it about these CCH's that would break insanity in the insane spirit and return the spirit back to a rational state?
What is it about these CCH's?
Well the CCH's are saying to the person come to present time, come into the present time "Now" universe. Come into now, and come into now, it keeps saying, come to present time, come to present time. It's quite safe here. It's quite safe to come into present time. Come into present time.
And the person eventually gets pulled in. They realize that this universe is safe to be in. and once they come into contact with this universe again, they come into contact with the basic law of this universe. And once they come back into contact with the basic law of this universe they come back into contact with the rational loop again. And they snap out of the insanity and snap back into the sanity condition.
Now it's as simple as that. You've got to say to them "come to present time, come to present time."
Ron Hubbard knew this all, many years before he developed the CCH's. Ron used to talk about this in early lectures in Scientology. I've heard him say this many times. He was right, too.
He said that you could walk through an insane asylum, and just go to every patient one by one and say, "Come to present time." Just snap your fingers in front of their faces to attract their attention and say, "Come to present time." He said. And some tiny, some small percentage of those people will immediately regain their sanity, and walk out of the asylum, absolutely sane.

Ron used to say that, and later he developed the CCH technique, and they were a highly specialized and highly mechanical way of saying to the person, “Come to present time”. They would get the person into present time, so that the insane person could come back into agreement with the postulates of this universe. And once they come back into agreement with the postulates of this universe the insanity is broken, because in this universe rationality is a deduction from the basic postulates upon which this universe is constructed. You see?

They go back into what is reasonable in this universe so their insanity breaks, because their insanity is unreasonable compared to this universe. You get it?

That's why the CCH's work when they work.

Look there is nothing magical about those CCH processes they're just a systematic and precise way of saying “Come to present time”, “Come to present time,” “Come to present time,” “Quite safe here,” “quite safe to go back into agreement with this physical universe.”

And the person eventually comes into present time, comes into agreement with the universe. Ceases to go into the strange weird logic of the insanity state and starts to adopt the rationality of the universe. Starts to go into X=X, things are what they are. A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously. And a thing either exists or it doesn't exist. Starts to adopt this approach, which is rational reasonable reason in this universe. Starts to adopt that and their insanity vanishes, get it?

## Case State after Insanity

Now finally on this subject of insanity what sort of condition would we expect the person's case to be in when an insane person becomes sane in therapy by the use of the CCH's? What sort of case condition? Where would we expect to find them?
Well we would expect to find them as a compulsive games player. You see the cycle goes, that the person goes from compulsive games play into insanity, which is itself a compulsive condition.
So we give them therapy, run the CCH's on them and we snap them back into sanity again. Well where are they going to be? Well their going to pick up life where it left off, they're going to pick it up at the point where they went insane. So, in other words, they're going to be a compulsive games player.
So that's where you would expect to find them. You would expect to find the person as a compulsive games player. So bear that in mind, it's a useful little thing to bear in mind, that when the insane regain their sanity they go into compulsive games play.
So, as we know the compulsive games player is at risk of going insane. You better not leave the person there.
You run the CCH's on this guy and you've got him sane, and you've got him up to compulsive games play, and so you say, "Oh, ahh…well I can now quit."
No you can't because while he's a compulsive games player he's at risk of going insane. He'll be back in the soup again, in six months, a year or five years. He'll go back into the soup again. He'll be back into the insanity state if you leave him as a compulsive games player.

You got to go further than that. He's got to be a non compulsive games player. You have got to get him out of that. Take him out of the risk area, take him out the area of risk of compulsive games play. Take him up to a point where he is no longer at risk.
In other words he's got to complete the first three levels of TROM. You've got to proof him against insanity. Then it's safe for him to quit. He can quit at the top of Level 3 of TROM. It's safe for anyone to quit therapy there, quite safe. They can quit at that point, because they're a non compulsive games player, and they're not going to go insane at this point.
So don't turn a person sane in therapy and then leave him as a compulsive games player. That is a definite flunk. It just simply isn't fair to the person.
You fished him out the soup. You've left him standing on this rock and then you go away and abandon him. Well he's going to slide off the rock and back into the soup again isn't he, you know. He's going to fall off the rock back into the sea.
You got to fish him right out onto dry land and dust him off and dry him off and get him all squared around so that he's no longer in any danger of falling back into that ocean again called insanity. That means turning him into a non compulsive games player. And that means running the first three levels of TROM on him solo. He's got to run them solo. He'll pick up levels two and three solo. Finish the job solo. Then he's proofed.

## Separate Therapist

Bear in mind a person's not proofed against insanity if they run Levels 1, 2 and 3 of TROM with a separate therapist, that doesn't proof them against insanity. Note when I say their proofed when they run the first three levels of TROM solo. That they complete to the top of Level 3 solo. In other words they follow through exactly as I've given it. Follow that? Good.

## Becoming Aware of the Structure of Insanity

Now every person as they run through Level 5 of TROM, will, just like I did, start to become curious about the subject of insanity and then start to pick up the structure of insanity and start to get the anatomy of it.
It won't happen suddenly over night. They'll start to become curious about it and left to themselves if they stay with Level 5 long enough they will get the whole anatomy out. They will get the whole lot out all by themselves eventually.
They might not discover it in exactly the same words and in exactly the same way that I put it together, because they might not be of the scientific bent. They may not be of a mathematical bent. They may not be able to use logic like I can. But they would certainly have the essence of it.
They would understand what insanity is in terms of postulates and if they come across what's on this tape they would just listen and say, “Yes, that's right, that's exactly the way it is. He's just expressed it a little different than I would. Yea, that's fine, but he's right, Dennis is, yes.”

So everyone who works on Level 5, long before they complete Level 5 of TROM will have an understanding of the anatomy of insanity. It's one of those things that falls out the hamper. Peculiar, but there it is, it falls out the hamper and will fall out every time on route to the completion of Level 5.
All I've really done is to take the cognitions that I had in that area and formalize them and done a logical analysis of it and put it together in a form that is understandable and related it to the subject of reason and unreason. I put the whole thing together in a logical construct, something which would be useful to scientists and mathematicians or for anyone who wants to do further investigation in this field. It's a valid reference point.
So, although a person listening to this material on the subject of insanity might take it all with a grain of salt and say, "Well yes Dennis may be right, and so forth" I think you'll discover that long before you get to the top of Level 5 you'll be nodding in great agreement with me, saying, "Yes what Dennis said was right on this subject. He knew about insanity and I'm finding it too. That the things he said are quite right and ahh…and so on."
In other words everyone before they get to the top of Level 5 will have various cognitions on what sanity is. And they will understand that when I talk about IP's I'm talking about insanity. They will understand insanity, not necessarily in exactly the form I've given it with the heavy stress on the logic of it but they will certainly know its basics, they would discover that long before they got to the top of Level 5.
Ok well that's all I want to say on the subject of insanity. I see I'm coming up to the end of this tape now and we will wind up this tape now and the next tape will be on the subject of sensations. It's a continuation of this subject but for convenience I will put it on a separate tape.
End of tape

# 03 Sensations

Insanity Point Lecture 3

By Dennis H Stephens

July 27, 1994

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

May 19, 2012

Today is the 27th of July 1994 and I want to take up now, on this third tape of material on the upper level tech of TROM, I want to take up this subject of sensations.
This tape in common with its predecessors must not be separated from the remainder of the set.
The word sensation is one of those words that when you look it up in the dictionary you rapidly wish that you hadn't. It's one of those words that the dictionary doesn't really help you very much on. The further you look it up in the dictionary the more confused you tend to become.

I suppose that the best definition of a sensation that we can find in English would be a sensation is that which is sensed. A sensation is that which is sensed, but unfortunately, you won't find that definition in the dictionary.
As a person works with the exercises of TROM, they sooner or later become aware of something on this subject of sensations and this something can be best expressed as the following:
**That sensation is generated at the boundary between opposition postulates in games play**.
Now if you know that. If you know that about a sensation you probably know more about sensations than anyone else does, because that is a very fundamental datum about sensations.

## Sensation Defined

**S**ensation is generated at the boundary between opposing postulates in games play. Now that proposition leads us to a definition of a sensation. We could actually define a sensation in TROM by saying that **sensation is that which is generated at the boundary between opposition postulates in games play**. And that would be a very good definition of a sensation, and it's a far better definition of a sensation than you will ever find in any dictionary, a far better definition.
It's a better definition simply because it's more useable. It's a more practical definition than what you will find in a dictionary. It does actually help you and it doesn't confuse you. It actually solves confusion rather than adding to your confusion.
Let's go through the definition a bit and take it apart and see if we can learn something by just examining the definition.
First we have that sensation is generated at the boundary. Generated! Now that tells you that sensation is not created in games play, it's generated in games play, and it's generated at the boundary between opposition postulates.

Well we know what opposition postulates are, we know of the goals packages and we can define an opposition postulate. So we know what an opposition postulate is.
Now this is the way it works out, this is the way it appears to be, and this is our simplest look at this subject of sensation. As soon as you separate the universe into the classes of self and not self and you occupy the class of self, and this is all done with postulates. And as soon as you achieve this state of self, then you look across at the class of not self and notice the postulates over there. Then any slightest opposition postulate that you put up to a postulate in the class of not self, will generate a sensation at the boundary between those two postulates.
So if you can get that, you understand what sensation is. It's something which occurs at the boundary there between a postulate and its opposition postulate. It's something which occurs at the boundary when the classes of self and not self are in conflict with each other.
Unless the two postulates involved are complementary postulates, some sensation will be generated at the boundary between the postulates. It may be a very light sensation, a very tenuous sensation, but **only when the postulates are complementary is no sensation generated at the boundary between them**.
If the two postulates are not complementary postulates then there is always the possibility of sensation being generated at the boundary between them. And if the postulates are opposing postulates, as they become more and more directly opposed, more exactly in opposition, as I should say, more and more correctly opposed to each other, the sensation becomes more pronounced and more obvious.
Now this tells us right away that sensation is a phenomenon of games play, it's a phenomenon of games play. In the absence of games we don't get this subject of sensation. In the no games state there is no sensation.

There's no sensation in the no games state. You have to be in a games state, in one of the game conditions, you have to be either, a non-compulsive, a voluntary or a compulsive games player or in the insanity state to be sensing any form of sensation.
You have to have divided the universe into the class of self and not self in order to generate sensation, in order to sense sensations.
In other words there must be a games condition, there has to be a games condition there. So sensation is a phenomenon of games play and that is absolutely fundamental.
Now sensation is generated at the boundary between opposing postulates in games play. The question that immediately arises is can a spiritual being create sensation? And the answer to that is, yes.
Obviously a spiritual being can create anything, but a spiritual being can only create sensation when he knows what he's creating. It's like anything else, you've got to know what you're creating before you can create it. You've got to know what it is before you can mock it up. And it's quite useless for a spiritual being to attempt to create sensation without understanding its anatomy.
When he understands it's anatomy he can create it. But until he understands its anatomy, or what it consists of, he won't have any success in creating it.
The great joker in the pack is, of course, that at the point where he understands the anatomy of the sensation and so can create the sensation he has no need to create the sensation because he has no desire to create it.

So there are some ramifications here on the subject of learning what the anatomy of sensation is. And it's not as simple as it might appear. I mean, a man might say, "Whoa, marvelous if I take up TROM I can learn the anatomy of sensations and then I'll be able to create sexual sensation and then I won't have to go down to a brothel every Saturday night and spend all my money in a brothel, you see. I'll be able to mock up all this sexual sensation."
Well the joker there is by the time he knows all about sexual sensation, he's long passed any desire spiritually to spend his Saturday nights inhabiting a brothel. There are various things he has to do before he will get into this state and by the time he gets into the state of being able to knowingly generate the sexual sensation and then mock it up simply as a postulate configuration or whatever it consists of, to create its anatomy, he's long passed the desire for it. You see that?
He can think of far more interesting things to do with his time on a Saturday night than spend it in a brothel. In other words, he's had a case change and his change of case will change his ideas on these things.
So when you walk this route towards the understanding of sensations and the creation of sensations, do understand that it can produce some considerable changes to your life.

## Sensation Peculiar to the Goals Package

Now moving on, one of my original earliest discoveries on the subject of sensations, working with the goals package, was this discovery that **the sensation generated in any particular goals package is peculiar to that goals package.** Now that is a very interesting discovery.

The sensation generated between the opposition postulates in any goals package is peculiar to that goals package. In other words, you take the "to know" goals package the sensations generated between the opposing postulates in that goals package are peculiar to that goals package.
And similarly the "to eat" goals package would have its own particular sensation, and the "to help" goals package would have its own particular sensation, and so on across the boards. Every goals package has its own peculiar sensations that are generated between the opposition legs in that goals package.

## Four Ways You Can Generate Sensation

Now this fundamental discovery was quickly followed by another discovery which is a much more important discovery. And that is that **the sensation that can be generated in a goals package can be generated by occupying any one of the four legs of that goals package and simply creating the postulate in that leg of the goals package and opposing it to its opposition postulate in the environment.**
In other words, you could take the "to sex" postulate and create that postulate, put yourself into that class and say, "Right well that's me and I'm going to create the "to sex" postulate and providing you can get someone out over that way to oppose you with a "to not be sexed" postulate, then you can generate sexual sensation with a "to sex" postulate. Similarly you can generate sexual sensation with a "to not sex" postulate, providing you can get someone over that way in the class of not self to oppose your "to not sex" with a "to be sexed" postulate.
Or you can generate sexual sensation by mocking up, in the class of self a… "To be sexed" postulate and providing you can get somebody, an opponent over that way to oppose you with a "to not sex" postulate.

Or, and finally, you can generate sexual sensation by mocking up a “to not be sexed” postulate and opposing it to someone over that way who is directing a “to sex” postulate at you.
So there's four ways you can create this sexual sensation.
Now that is a tremendously interesting datum. When you start to think about that, something very fundamental occurs. There's an important datum immediately deducible from that state of affairs.
And that is that if you can generate this sensation by occupying any one of the four legs of the goals package and opposing it to its opposition postulate in the environment then it follows that **the sensation being generated must only consist of four postulates of that goals package**.
Now this is one of those data that once you've grasped it the penny is suddenly dropped and you say, “Oh my god why didn't I think of that, before. It’s obvious.”
Let's say you take the “to sex” goals package. You can generate this sensation by occupying any one of those four legs in the package. All you require is that somebody over that way is going to oppose your postulate and you can generate this sensation while using any one of those four postulates. Then the sensation itself that you are generating can only consist of the four postulates of the “to sex” goals package.
If you think about it, it's obvious isn't it… it's obvious. I mean if you've got a “to sex” postulate sitting in space and it's opposed by a “to not be sexed” postulate and at the boundary between them we have this thing called sexual sensation being generated. Then we have a “to be sexed” postulate and a “to not sex” postulate sitting there and between them we find that there's sexual sensation being generated and it's the same sensation that was being generated between the other two postulates. Well this sensation being generated can only consist of some configuration of the four postulates of the “to sex” goals package. See?

We already know that the sexual sensation is peculiar to the "to sex" goals package. That was the first discovery. Then we found out that it can be generated from any one of the four legs of the package. So, the sensation, it follows logically, that the sensation must consist and can only consist of the four postulates of the goals package in a particular postulate configuration and it's our job to find out what this configuration is.

## The Anatomy of Sensation

If we can discover what this configuration is we then know the anatomy of the sensation. Do you get that? The anatomy of the sensation then in the particular goals package is simply a matter of determining, “What is the postulate configuration that occurs at the boundary between the opposition postulates?”
There's some configuration of postulates there and this configuration consists of all four postulates of the goals package, no more, no less. See?
It's not those four postulates plus other things. No, no, it's exactly, the four postulates of the goals package are necessary and sufficient to produce the sensation. Get it?
Now this might be a new idea to you, this idea that a sensation can actually only consist of postulates. That it's anatomy can be entirely a matter of postulates. That it's total existence is subject to postulates. Now this is unusual. Maybe it's a new thought to you, but you're going to have to come to grips with this idea.

## Postulates are Mass

Unfortunately a part of our general philosophy in the west, and this philosophy has been continued in the subject of Scientology, is to separate out mass from postulates, to keep them in separate and distinct classes.
In other words, in Scientology we have the idea that you can mock things up with a postulate. You make a postulate to create, and you create something and that which you create may be a mass. See? So the mass is the result of the postulate. But the idea of a mass or whatever it is, a creation, consisting of a postulate, ahh, now that's something new. Now that's something you have to wrap your mind around. That's a new idea to many who come to grips with this material in TROM for the first time, it's a new thought. It's a new idea. But it's one that you're going to have to come to grips with, as will become obvious as we proceed. So just bear with me for the moment.
But this idea that what you normally regard as a mass or as an energy manifestation or as a manifestation of particles, a sensation and such, may simply consist entirely of postulates in a certain configuration, and by configuration I mean a pattern, now that's something new.

## The Illusion is the Mass

Another way to look at it would be to say that, “Well if this is so then the actuality is the postulates and the illusion is the mass or the energy or the sensation.” You see that? One perceives the illusion but the actuality is the postulates and the particular postulates of the goals package in a certain configuration. Ok?

Now let's see how this can come about. In order to find out how it can come about it's necessary for us to imagine a game situation. And that is all that is necessary for us to do is to imagine a game situation. Then we'll see how this can come about, and see how this can occur.
Let's imagine a person in the general case occupying a game situation using postulate X.
Here we're going to use the XY postulate set, our general XY postulate set, our general case. And we have one person occupying an identity that's using the postulate X.
And his opposition postulate is the postulate 1-Y, OK?
The person is directing his X postulate towards his opponent and the opponent is directing the (1-Y) postulate towards him.
Now the two postulates are going out and somewhere between these two identities… call them A and B, we'll have A using an X postulate and the identity B is using a (1-Y) postulate, and somewhere between the two of them, the two postulates the X and the (1-Y) postulate are going to meet.

## Boundary Conditions

Now here we have what are technically known as boundary conditions. These are boundary conditions. And we have to go in and find out exactly what is going on under these boundary conditions.
Now let's take it from the viewpoint of the X postulate. The X postulate goes out and meets the (1-Y) postulate. Well now the purpose, the intention of the (1-Y) postulate is to do what? It's to drive this X postulate into 1-X. got that?

In other words, that is what the (1-Y) postulate is trying to do is to drive X into (1-X). If the (1-Y) postulate succeeds completely across the boards then identity A will change his postulate from X to (1-X). Then the postulate configuration that maintains will be (1-Y) and (1-X) which are complementary postulates signifying an overwhelm and the end of the game.
Remember our set is an XY set. It's got two complimentary postulates in it. It's got XY complementary postulate and (1-X)(1-Y) is the other pair of complementary postulates.
So the purpose of the (1-Y) is to drive X into (1-X) and so overwhelm X and create the end of game situation and complementary postulates (1-X)(1-Y). Ok?
But let's imagine that the situation is a stable situation. In other words the boundary is stable, the boundary is not moving towards A and it's not moving towards B. it's staying at its position.
In other words it's a static situation. But the postulates are still going out and there is this collision between these opposition postulates which is the boundary. Ok, can you imagine that?
Well now what is going to happen to this X postulate? Well let us imagine a little tiny parcel of an X postulate as it approaches the boundary.
This is rather like when you are working with differential calculus when you take a little tiny section of the thing being analyzed. Well this is very similar.
You take an infinitely tiny parcel of X postulate and as this tiny parcel of postulate goes toward the boundary it comes more and more under the influence of the (1-Y) postulate on the other side of the boundary and there are two forces acting upon this little parcel. There is a force behind it which is holding it and driving it into X and there is the force from the other side of the boundary, the opposition force which is driving it into (1-X).

And this little parcel gets closer and closer until its right up against the boundary, till the (1-Y) postulate is facing it, driving it inexorably into (1-X), but behind it there's the games player A driving with the X postulate so the little parcel is being held in X but being driven into (1-X). So when the limit is reached, at the limiting point the X postulate changes to the (1-X).
At a certain point on the boundary the (1-Y) is going to drive a little parcel of X postulate into (1-X) but this little parcel is being pressed hard up from behind by the next parcel of X. X is driving it from behind. Follow?
So the effect is this little parcel of (1-X) postulate and the little parcel of X postulate are going to be forced to bump together. And you're going to get the bonding of X to (1-X). Now that is going to happen on the X side of the boundary.
Now for exactly the same reasons on the (1-Y) side of the boundary we're going to get little parcels of (1-Y) hard up against the boundary, we're going to get the (1-Y) parcels being influenced by the X postulate on the other side of the boundary and being driven from (1-Y) into Y so we're going to get little tiny parcels of Y postulate there and little tiny parcels of (1-Y) postulate. They're going to be crushed together, forced together and driven together into the common class of Y(1-Y).
So one side of the boundary we're going to get the production of the postulate configuration X(1-X) and on the other side of the boundary, immediately facing it, hard up against it we're going to get the production of the postulate Y(1-Y).

## TIP's

Now we've already met this postulate configuration when we discussed insanity, we know what these are, we called them IP's.

So at the boundary between the opposition postulates we see the formation of the two IP's of the goals package, on the X side you see the X(1-X) IP, on the Y side there's Y(1-Y) IP. There are these two IP's forming. So the postulate configuration at the actual boundary, what we call the boundary condition, the boundary condition postulate is X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1. It's what we, when we're discussing insanity, call the Twin IP situation. TIP, remember the TIP? The Twin Impossibility Points?

So at the boundary, we have on the X side of the boundary a continuous creation of these little X(1-X) IP's.

We have the X(1-X) IP on one side of the boundary being continuously created, masses and masses of them. Imagine them as little tiny parcels of this IP being created continuously on one side of the boundary.

On the other side of the boundary there's a continuous creation of these Y(1-Y) IP's, and that is all that is happening at the boundary. There is nothing else at the boundary. There are just those four postulates you see?

Two postulates in the IP form on one side of the boundary and two postulates in the IP form on the other side of the boundary and they are the four postulates of the goals package. One side we've got X(1-X) and the other side we got Y(1-Y), but they are the four postulates of the goals package, of the XY goals package. You see that?

Now what happens to these little IP's? Do they just sort of sit there? No they don't. They merge.

Now to understand how they merge we have to just pick out of our massive creation of these IP's at the boundary one little parcel of X(1-X) IP and another little tiny parcel Y(1-Y) IP.

So we've got two postulates in the IP state. We got an X bonded to a (1-X) and right by its side, imagine right by its side, we've got a Y bonded to a (1-Y) IP.

Now put those postulates into a square. Put those postulates into a square. In the top left hand corner of the square you put the X postulate. OK, now in the bottom left hand corner of the square put the (1-X) postulate. On the top right hand corner of the square you put the Y postulate. Now in the bottom right hand corner of the square you put the (1-Y) postulate.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | | Y |
| | | |
| 1-X | | 1-Y |

Alright now let's go to the left hand corner to the X postulate and let's see what the situation is regarding this little tiny X postulate on the top left hand corner of the square.
It bonded to the 1-X at the bottom left hand corner of the square and that is the X(1-X) IP, see that? So it bonded to its IP in the twin, but on the top right hand corner of the square there is a Y postulate, now X and Y are complementary postulates in this universe and they tend to attract each other.

## Complementary Postulates attract and cancel each other out.

They have an attraction for each other; remember under the laws of postulates where I gave you that complementary postulates attract each other, merge and cancel each other out. Opposition postulates oppose each other and tend to fly apart and do not cancel each other out. That's the basic law of the cannons of the postulates, of their attraction and repulsion for each other. See them as rather like electric charges.

So we have the X postulate and the (1-X). X in the top left hand corner and (1-X) in the bottom left hand corner, their bonded together so they are pulling towards each other, we have the X and the Y, that's the top left hand corner and the top right hand corner pulling towards each other because they are complementary postulates. They're trying to merge but diagonally across the square from the X postulate is a (1-Y) postulate. Now that's an opposition postulate, X and (1-Y) are opposition postulates and they tend to fly apart. Ok?
So they would repel each other. Now what I said for X and (1-X) is true for the Y and (1-Y).
The Y and (1-Y) are bonded together, top right hand corner and bottom right hand corner are bonded together they're pulling towards each other and they form the IP Y(1-Y).
So Y is also attracted to the X postulate between the top right hand corner and the top left hand corner, but the bottom right hand is opposing the top left hand corner and the top right corner is also in opposition to its opposition postulate which is the (1-X) postulate across the other diagonal.
So you've got a square now, if you join the lines up in the square you'll see that X and Y are pulling towards each other, X and (1-X) are pulling towards each other but across the diagonal X and (1-Y) are flying apart and this is true for Y and (1-X) while Y and (1-Y) are attracted to each other.
So each postulate in each corner of the square is being pulled on by two postulates to merge but it's prevented from merging because across the diagonal it's being repelled by the postulate across the diagonal.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | = | Y |
| = | ≠ | = |
| 1-X | = | 1-Y |

Now if you were to take the X postulate out and draw up separately the forces acting upon the X postulate you would come to see that they form what is known in mechanics as a triangle of forces and that the three forces are in equilibrium. Now this is a little bit of high school mechanics. But it can be easily shown that the configuration is completely stable and that the X postulate will stay right where it is, in other words it's at rest. It's got no impetus to move anyplace. The X postulate just sits there and similarly with the (1-X) postulate and similarly with the Y postulate, and with the (1-Y) postulate they form a stable square.

The two IP's come together and stick with the X stuck to the Y and the (1-X) stuck to the (1-Y) and the X stuck to the (1-X) and the Y stuck to the (1-Y), but the X repelling the (1-Y) because they are opposition postulates and the Y repelling the (1-X) postulate and those last two repulsions being across the diagonals of the square and the whole thing is a stable configuration that will sit there in space. In other words you could leave it there; it has no intention to move any place. It’s a completely stable configuration.

Now that stable configuration is the basic sensation at the boundary between the opposing postulates. What you perceive as the sensation consists of those four postulates in that configuration I've just given to you. That's what the sensation is.

# TIPM

Sensation simply consists of those four postulates those twin IP's stuck together, into that configuration and we call that configuration TIPM. M stands for mass because that is what you perceive. You don't perceive it as postulates; you tend to perceive it as mass. So we call it TIPM, twin impossibility point mass, T I P M. and that is the technical name we use in TROM for a sensation T I P M.
We call it TIPM, because that's exactly what it is, it's twin impossibility point mass, that's its exact anatomy. So TIPM is a much better name for it than sensation, which is a completely non descriptive term, but TIPM is highly meaningful, because we know what we're talking about when we talk about TIPM.
Now let us consider what we might call a single parcel of TIPM in this XY goals package which is generated at the boundary between the X and the (1-Y) postulate, under the circumstances we've been discussing. We have the four postulates there, in the top left hand corner we have X, in the bottom left hand corner we have (1-X), the top right hand corner we have Y and in the bottom right hand corner we have (1-Y), and the forces between them are exactly as I've given and we know that this is a stable postulate configuration in a stable balance of forces.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| X | = | Y |
| = | ≠ | = |
| 1-X | = | 1-Y |

Now each one of these four postulates is quite capable of attracting its complementary postulate exterior to this little parcel. Do you follow that?

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| X | = | Y | = | X | = | Y |
| = | ≠ | = | ≠ | = | ≠ | = |
| 1-X | = | 1-Y | = | 1-X | = | 1-Y |

In other words the X postulate in the little parcel we're dealing with, although bonded to (1-X) and attracting and stuck to its Y postulate, which it can't completely merge with, of course, but stuck to the Y postulate. It's still quite capable of attracting the Y postulate from another parcel of TIPM nearby. And similarly with the (1-X) postulate in the bottom left hand corner it's quite capable of attracting the (1-Y) postulate from a nearby package of TIPM, and similarly with the Y and the (1-Y) postulates in the top right and the bottom right hand corner of our square.

Each of the four postulates in this stable configuration is capable of attracting its complementary postulates external to the package. The little parcel that we're considering in this whole mass of TIPM, that is milling about and forming at the boundary under these boundary conditions where these little parcels of TIPM are being constantly generated at the point of conflict between the opposing postulates is capable of bonding to another postulate set. You see that?

So the tendency will be for these little parcels of TIPM as they form to join up with each other. With the X joined up to the Y of another packet, another parcel of TIPM, and the (1-X) joined up to the (1-Y) and the Y joined up to an X of another parcel and the (1-Y) joined up to (1-X) of another parcel, and so on. You see?
All the bits join up by the attraction of the complementary postulates. That's what pulls them together. So the little squares will join up and form what we call a matrix and you will see a matrix there, you could draw it out on a piece of paper if you wanted to, you simply take your basic square and put by the side of it another square and put in your lines of force there and you would see the way they would join up. Bearing in mind that the complementary postulates attract each other and the opposition postulates repel each other.
So those forces would be sufficient to cause the whole mass of these little parcels of TIPM to form themselves into a matrix. You follow me?
At the boundary we don't actually have a mass of what you might call parcels of TIPM, we have one lump, there's a tendency for the little parcels of TIPM as they form and are generated in games play to bond to the other particles and the whole thing to coalesce and become a massive TIPM, a conglomerate of TIPM at the boundary between the opposing postulates.

## Flows, Dispersals and Ridges

Now Ron Hubbard, if you recall in the early days of Scientology, if you recall the book 8-80. Ron wrote a book 8-80 on energy flows back in 1951 or early 52 on the subject of energy flows and he talked of flows and dispersals and ridges and he said when you get to energy flows crashing together they form a ridge. Well he'd spotted this phenomenon in his own psyche and what Ron Hubbard called a ridge was actually the boundary condition between the opposing postulates in the goals package.

In other words we're talking about the same phenomena that Ron had spotted back in 1951 when we're talking about TIPM. But Ron didn't know it's anatomy, he hadn't got it's anatomy out, because he didn't ever clearly isolate the goals packages like I have done with TROM, but he knew that when two flows crash together that a ridge would form between them, he called that an energy ridge. And that surrounding this energy ridge would be a dispersal of energy. You remember he talked of flows dispersals and ridges.

Well I'll tell you where the dispersals fit in, in a moment, we'll get to those, we'll see how they fit in, and we will see how accurate Ron was. He was tremendously accurate in his observations but he just wasn't able to put it together in the form and to get the exact anatomy out like we can do it.

He saw it as energy. He couldn't grasp that what he was looking at as energy wasn't really energy it was a postulate configuration which we call TIPM, with the postulates in the IP state.

He never got that far, but we've got that far so we can analyze and get the complete anatomy of what Ron used to call a ridge, and what Ron used to call a flow. Well a flow is simply the flow of the postulates and where they crash together it forms a ridge.

Then we'll talk about the dispersal in the area of the ridge.

So we're not talking about anything here which was not forecast, you might say, by Ron Hubbard back in the early days of Scientology, and I refer you to his book 8-80, Scientology 8-80 I think. I remember the book was called, "The subject of flows dispersals and ridges."
So at the boundary we see this massive conglomeration of TIPM which will tend to form itself into a solid lump. In other words, this TIPM has an attraction for itself. In other words, the separate little parcels of TIPM have an attraction for each other. Left to their own devices they will collapse on each other and form a mass.
You could say that each particle or each little parcel of TIPM consists of the four postulates of the goals package in the postulate configuration I've described, that each little parcel would have a gravitational pull for the other particles. You follow? So the tendency for them, if left together in space, they would all collapse in on each other by the gravitational pull of the complementary postulates involved.
And so you would tend to see the collapse of each little parcel, these little parcels together. They might start as a confusion of particles or a confusion of parcels of TIPM but they would soon collapse in on each other and sort themselves out and become a solid lump, a matrix. What we call a matrix of TIPM, which would be quite a fixed thing.
It would tend to stick together because of the attraction between the complementary postulates that are holding it together. There would be no tendency for it to fly apart. It would have a cohesion because of the complementary postulates which it contained holding it together. You get that?
So understand that cohesive nature of TIPM it tends to have a gravitational attraction for other bits of TIPM.
Just thought I'd mention that in passing, we'll discuss that aspect of it more later on.

## Moving the Barrier

Well so far we've talked about this barrier being stuck between games player A and games player B. Now we must discover what happens when one of those players starts to win the game.
We can now move from the static situation we've been discussing to the dynamic situation that we see in actual life where one or other of the players starts to overwhelm the other player.
Now what happens when this occurs is that the boundary starts to move towards the loser. He no longer is able to hold the boundary out there, His postulate is insufficient to hold the boundary in its position and the boundary starts to move towards him.
The TIPM is still being formed at the boundary and as he progressively loses the game the boundary comes in closer and closer to him. Now as this happens he will go through a definite sequence of events, which you ought to know about. Actually if you were to continue to do Level 5 long enough you would discover all this material for yourself. You would discover all these events, all about boundaries and all about TIPM for yourself but it's necessary to understand the phenomena that we're talking about. Just what happens as this boundary moves towards the person.
Supposing X is the loser, he's losing the game. And this boundary of TIPM is moving relentlessly towards him. There's the opponents (1-Y) postulate that proceeds to overwhelm him, the boundary gets closer and closer.
Now the sequence starts there, and the first sign that he gets as he starts to come under the influence of the boundary conditions in the game is that the boundary gets so close to him that his own postulate begins to flip at random between the postulate and it's negative.

In other words he's beginning to get right up close to the boundary now and he's beginning to go into the boundary condition himself so his X postulate starts to flip.
He can't hold his postulate in X, it flips over to (1-X). It gets driven into overwhelm and he goes into (1-X), then he hauls it back out again and gets it back onto X and pushes on with the game. Then a moment later his postulate snaps into (1-X), then he snaps it back into X. And so at first this happens at random. This random snapping between the postulate X and its negative (1-X) as he's influenced by the boundary conditions, you see he's acting like the little parcels of X postulate do. They were being pushed backwards and forewords between the X and the (1-X). Well now it's happening to the games player himself.
Now the emotion, the feeling, the sense… well it's not sensation, the feeling that goes with this is the feeling of confusion. He starts to feel confused, goes into the feeling of confusion.
Now this is quite an important part of the proceeding, is this confusion, we better understand what we mean when we say confusion and analyze the word itself.

## Confusion

Now the word confusion comes from the Latin *fundere* means to pour. Also, the word confound comes from the Latin *fundere* to pour and the word confound and the word confuse mean much the same thing, to confound and to confuse.
So the word confuse in our language almost literally means to fuse with. You know, it's an interesting word isn't it, to fuse with. And we're talking about IP's where postulates are being bonded to their negative and being fused together. It's a very interesting word from its derivation.

It's almost as if someone way down the line sort of just picked it, picked this meaning, this idea of confusion, the idea of two things being bonded together.
Never the less that is exactly the feeling that the person gets as their IP barrier gets closer. The TIPM barrier I should say, moves up closer and closer to them. They go through a period of confusion where their postulates snap backwards and forwards.
They're in the X postulate and it keeps snapping to 1-X and they haul it back to X again, and they hold it at X for a while and it will snap over to 1-X and they get it back to X but it's random it's not regular it's random, confusion.
Now that feeling of confusion will intensify and then diminish and as it diminishes, the barrier is now getting closer it diminishes and the person goes into what is called a pulse reaction. They're now pulsing between the X postulate and the (1-X) postulate regularly.
They would be holding their postulate X then… (1-X)… X… (1-X)… X… (1-X) but it's not random, it's regular, it's a regular pulsation between the postulate and it's negative. Now this pulsation will get faster and faster till a certain point will be reached where the person is holding both postulates simultaneously. They're in X and (1-X), they're in both postulates simultaneously. They are in the IP.
Now at that point when they're right in the IP it's a rest point. There's no confusion, there's no pulse, it's a rest point. There's a moment of stillness and motionlessness in there. It's a rest point there, right in the IP.
Then they start to go out of the IP and start to go into the pulse again. They now go into the pulsation, a very, very fast pulsation of X, (1-X), X, (1-X), X, (1-X) in other words they start to go out in reverse from the way they came into the IP.

They go out, first pulsing X, (1-X), X, (1-X) then random (1-X), X, (1-X), X and the feeling of confusion will return then there's less and less X's and more and more (1-X)'s until they are in (1-X). Now they are in overwhelm.

The effect in other words is to drive the IP barrier through the person, it gets latterly driven through the person and out the other side, and the effect on his postulate is to change it from the postulate X as the IP approaches into (1-X) as the IP barrier goes through him and out the other side. The barrier gets driven through the person and comes out the other side leaving him in overwhelm holding the (1-X) postulate.

Now that sequence of events I've given you can happen in seconds or it can take minutes or it can take hours but it happens in every overwhelm in games play, no exceptions. Doesn't matter what the postulates are the person always, if he suffers an overwhelm, he goes through that sequence of events.

At first he has his postulate. He feels he's losing the game, the barrier gets closer and closer to him, he starts to feel confused then he starts to pulse between the postulate and it's negative postulate. Then he has this rest point where there is no motion. Then he's out the other side into the pulses again. Then he feels the confusion again. Then the confusion lessens and he settles into the negative postulate and the sequence is invariable. It happens every time, in every game.

Every time he's ever lost a game in this universe the being has gone through that sequence. Now you might say, “Well if that is so, how come it's not reported invariably? How come that the patients regressed in therapy don't report it?”

But they do report it. Every time a person goes into an engram, a pain engram, they will always report confusion if they get sufficient contact with the injury, sufficient contact with the impact, then they will report some confusion.

Well what about this pulse why don't they report the pulse? Well sometimes they do. I've known a preclear to say, “Well I don't know I seem to be sort of pulsing between things here … there but it's… you know”, but then the thing is gone and then there's a sort of calmness there and then he's back in the confusion again.
But the real reason why the person doesn't experience all the steps in the action in recall is because the rational mind abhors the IP state. You see that?
So he skids over it, he skids over the IP. The tendency is when you run an engram on a person or run a point of overwhelm, he'll pick up the point where he'll start to lose the game, he'll feel the confusion, then he'll feel the impact, and then he'll be in the overwhelm. He'll go straight through the IP unknowingly, because he abhors it. He just doesn't register it. And the next thing, there he is, he's in postulate reversal and his postulates got overwhelmed, and he didn't spot it, he didn't spot the IP. See? Simply because the rational mind abhors the IP state and so it won't duplicate it.
The rational mind can duplicate the confusion so when you run an engram on a preclear they almost invariably report some form of confusion. Sometimes they'll report the pulse but that's rare, but they never report the stillness right at the centre of the IP, because to experience that they would have to experience pure insanity and that they can't duplicate. They can't duplicate that because that's pure insanity that they went through.

## Insanity or Overwhelm

Now what is the difference between the person going insane and the person going into an overwhelm in games play?

Well there's really only one difference, the person going insane never came out. You know, he had no place to go, so he's stuck in the IP. It was his last game, so he's stuck in it. But your ordinary games player being overwhelmed in games play, he will go through the IP barrier, and come out the other side, simply because he's got some place to go. So he can come back out. And he does come back out. All he suffers is a postulate overwhelm.

## Sensation at Overwhelm

Now there's another phenomena that occurs that I haven't mentioned so far because I didn't want to burden you with too much all at once. But there's another phenomenon occurs as the person starts to lose the game and have the barrier move towards him.
As the IP barrier moves towards him the game sensation which he's been sensing all the time he has been playing this game, intensifies.
He can sense this barrier consists of IP's and he senses it as sensation. Remember I said that. He doesn't sense it as postulates, he sees it as a mass but he also doesn't sense it as IP's, he senses it as mass, as game sensation. So he's sensing the games sensation there and as the barrier moves towards him the game sensation intensifies.

## Inverse Square Law and Sensation

It can be easily shown, given that the postulate intensity is constant, that the intensity of sensation obeys the inverse square law in the universe. In other words, if the barrier is half the distance the sensation is four times as strong. It's the inverse square law in the universe, Newton's inverse square law of gravity.

But anyway, that's just an interesting point in passing but that is the law that it obeys. That the closer he gets to that barrier the intensity of the sensation he feels goes up according to that inverse square law. And this intensity of sensation increases and reaches a peak at the point where he goes into the IP, at which point it stops. Then when he comes out the other side, there's a peak sensation again. Then as he settles into the overwhelm, his postulate is changed to its negative so the barrier's gone and the sensation rapidly drops off to zero, because the game is ended now. He's in complimentary postulates with the opponent.

Once he goes through rapid confusion on the other side of the barrier and then complementary postulates, the games ended and all the sensation ends.

But the sensation peaks actually at the point just when he goes into the IP. Just when he goes through the IP barrier is the maximum point of sensation.

## Compulsive Games Players Crave Sensation

Now if you understand this about sensation and this relation between the IP barrier and sensation you will understand something which has puzzled many researchers in the human mind, in the human psyche, which we now can explain. This factor of why it is that games players, particularly compulsive games players will put their sanity at risk in order to enjoy games sensation. And they do it time and time again.
They will take enormous risk; they will put their life at risk in order to enjoy game sensation. What are they doing? They're pulling that IP barrier closer and closer to them in order to maximize the sensation.
Remember the inverse square law, the closer that barrier is to them the more sensation their going to enjoy, but you see the danger they're running for themselves. They could easily, if they're not careful, they could easily get stuck in that IP, in which case they lose everything, the sensations gone and their sanity's gone. See that?
And if the other side of the IP is death, and it may be, on one side of the IP they may be alive but the negative postulate may be their death. So when they go through the IP and out the other side their dead. You see that, it can happen when you have certain types of postulate configurations, certain types of postulates.
We find that the compulsive games player in order to generate the maximized game sensation will pull himself as close as possible to the IP barrier in order to maximize his sensation, and he will often boast of this, of how close he could get to it.

It's like adolescents in motor cars, you know, of how fast they can drive down a road at a brick wall and still be able to pull up in time before they crash into the wall. It's that sort of activity. It's how close they can get to the IP barrier. In other words, **they're simply trying to maximize the thrill, maximize the sensation, maximize the game sensation without either losing their life or their sanity.**
It's a fascinating phenomenon of games play, one that's been recorded and noticed by many students of philosophy and psychology and therapy. But none of them have ever been able to explain it, and for the first time in TROM we can understand it, because we've got the anatomy of it, we can see it exactly in terms of the postulates and the IP state, and we've got all the bits involved and we can see exactly how the person does it, and why they do it.
Once we know the relationship there, that the intensity of the sensation is inversely proportional to the distance between himself and the IP barrier. Get it?

## Sensation Generated by Games Play

You see the games player is in an awful fix on this subject of games sensation. He can't mock it up. He can't create it. He can only generate it in games play. And every games player sooner or later realizes this system of maximizing games sensation.
He might not know it exactly in the way that we have got it described, the way we understand it in TROM. He doesn't see it as clearly as we see it, but he does know that by taking risks he can maximize his game sensation, and it's the only way he knows how to generate the sensation.

He can't do it any other way. He can't mock it up. He can't create it. So he has a love hate relationship with this IP barrier. It attracts him like a moth to a flame. It's pure sensation, the barrier is. You see?
But like the moth to the flame, if the moth goes into the flame he's a dead moth. If the games player gets caught in the IP barrier and gets stuck right into the IP barrier, he's a gone games player because his sanity's gone, at least his sanity's gone, and maybe his life is gone too.
So there are the risks he takes, and there is the incredible fascination that the games player has on this subject of sensation. Get it?
It's a love/hate relationship. He's attracted by it like the moth to the flame, he can't keep away from it and he can't satisfy his craving by his own creativity because he can't mock it up. It won't create, it's quite incredible, it won't create. It can only be generated.
Now there's the inner datum, the inner secret, the inner button, the inner works of this subject of sensation and the craving of sensation, and its effect in games play.
But, as I was saying, the IP state when you come to experience it, come to examine it is really a toothless tiger. When you really get into it and learn how to handle it, it's a toothless tiger. It's the same with this subject of sensation.

## Craving for Sensation Disappears

As you work with Level 5 in TROM, you work with the postulates there and you work with the IP state. And understand where it fits into games play, and get to know its anatomy, and get to experience all of its parts, and so forth, you will find you're dealing with a toothless tiger.

You reach a point eventually where you don't perceive the barrier as a mass. You perceive the IP barrier, for what it is, a series of postulates in the IP configuration. And something interesting happens at that point, case wise, in Level 5, the craving for sensation disappears. It's gone, at the point where you know exactly what it is, you know all about its complete anatomy you've lost all desire for it. It's gone. Get it?
And besides, you might say it's only the mystery of what sensation is that keeps attracting the games player, cause he can't create it, and he can't create it because he doesn't know what it is.
At the point where he reaches the case level in TROM where he can create it exactly and precisely, his need for it is gone. He's like the man who says, “Marvelous, I think I'll TROM so I won't have to go to the brothel every Saturday night and I'll be able to mock up sexual sensation.”
But the exact point where he reaches his goal he doesn't have any need to mock up sexual sensation because he understands exactly what it is, he's got the whole postulate configuration there and it's gone. The whole thing's gone. The whole lot just falls apart, there's nothing there. The whole lot just evaporates into nothing. **The craving's gone, to be replaced with knowingness and understanding.**
Now that's what happens in therapy on this subject.
So when a person embarks on Level 5 of TROM, as I said in the write up when a person embarks on Level 5 it might change them into something different from human. They might not be what is normally regarded as human by the time they've finished it.

Well this is one of those aspects. See? Your attitude toward sensation is going to have a marked change and you will find instead of spending a large percentage of your life going around trying to generate games sensation, you can find other more interesting thing to do with your time than wasting it trying to find games sensation. When you simply understand the nature of this sensation, you lose interest in it, because you understand it.

## The Anatomy of Confusion and Dispersal

Now I've just been replaying this tape so far and I've realized that I mentioned this subject of confusion and dispersal, I mentioned Ron in 8-80 and flows dispersals and ridges and I said I'd tie up this subject of dispersal for you.
Well the subject of dispersal is the subject of confusion. What Ron meant by an energy dispersal is exactly matched by a person in a state of confusion when he's bouncing at random between a postulate and its negative.
That's all confusion is, by the way, that is the anatomy of confusion, is the random snapping between a postulate and its negative. That's all confusion is.
This feeling of confusion is the random snapping between a postulate and its negative. You can take any confusion apart that way. And that's all it consists of, there's nothing else there, nothing else in any confusion but the random snapping between a postulate and its negative, and that is the dispersal that Ron spoke about now in 8-80. That's an energy dispersal, that feeling of confusion, the confusion is the dispersal. There isn't anything else there. Confusion and dispersal are synonyms.

If you care to pick up the points in your life when you felt confused and re-experience them, and then think of this feeling of dispersal, feeling dispersed you'll find that it is exactly the same phenomena. There's no difference between the two phenomena. To feel dispersed is the same as feeling confused, there's no difference between them. **A confusion is a dispersal and a dispersal is a confusion and the anatomy of confusion is the random snapping between a postulate and its negative**

## TIPM, Qualities of(Twin Insanity Point Mass)

We now ought to take up the subject of the qualities of this stuff called TIPM. What are its qualities?
Well we already know that the qualities of the IP's are. Remember I gave the four qualities there of the IP, there's identification, motionlessness, timelessness or time stop and mass.
Well the TIPM because they only consist of IP's will also show the same four qualities. We need to take these up in turn and look at them in more detail to understand the nature of this stuff called TIPM.
Let us take up first this subject of **identification.** The TIPM consists of an identification between a postulate and it's negative and that is absolutely fundamental to the anatomy of TIPM.
But look the identification between a postulate and its negative is the very essence of irrationality which shows you that TIPM is not a thing of reason. It's not rational, it's not a rational state, it's not a rational thing, TIPM. It's highly irrational in fact TIPM is as irrational as anything can get. It's not rational.

Now this tells you right away that because TIPM is irrational it won't duplicate you, it won't adopt a complementary postulate with you. So you direct a postulate at it and order it to do something and it won't do it.
You order the TIPM to jump and it will refuse to jump. It won't jump, because it's not operating, that's the correct word, it's not operating in a rational manner, and so it simply will not duplicate any postulate directed at it. It will not adopt a complementary postulate to any postulate directed at it. So that's something you should know about TIPM.
It's completely irrational in that respect. It won't obey your orders. Whatever order you direct at it, it will simply not comply. It won't comply with any order directed at it.
Of course, by the same token, TIPM does not by its nature automatically oppose any postulates directed at it. Left to its own devices it will just sit there and it won't play games with you. It will just sit there.
In other words you order it to jump and it doesn't refuse to jump, it just sort of sits there being its quiet uncomplaining self. You get it?
So it neither adopts a complementary postulate to a postulate directed at it nor does it produce an opposition postulate to a postulate directed at it. It just sits there being it's quiet uncomplaining self. That's TIPM.
Tape ends abruptly.

# 04 Sensations

Insanity Point Lecture 4

By Dennis Stephens

Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin

May 20, 2012

This is tape 4 of the upper level material on TROM and tape 4 on the subject of sensations. And this tape, just like its predecessor must not be detached from the set.

## Motionlessness

All right now so much for the identification factor. Now let's take up this subject of motionlessness. Now because of its postulate structure where each postulate is bonded to its negative TIPM has no residual urge to move. However you could always move the stuff around by pulling at it or pushing at it, but bear in mind that left to its own devices it's quite motionless, because of its postulate structure.

And another one of its motion qualities is that once it is in motion, because it has no motion of its own, once it is in motion it tends to stay in motion until it's stopped. So that's another quality of TIPM. Once you do get the stuff on the move it stays in that state on the move simply because there's nothing inside it to prevent itself from moving, just another one of its qualities. All right so much for the motionlessness.

## Timelessness

Now timelessness is actually a time stop. Time actually stops in the TIPM at the point where the TIPM formed. Remember I discussed this one when we were talking about insanity, where the persons goes insane, that time stops for them at that point where they go insane.
Well similarly with the TIPM at the barrier, if you were to get right inside a particle of TIPM, the time actually stopped at the moment where the TIPM formed. So it's the point of genesis where the TIPM formed, if you were to examine this, very carefully the little individual packages of TIPM at the boundary. You get that? That's where the time stopped.
But there's a timelessness, we could use the word timelessness, there. There's a timelessness in TIPM, but bear in mind it's really a time stop. There's a stopped time there at the point where the TIPM formed.
Although the TIPM by itself contains no persistency postulate, it's on a time stop. It contains no time postulates. You can infuse it with a time postulate and make it persist in the universe. You can make it endure with a persistency postulate, and so forth. So it can be made to persist by endowing it with a time postulate, like any other creation in the universe can.

## Mass

Now let's look at the subject of mass. TIPM is perceived as mass. It's always perceived as mass by the viewer. He either refuses or is unable to perceive its exact postulate structure.

## Solidity

Now how about the solidity, that is a quality of mass. How about the solidity of the TIPM?
Well that really is a separate postulate; solidity in this universe is a function of how much importance you assign to a mass. In other words those things that are regarded as important tend to persist and become more solid. You remember that little postulate there in the universe.
So from that point of view its solidity would depend on how much importance you assign to the TIPM. Or, also, solidity of course can be a direct postulate in this universe. You can make a thing solid by direct postulate. So you can always make TIPM solid by postulating that it's solid.
So much for the subject of the mass there.
So I'd like to give you a reading from one of my research notes on this subject because I don't think I could improve upon them, so I'll give you a direct reading from my old research notes.

## TIPM is Mass in this Universe

TIPM, let’s talking about the mass effect of TIPM etc. and the various qualities of TIPM.

TIPM is therefore completely **malleable,** it's completely passive, like putty, it can be stretched, pushed, pulled and molded into any desired shape.
It can also be moved around and will stay where you put it or remain in a state of motion, if motion be imparted to it.
TIPM can also be endowed with any postulate or significance you care to put into it. If you call it a stone, it's a stone, because it's a passive structure. IP's whose postulates cancel each other out are quite neutral in terms of postulates. So it can be endowed with any postulate you care to put into it. Today you might order it into a stone. Tomorrow you powder it and mould it into house bricks and make a wall out of it.
TIPM is exactly analogous to child's modeling clay. Just as a child can play games with his clay so a spiritual being can play games with TIPM.
If you take a mass of TIPM and leave it in space close to another mass of TIPM and go away when you return the two masses will have moved together. Why? The bonding forces on the surface of the TIPM ensure that this will happen. The same forces that cause each element of TIPM to bond with other elements to form a mass of TIPM will cause separate masses of TIPM to come together if left undisturbed.
TIPM has a **gravitational** effect upon other TIPM and it all tends to come together in one lump.
As we discover these things we more and more see the similarities between TIPM and the mass of this universe, indeed they are identical.
TIPM also shows the phenomena of **condensation** once a mass of TIPM is made to continue through time it manifests a tendency to condense. The phenomenon of condensation is due to a decay of the IP postulate structure causing the mass to literally collapse in on itself.

It collapses, it becomes denser, and we call this collapse condensation. Condensed TIPM is collapsing TIPM. The process is continuous and the degree of collapse is a measure of the age of the TIPM.
These are the known qualities of TIPM. There are no doubt many others."
That's the end of the direct quote from my old research notes.

## Where the Mass Came From

So we do have in our understanding of TIPM and the IP state and the anatomy of sensation, we do have an understanding of where all this mass in the universe came from.
When you start to do research into the human spirit and the human psyche one of the great puzzles is where all the mass in this universe comes from. It is obviously not created mass. If all the mass in this universe was a mock up… look supposing it was mocked up by God, supposing God mocked up all the mass in this universe. Now you would only have to then say, as a spiritual being that this is God's mock up, and that would be the truth of the matter, wouldn't it, and the mass in the universe would start to thin down, would start to fade out because that would be the truth. You would be calling the truth of the matter and so the lie would vanish, you see?
If you said it was your mock up but it was really God's mock up, then of course that's a lie and that would tend to make it persist. I refer you to Ron Hubbard's axioms, Axiom 11.

But we can go around and look at the mass of this universe and say it's God's mockup, it's Joe's mockup, it's my mockup, it's Charles mockup, it doesn't make the slightest bit of difference whose mockup you assign it to be. It doesn't alter the quality of the mass of the universe in the slightest, so therefore, it is not created mass. Now that's one thing you learn on the research route when you're researching life and mass in this universe. That it is not created mass.

## Axiom 11

The considerations resulting in conditions of existence are fourfold:
a. AS-ISNESS is the condition of immediate creation without persistence, and is the condition of existence which exists at the moment of creation and the moment of destruction, and is different from other considerations in that it does not contain survival.
b. ALTER-ISNESS is the consideration which introduces change, and therefore time and persistence, into an AS-ISNESS to obtain persistency.
c. ISNESS is an apparency of existence brought about by the continuous alteration of an AS-ISNESS. This is called, when agreed upon, reality.
d. NOT-ISNESS is the effort to handle ISNESS by reducing its condition through the use of force. It is an apparency and cannot entirely vanquish an ISNESS.
Scientology Axioms by L Ron Hubbard 1954
And I knew this some years ago. I knew that the mass in this universe is not created mass, I knew that years ago, 20 years , 30 years ago, I knew that, it couldn't be, but I didn't know what it was. But now I've got into TROM and found out what it is.

It's TIPM, which is not created mass, its generated mass and now we understand these various qualities of TIPM. We can see how the mass in the universe comes about.
And because it's malleable like putty it can be changed from one state to another. We can get a gas, a cloud of particles there, which can condense into a gas cloud and a sun can form and then the particles can be changed into energy particles and go out and condense again and change into another state. And we see all the laws of physics, and the formation and the life and creation of suns and the death of suns, and it's all TIPM going through its various condensation states.

## TIPM is Sensation and Condenses into Mass

Games can be played in this universe by spiritual beings with this remarkable stuff called TIPM. And all the games that they play generate more sensation, and the sensation that generates between their opposing postulates then starts to condense down and become tiny particles which becomes the mass of this universe and keeps the universe going.
It's a self perpetuating machine, you see? The game played by the spiritual beings in the universe keep the universe provided with new TIPM. The old TIPM goes through a condensation cycle and starts off high on the tone scale, you might say, and ends up as dead matter in some black hole in space somewhere and becomes unusable anymore in games play by the spiritual beings.
But not to worry the universe is expanding and there are always plenty of games going on between the spiritual beings generating and creating more and more TIPM by their games which is now condensing into more and more so called mass in the universe. It's quite a game, isn't it?
It's quite a game. It's quite a system, and when you understand it you see the beauty of the system.

So I can assure you that this is the way it is. That when you're looking at the mass of this universe, don't kid yourself, it's all sensation mass. There isn't anything else here.
Oh, I wouldn't be as dogmatic as that, but I would say that 99.9999% of the mass of this universe is sensation mass condensed and the other 0.0001% is somebody's mock up. It may be yours, maybe mine but that is a very tiny proportion. When this universe first started almost the only mass in this universe was created mass, but at this late stage in the universe the vast proportion of the mass of the universe is TIPM. It's mass that's being generated in games play.
You know, you can imagine the beings at the beginning of this universe, they started to play games and this TIPM started to generate at the boundary between their games and they looked at it and they put it to one side and after a while it began to pile up in heaps and then they called in the disposal truck to take it away and the truck used to come around and take it away and then they ran out of places where they could put it and the stuff became an absolute menace and every time they played games they generated more TIPM until one day somebody had a bright idea and said, “look instead of trying to dispose of this stuff why don't we use it in games play so they started to use it. The beings started to use the TIPM and then the cycle was complete.

## If You're in this Universe you got Two Choices

Now they could play games with the TIPM and their games generated more TIPM and that way they ensured the perpetuation of the universe, the game of the universe forever. The snake rounded a loop and was now biting its own tail. The loop was complete and the universe could now go on forever.

And know this about this universe. **When this universe was created no postulate was ever made to say when it will end.** I've never come across any postulate; Ron Hubbard never came across any postulate, which said that the universe is going to end at a certain time. It's an open ended universe, time wise, this one is, and it goes on forever.

And if you're in it, if you're in this universe you got two choices, you're either going to jog along with it forever or you're going to find your way out, and the only way you're ever going to get out is to understand it. There ain't no other routes out.

And since it's an open ended universe it isn't going to stop, so the choice is yours, really.

Just to round this off I would like to give you the basic postulate configuration of TIPM. Bear in mind it's formed in a goals package between the opposing postulates in a goals package. So in terms of that goals package, let's call it the XY goals package, the logical expression of TIPM is X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1. That is the logical structure there of TIPM in terms of the XY postulates of the XY goals package. That's the general case. Are there any other postulates upon the TIPM and so affecting this logical configuration? No, there aren't. The games player may have made various other postulates but bear in mind the formation of the TIPM is in these little tiny parcels at the barrier so the only forces acting upon the TIPM are the forces I've mentioned in its generation. So there aren't any other postulates in the set. The one I've just given you, X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1 is the full and complete expression of the logical anatomy of TIPM. Ok?

Right, that takes us to the end of the subject of TIPM and Sensations. So I want to take up an allied subject which really does belong in the same department, you might say, as the subject of TIPM and Sensations and that is the subject of the E-meter.

## The E-Meter

The E-meter in general but more particularly and more specialized the moves of the E-meter and the significance of the various needle movements on the E-meter.
Now let me say at once that Ron Hubbard wrote a book on this subject and he's made many talks on the subject. Ron's ideas on what the E-meter read and so forth were correct as far as they went. There is no doubt about that.
What Ron Hubbard said on this subject is correct as far as it went. His ideas on what caused the E-meter to move are true, as I say, as far as they went.
And the ideas that you read of in the psychiatric and the psychological magazines when they talk about people's hands sweating and to do with the synapses and the right hand side and the left hand side of the brain, this is just garbage. It really is garbage.
Ron was on the right track. He didn't get all of it. Ron didn't get all of it unfortunately, but what Ron did get on the subject of the E-meter was right. If you follow what Ron said, he won't put you wrong on the subject of an E-meter, of what it actually is reading and what it actually is recording. What he said is right as far as it went, but he didn't get all of it.
Now with TROM we can add the rest. We can put the rest that Ron didn't get.

The E-meter needle in essence simply reads on postulates. That's all it reads. It reads postulates and postulate configurations.
Now Ron said it read on mass. Well, what is mass in this universe but a postulate configuration? So Ron was right when he said it read on mass. You get it?
But Ron didn't know that mass consists of a postulate configuration. Well, we do know that. We know mass is TIPM, we know that. So we know what it's reading on.
So where Ron said it read on mass he was quite right. It does, it reads on a mass, but basically it's reading on a postulate configuration, so the E-meter really reads on postulates, that's all it reads. It's only postulates that cause that needle to move. It's the postulates and changes of postulates that cause the needle to move.
Now if you understand that, you understand what makes an E-meter needle move. It's got nothing to do with sweat, it's got nothing to do with neurons, it's got nothing to do with synapses, it's got nothing to do with hemispheres of the brain, it's got nothing to do with psychones. It's got nothing to do with anything you'll find in a modern university course on the subject of psychology or any other rubbish of this nature.
The E-meter moves on postulates. Get that and you got the fundamentals right away. It moves… it reads on postulates and postulate configurations.
Ok now let's examine these various moves of an E-meter in terms of the postulate configurations.
The easiest way we can do this is to pull up our old friends A and B with A operating on the postulate X and B operating on the postulate (1-Y). And between them they would have this barrier where their two postulates are in opposition and there would be the barrier. You remember this example we used in the previous lecture. We will resurrect this and use it again.

Now supposing this situation had existed sometime in the A's past, and A had been overwhelmed in the game. Right? And it happened sometime in the past, and you are running this as an incident in the now. You follow what we've got?
You've got the preclear on the cans and he was A say, and he was in this game and he was running the X postulate and his opponent was running a (1-Y) postulate and A lost the game and got overwhelmed. He's holding the cans, and you're going to run him through this incident of the overwhelm. Now what sort of needle manifestations can we expect to see. All right now we'll assume that this guys in pretty good nick. He's in pretty good case shape.
So the first thing you would see would be a floating needle. That means that there's no postulate in his field at all there. He's just sitting idling at rest. And that's all that a floating needle means. That the person hasn't got any postulate there so therefore there's no opposition postulates. He's just sitting at rest. When the spiritual being is at rest you will see a floating needle.
When a person gets to the top of Level 3 you'll see a floating needle on a skin galvanometer that you've never seen before in your life. That thing is really going to float. You know. It would take an express train going through the auditing room to do anything about that float. It's a real floating needle, you know?
But you won't see that till you get a person to the top of Level 3 and that's one of the indicators, by the way, that a person has achieved the top of Level 3 is that they have an absolutely superb floating needle. And it takes one hell of a lot to shift it. So that's just a note in passing.

## Floating Needle

So we'll say this guys in pretty good nick, he may not be at the top of Level 3 but he's got a pretty good floating needle. There it is it's floating.
So you ask him to recall this incident. Now as he say's "Ok" he starts to think about it." Now the first thing you see is a slight tightening of the float. That's the very first indication that he's approaching an area of charge, is that the floating needle begins to narrow, and begins to tighten. You get a tightening of the float.

## Falling Needle

It's immediately followed by the fall, you'll see the fall. Now the fall is the second of our characteristic needle reads. The first of our characteristics reads is the float, I've just given the floating needle. I don't have to define it. It's defined in all of the text books there. The needle is literally, it's just floating, just floating.
[see glossary for the definition of a Floating Needle. –PM]
The fall, the needle falls away to the right. And it's characteristic of the person becoming aware of the postulates. First he's becoming aware of the postulate barrier, the barrier out there, the conflict between the postulate and the opposition postulate. He's first becoming aware of it. He comprehends it, he sees it, and he looks at it, and you see the needle fall.
It's almost as if he's running a flag up saying, "Awe, game!", needle falls. The fall is a realization more than anything else. It can be a discharge. It can be a discharge of tension, or it's a realization of discharge.

The fall is a very healthy needle movement. It means that charge is coming off the case. Realization, understanding is occurring, complementary postulates are occurring, realization is occurring, the person's spotted what is happening, all these things will cause a fall. Get it?
And so the first thing is the tightening of the float, then the fall. So you direct his attention now more to the incident. You say, "Alright now pick up the incident." And the fall now stops. This little series of falls that you saw stop. And he starts to put his attention on the incident and you go into the next important needle movement, which is the rise. This is the rise, the next most important needle movement, or it's the next needle movement in the set.

## The Rise

Now what's happening here is that he's beginning to get into the engram. He's becoming aware of this barrier and he's beginning to realize it's moving towards him, and he can't do much about it. He's trying his hardest, he's picking it up, he's starting to get into the engram and he's realizing that this barrier's moving towards him. And there's things happening now that he's not completely happy with.
The falls have stopped you see. You could say he's going into an area where he can't quite face it. He can't quite confront it. He is going into a bit of no confront here. See that?
And the effect is the rising needle. That's the rise.
Now it's a general principal in therapy that any auditor worth his salt never lets a needle rise very far before he does something about it. Because I can tell you, if you let a rise go on for too long you can just lose your preclear. He's gone mate. He just goes completely unconscious. He's gone. He can just rise his way straight into anaten.

So the good auditor lets a rise go on a little way then he'll say, "What's happening" and he'll get him back in, and then he'll see the needle fall again. Hang onto him, keep a close reign on the PC.
So that's just a little tip if you're using a meter. Never let the rise go on for too long, but let it go on a little while, but just keep your eye on it. If it keeps on rising say, "What's going on?" and he'll say, "Oh, Oh, I was just ahh… yes, it's a … I don't care… I didn't like that very" he starts to talk about the incident and then you'll see the falls again as he starts to confront the thing and look at the thing, and starts to come to grips with it again.
Anyway that's the rise. That's the third of our needle movements is the rise. When you get the rising needle it's a sign of an approaching overwhelm. There's something he can't handle here. The rise is not a happy needle movement. That's why an auditor should keep his eye on a rising needle. He should watch the rising needle.
When the PC's about to be overwhelmed by something if you don't do something about it he's going to be overwhelmed and maybe he's going to go in a direction you don't want him to go. In other words you're losing your PC, he's going, when that needle is rising.
So anyway you let him go and his needle rises and as he approaches the barrier, he gets closer and closer into the incident and starts to approach the overwhelm. The point in the incident where he got into the barrier, you know. Remember we talked about this barrier.

Now what happens to the needle as he starts to come up against the IP barrier? Now this is where we get into the very interesting point of needle motion here, and this is the something that Ron never did get quite right in Scientology. He got close to it but he didn't quite get it right and he made some awful errors in this area but he was completely excused because he didn't understand the IP state and he didn't understand the postulate configuration. So again he's to be excused.
In general he got needle movements right but he did make some errors in the area of the IP barrier. He made some mistakes in that area, but we're not going to make them.

## Rock Slam or Zigzag Needle

Now as a person comes up against the IP barrier, remember I said that he goes into confusion. Now he starts to snap from a postulate to its negative at random. You remember me saying that?
That's the first sign that he's coming up against the boundary condition. Well there's a characteristic needle motion that goes on as the person hits this boundary condition and starts to snap there from postulate to negative at random, and that is the Rock Slam. The needle goes into this characteristic zigzag motion.
It's quite characteristic when you've ever seen one, you never will forget it. It's the most dramatic of all needle motions. The needle goes to a position stays there for a second and then flies off and takes another position on the dial stays there for a moment or couple of moments then off it goes again and shoots across the dial and sticks in another position, and shoots across the dial and sticks in another position. Well that's the person snapping at random between a postulate and its negative.

Now that is the Rock Slam. That is the total significance of the Rock Slam. It's a confusion read, it's a dispersal read.
They are being blown about like a twig in a storm as they come up against this IP barrier. It's a tremendous area of confusion here, of all these particles bonding and so forth. All this bonding of particles and IP's being generated at the barrier and the person's getting mixed up in this confusion and he feels the confusion and it shows on the meter as the Rock Slam.
Now that is the total significance of a Rock Slam. Rock Slam has got nothing to do with overt acts, got nothing to do with ill repute or doing disrespectable things or disreputable things.
All sorts of lies have been told about the Rock Slam. The Rock Slam is simply this read, this characteristic read that the person gets when their right up against the IP barrier in games play and they begin to be influenced by the barrier of TIPM and their attention is snapping in between a postulate and it's negative. And it's the first sign, it's the first indicator that their right up against the barrier.
That overwhelm is almost upon them and their beginning to be badly influenced by the opponents postulate because their own postulate is snapping from positive to negative at random.
Now that is the Rock Slam. It's the most violent of all the E-meter reads. I've now given you precisely its nature and what causes it. And it has no other reason, nothing else that will because a Rock Slam but what I've just told you. That's the only reason for a Rock Slam on an E-meter.

When you see the Rock Slam that is what's happening. Now often you see a Rock Slam on a meter and the preclear, the person can't explain the Rock Slam. Well that's simply because their not-ising the confusion. They're in confusion but they don't know they're in confusion. The confusion can be so intense that the person simply blots it out of their psyche. They just simply put a postulate against the confusion to defend themselves against it.
So you see this violent Rock Slam on the meter and you say, "What's happening?" and they say, "Nothing." But you're looking at your meter; it's going absolutely berserk with a Rock Slam. PC says, "Nothing. Nothing's happening." There's the meter saying Rock Slam. Ok, well what's happening is you've got a not-ised Rock Slam that's all.
He's right up against this barrier and he's saying, "There's nothing there." So he is not-ising it. But the meter is telling the truth. That's where he is, he's hard up against the barrier and he's snapping one postulate to its negative and he doesn't know he's doing it even. He's just simply not-ised the whole works. The whole thing is above the level of his experience. He can't confront it. He can't handle it.
But another time you'll see the Rock Slam and you'll say to the person, "What' s happening?" And he'll say, "Awe, gee I feel sort of confused. Yea, oh....." And he'll explain what's happening, he isn't not-ising the confusion. He's experiencing the confusion. He's handling the confusion but you'll still get the Rock Slam.

## Pulse Needle

Now, as you move on, as the person moves closer and closer to the IP barrier, to the TIPM there, remember I said he goes out of the confusion and goes into a pulse.

Now as he moves out of the confusion what you see is the Rock Slam dies down and becomes a more orderly movement. Instead of it being a random movement from one side of the meter to the other, jerking. The needle goes from one side of the meter to the other side of the meter and then back again and you begin to see it's now beginning to pulse. The needle goes from a Rock Slam to what is called a pulse needle.
Now in Scientology they have various names for this the most common name was a theta bop, a theta bop, that's a fast pulsing needle and also it's known as a stage four.
Ron used to call it a stage four when the needle goes up, down, up, and down quite slowly. So it was never properly distinguished or identified in Scientology, this pulse needle, but it was recorded, Ron had it under those two names but it's a pulse read and it's the read that the person gets into when they've gone through the confusion and just before they go into the IP proper they go into the pulse read.
And you'll see this quite characteristic movement on the needle where they pulse. Needle goes up, sticks, down sticks, up sticks, down sticks, up sticks, down sticks, and it can be as fast as that or faster or slower. The pulse can vary in its velocity but it's quite a regular movement. Nothing jerky about it, it's quite regular. Can either be fast or slow or moderate, but there's the pulse read.
It's a very transient read, very transient. Sometimes if it's a fast moving engram that you were running there, if you took your eye off the meter you've missed the pulse. The person would go into the confusion through the pulse and out through the other side and you'd miss it. Other times you see the preclear sitting there pulsing quite happily, you know, well not happily but he's pulsing.

Now the preclear at the point where the needle is pulsing is rarely if ever aware of what's happening. You ask, "What's happening?" he doesn't know anything about it, he'll say, "Oh, I feel a bit woozy, you know." And he goes very silent, very thoughtful and there's the needle going pulse, pulse, pulse, pulse and the whole thing is usually well above his awareness level at that point. He's quite anaten, he's quite woozy when he's in the pulse needle.

Right, that is the pulse needle movement. That is the fifth one of our characteristic needle movements. Remember we had the floating needle, the falling needle, the rising needle, the Rock Slamming needle and now the pulsing needle.

Now as the person stops pulsing between the postulate and its negative and as the pulse speeds up there. You will see the pulse on the E-meter needle speed up and it tends to get faster until it becomes quite a buzz. It can become quite a buzz on the meter.

Sometimes if you've got one of these meters that doesn't respond very quickly you won't see the buzz. The needle will just get very sticky. But on a good meter that responds very quickly you can actually see the needle buzzing. It will buzz as if it… you know, just like a little bee buzzing, you know? It is buzzing fast backwards and forwards in an enormously rapid pulse. Now that is the indicator that the person is just about to go into the IP state. The pulse gets tinier and tinier and tinier and faster and faster and faster. Starts off with a wide slow pulse and as the pulse on the meter gets smaller and smaller, it gets smaller and smaller and faster and faster and it gets smaller and smaller faster, faster, smaller, smaller, faster, faster, smaller , smaller, faster, faster, small buzz, buzz, buzz, buzz, buzz, buzz, buzz, buzz, buzz, STOP. The needle sticks, bang.

## Stuck Needle

Now the person has moved into the IP. They're now in the IP state they're now holding the postulate and it's negative simultaneously. They're now in the motionlessness of the IP and you have a stuck needle.
Now that is the sixth and the final characteristic needle movement that you see on a skin galvanometer, is the stuck needle. It just sits there stuck. There it is stuck. Not moving. Now as the person moves through the incident, of course, the needle is stuck. Then they come out through the other side of the engram. They come out through the other side of the barrier. You will see all these movements in reverse.
The person will come from the stuck to the buzz, to the pulse, then there would be the Rock Slam, and then the Rock Slam would go into falls. There, should be a fairly high tone arm on the needle and it starts to go into falls and then it would regain its float as the person comes out of the incident.
The point from stuck needle coming out the other side of the engram into the overwhelm is much faster. The person, in good case shape, could go from the point of stuck needle through the pulse to the Rock Slam, falls, into the float, they could do it, oh, in a matter of a minute or two, maybe less than that if they're in good case shape. They could come straight out of it, Bang, into present time. Their float, they'd be back on the float again. Just depends on the state of case of the person.
So there are your six characteristic needle motions. I'll go through them again for you. First there is the floating needle, second is the fall, third is the rise, forth is the Rock Slam, fifth is the pulse and sixth is the stick, and so help me that is all the needle motions there are. There aren't any more.

## Manufacture Needle Movements

Now you might say, “Dennis, how can you be sure that what you say is factual and true, and how do you know that you aren't imagining all this correlation between these needle motions and these postulate configurations?” Very, very simple because once a person understands these postulate configurations he regains his ability to manufacture these needle motions.

In other words once a person's worked through Level 5 and works through these IP barriers, and so forth, he can actually create a **stuck needle.** He simply crates a postulate and it's negative.

He mocks up both a postulate and its negative simultaneously and just holds both of them simultaneously; both at the same intensity and the needle on an E-meter will stick, rigid. In other words he can manufacture a stuck needle.

Then when he takes his attention from one postulate to its negative, flip, flip, flip the E-meter will **pulse**, pulse, pulse in agreement with his postulate as he's flipping his postulate from one side to the other.

Then when he takes the postulate and snaps from a postulate to its negative at random you will see a **Rock Slam**. You won't see a violent Rock Slam because he's doing it self-determinedly, but every time he changes his postulate you'll see the flip. You'll see the needle take off there. You see a little tiny rock slam, you will manufacture the Rock Slam.

And the **fall** of course he can manufacture a fall at anytime. Simply put his attention on something and take it off then put it back on again, you'll see the fall.

And the **rise** of course he just, Oh, he can just go into complimentary postulates. Go into complimentary postulates with everything around him and you'll see a rising needle. That's a very easy one to manufacture.

So the person in good case shape on TROM who is at Level 5 and familiar with these postulate configurations can manufacture at will all the needle manifestations that an E-meter's capable of producing. And because he manufactures them in exactly the way I've said, it proves my point. You see that?
It proves that what I say is true because the person can manufacture them at will when he knows how to do it and the method he uses to manufacture them is exactly the same as the way they are in the bank. You follow me?
So that proves that what I say about the cause and what is the source of these E-meter movements is exactly the way they are. If they were any different you wouldn't be able to manufacture them consciously, you wouldn't be able to do it. But that is not the case, you can do it. You can manufacture them consciously, by simply doing consciously what you do unconsciously in your reactive bank. Get it?
So I'm on very firm ground here. I can prove it. I can prove what I'm saying because a person can manufacture these reads themselves when they know how to do it. So the E-meter is now explored territory, it's completely explored territory.

## Optional Piece of Equipment

As I said in the write up it's an optional piece of equipment, the E-meter or the Skin Galvanometer, as they're more properly called. It's not a necessary piece of equipment. There isn't any need for them anymore. We know all there is to know about E-meters.
When you get up to Level 5, as I say, you can personally create all the reads and put them on the meter. So what the hell, all the magic all the mystery has gone out of the E-meter now with TROM. We know exactly what that piece of equipment measures.

And we can really laugh when characters come along and say, “Oh, it's all to do with the way the hands sweat.” Oh yes really! We really have a giggle at those boys now, we can, because we can manufacture the reads.
When you can manufacture the reads you can really call them a liar, can't you? That's what I meant earlier when I said these characters come along and talk about synapses and so forth and hemispheres of the brain and get all this mixed up with E-meter reads and I called it garbage. I can prove its garbage. I mean it sincerely, its garbage. When I say that what their saying is garbage, it is garbage and I can prove it.

## Verifying Level 3 Completion

Well, probably the only use of an E-meter in TROM would be to check out at the top of Level 3 . That's the only conceivable use I can think of for an E-meter in TROM, is for a person to say to themselves, “Well now have I really finished timebreaking or am I deluding myself? Have I really timebroken everything in sight? Is there anything I missed?” And they should simply put themselves on the meter and do a bit of timebreaking and if that needle starts taking off again and that tone arm starts to move around again. Well they haven't finished. They haven't finished because I'll tell you when you finish Level 3 you have a float. You have a float that it would take the Russian Army to knock you off that float. It's that sort of float, you know, when you're at the top of Level 3 . It's quite a floating needle you've got. It's quite a float.

It's not necessarily a wide float. It might be a very narrow float but it's a very definite float and there's nothing you can think of all over the whole of your track, all over all the whole of your known track, this lifetime, past lives, anybody else's lives, this universe any universe, heaven, hell, earth the lot, doesn't matter what you think of, what you mock up, that needle just sits there and floats man, it just floats.
Now when that happens, then you can say, "Well I've got to the top of Level 3."

## What to Run on Level 2 and 3

But if you start thinking of incidents and start to get little sticks on that needle a little fall from that needle when you start to think of incidents, you haven't finished Level 3 . You haven't finished it. You haven't finished it because you can knock yourself off that float. There's things in them there incidents that you haven't timebroken.
You should get in there, get some of the emotions in them and timebreak the emotions out. Get some of the sensations in those incidents and timebreak the sensations, timebreak the postulates. Get in there, get everything in that incident, you know, get the lot.
Remember I said in the write up, do it on a gradient scale, take it a bit at a time. Get the important bits out then get the rest of it out.
But you don't have to use a meter while you're running Level 3 . As a check point at the end, it's a useful checkpoint, but look even this isn't necessary. When the person's finished Level 3 , they know it. They know it.

I tell you that when you're finished Level 3 it's just about impossible to timebreak anything because there's nothing really there. You know, soon as you get something out of your past to bring it into present time to timebreak it, it disappears. It just falls apart as soon as you touch it.
You say, “Oh now ahh... I'll just get my grandfather, get him into there, and I'll just timebreak grandfather and uh…uh…uh…where's grandfather gone? Oh dear he was here a moment ago…now where… where… where?”
I'll tell you where, he's gone.
Try grandmother. “Yes grandmother, I've got a bit of grandmother's hat here. Oh that's gone now… oh it's grandmothers hat. That's grandmother's hat …gran… oh it's all gone” you know it just goes on like this and… you know. You're just looking at present time, you know. And your tone is high, you're feeling good about it and your thinking all over your past and you keep thinking to yourself is there anything else I can find to timebreak? You start getting down to the bottom spots and looking under the carpets and up the chimney and you know, eventually you say to yourself, “Well I must have finished Level 3 simply because I can't find anything else to time break.” And you can't.
And when you start dragging stuff out of the past and putting it into present to timebreak there's nothing there. Before you can timebreak it it's gone, just, you know, just handling it, it's gone. Now that is a sure sign that Level 3 is starting to go flat. And if you were to put yourself on a meter about that time you'd see that float and that's the time to leave Level 3 .
But as I say there could be a use of an E-meter to check at that point but again it's not necessary cause if you keep going with Level 3 eventually you'd know it. You'd know it was flat. You'd know you had finished it simply because it's virtually impossible to go on with the procedure. You say well, “I've got nothing to timebreak. Everything I touch just becomes nothing in my fingers, everything I touch.”

And if you happen to be a trained auditor you'd look around your books on Scientology and every technique you can think of in Scientology, you think about it and try and run it on yourself and it's all flat. Nothing moves. Nothing does anything for you, no techniques you know of.
You look up all your books and all the techniques. You dig out Ron's "**Creation of Human Ability**" and go through all the techniques in there and run them all and it's all flatter than a flounder. There's nothing there, you know, nothing there at all. You say to yourself, "Well I must be at the top of Level 3 ." Now that's the time to leave Level 3.
That's the time to say, "Well it's time I got onto Level 4 now it's really time I got onto Level 4." And that is the right time to leave Level 3.
You shouldn't leave Level 3 before you get to that point. It's an error going on to Level 4 before you've reached that point in Level 3.

## Address the General before the Particular

Now why is this? Well why is it an error. Why is that an error? Well there is a very old rule here that I mentioned in the write up. **This is the rule that says that you must always address the general before you address the particular.** If a person leaves Level 3 very early they are violating this rule because Level 3 is general timebreaking, general timebreaking of their past with the present.
But once they go into Level 4 they're going into timebreaking of the eight classes of overwhelm of the general "to know" goals package. Now this is a particular class of things to timebreak. You see that.

So they first should do the general… Level 3 general timebreaking and only when they've exhausted that as far as they can possibly go should they then go into the particular which will be Level 4. Level 4 is a particular class of things to timebreak. The eight classes of overwhelm of the "to know" goals package.
Now that is the technical reason. That is the technical reason why it's a mistake to leave Level 3 before you've completely exhausted it. That's the technical reason why.
Ok well that wraps up the general subject of the E-meter.
Well I've just been replaying it and I realized there's two points that I've missed which I'd like now to add for completeness sake. The first of these is I forgot to tell you how a person can manufacture a floating needle. I told you how a person in therapy can manufacture all the other reads. All of the five reads, but I forgot to tell you how you can do a float.

## Manufacture a Floating Needle

Well a person can manufacture a **floating needle.** They would have to complete their therapy, obviously, up to the top of Level 3. Once they've got up to the top of Level 3 all they would have to do any time would be simply put themselves on the meter, timebreak out that day's activities till there was nothing else available, nothing else around to timebreak, and then run a little RI, and while they were running the RI or even before they started running the RI they would see the float.
The float would come back; the floating needle would come back. So the person at Level 3 plus would only have to just timebreak out the day's activities and run a little RI and sometime during that sequence their float would reappear. Their floating needle would come back.

## Tone Arm Male and Female Clear Reads

Now what Ron said about the male clear read and the female clear read, 12,500 ohms for the male and 5000 ohms for the female, I've had validation of this. As far as I'm concerned his observation is correct. There is nothing in my experience which invalidates his observation.
I've only seen good floating needles in males at 12,500 ohms. If you're a male at the top of Level 3 when you've got a good floating needle you can pretty well calibrate your meter against a 12,500 ohm resister, you know, you're so close to 12,500 ohms that you can just calibrate your meter against yourself as a standard resistor. And as far as I'm concerned it's exactly the same for the female at 5000 ohms.
So Ron's observations are correct there. I've got no personal experience to say that he was anything else but perfectly accurate when he gave those clear reads at 5000 ohms resistance for the female and 12,500 ohms resistance for the male. That's the numbers 2 and 3 on the E-meter tone arm.
So anyway there is that with the way a person can generate a floating needle.

## Rock Slam or Zigzag Needle

Now the other tiny point I'd like to make is that when I was talking about the E-meter and discussing the reads and so forth. I used the term Rock Slam for the fifth read. You know, the confusion read, I called it the Rock Slam.
Now strictly speaking in TROM the term we use, really a better term, and a descriptive term for that read is a zigzag. It's a zigzag needle. It's a zigzag read.
That is a far more descriptive term than the word Rock Slam.

The word Rock Slam only means something to people who know about the history of Scientology circa 1960. When Ron Hubbard was researching a very obscure part of the time track called the rock cycle. And the rock slam is a read that he thought was associated with that rock cycle so he called that read the rock slam. And the word stuck, the name stuck, but these days it's a completely inappropriate name for that read. A far better name is a zigzag read because that is descriptive. It is a zigzag. When you've ever seen one, that's the thing that comes to mind it is a zigzag.
So where I've used it, if this material is ever published, goes into published form the fifth read is not, repeat not to be called a Rock Slam read, it is to be called a Zigzag read. Zigzag.
So here are the six reads and I'll give them in the order of severity which happens to be the sequence of one to six. So here are the E-meter reads one to six in order of severity.
One is the floating needle
Number two is the fall
Number three is the rise
Number four is the zigzag
Number five is the pulse
Number six is the stuck
Now they are the complete set of E-meter reads. They are the only reads that we recognize in the field of TROM.
Now that is all I want to talk about on the subject of the E-meter

## Level 5(IP)

And the next thing I want to take up is the practical aspect, the practical implications of this subject of TIPM and the subject of IP's in therapy, the practical aspects.

The question arises do we have to incorporate any part of this technology (Insanity Point Tech) in running the goals packages at Level 5?
Well the broad general answer is no, we don't. A person could conceivably get there by running the goals packages exactly as I gave in the write up, but they would probably get there, and I say probably, they would probably get there faster if they adopted the following procedure at the point where the subject of the IP's started to become real to them.
Now this is an important proviso, there's no point in people mucking about with this IP procedure in therapy until it's real to them. There will come a time in their therapy when it will become real to them and that is the time that they should start incorporating it in their general procedure of goals package running at Level 5.
So a person may listen to this theory, and so forth, but if the subject isn't real to them subjectively when they're running goals packages, if the idea of an IP and so forth is unreal to them then they shouldn't attempt to incorporate it in their therapy at Level 5. They should simply go on with the write up and the instructions exactly as I gave them in the write up and sooner or later the subject of IP's will become real to them. Then they should dig out this material and find out how to incorporate the IP material into their therapy. Now you understand that.
It's important that you should grasp it. In other words you shouldn't force the issue. You can't make this stuff real by reading about it. You've got to experience it. You've got to build a case level. Your case has got to be ready for it, before it means anything to you subjectively.

It can mean a lot to you intellectually but the fact it means something to you intellectually won't make it mean anything to you subjectively. Until it means something to you subjectively there's absolutely no point in incorporating it into your therapy at Level 5 in the running of goals packages. Now have I made my point clear?
Ok well assuming the person gets to a point in Level 5 and the subject of the IP's starts to get very real to them, they start to see that these things do exist. Well how would they incorporate the IP tech into Level 5?
Well, first of all, once the IP tech is incorporated into Level 5 it becomes Level 5 (IP). It's a definite way of running the goals packages, you see that? So we must classify it separate, putting it under a separate name it becomes Level 5(IP). It will become level 5A(IP), level 5B(IP), level 5C(IP). All of level 5 will be run using the IP tech. once it becomes real to the person and they desire to use it. Ok?
So first of all, the name, we name it differently now, level 5(IP).
Now here is the general principle.
You're running a goals package. Whenever you change your postulate, just before you change your postulate you move through the IP barrier. That's one, that's number 1.
Then number 2. Just before you force the opponent to change his postulate you drive him through the IP barrier. And that's it. There are the two rules. That's it. There are no other rules involved. They are the two rules.

## Level 5(IP) Practical

Now let's take the general “to know” goals package and see how this would apply. I'll just give you briefly how it would work on the running of the first little bits of the general “to know” goals package at level 5A.

You start in, over there you have a person run a “must not be known” postulate while you're sitting here holding a “must know” postulate. Right.
The first step is that you are going to change your postulate to “mustn't know”, right.
Just before you change it you have to go through the IP. So level 5A IP would start with you, at your end of the comm. line, going from “must know” into “must know”, “mustn't know”, “must know”, “mustn't know”, generally into the IP and out the other side of the IP into “mustn't know”. Get that?
Next you are in "must not know" and you are opposed by a "must be known" and you are going to force him to change to "must not be known."
Then get the barrier in front of you, you'll see the barrier there, and you push the barrier across to the opponent and as it gets toward him you'll force him to go through the IP and his postulate will then go from “must be known” into “must be known”, “mustn't be known”, “must be known”, “mustn't be known” then he goes into the IP and comes out the other side with the postulate “mustn't be known”. Get that?
And that's it. Then the procedure repeats itself using the different postulates. And the next step would be exactly the same repetition of the procedure using different postulates.
So there are only those two things involved in the use of the level 5 IP. So it's a minute change of technology at level 5 but it can speed up considerably the erasure of the goals packages once the IP material starts to get real to the person. Once it's real to them they should add this little tiny refinement to the package.
And once they start to do this, within a very short time they will become familiar with the IP's, and they will understand and subjectively what it really is.

The whole subject is a toothless tiger. They can sit there quite happily holding a postulate and it's negative simultaneously. Doesn't mean anything to them, where it would drive the compulsive games player insane. They can hold it at will. Doesn't mean anything, it's a toothless tiger, you see that.
So, when you start working with the IP's you tend to start working them with considerable respect and a certain amount of fear but you rapidly lose all your respect for them and finally you just note them in passing. You know? Only occasionally do they produce any phenomena, do they produce anything but a yawn, and then after that of course the whole lot of level 5 starts to go flat, and the whole thing starts to erase.
As the IP phenomena doesn't completely erase, won't completely erase, until level 5 erases but the IP phenomena goes completely flat, completely meaningless, a completely toothless tiger but that is the precise point when all the goals packages erase and you finish with level 5. You get that?
So that's how you would incorporate the IP technology into level 5. It's a very tiny modification of our procedure and an easy modification for the person to achieve at that level.
By the way
Tape ends abruptly

# 05 Postulates, Self and the Obsessive IP

Insanity Point Lecture 5

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 its predecessors it mustn't be separated from the other members of the set.
The title of the lecture is “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 being perceives the IP as mass and not as a postulate configuration.

Actually this isn't as unusual as it sounds at first glance because we must remember 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 as they go into the IP they first 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.
It's well known, Ron Hubbard has documented this on many occasions, that a spiritual being tends to see a confusion as a mass rather than what it actually consists of.
In other words instead of seeing a collection of randomly moving particles the being will perceive it as a mass, and this is generally true.
So it's no real surprise that the spiritual being views the IP as a mass and not as a postulate configuration, and then we also add to this the known fact that the rational mind abhors the IP condition and almost refuses to experience it.
So the combination of those two things, that the being tends to view a confusion as a mass, and we add that to the fact that the rational mind abhors insanity, abhors the IP state, it is indeed no surprise at all that the IP state, the IP barrier is perceived by the spiritual being as a mass.
Now we must ask ourselves just what does the spiritual being associate this mass with. Well it clearly doesn't associate it with the IP state because he's unwilling to experience the IP.
So what does he associate the IP state with?
Well we know there are two IP's in the set. Let's consider the XY set and let's consider a being that is occupying the X postulate as his game postulate. And that postulate is in the class of self. And 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.

Now what does he associate, in terms of IP's, 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 the barrier with? What would he associate this sensation that he's sensed with? What would he, in terms of postulates?
Well now 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 what happens when the person with the X postulate wins the game. What does he associate with winning the game?
Well when he wins the game he not only notices the opponent is driven into the class of Y but he notices that the opponent seems to go through this mass, this barrier which we call the IP barrier and tends to experience the postulates there or goes through a confusion of postulates and then ends up in the postulate Y.

## Winning the Game

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

## Losing the Game

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 situation or the thing that the being associates with winning his game is the IP over the other side of the barrier.
In other words 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 wins his game the opponent gets driven through that IP. So that's the one he associates game sensation with.
In other words, the reason for the association is that he, by using his X postulate, his game postulate he generates the sensation and he sees it in terms of the game loss over that way. And he sees the other person going through from 1-Y into Y so he associates that IP with his X game. And he does not associate his own game loss with the game sensation.
Now this reasoning is quite general.
To put it another way, lets come in from another angle on his side of the fence. On his side of the barrier is the X(1-X) IP, isn't it? 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, 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.
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 which postulate he's operating on, or at least, when I say which postulate, which postulate or its negative he's operating on.

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 IP that he regards as sensation will X(1-X) IP.

## The General Law of Game Sensation

Now this leads us to the general law of game sensation in the goals package, the general law of games sensation. And 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.
Now on a previous lecture I've already pointed out how the games player as his play becomes more compulsive, as he becomes more compulsive, that he becomes obsessed with the generation of game sensation.
So we find that as the games player becomes more and more compulsive that the player becomes obsessed with the sensation and becomes obsessed with the generation of this particular IP.

## The Obsessive IP

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**.
So of the two IP's 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.

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 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 contain his game postulate. Get it?

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 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 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.

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

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

It's not an easy one to grasp and because 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, 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 that is not the way it is. That is not the way it is.

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

## To Eat Goals Package

Let's take a very simple example. Let's take 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 one of the two bodily goals packages, and it's a very easy one to erase with the average person unless they are into such things as 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.

## Mosquito bites

Just in passing, I'd better give you some data I have on the “to eat” goals package because it won't appear anywhere else. 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. The human body does have a very tiny tolerance of being eaten.

You see if games play was completely compulsive and it got itself down to a single games class set, the goals package was down to a single games class, the body would be in the class "to eat" and "to not be eaten", wouldn't it. That would be the final remaining 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". It doesn't like being in that class, but it can just get into it.
What makes me so sure that the body can just get into it, and the fact that the body doesn't like being in that class is the enormous reaction that the human body does have to being eaten.
You get this little tiny insect like a mosquito comes along and sticks his proboscis into your arm and takes a microscopic amount of blood away from you as it's dinner and flies away and your arm produces quite an enormous bump, and you get a similar thing with a gnat bite or an ant bite. In other words the bodies reaction to such a tiny nibble from such a tiny insect is quite disproportionate 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 great intolerance to being eaten. It simply doesn't like being eaten at all. It reacts violently to other organisms that want to take a nibble out of it. But it can be eaten and it does have some tolerance of being eaten even if the tolerance is only very slight.
It's a fascinating goals package, as you erase the "to eat" goals package you would learn all sorts of things about this subject of eating. 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.

## Plants play the " Must not be Eaten" Game

Amongst plants the big game in the "to eat" goals package is not "to eat". Plants for many millions of years have polished up all their possibilities on the subject of eating. You know, they've perfected their root system and their system of photosynthesis, of converting the carbon dioxide in the air and the sun light and combining the two together to produce their chemistry and that's all been set up a long while ago.
So the postulate "to eat" in the plant has pretty well got to the limit. All plants today have pretty well got to the limit on that.
Now the big game amongst plants is "to not be eaten." That is the big game for plants and if plants are evolving at all, their evolving more and more in that direction of "to not be eaten". In other words they haven't reached their limits yet, they're still exploring the possibilities there.
We humans ought to be very grateful to the plant kingdom's subject of not wanting to be eaten because the plants produce all sorts of very interesting drugs that we use in medicine. The vast majority of these drugs are simply in the plant to prevent the plant from being eaten.
You take the marijuana plant which has got in its leaves and stems the drug cannabis. Well cannabis, of course, as anyone whose tried it knows, is a bit of a mind bending drug. And it's quite clear the purpose of this drug is to deter animals from eating it.
You get this little zebra and he comes along and takes a nibble at this cannabis plant and the cannabis blows its mind and the zebra goes whoopee and gets a high and goes off and tries to mate with a lion and that's the last that's heard of the zebra. You see?
So, that plant is not going to be eaten by that zebra again. You get the idea? That just gives you one example there.

Sometimes the chemicals used in the plant are quite lethal to animals, 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.

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

And the reason all these chemicals are in the plant is to prevent the plant being eaten by animals, so that the "not being eaten" game of the plant is big business amongst plants. 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.

Now for 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 "must be eaten"/"mustn't be eaten" IP. 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 close to that IP, you'll find yourself rapidly into the subject of digestion and your right at the very core of this whole subject of eating, as far as the human being is 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. His whole fixation as a being in terms of eating is on this subject of "to be eaten/to not be eaten".

The IP, that “must be eaten/mustn't 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
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 “mustn't 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 tummy. Where 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 the one we would predict because the body is obsessed with the eating and not being eaten, that is it's obsession.
But its game postulate is “to eat”. That's for sure, that's the body's game postulate is “to eat” and from that, of course, we would predict that the obsessive IP would be the “must be eaten/mustn't be eaten” IP. That is the one that is the obsessive IP when we come to test this experimentally with a human body.
So simply on the subject of eating we see evidence straight away.
By the way, any queasy effect from playing with 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 recommend that you play with the IP's of the “to eat” goals package until you've erased “to eat” in therapy. I wouldn't recommend it; otherwise you can give yourself quite a queasy tummy.
Once the “to eat” goals package is erased out of your psyche, of course, it won't matter what you play with on the subject of the “to eat” goals package it won't adversely affect your body.

## 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 adolescent lads driving their car 60 miles an hour out towards a brick wall to get the thrill of seeing how close they can get to the wall when they pull up.

Now what is the postulate structure? What are the postulates here and what are the IP's here? Well the actual postulate here is “to kill” and the thing on the receiving end of their postulate is their body. Their game postulate is “to kill” so the IP is the “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.

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 that IP, without killing their body.

And the purpose of the game is to pick up the sensation from the “must be killed/mustn't be killed” IP.

Now that we can see that game we can understand it in terms of, winning the game, losing the game, the IP's and the postulates.

It's a nice little example of what we would predict and what we see in practice. Once you understand the IP's and the game postulates and the IP's, in the class of self and in 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, 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 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.

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

When I discussed the subject of the "to sex" goals package on one of the earlier supplementary tapes, if you recall, I said 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 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 it is that situation that brings about the male orgasm, the male sexual orgasm.

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

So in the "to sex" goals package, 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 determine with invariable accuracy, and I stress the words “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 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.

There are more sexual quirks per square inch of humanity than there are quirks on any other subject under the sun. And people do get very worried about their sexual quirks, and what worries them about their sexual quirks is that they don't know whether they are in the male universe or in the female universe, this is what basically bothers them.

I remember I had a preclear in London back in the days when we were running engrams and this chappie had a sexual quirk and his sexual quirk was that it used to give him a sexual thrill 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 wear rubber Wellington boots, you see.

And now 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 feared that he may be homosexual because 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 would get an erection again, you see.

So he just 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 there wasn't too much I could bring to bear on this subject. We cleaned up his prenatal bank; I remember that, we found out that it was what you might call a continuing problem. That his dad apparently had the same fixation upon Wellington boots and that had got into the prenatal coitus engrams and the thing had got passed on to his son through his childhood and so forth.

It was a rather complicated story but it was one of these continuing aberrations, you might say, or continuing quirks that were being passed down the male line, from father to son. God knows how many generations it had been passed down. But he'd certainly got this quirk, and as far as we knew 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 when he left me as when he arrived but I won't go so far as to say I erased 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 I know it would have been easy to resolve the whole thing. But he was happy and he went on his way and thanked me very much for what I'd done for him.

There was an example of a sexual quirk that was bothering the person.

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

Well he was very sure of one thing, very sure of the fact that 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 he had this idea, this fixed idea that if a girl wore Wellington boots it made her sexier and she was more in favor of going to bed with him, at least that was what he thought. In other words it made the girl more amenable to sex.

Well now once you know that, you now know that the quirk there, the thing that was exciting him was actually the subject of the IP "must be sexed/mustn't be sexed." You see that? It is because the fixation was upon the female being more amenable to being sexed. You see that? She is more amenable to sex.

So clearly that was the obsessive IP. He was obviously in the "must sex" postulate and the female was clearly over the other side of the fence. So he was clearly in the male universe. Remember as I said early on in this lecture if you know the obsessive IP you can determine 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 he regarded that wearing Wellington boots made girls more amenable "to be sexed," fixed him right away. If we put that postulate into the class of not self then 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 that problem is solved.

But what, you might ask, about he himself being sexually aroused when he wore Wellington boots, how come? Well surely that was an example of him being out of gender.

Nope he's still in male gender because, look, it's still the person wearing Wellington boots who 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.
The rule is that 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.
It fixes it. It's got nothing to do with whose body is involved, it could be a girl's body, it could be his body, another man's body, a male body, or you can be a female. I mean a female can have the same thing. But whoever is fixated upon that IP is in the male universe.
If they're 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 they're a female. It fixes it.

## Gender Obsessive IP's

Now the IP's of the "to sex" goals package the two IP's there we call them the gender obsessive IP's.
In a general goals package we just call them the obsessive IP's. But because they fix gender, fix it thoroughly, because it fixes gender we call those the gender obsessive IP's.
So for the male the "must be sexed/mustn't be sexed" IP is the male gender obsessive IP and the "must sex/mustn't sex" IP is the female gender obsessive IP.
Now let us take some more examples of this and we'll see how it works out with other quite common quirks.
And don't kid yourself on the subject of sex if you've audited a 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 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 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's a homosexual.

It's awfully common, it's awfully common, it 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 the lad gets a sexual thrill out of it. It gives him a sexual kick and he thinks, "Oh my God, I'm a homosexual!"

Well now let's examine this situation in terms of what we know. Let's take our adolescent boy 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 his body was driven through.

His body was driven into "must be sexed," in the rape situation. 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? It will give him sexual sensation. 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 that 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 postulates.

We're only concerned here with the postulates. It's got nothing to do with the body, just the postulates that are involved. You see that?

Once you understand that, you've got it. So this young lad worrying about being a homosexual is completely false, 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. 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 grasp this and breathe a sigh of relief, and realize what's going on.

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

Well, what's the IP here? By wearing feminine clothes he's depriving other males 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 feminine sex game, that is. He's clearly out of gender. He's out of his masculine gender and he's into feminine gender. You see that?

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

This cross clothing of children into clothes of the opposite gender and so forth by various parents is a fertile area for sexual quirks. For example take a woman 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?

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? In effect, the shear presence 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 his mother a thrill is the "must be sexed/mustn't be sexed" IP. She's driving her son through that IP into "must be sexed." Now 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 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 female child would deprive the female child of her "mustn't sex" postulate and drive her into "must sex". In other words it would masculinize the young girl, 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.

So you see that whatever the situation is with this understanding of the gender obsessive IP we can tie up the gender obsessive IP with the gender. This 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 the effect of the quirk has on the person we can determine whether the person is in the male universe or the female universe.

Quite interesting isn't it? It's quite interesting that we can do this and thereby resolve so many of these problems. Now 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 solved humanities 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 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
So a person with a sexual quirk, knowing this technology, only has to look at the IP's and they'll know at a glance which universe there in. They'll know sexually they're in the male universe or they will know they're in the female universe. It's as simple as that.
So you see this subject of sensation and the IP, self, not-self and the postulates has got enormous ramifications, doesn't it. It doesn't sound like very much when we start in on it but we now find that it's of enormous social value in our society not just on the subject of sex.
I mean if it was only useful on the subject of sex 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, the adolescent boys driving their car into the brick wall, and the example of the "to eat" goals package. There are other examples there, so it applies to any goals package
Well I hope this information, this data on this subject proved useful to you and thank you very much.
End of tape

# 06 The Loop

## The Possible, The Impossible and the Identity

Well, I see we got some space left on this tape and decided to usefully fill it and introduce you to a piece of information called the loop.
Now the loop is a piece of information which gives the relationship between a postulate and what that postulate permits to be possible and what that postulate permits to be impossible.
Now the first thing you should know about the loop is that it is not peculiar to this universe, it is a general principle that will be applicable to any universe. But it is certainly applicable to this universe.
Now what it amounts to is this; if you have a postulate you can deduce from the postulate what is possible in the universe in terms of that postulate and knowing what is possible in terms of that postulate in the universe you can deduce what is impossible in the universe in terms of that postulate, and, knowing what is impossible in terms of that postulate in the universe you can deduce the postulate.
So it is a loop, it is like having 'a ', 'b ' and 'c ' and if you know 'a' you can deduce 'b ', and if you know 'b ' you can deduce 'c ' and if you know 'c ' you can deduce 'a ', you've got the loop. It is like a snake going round and being connected up …, the tail end of the snake is connected up to the mouth of the snake. The whole thing is connected up in a circle and that is why we call it a loop.

Now it is very easy to prove logically that when we have a situation like that where 'b' is a valid deduction from 'a' and 'c' is a valid deduction from 'b' and 'a' is a valid deduction from 'c' that 'a' and 'b' and 'c' are all identical to each other. In other words 'a' equals 'b' equals 'c' equals 'a'(a=b=c=a), the whole lot are identical to one and another. It is very easy to prove this logically, I won't bother to prove it on this tape; you can find the proof in any logical text book. It is an easy proof.

Now I will give you a very simple example of this. Let's consider a particular loop, let's say that we entered a particular loop, we discover that 'all crows are birds'.

Now that is the relationship, that's the postulate; 'all crows are birds'. Now from this we can quite validly deduce that it is impossible for the class of creatures that are crows and non-birds to exist, so that is our first deduction, we have now deduced the impossible, what that postulate 'all crows are birds' makes impossible in our universe, you see.

Knowing that this class of creatures that are both crows and non-birds doesn't exist in the universe, that the postulate has made impossible, we can now deduce what is possible in the universe in terms of this postulate.

Well that turns out to be: we can either have birds in the universe or non-birds in the universe, or we can have both, that tells us what is possible in terms of our postulate.

Now in that particular example we have not really learned an awful lot, but let's get very fundamental, let's take a very basic postulate in this particular universe that we all inhabit. We know in this universe that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

We know that, we call that the law of the impossible in the universe. I have already mentioned that. This was on an earlier supplementary lecture, that this is a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is constructed, this idea that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

So here we have an element in a loop, you say 'ah we recognize this as an element of a loop. You say "Ok let's find the rest of the loop." There are two more elements in this loop. Let's find the rest of the elements of the loop.
Ok now we got the impossible, we should be able now to easily deduce what is possible. Yes?
Well, what is possible in this universe is that a thing either exists or it doesn't exist, that is possible, that exhausts the possibilities.
So now we have the impossible, a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously, that is the law of the impossible, now we have the law of the possible that a thing either exist or it doesn't exist.
All right now that is two out of the three members of the loop. Well what is the third member of the loop?
The postulate here is that let 'x' be the thing that exists, if the thing exists we call it 'x', well 'x' equals 'x', if 'x' equals 'x', that is the 3rd part of the loop.
[Note. The three parts of the loop are:
The Possible – a thing either exists or it doesn't exist.
The Impossible – a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.
The identity – a thing is itself. X=X
-PM]
Now each element of the 3 elements in the loop is identical to the other 2 elements. All parts of the loop are identical to the remainder of the loop.
This identification is not a false identification, it is a true identification. The postulate that 'x' equals 'x', obviously is true in this universe. All 'x's are 'x's, there is no doubt about that, all cats are cats and all kings are kings and all coal heavers are coal heavers, all 'x's are 'x's is true.

But what isn't immediately obvious is to say that 'x' cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously is just another way of saying that 'x' equals 'x'. Now that isn't obvious is it? But it is true, because of the loop.
When we say that 'x' equals 'x', another way of saying 'x' equals 'x' is to say that 'x' cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously and another way to say that 'x' equals 'x' or to say that 'x' cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously is to say that 'x' either exists or it doesn't exist.
So again you see, now we are into something useful, aren't we? Now we are really discovering something, it is not obvious that those 3 expressions are actually meaning the same thing, are simply different ways of saying the same thing, but it is so, I can assure you because of the identification in the loop, and the fact that the identification is a true identification.
Now this loop will appear in another lecture. I mentioned that at this stage we won't be using it, I won't be discussing the loop any further at this stage, but the loop will appear in a later supplementary lecture when we take up the subject of the anatomy of insanity, we will find this loop turning up again.
So you see, you will discover that it does have some tremendous practical uses this does, but I am given it to you at this stage, partly to fill up this little blank on this tape that we have here, and also to give you some time to think about it, to get your mind wrapped around this idea of this connection between a postulate and the subject of the possible and the subject of the impossible. To see that there is a very real connection between these 3 things, which is true in all universes. To give you some time to prepare your mind for this idea.
Ok that is all I want to say on the subject, I better get off the subject now before this tape runs off the end of the spool.

# 07 Delusions

By Dennis H. Stephens

Transcribed from a taped lecture dated

16th of August 1994

Well, now I would like to take up the subject of delusions, which is a related subject to the subject of surprise, as you will discover.

**A delusion is a false impression.** That is a very good definition of a delusion: a false impression. One looks at something and believes it to be different than it actually is. That is a false impression. So that is a delusion.

Now, as a matter of fact, there are basically only two types of delusion in this universe, and they match the two basic types of lies in this universe.

Now, let's just reiterate the two basic lies in this universe. There are only two lies, there are only two basic lies in this universe. One of them is to say that a thing exists when you know that it doesn't exist. That's the first lie. And the second lie is to say that a thing doesn't exist when you know that it does exist.

Now, no matter how complex a lie is, it can always be broken down into the one or the other, or both of those components. They are the two basic lies in this universe. And from those two basic lies we arrive at the two basic delusions in this universe.

Now, the first basic delusion is to believe that a thing exists when in fact it doesn't exist; and the second basic delusion is to believe that a thing doesn't exist when in fact it does exist. Now you can see how the two basic delusions actually stem from the two basic lies in the universe.

Now, there's nothing essentially wrong with having a delusion. I mean, we all have them, you know.

You watch a child, when a child is learning about life and learning about the universe around him, he gets the wildest ideas about life.

And you talk to a young child about things, and they will tell you the wildest things about why things happen, you know, and the reasons for this and the reasons for that. And you listen to this and you say, "*Oh my god!*"

But it all makes sense to the child, and it all fits together in his mind, and it's quite okay with him. And most of it, of course, is non-factual.

Well, this is quite okay; there's no reason why the child shouldn't be like this, as long as the child can correct his delusions. You see that?

And the child, the rational, sane child does. He has an idea, he sees something and he has an idea about it, and then, later on, further evidence shows up and he says, "*So well, my ideas about this aren't right,*" and "*No, that's not quite right.*" And then he changes his ideas to make his ideas fit the way things are in the universe, for he is now learning about the universe. And so on. You see that?

So there's nothing wrong with being deluded. It happens to all of us. All of us went through childhood and a period of delusions, and so forth.

No, the problem that arises with a delusion is when you can't change it. When it becomes fixed, then that is the problem; the fixed delusion, you know.
When your delusions become fixed, that's when the brawny men in the short white jackets turn up and cart you off to the local asylum. You see. That's when you're in trouble. When you can't change your delusions in the face of evidence, which clearly indicates that these delusions are false you are in trouble.
So the first thing we have to get over is this idea there's anything wrong with having a delusion. We all have them, you know. We all have delusions. So you just have to get off this idea there's anything wrong about having a delusion.

## Humor and Laughter

As a matter of interest: the whole subject of humor and laughter, and so forth, is based upon the subject of delusions. If nobody had any delusions there would be no humor and no laughter in the universe.
Now, how does this work out? Well, you listen to someone telling you a joke and if you examine what is going on very carefully, it runs somewhat like this: He's setting up a situation for you, he's sort of painting a picture; he's setting up a scenario, as they say, of a situation for you. And as you listen to it you sort of build it up, you build up a picture in your own mind what's going on.

What you don't know is that it's a delusion; that there's a delusion here. There's something there that you don't know. And he's not telling you; he's building up a scenario for you, and you finally get the whole picture, and it all looks okay, and then suddenly he gives you the punch line. As soon as you get the punch line you realize that you were deluded, that it wasn't what you thought it was, and you laugh. And the laughter is the rejection of the delusion. You get it?

You can define laughter as the explosive rejection of a delusion. And that's really all laughter is, it's the explosive rejection of a delusion.

The person is saying to himself, "Oh gee, I thought it was that way, and it wasn't! It was this way."

What he thought was the situation wasn't the situation; it was different from what he thought. And the sudden rejection of the delusion and the acceptance of the facts is accompanied with laughter; and also with surprise, which is the factor that relates the subject of laughter and humor to the subject of surprise.

When you hear the punch line in the joke, there's always an element of surprise in it too, isn't there? There's a surprise there, there's a surprise factor. So the phenomenon of laughter, the explosive rejection of a delusion, is related to the subject of surprise, so that they definitely go hand in hand, these two subjects.

Now, we can learn quite a lot about this by following through on this idea. It tells us immediately that while a person can change their delusions, can change their mind, you might say, change their ideas in the face of further evidence, they can laugh. Right? See that?

Because the laughter only occurs at the point where they reject the delusion, if they can't reject the delusion, i.e. they can't change the delusion that's in their mind, they can't laugh.

And we see this phenomenon with people. That the person, you might say the up tone scale person, who's free to change his mind, can change his delusions very easily, very rapidly. And this person laughs rather easily. And we say this person has a quick and ready sense of humor.
But we get another person who is *stuck*, we say, in his delusions, stuck in his ideas. We tell him jokes and he never laughs. You see, he can't, because he cannot reject the delusion, any delusion, he can't laugh! You see? And that's why he doesn't laugh! You see that?
And this is why this test, of whether a person laughs very much and how easy it is to make them laugh, is a very good test of how serious case-wise a person is. The worse off they are case-wise the more difficulty they will have on the subject of rejecting delusions.
You might say that as they go down the tone scale, or as they get worse and worse off case-wise, they become stuck in these delusions. They become less able to change these delusions. And it shows itself most immediately in an inability to laugh. So, this subject of the delusion is quite an important subject, when we relate it to the subject of the ability to laugh and understanding just what laughter is. And let's not kid ourselves, this is it, you know. We've got it here. We know what laughter is. We know what this subject of laughter and humor is.

## Comedian

If you understood what I'm saying very well on the subject of humor, you could become quite a comedian, assuming you had the ability to put it together, because you've got the actual essence here of humor.

It's the creation of a delusion; followed by the punch line, which shows the falsity of the delusion that was built up and is causing the other person to explosively reject the delusion with laughter and so call you a comedian, call you a funny man.

That's the way it goes, that's the way it's done. This is the inner secret of the inner secret of how to make people laugh, I can assure you.

But before you could be absolutely certain that you could make the person laugh you better find out how able this person is to change their delusions. If this person can't change their delusions very quickly and very rapidly they won't laugh at anything you say. They won't laugh at anything anyone says. They're stuck.

So that's what I wanted to tell you on the subject of delusions and tie it up with the subject of surprise for you, and tie it up with the subject of laughter and the subject of humor.

And I hope this material is of value to you.

Thank you.

END OF TRANSCRIPT

# Glossary

**Anaten**. 1 . an abbreviation of analytical attenuation meaning diminution or weakening of the analytical awareness of an individual for a brief or extensive period of time. If sufficiently great, it can result in unconsciousness. (It stems from the restimulation of an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness.) (Scn AD)
2 . simply a drop in ARC to an extreme. (PAB 70) 3 . the physiological by-product of unconsciousness. (SOS, Bk. 2, p. 170) 4. dope-off. (Abil 52)

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

**Dianetics** 1 . DIA (Greek) through, NOUS (Greek) soul deals with a system of mental image pictures in relation to psychic (spiritual) trauma. The mental image pictures are believed on the basis of personal revelation to be comprising mental activity created and formed by the spirit, and not by the body or brain. (BPL 24 Sept 73 V)
2 . Dn addresses the body. Thus Dn is used to knock out and erase illnesses, unwanted sensations, misemotion, somatics, pain, etc. Dn came before Scn. It disposed of body illness and the difficulties a thetan was having with his body. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)
3 . a technology that runs and erases locks, secondaries and engrams and their chains. (HCOB 17 Apr 69)

4 . Dn could be called a study of man. Dn and Scn, up to the point of stable exteriorization, operate in exactly the same field with exactly the same tools. It is only after man is sufficiently exteriorized to become a spirit that we depart from Dn; for here, considering man as a spirit, we must enter the field of religion. (PAB 42)
5 . a precision science. It stems from the study and codification of survival. (COHA, p. 148)
6 . a system of coordinated axioms which resolve problems concerning human behavior and psychosomatic illnesses. (5110CM08B)
7 . Dn is not psychiatry. It is not psycho- analysis. It is not psychology. It is not personal relations. It is not hypnotism. It is a science of mind. (DMSMH, p. 168)
8 . the route from aberrated or aberrated and ill human to capable human. (HCOB 3 Apr 66) Abbr. Dn.

**Difference**. 1. The concept of differences in this universe, a concept that A is different from B is essentially the concept that A and B have no common class.
2. in actual practice you have to bond A to some quality X and bond B to the absence of X or not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to some quality Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

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

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

**Floating needle**. 1. "An idle needle, one which is drifting slightly to the right and slightly to the left very easily and gently, denotes a comfortable status of mind on the part of the patient, and tells the practitioner that he is nowhere near any subject that distresses him, or, if it follows an emotional outburst, tells him that the outburst itself is spent, and that the subject now can be abandoned for the moment." [JOURNAL OF SCIENTOLOGY, Issue 1-G (Aug. 1952), ELECTRONICS GIVES LIFE TO FREUD'S THEORY]
2. "It means an idle, uninfluenced motion, no matter what you say about the goal or terminal. It isn't just null, it's uninfluenced by anything (except body reactions). Man it's really free. You'll know when you see one. They're really pretty startling. The needle just idles around and yawns at your questions on the subject." [E-meter Essentials (1961)]

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

**Free Needle** 1. "A needle which shows none of the reactions described above. It floats back and forth easily, registering only the body, its breathing, heartbeats, etc. While needle free, no facsimiles are being impinged on the body." [HCOB 30 Apr. 60, ACC TRs]
2. “A real F/N means the pc is out the top, an ARC Br needle means he’s out the bottom. He ceases to mock up, through grief.” [HCOB 5 Oct. 68, ARC BREAK NEEDLES]

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

**To Be Known** also making known and bringing into existence –1. When you first arrived at this universe as a spiritual being you looked around and thought it would be an interesting game to play. It would be fun to communicate with the other beings here.
However you quickly realized that in this universe you can’t play games if no one recognizes you exist.
In order to play games or commuinicate with other beings you must be noticed, must be recognized to exist, you must “be known.”
This is what Dennis means by “to be known”. You want “to be known” by others so they will communicate with you and allow you to play the games with them. Also you want the effects you create to be known by others so if you grow a garden and share the tomatoes with your friends you can say that you want tomatoes “to be known” by you and tomatoes “to be known” by others. -editor
2. This is the creative postulate to bring something into existance and to make it known.
3. Life is a spiritual quality. Life can bring things into existence. That which is brought into existence is called an effect. All effects are intended to be noticed by others so they include the postulate “to be known.”

**To Know –** this is the postulate to learn, experience, percieve something. It exactly complements and satisifies the postulate "to be known."

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

**Mind**- 1. pictures which have been made of experiences and plotted against time and preserved in energy and mass in the vicinity of the being and which when restimulated are re-created without his analytical awareness. (SH Spec 72, 6607C28)
2 . a literal record of experience plotted against time from the earliest moment of aberration until now plus additional ideas the fellow got about it, plus other things he may have mocked up or created on top of it in mental mass, plus some machines, plus some valences. (SH Spec 70, 6607C21)
3 . a network of communications and pictures, energies and masses, which are brought into being by the activities of the thetan versus the physical universe or other thetans. The mind is a communication and control system between the thetan and his environment. (FOT, p. 56)
4 . the purpose of the mind is to pose and resolve problems relating to survival and to direct the effort of the organism according to these solutions. (Scn 0-8, p. 76)
5 . a natively self-determined computer which poses, observes and resolves problems to accomplish survival. It does its thinking with facsimiles of experience or facsimiles of synthetic experience. It is natively cause. It seeks to be minimally an effect. (HFP, p. 33)

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

**Overt act**- 1. an overt act is not just injuring someone or something; an overt act is an act of omission or commission which does the least good for the least number of dynamics or the most harm to the greatest number of dynamics. (HCO PL 1 Nov 70 III)
2 . an intentionally committed harmful act committed in an effort to resolve a problem. (SH Spec 44, 6410C27)
3 . that thing which you do which you aren't willing to have happen to you. (lSH ACC 10, 6009C14)

**Preclear or PC**- 1. a person who, through Scn processing, is finding out more about himself and life. (PXL, p. 20)
2 . a spiritual being who is now on the road to becoming Clear, hence preclear. (HCOB 5 Apr 69)
3 . one who is discovering things about himself and who is becoming clearer. (HCO PL 21 Aug 63)

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

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

**Scientology** - 1. it is formed from the Latin word scio, which means know or distinguish, being related to the word scindo, which means cleave. (Thus, the idea of differentiation is strongly implied.) It is formed from the Greek word logos, which means THE WORD, or OUTWARD FORM BY WHICH THE INWARD THOUGHT IS EXPRESSED AND MADE KNOWN: also THE INWARD THOUGHT or REASON ITSELF. Thus, SCIENTOLOGY means KNOWING ABOUT KNOWING, or SCIENCE OF KNOWLEDGE. (Scn 8- 80, p. 8)
2. Scientology addresses the thetan. Scientology is used to increase spiritual freedom, intelligence, ability, and to produce immortality. (HCOB 22 Apr 69)
3 . an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (HCOB 9 Jul 59)
4 . a religious philosophy in its highest meaning as it brings man to total freedom and truth. (HCOB 18 Apr 67)
5 . the science of knowing how to know answers. It is a wisdom in the tradition of ten thousand years of search in Asia and Western civilization. It is the science of human affairs which treats the livingness and beingness of man, and demonstrates to him a pathway to greater freedom. (COHA, p. 9)

6 . an organization of the pertinencies which are mutually held true by all men in all times, and the development of technologies which demonstrate the existence of new phenomena not hitherto known, which are useful in creating states of beingness considered more desireable by man. (COHA, p. 9)
7 . the science of knowing how to know. It is the science of knowing sciences. It seeks to embrace the sciences and humanities as a clarification of knowledge itself. Into all these things—biology, physics, psychology and life itself—the skills of Scientoloa can bring order and simplification. (Scn 8-8008, p. 11)
8 . the study of the human spirit in its relationship to the physical universe and its living forms. (Abil 146)
9 . a science of life. It is the one thing senior to life because it handles all the factors of life. It contains the data necessary to live as a free being. A reality in Scientoloa is a reality on life. (Aud 27 UK)
1 0 . a body of knowledge which, when properly used, gives freedom and truth to the individual. (COHA, p. 251)
11. Scientoloa is an organized body of scientific research knowledge concerning life, life sources and the mind and includes practices that improve the intelligence, state and conduct of persons. (Abil Mi 104)
1 2 . knowledge and its application in the conquest of the material universe. (HCL 1, 5203CM03A)
1 3 . an applied philosophy designed and developed to make the able more able. In this sphere it is tremendously successful. (HCO PL 27 Oct 64)
1 4 . an applied religious philosophy dealing with the study of knowledge, which through the application of its technology, can bring about desirable changes in the conditions of life. (HCO PL 15 Apr 71R)

**Serfac service facsimile, service mechanism**. 1. these are called “service facsimiles.” “Service” because they serve him. “Facsimiles” because they are in mental image picture form. They explain his disabilities as well. The facsimile part is actually a self- installed disability that “explains” how he is not responsible for being able to cope. So he is not wrong for not coping. Part of the “package” is to be right by making wrong. The service facsimile is therefore a picture containing an explanation of self condition and also a fixed method of making others wrong. (HCOB 15 Feb 74)
2 . this is actually part of a chain of incidents which the individual uses to invite sympathy or cooperation on the part of the environment. One uses engrams to handle himself and others and the environment after one has himself conceived that he has failed to handle himself, others and the general environment. (AP&A, p. 7)
3 . it is simply a time when you tried to do something and were hurt or failed and got sympathy for it. Then afterwards when you were hurt or failed and wanted an explanation, you used it. And if you didn’t succeed in getting sympathy for it, you used it so hard it became a psychosomatic illness. (HFP, p. 89)
4 . every time you fail, you pick up this facsimile and become sick or sadly noble. It’s your explanation to yourself and the world as to how and why you failed. It once got you sympathy. (HFP, p. 89)

5 . that facsimile which the preclear uses to apologize for his failures. In other words, it is used to make others wrong and procure their cooperation in the survival of the preclear. If the preclear well cannot achieve survival, he attempts an illness or disability as a survival computation. The workability and necessity of the service facsimile is only superficially useful. The service facsimile is an action method of withdrawing from a state of beingness to a state of not beingness and is intended to persuade others to coax the individual back into a state of beingness. (AP&A, p. 43)
6 . that computation generated by the preclear (not the bank) to make self right and others wrong, to dominate or escape domination and enhance own survival and injure that of others. (HCOB 1 Sept 63)

**Similar** – 1. the definition of A is similar to B is that the class of A and B has members in it. It is not a null class. If A and B is not a null class then A is similar to B. however this definition lacks conviction.
2. in actual practice you have to bond A to X and bond B to not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. (see the book 02 Philosophy of TROM article Level 2 of TROM)

**Somatic**, 1. by somatic is meant a pain or ache sensation and also misemotion or even unconsciousness. There are a thousand different descriptive words that could add up to a feeling. Pains, aches, dizziness, sadness—these are all feelings. Awareness, pleasant or unpleasant, of a body. ( HCOB 26 Apr 69)
2 . body sensation, illness or pain or discomfort. “Soma” means body. Hence psychosomatic or pains stemming from the mind. (HCOB 23 Apr 69)

3 . this is a general word for uncomfortable physical perceptions coming from the reactive mind. Its genus is early Dn and it is a general, common package word used by Scientologists to denote "pain" or "sensation" with no difference made between them. To the Scientologist anything is a somatic if it emanates from the various parts of the reactive mind and produces an awareness of reactivity. Symbol: SOM. (HCOB 8 Nov 62)
4 . the word somatic means, actually, bodily or physical. Because the word pain is restimulative, and because the word pain has in the past led to a confusion between physical pain and mental pain, the word somatic is used in Dn to denote physical pain or discomfort, of any kind. It can mean actual pain, such as that caused by a cut or a blow; or it can mean discomfort, as from heat or cold; it can mean itching—in short, anything physically uncomfortable. It does not include mental discomfort such as grief. Hard breathing would not be a somatic; it would be a symptom of misemotion suppression. Somatic means a non-survival physical state of being. (SOS, p. 79)

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

s and Scientology Technical Dictionary