The Exclusion Postulate
By Dennis Stephens
April 20, 1993
Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin
July 1, 2012

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

It occurred to me the other day that umm… that while I have this material umm… available I may as well give it to you mainly because anyone doing level 5 will… will come across this data but it will take them some time to put it together into a coherent form, and ahh… which I've done. It took me some time to do it. So anyone doing the… doing the exercises will… will… will find this data particularly useful because it will… will help clarify the material that show… that shows up.

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

Well both those tapes, one on the subject of Dissociation and one on the subject of the uhh… or reply to the subject of Unstacking, contains very, very useful background material on level 5, which I won't repeat because I know you have the material, won't bother to repeat it on this tape.

1;47

Sooner,.. sooner or later on level 5 it's necessary to ahh… to jump in at the deep end, so to speak, on the subject of postulates and the universe and uhh… this time is about now on the subject ahh... a… a… of the theory here, what we're dealing with.

2:11

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

So the ahh… so the… the… the physical universe in which we live, in which we share umm… follows that same rule in that umm… it's a… it's a universe and it's based upon ahh… a postulate structure, it's based upon certain laws, this universe and umm… many… many of the laws… the… the…the law of phi… the physical laws of this universe have been discovered by

ahh… by scientists and so forth using their measuring equipment and their observations and so forth, but umm… these… these laws are… the physical laws of the universe are deductions from the basic laws of the universe. In other words that the universe is based on laws very much more fundamental than the… than the laws of physics and uhh… you would ahh… you would have to expand the laws… you'd have to expand the subject of physics considerably to… to include the subject to include of life before you could umm… expect to… to uncover the basic laws upon which this universe is constructed by studying the subject of physics.

3:46

In other words the subject of physics as we understand it today on this planet is far to limited because it doesn't include the subject of life and because of that limitation it umm… it cannot encompass the ahh… the basic laws from which this universe is constructed.

04:04

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

04:24

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

04:47

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

05:09

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

There's no great secret about this law, it's just that it's umm… it's [chuckle] it's very deeply hidden if you happen not to know where to look for it. The place to look for it, of course, is in… is amongst the goals packages and particularly among… on the "to know" goals package. and uhh… and the ahh… the goals package configuration there of the basic "to know" goals package.

You start working with that and ahh… the basic law of this universe is going to… is going to drop out the hamper. Bang! It's bound to drop out sooner or later for anyone working on level 5A, which is why I'm mentioning it here. Cause it may be a surprise to them, they… they might come across it and they might not know what it is. And they might think, "Oh, it's just another postulate."

06:12

All Postulates Limit the Possible and Thereby Define the Reasonable

Well, I can assure you that… that uhh… that it isn't… that it… the basic law of this universe as i… and I'll give it to you now, is the basic law. It is provable... demonstratedly provable as such that it is the basic law cause it explains so much of the phenomena that occurs in this universe.

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

07:00

Until a Postulate is Made Everything is Possible

All postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. Once you understand that, you understand that… that… that proposition, you understand an awful lot about universes. You understand that until a postulate is made everything is possible. That any postulate, no matter what it is, limits the possible. For example umm… if you… a person says, " alright well now the law is that no car will travel at more than 80 kilometers an hour on this stretch of road." Well that's the law. Well how's that limit the possible? Well it limits the speed of the cars on that stretch of road, you see?

07:43

I can make another example: if you say… maybe you make a postulate and say, "Well uhh…I'll go to Cannes umm… this week end." Well, how does that limit the possible? If you go to Cannes you're not going… you're not going to go anywhere else which is not Cannes, are you? You see? So you limited your… your options, as they say, or you limit your possibilities. And no matter which postulate… what postulate you make you'll find that any postulate that you make will limit the possible.

08:12

So all postulates… the first thing about a postulate is… any postulate limits the possible that's it's fundamental purpose, to limit the possible.

08:22

Now how about this second bit, and thereby defines the reasonable." Now that is really something. The subject of what is reasonable in this universe is a terrible puzzle; it's a great puzzle. You can go up to almost anyone and say, "well, you know you get them to talk… they talk about things and so forth… and people bang the table and say, "Well this is reasonable and that is unreasonable." And they talk about what is reasonable and what is unreasonable but if you say to them, "What is reason and what is unreasonable and what is reasonable?" they can't define the terms they'll say well… they'll give you an example of something they consider is reasonable and they'll give you an example of what they consider is unreasonable, but they cannot define reason, reasonableness and unreasonableness or reason itself. They simple cannot define it.

09:16

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

09:46

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

10:03

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

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

10:26

Example, umm… if the… if the postulate is that uhh… Every house in Australia will have a roof on it. In other words if a law says that all houses… no house shall be sold without a roof, all houses would have a roof on it, then it's reasonable, if you buy a house it's reasonable to expect the house to have a roof on it, because it's consistent with the postulate which that all houses in Australia will have a roof on them. See that?

10:57

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

11:16

In the absence of postulates the concept of reason is meaningless

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

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

11:59

In other words the postulate defines what is reasonable. It defines it because that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with the postulate. So it's … it's … it's … there's nothing difficult about this. It's a very, very… it's very, very simple. It's so simple, this is, so simple, that you can… you can… you can almost… have to make it more complicated in order to understand it. It's so terribly, terribly simple but life gets so involved in this subject of what is reasonable and what is unreasonable that it forgets the basics and forgets the simplicities and so you come up to a person and say, "Well, What is reasonable? What is unreasonable? What is the definition of reason?"

and I don't know how many people in Australia you can walk up to and say, ummm… "What is ahh… What's a good definition of reason?" I don't know how many people will say now umm… "All postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. And umm… that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with a postulate." you know. You might find somebody in… somebody else in Australia who would say that but I think it is very, very doubtful, very doubtful in deed.

13:07

I'll tell you what, I wouldn't have said it until I'd done level 5 of my technology and till I'd got myself a few yards deep in level 5 and uhh… understood about universes and got the basic postulate of this universe out and so forth. I wouldn't have… I wouldn't have answered that I did know what reason was either, I was just like anyone else. I couldn't relate it to postulates. If you can't relate it to postulates you can't relate it to anything, because it won't relate to anything else, the subject of reason.

13:39

We can define reason as a complementary postulate

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

13:59

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

14:16

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

14:32

That's the most reasonable thing because that is the … the absolute essence of… the totality of the consistency. That is as consistent as you can get with his postulate. His postulate is "to be known" and if you adopt a "to know" postulate which is the complementary postulate of "to be known" then you will be as reasonable as you can get. You will be as consistent as you can get with his postulate. So reason is a complementary postulate in this universe and that is the most precise definition there is in this universe of reason. It is a complementary postulate.

15:09

Which tells you immediately that the opposition postulate is as unreasonable as you can get. A person has the postulate "to be known" and about as unreasonable as you can be… well, as unreasonable as you can be is "to not know", "to not know" him. Cause it… it's… [chuckle] totally inconsistent with his postulate. His postulate is "to be known" and your directing a "to not know" postulate towards him. Well you couldn't get any more inconsistent with his postulate than that. And you couldn't get umm… you couldn't get more unreasonable as far as he's concerned, than that. You follow?

15:51

All games must be unreasonable

Now this definition of reason being a complementary postulate tells you immediately that all games because they contain conflicting postulates… a game is a con… a game is a… is a… is a conflict… sorry… a game is a contest in conviction and contains opposing postulates by

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

16:37

It drops out straight away from the datum that uhh… that reason is a complementary postulate. If reason is a complementary postulate then all games are unreasonable. The conflict does not… there's no reason in conflict, it's an unreasonable activity, see, it's an unreasonable activity.

16:58

It might be… it might be … I mean it might be fun, games might be fun but so help me they're not reasonable. I mean you've got 22 men in two football teams standing on a football field and their about to start a game of football. It's not reasonable for them to play this game of football. The reasonable thing to do, if they want to be reasonable at all about it is at the beginning of the game one of the men to pick up the ball and run it round … and run it down and put it in the opposing goal. You see that?

If they gonna play this… if the idea is to get the ball into the goal between those two posts well they might as well pick it up, run it down and put it down there, it that's their purpose. It's not reasonable for 11 of them to try and get that ball into that goal… net… get that ball into the net and 11 of them… the other 11 to try and stop it from happening. That is not reasonable. It is not a reasonable activity… it might be a lot of fun but it's certainly not reasonable. See that?

The more conflict there is the less reason there is.

So that… that's just an example of an unreasonable game. Well it… no more unreasonable than any other game. The fact that the conflict is there; the fact that the postulates are opposing each other is the very essence of unreason because reason is a complementary postulate. Then this tells you right away that when a person comes up to you and says, "What we need in our society is more conflict and more competition and uhh… and so on." That they're also saying that we need more and more unreason. You see that? Because the conflict, the competition and so on and the opposition all produces unreason. The more… the more conflict there is the less reason there is, and so on.

18:37

A tremendous amount of data starts to make sense once you understand these basics. Once… all drops out of this hamper, of all postulates limit the possible and therefore define the reasonable, and the reasonable is a complementary postulate.

18:56

Ok now, I could expand that material out considerable umm… if… once a person grasps it they… they can expand it out themselves; it has enormous ramifications, so far. Well I've spoken so far on this tape. But anyway we'll go on and get the basic postulate of this universe.

19:17

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

So here we go. The basic postulate… on wh… upon which this universe is constructed is quote the class of knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.

I'll repeat it. The class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known. end of quote.

19:50

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

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

Now, the class of the knowable is coextensive with… well that is a technical term, it's not a difficult technical term, it's a term used in logic umm… it means umm…when we say two things co… two classes are coextensive it's just a very… it's a term a logician would use when he… he means that the two classes… that the… that the members of these classes umm… are identical in their characteristics. They have identical characteristics.

20:47

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

21:15

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

21:43

Now before I uhh… go on talking about the basic law of the universe I want to give you a very, very valid a very, very useful valid deduction from this law, which is of everyday use in… in… in society and of tremendous use in science and is well known and so forth. But ahh… I'll give it to you as a deduction from the basic law of the universe. Umm… here we go. It's a little bit umm… I could give it to you in terms of Boolean algebra but that wouldn't help… wouldn't make it any clearer either, but because the symbolism… unless the person listening to the tape understands the Boolean algebra it would be just as mysterious. So I better give it to you in terms of formal logic, the deduction, so here we go.

22:31

If the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known then a thing is either knowable by reason of existing or is not knowable by reason of not existing therefore a thing either exists or it doesn't exist therefore a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

23:09

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

23:19

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

24:02

Now certainly Aristotle based his own ahh… logic, his grasp of logic and all his writings on logic and all his subject of logic on that principle, and Aristotelian logic held fast in our society in the whole of the western world for something like 1850 years. So ahh… and it's still… all that happens today, all that happened in 1850 or about 1850 years after Aristotle was that a guy called George Boole and English mathematician came along and took that basic principle that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously and used it… expressed it mathematically, and used it as the basis of the algebra of logic, the algebra of the logic of classes, which is called Boolean algebra. And ahh… thereby made logic into a mathematical subject rather than a philosophical subject. At least he turned the logic of classes into a mathematical subject rather than a philosophical subject. And uhh… never the less, the Boolean algebra is based upon that… likely that same proposition "that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simult… cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously." Which is itself a valid deduction from the basic law of this universe.

25:43

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

26:11

And ahh… In other words, when you to take propositions apart using that basic law that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously you start to build up a science of logic. Well you try and build up a science of logic without that basic law you end up with a mess. You just end up with a dogs breakfast. And you end up with unreason. You have to have that basic law in there, you see? That a thing cannot exist and not exist simultaneously. It's the bas… absolute basic… Aristotle was completely right when he said that the most fundamental of all philosophical principles is that a thing cannot both possess and not possess a quality.

26:49

Now one day when I get a bit of time, and it's one of these things I mean to do and I keep putting it off, I'm gong to sit down and write down the basic law of this universe and see what other valid deductions there are from this basic law, but that one, I know, is a valid deduction. And… and… that produce….that… that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously produced the science of logic. I'm just wondering what other valid deductions can be made from the basic law which could be used as the basic for other sciences and for… and for other endeavors… and other human endeavors.

27:26

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

27:40

Now lets ahh… examine this basic law of the universe more closely. What is it telling us? Well it tells us essentially that there's two… there's two activities in this universe which are utterly and completely futile. One of these activities is to try and know something, which doesn't exist. Now that is the essence of futility, because the… you simply can't know it unless it exists. If it doesn't exist it's unknowable. The basic law of the universe says so.

28:07

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

28:20

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

28:38

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

29:35

As Ron Hubbard explained in Axiom 11, you know, "the futility of not isness" yet people do it all the time, you know, they've got this… they've got this memory… painful memory and they spend half their life trying to blot it out of their mind. Well they're not going to do it are they? They're just going to make themselves miserable, ruin their health and will… one way or the other. Why? Well the basic uni… the basic law upon which the universe is constructed says it's… you can't do it. If it exists it's knowable and no… your… and no amount of endeavoring to not know it is going to change that in the slightest. If the thing exists therefore it's knowable.

30:16

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

30:37

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

30:43

But this is, of course is basic in the… in the understanding of Scient… Dianetics and Scientology. That ahh… what you resist you become. You know? What you not know you end up getting wrapped round your neck. I mean there's a thousand ways Ron has expressed this in

Scientology and quite rightly so too, but again you see, it's a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is constructed. It gives you the only two futile things in the universe.

31:12

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

31:19

ah.. ah… I meant these things simply aren't of a matter of opinion, you know, there not of a matter of which school you go to, you know, it's a… it's a matter upon… you living in a universe, your acting and working and so forth totally… within a universe and your subscribing to the laws of the universe and the law… the basic law of the universe your subscribing to tells you that's it's futile to… try and… know things that don't exist and it's futile to try and not know things that do exits.

31:59

Games play only consists fundamentally of these two futile activities

Yet all of games play contain these possibilities. When we examine the game… what we call games play we find the people doing these things. That… that they try to discover things that don't exist and they try and not … not know things that do exist. And we find these… these… that all of games… in fact fundamentally, you could say, games… you could say that fundamentally games play… only… games play only consists fundamentally of these two fut… futile activities, which is why games play fundamentally is a very futile activity in this universe.

32:39

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

33:13

So there's quite a lot that umm… even at a superficial level starts to fall out of this umm… subject of the basic … postulate upon which this universe is umm… is constructed. We immediately understand what games play consists of and what… the futility of it. But bear in mind that the … the basic law of the universe does allow games to occur, you see. The law sets the universe up and says the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known. I mean, it doesn't forbid you, doesn't say that you can't go around and try and know things that don't exist. It doesn't forbid from trying "to not know" things that do exist. It allows this to be possible, but you'll never succeed. It doesn't actually

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

34:19

So there's a certain subtlety involved here, but of course any… any… any purpose… any goal, any law, any purpose is a limitation of the possible and only by limiting the possible is it possible to set up any forms of games play. You have to have some limitation of the possible and that is the basic limitation in this universe, is the basic law upon which this universe is constructed.

34:46

Now we know as a… as a deduction… a valid deduction from the basic law of the universe that classes of objects… classes of objects obey the… the uhh… the, what's known as the dictum of Aristotle. That umm… which in modern terminology would be that a thing either exists or it doesn't exist and a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously and uhh… by use of this… thi…thi… this proposition you… you can…you can formulate a very, very workable logic umm… which explains the.. the… the uhh… relationships between classes in the… of objects and so forth in the.. in the universe itself. This is the uhh… the uhh… the subject of logic and the log… logic of classes, Boolean Algebra.

35:36

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

36:24

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

Well… well… well let's examine it.

36:39

Well what … what we're looking at here is the difference between a postulate and an object. We're … we're trying to see.. see if their difference in there… in there… in their nature. Well now one immediate difference, immediately comes to mind. A postulate… let's take … let's take… say the postulate "to know", all right. You can start off with a high intensity postulate "to know" and uhh… it's on a scale and as the intensity of the postulate lessens, gets less and less and less, it will go down to a zero point where there's no postulate then it will go over the zero

point and will reappear in the negative. You get a very, very faint “to not know” postulate.” And that “to not know” postulate could be intensified up to a maximum intensity of maximum “to not know”.

37:26

Now this is different from an object. An object doesn’t… doesn’t obey that… doesn’t obey that… doesn’t obey that … that… that rule at all. You don’t… you’ve got this… this lump of rock, you know, and you… you ahh… have it in full intensity and ahh… you reduce it’s intensity and you get a point of zero intensity and then there’s no rock and then it goes into minus .. a little minus intensity of a rock and it goes into more minus until you get a maximum … maximum intensity of no rock. No, no it doesn’t work with rocks. It works for postulates, it doesn’t work for rocks so there’s an immediate difference between the postulate and ahh… and… and…. the object… an object in the universe.

38:08

So must bear… must bear that in mind.

38:08

Now is there any other law, which applies to postulates, which doesn’t apply to objects in the universe? Yes there’s ahh…there’s… there’s one other law, which applies to postulates which doesn’t apply to objects in the universe. This is the law of the complementary postulate. Now it’s ahh… you’ll become very, very aware of this in… when you start working with postulates at level 5, that complementary postulates satisfy each other and vanish each other. Complementary postulates satisfy each other and vanish each other.

38:45

Now what this means is, for example, you put up a “to be known” postulate and by it’s side you mock up a “to know” postulate, and the two postulates satisfy each other and they cancel each other out and they will vanish each other. And you will find that the two postulates after a second or two will be gone. And you say, “Where have they gone to?” Well they canceled each other out. You’d have to mock them up again and if you wanted to hold them in existence you would have to continue to hole… to create them and hold them in existence. Soon as you let them go they satisfy each other and they vanish. So there’s the law of the complementary postulate.

39:22

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

39:33

Now I see that I getting to the end of this spool so just run… just run the tape on to the end of the spool Greg and we'll pick up… pick it up on the other side.

There we are back on side two, Greg, same date.

39:50

So we have umm… ahh…. We have two … two… two laws there which are applicable to postulates which aren't applicable to classes of objects and umm… we now must ask ourselves the question does the law which is applicable to objects, in other words, "a thing cannot exist and not exist simultaneously", is that applicable to postulates? Well, yes it is. A postulate cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously, so that obeys the same law as the law of objects and the law of classes. So the … the postu… objects in the universe … classes of objects and objects in the universe just obey that one law, one fundamental law. A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

40:32

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

40:55

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

41:09

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

41:14

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

41:24

Now the law of the complementary postulate. The law which says that a postulate plus it's complementary postulate satisfy each other and cause their mutual vanishment has some very important influence on games play in the universe. The effect of this law is as follows: that… if you can imagine people playing a light hearted games and so forth and having a desire to play games ahh… and they want kee…. Get their game going and keep their game going. Every time they happen to accidentally match up with complementary postulates the game ends. The game

simply stops you see. And the postulates vanish. They satisfy each other and they cancel each other out and they… the postulates disappear. You imagine a games player saying, "Oh damn I've managed to get complementary postulates again so he… after a while, in games play, in the universe, the… there's always this tendency to avoiding the complementary postulate situation because it… it… it… unnecessarily, from the point of view of the games player, ends the game.

42:29

So this class of… of the… of both the postulate and it's complementary postulate tends to vanish out of games play. That's the fund… one of the first things you see to go out of games play in the universe, the… is the… is the…ahh… the lack of appreciation for the fact that you can end the game by adopting complementary postulates. First of all it's regarded as a nuisance to end the game because they want to keep the game going to enjoy the sensation of the games play and so accidentally in games, in the heat of the moment, happen to accidentally match their complementary postulates… they… they … it ends the game, the game stops, you see, and the game unmocks. So they… they come to resist or oppo… not resist or oppose but to avoid the complementary postulates. And so the effect is to concentrate more and more on the opposition postulates and less and less on the complementary postulates. And the effect of this is to make the games play more and more compulsive. You follow that? You see how that would be? It follows directly from the law of the complementary postulate.

43:51

If you go into… if you go into a game, you… obviously if you go into a game in the beginning you know the laws, and know everything about it. You want to play the game. You want to play games and uhh… well one thing you want to avoid is the… to end the game. You want to get the game started see, so you avoid the complementary postulate and then when the game gets started you… you… the tendency is to forget about… because your trying to avoid the complementary postulate situation it tends to go out of games play, and then when you try to end the game you've forgotten how to do it.

44:25

I know it sounds silly but this is the way… this is the way it comes about and games play then tends, because of the law of complementary postulates tends to go from light hearted, casual, voluntary games play, tends to go into compulsive games play. It becomes compulsive once the players lose the ability to end the game with complementary postulates and they lose the ability simply because they… they no longer… in the early days of playing the game they… it was a nuisance to end the game with complementary postulates so they… they put it to one side, and said we won't use complementary postulates to end the game and then they forgot about it and they lost it, you see. They lost the ability. And they then got into comple… into compulsive games play, cause once you take the complementary postulates out of the games situation your only left with the game situation. You see this? There's ahh… your not left… the complementary postulates have gone.

45:24

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

45:39

Lets call the postulate X. so there's X and the negative, which is "not X". and there's the complementary postulate to X we'll call that B and there's "not B" which is the negative of B. so there's only X and "not X" and B and "not B". So there's only four classes in the set.

46:00

There's XB, X "not B", "not X" B and "not X" "not B". Follow? That's four classes. That exhausts the possibilities of the system. See that, that exhaust the possibilities. But XB is a complementary postulate class cause X and B are complementary postulates; and "not X and "not B" are complementary postulates and they're the ones who are avoided. So the tendency is for those to go out of games play and the game then to consist of just X and "not B" and/or "not X" and B. see that?

46:52

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

47:25

The games play is compulsive simply because it cannot be ended. There's no way to end the game at this point because the complementary postulates have gone. The opposed people cannot occupy those postulates because there out of the set, you see. The sets just reduced to the games classes. There's … ahh… umm… postulates ahh… classes one is gone, two is present still, three is present and class four is gone so your left with just classes two and three which are the two games classes, and that is… is … is the technical definition of compulsive games play.

48:00

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

48:07

Now in terms of the "to know" goals package what would this look like, a compulsive games condition? Well the person is either in a state of "must be known" facing an opponent who

“mustn’t know” or he’s in a state of “must know” facing an opponent who “mustn’t be known” or visa versa giving a total of four possible games classes in all.

48:35

In other words he… whichever one of the four postulates in the set he’s in, he’s facing the opposition postulate. Put it… that’s another way to put it. There’s only… the set reduces to only two games classes but there’s four possibilities because there’s four … four… four postulates in the set

48:50

So whichever postulate he occupies he’s always facing somebody with… he’s always facing the opposition postulate. He’s never facing a complementary postulate cause they’ve gone out the set. Now that is… that is compulsive games play.

49:04

Now there one other characteristic that goes with compulsive games play and that is that the little other umm… law that goes with the postulates of maximum intensity down to zero point … down to zero point and out through to minus intensity vanishes. That … that… that law goes out and simply becomes plus intensity or minus intensity. In other words the person’s in there pitching full steam the whole time and there’s no zero point, there’s no point ever where there’s no postulate in games play. There… there… they’re simply all the time they’re playing the game. The game is continuous, in other words, there’s no point where they stop playing it. They can’t stop playing it. You see? It’s compulsive so there’s no zero, there’s no null point, there’s no zero point on the scale for any of the postulates. So that law goes out when we go into compulsive games play.

50:04

So the… in compulsive games play the law of the complementary postulate has gone out. And also the law of the scale, we call it the law of the scale, has gone out. And all that’s left is the law of “ a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously”. So the postulates… the law which says that a postulate cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

50:22

In other words that same law that governs the postulates in the universe, it governs objects and classes in the universe. So once the postulate set, it goes into compulsive games play, once games play becomes compulsive, postulates obey exactly the same law, logically, they obey exactly the same law, logically, as do classes and objects in the universe and can be manipulated as such in a logical system, which is very, very interesting and so forth.

50:54

In other words, while we're dealing with compulsive games play we can use the same logic for postulates as we can for classes, but once we go into non-compulsive games play, voluntary games play, we have to realize that we can't use the same logic for postulates that we can for object because the postulates obey two other laws. And you understand that? There… there… they're technical basics that we're dealing with.

51:23

It would actually be possible to formulate a mathematical logic, which umm… allows for the… these extra qualities of… of postulates in the natural native… native state including those three… including all the… all the laws that govern postulates. In other words, non… the… the…ahh… a logic which governs postulates in non compulsive games play. Ahm… I get some time one day I might see if I can formulate such a logic but it's not really necessary to do so because any logical constructs you would need or I've ever needed dealing with postulates, the application of Boolean algebra to postulates is always been to do with compulsive games play, so I simply treat the postulates as if they were objects and classes of objects, and so forth, and the answers come out right, of course, simply because in compulsive games the postulates can be handled as if they are objects. The logic is the same.

52:20

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

52:41

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

53:05

Well the relationship between X and B is that X = "not B", that is the relationship between the postulates. Ouch! We have an identification in the set, an identification occurs within the set, in the postulate set in compulsive games play. Once compulsive games play is undertaken, the… the… there's an identification between two of the postulates in the set and the identification is between X and "not B" . X= "not B" and B = "not X", another identification in the set. In other word if you hand…if the games play became compulsive in the "to know" goals package then "to know" would become, in the mind, would become identical with "to not be known" and "to be known" would become identical with "to not know".

54:03

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

Let's… Let us… let us take an example of the person who is compulsively assertive. He's being known, he's making his presence felt, he's laying down the law, he's thumping the table, well if you've ever met such a person, been in the presence of such a person you'll know one thing this person cannot do. That is he cannot know anything. He cannot… cannot receive any communication while he's in that state of mind. So he's in a state of "must be known" and "not know" and the two are identical. While he's in the state of "must be known" he's in a state of "not know." So he can't know, he can't receive any communications, while he's in this state of compulsive "must be known".

54:49

So there's an example there.

54:52

If you've ever tried to talk to… talk to an angry person you'll see this same thing. He…he… he's assertive, he's angry. You can't get through to him while he's angry. He's got to cool down, once he cools down then you… then you …then you can talk… converse with him. He'll then receive more messages. But while he's in this state of compulsive "must be known" he can't receive messages, simply because "must be known" equals "to not know". The set, you see, is ahh… the identification is in the set.

55:24

All right let's give another example in the "to know" goals package the "to know" postulate can become compulsive. And when the person becomes compulsive "to know" can be associated with the person wanting to hide. We get the example of the old lady peering out from behind her curtains and watching people walking up and down the road. You see? We get the nosey parker hiding, in hiding, You see? Compulsive know and also compulsive "mustn't be known". So "must know", "mustn't be known" become the identification there.

(Nosey Parker- a London park groundskeeper "parker" who spies on young lovers in the park)

55:56

Also in the "to know" goals package when it becomes compulsive a person who is in a state of "mustn't be known", in a state of hiding, you'll find that their always furtively looking out to see if anyone is looking at them. Everyone's aware of this phenomena of the… of the… the person in compulsive hiding. The person's hiding in a house say, they've got all the shutters drawn, the.. the … the urge to put aside a shutter and peer outside and see if anyone's looking in is almost irresistible. You see?

56:30

The “to not be known” is identified… is equal to, is identified with the postulate “to know”.

56:41

Finally in the “to know” goals package the person dramatizing “to not know” he’s … he’s highly rejective… highly rejecting, well he’s going to be noisy. I don’t know whether you’ve noticed this, you probably have, but all protestors are noisy. I’ve never heard of people quietly protesting. Well a protestor is dramatizing a “not know” postulate and he does it noisily. There’s no such thing as a quiet protestor. See? “Not know” is identical with “must be known” and “must be known” is assertive, so he’s asserting his protest because the “not know” postulate is identified with the “to must be known” postulate.

57:21

So we have plenty… plenty of validation of this datum from the… the basic “to know” goals package, and it applies to every other goals package too, I can assure you. It’s not peculiar to the “to know” goals package. That identification is there in compulsive games play. That the… that ahh… X = “not B” and B = “not X” in the.. in the… in the postulate set in the goals package

57:49

In terms of propositions; the propositions are if X then ‘not B”, if “not B” then X, if B then “not X”, if “not X” then B there… they are the propositions if you want it in terms of propositions and the identification is B = “not X” and “not X” = B and X = “not B” and “not B” = X. they are the identifications in the set.

58:14

43 years ago in 1950 Ron Hubbard published a book called “Dianetics Modern Science of Mental Health” and in that book he postulated a thing called the reactive mind and he said that the logic of the reactive mind contains an identification of A=A=A. you recall that? In Dianetics it was the… one of the foundation stones of Ron’s reactive mind theory, was the identification in the reactive bank. “A=A=A” and the analytical mind, he said, contain… didn’t contain this identification. It was free, the reactive bank was locked into a fixed identification pattern.

59:02

Now, now, could it be. Could it just be! Could it just be that when we look at compulsive games play with the compulsive identification in the postulate set, are we looking at the same phenomena that Ron Hubbard was looking at when he said that a reactive bank contains an identification of A=A=A. could it be?

59:25

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

59:38

Now Ron, Dear Ron, for all his tremendous qualities as a man, as a researcher and he was a genius, he was no logician, and he was unable to put this subject onto a logical foundation. I've been able to do this and been able to put this subject together, and we got the subject of postulates and the laws governing the postulates, games play, compulsive games play and the identification and we're back where we were. We're now validating Ron's data of 1950.

1:00:14

This is it! This is it. We've found it. He never could find it. He could never explain why the reactive bank had an A=A=A identification but now we know why, why it's in there, it comes from compulsive games play and we know how games play gets compulsive in the universe from the postulate set. The whole thing now… we've got all the bits and all the bits fit together, we've completed Ron's work on the subject of Dianetics in terms of the… the ahh… identification in the reactive bank.

1:00:45

So is it any wonder at level 5 when we erase these goals packages and break these… these identifications… these identifications… these false identifications in the postulate sets at level 5, level 5A and level 5B where we erase the goals packages and break these identifications that we're just breaking up the reactive mind itself. Yes, exactly. That is exactly and precisely what we are doing. We're breaking up the A=A of the bank. We're just tearing the bank apart at level 5.

1:01:20

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

1:01:43

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

1:02:19

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

1:02:51

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

1:03:27

Being able to once again see things as differently or see similarities and differences between things… the… the … what Ron so beautifully explained in Dianetics, that the analytical mind works in differences and similarities and the reactive bank works in identifications.

1:03:44

Exclusion Postulate

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

We…we see that when games play becomes compulsive that there is always a false identification. That when the persons in one postulate he's actually in two postulates and it's called twin postulate games play. It's a compulsive games player with twin postulate games play. He's quite incapable of adopting one postulate. Whenever he adopts one postulate he adopts it's… it's…. it's twin, the one it's identified with so it's always in two postulates. He's in a games postulate and he's in this other postulate which is somewhat hidden, you don't have to search for it very far, but it's there if he's in a compulsive game… in a state of compulsive games play. And we call this other postulate the Exclusion Postulate.

1:04:45

Now, why do we… why do we call this postulate the Exclusion Postulate? Well simply because it excludes him, it excludes the games player out of the class of the opponent. Of the class he's trying to drive the opponent into.

1:04:58

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

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

1:05:53

Now you say, "Well… well, what the devil? Why did… why doesn't he want to come out… go into that class?" Why doesn't he want to go into that class?" well it's not particularly obvious in the "to know" goals package but let's take a… a… a ahh… a more destructive goals package. Let's take the… the ahh… let's take the … the….the goal to stab. Now a person in a stabbing game he… he… ahh… he… one thing he doesn't want to do, he wants to … well two things he wants to do he wants to stab the opponent but he doesn't want to be stabbed. So… the games play is compulsive. He's occupying the class of "to stab" and "to not be stabbed".

1:06:38

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

1:06:49

The opponent is standing over there he in the… the opponents in the class of "to not be stabbed" and ahh… he's trying to drive this guy from "to not be stabbed" into "to be stabbed". But when he… if he succeeds the last thing he wants is to… the games player wants is to end up in that class himself. You see that? He doesn't want to be stabbed. But we call it an exclusion postulate that is the best name for the postulate.

1:07:14

So when we look at compulsive games play we're looking at twin postulate games play. It's always… the second postulate is always there. There's the games postulate and the exclusion postulate and the … the … exclusion postulate is always identical to the opposition to the games postulate. Always there… the exclusion postulate is identical to the opposition to the games postulate.

1:07:41

In other words if he's in the… in the… in… if his games postulate is "to stab" the opposition postulate is "to not be stabbed". Well that's exactly what his exclusion postulate will be.

1:07:50

So he's… he's in two postulates

1:07:56

Now umm… one of the reasons I've cut this tape for you is that these exclusion postulates; this twin postulate games play shows up with a vengeance when you start dealing with some of the junior goals packages at level 5B, and it can show up at level 5A and you start wondering what the hell's going on when you find these… these… these; the person will find themselves in a… in two postulates. They've got their games postulate and suddenly this other postulate turns up which is the opposition postulate and their sitting there saying, "Oh my god what am I doing with the opponents postulate?" so this is why I'm explaining it, it's an exclusion postulate.

1:08:34

This is how I discovered it, how I discovered it. It was only later that I put the logic together. First of all I discovered it empirically. I found it in auditing. I found it in session. Then explained it, the phenomenon.

1;08:48

The Exclusion Postulate. I first realized what it was for and then I realized it was identification in the set, and put the set together and got it all out. You see? It all started to come out.

1:08:58

So this is one of the reasons why I am cutting this tape. So there's always… when the games lay is compulsive there's always twin postulate games play, there's always two… the persons in two postulates. He's in the game… he's got a game postulate, whatever that game postulate is he will… there will be an exclusion postulate that will… sits there too and keeps him out of the class that he's trying to drive the opponent into. Keeps him out of that class. Or if you want to put it the other way the exclusion postulate is identical to the opponent… the opponents… to opposition postulate to the game postulate. It's the … identical to the opposition postulate to the game postulate.

1:09:36

So we can see two players in compulsive games play, going back to our XB set. The first player is in the class of X and we… he's got an X games postulate and a… and a… and a "not B" exclusion postulate and the other player opposing him has got a "not B" games postulate and an X exclusion postulate, and there the two have… have ding-donged at each other.

1:10:01

The general rule of compulsive games play that in any game there are only… there's only one games class involved. In other words there's only two postulates involved between the… the… the… the two… the two players. He's using X as a games postulate and "not B" as an exclusion

postulate and his opponent is using “not B” as a games postulate and X as an exclusion postulate. So there’s only those two postulates involved in any… in any game.

1:10:36

Got two of them and they’ve both got the same two but one of them is using one as a games postulate and he’s got the other one as an exclusion postulate and the other guys using one… the other one as his games postulate and he’s got the other one as his exclusion postulate. It… it… it’s a little bit complicated to explain it but it’s very, very simple when you write it down and when you draw it out on a piece of paper. You see the exclusion postulate and you see why I called it an exclusion postulate because it keeps the person out of the class he’s trying to drive the person… trying to drive the opponent into.

1:11:05

When games play becomes compulsive it can become very undesirable to end up in that class. You might become… a person might be committing some pretty nasty overt acts in compulsive games play and the last place he wants to end up is to be in the class… same class as the person… same class as the opponent is being driven into. You know? Like the example of the stabbing, you know. It’s all right to go around stabbing people but umm… it’s not all right to be… to be… stabbed.

1:11:33

You know it’s all right for Adolph Hitler to kill 6 million Jews but one thing Hitler didn’t want to be was a dead Jew. One that had just been gassed in one of Hitler’s gas chambers. You know. That was an intolerable… intolerable place for him to be. You see?

1:11:46

So ahh…they will receive compulsive games play. I’m sure Hitler had a very strong… very strong exclusion postulate to not be gassed, to not be a gassed Jew. [Chuckle] So much for that.

1:12:01

The question arises does this subject of the compuls… of the exclusion postulate… twin postulate games play make any slightest difference to level 5A, the actual techniques of level 5A practical? Nope, not in the slightest. Once you become aware that they exist, those twin postulates are there you just do the technique exactly as I’ve given it. The fact that your operating on twin postulates doesn’t have anything to do with it. You treat them as single postulates then you win, every time.

1:12:36

Now you don’t have to do anything about these twin postulates just… know them… know them as theory and know that their a part of compulsive games play but when you take them apart in

games… in goals package form at level 5A and level 5B, you do level 5A and level 5B exactly as I've given it. It comes apart that… that… that way and it won't come apart any other way I can assure you because the twin goals package… the twin postulates of compulsive games play is based upon a false identification. It's got a lie built into it. The identification is false so any attempt to introduce twin postulates into therapy is doomed to failure because you're simply… you're simply dramatizing the lie. The truth is single postulates. You…you'll win at level 5A and level 5B when you work with single postulates. You lose all the time if you try and introduce twin postulates to level 5A and level 5B, so just note that down. Note that down.

1:13:31

I've tried it. I've tested it all it only works on single postulates so don't try mucking about at level 5A and level 5B with twin postulates. You'll just… you'll just make your self… knock yourself into apathy and make yourself miserable. You're just dramatizing the lie. The A… Just dramatizing the A=A=A of the reactive bank.

1:13:52

Now, finally I want to end up with this tape with just a little bit of… word on the practical of level 5 here, and relate it to what we've been talking about. When you get some area of the bank or the mind which simply refuses to come apart at level 5, level 5A, level 5B, level 5C, doesn't matter what it is you find there… you sweat at it, you sweat at it and it simply refuses to come apart. Come… to erase then search for the double bind, look for the false identification. You should have that written up on your auditing wall search for the double bind. It's always present, there's always a false identification in there somewhere. You've got a goals package with a false identification in it, with compulsive games play in it and there's a… there's this… there's a false identification in there somewhere and that is the cause of why it won't come apart

1:14:57

Now this is absolutely fundamental, it's the only thing that will stop it from erasing at level 5. There's nothing else that will stop it. You've simply got a false identification in it and you haven't spotted it. It's in there somewhere. You're going to have to find it.

1:15:16

You know you may get to level 5C, this… this… this happens quite often, you get some object there at level 5C your trying to erase it and you're can't erase it at level 5C, well it's probably associated with a goals package which has got a false identification in it. You know the ahh… the object itself is… is got itself mixed up in games play with this goals package which has become important to the goals package and the goals package has got itself important to the object and the object has got itself related to this goals package and the games play in the goals package has become compulsive and you can't get rid of the object in the mind.

1:16:03

Well what you've got to do, you got to knuckle down and erase that goals package. Then the object will vanish, it will erase easily. There are no exceptions to this rule. If it's not coming apart at level 5 A, B, or C there's a double bind, there's a false identification and there's a goals package here somewhere and ahh… your not… you haven't erased the goals package. There's a false identification here. There a false identi… and it's to do with the goals package there. There's a goals package with a false identification in it, which is associated with this area and it won't… simply won't come apart until you break the identification in the goals package.

1:16:46

So ahmm… don't ask…. Try and put me through hoops, poor old Ron Hubbard used to be put through hoops on this, you know, people write in and say, "I done all your techniques Ron, and nothing happened" and boy Ron had to burn the mid night oil. Well I'm not going to go through hoops on this one cause I know, I been through the mid night oil myself on this and there aren't any exceptions. If it doesn't come apart at level 5 then you haven't completed level 5. There's a false identification, there's a goals package in there somewhere and with a false identification and that's all that can stop it from erasing at level 5.

1:17:26

There, that is… that is very important data, there. It's only this A=A=A of the bank… this ahh… this false identification of compulsive games play that can prevent erasure at level 5 and that is what level 5 is there to take apart. It needs this powerful technique of level 5 to break this false identification in the… in the goals package, break it. Only level 5 will break it, but ahh… sometimes that the… you get stuck on the false identification and you say, "Well level 5's not enough to break it." Well, it is, if you back it up to the right area it is powerful enough to break it.

1:18:06

So ahh… I don't go… it's no good trying to put me through hoops on this one. I'll simply, you know, if you write to me and say, "Well I tried it all and I still got this thing and it won't erase at level 5." I'll say, "Well, just complete level 5. Go back and go through level 5A again. Go and find… go back through level 5B. Find another goals package, there's one there somewhere." And the chances are that it's one of these goals packages that I happen to know that it's got a false identification in it, like the "to sex" goals package. I happen to know that one got a false identification in it. Ever since human beings adopted umm…com… ahh…adopted gender specialization and human beings were born either as males or females it's got a built in item… built in false identification, that goals package has. So if you get anything associated with sex and it won't erase well just erase that…because you erase that "to sex" goals package then it will all come apart.

1:19:00

I've been through all these hoops myself, Greg, on this one you know. I … I… I … burnt the midnight oil, I've said to myself, "Dennis, there's got to be other techniques here to take these

things apart… and I can't get these apart." Every time I've said that and I've looked into it further, I've realized I've come across a god damned false identification of a goals package there which I hadn't spotted and once I took the false identification apart, took the compulsive games play apart, erased the goals package, it all came apart swim… swimmingly. It all come apart exactly as the textbook said.

1:19:35

So that's my umm… I wanted to say those final words on this subject. It's all there at level 5A, B and C plus the little bits I've given you, that little addendum I gave you there. It's … it's all there, you don't need any other practical to take a bank apart.

If I ever … I'll say it now, if I ever come up with a level 6. It won't be anything to do with taking the bank apart it will be do with something… something quite different. It will be something to do with something the… that the anatomy of creating sensations or something like that. It will be something quite, quite different than this whole subject of the reactive bank because as far as I'm concerned that is a solved problem at level…level 5 ends that. You start solv… taking the bank apart at level 1, you continue with levels 2, 3, 4. You finish it at level 5 and when your finished level 5 that's the end of the bank. It's gone. There's nothing else there. There's no bank. There's no more bank left, that's it. And if there's still bank there, then you haven't completed level 5.

1:20:36

Now that's my final words no the subject and I'm not going to be burning midnight oil on the subject. I've done enough burning of midnight oil on my own bank without burning midnight oil on other people's.

1:20:48

So I see I'm getting to the end of this tape, so all the best for now and umm…. Ta ta.

1:20:52
end of tape