Insanity Point Lecture 01- Insanity
By Dennis Stephens June 30 1994
Transcribed by
Pete McLaughlin May 7, 2012

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 the word…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… 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. There is no other use of the word health. No other connection between the word health and the word sane that I know of in our… in modern English.
However, it's long been known by mankind that there's a connection between this subject of sanity and this subject of reason. And ahh…there's also, it's been known, people with… that unhealthy people, particularly unhealthy people with unhealthy minds don't reason to well. So there's a…there's a connection there. There's connectivity there too.

1:26

In our modern society, the word insane is largely used in a legal sense. More and more, only the legal profession have any use for this term of insanity, the term insane and this subject of insanity.
The medical profession gave the term away many, 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 ahhh… and there they stand.

02:12

But ummm…the subject of insanity umm… they won't have apart in it's legal sense and one can understand why. You see the problem that the law has with the subject of ahhh… of insanity started many, many…many, many years ago when some bright young barrister umm…pleaded his client ummm…innocent of a crime on the grounds of insanity. And ahhh… once he did this, of course, the ahhh…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.

2:50

In other words, they were looking for a definition of insanity. And the law…I believe this was about…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, 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 ahh…that that rule is, with modest… various modifications, is 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, very similar…very, very similar rules. Very, very similar, very, very similar definitions of insanity.

03:53

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 apart of it. They're quite happy with the term psychosis which they can…which they can fit into their…fit into a medical structure. They can't fit this definition into a medical structure, the legal definition of insanity, into a medical structure, so they have no use for it.

04:15

Well quite frankly, neither can we. What we can't put ahh…We can't use their def… 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 a completely useless definition for a social scientist, for 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.

04:53

Never the less, if we want to understand this subject of insanity we ought to have some form of a…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…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.

05:07

Reason

Well the thing that's…that insanity or sanity connects itself most obviously to is this subject… is this subject of reason. That is the…that is the thing it is most obviously connected to. It's ahh… as I pointed out earlier, that ahh… it's been well known that insane people do not reason very well. They reason very, very badly. And people with unhealthy minds reason very badly. It's been well known, this, for many, many centuries this is… that this is so.

05:38

So the most obvious connection between… the most obvious thing to define sanity and insanity is in terms of reason and that is what we do in TROM. We…We…We ahh…We don't talk about health and healthy minds but we're …we're very much concerned with this subject of… of…of reason and so forth.

06:10

A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously

Now, in TROM, we know…now this is not an original…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…in logic. It's reason…It's the subject of reason in science and it happens to be the subject of reason in the universe at large.

06:55

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, very firm ground because it turns out that the proposition that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously is a…is a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is evidently constructed.

07:22

So we're on very, 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."

07:34

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

07:51

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 is… why you get this phenomena, is that nobody knows what reason is. You see?

08:08

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 obvious connection between this subject of unreason and insanity. Now you see why mankind has trouble with this subject.

08:28

The …the endpoint that mankind gets to… onto this subject of insanity is..is that he…the final endpoint is he says, "Well ahh…any person who disagrees with me is insane." Now that… that's the…that's the final fling of the compulsive games player. You know. If…if…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… that…that is the final…final step there… there… of the compulsive games player.

09:09

But there's ahh…umm…This might be a method of…of…of ahh…of settling games. It might be a very, very valid idea of getting rid of the opponent.

I mean in the history of;…in history shows a vast number of occasions where people who've disagreed with the establishment have been clapped away in insane asylums or… or maybe even executed, or…or… 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 know?

09:50

You can go to various…various countries in the in the…in the third world and umm… anybody who disagrees with what the president says…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's dumped out at sea somewhere. That's it, you know? So he's gone.

Obviously insane. Done with him. He disagreed with what the establishment said. You see this is what the games player considers as reason and unreason. The man is obviously insane because he disagrees with me.

10:29

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. Cause we know… cause we know what reason is. It's got nothing to do…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…you… you get the drift of what …I…I'm onto here.

10:59

Mankind at large doesn't know anything about this subject. Only… the scientists know a bit, the… 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.

11:16

People who have never studied science or studied logic, studied mathematics have no vaguest idea of what reason consists of. Really they don't, 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 umm…business people…business men, 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… any wild idea out of thin air and say, "well that's as good definition of insanity." You see that?

11:58

That's what's happened in our…in our society all the time on this subject of insanity. There's as… 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

12:22

Now, I have to give you this little digression because you may believe that our society knows a lot about insanity. In truth of the matter it knows nothing. Knows nothing about insanity.

12:31

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 is… what do you think is reason? What't the definition of reaons?" 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.

12:59

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.

13:10

But, enough of this digression, let's get back onto the main road.

13:15

<div align="center">Insanity defined</div>

Well now we're… we're ready really now to give our definition of…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… what I'm going to give you is the definition that we use in TROM.

13:39

Here we go. **A person is insane when they believe that a thing can both exist and not exist simultaneously**.

Now I'll just check that back. It's not garbled so there is no need for me to repeat it.

That is the definition of insanity that we use in TROM. A person is insane when they believe that a thing can not…can both exist and not exist simultaneously.

14:08

Now as you listen to the definition it doesn't seem pretty… 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, never the less, is the definition of insanity. That is the definition of ahh…of insanity. It ties it up completely with the subject of unreason.

14:35

But although, it's ahh… 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. And,,,and,,,and,,,So you will start to almost feel the planet move under your feet when you start thinking about this subject

15:00
Prerequisite for insanity

Now the ahh…the first step on this ahh…on this road is what we might call, and is probably very correctly called, the prerequisite for insanity, the prerequisite for insanity. And again this is not understood outside of TROM.

By the way the…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 ahhh…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.

15:50

But, never the less, we've come to grips with it and we can define it.

Insanity and Compulsive Games Play

But that's… as I say is that 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**.

I've just played that back, it's not garbled.

Now what do we… what do we mean by that? Well it's pretty self-explanatory isn't it. A person doesn't go… can only go insane if they have no class to go into if their overwhelmed in games play.

In other words a person can reduce their postulate set down to two games classes. They can…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… if they reduce their set down to a single game class set?

Now this ties this up…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 postulate set of the goals package… reduction of the goals package. Recall that material? There on supplementary tape number 3.

If the goals package…or the postulate… 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 ummm…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.

18:06

You might say, "Well he'll simply go into one of the other games classes. No he can't, cause he's postulated that he can't go there. His last overwhelm said no. his last overwhelm… when he last left that class… he… he said, "Well I can no longer play this game. I can no longer stay in this game. I've gotta get out of this game. It's not playable by me any more." So he reduced that possibility down to zero.

18:35

Now the last possibility is reduced down to zero. So where is he gonna go?

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.

19:18

Once the person reduces the the…ahh…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.

Two games classes, then it gets reduced down to one games class and at that point every time he plays…he starts to use this…this…this class in games play he's playing with…he's…he's putting his sanity on the line. Because if he loses the next game. The next game he loses. He's lost his sanity.

19:44

He's gone. There is no other place he can go but into insanity.

And our…our…my problem is to … our problem is to…to…to put forward this scheme… this scheme to show how this occurs. And to put it…put it into… get it all written down, and so forth. 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…we're dealing with the very essence of unreason.

20:18

Don't kid yourself. I wouldn't be giving you this data if I didn't know that…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 and further testing. 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… it is what I'm saying it is.

That right at the heart of it…of every insanity you find in the person… right at the heart of every insanity you will find this urge to make a thing both exist and not exist simultaneously, or the urge to…to…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. It is… this attempt to try and work on a postulate while working on its negative, to operate on a postulate while working on its negative.

21:28

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?

21:42

Now another datum that immediately falls out the hamper once we know this prerequisite for insanity is this sub…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 we can proof a person…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 their…that they will…that that…that they won't go mad. But it wasn't understood why.

We know why. We can explain why. Why it is. We …we…we're running on a senior datum here than…than the other psychotherapies because we can correlate this material so closely because of our quite profound knowledge and understanding of games play.

22:45

So how…how could we proof a …how can we proof a person against insanity? Very, very simply., very, very simple. Very, very simple way a person can be proofed against insanity. All they have to do is do levels One, Two, Three of TROM. Solo. That's all they have to do. Anyone who's achieved the first three levels of TROM, they've proofed themselves against insanity.

23:17

Why? Because by the time the person gets to the top of level Three, they are no longer a compulsive games player. They've taken so much charge off their…their…their game compulsions that their game compulsions are now no longer game compulsions.

They play games still but the compulsions gone. The charge is off it. The intensity of charge is off their bank by the time they get to the top of level Three. They've taken enormous charge off their case and their no longer a compulsive games player. And because their no longer a compulsive games player they have no danger of ever going insane.

23:59

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…proofing of the individual is the first three levels of TROM.

24:21

A person doesn't have to go as far as level Four or level Five. They don't have to erase all the goals packages in their mind. Oh no that's not necessary, just levels One, Two and Three completed solo is sufficient to proof any person against insanity.

24:40

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… their… 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?

25:10

And as they haven't got all their eggs in one basket they can suffer overwhelm and always have a place to go to. 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.

25:38

Now I want to give you an example of this. You'll see it… you'll see it very, very clearly. You'll see how this would go.

I'll go through an example, and work the example through with you very, very carefully and you'll see exactly how the person goes insane. And we'll relate it exactly to the…to the ahh…to the postulates involved.

Boolean Algebra

But before I do so I have some… 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… I've got to. I have no choice. I've got to use the algebra of logic which is Boolean Algebra. So 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 ahh…into a mass of verbiage. I won't get my point across. So I'm gonna 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.

27:10

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 there so you can understand the terms and see it in terms of the symbolism.

27:25

Einstein had this same problem with his umm… with his relativity theory. It's generally recognized that it's quite impossible to explain relativity theory…Einstein's relativity theory in words to anyone.

But it ahhh… once a person understands sufficient advanced mathematics it's…it's…it's quite understandable. They see the mathematics, it all makes sense but when they try and put it into words… they can't put it into words. But they see it in terms of the mathematical symbols.

27:58

This is simply because the mathematics is a much more precise…much more precise tool than the English language. And it's similar…I'm up against the same problem trying to explain and discuss this subject of insanity, and so forth while just using words. The words just aren't precise enough. I will have to lapse into the symbolism of logic in order to… 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…with the algebra of logic. I've just 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 ahhh…explain a little bit more of it in order to complete this upper level…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 so forth and their deductions one from another. But first of all the symbolisms so we can…actually… somebody actually listening to this can actually write it down on paper and see the symbolism.

29:31
$$X \text{ and } 1-X$$

Ummm…When we put down a symbol, say "X" that really means "X" exists. Ummm… If we want to put down "not X" we write that down as "1-X" and because it's ahhh…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…X exists, X doesn't exist is 1-X the whole universe less X. See that?

30:05
$$(\text{Brackets})$$

Simple, quite simple…symbolism. Normally, for convenience sake we surround the 1-X with a Bracket, so I'll… when I'm gonna give you 1-X, I'll give it to you in the form (1-X). Get that?

30:22

So that's what it…that's what a 1 minus X will sound like when it comes over to you. (1-X).

Now there's going to be nothing else inside the bracket except 1-X or 1-Y. so forth. It will be 1 minus sign 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.

30:55

<center>Equal = and Not Equal To ≠</center>

Right, next is the ahhh…the…the signs that we're going to use.

First is the equal sign. Well the equal sign's 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 ummm… in logic and that is the sign of not equal to. 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… the sign for not equals.

31:51

Now fundamentally in logic this…the ahhh…the statement ahhh…or the sign not equal simply means that equality is not the case. That's what it means. **Equality is not the case**. It's not equals. See? Equality is not the case. That's all it means, the symbol.

32:11

<center>0,Zilch, Zero, Nothing and Naught</center>

Now in the logic zero means the same as it does in ordinary arithmetic, ordinary algebra it means nothing. Zilch, nothing, zero

<center>1 and Universe</center>

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…in the situation. That is… we express that with the figure "1". So the only numbers that appear in the logic are zero's and one's. We don't have any other numbers. It's a much more simple mathematics than ordinary mathematics, I can assure you.

32:50

Classes and Common Classes

Now I've… on lecture 10 I've already explained this subject of classes and common classes and so forth. I don't have to go… give you that material again. That's already given on lecture 10, which is a forerunner to this one, and a necessary prerequisite to this one. So you have the subject of common classes. So you know what a common class is. And so on.

33:19

Plus +

Now I better also at this point give you the meaning of the plus sign "+" in logic. The plus sign it's slightly different from its use in ordinary ahh…in ordinary arithmetic and algebra. Umm… In logic the use of the plus sign depends upon ummm…what the thing, what's on the other side of the equation. For example, if we have, say, X+Y=naught. It means that both X and Y…both X equals naught and Y equals naught. And the combination of X+Y equals naught means that ahhh…both of them equal naught. Get that?

34:01

So X+Y equals naught means exactly the same as X equals naught and Y equals naught. We put them together and say X plus Y equals naught.

34:11

But when we say "X plus Y equals 1" we don't …we're not…we can't use that additive when they…when their equal to one. When their equal to the universe.

X plus Y equals 1 has the meaning that the universe either consists of X or it consists of Y or it may consist of both. It's indeterminent. We'd have to…we'd have to do something about that… about that equation. It may consist of both.

In other words, it's an either/or situation. But we don't know whether it's the ahhh…We don't know whether it's the inclusive OR or the excl…what they call the inclusive OR or the exclusive OR. So we don't know, but it's certainly… when we have an equation equal to one the plus sign is quite disjunctive quite seperative. We can't just add them together like we can in arithmetic. Quite disjunctive, it's definitely an either/ or situation. Either X or its Y or it's both. That's the way it's generally in...interpreted in logic, the equation X+Y=1.

35:28

$$X \neq 0$$

Now, what about the equation X is not equal to naught "X≠0"? Well that means that X is not…it's somewhere in between X is…is …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. It really, what **it means is that some X's do exist**. See that?

35:53

It's not the case that X doesn't exist. That is precisely what X is not equal naught means. It means that it is not the case that X doesn't exist. X may be equal to 1in that set of circumstances. We don't know. But it's certainly…it is not the case that X does not exist, and that's what X is not equal to naught "X≠0" means.

36:20

Little bit complex until you get to grips with it but it ahhh…the use of that not equal "≠" sign but I can assure you it all make s sense.

It's only by the way in the last 50 or … or a hundred years or so that they've … the logicians have got out the use of these signs and got them… 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 ahhh…it's the history of how not to do it. It's taken ahhh…it…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 ahhh…of what is meant by the sign…what is meant by the not equal sign. And how we interpret the…the…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.

37:20

$$X≠0 \text{ versus } X=0$$

It must be clearly understood that the sign… say 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?

37:47

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?

37:58

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… 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 means ahhh…that is to say it is the antithesis of umm…X doesn't exist and Y doesn't exist. It's the antithesis of that.

So it means that ahh…either…either ahh…some X's exist or…or some Y's exist or some of both exist. With the added implication that it may be the case that umm…that ummm…that X = 1 or Y = 1 or both X and Y are both equal to 1. That can be…That can be the interpretation of X+Y≠0. It simply means that it's not the case that X+Y=0.

39:25

Ahmm…Well…Well that's the …that's the end of the ahh…that's the end of the…of the snappy basic course in Boolean algebra. We're now going to press on with our ahhh… we're now going to press on with our material and it's time that we ahhh…it's time that we took up this umm…this example that I mentioned to you so we can understand more clearly how this subject of insanity comes about and exactly what it looks like when it does come about.

40:00

What we're now in a position to do this because we're now in a position to use our symbols…to use our symbolism, very, very precisely.

40:10

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.

Do you remember the example I gave of the Barber of Seville? The ahhh…which is a well known historical logical paradox actually. And ahhh… I'll just refresh your memory. Remember the barber, the king who ummm…he's in this town…there's the king there with the barber and ahhh… 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. Ahh…all those…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 ahhh…so he…he…he went…the only thing he could do…he… he went insane.

41:32

Now let's examine exactly what the…what the problem is here.

In order to take this problem apart the easiest way is to start to put our…our postulate set together and ahhh…and…and…and tick off the possibilities. Clearly we've got a postulate set here of umm…of ahhh…ummm a person…ahh…ahh…let's nominate S the letter S as a person who shaves themselves. And the letter B that is a person who is shaved by the town barber. So is the S…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. There both postulates so it's a postulate set were looking at here.

<div align="center">

Postulates
S to shave oneself
B to be shaved by the town barber

</div>

42:32
<div align="center">

Cross Packaging

</div>

Both postulates aren't in the same goals package so there's a bit of cross packaging going on here but never the less it's still a…it's still a…it's still a postulate set. It's not a…not a goals package as we would understand it but it's certainly a postulate set.

42:47

Now first of all let us write down all the possibilities in this set. Well there's the ahh…four possible classes. There's ahhh…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.

<div align="center">

Four Classes

</div>

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

43:38

This is the class of B(1-B) and for completeness sake we will the… another insanity class of S(1-S).
<div align="center">

Insanity Classes

</div>

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…of our…of our set. Now normally if we were doing a logical analysis of this particular problem we would suc…we would simply restrict ourselves to the first four classes. That last two classes would be made equal to naught by the

basic law of reason in the universe which says that ahh…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 would be… 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.

45:00

Actually they're always are six classes in the set when you…when it's a…When there's two elements in the set there's the four main classes then the two insane…the two possible insanity classes. But we normally th…that…there, as I say, the two insanity classes aren't used because we're not dealing with the subject of insanity.

Normally we're dealing only with the subject of reason. But as we're…on this tape dealing with the subject of insanity we're going to have to put extra insanity classes in and complete the set. So we've got six classes. Ok?

45:36

And we're going to leave the… the B(1-B).class in and the S(1-S) class in. we're going to leave those in. we're not going to make those equal to zero, because we're…the…the…this ahh…we're going to try and understand how this guy went insane. So we can't make those classes equal to zero and cancel them out the set because one of them…one or the other or both might be useful in the analysis. So we will have to leave them in.

46:09
                                    The Six Classes

Ok, off we go now. Let's start ticking off the classes. The first of the ummm…let's have a look at the king said.

46:22

But ummm… before we take up what the king said, there's two things we should actually do first. One of these is umm…from a practical point of view we should number our six classes from one to six. So, umm…we'll just…I'll assume you've got them written down and just number them in order I gave them to you from one through to six starting with the reason classes and five and 6 will be the two insanity classes. Ok, so just number those from one to six.

                                    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 the next thing we have to do, you realize 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 it clearly, 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.

47:28

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…we…we must first of all discover if there's any limitations to the set by the very nature of the…of …of the postulates themselves and when we examine this we find that that is actually the case. That this town barber doesn't have these…doesn't have a full freedom of choice even regardless of what the king said.

48:03

For example, for example it's quite obvious that if umm…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 there the… there's…there's two propositions straight away that affect the set.

Now the…the first of these propositions if the…if the barber shaves himself he is being shaved by the town barber knocks out umm…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

48:46

And the ahh…the…the…the second of these umm…these propositions knocks out number 3 in the set. I won't give you what it is but 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 before…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

49:15

So he…he…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. There the only options.

So they are his options as he approaches the notice board and reads the notice in the town square about the kings edict, bear that in mind, that's…that's his…they are his only options

49:42
Consider the King's Edict

Now let us…Now let us consider the king's edict. The first thing is he says…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 ahh…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

50:09

So we imagine the town barber, he reads the edict up..he reads that first part of the edict, he says, "Oh, yes, on pain of death ummm… 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 now one class he can occupy in the sanity part of the ahh… the reason part of the ahh…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

50:49

Now notice now that his set has been reduced to a one game class set, a one game class set. Remember this is…this is not a goals package but, never the less, the same principle applies that the…we started off with four classes in the set, in the reason part of the set and we've now got it down to one. There's only one reason class that he can occupy in that set and that is to shave himself and be shaved by the town barber.

51:20

Ok, so the barber now reads on and the next part the kings edict says umm…"all those and only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber." Now there's 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, we interpret that to mean that number 4 of our set goes out to zero. Yes, yes that's right number 4. The king is simply being repetitive. The ahh…that 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 your doing a logical analysis it's not atall unusual to find the persons utterances that the people say are highly repetitive. That's ok it…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."

52:43

Now this proposition, "Only those who don't shave themselves will be shaved by the town barber." Means the same as saying…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

53:11

Now then…up to …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, "Yea, 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.

53:56

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

54:19

Now let's take a pause here for a moment and uhh…understand exactly what the… what this unfortunate barber's problem is. Or…umm…another way to look at it, what his problem isn't. He doesn't have any problem shaving himself. That is…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… we can… we can reduce that to zero. That umm…that …that…we can wipe that one out. That's not his problem. That…that…that one goes out.

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

55:00

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 prevents from shav…the edict only prevents him from shaving himself because he's the town barber. You see that? So his problem is that he's the town barber. So you understand that he has no problem shaving himself. The… the… his difficulties on…on… on identity. It's an identity problem. So it's this…this…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?

55:49

He'd be alright you see 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.

56:05

So as he stands there looking at the notice board his mind will go from must be shaved from the town barber but I can't be shaved by the town barber. Which is…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?

56:46

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

57:15

Now if you can follow that, you've got it. So our set now reduces to…umm… the first four classes are zero, there all zero classes and class 6 we've agreed that is a zero class and ahhh…the 5th class is…is…is "1". He…he…his existence class. He is now in the insanity class of both "must shave himself" and "mustn't shave himself" simultaneously.

57:46

Now, factually, this…this…this may save his…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, save his life.

 So it may or may not solve his problem, but never the less that's what's going to happen to him. He's going to go insane.

58:14

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.

58:43

Of course, he would have no problem at all if he hadn't been fixed in the identity of the town barber. Let us assume that he'd umm…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 gam…of the barber…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 was ummm…ahh…

59:19

He would have simply read the edict and said, "Ok, umm…I'll… What will happen is," he said, "While I'm ahh…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…the other men in the town, I'll be the town barber." So he goes back to ….. End of problem. Get that?

59:43

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 of ahh…put his identity back on umm…of the town barber, ready…all ready to receive the next customer.

1:00:23

Now I can assure you that ahh…you now, if you'd been following this through carefully and closely you…you now know much more about that logical paradox than the guy who dreamed it up. I can assure you. Because you now know…you now know all about the insanity side of it, which he obviously didn't…he clearly never knew.

So you now …you know him… one hell of a lot about that logical paradox, but we can see how useful that little logical paradox was to us. We…we…we…what it gives us by using it. We can use it to understand the…how a person goes from compulsive games play into insanity.

01:01:05

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. Now that's a…that's a definition.

$X(1-X)=1$, X and not X simultaneously

That is a definite term we call that an insanity class. And there's a… it's also… we call it, 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. So when we try…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.

1:02:20

It's impossible…impossibility point because in this universe it's impossible to…to…to maintain that ahh…maintain that class and retain one's sanity. Quite impossible to hold that class.

It's a point of imposs…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 tis 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 say… when we refute that datum and say "$X(1-X)=1$" that….well…well…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's insane. We're into insanity.

01:03:57

See that? And that's the basis of insanity.

01:04:02

Mocking up Insanity

If you was to say to yourself…if you was to…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 go it faster and faster, from one postulate to the other, backwards and forwards. Until you've gon…your holding both postulates simultaneously.

At the point where your holding them both simultaneously you'll start to feel a sort of a glee of insanity. A sort of a spinny feeling in your psyche. Well that's the time to quit. Cause that's when your going. That's when your going into the IP. That's the point your…your going insane. Your going into the insanity.

01:05:02

So if you umm…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 your 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 spinny feeling. There's a sort of glee of irresponsibility attached to it. It's a certain definite emotion that's attached with it…that…that goes with the IP and trying to achieve the IP. It's the emotion of insanity.

01:05:43

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 spinny feeling. A definite feeling as if the…the…the world is spinning around under your feet. And you feel as if you might take off into space at any moment. Definite spinny feeling.

1:06:21

Though you can subjectively create the…the…the emotion, the feeling of insanity, now we 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've given to you can be proven very easily in s…in Boolean algebra.

$$X(1-X)=1, \text{ X is and is not simultaneously}$$

01;07;02

Here we go. We can ahh…we can deduce from "X(1-X)=1" that "X +(1-X)=0."

$$X +(1-X)=0, \text{ neither X exists nor not X exists.}$$

In other words it's a state of…it's a state of affairs where X both exists…X umm…neither X exists nor not X exists. Get it?

$$X + (1-X)=1, \text{ either X exists or not X exist or both exist}$$

"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"

$$X +(1-X)=0, \text{ neither X exists nor not X exists.}$$

01:08:10

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…the…the reason part…the reasonable part of the postulate set is reduced to zero. While the person's in the IP state the reason part of the postulate sets into 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 the

classes …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.

1:09:20

So the person cannot be, if they're in the insanity class, they can't be in one of the sane classes, see, 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…if the barber's in the state of $B(1-B)=1$, the rest of the set… the rest of the works… 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 the first of the interesting deductions.

Eg. $B(1-B)=1$, 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

01:10:22

Now the second of the interesting deductions that if $X(1-X)=1$ then $X=(1-X)$. X becomes equal to one minus X. In terms of our barber once he goes into the IP of $B(1-B)=1$ then being a barber is identical to not being a barber. There is no difference in his mind in being a barber and not being a barber. The two are completely identical with each other. That's the other deduction.

Eg. 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

01:11:07

From the…ahh… from the relationship $X(1-X)=1$

1:11:19

So there's the two…two…two enormously useful deductions from that…in the insanity… in the insanity of the IP from the insanity class. Or the IP as we call it. They're the two valid deductions from the IP. That's it.

01:11:36

When $X(1-X)=1$ then $X=1-X$ …, or more precisely $X=(1-X)$

1:11:59

The existence equals it's absence and that is insane I can assure you. That is insanity.

01:12:07

Fear of Insanity

Now once you start to work with these IP's and so forth, you rapidly start to lose your fear of them. The vast majority of humanity…of humanity are absolutely scared of this subject of insanity. 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 games player… the compulsive games player I should say 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 harder he….the more compulsive the games play he gets into… and the hotter… as the game hots up, the closer and 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 he's walking closer…as the game hots up more and more he's walking closer and closer to the… to the gates of hell, to the gates of insanity. And ahhh…sometimes you…you…you…the…the games player will tell you this.

 It's written up in books, you know, written up in novels and so forth. That nothing works. 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. They're…

1:14:00

But this is the view of the compulsive games player whose…whose…whose caught up in compulsive games play.

How about to the non compulsive games player. Or the person whose completed ahhh…umm…levels one, two, three in TROM…of TROM and is well on his way through level four and five. Or a person whose completed level five. 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.

1:14:35

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 complete…completed the…the…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, and so forth, the whole is a toothless tiger. He no longer dreads insanity. He'll sit there and try and go to China and not got to China simultaneously. He'll play…it's a game. It doesn't mean anything to him. It's just…so much…it's just another interesting game…thing to do. You know, try and go insane. I mean this quite seriously.

1:15:31

The person… Once you understand this material and your…your...your state of case, you've cleared off your first three levels of TROM, and are well on the way, and you understand this material that I'm giving you, 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 your going insane. No uh…it's a …it's a…it's just a toothless tiger. That's the one thing you know that you're not going to do. Get it?

1:16:14

So don't think that ahh…it's a terrible thing that even a person, you know, when they've completed all their TROM they've got to be very, very careful not to go insane. No there's nothing there. There's no charge on it.

Put it this way, that when…by the time you've completed the five levels of TROM you can…you can…you can try your hard….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 going to happen on that meter, except a little tick maybe. Nothing awful is going to happen. You won't even…it'll hardly,,,it will hardly read on the meter. So you're dealing with a toothless tiger I can assure you. There's absolutely nothing there.

01:17:02

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. That's the last monster. I'm giving you the last monster. The last monster in the mind, in the deep recesses of the mind. Is the fear that you will go insane. Well it's a toothless tiger. There's nothing there.

01:17:40

If you do your exercises. If you do levels one, two, three of TROM. Plus and you know this material. Now I couldn't make it any more clear than this, could I.

1:17:56

I couldn't make it any clearer than this.

IP and the Goals Package

Ok, now the umm…the… the example I've given you, the barber in the Barber of Seville is an example which is not umm…is not one of a postulate…it's 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…give you the full data in terms of a goals package.

We'll…we'll… We'll pick up…umm…ahh….a gereral 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…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)

01:18:57

Now I want to give you all the reductions in the set and give you the symbolism as we…as we go so you've got the whole…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.

1:19:15

Now the person first enters into the…into the situation there ahhh…becoming …as a non compulsive games player. Now he does this by making the postulate X is not equal to Y. $X \neq Y$. He makes that postulate. That…that…that postulate…if he doesn't make that postulate he could lose the whole set by complementary postulate because he… at any time he can accidently 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 $X \neq Y$.

1:19:56

Now, let's expand that postulate and see what it looks like: the postulate $X \neq Y$ becomes…becomes…the symbolism $X(1-Y) + Y(1-X) \neq 0$

Now all that means is that at least one of those two classes has got members in it and therefore exists, and while one of those two classes has…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 this…the postulate set in existence, and prevents the whole lot vanishing by the …by accidentally making the postulate that X=Y".

Simply postulate that X is not equal to Y and the…the… from that point onwards the set remains in existence for you and you can then become a non compulsive games player in that set.

1:21:10

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 compulsive in the…in the goals package…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 $X=(1-Y)$.

1:21:46

Now how does that look in term of the ahh…in…in…in terms of our symbolism? Well the set now looks like $X(1-Y) + Y(1-X) = 1$ see the difference? Before it was…those two classes were not equal to zero now there equal to 1.

While those two classes are equal to 1 they're…they're…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 ahh…can't become…can't exist…can't…can have no existence.

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)~~

Course, the only existence classes are the two games classes. So games play is not compulsive. The person has two games classes. He can occupy either one or the other. He's a compulsive game player with the option…with the option of either occupying X(1-Y) or Y(1-X).

1:23:06

Those should …Now that games play continues in the universe until eventually he suffers overwhelm of one of his classes. Let's say the Y class suffers overwhelm and can… in his own mind he considers he can no longer occupy that class. In other words that ahh…he considers now that Y=0.

But as soon as Y…as soon as Y =0 then (1-X) must also be equal to naught because of the…because remember he's made id…this postulate that ahh… X=(1-Y), which is the same as saying that Y =(1-X), so as soon as he loses Y, Y =0, he would also lose (1-X). So Y =0 and (1-X)=0. Both maintain.

1:24:10

So he's now left with this single game class of X(1-Y)=. He's now reduced it down to…down to ahh…single game class postulate set.

1:24:30

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

1:25:02

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?

1:25:10

Well, before we discuss what happens lets briefly just review the position ahm…he's made the postulates X≠Y. he's made the postulate that X=(1-Y). He's made the postulate that Y=0, and he's also got the postulate that (1-X)=0. And he's in a games class of X. that's his games class. Remember that's his last games class is X. and he's got this other postulate there which is bonded to X cause X=(1-Y), he's got this other postulate of (1-Y) cause (1-Y)=(1-X) so he's in this double class of X, (1-Y). X is the game postulate, (1-Y) is the exclusion postulate. Now that's his…that's his position.

1:26:11

Now he's….Now the opponents postulate is inexorably driving him from X into the (1-X). That is to say the opponent is inexorably bonding X to (1-X) and (1-X) to X. In other words the…the…the effect is…the opponent is driving him into the identification X equals (1-X).

You see he can't leave X. that's his…that's his… that's his last haven. That's his last…that's his last…that's his 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 (1-X), as well.

1:26:56

But this identification, X=(1-X), can't take place while he is still holding the identification X=(1-Y). Because if X=(1-X) and X=(1-Y) then (1-X)=(1-Y). and if (1-X)=(1-Y) 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 so 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 X is now free of the (1-Y) and the X bonds to the (1-X) and we have the identification X=(1-X), quite separate and free of the (1-Y) postulate.

1:27:54

Meanwhile the (1-Y) postulate has been under pressure from the opponent to go into Y and for exactly the same reasons the (1-Y), as I've given you a few moments ago, for exactly the same reasons, the (1-Y) postulate breaks it's bonding with X and goes…and snaps in…and snaps into the identification Y, (1-Y)=Y and becomes the other IP in the set.

1:28:27

The set now reduces to X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1. With the player in the IP X(1-X).

1:28:47

Now why is he in there? Because X was his last games postulate. That was his last… that was his last sense of self identity. He was the games player using that X postulate so that's where he sticks and that's where he…that's the IP he ends up in.

1:29:05

Can he move across to the other IP? No he can't do so. He can't move across to the other IP although the…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 the…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.

1:29:31
End of tape.