

Insanity Point Lecture 02
July 3, 1994
By Dennis Stephens
Transcribed by Pete McLaughlin
May 13, 2012

This is the third of July 1994 and uhhh...is the...this is the second tape in the... in the sequence when we are discussing the subject of insanity, IP's etc. This tape is a direct continuation of the ... of it's predecessor and uhhh... should always be accompanied by it's predecessor, for obvious reasons.

We have the ahh...or we have discovered the IP set of $X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1$ and it is umm... necessary at this stage to ahh...to discuss the qualities and nature of this IP set and I hope to be able to answer all possible...considerable questions on this subject of the nature of this IP set in what...what follows.

01:12

The...the first question we must take up is the one that's hanging fire from the last tape and that is the question of whether who is stuck in the ahh... $X(1-X)$ IP can move across to the $Y(1-Y)$ IP, and I said that he cannot do this and we now have to find out why this is so.

1:48

When Ahh...working with IP's in ahh...in logical analysis it's a very useful ruse de guerre(trick of war) to ahh...simply ahh..umm...substitute in place of the little IP ahh...ahh...ahh..another symbol. For example if we, instead of our umm...our IP set that we...our IP set that we got there...if we replace it with the set of $A+B=1$, where A = the IP $X(1-X)$ and $B = Y(1-Y)$ so we...we...were now using a substitution set.

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

3:11

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

3:47

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

4:20

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

4:57

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

And ahh...we immediately...when we look at this class, we immediately see that if that is so then $X=Y$, and $(1-X)=(1-Y)$. but that can't hold, because the person, remember, the per...the games player in his decent down through into compulsive games play has postulated that $X \neq Y$, he has to make this postulate otherwise he'll lose the whole set, if he accidentally postulates that $X=Y$. You see that?

5:51

So his old postulate of $X \neq Y$ is still running so that prevents those two IP's...that class of two IP's...the common class of the two IP's from existing. So that class is equal to zero. And then the set now reduces down to ...to ahhh...well in terms...let's go over the AB set because it's easier to express it now becomes $A(1-B)+B(1-A)=1$. It's the exclusive OR. So the person is either in the A IP...in one of the IP's and not in the other IP, or is in the other IP and not in the first IP.

Now that is a simple double bind. In other words it's a simple double bind. I refer you to the double bind technology. It's an exactly analogous to the example I gave you in the double bind tech of the young man who...who...who couldn't get a job because he was inexperienced. You remember that double bind on an earlier tape? Well this is an exactly similar thing, it's a straight forward double bind and it locks the person in one...in the IP that he's...that he was in when he went into the IP state.

7:26

In our example the person, remember, his last game was X ... his last game postulate was X . So he goes into the $X(1-X)$ IP. And the other IP although is in... is in the still it's not available to

him. It's over that way and he can't get to it because he's locked out by the... by the mechanism of the double bind.

7:50

So that answers that question. If you follow this through you see...see the reasoning behind that.

7:56

Twin IP's...TIPS

Now before we precede any further we...we...we ought to name this baby we have our hands on. We got this baby called ahh... you know, we've got two IP's and we've got...with a plus sign in between them and their equal to 1. Well we ought to name this. Well we...we...we do have a name for it in TROM, we call it a TWIN IP. And the initial is TIP. That is T I P. Twin...it means twin IP's. Twin IP's.

08:30

And its initials is TIP, usually with the S because it's plural their Twin IP's...TIPS.

08:40

So henceforth when I refer to twin IP's what I mean in the general case, the IP's $X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1$ that's what I'm referring to when I'm talking about the twin IP's.

09:01

Four Characteristics of the IP State

Now we're in the fortunate position in TROM of being able to... able to define these IP's...these umm...these... these TIPS. This state of twin IP's. We're...we're able to...we're able to define it, and umm...which umm... which virtually means that we can define the IP state.

It has four... There are four characteristics to the IP state, which do define it. And if a person manifests these four characteristics then he is in the IP state. And if...if he's ahh...if he's in the IP state he will manifest these four characteristics. So it's a definition of the IP state we're...we...I'm going to give you now. And it's something you should know if you want to understand this upper level tech in TROM. You should understand this...these... these characteristics...this definition of the IP state.

10:01

The First Phenomena – Identification

Now the first of the characteristics of the IP is identification. In the IP state a postulate is identified with its negative. A postulate is identified with its negative. Now that is the first of the characteristics.

It's quite self explanatory and it's quite obvious, it comes and you can see it in terms of the symbolism and you can see how it's come apart. So I don't really have to say any more about it...about that at this stage.

10:38

The Second Phenomena – Motionlessness

Now the next characteristic of the IP is motionlessness. Motionlessness. That is lack of motion. Now let's discuss this briefly. Quite clearly if a person is operating upon a postulate and it's negative he's in a state of motionlessness. For example, if a person is both striving to go to China and striving to not go to China he isn't going any place. He is in a state of absolute stillness. He isn't moving. And why is he in a state of stillness? Well the two... postulates there...the two postulates there are simply contradicting each other. One is the exact contradiction of the other. And so they stop each other. They simply stop each other BANG. Right there, BANG. Get it?

11:44

So there's no motion in the...in the IP state. There's no motion. It...it's a state of motionlessness. It's a...it's a stop motion. It's a point of stop motion. There is no motion in the IP state. If you don't believe this you should...you should get the idea of trying to go to China and trying to not go to China simultaneously. And you will quickly realize that while you're holding these two postulates you aren't going anyplace.

12:20

It's not that you can hold those two postulates and ahh...while holding the postulate to go to China and hold the postulate to not go to China you can then go to South Africa. No no...no, no you can't do that. While you holding the postulate to go to China and the postulate to not go to China you can't go to South Africa.

12:41

Why not? Because it contradicts the postulate to go to China. Get it?

So that is the second of the ahh...that is the second of the characteristics of the...of the IP is motionlessness. No motion. Lack..complete lack of motion.

13:05

The Third Phenomena - Timelessness

Now the...the ...the third characteristic of...of the ahh...of the IP is umm...is timelessness...timelessness or if you prefer...ahh...I'll call it...there's another name for it we also call it a time stop. Essentially it's time...it's a state of timelessness. Actually this stems from the motionlessness. But umm...this is the way it works out. That every postulate has a time component to it. Time is required in order to...to ahh...to put a postulate into action. So the being in the universe, when he's playing games with the postulates, he's always creating a little

time, even if he is doing it automatically and unknowingly. He is always endeavoring to create a little time in which to...to...to fulfill his postulates. So he keeps doing this continuously and hence the whole universe jogs along through time. You see that?

14:10

So...so, there's a time component to...to every postulate and as the...without this time component ...without the postulates, I should say, there could be no time component. The time component vanishes. When the postulate vanishes the time component vanishes because the time is ...is...is bound in to the universe. It's a...it's a universe...the time is built into the postulate structure of the universe. Umm...as I said many times this universe only consists of life and postulates, but the postulates need time in order to... in order to ahh...to ahh...to fulfill themselves. So if you're in a state where there's...where there's no postulates then there's no time. It does follow there.

15:13

But we know that the IP state is a state of...of their postulates. Remember that... if $X(1-X)=1$ then X plus $1-X$...sorry $X+(1-X)=0$. Both the X and the $1-X$ are zero. So there's ...there's ...in the IP state there's no postulate and therefore there is no time. There's no time in the IP state. There's a timelessness.

16:01

Actually it's more of a time stop. What happens is that...that the game goes right the way...time jogs along right the way up to the point that the postulates went into IP and they stop at the precise instant. It's a time stop rather than the time...timelessness, but we...we refer to it as timelessness, the IP state. But the onset of the IP state is the time stop. That's where time stops.

16:31

And this is quite well known in the field of psychiatry, that a person will actually go insane at a certain moment in time. And sometimes, umm... they may...they stay...they may stay insane for six months or a year and maybe they get some treatment or maybe for any number of reasons suddenly the person snaps out of it and they look around and say, "where am I?" and they say, "Well you're in this institution." And he says, "Well what date is it?" and he's got a whole year missing out of his life. And ahh...time stopped for him, you see, at the point where the IP... where he went into the IP state a year previously. Now he's come back out the IP state and he's now back into the sanity again.

17:14

This is so common, this is, in psychiatry. It's documented. If you read up books of psychiatry and the treating, and the insane and so forth it's very, very common. So common it's not at all unusual that ahh...this is... that this will happen. And people have memory lapses that they come back out...they go into insanity and there for a period of time they have no memory of the

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

18:11

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

18:20

Now I don't have to remind listeners to this tape ahh... who have studied the subjects of Dianetics and Scientology and being stuck. And they know all about this subject of being stuck on the time track. I would ahh... refer you to the connection between this material that I'm talking about now, the IP's, and the stuck in time and the fact that a person can be stuck on the time track. So I just ahhh... I just point it out at this juncture that there is ahh... that there is a connection between being stuck on the time track and the IP state. You can be stuck on the time track for other reasons than IP's but sure as hell if you went into an IP state you... you'll... you'll be stuck there. That's where... that's where your attention will be stuck. It will stick your attention because there is no time in the IP state.

19:13

If a person went into the IP state and then came out again there will be a little time stop there which would hold his attention at that point in time. We'll discuss this a little more when we...when we're talking about Sensations.

19:26

That umm...At this juncture I'll just remind you that ahh...the phenomena does exist and to relate it, this subject of time...of time stop and timelessness of the IP, to relate it to what you know of...of...of...of being stuck on the time track and the Engram bank. Just relate this...this phenomena.

19:48

The Fourth Phenomena -Mass

Now the...the fourth phenomena that's associated with the IP state, that chara...not associated but characterizes the IP state is the phenomena of mass. M A double S...Mass.

Now I won't go in and talk about this any more because what I'll be discussing it much more fully when we talk about sensations and the anatomy of sensations later on. So at this stage just bear it in mind the fourth characteristic of the IP is mass.

20:23

Those Characteristics are Necessary and Sufficient to Define the IP State.

So there we have the four...four characteristics of the IP. The identification between a postulate and its negative, the subject of motionlessness, timelessness and mass. They are the four characteristics and they do define the IP state. They...they...They are necessary and sufficient to define the IP state. By that...by that I mean that there might be...may be other characteristics, there may be many other characteristics of the IP state but those four are necessary and sufficient to define it.

21:01

Right, now ahh...questions as umm...various questions are going to arise from the last section of the preceding tape. We now have a person in the twin IP's $X(1-X)$ and there's the other IP of $Y(1-Y)$. you've got these twin IP's and the...and these equal to 1, and the person's either in one or the other but there stuck in the X one, the X IP. And the immediate question comes to mind that a person's going to say, "Well wait a minute Dennis. Hold your horses. Didn't you say that $Y=0$. Isn't that a part of the compulsive games play that the person went into when he reduced his...his...his...his umm...his...his...his goals package...his postulate set down to a one game class he postulated that $Y=0$ and he postulated that $1-X=0$. And now you've got these appearing...re...you've got X reappear...you've got Y reappearing in one IP and we've now got one...and $1-X$ reappearing in the other IP. How do you account for that Dennis?"

Well very, very simply. I'll draw your attention to the fact that in the IP state that when $X(1-X)=1$ then $X+(1-X)=0$. So in the IP state all $X, (1-X), Y$ and $(1-Y)$ are all equal to naught. See...so that there's nothing there in terms of reason. You're looking at a different state, you see. You've moved from the state of rationality into a state of irrationality. Get it?

23:15

I know it's peculiar. And you say, "Well if it's...it...if...none of these postulates exist then how come we're...how come we're equating them to 1? Well we're dis...chuckle...by convention we're saying that these exist in the insanity state. You see that?"

We're having to ...time to utilize our logic, you see. Otherwise we can't use the logic. But you must bear in mind that in the IP state...all the postulates in the IP state are equal to zero. It's a direct deduction from the fact that it's in an IP state. The IP state is impossible in terms of reason, you see? It's quite impossible. Therefore the postulate doesn't exist. Chuckle. Obviously. So that answers that question of how come the ahh...the...the person can be in a ...ahh...the IP $X(1-X)$ when he's already post...previously postulated that $1-X=0$. But when he goes into that IP he postulates $X=0$, too. The whole lot goes, when he goes into the IP. So that ahh...that answers that query.

24:39

Now a few brief words on the social aspects of what we're...of what we're talking about here. Umm...When a, so called, sane person meets an insane person the first response the sane person has is to believe that the insane person is...is playing a game, he's putting it on. And he's...he's inclined to sort of slap him on the back and say, "Ok, that's very, very good...ahh...that's a good game. Ok now snap out of it and talk to me." It takes him some little while to grasp the insane person is not...he's not putting it on. It's not an act. He actually does think the way he...he is the way he is and it's not a sham...it's not a front. It's not something he is putting on consciously and can put on and take off at will. He's stuck in it. And his logic...strange logic of the insane is something he...the insane person is stuck with.

And once the sane person...or the so called sane person..the...the umm...the so called sane person realizes this he's abhorrent of insanity. He...he ...he pulls away from it as if it's the plague. And umm...it's no...it's no... it's no exaggeration to say that a study...to study insanity...the study of insanity is the most difficult of all studies that a person can undertake. Umm...it...ahh...working with the insane burns out more psychiatrists than any other field of medical practice. The burn out rate amongst them is absolutely incredible amongst the people who work with the insane. It's a very, very trying occupation for a sane person to...to...to try and understand insanity. And ahh... this is largely because of the ignorance of the state...largely because of ignorance of the state.

27:02

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

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

28:10

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

28:51

The...rational mind simply ab...ab... abhors the IP state. It abhors insanity. It's the complete antithesis of rationality. You see?

The rational mind works on the prop...on the proposition that $X(1-X)=0$ and the insane person is working on the proposition that $X(1-X)=1$. And it's a complete contradiction. You couldn't be more contrary to the...to the rational mind. It's the complete antithesis to the rational mind. And the rational mind abhors it and shuns away from it. So I won't be surprised if anyone hearing this tape thinks that I've lost my marbles. That Dennis Stephens has got... finally gone mad with his TROM.

That would be...that would be one extreme reaction to listening to this mat...listening to these tapes and the other...the most moderate reaction would be that a person would have incredible difficulty understanding what the hell I'm talking about. Even those who are familiar with logical analysis, you know. Familiar with Boolean algebra and don't have any problem with the symbolism. Unless their well advanced in TROM...well advanced through the levels...their going to have some difficulty grasping this material, simply because the mind abhors the subject of insanity.

30:29

But this is so...umm...you've only got to look at history...the history of the way we treat the insane. All down history the umm...the minority class of humanity that has been treated the worst in the... during the whole of history has always been the insane. No minority group has been treated like we've treated the insane.

Even in this century we've been hacking their... hacking their brains out with ice picks and... and ahh subjecting them to violent electric shocks all under the name of helping them. I mean how on earth you expect to help a person when you're subjecting them t violent electric shocks and hacking bits of their brains out. Gives you some idea of ahh..of...of the abhorrence of the rational mind has of insanity and the fact that the...that ...it's simply...that the state is simply not understood. You...you...you think of the worst things that it's possible for a group of people to do to a minority. You...you...whatever you think...you think...the very worst that a majority group could do to a minority group then you... pick up a history book and read back through history and you'll find that somewhere, sometime a majority group have done this to the insane. No exceptions. They've done it. It's there on the track. All the horrors have been done to the insane. No minority group has been so badly treated by mankind as...as is insane brothers and sisters.

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

Well I can assure you that Dennis isn't wrong. What I'm giving you is correct. It is correct. As I said right at the beginning of this material that I...I...I discovered this stuff some years ago, and I put it on the back burner. Even I suspected...I thought well I'll...I'll...I just want to be absolutely certain of this before I mention it to anyone but as more and more data piled up it became more and more obvious that this is exactly right...this is exactly the way it is. And all I've done over the years is perfect the technology.

33:12

A few years ago I couldn't have presented it in such a...ahh...a coherent form as I can present it now. I've rounded it off in the few years. But essentially it hasn't changed, it's still the... it's still the IP tech., it's still the IP technology, the upper tech of TROM.

33:38

The subject of the IP is the subject of insanity and ...and ahh...also and un...a virtual...finally an understanding of this subject of sensation.

In order to... help people to understand the IP state I will give you another postulate configuration. Ahh...another way of looking at one...not...another postulate configuration but another way of looking umm... at the...at the subject of ahh... of insanity, and another way of looking at compulsive games play, as a more diagrammatic representation, which may make more sense, may help more people to...to grasp what I'm getting at.

34:17

Now first of all, umm...I'd like to give the diagrammatic representation of the compulsive games state. Now this is a state where we have...we're still discussing the XY set, and the postulates that are holding are $X \neq Y$ and $X = 1 - Y$ or more precisely in terms of our symbolism $X = (1 - Y)$. Now that is the compulsive game state, compulsive game.

35:00

Now we can represent this as a...as a matrix, a diagrammatic. There is a way of doing it diagrammatically which may be of assistance to you instead of seeing it in terms of the logical symbols. Some people's minds do better with diagrams than they do with symbols. It's the difference between the geometer and the algebra...algebraist. The algebraist works best with symbols and the geometer works best with pictorial representations.

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

X		Y
1-Y		1-X

36:22

And there we've got...we've got our square with four corners and there's a symbol in each corner.

Then between the top left hand corner symbol, the X, and the bottom left hand corner symbol we put the sign...bottom left hand corner which is a 1-Y we put an equal sign so we have $X=1-Y$.

Then between the bottom left hand corner symbol 1-Y and the bottom right hand corner symbol of 1-X we put a not equal sign.

Then between the bottom right hand corner symbol of 1-X and the top right hand corner symbol of Y we put and = sign. And between the top right hand corner symbol of Y and the top left hand corner symbol of X we put a not equal sign.

X	\neq	Y
=		=
1-Y	\neq	1-X

Compulsive Games State

37:47

Now if you look at that and examine it you'll see that it's virtually saying that X is not equal to ...X is not equal to Y, 1-X is not equal to 1-Y, Y is equal to not X and X is equal to not Y and that defines the...that defines the ahh...the compulsive games state. So that...there's that one. When you've got that written down put that to one side. That's the diagrammatic representation of the compulsive games state.

38:20

I'll now give you the diagrammatic representation of the IP state. Again we have our square. Put up your square and in the top left hand corner we have an X symbol, in the bottom left hand corner this time we have a 1-X symbol and in the top right hand corner we have a Y symbol and in the bottom right hand corner we have a 1-Y symbol.

X		Y
1-X	\neq	1-Y

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

X	\neq	Y
=		=
1-X	\neq	1-Y

IP State

We have X is equal to 1-X and Y is equal to 1-Y and X is not equal to Y and not X is not equal to not Y. Now that is our IP state.

40:01

Now when you examine those two...you examine those two...two squares carefully and you'll notice that all that's happened, the only difference between the two is that the bonding has changed. The X has changed its bonding. Instead of being bonded to 1-Y, X is now bonded to 1-X and Y instead of being bonded to 1-X is now bonded 1-Y. It's a change in the bondings or the identifications, more strictly speaking...the correct word I should used would have been identifications.

This is a double bondings. But the...the ...the double bondings have changed. And that the only difference between those two squares. Now if you can understand that and grasp that you can see the... immediately and get the very essence of the basic difference between compulsive games play and insanity. There's just that simple change of bonding. If you can grasp it, it will go click in your mind and you've got it. You'll see it instantly and all the mystery about insanity will vanish out of your mind. You'll see it clearly. Blazing. You'll see it. Got it. There it is, you understand it. Just a simple flip of bonding from the compulsive games state to the IP state.

41:30

And that's what happens to the unfortunate compulsive games player, his bonding flips. And he flips into the insanity bonding. Then he's gone. He's gone into insanity

41:44

Just to round off and complete your diagrams under the diagram for the compulsive games state we'll write the symbolism for it, which is $X(1-Y)+Y(1-X)=1$, with $X \neq Y$ and $X=1-Y$.

X	≠	Y
=		=
1-Y	≠	1-X

Compulsive Games State

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

With $X \neq Y$ and $X=1-Y$

Alright now under the diagrammatic representation the square for the IP state you can write...write... we'll write in the symbolism for that which is $X(1-X)+Y(1-Y)=1$ with $X \neq Y$ and $X=1-X$ and $Y=1-Y$ and lest...lest you forget it...lest you forget it $X(1-X)=1-Y(1-Y)$. That final identification is just to remind you that there is a double bind there.

Note: the formula for the double bind is $X(1-X)=Y(1-Y)$ which reads the insanity point for X equals the insanity point for Y. Dennis misstated the formula above.

43:29

The Loop

Now on a previous supplementary lecture I introduced the subject of the Loop. And ahh...this is a very, very useful piece of information in this context of sanity and insanity because it gives us the clearest difference between the subject of insanity and the subject of sanity. In other word if you...we can express sanity in terms of the loop and we can express insanity in terms of a loop. And once you put them side by side and compare them you immediately see the difference between sanity and insanity.

44:20

Now let's give you first the...the sym...what we shall call the sanity loop. Now there's three parts to the loop, like any loop, and the first part is the postulate and the postulate that goes with sanity is the postulate that a thing is itself. **A thing is itself**. And that is expressed by $X=X$.

Now another way to express that postulate is to say that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously, and that is expressed by $X(1-X)=0$. Now another way to express that is to say that a thing either exists or it doesn't exist. And that is expressed by $X+(1-X)=1$.

All three of...all that we know...all three of those elements are identical to each other and are simply various methods of saying the same thing. If you were...if you were to think about this very, very carefully and very closely and ponder it and look at those three very, very carefully it would...it would begin to occur to you that they are exactly what they say they are, that they are different methods of saying exactly the same thing

46:00

Now that...so much for the sanity loop. Now let's have a look at the insanity loop. First of all the postulate, now the postulate in the insanity loop is **a thing is its absence**. And this is expressed by $X=(1-X)$. Another way to say this is to say that a thing both exists and doesn't exist simultaneously, and that is expressed by $X(1-X)=1$.

Now another way to say this is to say that neither a thing nor its absence exists, and this is expressed by $X+(1-X)=0$.

Now just as in the...the sanity loop, all the elements in the insanity loop are identical to each other but there is one difference here, there's one difference between the two loops, in this respect, the sanity loop, not only are all the elements in the loop identical to each other but all the elements in the sanity loop are true in this universe.

Now, in the insanity loop all the elements in the loop are identical to each other but each of them are false in this universe.

47:56

The...the...the sanity loop is the very essence of reason in this universe. The insanity loop is the very essence of unreason or insanity in this universe.

Now the rationale behind that last statement is a very simple one that the...that the sanity loop, the element $X(1-X)=0$ is a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is constructed, therefore that element is true in this universe, therefore the other two elements in the sanity loop are also true in this universe because their identical to the first element, and the identification is a true identification.

The insanity loop on the other hand, every element of this insanity loop is a complete contradiction of its partner in the sanity loop and therefore it's false in this universe.

Even though, even though...even though the identification...internal identification between the elements of the insanity loop is a true identification.

49:29

Now, as I said earlier, if you... if you duplicate exactly what I've just said on this subject on the difference between sanity and insanity you will have the clearest possible understanding of the difference between these two subjects in this universe.

Now, sooner or later, somebody's going to raise this question and say, "Well, how can you be sure Dennis that the umm...that the insanity postulate is $X=1-X$ and that the insanity postulate is not $X \neq X$?"

The answer to that question is very, very simple. The insanity...the insanity state depends upon the postulates of $X=1-X$. they have to both be of the same intensity for the state to occur. And that can only happen when $X=1-X$. if...if we simply say that $X \neq X$ that isn't sufficient to give us that identification. The identification may be there but it's not implied. But once we say $X=1-X$ we're definitely saying the intensity of X is identical to the intensity of $1-X$, and that is necessary the insanity state. The insanity state does not occur unless those two...unless a postulate and its absence or a postulate and its negative are both of exactly...both being held with exactly the same intensity.

51:29

Now...Now once that follows...once that follows...once you have $X=1-X$ then the rest of the loop follows. Everything else in the loop follows. You get that?

51:41

So, if then briefly the postulate $X \neq X$ it isn't... simply is insufficient to... to... to establish the insanity state in this universe.

What it establishes I don't know, but it certainly doesn't establish the insanity state in this universe. It's simply not... not a strong enough postulate to establish it.

There is... there is... there is definitely an identification in this state, in the insanity state. The insanity state like the compulsive games state is a compulsive state. There is... there is identification in the state. So it requires... to be based upon a postulate which has an identification in it, and the postulate $X \neq X$ contains no identification. So from that... that viewpoint... there's an... another angle from which you can understand it, that X ... that the postulate $X \neq$ to... the postulate $X \neq X$ is insufficient for our purposes here, because the insanity state like the... like the compulsive games condition which precedes it in... in... in life, and from which it is derived, that the insanity condition is itself a compulsive condition and contains identifications all of which happen to be false.

53:16

Now I... I think we've picked our way through the mine field very, very... very, very carefully and very, very precisely. I've replayed this material... listened to it and we've picked our way through the mine field. From this point onward it gets easier. If you've followed it up to this point then you're over the hump. If you can understand it up to this point you've got an... you've got the subject of insanity understood. And the whole subject of the IP and Twin IP's and so forth is within your grasp. And the rest of this material is easy. We're over the hump in other words

53:55

Now it's necessary from this point to... or at this point to ahh... to be very clear what we mean when we talk about insanity in relationship to... to a person in therapy.

Umm we've... we've got to now talk about some aspects of human case conditions. Ahh... there is such a thing as a brain damaged person. Now this ahh... this is a medical fact that people can develop brain damage which can affect their behavior. A person... some people can be born brain damaged and their behavior will be affected by this brain damage for the... for the remainder of their life. There is such a thing as a brain damaged person. Now some types of brain damage produce in the individual manifestations and characteristics which appear to be identical to insanity. And for all we know the individual, the... the... the spirit manifesting umm... there, may also be insane. You see?

55:24

We... [Chuckle]... you see we've got the spirit and we've got the body. We can have ahh... we can have a rational spirit trying to function through a brain damaged body and therefore giving the manifestation of being insane. Get it?

Or we can have an insane spirit manifesting through ahh...an undamaged...ahh...brain and giving all the manifestations of insanity. But we can also have this state of affairs that...it will be very, very rare indeed of an insane spiritual being manifesting through a brain damaged body, and again manifesting insanity.

Now all these three possibilities can occur. Get it? Or there's the fourth possibility of a rational spiritual being operating through an un-braindamaged body. That would be the fourth possibility, and that includes....that completes the whole set now. That would cover all the possibilities.

56:32

Now it must be clearly understood that when I'm talking about this subject of insanity this is only...I'm only talking about the spiritual being and his postulates. I'm not talking about brain damage.

This is...brain damage is a medical phenomena. If you wish to know about brain damage you should go and consult a doctor and consult the medical textbooks, consult the literature on this subject which is quite extensive. Medicine knows one hell of a lot about the symptoms of brain damage. We know an awful lot about it. But umm...I give you this ahh...I give you this advisedly don't make the mistake of assuming that a brain damaged person is insane just because they manifest very peculiar behavior. They may have...the spirit the human spirit behind it may be insane or may not be insane. And you cannot prove that, his state of sanity or insanity, if he happens to possess a damaged brain. You simply won't be able to determine it by his behavior if he det...if he possesses a damaged brain. Now do you understand that?

57:47

On the other hand our mental hospitals are full of individuals, who, to use the vernacular, are as nutty as a fruit cake and there is nothing wrong with their brains at all.

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

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

58:43

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

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

So you see that this subject of brain damage it...it muddies the water up, doesn't it? It muddies the water considerably. Umm...if you want to deal with the insane, the first thing you better find out, if you want to deal with a person that superficially gives the manifestations of insanity, you better go and have them thoroughly examined by a medical doctor, and put them through all the tests known to medicine, x-rays their brain and so forth, the whole works to find out if they are suffering any brain damage.

59:40

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

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

The therapy will certainly improve the person but we don't even know that we're dealing with an insane spiritual being, we may simply....there may be...maybe the case that ahh...we've got a rational sane spiritual being trying to operate through a brain damaged body in which case our techniques we're running are inappropriate. You follow me?

1:00:56

Bear in mind the four classes that I gave you. You've got a sane being operating an un-brain damaged body, you've got a sane being operating a brain damaged body, or you've got an insane being operating a non-brain damaged body, or it can be an insane being operating a brain damaged body. Now did you get the four classes?

1:01:28

You see a person that's manifesting insanity well the only thing you know for sure when you see and insane person, a person manifesting insane behavior, is that this person isn't...isn't the class...isn't the class of beings that is a rational being occupying a non brain damaged body. He can't be that class, but he may be one of the other of the three classes. You don't know.

You have to subject this person to medical tests to find out if their brain damaged, and if it turns out they have no brain damage then we...we know then for sure that the insanity must be to do with the human spirit and our technology, our...our therapy techniques for handling insanity will...will...will then 100 percent certain that we'll going to win. But we don't have this guarantee in any other circumstances.

If this person is brain damaged our therapy may or may not help the person. It probably will help him but we have no guarantee. Simply because we don't know what the state of the...well we just don't know, we don't know about this variable called brain damage. You see?

1:02:51

CCH's

Now what are the techniques that...to best help the insane person. What are the techniques we use? Well they are, I gave this in the write up, they are the CCH's. CCH 1 to 4.

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

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

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

1:04:52

Now... Now this tells you that from a common sense point of view, that umm...if you've got some... some... some patient...some preclear there that's manifesting a high degree of irrationality, of insanity and has done so for some years that your... and you want to take this person on in therapy well for god's sake get this person tested for brain damage before you do anything. Just don't...just find out what you're dealing with. If the tests say the person is brain damaged well know then where you stand. If the tests turn out that the person is not brain damaged well, ok that gives you some confidence that your CCH's, and so forth, are going to... going to eventually get the person up to a point where they can pass level 1 of TROM. Then they will be able to run solo. You get it?

1:05:54

But if a person is brain damaged you don't have this assurance. I don't know, I don't know what's going to happen. You run CCH's on a brain damaged person. I don't know. Got no...I've got no data on it. Don't think they've got any data down at the Church of Scientology either.

My...My best guess is that it would...that the techniques would benefit a brain damaged person, but the certainly...I'd be very surprised if it did anything to cure their brain damage. These tech...If the CCH's cured their brain damage, I'd be very surprised to hear that. But never the less it would no doubt benefit...benefit the person. It certainly wouldn't harm them. Benefit the person.

1:06:41

But don't expect a brain damaged person to ever, this is the point really, this is the bottom line, don't really expect the brain damaged person to ever be able to, to get onto...to TROM solo. You know? Just don't expect it. Don't expect it.

1:06:59

You may be able to help them with the CCH's but I ahh...but it's doubtful if they would ever pass the test, pass the level 1 test to be able to get onto level 2 solo. They might, but uhh... I think you could consider yourself very, very lucky if they did or their brain damage would be very, very minor.

1:07:28

But as I say, if you're dealing with a brain damaged preclear your own mate. You're on your own. I...it's not my specialty. I can only advise you, but...but I must tell you I'm not an expert in that field. But I am an expert in the field of the human spirits who are operating bodies which aren't brain damaged, I do know a lot about those. I can help you in that area, but I can't help you in the area of brain damaged human beings. You should go and consult...you should go and consult with medical specialists on that subject, they can tell you much more than I can.

1:08:03

Well, Why is it, then that these ...if the CCH's...let us consider a person that is ahh...we have ahh...an insane spirit or a person who needs the CCH's running say. Let's...Let's just say we have a person who can't pass the test at level 1, either because the human spirit is insane, but this person has no brain damage, let's take that case, that's and area we can...can talk about. What is it about these CCH's that would break insanity in the...in the insane spirit and return the spirit back to a rational state. What is it about these CCH's

1:08:45

Well the CCH's are saying to the person come to present time, come into the present time "Now" universe. Come into now, and come into now, it keeps saying, come to present time, come to present time. It's quite safe here. It's quite safe to come into present time. Come into present time. And the person eventually gets pulled in, pulled in, they realize that this universe is safe to be in. and once they come into contact with this universe again, they come into contact with the basic law of this universe. And once they come back into contact with the basic law of this universe they come back into contact with the rational loop again. And there....they snap out of the insanity and snap back into the sanity condition.

1:09:36

Now it's as simple as that. It's simply.... You've got to say to them come to present time, come to present time.

I mean...Ron Hubbard knew this all the many years before he developed the CCH's. He...Ron used to talk about this in early lectures in Scientology. I've heard him say this many, many times. He was right, too.

He said that you could walk through an insane asylum, he said, and just say to all the patients, go to every patient one by one and say, "Come to present time." Just snap your fingers in front of their faces to attract their attention and say, "Come to present time." He said. And some tiny, some small percentage of those people will immediately regain their sanity, and walk out... walk out of the asylum, absolutely sane.

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

1:11:08

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

That's why the CCH's work when they work. You...look there is nothing magical about those CCH processes they're just a systematic and precise way of saying come to present time. Come to present time, come to present time. Quite safe here, quite safe to go back into agreement with this physical universe.

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

1:12:29

Now finally on this subject of insanity what sort of condition would we expect the person's case to be in when an insane person becomes sane in therapy by the use of the CCH's? What sort of case condition? Where would we expect to find them?

Well we're...Well we would expect to find them as a compulsive games player. You see the cycle goes, that the person goes from compulsive games play into insanity, which is itself a compulsive condition.

So we give...we give them therapy, run the CCH's on them and we snap them back into sanity again. Well where are they going to be? Well their going to pick up life where it left off. Their

going to pick at the point where they went insane, but this...so in other words their going to be a compulsive games player. So that's where you would expect to find them. You would expect to find the person as a compulsive games player. So bear that in mind, it's a useful little thing to bear in mind that when the insane regain their insanity they go into compulsive games play.

1:13:49

So, and as we know the compuls...the compulsive... the compulsive games player is at risk of going insane. You better not leave the person. You know you run the CCH's on this guy and you've got him sane, and you've got him up to compulsive games play, and you... so you say, "Oh, ahh...well I can now quit.". No you can't because while he's a compulsive games player he's at risk of going insane. He'll be back in the soup again, in six months, a year or five years. He will... He'll go back into the soup again, back in... He'll be back into the insanity state if you leave him as a compulsive games player.

You gotta go further than that. He's gotta be a non compulsive games player. You gotta get him out of that. Take him out the risk area, take him out the area of risk of compulsive games play. Take him up to a point where he is no longer at risk. In other words he's gotta complete the first three levels of TROM. You've gotta proof him against insanity. Then you... Then it's safe for him t quit. He can quit at the top of level three of TROM. It's safe for anyone to quit therapy there, quite safe. They can quit at that point, because they're a non compulsive games player, and they're not going to go insane at this point.

1:15:10

So don't ...d ..d..don't leave...don't turn a person sane in therapy and then leave him as a compulsive games player. That is a definite flunk. It just simply isn't fair to the person. You fished him out the soup. You've left him standing on this rock and then you go away and abandon him. Well he's going to slide off the rock and back into the soup again isn't he, you know. He's going to fall off the rock back into the sea.

You gotta fish him right out onto dry land and dust him off and dry him off and get him all squared around so that he's...he's no longer in any danger of falling back into that ocean again called insanity. That means turning him into a non compulsive games player. And that means running the first three levels of TROM on him solo. He's gotta run them solo. He'll pick up levels two and three solo. Finish the job solo. Then he's proofed.

1:16:06

Separate Therapist

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

1:16:33

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

1:18:02

So every...everyone who completes level five, long before they complete level five of TROM will have an understanding of the anatomy of insanity. It's one of those things that falls out the hamper. Peculiar, but there it is, it falls out the hamper and will fall out every time on route to the completion of level five.

All I've really done is to take the cognitions that I had in that area there and formalize them and done a logical analysis of and put it together in a form that is understandable and related it to the subject of reason and unreason and put the whole thing together in a logical construct. Something which would be useful to scientists and mathematicians and so forth, anyone who wants to do further investigation in this field. It's a valid, valid reference point.

1:19:00

So, although a person listens to this material on the subject of insanity might take it all with a grain of salt and say, "well yes Dennis may be right...and so forth" I think you'll discover that when you get...before...long before you get to the top of level five you'll be nodding in great agreement with me, saying, "Yes what Dennis said was right on this subject. He knew about insanity and I'm finding it too. That what he...the things he said are quite right and ahh...and so on."

In other words everyone before they get to the top of level five will have a familiarity will have various cognitions on what sanity is and what insanity is. And they will... will... will understand that when I talk about IP's I'm talking about insanity. I understand insanity in... not necessarily in the exactly in the form I got it, I've given it in the heavy stress on the logic of it but they will certainly... will certainly know it's basics, they would discover that long before they...long before they got to the top of level five

Ok well that's all I want to say on the subject of insanity. I see I'm coming up to the end of this tape now and ahh...we will... we will wind up this tape now and ahh...the next tape will be on the subject of sensations. It's a continuation of this subject but for convenience I will put it on a separate tape. It might be best to put it on a separate tape.

End of tape
1:20:37