TROM Level Two: Finding Differences and Similarities Between "Then and Now"
Definitions: Difference, Similarity
by
Dennis Stephens

Now I'd like to give you some more information on the subject of Level 2 of TROM. Now Level 2 is the level, which is devoted to finding differences and similarities between "then and now" and I'd like to give you some more information on the subject of differences and similarities in order that it may be of assistance to you when running Level 2.

When we look up the word "difference" in the dictionary we find that the dictionary defines a "difference" as a "non identity", in other words the dictionary is saying that if two things are different then they aren't identical. Now this definition of a "difference" in terms of a non-identity isn't very useful to us for the following reason – it's well known in science that to define one thing in terms of the absence of another – it never leads us to a useful definition – all good definitions of things are when we define a thing in terms of something else – when we define a thing in terms of the absence of something else the definition is hardly useful to us at all. The reason for this, there is an excellent logical reason for this that when we say that two things are different when they are not identical then we are faced with defining "non-identity" in logic. Well we can define "non-identity" in logic, it is not a difficult thing to define but unfortunately it doesn't lead us to equations which we can easily manipulate, it leads us to what we call in logic "in-equations", what's called an "in-equation", we end up with something which is not equal to nought, something which is not equal to zero and such equations are very, very difficult to manipulate, very difficult to manipulate in logic and aren't particularly useful at all. So if at all possible in science we always try and define something in terms of the existence of something else and if only because such a definition is useful, can be useful to us.

Now my feeling on the subject, I have a gut feeling on this subject of defining a "difference" as a "lack of identity", in other words to say that two things are different if they aren't identical. I have a feeling here that this definition has been wrong down the time track in the western world for some few hundreds of years and I think it probably started back in the middle ages sometime, maybe 16, 17 hundred, something like that, when somebody said well we ought to be able to define a difference and they looked across and said "What do think Bill?" and Bill thought about it for a moment and said "Well, if two things are different they aren't identical and that's a good definition of difference isn't it" and the other person said "Yes, right, we'll put that into the dictionary" and it's been in there ever since – nobody's queried it, nobody's really thought about it much, it's been reprinted from edition to edition of the dictionary and it looks alright, the only thing is that it is just about useless from a scientific point of view as a definition. It's just about useless. You can't… You simply can't use it as a definition.

Now this situation prompted me… this situation prompted me recently to look into the subject of "differences" and look into it on the track and the universe in general and I quickly realised that there is more to this subject of differences than meets the gaze. There is a very early… There is a very early game on the subject of "differences" in this universe, which pops up as soon as you start to look at it you know. And this is the way it works – you have got these two spiritual beings very early on in the universe you see and one of them's got these two mock ups, ones called, shall we say, is called "A" and the other one's called "B" and he's saying to the other person, now what you a… you know they are talking about these two mock-ups, you see, and the person says, the owner of the mock-up says, "they are quite different of course aren't they" and the other being… the other spiritual being says "Well, I don't see as how they are different" and the first person says "Well, they are obviously different" and the other guy says "Well, I don't see as how they are different at all". Now what the first person, the owner of the mock-ups, doesn't realise is that the other guy is playing games with him, the other guy can quite clearly see the difference between the two mock-ups but in order to play a game he is saying that they are not different. In other words, he is saying to the owner of the mock-ups, he is saying "prove it, prove that they are different" and the other guy has to go away and think about this, he thinks "Well how can I convince this

other person that these two mock-ups of mine are actually different from each other" so he gives this some thought and then he finally realises how he could solve this problem. So he a… So having solved the problem he goes up to the other guy and says "right, these two mock-ups of mine here, you can see how they are different" and the guy says "no, no, he says, I can't see as how they are different" he says "well, there's mock-up "A", and here's mock-up "B" - you'll notice that mock-up "A" possesses this quality "X" and the other guy nods and says "yes, I do see that". He says "Well, now this mock-up "B" over here does not possess this quality "X" right?" Now the guy admits it, he says "Yes, that is quite true that mock-up "B" over here does not possess this quality "X". "So therefore", says the owner of the mock-ups, "the two mock-ups are different". The other guy thinks about it for a moment and reluctantly has to admit that "Yes, you are right, they are different – if "A" possesses this quality "X" and "B" does not possess this quality "X" then "A" is different from "B".

Now there is the …, there is the proof, there is the proof and there is the "game" of "differences" in the universe. The game is simply that in order to establish that "A" is different from "B" one has to establish that "A" possesses some quality, call it "X", and "B" does not posses this quality "X" and having established that one has now established that "A" is different from "B" and by establishing that "A" is different from "B" I mean one has proved it, one has proved it against all comers. Now if you think about this for a moment you see that this is a very excellent definition of a difference, that this guy early on in the universe has actually defined a difference, he defined it in order to have to prove it he defined it and we can define a difference in that way and it is a perfectly workable definition. We simply say that "A" is different from "B" if "A" possesses a quality "X" and "B" does not possess this quality "X". And, by reverse if "A" possesses this quality "X" and "B" does not possess this quality "X" then "A" is different from "B", see, it's a beautiful definition and note that it's a definition in terms of "existences" and is not a definition in terms "absences".

Well now it would be very useful if we could reduce this state of affairs to some logical propositions and develop some equations on the subject wouldn't it. We would then have a very, very workable definition of "difference" in the universe and would be able to compare this definition with what it says in the dictionary. So let's go ahead and do this.

Now when we say that "A" possesses this quality "X" we only mean that the proposition if "A then X", that's all we mean when we say that "A" possesses a quality "X", we only mean that the relationship if "A then X" holds and when we say that "B" does not possess a quality "X" then all we mean is that the relationship if 'A' … sorry…the relationship if "B" then "not X" holds.

Now it is very, very easy to manipulate these two relationships, reduce them to symbols and so forth and arrive at some equations, which represent this definition, which represent the universe with this definition. Now I won't bother you with just how one would feed this material into the "logical" sausage machine and turn the handle and get the answers out. I can assure you that the answers that you get out are quite valid and the answers come out like this – first of all we have the common class both "A and B". Well that common class is a null class, it doesn't exist, AB is a null class. Then we have the common class of "A and not B". Well every time we see this class of "A and not B" we see this property… this quality "X". Then we get the class of "B" and "not A" and every time we see this class we see the property "not X". Finally when we see the class of neither "A" nor "B" it is indeterminate, we can either see the property "X" or not see the property "X", it is quite indeterminate and that is our universe… that is our universe of our definition.

Now the first thing we would like to know is how does this definition compare to the definition given in the dictionary that two things are different if they are not identical? Well, they are very, very close, actually our definition is just a shade stronger that is all. It is just a shade stronger. The only difference between our definition and the definition given in the dictionary is that we are very definite and very positive that if "A" is different from "B" then this common class of both "A" and "B" does not exist whereas the dictionary definition where it says that if "A" is different from "B" then "A" and "B" are not identical, that definition does allow the common class of "AB" to exist. So that is the only difference between the… that is the only difference between the two definitions, ours is just a little firmer and it certainly includes the dictionary definition but ours is a little bit stronger, just a little bit stronger.

We now have to ask ourselves are we justified in taking this extra step, is it true, is it so? That when… are we justified in saying that if two things are different, if “A” is different from “B” then the common class of “AB” is null and that these two things have no common class. Well common experience tells us that yes, we are, we are quite justified in doing this so therefore our definition is correct and the definition in the dictionary isn't strong enough, it's simply not quite strong enough, it's almost right the dictionary definition but it's not quite strong enough. The two fellows playing the game back at the… early on in the universe, they got it right. By proving the difference he defined it and by using that proof we come up with a workable definition of a difference.

Let's just comment on that a little further. Quite clearly if two things are different, then if “A” is different from “B” then quite clearly every time you see “A” you don't see “B”, you follow that? In other words, they can't have a common class, if “A” is different from “B” then every time you see “A” you don't see “B” and every time you see “B” you don't see “A” because they are different, you see. And that really does define the difference. That is the essential quality of this subject called “differences”, that they have no common class. Now if you know that about differences, if “A” is different from “B” then the common class of “AB” is null then they have no common class, you understand more about differences than the guy who wrote the dictionary because the dictionary definition does not include that, the dictionary definition isn't strong enough to give you that. But our definition of a “difference” is strong enough and what is our definition of a “difference”? Right well here we go, if “A” is different from “B” then “A” possesses a quality “X” and “B” does not possess that quality “X” and vice versa, and that is our definition of a difference. We define it in terms of this quality “X”.

Now as soon as we define our difference in this way immediately things start to… the definition is useful, immediately starts to become useful. Now before going on to talk about the usefulness of this definition I would like now to go on to discuss the definition of a “similarity”. We ought really to run these two parallel together. So we are now going to talk about the subject of “similarities” and then we will tie up the whole subject.

Now when we consult the dictionary on this subject of “similarities” we find that the dictionary says that if “A” is similar to “B” then “A” and “B” are alike. Well when we come to examine this we find that this is so. I have researched this back on the track and this is so and what we really mean when we say that “A” and “B” are similar is that they have something in common and that is the essence of “similarity” that the two things possess something in common. They share some quality… they share a quality or they share a property and that is what we mean when we say that the two things are similar. Now this is exactly in accordance with the dictionary so there is no variance at all in our definition in TROM for a “similarity” as compared to the dictionary. There is no variance at all. We're completely in line with the dictionary definition there.

So what would be our definition? We could give a very, very precise definition of a “similarity” and what would our definition in TROM be of a “similarity”? Well, here we go – if “A” is similar to “B” then both “A” and “B” possess this quality “Y” and vice versa. Now again putting those propositions, reducing them to symbols and pushing them through the logical sausage machine, we end up with a universe that looks like this – that every time we see the common class of both “A” and “B”, we see this quality “Y”. Every time we see the common class of “A and not B” we see this quality “Y”. Every time we see the common class of “B” and not A” we see this quality “Y” and every time we see the common class of neither “A” nor “B” it's indeterminate. We don’t know whether we see the quality…we may see the quality “Y” or we may not see the quality “Y”. That gives us our universe of the “similarity”.

Now as we examine the subject of “Differences and Similarities” in terms of our definitions, we’re struck at once… we see at once that any two objects, any two things in the universe can be both different and similar simultaneously. And further than that one would be hard put in this universe to find two objects that weren't both different and similar. In other words as you examine these two things you would start to see differences between them and you would start to see similarities between them. Only if you had two objects that were completely identical would you see a different set of circumstances. But look you don't find two objects in this universe that are utterly and completely identical because all the objects in this

universe are separated out in space. The mere fact that two objects are occupying different positions in space means that they are different. They are in different positions, we have a quality "X" you see, different location in space. So if two objects are in different locations in space they are different by definition, by our definition of "difference". So we don't find… as Ron Hubbard used to say, and said on many occasions that this universe is stretched, that everything is stretched out - that we don't find two objects in the universe that are actually identical to each other. In this universe the only thing that a thing is identical with is with itself. And that happens to be the truth of the matter in this universe.

So in summary, we now have our definition of a "difference", we have our definition of a "similarity" and we have discovered that all the objects you are likely to come across if you examine them closely enough, all the objects in this universe, if you examine them closely enough you will find that they do possess differences and you will be able to find similarities between them. The final rider that you won't expect to be able to find any two objects in the universe that are identical. If you do find that any are identical just bear in mind that if they are in different positions in space they aren't identical.

Right well now, between the "then" objects and the "now" objects we are saying that these two objects do not possess a common class. Bear in mind that is the essential part of a "difference" - if two things are different their common class is null, they do not have a common class. So we are separating all the time, every time we are doing the command on Level 2, the "Difference" command, we're separating out all the time and we are running all the "similarities" simply to keep the flow balanced out, that's all. If we were to keep going on "differences" all the while the flows would become unbalanced. So we go over to the "similarities" to let a person see that the two things can not only be different but can also have similarities too, to balance the flows, so backwards and forwards we go. But all the time we're separating out "then" from "now" and saying that "now" and "then" have no common class. By saying this, and get this, and this is the essence of it, by saying that, we are breaking the command power of the past over the present. In other words we are just kicking at the reactive bank and the command power of the engrams and the whole idea that the past has a command power over the present. By finding differences and similarities between "then" and "now" objects the person is literally taking over the automaticity of their reactive bank, they are taking over so that they themselves are able now to bring things into the present and take them out of the present, noticing the differences and the similarities there. So they are taking over the complete automaticity of their own bank. And so of course the bank just collapses, because now the person can do consciously, analytically that which their reactive bank used to do. So of course, the reactive bank just fades out of existence. That is Level 2 and that is precisely why it works.

Well I hope this material you will find of assistance and give you an added reality and increase your reality of Level 2 of TROM. Thank you very much.

End of Tape.