THE EXCLUSION POSTULATE

Dennis H. Stephens

Sooner or later on level Five[1] it's necessary to jump in at the deep end, so to speak, on the subject of postulates[2] and the universe. I've already talked about universes, and all universes consist of life plus postulates. That's all they consist of: there's nothing else in any universe but life and postulates. Anything else you consider is in there is purely an illusion, a sleight of hand. There's nothing else in any universe that you could conceive of but life and postulates.

So the physical universe in which we live, in which we share, follows that same rule in that it's a universe and it's based upon a postulate structure. This universe is based upon certain laws. And many of the physical laws of this universe have been discovered by scientists using their measuring equipment and their observations, but these physical laws are deductions from the basic laws of the universe. In other words, the universe is based on laws very much more fundamental than the laws of physics, and you would have to expand the subject of physics considerably to include the subject of life before you could expect to uncover the basic laws upon which this universe is constructed by studying the subject of physics. In other words the subject of physics as we understand it today on this planet is far too limited because it doesn't include the subject of life and because of that limitation it cannot encompass the basic laws from which this universe is constructed.

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

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

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

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

There's no great secret about this law, it's just that it's very deeply hidden if you happen not to know where to look for it. The place to look for it, of course, is among the goals packages and particularly the "to know" goals package, and the goals package configuration there of the basic "to know" goals package. You start working with that and the basic law of this universe is going to drop out the hamper - Bang! It's bound to drop out sooner or later for anyone working on level 5A, which is why I'm mentioning it here. Because it may be a surprise to them; they might come across it and not know what it is. And they might think, "Oh, it's just another postulate." Well, I can assure you that it isn't. That the basic law of this universe, and I'll give it to you now, is the basic law. And it is demonstratedly provable that it is the basic law because it explains so much of the phenomena that occurs in this universe.

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

Once you understand that proposition, you understand an awful lot about universes. You understand that until a postulate is made, everything is possible[3]. Any postulate, no matter what it is, limits the possible. For example, if a person says "Alright, well now the law is that no car will travel at more than 80 kilometers an hour on this stretch of road." That's the law. How does that limit the possible? Well, it limits the speed of the cars on that stretch of road, you see?

Another example: you make a postulate and say, "Well uhh…I'll go to Cairns this weekend." Well, how does that limit the possible? If you go to Cairns you're not going to go anywhere else which is not Cairns, are you? So you limited your options or your possibilities. And no matter what postulate you make, you'll find that any postulate you make will limit the possible.

So the first thing about a postulate is: Any postulate limits the possible. That's its fundamental purpose, to limit the possible.

Now how about this second bit, 'and thereby defines the reasonable'? Now that is really something. The subject of what is reasonable in this universe is a terrible puzzle.

You can go up to almost anyone and say, "Well, you know…" You get them to talk, they talk about things and so forth and people bang the table and say, "Well this is reasonable and that is unreasonable." And they talk about

what is reasonable and what is unreasonable, but if you say to them, "What is reason? And what is unreasonable? And what is reasonable?" they can't define the terms. They'll give you an example of something they consider is reasonable and they'll give you an example of what they consider is unreasonable, but they cannot define reasonableness and unreasonableness or reason itself. They simple cannot define it.

If you were to talk to a physical scientist you get closer to a definition of reason. If you were to talk to a logician you'd get even closer to a definition of reason because logic is the science of reason, but even the logicians don't grasp this fundamental relationship between postulates and reason. At least I think most of them would if you were to give it to them. They'd say, "Oh, yes, I sort of knew it but I didn't know it in those words." But the average person simply doesn't understand the subject of reason. He doesn't understand what is reasonable and what is unreasonable, although he'll give you endless examples of what he considers reasonable and what he considers unreasonable.

So all postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. Now how does a postulate define the reasonable? Well, this is the way it goes: that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with the postulate. It's really as simple as that!

For example, if the postulate is every house in Australia will have a roof on it, in other words if a law says that no house shall be sold without a roof, all houses will have a roof on it, then if you buy a house it's reasonable to expect the house to have a roof on it, because it's consistent with the postulate which that all houses in Australia will have a roof on them. See that? And if you were to buy a house and notice that it hadn't got a roof on it, that would be inconsistent with the postulate that all houses will have a roof on them and so you could say, "Well, this is unreasonable. I shouldn't have expected to buy a house without a roof on it".

So that's the connection between reason and the postulate and there's no other senior definition of reason in this universe. Reason is only that which is consistent with a postulate. That is to say that in the absence of postulates the concept of reason is meaningless. The concept of reason only has meaning in the presence of postulates and that which is reasonable is that which is consistent with a postulate.

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

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

I wouldn't have said it until I'd got myself a few yards deep into level Five and understood about universes and got the basic postulate of this universe out. I wouldn't have answered that I did know what reason was either, I was just like anyone else. I couldn't relate it to postulates. If you can't relate it to postulates you can't relate it to anything, because the subject of reason won't relate to anything else.

Now can we actually get more precise on the definition of reason than to say that reason is that which is consistent with a postulate? Yes, we can. We can go one little step further and we can define reason as a complementary postulate. Reason is a complementary postulate. Now how does that come about? Well, that which is most consistent with a postulate is its complementary postulate, you see? You can't get more consistent with a postulate than the complement to that postulate. So the complementary postulate must be the very essence of reason regarding a postulate.

In other words the most reasonable thing... a person wants to "be known" say, he's operating on the "to be known" postulate, the most reasonable thing you can do regarding that person is "to know" him. You see that? That's the most reasonable thing because that is the absolute essence of the totality of the consistency. That is as consistent as you can get with his postulate. His postulate is "to be known" and if you adopt a "to know" postulate which is the complementary postulate of "to be known" then you will be as reasonable as you can get. You will be as consistent as you can get with his postulate. So reason is a complementary postulate in this universe and that is the most precise definition there is in this universe of reason. It is a complementary postulate.

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

Now this definition of reason being a complementary postulate tells you immediately that all games must be unreasonable because they contain

conflicting postulates. A game is a contest in conviction and contains opposing postulates by definition; that is the definition of a game, it's a contest in conviction. There's two people trying to convince each other of opposing postulates. If reason is a complementary postulate then all games must be unreasonable.

There's no reason in conflict, it's an unreasonable activity. Games might be fun but they're not reasonable. You've got 22 men in two football teams standing on a football field and they're about to start a game of football. It's not reasonable for them to play this game of football. The reasonable thing to do, if they want to be reasonable at all about it, is at the beginning of the game one of the men to pick up the ball and run down and put it in the opposing goal. You see that?

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

So that's just an example of an unreasonable game. Well, it's no more unreasonable than any other game. The fact that the conflict is there, the fact that the postulates are opposing each other, is the very essence of unreason because reason is a complementary postulate.

Then this tells you right away that when a person comes up to you and says, "What we need in our society is more conflict and more competition and so on," they're also saying that we need more and more unreason. Because the conflict, the competition and so on and the opposition all produce unreason. The more conflict there is, the less reason there is.

A tremendous amount of data starts to make sense once you understand these basics of all postulates limit the possible and therefore define the reasonable, and the reasonable is a complementary postulate. I could expand that material out considerably, but once a person grasps it they can expand it out themselves; it has enormous ramifications.

Basic Postulate of this Universe

The basic postulate upon which this universe is constructed is *The class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of those things brought into existence to be known.* Now that's a pretty big mouthful. I better break that down into little bits and we'll examine it in detail.

What do we mean by the class of the knowable? We mean the class of those things it's possible to know.

Now, the class of the knowable is coextensive with – well, that is a technical term used in logic. When we say two classes are coextensive, it's a term a logician would use when he means that the members of these classes are identical in their characteristics. They have identical characteristics.

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

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

Now before I go on talking about the basic law of the universe I want to give you a very, very useful valid deduction from this law, which is of everyday use in society and is of tremendous use in science and is well known.

If the class of the knowable is coextensive with the class of things brought into existence to be known, then a thing is either knowable by reason of existing or is not knowable by reason of not existing.

Therefore a thing either exists or it doesn't exist.

Therefore a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

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

Now certainly Aristotle based his own logic, his grasp of logic and all his writings on logic and all his subject of logic on that principle, and Aristotelian logic held fast in our society in the whole of the western world for something like 1850^4 years. So all that happened in 1850 was that a guy called George Boole, an English mathematician, came along and took that basic principle that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously and expressed it mathematically, and used it as the basis of the algebra of logic, the algebra of

the logic of classes, which is called Boolean algebra. And thereby made logic into a mathematical subject rather than a philosophical subject. At least, he turned the logic of classes into a mathematical subject rather than a philosophical subject. But nevertheless the Boolean algebra is based upon exactly that same proposition "that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously." Which is itself a valid deduction from the basic law of this universe.

Interesting isn't it? That's the basis of logic, the basic of the science of reason as we understand it in our world. And it's no different in the eastern world; the logic of India[5] and China is based upon the same postulate, I assure you.

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

Now one day when I get a bit of time, and it's one of these things I mean to do and I keep putting it off, I'm gong to sit down and write down the basic law of this universe and see what other valid deductions there are from this basic law, but that one, I know, is a valid deduction. And that a thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously produced the science of logic. I'm just wondering what other valid deductions can be made from the basic law which could be used as the basic for other sciences and for other human endeavors. There's no doubt many other valid deductions that can be made from that basic law upon which this universe is constructed.

Now let's examine this basic law of the universe more closely. What is it telling us? Well, it tells us essentially that there's two activities in this universe which are utterly and completely futile. One of these activities is to try and know something that doesn't exist. Now that is the essence of futility, because you simply can't know it unless it exists. If it doesn't exist it's unknowable. The basic law of the universe says so. So if a thing doesn't exist in the universe it's absolutely futile to go around and try and discover it. Yet people spend half their lives trying to discover things that don't exist. It's true, they do.

Of course the person believes that this thing does exist or believes that it might exist, so he keeps searching for it. But nevertheless, if it turns out that the thing doesn't exist they've wasted their time because there's nothing there they won't find it if it doesn't exist.

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

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

The thing existed at that moment in time in the universe. It may not exist at this moment in time now, but it existed at that moment in time. If you put your attention back to that moment in space and time you will find that event occurring. So you better know it: then, when you know it, you can then go off and do other things. While you're not-knowing it you can get yourself into an awful mess.

But this, of course, is basic in the understanding of dianetics and scientology: that what you resist you become. What you not-know you end up getting wrapped round your neck. There's a thousand ways that Ron expressed this in scientology, and quite rightly so too, but again you see, it's a valid deduction from the basic law upon which this universe is constructed. It gives you the only two futile things in the universe. The first thing is to try and know something that doesn't exist, and the other futile thing is to try and not-know something that does exist. Both of them are the essence of futility in this universe.

These things simply aren't of a matter of opinion, they're not of a matter of which school you go to, you know. You're living in a universe, you're acting and working and so forth totally within a universe and you're subscribing to the laws of the universe and the basic law of the universe you're subscribing to tells you that's it's futile to try and know things that don't exist and it's futile to try and not-know things that do exist.

Yet all of games play contains these two possibilities. When we examine what we call games play we find the people doing these things. They try to discover things that don't exist and they try and not-know things that do exist. And you could say that fundamentally games play only consists of these two

futile activities, which is why games play fundamentally is a very futile activity in this universe.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Laws of Postulates

What we're looking at here is the difference between a postulate and an object. We're trying to see if they're different in their nature. Well now, one difference immediately comes to mind. A postulate, let's take say the postulate "to know". You can start off with a high intensity postulate "to know" and it's on a scale and as the intensity of the postulate lessens, gets less and less and less, it will go down to a zero point where there's no postulate then it will go over the zero point and will reappear in the negative. You get a very, very faint "to not know" postulate." And that "to not know" postulate could be intensified up to a maximum intensity of "to not know".

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

So we must bear that in mind.

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

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

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

So we have two laws there which are applicable to postulates which aren't applicable to classes of objects and we now must ask ourselves the question does the law which is applicable to objects, in other words, "a thing

cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously", is that applicable to postulates? Well, yes it is. A postulate cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously, so that obeys the same law as the law of objects and the law of classes. So the classes of objects and objects in the universe just obey that one law, one fundamental law. A thing cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously.

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

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

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

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

Why Games go Compulsive

Now the law of the complementary postulate, which says that a postulate plus its complementary postulate satisfy each other and cause their mutual vanishment, has some very important influence on games play in the universe. The effect of this law is as follows: that if you can imagine people playing light hearted games and so forth and having a desire to play games and they want to get their game going and keep their game going. Every time they happen to accidentally match up with complementary postulates the game ends. The game simply stops, you see, and the postulates vanish. They satisfy each other and they cancel each other out and the postulates disappear. You imagine a games player saying, "Oh damn, I've managed to get complementary postulates again", so after a while, in games play, in the universe, there's always this tendency to avoiding the complementary postulate situation because it unnecessarily, from the point of view of the games player, ends the game.

So this class of both the postulate and its complementary postulate tends to vanish out of games play. That's one of the first things you see to go out of games play in the universe, the lack of appreciation for the fact that you can end the game by adopting complementary postulates. First of all it's regarded as a nuisance to end the game because they want to keep the game going to enjoy the sensation of the games play and so accidentally in games, in the heat of the moment, happen to accidentally match their complementary postulates it ends the game. The game stops, you see, and the game unmocks.

So they come to not resist or oppose but to avoid the complementary postulates. And so the effect is to concentrate more and more on the opposition postulates and less and less upon the complementary postulates. And the effect of this is to make the game play more and more compulsive. You follow that? You see how that would be? It follows directly from the law of the complementary postulate.

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

I know it sounds silly, but this is the way it comes about. Games play, because of the law of complementary postulates, tends to go from lighthearted, casual, voluntary games play into compulsive games play. It becomes compulsive once the players lose the ability to end the game with complementary postulates. In the early days of playing the game it was a nuisance to end the game with complementary postulates so they put it to one side, and said we won't use complementary postulates to end the game and then they forgot about it and they lost the ability. And they then got into compulsive games play, because once you take the complementary postulates out of the games situation you're only left with the game situation. The complementary postulates have gone.

Imagine what we call a postulate set. You see there's only four postulates in a goals package. There's the postulate plus its negative plus the complementary postulate plus its negative.

Let's call the postulate *x*. So there's *x* and the negative, which is not-*x*. And there's the complementary postulate to *x*, we'll call that *b* and there's not-*b* which is the negative of *b*. There's only *x* and not-*x,* and *b* and not-*b* , so there's only four classes in the set. There's:

x, b	not-*x, b*
x, not-*b*	not-*x*, not-*b*

That's four classes. That exhausts the possibilities of the system. But *x,b* is a complementary postulate class because *x* and *b* are complementary postulates; and not-*x* and not-*b* are complementary postulates. And they're the

ones that are avoided, so the tendency is for those to go out of games play and the game then to consist of just *x* and not-*b*, or not-*x* and *b*.

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

~~*x, b*~~	**not-*x*, *b***
x*, not-*b	~~not-*x*, not-*b*~~

The games play is compulsive simply because it cannot be ended. There's no way to end the game at this point because the complementary postulates have gone. The opposed people cannot occupy those postulates because they're out of the set, you see. The set's just reduced to the games classes. Class one is gone, two is present still, three is present and class four is gone so you're left with just classes two and three, which are the two games classes, and that is the technical definition of compulsive games play. And that is how games play becomes compulsive in this universe, it stems from the law of the complementary postulate.

Now in terms of the "to know" goals package what would this look like, a compulsive games condition? Well the person is either in a state of "must be known" facing an opponent who "mustn't know" or he's in a state of "must know" facing an opponent who "mustn't be known", or visa versa giving a total of four possible games classes in all.

In other words, whichever one of the four postulates in the set he's in, he's facing the opposition postulate. That's another way to put it: the set reduces to two games classes but there's four possibilities because there's four postulates in the set. So whichever postulate he occupies he's always facing the opposition postulate. He's never facing a complementary postulate because they've gone out the set. Now that is compulsive games play.

Now there is one other characteristic that goes with compulsive games play, and that is that the other little law that goes with the postulates of maximum intensity down to zero point and out through to minus intensity - vanishes. That law goes out and it simply becomes plus intensity or minus intensity. In other words, the person's in there pitching full steam the whole time and there's no zero point, there's no point ever where there's no postulate in games play. They're simply playing the game all the time. The game is continuous; in other words there's no point where they stop playing it. They can't stop playing

it, you see? It's compulsive, so there's no null point, no zero point on the scale for any of the postulates. So that law goes out when we go into compulsive games play.

So in compulsive games play the law of the complementary postulate has gone out, and also the law of the scale has gone out. And all that's left is the law which says that a postulate cannot both exist and not exist simultaneously. In other words that same law that governs the postulates in the universe governs objects and classes in the universe. So once games play becomes compulsive, postulates obey exactly the same law, logically, as do classes and objects in the universe and can be manipulated as such in a logical system. Which is very, very interesting. While we're dealing with compulsive games play we can use the same logic for postulates as we can for classes, but once we go into non-compulsive games play, voluntary games play, we have to realise that we can't use the same logic for postulates because they obey two other laws.

It would actually be possible to formulate a mathematical logic which allows for these extra qualities of postulates in the natural native state including all the laws that govern postulates. In other words, a logic which governs postulates in non-compulsive games play[6]. If I get some time one day I might see if I can formulate such a logic but it's not really necessary to do so because any logical constructs you would need or I've ever needed dealing with postulates, the application of Boolean algebra to postulates has always been to do with compulsive games play, so I simply treat the postulates as if they were objects and classes of objects. The answers come out right, of course, simply because in compulsive games the postulates can be handled as if they are objects. The logic is the same.

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

For example, what is the relationship in our *x,b* postulate set when the games play is compulsive? When the *x,b* class is reduced to zero and the not-*x* , not-*b* class is reduced to zero, and the set only consists of *x* and not-*b* or *b* and not-*x*, just what is the relationship between *x* and *b*?

Well, the relationship between *x* and *b* is that *x* equals not-*b*. That is the relationship between the postulates. Ouch! We have an identification in the set!

An identification occurs within the postulate set in compulsive games play. Once compulsive games play is undertaken, there is an identification

between two of the postulates in the set and the identification is between *x* and not-*b*; *x* equals not-*b* and *b* equals not-*x*, another identification in the set. In other words if the games play became compulsive in the "to know" goals package then "to know" would become identical in the mind with "to not be known" and "to be known" would become identical with "to not know"[7].

Now is there any justification for this, any application of this; do we see this sort of thing going on in everyday life? Indeed, we do.

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

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

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

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

Finally in the "to know" goals package, the person dramatizing "to not know" he's highly rejecting, well he's going to be noisy. I don't know whether you've noticed this, you probably have, but all protestors are noisy. I've never

heard of people quietly protesting. Well, a protestor is dramatizing a "not know" postulate and he does it noisily. There's no such thing as a quiet protestor. See? "Not know" is identical with "must be known" and "must be known" is assertive, so he's asserting his protest because the "not know" postulate is identified with the "must be known" postulate.

So we have plenty of validation of this datum from the basic "to know" goals package. And it applies to every other goals package too, I can assure you; it's not peculiar to the "to know" goals package. That identification is there in compulsive games play, that *x* = not-*b* and *b* = not-*x* in the postulate set, in the goals package. The propositions are:

if *x* then not-*b*
if not-*b* then *x*
if *b* then not-*x*
if not-*x* then *b*

if you want it in terms of propositions, and the identification is *b* = not-*x* and not-*x* = *b,* and *x* = not-*b* and not-*b* = *x*. They are the identifications in the set.

43 years ago in 1950 Ron Hubbard published a book called *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* and in that book he postulated a thing called the reactive mind and he said that the logic of the reactive mind contains an identification of A=A=A. You recall that? In dianetics, one of the foundation stones of Ron's reactive mind theory was the identification in the reactive bank, "A=A=A". And the analytical mind, he said, didn't contain this identification. It was free, but the reactive bank was locked into a fixed identification pattern.

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

Could it be? Yes it is! We are looking at exactly the same phenomenon. When we're looking at compulsive games play we're looking at the A=A=A of the reactive mind.

Now Ron, for all his tremendous qualities as a man, as a researcher - and he was a genius - he was no logician, and he was unable to put this subject on to a logical foundation. I've been able to do this, and we get the subject of postulates and the laws governing the postulates, games play, compulsive games play and the identification and we're back where we were. We're now validating Ron's data of 1950. This is it. We've found it. He never could find it. He could never explain why the reactive bank had an A=A=A identification but now we know why it's in there. It comes from compulsive games play, and we know how games play gets compulsive in the universe from the postulate set. Now we've got all the bits, and all the bits fit together. We've

completed Ron's work on the subject of dianetics in terms of the identification in the reactive bank.

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

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

The term double bind is not originally my own. I first came across the term double bind in a reference in a book written by an anthropologist by the name of Gregory Bateson who wrote a book[8] in the 1950s, and he used the term double bind in terms of an identification. I don't know exactly how he used the term because I never read the book, I've only read references to the book, but I do know he used it in terms of an identification so I'm carrying on the use of the word when we talk about this false identification.

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

And one of the prime objects of level 5A, level 5B is to break these double binds in the postulate sets; to therefore break them in the reactive mind. To return the person's thinking back to the rationality of non compulsive, non false identifications. Being able to once again see things as differently or see similarities and differences between things. What Ron so beautifully explained in dianetics, that the analytical mind works in differences and similarities and the reactive bank works in identifications.

-oOo-

The Exclusion Postulate

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

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

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

In other words his games postulate is trying to drive the opponent into a certain postulate and his exclusion postulate keeps him out of that class that he's trying to drive the opponent into. In terms of the "to know" goals package the person is operating on "to be known" and the games player is compulsive his opponent would be occupying "to not know", and if the games player is compulsive the person occupying "to be known" would also be operating on a "to not know" postulate. But the "to not know" postulate will be keeping him out of the class that he's trying to drive the opponent into.

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

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

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

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

In other words if his games postulate is “to stab”, the opposition postulate is “to not be stabbed”. Well, that’s exactly what his exclusion postulate will be. So he’s in two postulates.

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

This is how I discovered it. It was only later that I put the logic together. First of all I discovered it empirically. I found it in session, then explained the phenomenon of the exclusion postulate. I first realised what it was for and then I realised it was identification in the set, put the set together and got it all out.

So when the games play is compulsive there’s always twin postulate games play, the person’s in two postulates. He’s got a game postulate, whatever that game postulate is, there will be an exclusion postulate that sits there too and keeps him out of the class that he’s trying to drive the opponent into. Or if you want to put it the other way the exclusion postulate is identical to the opposition postulate to the game postulate.

So we can see two players in compulsive games play, going back to our *x,b* set. The first player is in the class of *x* and he’s got an *x* games postulate and a not-*b* exclusion postulate and the other player opposing him has got a not-*b* games postulate and an *x* exclusion postulate. And there the two are ding-dong[9] at each other.

The general rule of compulsive games play that in any game there’s only one games class involved. In other words there’s only two postulates involved between the two players. He’s using *x* as a games postulate and not-*b* as an exclusion postulate and his opponent is using not-*b* as a games postulate and *x* as an exclusion postulate. So there’s only those two postulates involved in any game.

They’ve both got the same two but one of them is using one as a games postulate and he’s got the other one as an exclusion postulate and the other guy’s using the other one as his games postulate and he’s got the other one as his exclusion postulate. It’s a little bit complicated to explain it but it’s very, very simple when you write it down and when you draw it out on a piece of

paper. You see the exclusion postulate and you see why I called it an exclusion postulate because it keeps the person out of the class he's trying to drive the opponent into.

When games play becomes compulsive it can become very undesirable to end up in that class. A person might be committing some pretty nasty overt acts in compulsive games play and the last place he wants to end up is to be in the same class as the opponent is being driven into. Like the example of the stabbing: it's alright to go around stabbing people but it's not alright to be stabbed. You know, it's all right for Adolf Hitler to kill six million Jews but one thing Adolf Hitler didn't want to be was a dead Jew - one that had just been gassed in one of Hitler's gas chambers. That was an intolerable place for him to be, you see. So there we will see compulsive games play. I'm sure Hitler had a very strong exclusion postulate to not be gassed, to not be a gassed Jew.

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

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

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

-oOo-

Now, finally I want to end up with this tape with just a little word on the practical of level Five here, and relate it to what we've been talking about. When you get some area of the bank or the mind which simply refuses to come apart at level Five, level 5A, level 5B, level 5C, doesn't matter what it is you find

there, you sweat at it, you sweat at it and it simply refuses to come apart, to erase, then search for the double bind, look for the false identification.

You should have that written up on your auditing wall: *Search for the double bind*. It's always present, there's always a false identification in there somewhere. You've got a goals package with compulsive games play in it and there's a false identification in there somewhere and that is the cause of why it won't come apart.

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

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

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

So don't try and put me through hoops. Poor old Ron Hubbard used to be put through hoops on this, you know, people wrote in and said, "I done all your techniques Ron, and nothing happened" and, boy, Ron had to burn the midnight oil. Well, I'm not going to go through hoops on this one because I know, I've been through the midnight oil myself on this and there aren't any exceptions. If it doesn't come apart at level Five then you haven't completed level Five. There's a false identification, there's a goals package in there somewhere and with a false identification and that's all that can stop it from erasing at level Five.

That is very important data there. It's only this A=A=A of the bank, this false identification of compulsive games play that can prevent erasure at level Five and that is what level Five is there to take apart. It needs this powerful

technique of level Five to break this false identification in the goals package. Only level Five will break it, but sometimes you get stuck on the false identification and you say, "Well, level Five's not enough to break it." Well, it is, if you back it up to the right area.

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

I've been through all these hoops myself on this one. I burnt the midnight oil, I've said to myself, "Dennis, there's got to be other techniques here to take these things apart - and I can't get these apart." Every time I've said that and looked into it further, I've realised I've come across a god damned false identification of a goals package there which I hadn't spotted and once I took the false identification apart, took the compulsive games play apart, erased the goals package, it all came apart swimmingly. It all came apart exactly as the textbook said.

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

I'll say it now, if I ever come up with a level Six it won't be anything to do with taking the bank apart, it will be do with something quite different. It will be something to do with the anatomy of creating sensations or something like that. It will be something quite, quite different to this whole subject of the reactive bank because as far as I'm concerned level Five ends that. You start taking the bank apart at level one, you continue with levels Two, Three, Four. You finish it at level Five and when you're finished level Five that's the end of the bank. It's gone. There's nothing else there. There's no more bank left, that's it. And if there's still bank there, then you haven't completed level Five.

Now that's my final words on the subject and I'm not going to be burning midnight oil on it. I've done enough burning of midnight oil on my own bank without burning midnight oil on other people's.

audio recording of 20 April 1993

[1] Level Five is the final level of TROM, the mental discipline that Stephens taught.

[2] Stephens adopted Hubbard's usage of 'postulate' for a causative thought; an intention, goal, decision, mental act. No standard English word fits this concept precisely; the closest term might be the Sanskrit *saṃskāra.*

[3] "In order to make a universe, thought must limit itself." DeMille, R. & Hubbard, L.R. (1952) *The Solidness of Apathy*. Professional Course Booklet 33.

[4] Actually closer to 2200 years from Aristotle to Boole.

[5] For example, by Nāgārjuna in the *Śūnyatāsaptati*.

[6] This may be done using one-dimensional Euclidean vectors, which allow the postulates to have a range of positive or negative magnitudes instead of the 'all or nothing' of Boolean algebra.

[7] Called an exclusive disjunction or XOR in formal logic.

[8] Bateson, G. (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. (Chandler: San Francisco).

[9] A fight (Australian idiom).

transcribed and edited by David Cooke