02 Level 2 After Level 5 Part B

By Dennis Stephens

January 3rd 1994

Transcribed by Leona McLaughlin

April 14, 2012

Hello Greg, this is January the ah… January the 3rd, Monday January 3rd, 1994 and ahh… so far this year in Redmond Bay it has been very, very hot. Extreme heat, extreme heat, with northerly winds. Most trying, most trying.

I am recording this um… on a very hot afternoon, I am having to turn the fans off because the otherwise the fans… the sound of the fans will go on to the tape thru the microphone so it ahh… it promises to be a… be a hot afternoon.

00:37

A since I'm cutting the… cutting the last tape on subject of um Level 2 after Level 5, I realized the um… so much more new material come to light the ahh… I really, really better call the last tape um a part A and I will call this part B so the old tape is part A of Level 2 after Level 5 and this is a part B of a Level 2 after Level 5.

## The Best Way to Run the Process

01:08

Um the… first of all I'll give you the… the best way to… to run this procedure that I know of to date. Ah…First of all running the process itself. um The best way to run the… to the process,… you've done everything, you see, you've done your test you, you, you found your bonding your you know you got your classes here, you got you're A and you got your B and you're… you're already to break the bonding. Right, well this is the best way to run the process.

01:44

Umm...The first off you start to find some differences between A and B. Now you run that process until no more answers. Now that is the best way to run that process, till no more answers. You run differences between A and B until you have no more answers. Then you will switch over then to similarities. You then start finding similarities between A and B and you will run this until you have no more answers. Then you will go back and do, differences between A and B, again until no more answers, and back on to similarities between A and B unto no more answers, then back again. You go backwards and foreword until you have absolutely no more answers on either side of the process. Follow that? And that is the best way to run the process.

02:44

There is absolutely no point in sitting there comm-lagging the answers out. The reason being that ahh… when you run differences you start as-ising the differences and then the similarities start to show up so you run you run the differences till you, till you have no more then you are ready to run similarities, you see, so then you start as-ising a few similarities, as-ising similarities till you have no more of those and then differences start to show up again so by…by are running one against the other; you get the optimum gain from the process.

03:18

It simply, because a it's a flip-floper process, your running differences and similarities back to back and because you can do this you can run this process till no more answers.

By the way that's a general principle of auditing. It's… it's a not very well known principle of auditing but it's a general principle of auditing that when you have a flip-flop back to back process of this nature, where… where running one side stimulates answers on the other side and running the other side stimulates answers on the first side, you could always run both sides to no more… or run ether side, to no more answers, then over to the other side to no more answers it's quite safe to do this on a…on a flip-flop type of process.

0:04:01

For example you could run ARC straightwire process, general ARC straightwire on a person if you wanted to an ordinary Scientology auditing you could run it, you could run it to no more answers, you would be quite, quite safe because of the flip-flop of process running. Running moments of afffinity um… the trick is moments of communication in the mind and creating moments of reality, so by running you could run affinity till no more answers then moments of good communication to no more answers, then moments of reality agreement to no more answers then back to, to good communication or back to high affinity to no more answers. You see that? You could run an ARC straightwire like that, to… to no more answers quite safe to do so, when you got a flip-flop type process like this.

04:49

Not a generally… not a generally well known principle of auditing but it's true. When your are running a flip-flop type of process like this, of course, when you arrive at the point of no more answers, of course, that… that will also be a point of no more change, so it doesn't violate the general rule of auditing that you… you continue with a command until no more change, because when you've…you've got no more answers you will find

that's a point of no more change so it is quite safe to leave it, OK so much for that. A little back ground material there.

05:18

But bear in mind that ahh… it's ahh…it's not entirely safe to run all auditing commands till no more answers. Some types of auditing commands, the non flip-flop type, when you're just running a single auditing command that should be run to no more change that is precisely correct. It's not entirely safe to run a…all processes to no more answers but I think any… any ahh… any therapist worth his salt would know this.

05:44

OK, that's the way you would run, that's the way you would run… run the process um… you just flip-flop between differences and similarities. Now as you… as you run the process you will find the A in terminal A and terminal B will start to merge you will get these merging phenomena in the mi… of the two and ahh… as you start to complete the process the process begins to run flat you will you will see the merging of the two into one single terminal.

Now all that indicates is that there is now a common class. That you can conceive of a common class there of AB. In other words, this… this class now is no longer a null class and it's got members in the class so therefore bonding is broken is broken. Soon as you can conceive of a common class between A and B well obviously you've achieved your goal your whole goal is to break the bonding and that's what you've succeeded in doing once A and B have a common class, in other word, they ahh… they have some common qualities there.

06:56

It's worth… interesting to note that if you continue the process beyond this point there…that not only will you get the merging but the whole um… you will start to go into the erasure you will see the terminal even the common terminal start to erase eventually and as the charge goes off it more and more and more not only will you get the common class you get the merging into one common class but then this common class will start to fade out and eventually you will find it very extremely difficult to put up the two terminals you put up one terminal and before… then you've got to mock up the other terminal, you know, as you mock up the second terminal the fist on vanishes… it erases, and put the first one back up the second on vanishes. You can't hold the two, in other words, you are working with an erasure process, so be prepared for erasure . You looking at erasure .

07:53

Now this won't happen if you attempt this process prior to level 5. What is happening is, remember that I am using this process after level 5 has been flattened, see, it's been run

on a erased bank so of course you can expect to find that the matrix itself starts to break down and you start to see that the… the terminals state to go into erasure even… even as you are trying to work the process beyond the point when you should of finished it. It's not…it's not harmful to do so, it's just... you know, just note it in passing that you will go into erasure if you go passed the point of merging and eventually… so don't be surprised if that happens, don't be surprised if your terminals erase and it become very, very difficult to hold both of them in existence at the same time.

0:08:39

So that's the… that's really the… the um… the final end point of the procedure would be the erasure of the ahh… of the two… not only the two terminals be the erasure of the common two you would be left with a handful of nothing. That will be… that will um the end point there, the final end point. But the process can be quite safely left at the point where you can see that A and B do have a common class when you've broken the bonding after all that is the goal to break the bonding but if you want to you can run the process thru to erasure it only takes a few more commands to do so I can assure you and you go thru to erasure.

09:22

Now there's only two exceptions, there is two areas of life, life and living where this won't occur: The first of them is when you are dealing with um… when you dealing with ahh… areas where the body is involved for example on the subjects of eating and sex.

Remember when I cut a lecture on the subject of sex I told you that although you can erase sexuality from the human mind you break the double bind of sexuality in the mind your can't break it from the body. So you will still find, you may find, that some of your classes, A and B classes, associated with the subject of eating or the subject of sex there that you won't…you won't get a clean erasure simply because the body itself will be holding these in existence still, because the body will still be subscribing to the double bind and still be holding it in existence. So be prepared for that to happen, be prepared for that to happen.

10:25

And the other area where you won't get a clean… won't necessarily get a clean erasure is when the… the two objects within the A and B by their intrinsic nature in the universe are separate. Do you follow that?

For example supposing your A was a living being, a living creature and your B was a object. Well they are intrinsically different, aren't they? One is a living creature, one is alive and the other one is not alive, so you won't… you wouldn't expect to get a merging there would you? You see, because you're asking them for this… this… this merge to this common class to be both alive and not alive simultaneous which is a contradiction. So it can't merge you see so if you bear that in mind, if your A and your B if their

intrinsically different by their very nature, and if merging them would produce a contradiction, a logical contradiction, then of course you won't get the merging and you won't get the erasure so just bear that in mind there.

11:42

That um… there's two areas where you can expect not to get an erasure , not to get a clean merging, not to get an erasure. One is where the body is concerned that's on the subject the body goals packages, that's…mainly on the subject of sex and less on the subject of eating and also the second area is this area of ahh… where A and B are intrinsically different you wouldn't expect the get a clean erasure there or even a clean merging.

0:12:18.4

OK, now the subject of RI um… strangely um… RI does… running of RI can be helpful in this procedure. The procedure, as I say, is extremely fast and um the matrix itself is a little sort of energy mass. It is strange but there it is, the matrix itself, as the matrix blows there is a little… slit loss of energy mass. So be prepared to run a little RI on this procedure don't be surprised if you need to run RI while running Level 2 after Level 5 and it's correct to do so.

You should run it just like you would run it normally. You should run RI before you start the process, you should run it during the process, if necessary, and you should run it at the end of the process. So don't neglect RI on the…on Level 2 after Level 5.

13:12

The ahh… theoretical reason is, I think… just intimated… reason for this is that loss of matrix, loss of matrix is also loss of importance so you have to repair this importance of the ahh… be prepared to use your RI. OK?

Now if you've been following this very, very carefully, following this through very carefully, you will have realized that um… that Level 2 after Level 5 is a erasure process, is an erasure process, which tells us that Level 2 itself… Level 2 of my technology is an erasure process, except for the interfering factor of the goals packages. Do you see that?

Once we remove the interfering factor for the goals packages, the live goals packages, you know that you've erased the "to know" goals packages and all the ahh…all the junior goals packages that need to be run have also been run and the general "to know" goals packages have gone thru to erasure . Once you've handled the goals packages Level 2 itself becomes an erasure process. In other words you can take any two terminals, and I've check this out and proven it quit conclusively, you can mock up any two terminals there and put them side by side in the mind and start finding differences and similarities between them and ahh… within a few commands, run each side to no more answers, and

within a few commands you will be sitting there with a handful of nothing. You can blow them. You can blow them.

14:50

Now this won't happen on Level 2 before level… before you run Level 5 but it happens when you run Level 2 after Level 5 so we would… we would confidently expect to get the phenomena that we do get when we use this process to… to break bonding. We would expect to… to walk into erasure, which is precisely what does happen because ahh… Level 2 is an erasure process after you have run Level 5. So um… bear that in mind, bear that in mind.

Level 3, by the way, is also a erasure process after you run Level 5. Level 2 and Level 3 are erasure processes after you have run Level 5. It tells you that if you wanted to you could time break A and B after you have ran Level 2 differences and similarities. You… you could timebreak them, but you would have to be quick because I am sure that just running the differences and similarities would eventually leave you handing…holding a handful of nothing. So you better be quick with your timebreaking because Level 2 is going to erase them. They're going to go on Level 2 you won't have anything to timebreak on Level 3, but um similarly it is… as general procedure Level 3 timebreaking is an erasure process after you've run Level 5. You see that?

16:24

So, so just bear that in mind too, in passing. It's a technical datum. That Level 2 and Level 3 are both erasure processes after you run Level 5 after you have flattened Level 5 and the "to know" goals package has gone thru to erasure. That signifies the erasure of Level V.

16:43

After you've completed the erasure of Level 5, after you have finished with Level 5, both Level 2 and Level 3 are erasure processes. And they're very, very fast erasure processes to I can assure you. Very, very useful to bear in mind.

17:05

## Running Assists with TROM

The main use of this sort of thing would be in ahh…say on an assist. After a person has finished Level 5 say, and they, maybe, cut their finger say all they'd have to do is just pick up,… pick the umm…the…the trauma of the cut finger. You know, where the knife cut the finger and they just pick it up and bring it… and just timebreak it, you know just become simultaneously aware of the cut when it…at the moment when it was occurring and of present time around them now and they would… the thing would blow, bang, just like that.

17:40

Or they could find differences and similaries between the bits and pieces of the trauma of the cut finger and that would…that too would blow it. You know, simply timebreak it.

17:49

So Level 2 or Level 3 can be used there, above Level 5 as an erasure procedure which, of course, Level 2 and Level 3 are not an erasure procedure prior to Level 5. You got to do Level 5 you can't… Level 2 and Level 3 are not a substitute procedure for Level 5.

You can stay on Level 2 and Level 3 forever. They eventually go null as processes. And then you have to do Level 5.But after you finish level 5 you can go back use them as erasure processes. Follow?

18:21

Level 2 and Level 3 are not substitutes for Level 5. They were never intended to be such and they are not a substitute. In other words, you can't blow the bank on Level 2 and Level 3. The only way you will blow the bank is on Level 5.

18:34

Now there's a few rules I can give you, which will make the running of Level 2 after Level 5 a lot easier. Now the first of these rules:
Rule 1 is ah… keep it simple, if you're not careful with this procedure you can, you can work yourself into an enormous amount of complexity and the procedure so grinds to… it just drowns in complexity, the procedure does.

Now the way to avoid all this complexity is, right back at the beginning of the procedure, is when you do your test. When your testing to find if a bonding exists, you know where you think of A and ahh… when you think of A and you think of B when you think of A you think of both A and B. Alright, well keep A simple. That… that… that's the secret. Keep A simple.

19:31

If you make A complicated, then you're asking to get an complicated B. But if you keep A simple the chances are you will get a fairly simple B pop up in your mind but if you are… go in for complicated A's your leaving yourself wide open for complicated B's and the procedure is going to become a nightmare. If you have complicated A's and complicated B's. Do you see that?

19:54

You can't control what is going to pop up. When you think of A… you think of A then B pops up. You think of this… you think A and B pops up. Well you can control A. You can keep A simple, but you can't control B. So keep A simple and you are doing all you can to keep to… keep the procedure simple.

20:21

Now let me give you a example of this ahh…supposing you… on Level A you… correct would be say… you think of girl… every time you think of a girl you think of a person wearing a dress. Ok, that's fine. That will be correct but wrong would be to think of a black girl. Black. It's complicated, you've introduced the subject of blackness. You've now got a black girl. You've now introduced the subject of blackness and non-blackness into you procedure, which is quit unnecessary. Keep it simple a single terminal.

21:02

Think of a girl. A girl is a person. You've got a girl person. Well all girls are people. All girls are persons, so that's fine .A girl person, nice and simple. Black girl, no. White girl, no. To complicated. See keep it simple keep it down to a single… keep A down to a single…a single identity… a single class not… you don't want common classes A when you are doing the test keep them down to single classes as far as possible. Get it down… keep A as simple as you can and you will win all the time.

You make A complicated and you will drown in nightmare of complexity I'll tell you, on this procedure. So right at the outset keep A simple then you will get a simple B.

21:50

But if B shows up complicated well there is nothing you can do about it you are just going to have to work with a complicated B. It's the way your mind is stacked. You see?

Keep A simple and you will go as far as you can on keeping B simple.

22:05

Give you an example here. You think of a… of a person wearing a dress and a black girl shows up. Well there's nothing you can do with that. You're just going to have to work with a black girl I am sorry that's the way your mind is staked. You see?

22:22

But you've kept it as simple as you can because A… your A was simple you… you thought of a person wearing a dress, well as a person wearing a dress. Well as an… only people wear dresses, you've kept it as simple as you can. Haven't you?

22:41

So the golden rule is keep A simple when you are doing your test. Then…But you must take whatever shows up. Once B shows up don't ever… don't try and modify B. Stay with B.

You must accept what shows up; because that's the way your mind's staked. That's what your… that's what… that's the bonding you're trying to break. You mustn't muck around with B. Once you… once you've set up A and a B shows up. Well you're stuck with that B. You're going to have to… that's the one you are going to have to work with. Ok that… so much for that. That's rule 1. Keep it simple.

0:23:13

Rule 2. Is the universe of discourse rule. The universe of discourse rule. Now no matter what A and B are when you're doing the test, you know. You do the test and you got an A and a B pops up. And you've now got an A and you've got a B. Now, no matter what the A and the B are… they have some universe of discourse… in… in which they both reside and it is up to you to find it.

23:40

You're going to have to find it and the best place to find it is right away. Best time to find it is right away. Find it right away.

23:47

Now let's give you an example here… of a universe of discourse. You ahh… I'll give you more than one example. You, you think of a person wearing a dress, and ahh… your mind offers you up a girl. Ok. Well what's the universe of discourse? What, in other words, what universe do they both belong to. A person wearing a dress and a girl well they're both people aren't they. The universe of people. Their not the universe of inanimate objects or, or airy spaces their the universe of people. A girl is… a person wearing a dress is a person and a girl is a person. So really what your saying is uhh… if girl ahh… if person… if person wearing dress then girl person. That is your… that really is your correct ahh… is your correct proposition, is your correct bonding. Um… but… So you have a person wearing a dress bonded to a girl within… all within the class of people. Get it? But you must be aware that they are within the class of people before you do the process, otherwise you can go badly astray, I can assure you.

25:05

You can go very badly astray on this. I… you will see.. I'll show you how badly astray you can go if you don't realize that you're dealing with a common universe, an ahh… a universe of discourse.

25:24

So, ok, you… you… you do your test and you, you think of a person wearing a dress and a girl pops up in your mind you say "Ok, that's fine, so now the terminals I am going to be working with will be a person wearing a dress and a non girl." Ok, fine, that's…there's your two thermals that you're going to be working with on the procedure. Right, so you say a non girl. Right. Well a caterpillar is a non girl. So I'm going to find some differences between a person wearing a dress and a caterpillar. Flunk. You didn't discover your universe of discourse. Hmmm…

Correct… This is the correct way to do it. So right now every time I think of a person wearing a dress I think of a girl. Ok I have a person wearing a dress and a girl. Now there both what? Well their both people. Girls are people and persons wearing a dress…there's a person. So we have a person wearing a dress and a person who is a girl. Ok, now the terminals we'll be dealing with will be a person wearing a dress and a person who is a non girl. Correct, correct. So your two terminals will be a person wearing a dress and a person that is a non girl. And, now you win. You find…you start to find differences between those two, and the process runs. You see that?

26:58

Because you…because you found your universe of discourse. If you don't find… if you don't find the universe of discourse, you… you… it's an open ended process. You could just run it on forever. You know you could say "Well now a non… a caterpillar is a non girl." So you could flounder on finding differences and similarities between a person wearing dress and a… and a caterpillar.

0:27:25

And you will get no merging because once a a ahh… or it's very unlikely you'll get a merging because a person wearing a dress who is also a caterpillar is not as easy thing to conceive of. It certainly does not exist in this universe. So it is doubtful that you will get any merging and um…and you'll simply be wasting time.

So you… you'll eventually bow out of that one after failure. And you think "Oh,well is there anything… so well you think now there um… a house brick is also a non girl. So you start finding differences and similarities between a person wearing a dress and a house brick. And ahh… again you'll see everything you are finding is outside your universe of discourse because the universe of discourse is a person so everything you've got to find there should be a person. You see that?

28:18

So you should be looking for a non… a person who is a non girl. That limits the… that limits it down to a person… a person who is a non girl. It's going to be ahh…that limits it down considerably doesn't it? See that? And… and you'll win. You'll win.

28:38

Now some might argue that by doing this your… your short-circuiting the… the end point of the process because finding a common universe that A and B are in you, you are short-circuiting the point that you want to get. Well so what? Ha! Ha! Ha! Well so what? You're going to have to find this anyway sooner are latter so you might as will do it now the process won't run any other way. You, right at the very beginning, you better find this universe of discourse and…and work with it. And this gets you over your major difficulty when dealing with negative classes.

0:29:20

You will find early on in the procedure that you will find… until you work with… discover the subject of universes of discourse. You're struck with horror these… B quite often shows up as a negative class. You're dealing with a positive class then negative class or maybe you'll be dealing with two negative classes but if you isolate your… your… your universe of discourse it doesn't matter if you're dealing with a positive class… a girl…or a negative class say a non girl. It doesn't matter. Once you got your universe of discourse you can find… you can find examples inside your universe of discourse. You see that? On, on either side on the A or the B. Can't you follow?

30:06

It doesn't matter if A is negative or B is negative once you've, once you've got your universe of discourse the process runs very, very easily and very, very smoothly. Until you've got your universe of discourse it's an open ended process and you are not going to get anywhere with it on… on either side on the A or the B. Can't you follow?

0:30:26

It doesn't matter if A is negative or B is negative once you, once you have your universe of discourse the process runs very, very easily and very, very smoothly. Until you've got you universe of discourse it's an open ended process and you are not going to get anywhere with it. That was one of the major bugs I had to get out of the process, was to find out… to get that major bug out. It's simply a matter of the… getting the correct universe of discourse before you start doing process.

30:53

Well they are the only two rules. The only two rules that are applied to the process, is the rule of simplicity, keep it simple keep A simple, the thing you think of when you are doing the test. Keep A simple. Keep it to a single class. A…A single class and you will win. And… soon as you get both your A and your B you… you think of A and B pops up in your mind so you got B you got your two things there. You got what you bonded. You got your if A then B, you know, what is bonded to what. Find your… next thing to do is find your universe of discourse and ahh… that's the second rule.

31:35

And once you have done those two things. You've followed those two rules. It runs like a well oiled dream, I can assure you. But if you don't know those two rules, you are in real trouble with the procedure and you can never make it run I can assure you. But with those two rules you will make the procedure run. It's a beautiful little process. It's a beautiful procedure for bond braking.

31:56

I'd like to just finish off with a few theoretical ramification of this material so you will know you got your theo..theoretical material very, very sound um… when… when you run the process.

32:10
The concept of differences in this universe, a concept that A is different from B is essentially the concept that A and B have no common class. In other words, if… if the common class of A and B is null and A and B have no common class then A is different from B and that defines it. You know. If A is different from B and A and B have no common class, and if A and B have know common class then A is different from B. But unfortunately in this universe you can't hold that phenomena. It, it lacks conviction. You know.

32:54

In other words you have a couple of mockups here, you know, you mockup, mockup these two things and along comes you friend you say, "Well I got these two mockups and A is there…there's A here and there's B there and A is different from B" and he looks at them and he says "Well I can't see their different from B."He says "I can't see how A is different from B." And ahh… you say well, you know, there's A… look at them they look different. And he says "Well they don't look very different to me they look very much the same to me."

33:21

He, he actually is playing games with you. OK, how do you get over this? Well the only way to get over this is to bond A to some quality X and bond B to some quality not X. Then your friend trots up you says look at these two mockups, you see. And um… "A is different from B." He says, "Oh, I don't think A is different from B." You say, "Yes it is you see A has got the quality X and B has got the quality not X so that makes A different from B." "Oh, yes, he says, I can see it clearly now. A and B are different aren't they." he says. You have convinced him,

So the bonding of A to X and the bonding of B to not X is a conviction phenomena. The actual definition of difference in the universe is that A and B have no common class. That's… that's… that's the truth of the matter… and you will go a long way, I can assure you, to discover this truth it is a very, very deeply buried truth. It is not an obvious truth but it is true. That is the way it is. I will say more about that in a few minutes.

0:34:39

That ahh… now with similarities… it's exactly the same thing with similarities the, the definition of, of A is similar to B is that the class, the class of A and B has members in it. It is not a null class. If A and B is not a null class then A is similar to B. In other words, A and B have something in common. That's another way of saying that A and B is not a null… A, B is not a null class. You see that?

35:10
So that's… that's how we define a similarity we say the A is similar to B if the A, B class has members in it and by reverse if the A, B class has members in it then A is similar to B.

And we… so if we… if we want… but again we're up against this difficulty of conviction. Along comes someone. You say "I got these two mockups and the A, A is similar to B." And he says perversely, "Well I don't see how they are very similar. They look very different to me." He is playing games with you. But there you say, "Ahh look but you see A possesses this quality Y and B also possesses this quality Y so they both possess this quality in common therefore they have a common class. They have something in common so therefore they're similar aren't they?" " Oh yes," he says "I can see it now."

So again it's the conviction phenomena. So, so similarity to… the definition of a similarity is that simple thing that A, B… the class A, B has members in it, just the very basic definition of difference between A and B when A and B are different then the class A, B is null. That's the basic definition… definition of a difference.

So bear in mind the basic definitions but you can't use then in the universe… well you, you should know them… but in games play in actual practice you have to bond A to X and bond B to not X in order to convince others that A is different to B. Similarly you have to bond A to Y and bond B to Y to convince others that A is similar to B. Get it?

0:37:10

So it is not atoll unusual in this universe to find two objects which are both different and similar not atoll surprising is it, which we find. Most objects in this universe you can find differences between them and you can also find similarities between them and that's why you can do that because of the phenomena. This is what I am telling you, the conviction phenomena. All the bits fit when you know what's going on. You see?

37:35

So it's not… There's no contradiction between, between the fact the two objects A and B can be different and they can have differences, you can find differences between them and you can also find similarities between them. In fact that is norm… the normally the case in this universe. That two objects will be different and similar simultaneously and it's achieved by making A… bonding A to this quality X and bonding B to the quality not X and bonding… and bonding A to the quality Y and bonding B to the quality Y and then you have done it. Then A and B are both different and similar.

38:20

That's the way it works in the universe. And this is very, very different to the way it looks when you look it up in the dictionary. When you look it up in the dictionary, look up the word different in the dictionary you will find different defined as "not identical to," not identical that's what different means not identical. So when, when a person says two things are different they mean they are not the same.

Well now logically you're in great trouble if you try and define difference in terms of non-identity. You're in great trouble logically if you try… attempt to do this, although you can logically define identity very, very precisely. I mean A is identical to B logically if… if the proposition if A then B and the proposition if B then A, if both those propositions maintain that A is identical to B or at least it's ahh… equivalent to B logically. But um… certainly those two would um… um… if those two… if those two hold, if A then B and if B then A, they both hold. You could say that A is identical to B.

39:40

Certainly that applies in the human mind. So the two will be identical there, but these are… if they are not identical or if they're different and then if they are not identical, and if they're not identical then they're different. Ahh no, no, now you're in trouble here your really in logical difficulty because you cannot… you're not easily able to define the subject of non identity. It's difficult to define it logically like you can defined identity you can define identity very easily within… within the terms of the proposition if A and B but you can't defined the non-identity with an if A then B type of postulate.

40:35

Non-identity is simply the absence of identity. It leads you into a… what is called… in illogic, what's know as a… as a non-equation. You end up with something which is not equal to naught. You see that? Instead of something which is equal to naught. You don't end up with equation you end up with non-equations and non-equations are notoriously… it is impossible to arrive at a definition of anything when you are dealing with non-equations.

This is… this is known in philosophy. And ahh… so you're in deep trouble if you subscribe to what's in the dictionary on the subject of differences. They defined the differences as a non-identity.

41:15

And I don't think anyone has done any work in this area for 4 or 5 hundred years. I think what happen about 4 or 5 hundred years ago somebody said, "Look we better have some definition of a difference you know what is the word different… how to we define difference. What do you think Joe." and Joe says "Well if two thing aren't identical they must be different." And the guy says, "Oh ya, that's good. That's certainly true. Ya that'll do fine. That will do fine." And it's been jogging down the time track every since.

41:44

You define difference in terms of non-identity, and it doesn't work. You simply can't do it. You try and do it. You try to set up a logical system, the difference based on non-identity. You immediately get in deep, very deep, deep logical difficulties, logical trouble with your definition of a difference. And you end up with something which bears no relationship to what actually happens in the really universe.

42:16

But my definition of difference works exactly the way it works in the universe. And it explains why objects… two objects A and B can be both different and similar. So we don't get this difficultly we have a very smooth run of it when we define differences and similarities the way I define them.

42:35

So I'm… I'm sure that my definition is correct. It feels right. It checks out and you can… you can… you can derive some very workable procedures… psychological procedures from the definition. So I am pretty darn sure that my definition of… of… of a difference my definition of a similarly is the correct definition in this universe. The one in the dictionary is simply wrong, it's simply wrong, when they define a difference as a non-identity. Two things are different if they are not identical. That is simply sloppy. It is simply wrong. It isn't the way it is.

43:13

Now there's no equivalent difficulty on the subject of similarities. Look up the word similarity in the dictionary. It defines similarity as alike. Well two things are similar if they're alike. Ok, well that's a bit wish-washy, you can't do much with it. You know it's a…not a definition you can work with. You couldn't… you couldn't… you couldn't do anything with it. So, ahh…but at least you don't ahh…you don't get into any great… any great difficulties with it but you can't use it, logically speaking to try and work with.

So my definition of similarities is the only one I know of. There is nothing in the dictionary that helps you. I don't know whether there is any, accepted scientifically, definition of a similarity. I have certainly never come across any scientific text book. I have never come across any dif… any definition of a difference or any definition of a… of a similarity. Only the dictionary defines a difference as a non-identity, and I can assure you, you get into… you get into more deep water then you'd ever want to get into if you try and use that… use that as a definition of a difference. It simply doesn't work. So I just gave you that background material for you edification.

0:44:38

That ahh…it's worthwhile to bear in mind when working with differences and similarities to get the technological background of it exactly right the…the actual definition of a difference is that… difference…If A and B are different then they have…then their common class is null. That…that's it. That's it. That's the definition. If the common class of A and B is null then A and B are different. You see?

That there is the definition and similar with similarities, if A and B is similar then there common class is not null. And if the common class of A and B is not null then A and B are similar. Now there's you basic definition but because of the conviction phenomena in the universe it works out the way I've given it by bonding to make A different from B you bond A to… to quality X and you bond B to quality not X and to make A similar to B you bond A to a quality Y and you bond B to a quality Y.

45:50

On the… tape… tape A of this set by the way I use the um symbol X for both differences for the qualities in both differences and similarities and it made it a little bit confusing. It is best to keep it separate. When dealing with difference use the quality X and when dealing with similarity use the quality Y and you keep them separate.

46:12

So that… there it is… there's the subject. I can pretty well wrap this subject up now. I got this wrapped up and I am very, very pleased with this piece of technology. I am very, very happy with it and um I am pretty sure I have got all the… all the bugs out of it now all… all the bugs have come out. I can't think… I have been testing it… testing it for a couple of weeks…no less than that, but a pretty exhaustive testing for the last week, or so. And ahh… I haven't come across any more bugs. But it's a very useful piece of technology and it winds up our… it wraps up our… our 5 levels very nicely.

47:00

We go though levels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 then when we… when we go into bond breaking we go back and use level 2, or even level 3 if we want to, in the specialized application but

we're still within the 5… the 5 procedures of 1… level 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 we still haven't gone outside it we just using level 2 after level 5, level 3 after level 5. You see that?

47:30

But I will call this tape Level 2 after Level 5 even though I do mention the idea of using level 3 after level 5.

47:40

I can assure you that the… the procedure is a very powerful procedure it is a very powerful procedure for… for, for breaking bonding in the mind and that I say the only limitation is when you are dealing with the area of… where you got the body goals packages. Particularly the subject of sex and the subject of eating you won't find that you'll be able to do… you wont be able to find that you'll get much of any erasure there or a breaking of the bonding there because the body simply is um… is um… addicted to these um these false identifications. He is addicted to this bonding.

And also where, as I've also pointed out, you won't be able to get a complete breaking of the bonding when you got two… two objects which by their very nature are intrinsically um… intrinsically different by their very nature …by their very nature…their very nature as objects they're intrinsically different then of course you won't expect to get any… any blending or any erasure there.

But within those limitations the procedure is extremely powerful within those limitations. In other words what I am saying is that if the only… if the difference between A and B is only being set up by you… you and your psyche then you will knock it into a cocked hat by using level 2 after level 5. Don't you understand me?

49:10

If it's…If the difference is subjective…is entirely subjective in your psyche and it's nothing to do with your body and it's got nothing to do with the rest of the universe around you. If it's entirely something you dreamed up one day.

Then level 2 after level 5 is for you. You can break that bonding and be free of it forever. You can erase it and say goodbye to it forever by using level 2 after level 5.

So again I wish you… wish you good luck with the procedure and bye bye for now.

End of tape

49:44