

## Relationships- Bonding

Today is the 21<sup>st</sup> of February 1994. And today I want to take up this vitally important subject of relationships, which technically is the subject of bonding.

So the lecture will be entitled Bonding but the material it covers will be this subject of relationships.

First off we need to discover what a relationship is. Well, fundamentally, **a relationship is a connection.** Is a connection. When we say... when we say two things are related we... we only really mean fundamentally that there is a connection between them. For example in our society there's clearly a connection between a person who wears a dress and a girl. These two things are connected in our society, and so we say they are related.

The concept of relationship and connectivity is quite interchangeable. If two things are connected then they are related. And if two things are related then they are connected.

0:01:22

Ah...it's a ... it's a two way proposition. You can't have one without the other. On the other hand, there doesn't appear to be any relationship between the subject of Eskimo's breakfast and Beethoven's Symphonies. So we would say that these two things are unrelated.

01:48

So they are unconnected.

Now the first thing we need to know about a relationship is that it's always between two or more things. A thing cannot be related to itself in isolation. You see that? So that's absolutely fundamental to the idea of a relationship. There's always two things...or more things involved. I mean three things could all be related to each other. But when you examine these complex relationships they can always be... any complex relationship of more than two things... when all say..you've got three things and they are all related to each other and their all connected to each other. Um...You can always break these ... this connectivity down into a series of pairs. You know if you've got A, B and C related to each other well you can break it down to the relationships between A and B, and between A and C, and the relationship between B and C.

2:47

You see, you can always break it down into a series of pairs. So a fundamental relationship is always a relationship of a pair. One thing to another. And certainly a thing cannot have a relationship with itself.

03:04

Now the next thing we need to know about a relationship is that all relationships are achieved by postulates. **All relationships are achieved by postulates.**

03:18

Things are related one to the other by making postulates. Now if you don't understand that you'll park yourself right here on the subject of relationships. You've got to get that. It's done by postulates. It's all done by postulates.

03:37

Well, as we already know this universe only consists of life and postulates. It's no great surprise to us to discover that all relationships are achieved by postulates, is it? But never-the-less you better grasp this.

03:51

Now, in life...in life and livingness there is a vast number of ways in which a relationship can be postulated. In other words a relationship postulate can occur in many, many ways in life. I won't bother to classify them. I haven't bothered to classify them. There is no need for me to classify them. But I can assure you it's a considerable number of ways.

4:21

I'll give you an example of the diversity of relationship postulates and you'll see what I mean. In the Old Testament of the Bible it is said that God said, "Let there be light." Now "Let there be light" doesn't sound like a relationship postulate but ah... thefact... a matter of fact it is. It is a relationship postulate. It's not a postulate in isolation because what God intended, according to the Old Testament was that the light should occur in the universe. So we have the two things. We have the universe, and we have light. So, really what God was saying... the type of postulate he was saying was that if the universe exists then light will exist.

5:09

That's really what he was saying. That if the universe exists then light exists. He may of expressed the postulate as let there be light, but that is what he meant. He meant that granting that the universe exists, and the universe does exist. Then there will be light in the universe., Another way of saying that if the universe exists then light exists in that universe. If universe then light. That's what he was saying.

5:43

So there's...here's an example there of a relationship that doesn't obviously appear to be a relationship. When you say the postulate let there be light. It doesn't immediately appear that it's a relationship postulate. Yet it is a relationship postulate.

5:59

All right I'll give you another example. And this is possibly a more obvious example. A man says "I love Mary." Well now that's a relationship postulate. We've got the subject of him. We've got the subject of love. And we've got the subject of Mary. That's actually three things in this situation. And he's connecting up in a manner that says "I love Mary." Another way to express this postulate that "I love Mary" would be... is to say that Mary is within the class of people that I love.

You see that? Now that's a very precise way of expressing the postulate. But people don't normally say that in conversation. The man would say that "well I love Mary" he wouldn't say that Mary is within the class of people that I love. He wouldn't say that. But never the less the latter is the more precise way to express the postulate.

6:58

Well, let's give another example of a relationship. A person says to himself or says to the world at large "All people who wear dresses are girls." See that, well that definitely is a relationship postulate. And ah... we could express that in another way by saying that his postulate is that if girl exist...sorry. If people who wear dresses exist then girls exist. That's another way of expressing that. You see? When you come to examine this subject of relationships and the nature of these various relationship postulates and they will come up...they will come up in therapy. Don't kid yourself on this subject. They're going to show up in droves as soon as you start working in therapy. Particularly at the upper levels. Levels 4 and 5. You're going to get these relationship postulates. [They're] going to start coming up. And you'll be struck by the diversity of these postulates. And you'll also be struck. And say to yourself "wouldn't it be nice... wouldn't it be lovely if there was a standard... That every relationship postulate could be reduced to a standard form.

8:16

A standard type of postulate, which means exactly the same as the one I find in my mind. Well is that possible? In other words, can we standardize all relationship postulates and put them into a certain form? Yes we can. We can do this. But before I talk about this, we'll have to talk a little bit about logic. A little bit about the subject of logic.

08:48

In the field of logic, this subject of how to express relationships between things was a great problem for many, many years. They too were struck by the diversity of relationships. The way that relationships could...The logicians were struck by the diversity in the way that relationships could exist between things. And they too looked for a standardized...ah... standard form of the relationship postulate. Oh, but they didn't call it a relationship postulate. They simply were looking for a standardized form of relationship. They were looking for something that, no matter what they found, in the real universe. No matter what the relationship was. No matter how it expressed itself in the real universe it could be broken down into some simplicity. And so it could be used in the logical system.

09:44

And eventually they found what they called the fundamental logical relationship. That any relationship between things in the universe can be broken down into this simplicity and thus understood. And thus standardized, and understood in the terms of this simplicity.

10:07

Now when we searched for a standardization of relationship... of the relationship postulates standardized. There is absolutely no reason why we shouldn't use the same standard form that the logician uses. I mean, the logicians went to great lengths to discover the fundamental relationship postulate. And there is no reason why we shouldn't use it.

10:35

Or to put it another way round, we couldn't do any better no matter how we worked at this subject of relationship postulates and standardized them. Tried to ... and first of all classify them and then standardize them. We would basically end up with the same postulate that the logicians ended up with. I can assure you of that. We wouldn't come up with anything new. There is only in this universe, there is only one fundamental relationship postulate.

11:06

And that's the one the logicians use. Life doesn't use it very much. It can use something very similar to it. Life does. But it doesn't use it very much. It's lovely to be able to convert any relationship you find in the mind into this standard form. But you might say, "Does any advantage accrue to taking a relationship in the mind and reducing it to a standardized form... to a standard form?" Yes, considerable advantages accrue which you don't notice and don't know about until you actually do the reduction to the standardization.

11:46

Once you take this relationship and reduce it to the standard form you are then in a position to learn much, much more about that relationship than you could ever learn while it was in the non-standardized form. In other words, there's tremendous advantages to be gained by taking the relationships as they appear in the mind and reducing them to the standard form.

12:09

The standard form. Now what is this standard form of a relationship? Well before I give you that standard form we will have to talk, unfortunately, just a little about... about the logic of classes. We won't have to go very much into it but unless I give you a few of the basics of the subject of the logical classes you won't see the advantages of putting a relationship into its basic logical form. So we better talk about this... a little bit about the logical classes. And then you'll see... the enormous advantages that accrue by using the... using the logical form of relationships.

12:55

## Class

Well first of all we better briefly say... well... what is a class? We'd better make some definitions here otherwise we're going to get into a frightful mess if we don't define a few terms. All these terms are going to be used later in the lecture so you better cock your ears up. They're not complicated terms. But we're going to define them.

First of all what is a class? Well a class is defined, and this is as good a definition as any, however, you may find more precise definitions in logical text books but for our purposes of a class ,it's as good a definition as any. A class can be defined as a group whose members each have one or more things in common. **A group whose members have one or more things in common**

13:46

Now for example, the... ahh...men are a class. They are a class of beings. Are men. They all have in common... ahh... masculinity. They all have masculinity in common. They may have many other things in common in the class of men. But they at least have that in common. So that is sufficient to designate them as a class. That they've all got masculinity in common.

14:12

Alright, so much for a class. It's a simple...a simple enough definition.

## Common Class

Now the next thing is a common class. A common class is best defined as a class which consists of two or more classes. For example a common class would be the class of black men. And here we have the class of black...black beings. That would be a distinct class in the universe. Black beings. And ah... men is a class in the universe. The class of men, but the common class of black men, they possess...they have in common that their men and they also have in common that they're black. They're black beings. So they're both men and black beings. You see? So they're black men. We would say this is the class of black men. You see that? Now that's a common class.

15:20

A more complex class would be black men over 6 foot tall. They would have in common. Each one...Each member of this class would be a black being, would be a man, and would be over 6 foot tall. See that? So that would be black men over 6 foot tall. Would be the common class of black men over 6 foot tall. Again it's quite a straight forward...ah... quite a straight forward system.

15:45

## Null Class

Now the next ah... next definition I want to give you. And this is a very, very important one, is the concept of the null class. Null class. N-U-double L. the word null comes from the Latin nullis meaning not any. So it's no surprise to discover that a null class is a class that's empty. **It has no members in it.** So that is what a null class is. It's an empty class. There's no members in it.

16:16

I'll give you a couple of examples of empty classes. Null classes. The class of green cats is a null class. The class of green things is a well populated class. There's plenty of things in this universe that are green. And the class of cats is a well defined class. But the common class of green cats is null. Cats evidently, for reasons best known to themselves. Don't come out in the color green. So, you won't find... although you find plenty of cats about and plenty of green objects about... green things about. You won't find any green cats. Green cat. This is a null class.

So, and another example of a null class would be crows. The common class of crows that are non birds. Can you see? That too is a null class. It's an empty class. Crows that are non birds. There's plenty of things in the universe that ahh... plenty of crows about. And there's plenty of things in the universe that aren't birds. But the... but the class of things that are both crows and non birds does not exist. There aren't any crows that are non birds. The reason why there aren't any crows that are non birds is because all crows are birds. You see? If all crows are birds, and in this universe all crows are birds, then the common class of crows that are non birds does not exist.

18:01

So again that is a null class. You see that?

18:09

So one must be wary of making permutations and combinations of classes. It's quite all right to do this but you can't always be sure that the classes you arrive at when you start combining these classes at random. While though each individual class you specify may have members in it you can't be sure that the common class that you end up with is going to have members in it. It may be a null class. You would have to test it. There may, in other words, there may postulates in the universe which make the postulate that you arrived at into a null class. You see that? So don't always assume... you mustn't always assume that all classes have got members in them. There's quite a lot of null classes in this universe, quite a lot of them.

18:59

### Bonding Relationship Postulate

Right, well, so far so good. We're getting on very, very well here. We've defined a relationship. We've defined a class. We've defined a common class, and we've defined a null class. We're getting on very, very well. We're now in a position to specify the basic bonding relationship

postulate in the field of logic. Now this postulate is the..what... in simplest form of “if A then B”. That is the basic form of the postulate. If A then B.

Now what do we mean when we say “if A then B”? Well we simply mean if A exists then B exists. That’s what we mean fundamentally. That if A exists then B exists.

Now if that postulate... our postulate is determined to make this so. That is what we’re postulating. When we say “if A then B” we are saying if A exists then B exists. Or, to put it another way, every time we see A we will see B. Every time we see A we will see B.

20:21

Now the postulate does not say. When we say if A then B. The postulate doesn’t say that A exists. It says that if A exists. Conditional. That if A exists then B exists. Follow?

20:36

So it’s not, when you say “if A then B.” It’s not quite the same as saying all A’s have B. See that? In certain specified instances “all A’s have B” might be the same as “if A then B.” Let’s give an example here to differentiate those two out.

In this universe all crows are birds. You can postulate all crows are birds. Ok? Now that’s true... that’s true. All crows are birds in this universe. They all obey that postulate... The postulate there.

I don’t know who made the postulate, whether the birds made it, Or whether god made it. We’re not concerned who made the postulate, but the postulate exists in the universe that all crows are birds. Now we can express that... this postulate says that all crows are birds implies that crows exist. When you say “all crows are birds”, this implication, that crows exist.

But when we say “if crow then bird”, there is no such implication. So it’s a much more precise postulate. But it means the same thing. It means... “if crow then bird” means exactly the same thing as “all crows are birds.” The only difference is that “all crows are birds” implies that crows exist, and because crows exist birds exist. If crow then bird.

But when we say “if crow then bird” is a conditional postulate. We don’t much saying that crows exist. But if crows exist... if the crows do exist, and we don’t know whether they exist or not, but if a crow exists then it’s a bird. But, of course, there may not be any crows at all.

22:28

So our postulate, “if crow then bird,”... “if crows then birds” or if crow then bird could exist in a universe where there’s no crows and no birds. You see? Where the postulate all crows are birds does really need the existence of crows, therefore, the existence of birds to put itself into action. But the postulate “if crow then bird” could exist in a universe where there’s no crows and no birds. It’s simply a postulate, simply a relationship. It just says if crows exist then birds exist.

Now you see the difference between the two? You see that “if crow then bird” is a much more fundamental [way] to express the postulate. It doesn’t require the existence of the junior universes of crows, birds or whatever that, or whatever A and B happen to be in this situation we are considering. You see that’s the most fundamental of it is “if A then B”.

23:25

Now. In the field of logic, you might be interested to know this, that any logical proposition or proposition. No matter how complex. You can have... ah...you can have... no matter how complex the propositions are... the logical propositions are. They can be broken down into a series of “if A then B” propositions. Now this is true in the field of logic. You can have something as complex say as the programming of a mighty computer and that may have millions maybe billions of relationships in its memory bank but um...this whole mishmash of relationships could, if you wanted to. Would spend the time at it. You could break it down into a series of “if A then B” relationships. If A then B bondings. You see that?

24:25

Or to put it another way. You can build up. No matter how complex the relationships you want in your computer you can build them up to any great complexity in terms of if A then B postulates. You just keep feeding If A then B postulates into the computer and you’ll end up with any degree of complexity you desire in your memory bank or in your postulate structure in your program of your computer. You see?

24:53

So it doesn’t matter how complex it is. It goes two ways. You can build up complex structures or complex relationship postulates from the simple “if A then B’s.” or you can break down the complex ones into their “if A then B” parts. You see that? Goes either way.

25:14

Go from simplicity to complexity then break the complexity back to the simplicity.

25:25

Now you’re beginning to see that there is some advantage to using the logical system over dealing with all this different types of relationship postulates we find in life. Already we’re beginning to see advantages, aren’t we?

25:39

See that we can break down a complexity into a simplicity and go from a simplicity to a complexity, by using this system. Using the if A then B system, which we can’t do on another system. But anyway I thought I’d mention that to you.



And it's no different than the human mind. No matter how complex the relationships are in the human psyche, they can all, each and every one of them, can be broken down into a series of "if A then B" relationships. And can be utilized as such. And, strangely enough, once you break them down into "if A then B" relationships they can be utilized and can be manipulated in the logical system, if you wish, because logic. The logicians divert their subject where you can manipulate these "if A then B" postulates within a system. And can come out with deductions and so forth.

26:44

Before you can use the system of the logicians you've got to put your postulates in the form, your relationships in the form. That the systems can handle and the logical systems can handle "if A then B" postulates. Because all logic... that's the basis of all relationships. You see?

So that any logical system can handle an "if A then B" postulate. So you get your life and livingness postulates once you reduce them down to "if A then B." The actual postulates. They can be manipulated in a logical system. That's another advantage of doing this. You might not want to do so but you can do so once you've reduced them down to this simplicity.

27:27

So again we are seeing that there are more advantages accruing here. Beginning to look good isn't it? Beginning to look good.

27:32

Now what is the effect of making an "if A then B" postulate? Now we're beginning to get in an area where you'll really begin to see the advantages of going into the simplicity of it. The "if A then B", rather than with dealing with the complexity of dealing with the relationship postulates of the human mind. The advantage of converting the complex relationship postulates in the mind into the simple postulate of "if A then B".

28:03

What is the effect of an "if A then B" postulate. Well we know that the effect of all postulates limit freedom. Every postulate. You'll find this in one of the earlier supplementary lectures. It's in the definition... one of the very, very early definitions, that it applies in the universe. That ummm.. remember when I said uh... when I said that all postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. All postulates limit the possible and thereby define the reasonable. Well a relationship is no exception to this rule. It's a postulate. So it limits the possible. Therefore, it results, like any postulate in a lowering of freedom of choice.

28:51

Well let's examine an "if A then B" postulate and see what and how this comes about and what freedom of choice is lost when you make an if A then B postulate. Let us take, for example, the postulate... the relationship postulate "if crow then bird". Now what freedom is lost in that area? Well when we say if crow then bird we are saying that this common class that are both crows and non birds does not exist. I'll give it to you again. When we say "if crow then bird", make the postulate "if crow then bird" we are saying that this common class that is both a crow and a non bird does not exist. It's a null class.

29:47

And that, so help me, is the only effect of the "if crow then bird" postulate. It has no other effect. It simply empties that class. So you lose... so you lose one of the possible classes on the subject. When you say if crow then bird. You've lost some freedom here. Well, let's have a look and examine what freedom you've lost.

Well now there is this little thing called a postulate set here. There's this subject of crows. This class of crows and this class of birds. Well we already know that... that umm...that there's four poss...four possible permutations between the subject of crows and birds. There is this class of things that are both crows and birds, there is a class of things that crows and not birds, and there is a class of things that are non crows and birds, and a class of things that are neither crows or birds. And that's ...the totality... the sum of those four classes constitutes the whole universe and we call this a set. A set. A postulate set.

31:05

It's a set of the postulates. Remember I've used the words postulate set when dealing the postulates of the goals packages. But these are also... it's still a postulate set. But we're using this postulate... the relationship postulate so you still call it a postulate set or loosely we simply call it a set. It's essentially... it's still a postulate set.

31:29

So there is four classes in the set. There's the class of both crows and birds, both crows and non birds, both non crows and birds. And both non crows and non birds. And when we say if crow then bird we've taken this class of both a crow and a non bird and reduced it to a null class. So now we've only... in our universe now we haven't got four classes. The universe now has only got three classes. We got the class that is both a crow and a bird, the class that is neither crow and a bird or the class that is neither a crow nor a bird. And that's...that's what it looks like in this universe.

Course it happens to be true in the real universe... that if crow then bird is a true postulate, and the universe subscribes to that postulate. It's true in the universe. There is only those three classes extant. The fourth class. The class of creatures that are both crows and non birds doesn't exist.

32:38

They don't exist because the postulate that if crow then bird reduces that class to a null class. You follow? So there's the freedom that's lost.

32:50

Now, this is sneaky isn't it? This is sneaky. If you've been following this you'll realize that you can lose freedom by making relationship postulates. Every time you make a relationship postulate you've lost a little bit of freedom. Now that is something worth knowing isn't it. You know, when you've gone around relating one thing to another, no matter how you do it. Once you've related one thing to another. Once you've connected two things together. No matter how you've done it. No matter what you call this relationship postulate. Fundamentally you've gone and lost some freedom.

33:31

As can be easily demonstrated by converting your relationship postulate into the four "If A then B" and seeing which...and seeing which member of the set is gone. One of the members of the set will have gone. Would have been reduced to a null class because of your if A then B postulate. You see that?

33:53

So there's a distinct relationship between relationships and freedom. Every relationship that is made is a loss of some freedom of choice. And that is the datum. And it's a very, very important datum, a vitally important datum on the subject of relationships. You'd better know that one. You'd better know that one. That is the liability of making relationship postulates. Because every time you make a relationship postulate you've lost a little freedom of choice. And you haven't ... it's not obvious is it? Not obvious.

34:30

A child may postulate. Or a young man or child may postulate all those... "all people who wear dresses are girls." It may not be obvious to him, but he should know in his own mind he's now lost a bit of freedom. He can no longer now have the class of a person who wears a dress who isn't a girl. That class is now a null class in his mind. It's an empty class. He can't have that class anymore. All the other three classes in the set... and I won't specify, I'll leave this as an exercise for you. There's three other classes in this set that can exist in this universe. But that fourth class, that is of a person...that is both a person who wears a dress and is not a girl. That class can't exist in his mind. There is no such animal he'll say. Once he makes the postulate "if person wearing a dress then a girl." Once he's made that postulate.

35:35

The class of people who wear dresses who are non girls don't exist in his class. No such animal as far as he's concerned. And he will stand you out if you argue with him or talk to him on the

subject “ They don’t exist.” He’ll just simply justify and rationalize for his postulate... his postulate. You see that?

35:56

So bear in mind, you can lose all the freedom there is in this universe by injudiciously making relationship postulates. By the injudicious use of... making relationship postulates. You can lose all the freedom there is in this universe. And you can dig yourself into a hole and jump into it. And you should understand that about relationships, and relationship postulates, very, very important. You see? T’is an important subject, isn’t it. Very important subject, relationships.

36:28

Well now, if you’re going to convert all your relationship postulates you come across in your mind into the form “if A then B”, you better be very familiar with what this postulate “if A then B” really means. And so forth.

Well I can give you a little example here. Little something that will help you to understand. Something that will make it... something graphic. Or make it stick it in your mind. So that you understand what we mean when we say “if A then B”.

37:03

Supposing we live in a town and we see two men A and B. and they have a tandem bicycle. And B always rides at the front of the bicycle. He’s always at the front of the bicycle. And A always rides behind him at the back of the bicycle. Follow that?

37:32

Now, sometimes when we go out... when we go out walking around the town we see A and B on their tandem bicycle. Going about there’s B driving it at the front doing the steering and there’s A behind him. They’re both going along. That’s one possibility. Now, there’s other times we go out walking around the town, we see B on the tandem bicycle all by himself. On the front of it, he’s all by himself and there’s no A at the back. A’s just not there. See? So we could see that possibility.

38:12

Another time we go out walking around the town we don’t see either of them. There’s no A no B and no tandem bicycle. See that? But the one thing we can’t see is A and not B. Why can’t we see A and not B? Well you can’t drive a tandem bicycle from the back, because you can’t steer it. And A only rides at the back of the tandem bicycle. So if B doesn’t...isn’t there, if we don’t see B on the tandem bicycle then we’re sure as Hell ain’t gonna see A.

38:59

So does that little set... example help you? There's the three sets you see, of the tandem bicycle. We either see both A and B, or we see B and not A, or we see neither A nor B. But we never see A and not B. and that gives you a graphic example of an "if A then B" postulate in terms of the tandem bicycle.

39:30

The reason we never see A... never see A and not B is because if B is absent then A is absent.

39:40

Now that is a very important relationship. And we call that... "if not B then not A", we call the reverse proposition or more precisely the reverse interpretation.

George Boole called it the reverse interpretation. Well he's a good enough authority on the subject. We..we shall call it the reverse interpretation. We've got an "if A then B" postulate. If A then B... in other words if "if A then B" is true then the reverse interpretation of that postulate is "if not B then not A." Now this is... that's not a deduction. It's simply another way of saying the postulate. Another way of saying "if A then B" is to say "if not B then not A.". Another way to say every time that we see A on the bike...on the tandem bicycle we see B on the tandem bicycle. Another way to say that is to say that when we don't see B on the tandem bicycle we never see A. it means exactly the same thing. It's a reverse interpretation of the if A then B postulate.

40:55

So bear that in mind. Every if A then B postulate's got it's reverse interpretation, which is not a deduction. It's just simply another way of saying it, another way of saying it. In other words we might... instead of saying if A then B, we might just as well say if not B then not A. It means exactly the same thing. And the reverse interpretation of the postulate "if not B then not A" is "if A then B". See that?

41.21

They share that relationship. Those two postulates share that relationship with each other. If one is the reverse...if one is the reverse relationship or the reverse interpretation of the other.

41:35

Well now I'm just looking at this... looking at this tape. I see I'm getting towards the end of this side. So we'll close off this side of this tape here. So just spool the tape on to the end and flip over to the other side.

41:54

Here we are. Back again on side two.

All right, so much for the example of the two men on the tandem bicycle. I hope that helps you to understand the ah... understand what we mean when we say "if A then B". You should by now, if you've been following this, have a pretty firm grasp of what we mean when we say "if A then B."

42:15

### Bonding

Now next I'd like to talk a little more of this subject of Bonding and why we call a relationship a bonding.

Well it's not immediately obvious why we call a relationship a bonding until you get into the subject of if A then B. until you see the basics. The basic relationship "if A then B" which is the basic relationship. Once you see... get this basic relationship you see that ah.. its connection between the relationship and the subject of bonding.

Now when we say if A then B we are virtually bonding A to B. A is bonded to B. take the example of the men on the tandem bicycle. A... B has no restrictions. He can appear on the bicycle anytime he wants to, can't he. He can drive the bicycle any time he wants. Or not drive it. He has no restrictions. But A is restricted. Once the postulate A... if A then B is made, A is restricted if A exists then B exists. And that is a restriction. So, the if A then B postulate puts no restriction on B but puts a restriction on A.

43:30

In other words, A... B can use the tandem bicycle any time he wants to, but A can only use the bicycle when B is using it. Get it? You see that example is a good example. How useful that little example is of the tandem bicycle. It brings that to light and brings that forward very, very clearly. This fact. On the bonding. That A is bonded to B. that B is not bonded to A. which is true in any if A then B postulate. Bonding, when we say if A then B, the bonding is between A and B. there is no bonding between B and A when we say if A then B. A is stuck to B. but B isn't stuck to A because B is free. But A is joined... is connected and is dependent upon B.

44:25

Now this subject of bonding is not immediately apparent when you're talking about sticking wallpaper onto walls. But it becomes very apparent when you start getting down to relationship postulates of if A then B. we stick the wall paper onto the wall and the wallpaper is stuck to the wall but the wall is also bonded to the wallpaper. Isn't it? So we tend loosely in life when we think of bonding we think of two things bonded to each other. Well that might be true for wallpaper and walls but when it gets down to postulates and bits and pieces in the mind. We have... we can't use this...this... this..we have...we can't use this rough look at it, we have to get

down to more precision. And once we get down to If A then B postulate we're getting very precise here. We see that ah...we can have situations where A is stuck to B and B is not stuck to A. that's something which you can't have with wallpaper and walls. You see? But you can have in your own psyche.

45:22

To give you another example of the.. of the sticky...of the bonding effect. You'll see it with the man who postulates if person wearing dress then girl. Now such a man can think of a girl without necessarily thinking of a person who is wearing a dress. He may think of a person who is wearing a dress when he thinks of a girl, or he may not think of a person who wears a dress when he thinks of a girl. But such a man cannot think of a person who is wearing a dress without thinking of a girl. Now you see which way round the bonding is? The bonding is between the person who wears a dress and a girl. There's no bonding between the girl and a person who wears a dress, in his mind.

46:15

In other words, in his mind the subject of people who wear dresses is stuck to the subject of girls. But in his mind the subject of girls is not stuck to the subject of people who wear dresses.

46:32

The general rule of thumb to help you to remember the if A then B relationship, which way round it is. **In the if A then B relationship the front end of the relationship is stuck to the back end of the relationship. But the back end of the relationship is not stuck to the front end of the relationship.** Now that's true for any if A then B relationship.

46:54

When you... when you thoroughly grasp this you'll see that... see why that.. why we say that the technical subject of the subject of relationships is this subject of bonding. The technical subject is the subject of bonding. And you should start to think of relationships in terms of bondings. When you start thinking about relationships in terms of bondings you begin to really understand them.

47:21

Leave the subject of relationships to the psychoanalysts and the politicians and the sociologists who like to skid over the surface of these things and just take rather a casual look. **But when you want to get down to real precision, as you need to do if you're going to take your mind apart, want to get down to real precision then start seeing relationships in terms of bondings.** And then you'll start to really start to understand them.

47:45

Now there's two things you should know about the if A then B postulate. It's got the word "then" in it. Well, the first thing you need to know about the then that it's not... we're not using in a temporal sense. We are not saying that if A "then" ten minutes later B. we're not using "then" in that sense. We're using "then" in the sense of exists. If A exists then B exists. There is no temporal gap between A and B. We're not using the word then in its' temporal sense. We're using it in the connecting sense. "then" is a conjunction. Then. We're using it in the connecting sense. Not in the temporal tense. So when we say if A then B it's a pure relationship. There's no temporal sense in it. There's no time in the postulate. It's not a time postulate. There is no time implied in the then. If A then B. we're not saying if A exists then a certain time after B exists. We are saying if A exists B exists. They can both be existing simultaneously. If A then B. every time we see A we see B. there is no time in it. Get that? So "then" is not temporal.

49:00

And the other thing you need to know is that if A then B is a pure relationship postulate. It does not imply that A is the cause of B, or it doesn't imply that B is the cause of A. It is not a causal situation... relationship between A and B. when we say if A then B we are not implying that A is the cause of B. or that B is the cause of A. or that not A is the cause of not B. or that not B is the cause of not A. or any other sequence or any other combination of AB , not A not B relationships in the set. We're not implying anything causes it when we say if A then B. we're simply saying when A exists, if A exists then B exists. Every time we see A, we see B. and if we don't see B we don't see A. and A is bonded to B. that's all we're saying. There is no causative. It's not a causative relationship. Get that in mind. Get very, very clear. No causation here.

50:06

Now though the "if A then B" postulate doesn't imply any causation between the elements of the postulate, between the elements of the postulate. The relationship postulate as a postulate is a true postulate but like any postulate it is a causative consideration. So the whole postulate "if A then B" has a... once postulated into the mind, into the psyche, is causative. It's causative upon the individual and upon his surroundings. And so on.

50:41

So get it quite clear. The .. the.. the postulate itself is like any postulate. Is a causative consideration, but there's no causation. When we say if A then B, there's no causation being implied between the elements of A and B within the postulate. That's the whole point I'm trying to make.

51:03

### Sufficiency and Necessity

Now, although there's no causation implied between the elements in an "if A then B" postulate, there is a necessity relationship between the elements and a relationship of sufficiency between the elements. Which I'll proceed to explain to you because you should know about them. When we postulate if A then B we are either postulating that B... that the existence of B is a necessary



condition to the existence of A. or we're postulating that the existence of A is a sufficient condition for the existence of B. Here are a couple of examples.

51:50

Here to separate those two out. And to clarify what I mean by ... what I mean by the necessity bonding and the sufficiency bonding.

52:03

### Sufficiency Bonding Example

First of all the sufficiency bonding. A man says to his son. He says "if the weather is fine tomorrow then we will have a picnic." Now the relationship here... the postulate here is "if fine weather then picnic". Well now the man is saying in essence that the fine weather is a sufficient condition for the picnic. In other words that if the weather is fine then there will be a picnic tomorrow.

There may well be other things which are sufficient conditions for the picnic tomorrow. But fine weather is certainly one of them. If the weather is fine there will be a picnic tomorrow. He will take the lad out for a picnic. So that is an example of sufficiency. If fine weather then picnic. The fine weather is a sufficient condition for the picnic.

Clearly it's not that the picnic is a necessary condition for the fine weather. That doesn't make any sense, does it? The fine weather is not a necessary condition, so it... the picnic is not a necessary condition for the fine weather.

53:20

Now the correct relationship there is a sufficiency relationship, that the fine weather is a sufficient condition for the picnic. Ok on that one? You see that is an example of sufficiency.

53:32

### Necessity Bonding Example

Now let's give an example of the necessity bonding. A young boy goes... starts off at school and he notices that all the other boys are wearing trousers and so is he. He notices that all the boys are wearing trousers. And he's in the frame of mind to establish his masculinity. And he has this bright idea that ah... these things... that all the males and all the boys are wearing trousers so ah... he might be able to establish his masculinity, which is something he really wants to do, so he postulates "if boy then wearing trousers." That's his postulate. When he's making that postulate, the idea is he's bonding his masculinity to the wearing of trousers in these circumstances, in order to establish his masculinity. Because the trousers are a recognized and accepted male gender symbol in the society in which he lives. So he's bonding his ahh... his masculinity to the existing gender symbol, the trousers. Get it?

54:50

Now let's examine this in terms of sufficiency and necessity. Is the ... is being a boy a sufficient condition for wearing the trousers? Well, no. no. and why not, because it's being a boy that he is trying to establish. You see that? He feels a lack of establishment of his masculinity. It's the masculinity he's trying to establish by the wearing of the trousers. Now the correct relationship there, it's a necessity bonding, that the wearing of the trousers is a necessary condition for being a boy in his mind. But the relationship is if boy then wearing trousers, with a necessity relationship between the wearing of the trousers and being a boy. The wearing of the trousers is a necessary condition to being a boy.

55:50

Now there is an example of the necessity relationship.

55:55

Now when you examine if A then B postulates you'll find that their either sufficient... either A is a sufficient condition for B or B is a necessary condition for A. it's always going to be one or the other. It's always going to be one or the other. And sometimes, very, very rarely it means both. Both will apply.

56:21

#### Both Necessity and Sufficiency Example

I'll give you an example here that will... will both and I'll explain how and under what circumstances you get both being applicable. Let's take our example of the crows and the birds. If crow then bird. Now that's a true relationship in this universe on this planet. But, um... certainly ahm... being a crow is a sufficient condition for being a bird. There is no doubt about that. Being a crow is sufficient condition for being a bird. But on the other hand, being a bird is a necessary condition for being a crow. You can't be a crow unless you're a bird. So, being a bird is a necessary condition for being a crow.

57:05

Both of them apply. The crow is a sufficient condition... crow is sufficient for bird. And bird is necessary for crow. Now how does this come about? Well it comes about because of the way we define a crow. We define a crow as within the class of a bird. A part of our definition of a crow is the fact that it is a bird. You see? It's a type of bird, is a crow. Once we define a crow as a type of bird we've put A within the class of B. and we've made the "if A then B" postulate within our definition. And ah, this shows up when we examine the postulate. That ah.. That we find the if A then B is a sufficiency relationship and a necessity relationship. They're both present. And we call this... it's known in logic as a logical tautology. It's a tautology. "If crow then bird" is a logical tautology.

58:05

And what we mean when we say it's a logical tautology we mean the relationship is true because of the way we define A and the way we define B. you understand that? That is what we mean by a logical tautology.

58:24

Now, I can prove that every time you find both a sufficiency and necessity relationship in an "if A then B" postulate, I can prove it logically, it's always in a logical tautology.

Now I've never seen the proof of this in any logical textbook. And I think my proof must be quite original. And I hope I should send it off to some logical journal somewhere, and it will no doubt get swept up and collected and written up one day in a logical textbook, but maybe I'll get round to it one day. But certainly it is so, I can assure you, even though it doesn't appear in any of the logical textbooks. I do have the proof tucked away in some of my research notes. It is a fact I can assure you. But it's only something that... only just marginally concerned with.

That you somehow be looking in your psyche and you come across an if A then B relationship and you find that when you take the relationship apart there's al... both a sufficiency and a necessity relationship there within your if A then B. Well just know that it's true that this if A then B relationship in your psyche is true by logical necessity. By the way you are defining if A and B in your mind. That as a person you are defining A and B that way and that's why it's coming out this way. So it's valuable to you. But it's quite rare. It's quite rare. Never the less, again you should understand it, why the phenomenon occurs when it does occur.

1:00:00

### Double Bonding

Well that completes our subject of the single bonding and I wish that that was the end of the subject. The universe would be a far better place if the ... if there was only the single bondings extant. But now we introduce you to the demon. The evil demon of the piece is the double bonding. The double bind.

1:00:19

Now what is a double bind? Well a double bind is a single binding plus its reverse. When the single binding "if A then B". The reverse of "if A then B" is "if B then A." so if we have a situation where if A then B maintains and coupled with if B then A then that is a double bonding. A double bind. We now have A bonded to B, B bonded to A.

Now this is a deadly situation. This is a deadly situation. It's something which you will not discover until you get into the subject of relationships and get them down to if A then B's.

The deadly nature of the double bind is not apparent until you get into this subject of relationships and break them down into their if A then B components. Then you begin to get into the double binds and see their awful nature. While you're skidding over the surface and just

looking generally at human relationships you don't spot the double bind. It's only when you get...you take the relationship, reduce it to its "if A then B" and you suddenly realize "My God the reverse is true too." And you... then you realize the horror of what you're up against. The double bind. The double bonding.

1:01:39

Now we've met the double bind in the postulate set. Their's a double bind in... when...when games play becomes compulsive in the ordinary postulate set, in the "to Know" goals package or any other goals package. In the goals package when we find a false identification between the elements of the goals package. Remember it? That's a double bind.

Well we can get a double bind in the postulate set in a relationship and it is equally deadly. It is equally entrapping as you would expect, and very, very hidden. Just as hidden. The double bind is just as hidden in the relationship... in relationships as in the goals packages. Just as hidden and just as deadly.

1:02:27

When I first came across the subject of the double bind in my research I called it the double lock on the mind. The double lock on the mind. Because once the double bind is extant the person is virtually trapped within a situation which has a double lock on it.

1:02:54

Well what do I mean by a double lock? Well I mean that (chuckle) that one lock...lock A keeps lock B in place and lock B keeps lock A in place. There is a double lock. And he can't unlock lock A because he is in lock B and he can't unlock lock B because he's locked in A.

1: 03:15

### Double Bind Example

I'll give you an example of the double bind and you'll see the shear horror of the situation. And they do occur. Their very, very common in life double binds are, relationship double binds. They're not at all unusual. But they're a great mystery. And people get caught in them. And a double bind can ruin your life I can assure you. Many people have their life ruined by a double bind.

1:03:37

I'll give you an example of one. Now a young man leaves school and applies for a job and he's told by the interviewer that um...that he can't be given a job because he's inexperienced. So the young man says "well now um...how do I get some experience?" and the interviewer says "well the only way to get experience is to get a job, which we can't give you because you're inexperienced." And that's the end of the interview and the young man staggers off into the daylight or into the night feeling completely crushed. Unless this young man is of particularly

clear mental abilities or is a student of logic or what have you, he's going to feel absolutely defeated. His mind is gonna go round... he's gonna go around like a rat in a maze, his mind is. He's going to say, "Wait a minute, I can't get a job because I'm inexperienced, and the only way to get experience is to get a job, which I can't get because I'm inexperienced. So I need to get experience to get a job. Wait a minute" and he starts in again. And he goes round and round and round this thing "Well I need to get some experience but I can't get any experience cause I haven't got a job and I can't get a job because I'm inexperienced. And ah...I can't...without experience I can't get a job and without the job I can't get any experience. There is no way. I'm doomed. I can't get... I can't move... I'm stuck" and he's right he is. The relationship here is,... and this is why he is like a rat in a maze, the relationship is if employable then experienced and it's reverse if experienced then employable.

1:05:41

The effect of the two ahh...of the two postulates, the two relationships is to reduce the set, the employable experienced set either to both employable and experienced or neither employable nor experienced. The classes of experienced and not employable and employable and not experienced don't exist in this set. The two postulates null...make those into null classes. You see? And the unfortunate young man is stuck in the class of neither experienced nor employable. And there is no way in the world he can get across to the class of both employable and experienced. Why not? Well, the double lock, it's a double locking mechanism. He can't go from inexperienced to experienced because he is not employable, and he can't go from not employable to employable because he is not experienced. See that?

1:06:48

And ah...so he's ...so he's trapped. He's trapped in the class of neither employable nor experienced. And there is no way in the world he can get, while those postulates are extant, while he is agreeing to those postulates, there is no way in the world that he can go, get across from the class that he is in, neither experienced nor employable, to the class of both employable and experienced. There's no way. The double bind simply locks him out. He's locked out. You see the viciousness of the mechanism. It's a double lock.

It's a double lock devise. And he's locked out by... much stronger than he would be locked out by bands of steel. You know? I mean.. there's a..by iron bars have got nothing...nothing to the power of the double bind. When you start to get into some of these double binds in the human psyche you'll realize that bands of steel have got nothing compared to the power of the double bind. It's truly a double lock on the mind.

1:07:51

Well how does the young man, lets finish the example off, how could the young man break the double bind? Well he could umm...he could treat it as an incident in therapy in TROM. And he could ahh...take it apart at level 4, and if he knew about Bondings and so forth, he could get it apart. And ah... or at level 5 eventually he would...he'd get it apart. He'd keep working at it and

he'd get mighty curious about these relationships, these Bondings, eventually he'd come up with what the hell was going on. But if he'd heard this tape he'd get it apart rather quickly. If he knew about the "if A then B" postulate, and the subject of relationships that I am talking about on this tape. He'd get it apart rather quickly.

1:08:38

Now as most people have been caught up, some time in their life, have been caught up with a double bind situation. And you see that this tape, that I am giving you, is covering just the material, covering how to take a double bind apart. What it consist of and how to get it apart very quickly. Well the young man he only has to examine the interview and write down his postulates that occur during the interview and he would quickly, . . . quickly say, "Well it's these two postulates "if employable then experienced" and "if experienced then employable." Bang. This is it."

1:09:15

Now are both these postulates true? Is it true, that all those who are experienced are employable and all those who are employable are experienced? Now is it true?

Well let's take these postulates one at a time. Let's take the postulate "if employable then experienced." Well now, is this a true postulate? Well now, no it's not, it can't be a true postulate. Why not? Well if it were true that all those who were employable were experienced then no one would have a job, because by necessity everyone is inexperienced when they start their first job. You see that?

So the postulate can't be a true postulate in our society. If the postulate were true, no one would have a job in this society because no one would ever get started at work. You see? But people do work, are working, therefore the postulates false. So that's a false postulate.

Now how about the other postulate, "If experienced then employable"? Well this postulate is probably closer to being true, but allows some . . . that can be true and cannot be true. Under certain circumstances it's true and under certain circumstances it's not true. So we just have to say, "Well that's ok, that postulate is, it depends on the circumstances."

Now that's all right there's nothing wrong with that one. But the postulate if employable then experienced is a lie. That has to be false, that one. And once you see that postulate is false. The double bind collapses.

1:11:00

Once the young man could spot it, He'll say, "Well that false, that's a lie. They sold me a lie. They got me to agree to the postulate, "if employable then experienced". And that's a false postulate."

Once he realized that they . . . they've hung a lie on him, he breaks out of the lie. Now the double bind become a single bind and he's free. See the single bonding is not entrapping. There is no

entrapment in the single bonding. It's only the double bind that's the trap. So he walks out the trap. He just gets very furious about the employer and goes down and punches... or the interviewer. And is likely to go down and punch him in the nose for trying to hang a lie on him. He been conned in other words. He'd be very annoyed, and rightly so, too.

1:11:49

Now it's a strange thing about double bind, the entrapping effect of double bind. That when you examine them and take them apart, using the data I'm giving you on this tape, you always, repeat always find that one of the postulates is a lie. There is always a lie involved in a double bind. You never find the if A then B postulate and its relationship...and its ... sorry and its reverse are both true. Both of them could be false. But at least one of them is false, or maybe both of them. They can't both be true. You see that? They can't both be true. If they were both true you wouldn't be trapped in anything.

That fact that you're trapped and you're inconvenienced, you're emotionally disturbed by the situation, and you've suffered a great loss of freedom, and you feel you're walking around in a trap. You feel you're in a prison. You feel...your your...your mind feels like a rat in a maze. You're in a double bind mate. Find it. See that?

1:12:58

And the fact that you're in this situation, one or the other or both of the postulates that you're subscribing to are false. One or the other of the postulates in the double bind are false.

In other words there's always a lie present in a double bind, and that is a very, very important datum. It's up to you to find where the lie is. Only the truth will free you from the double bind. One of the postulates is false in the double bind. It's false. There's a lie in there somewhere. There has to be. Just as the double bind in the postulate set...you know, the postulates in the goals packages, there is always a lie there in the double bind there.

It's similarly in the relationship postulates, if there is a double bind in the relationships...in the "if A then B" relationships postulates then one or the other of the relationships is a lie. If they were both true you wouldn't be trapped in anything I can assure you. If they were both true. So they can both be false. So that's the way it stands. That's the decision.

1: 14:06

Now a double bind is deadly. It can ruin your life. Single bonding ok. Double bind awful.

And you'll find that some of the most sticky, awful incidents you have ever experienced in your life. And ones that you've never really got away from contain double binds. And they probably contain more, more than one. So they stick out like beacons on your timetrack, they do, a double bind.

If you're caught up in one you'll know all about it mate. You won't have to search for them they'll come searching for you once you know what to look for. Just listening to this tape, if you understand what I'm talking about, you've probably...in a a ...you haven't... you've got incidents that are unresolved from the subject of double binds. These will be...these,,,these,,,incidents will be wrapped around your neck right now while you're listening to this tape.

Incidents will come searching you out, it will. If you understand... once you understand the mechanism the incident will come out...come and search you out. And pleading with you to get it...get... to resolve it, take the lie out. To get rid of the double bind.

1:15:11

Ok, so much for the double bind. You understand the mechanism. You understand how to take it apart.

1:15:17

#### Test

Alright, well now, this subject... let's go now from theory...let's look at a few practical aspects of this. How would you know... how would you find if you had a bonding in your mind? Very, very simple. There is a very, very simple test for a bonding. If A is bonded to B in your mind then every time you think of A you will think of B. it's as simple as that.

If every time you think of a person wearing a dress you think of a girl then I can assure you that the bonding "if person wearing dress then girl" you are subscribing to that bonding. You are subscribing to that postulate. You are subscribing to that relationship. See that? There's the test.

It's an infallible test It will never let you down. It's a very simple test. There are more complicated tests but you don't need to know them so I won't bother to give them to you. The simple test is infallible and will never let you down. If every time you think of A you will also think of B. Ok. If that happens then "if A then B" is extant.

1:16:23

Now what do you have to do about it in therapy? Nothing. Nothing. Unless it hangs fire. Nothing. Get me on this one. You don't do anything about these relationship postulates in therapy unless they hang fire. You just do the steps as I've given them to you. Do level one. Do level two. You do level three. And you do level four. And you do level five. And you don't concern yourself with the relationship postulates unless they hang fire.

1:16:59

Now. Now the only place they're going to hang fire eventually, and they might show up at level two, level three and you note them and you do take a bit of charge off them. Take a bit of charge



off them at level two, a bit more charge at level three, and level four you get a bit of charge, and at level five and ...and more charge comes off them but the things still hanging fire.

Ok. You've got right at the top of level five. You've nulled the "to know" goals package. You've run a lot of junior goals packages. You've run a lot of junior universes. This damn...double bind. This damned relationship is still hanging fire.

Alright, what can you do about it? Well we can erase them out the mind. Now any if A then B postulate can be erased from the mind by making it the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level Five C.

I'll give it to you again. Any "if A then B" postulate can be erased from the mind by making it the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level Five C.

But don't make a thing out of it. Look, 999 out of a thousand Bondings in your mind are going to come apart in routine therapy. They're simply going to fall apart under the impact of the levels of therapy. There's just the odd one or two that are going to hang fire and you need to know how to erase them. And the way to erase them, you make them the subject matter of the "to know" goals package at level Five C.

1:18:39

Now why does that erase them? It erases them like it...because any postulate can be made the subject matter of the "to know" goals package...it...at level Five C.

It's an existence isn't it? Any existence can be made the subject matter of that goals package. And is erasable at level Five C. So that's the way you...that's the way you will take them apart at level Five C.

They be...in other words the technology, the final technology of erasure of the relationship of "if A then B postulates from the mind" and get them...and put them.. for god's sake put them into the form "if A then B" before you attempt to erase them. Put them into the "if A then B form" and then erase them at level Five C.

It's one of the last things you do in therapy, by the way, will be these sticky hanging fire "if A then B relationships", that are hanging fire still.

1:19:36

Then you just knuckle down. One of the last things you do before the whole lot blows at level...before the whole lot level Five blows will be to get rid of these sticky, hanging fire relationships in your psyche.

1:19:47

Exceptions to the Rule

One exception to this general rule that I've given you, they can all be erased at level Five C with the exception of those relationships that you hold in common with your body. And now these will, almost exclusively, be relationships of a certain type on the subject of sex.

### Masculinity Double Bind

Now I can tell you what they will be. So you won't be surprised when you come across them. There is a double bind between the junior universe of masculinity and the postulate "must sex". And a double bind between the junior universe of masculinity and the postulate "mustn't be sexed."

### Femininity Double Bind

There is a double bind between the junior universe of femininity and the postulate must be sexed. And there's a junior universe...I'm sorry I messed up. Double bind between the junior universe of femininity and the postulate "mustn't sex".

1:20:55

Now they are the main ones. They are the main ones. You can erase them out of your psyche, but the body will still be subscribing to them. So don't be surprised if they continue to hang fire. Just become aware that their hanging fire because of their body relationships. Their part of your bodies psyche as well as yours. So just separate them out and then they'll go. Otherwise they'll go on forever.

1:21:22

### Eating Double Bind

Now they are the only exceptions that I know of. There could be...some people may have relationships on the subject of eating that also may hang fire. But I haven't come across them in my psyche. But they could occur too. But so..so look out for those as well. You could hold some relationships in common with your body on the subject of eating.

1:21:46

OK, well that about wraps it up, that about wraps it up. I wish you luck with your subject of relationships and bondings, and I wish you good luck in the erasure of these relationships in your psyche and in therapy. Bye bye for now.

End of tape.

